

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF ARIZONA
ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

VOLUME II

PUBLIC SESSION

Prescott, Arizona
September 5, 2001
11:11 p.m.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION

LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate No. 50349

1 THE STATE OF ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING
2 COMMISSION continued in Public Session on September 5,
3 2001, at 11:11 o'clock p.m., in Yavapai County at the
4 Prescott City Hall, 201 South Cortez, Prescott, Arizona,
5 in the presence of:

6

7 APPEARANCES:

8 CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN

9 VICE CHAIRMAN ANDI E. MINKOFF

10 COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK

11 COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL

12 COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

13 LISA HAUSER, Commission Counsel

14 JOSE DE JESUS RIVERA, Commission Counsel

15 DR. FLORENCE ADAMS, NDC, Consultant

16 DOUG JOHNSON, NDC, Consultant

17 MARGUERITE MARY LEONI, NDC Counsel

18 MARION PORCH, NDC Support Staff

19 ADOLFO ECHEVESTE, Executive Director

20 AMY REZZONICO, Press Information Officer

21 PAUL CULLOR, Outreach Staff

22 MIKE SAUNDERS, Outreach Staff

23 AUGUSTA KNIGHT, Outreach Staff

24 Spanish Interpreter

25 LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Court Reporter

 ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
 Phoenix, Arizona

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

PRESENTATION BY:

DOUG JOHNSON - NDC

1 southern portion of the state.

2 And just to briefly take up where we're
3 coming up with these different areas, how different
4 parts of the state can be laid out, each of the pieces
5 of the statewide map, regional areas, focus in on key
6 questions there, regional areas, the statewide maps, how
7 pieces fit together.

8 The goal is interchangeable pieces. As
9 you know, not everything is interchangeable in the
10 state. Everything fits in with everything else, changes
11 everything else, and hopefully we'll find out what it is
12 for a map we want to get.

13 In the southern area there are five key
14 areas, sources of considerable community interest, or as
15 we drew maps, it came down as key points where AURs,
16 communities of interest, or other criteria and
17 principles overlap or come into conflict: Yuma, Casa
18 Grande, the border district and Cochise are all southern
19 particular interests, and EACO, on this list, as in the
20 north overlaps both areas.

21 So, as you know, this is the adopted map.
22 You can see, we drew it with Yuma and La Paz. We don't
23 really have what we call a border district, more of
24 Pinal and Tohono O'odham and a Nogales district, and a
25 division of Cochise.

1 Does someone have the laser pointer?

2 MR. RIVERA: You have to pay for it.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: There's that bribe:
4 breakfast.

5 MR. JOHNSON: So you are all fairly
6 familiar with the map. This is the one posted on the
7 web.

8 Let me go on to area two, another test
9 map. You can see the notes on the side. This one has a
10 border district. You can see it takes in all of
11 Cochise, very similar to some of the scenarios presented
12 in Cochise. The main difference, we tried to put Sierra
13 Vista together as with Scenario Five, the Ortega
14 proposal.

15 MR. RIVERA: Ruben Ortega, not Danny
16 Ortega.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Not only put Sierra Vista
18 with Tucson, but split it, put Sierra Vista and avoid
19 the split. Put it with Santa Cruz and a considerable
20 portion Pima County.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: Majority-minority?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Majority-minority.

23 Casa Grande, Pinal, unifies, not having
24 the Sierra Vista Tucson districts. They have to make up
25 elsewhere. District Z, North Tucson, Saddlebrooke,

1 takes in North Pinal. Anything to take off Tucson has
2 to be picked off somewhere else.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: W minority-majority?

4 MR. JOHNSON: W is not.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: What are the
6 percentages, off the top of your head?

7 MR. JOHNSON: I don't know.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What is the letter
9 notation for the border district.

10 MR. JOHNSON: This is actually Y, hidden
11 in there. It's at the central point. I didn't notice
12 until you asked that, District Y.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on Y, if
14 looking at communities, of looking, minority
15 communities, border issues, all the way across, rural,
16 we've got some mining. I'm trying to think if anything
17 else really ties those together.

18 Are those the primary pieces that would
19 fit?

20 MR. JOHNSON: I don't remember all the
21 notes Mr. Baldenegro had. Those are the key ones. He
22 made a very detailed presentation. Those are key ones.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: His presentation
24 included Yuma.

25 MR. JOHNSON: His district was the

1 Congressional District.

2 MR. JOHNSON: The only real concern, this
3 triggers the fact the Tohono O'odham expressed
4 considerable concern about being included in a district,
5 dominated, as this may be, by Cochise. Cochise has
6 117,000 people. The rest of this is 54,000 between the
7 Santa Cruz and this area.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Any other Native
9 American Reservations there other than the Tohono
10 O'odham?

11 MR. RIVERA: The Pascua Yaqui piece,
12 Tucson.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's it?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Pascua Yaqui are not in Y?

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

18 MR. JOHNSON: When I show the zoom-in
19 maps, it will show.

20 Let me jump in.

21 Test three is largely in response to both
22 Mr. Baldenegro and the Tohono O'odham concerns. What we
23 tried to do in this test is draw a border district that
24 caught in the border communities, also the Town of
25 Douglas that wanted the mining, or majority-minority

1 district without the border dominated district. One
2 reaction.

3 None of the maps are perfect, I should
4 note. None of the maps are ones we recommend. What --

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Why a
6 majority-minority district?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Minority-majority heavily,
8 includes border towns.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Nogales.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Nogales as well.

11 MR. RIVERA: I think my cousin is there.

12 MR. JOHNSON: One small area, 30 percent
13 Hispanic, 50 percent minority, turned out to be a
14 prison.

15 MR. RIVERA: That's where my cousin was.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MR. JOHNSON: In response to
18 Mr. Baldenegro, it was to make sure we take it into
19 account.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I remind everybody, we're
21 on the record.

22 (The record notes Mr. Rivera's previous
23 comments were spoken with levity and laughing.)

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District E, echo
25 district, the western part, western edge of the county,

1 you've taken out Cochise. Other than that, does it
2 remain the same?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Up further, it includes
4 Flagstaff, Gila, and comes down.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Can we look at what
6 happens to the north?

7 MR. JOHNSON: We can show the statewide
8 maps.

9 The other piece, essentially the western,
10 northwestern, and southwestern Santa Cruz, it's part a
11 Hispanic AUR put with the southwestern Tucson, CC, DD
12 dominated districts.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Include Green
14 Valley?

15 MR. JOHNSON: CC does.

16 CC includes the I-19 corridor, the I-19
17 corridor except Nogales and overlapping communities of
18 interest, I-19, Green Valley, and Tucson.

19 Other things to point out on this map --

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: What did you do over
21 there in Yuma? Holy moley.

22 MR. JOHNSON: This is an alternative. We
23 mentioned a little bit about the north, you to need get
24 8,000 people to finish the Mohave Yuma districts. This
25 area of Ajo, Gila Bend, the whole area totals 8,000

1 people. And so it stays out of the municipal parts, or
2 urban parts of Maricopa, takes Gila Bend to finish the
3 districts. The configuration is only Mohave County and
4 La Paz, a tradeoff, stick out here, stick out in
5 Maricopa, or stick out in Yavapai to finish the
6 districts, three trade-offs to look at.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is District D?

8 MR. JOHNSON: District D, roughly done,
9 figures the West Valley district. The goal of this map
10 in that area is to not intrude into the West Valley
11 cities from the outside. The configuration of this
12 district, it could use work, probably end up putting D
13 and L together dividing North-South. So the key thing
14 to focus on here is this is Maricopa, the urban Maricopa
15 area, and it doesn't have intrusion by Yavapai, La Paz,
16 or Yuma areas, and includes Apache Junction and Gold
17 Canyon.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Gold Canyon with
19 Maricopa or Pinal?

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is Casa Grande split?

21 MR. JOHNSON: No. There's a line right
22 there by the south border of the Gila River Reservation.
23 The Ak-Chin Reservation goes north. The communities of
24 Casa Grande are all unified and in, I think, Nogales are
25 probably the most urban part of the entire district.

1 MS. HAUSER: Doug, do you have the
2 demographics for each of the alternatives?

3 MR. JOHNSON: I have them for the
4 statewide maps. I'll put the pieces together. I'll
5 hand them out to you as soon as I can show them.

6 The fourth option in the south, this one
7 is Casa Grande with Tohono O'odham, the urban
8 reservations. There is no border district -- I should
9 point out W and CC are showing up very similar. The
10 border between them is that dark line and the county
11 line. All Santa Cruz County is W. CC remains
12 dominated, all the people, and it does take CC from a
13 majority-minority to a solidly minority Hispanic
14 district, which has appeal there. In a way, the
15 offsets, the Santa Cruz Air Force Base, the immediately
16 surrounding area is taken into the pink DD East Tucson
17 District. So that's a tradeoff there. The --

18 Let me see. Tohono O'odham takes in an
19 urban configuration. This picks up Buckeye, short, pure
20 rural population, one place to go get it. That's all it
21 takes to get it.

22 Oh, EACO. This one has nice compact
23 districts, meets a bunch of goals of Tucson. Tohono
24 disadvantages. AUR, EACO, is one thing to keep in mind.
25 This is also one very close to the Cochise scenarios, as

1 well taking non-Reservation Graham and all of Greenlee.

2 The way this offsets it, you see the
3 statewide map taking in the portion Flagstaff and more
4 of Coconino up in north. I'll illustrate that in the
5 statewide map.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Some eastwide mining
7 communities.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Eastwide mining communities.
9 Dudleyville and Kearny. I'll go into what was EACO and
10 Superior and Top of the World, go in with Tohono and
11 Casa Grande.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Four Tucson
13 districts in this?

14 MR. JOHNSON: No, four, Z, A, DD --

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is DD?

16 MS. HAUSER: I see five.

17 MR. JOHNSON: I'll zoom in for Tucson on
18 that. I'll come back.

19 Let me come back, zoom in on Tucson for
20 this.

21 The last southern configuration, the
22 ripple is taking Apache out of EACO, putting it up with
23 Navajo, which is one of the possible ripples that could
24 occur. This one maintains kind of an EACO tone as we've
25 been calling it. EACO loses reservations, keeps

1 everything else, picks up a considerable part of eastern
2 Pinal.

3 We also illustrate this map, another one
4 of the Cochise County proposals, and take all of
5 Cochise, all of Santa Cruz, and essentially just the
6 Tohono reservation here.

7 This one, it makes Cochise County happy,
8 their proposals. Its affects on Pinal are not what we'd
9 want to brag about, because Sierra Vista is no longer
10 included in portions of Santa Cruz, no longer in
11 included Tucson districts, we have to go up central
12 Pinal up to Florence.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put up Tohono up
14 again.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Tohono O'odham objections?

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: What is the
17 population of the Apache White Mountain and San Carlos?
18 15,000 total?

19 MR. JOHNSON: About thirteen in one and
20 nine in the other. Roughly 22,000 or so. The tradeoff
21 is straight here, dropping 22,000, picking up 22,000.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Communities of
23 interest, the reason for pulling in those two
24 reservations is to take them back into the community of
25 native, the Hopi, Navajo, and other --

1 MR. JOHNSON: Right. This is a test of
2 the request of one Apache tribe to be in with the
3 Navajo.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Maricopa versions, Maricopa
5 has seen larger maps. There are four key looks at the
6 Apache Junction, Tempe, East Valley, all tied together.
7 Bring Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, it ripples through
8 South Mountain as well. We've only done one of the
9 trade-offs. Every test, the Isaac School District AUR
10 is separated slightly in the maps and also had a lot of
11 the community area near Indian School separated east at
12 19th that wanted to be unified.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Westwood Village.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Westwood Village. It TURNED
15 out to be identical population in the same districts.
16 Just swapped them back and forth very easily. We love
17 changes like that, very easy to do. It's possible to do
18 in all tests. It's not illustrated in all you see.

19 The other two areas, four urban
20 reservations in the West Valley, which are really the
21 key focus, Maricopa, adopted the map, looking for key
22 areas, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, out of Maricopa
23 with the urban districts, Tempe is all but unified in
24 District Q. Again, Isaac School, the switch we can make
25 easily, and then South Yavapai District comes down and

1 takes in a lot of the area of Peoria, the Sun Cities, El
2 Mirage, Buckeye, and really the Maricopa district.

3 The first test we've run continues to keep
4 Apache Junction and Gold Canyon not with the East
5 Valley, out of the urban districts. So that means Tempe
6 and the East Valley districts stay the same.

7 Changes here are this is where the two
8 Yavapai County districts come down. One is Verde
9 Valley, the Sedona Valley coming down into Cave Creek
10 and Peoria, and the Tri-Cities Districts coming down
11 into Surprise and Buckeye since all three, all these
12 Maricopa scenarios are closely related.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me interrupt.

14 When done in relation to what we're doing,
15 being done before the Phoenix meetings, done before --
16 these reflect --

17 DR. ADAMS: Ongoing.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Inter-tribal, South
19 Mountain, Estrella.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Directly driven.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: 17th?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Detailed information from
23 the Commission hearings or from citizens where we could
24 incorporate it, happened to be in area already, we would
25 attempt to, from the most part addressing the

1 Commission's instructions.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Doug, in the
3 presentation, for instance, I'm thinking of something we
4 heard at the meeting yesterday, there was pretty
5 consistent citizen input, probably need to test, can we
6 also give you those suggestions so you can begin working
7 on them in your next free moment?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Certainly. If you want to
9 give us information at the end of this meeting, or
10 e-mail "please look into it," call us, however you want.

11 DR. ADAMS: I'd add, Commissioner Minkoff,
12 we were provided seven summaries of the meetings held
13 last week. What we've done is taken a close look at the
14 items as they've come up. We don't have the detailed
15 transcripts from Tucson, so we can't look at some areas,
16 are having to go by our own notes, and some of the draft
17 notes. But what we're trying to do, as these things
18 come up, at least test them as we know you'll probably
19 be requesting tests of options.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One of the things I
21 remember coming up out Estrella yesterday, the five West
22 Valley communities all desiring to be in the same
23 district, which would require radical redesign of the
24 districts in Maricopa County. I think it's something
25 enough people said it, we probably need to test it. I

1 don't know whether it works or not, and obviously won't
2 know. Those are the kind of things that come up at the
3 meetings. There will be particular effort, like we
4 heard tonight, to do something different than what was
5 shown at the meeting.

6 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, I know
7 for a meeting, having spoken to Alan Heslop earlier,
8 he's completed a summary for the meeting, and we'll have
9 information about that.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You are
11 automatically testing anything, any subject of
12 significance from the testimony?

13 DR. ADAMS: Correct.

14 MR. JOHNSON: One thing, posting different
15 scenarios on the web, now citizens say: Okay, I want to
16 move these five districts around. As long as we do it
17 in the context of any one of the scenarios, so we know
18 it will work on a statewide basis, hopefully we'll get
19 detailed direction as well.

20 This is good example of that, the question
21 on the West Valley district here. In part due to time
22 constraints, in part we haven't had a chance to look at
23 the detailed transcripts to address that valley area, we
24 drew the West Valley focus, the West Valley together,
25 didn't spend any time at all on D and L to go in this

1 plan. Those districts can easily rotate around in a
2 logical distribution.

3 What this test does show, if we include
4 Apache Junction and Gold Canyon, we'll have population
5 to make almost entirely Maricopa Districts without
6 intrusion from the surrounding area except in the
7 Scottsdale, Cave Creek area. Again, could rotate and be
8 intrusion on the west side, if the goal is we needed to
9 do it for some other purpose in Yavapai. But you can
10 see, and this is a district where, my apologies on the
11 color here, have a district with most of Scottsdale
12 here, the neck of Scottsdale, and central district of
13 the Salt River here.

14 Let me clarify that. Other results are
15 putting Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and it ripples
16 through East Valley. We did not change the Gilbert
17 district, a small portion of the Mesa, Gilbert that
18 essentially unified and does ripple through. It affects
19 Mesa. Mesa maintains a significant portion of the
20 Apache Junction and entirely Mesa in R, a third of the
21 District in Q. Q, however, Tempe is no longer unified
22 in this. If we bring in Apache Junction without going
23 to reservations on the other side, then Tempe goes back
24 to division at the 60 Highway with a small piece of
25 Tempe split off Scottsdale.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Three pieces.

2 MR. JOHNSON: The main impact is to bring
3 Apache, Gold Canyon, with no options unless through the
4 reservations north or south or through South Mountain
5 district all the way through.

6 We attempted to divide, to distinguish, I
7 should say.

8 The other piece of this, I should say, the
9 division of Chandler is greatly reduced. Instead, the
10 dividing line is through a middle of Chandler and now
11 breaks off a small arm of Chandler.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: When Chandler spoke
13 to us, they were comfortable with the division at Dobson
14 Road. That's what they asked for.

15 In order to not chop up Tempe the way it
16 was chopped up, if you could in this scenario redivide
17 Chandler at Dobson Road and put it into District T, take
18 the portion of District T, put it back with Q, put the
19 Mesa portion in with, I guess, District U, if you do
20 that kind of switch so you don't have to chop up Tempe
21 quite so much, the Mesa portion is what it is, whether
22 in Q or U. It's not with the rest of Mesa. That might
23 allow Tempe to be more unified.

24 MR. JOHNSON: It is an option that would
25 bring in more of Tempe. We looked at how much it spins

1 around three districts. You could bring the divider
2 further down and get more of Tempe together. You
3 wouldn't be able to come down as far as we were before.

4 The thing is Chandler would come up, take
5 a portion of Mesa as an option. It was torn before the
6 competing priorities all over the East Valley. Mesa
7 didn't want a small sliver of Tempe, didn't want to be
8 divided.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How much of Mesa is
10 in this?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Mesa, 50, 60 thousand
12 people. Most have to stay there. That's a bridge.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Couldn't put them
14 in U, put the rest in T, and then the rest in Q?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Not enough people. Well,
16 could go into Chandler here, further than we did before,
17 to make it up.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Oh.

19 MR. JOHNSON: We could get halfway between
20 the plans, if that's what we wanted to do.

21 This test, the two lines, people liked the
22 highway on the map. If they prefer that, we could do
23 it.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on this one,
25 looking at M, L, and D, what was the background or

1 rationale for the wraparound and having such a long
2 north-south as opposed to trying to get three fairly
3 compact districts there?

4 MR. JOHNSON: District M, M is part of a
5 Hispanic AUR tied into all relationships for the
6 districts there. We didn't want to change M at all in
7 this test, because of those percentages being everywhere
8 people liked them, D and L not looking more appropriate
9 for a division, those were tied.

10 Definitely before we brought anything for
11 vote, certainly wanted to reconfigure those, in large
12 part looking at transcripts and more closely tying to
13 city borders, H could be figured in to work as well.

14 M has other issues.

15 Going to Tucson, the last area before I
16 get to the statewide pieces.

17 Tucson, four key points, south and central
18 Tucson, two points, discussion of the sliver,
19 north-south sliver between AA and CC, where there was a
20 request to move that, to make a more logical community
21 border. I haven't had a chance to draw the tradeoff
22 yet. In the initial analysis there shouldn't be much
23 problem. Steps two and three at that meeting, had to
24 get into 20, 25,000 people, big issues.

25 The other piece, other question in that

1 area, the Pascua Yaqui request for communities in the
2 Tucson area to be united. We have the reservation
3 united, a good description of kind of the northeast
4 Tucson piece of that, but Marana and South Tucson areas,
5 we are waiting for a map and requested that from them.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can I ask a question
7 from counsel for them? Had the principle to keep tribal
8 areas together, primarily reservation areas, there are a
9 lot of communities, a lot of areas where Native
10 Americans do reside outside traditional lands. The
11 incident of the Pascua Yaqui is one community with an
12 internal area of 50 residents, another 115 miles away,
13 Marana, 100, 200, for all I know. What is the feeling
14 of either, you know, rejecting, let's not keep them
15 together because it's a gross gerrymander if we tried to
16 tie them all together? I'm trying to find out what are
17 the rules of the game.

18 MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elder, you
19 are the ones that established the AURs, Native American
20 communities. Unless you get to the point of violating
21 Section Two or Section Five, there are no other criteria
22 to keep them together. In this situation, I don't think
23 you are violating Section Two or five.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue here, it
25 seems to me, we don't have reservation land. What we

1 have are members, subscribed members of a tribe, just as
2 we would with Flagstaff, living in Flagstaff off
3 reservation area still subscribed members of the Navajo
4 Nation.

5 MR. RIVERA: To a large extent Hopis have
6 substantial amounts of land outside the reservation, and
7 it's similar to that aspect.

8 You as Commissioners establish the AUR,
9 determined what AURs were, what the principles were.
10 It's not a solid, hard line. This does not violate
11 Section Two or five. You can.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Jose, my remembrance
13 is what we discussed were tribal lands. They were not
14 communities, areas outside tribal lands. There is not
15 something here, even a need to have the test done to see
16 how we link all these -- it's four different areas,
17 probably 40 miles apart.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think -- I agree,
19 Mr. Elder. I don't know that it would prove
20 particularly useful in testing. I do think, however,
21 knowing that there are pockets of Pascua Yaqui in Tucson
22 and where they are is useful in terms of drawing the
23 interior boundaries of Tucson districts, that is to say
24 as those districts may be reconfigured, either bullet
25 .1, some other testimony we've gotten in the Tucson

1 area, knowing those concentrations exist can be useful
2 and instructive in where lines might be drawn.

3 An attempt to unify them I think is
4 counterproductive in terms of the entire configuration
5 of the Tucson districts.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think individual
7 tribes making specific requests of which tribes they
8 prefer to be with, would prefer to be with, follows the
9 same parameters. We have principles, we all have
10 preferences, and to accommodate all of those at the
11 expense of a variety of other more significant issues
12 would be prohibitive.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sorry to interrupt.

14 MR. JOHNSON: No problem.

15 The other key point I point out, the
16 testimony from the Tucson area, three point, area
17 connections to Tucson as opposed to the Tohono O'odham
18 issue. We looked at it, connect to AA in all tests
19 without issues coming up.

20 This is the adopted plan.

21 One thing, the Pascua Yaqui, the only
22 reason we think we might be able to do it without too
23 much trouble once we get the maps for the areas
24 generally described is right at the northeast border
25 here, South Tucson --

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One up in Marana.

2 MR. JOHNSON: I have no idea of Marana,
3 where it is.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It is west of the freeway.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'll show you. They
6 have one area just about the A of Marana. You have the
7 one area referred to right there at the convergence of
8 I-10, I-19, and Grant Road right there on the east side
9 within the first half mile of Grant Road, right in the
10 center core. Trying to run a leg up to connect
11 something there, connect something there, heck --

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is the main
13 part of the Reservation?

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The main part of the
15 Reservation, this little piece of Santaveer District,
16 Tohono O'odham, Pascua Yaqui, this little area here.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put that in AA.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: That is taken out,
19 Pascua Yaqui and Tohono O'odham are together on tribal
20 lands.

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Unify the Pascua
22 Yaqui in AA, rather than the Tohono O'odham. There's no
23 way with all that territory.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Theoretically, expand AA,
25 bring all the folks together would be problematic. The

1 part about reaching up to Marana to take the Ruin Pueblo
2 into same the district.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Separate Tohono
4 O'odham, unify Pascua Yaqui and Tohono O'odham.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The area here, AA,
6 expand the area here through AA.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In order to reach.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: C could come back.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In order to do that, reach
10 into South Tucson, a one-mile square of incorporated
11 city, and you would have to extract 50 people. And it
12 would make no sense to do it.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm
14 wrong, we still basically have five Tucson dominated
15 districts there, right?

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: On that map, yes.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Adopted by --

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: This is adopted.
19 Sorry.

20 MR. JOHNSON: I should point out, as the
21 Commissioners note, District DD in this case goes down
22 and takes in the northeastern corner of Santa Cruz and
23 Sierra Vista.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sierra Vista.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: This is the adopted

1 map.

2 MR. JOHNSON: The first test we ran, you
3 can see if this focuses a little bit. District DD, in
4 this case, this is a district where it comes out of
5 Sierra Vista, Cochise County is unified, DD is not in
6 it, the north half of Santa Cruz as opposed to northeast
7 corner. As a result of DD coming out of Sierra Vista,
8 more Catalina Foothills District Z, more Lynn Valley,
9 Saddlebrooke district goes north into east Pinal County.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: How far does it go, Doug?
11 What does it take?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Takes a lot. This one goes
13 up to Florence. Not including Florence, but a lot.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Kearny.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Kearny and Mammoth.

16 MR. JOHNSON: All tests, Three Points is
17 with AA. Some strange lines on the border, all are done
18 to make sure it works from a population equality
19 standpoint. We'd clean these up in the final map.

20 This is the next test we did in the Tucson
21 area, in this case Santa Cruz County. This is the
22 skinny border district, I should say, the Tohono O'odham
23 District, that comes across and picked up Douglas. DD,
24 EE stretches across Santa Cruz, remains --

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do the numbers correspond?

1 Does Southern Arizona two correspond with Tucson two?

2 MR. JOHNSON: No. We'll see them put
3 together --

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It would be really helpful
5 on a map labeled to zoom in on Tucson and also be to
6 maybe put them together.

7 MR. JOHNSON: The trap between -- many
8 maps are the same.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're trying to be
10 instructive.

11 MR. JOHNSON: After the presentation, I'll
12 show statewide map references.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe go statewide,
14 zoom in. I'm completely confused. One in the north.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Keep going.

16 MR. JOHNSON: There's only one more.

17 This is to show you Santa Cruz County
18 split up. Z only gets Saddlebrooke. This is where EACO
19 comes down into Cochise.

20 This map is the major change, Tucson area
21 zoom-ins.

22 This is one where CC comes into Santa Cruz
23 County, it's out of the Air Force area. That's entirely
24 DD. CC, however, remains dominated by the Tucson area.
25 Population is extremely dense, a hundred thousand people

1 from the Tucson area.

2 Commissioner Huntwork, to return to your
3 question asked earlier about the map, we still do get
4 the five Tucson dominated districts even though this one
5 small area of Tucson population is still there.

6 This is the Cochise united Santa Cruz map.
7 District DD is entirely within Pima County, shows how
8 much more Pima County picks up. This where District Z
9 goes up into central Pinal and takes in all of that
10 area.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Central Pinal like --

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Includes Casa Grande.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This one really is
14 chopped up.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Four significant pieces as
16 opposed to four corners. Chopping up.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: That is where Cochise
18 is taking in Graham and Greenlee.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, and Santa Cruz.

20 Now statewide, the maps put the pieces
21 together. The principles in each of the maps, they
22 start out saying two, three of the goals had in drawing
23 the statewide map. You know the key areas now.

24 The current LD gives, since that's where
25 you were coming from, you see the statewide map. It's

1 lines how divide areas, the current districts in Tucson,
2 current districts in Maricopa. It's the adopted and you
3 know well. I'll skip through it quickly. Scenario A,
4 started in the Cochise counties, Ortega districts,
5 unified Sierra Vista and put it with the statewide map.

6 What is the impact statewide? Able to
7 preserve EACO, the Kingman river district, unified
8 Prescott and the Verde Valleys.

9 This is scenario A, the statewide map.
10 Key points, here's the border district. Split Santa
11 Cruz. Each of the Yavapai Valley areas is unified and
12 each comes down into Maricopa.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Phoenix /rea.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Deeply into the Phoenix
15 area.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Yavapai is split on
17 Mingus? I'm confused there.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Keeping to --

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Split at Verde
20 Valley, right in the middle?

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: Unify Verde?
22 Splitting Verde?

23 MR. JOHNSON: It follows essentially the
24 Census tract and Census tract divisions of the
25 population. All population of Verde Valley is here.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Split at Mingus
2 Mountain.

3 DR. ADAMS: Basically.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Over here on whatever
5 the right district is, C.

6 MR. JOHNSON: C.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: C comes down.

8 MR. JOHNSON: C comes down to North
9 Phoenix, the valley area, a piece of Flagstaff.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: And C.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Florence, is there
12 another one of those?

13 MS. LEONI: We're passing those out.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Everybody but me.

15 MS. LEONI: Strange.

16 DR. ADAMS: Strange. I believe I passed
17 one to the Chair but not the other Commissioners yet.

18 MS. LEONI: What you just received is the
19 demographic data for the full maps.

20 MR. JOHNSON: The top stapled the maps and
21 the letter.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I apologize. I'm
23 not able to absorb any more information. Further
24 participation in the meeting is pointless. I'll excuse
25 myself and study this at length when I have the ability

1 to. I now have the breakdown, which will be helpful.
2 Hopefully in a day or two it will be on computer.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll be there
4 myself. Just go through quickly.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There is a scheduling
6 issue you may want to participate in.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If it's okay with
8 the rest with you, go through quickly. No questions.
9 I'll study them. I'm where Jim is.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The scheduling
11 issue, is it helpful to me?

12 MR. JOHNSON: I could wrap up in five
13 minutes.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I have
15 a motion. I'd like to have the full Commission, if we
16 could, later on.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Move expeditiously through
18 this, and see what we can about scheduling.

19 MR. JOHNSON: I'll point out I'll point
20 out different pieces. A Northern District takes in
21 pieces of North Holbrook, not Holbrook, splits Yavapai
22 in half, and creates a Northern District here. You've
23 seen scenarios here now probably very familiar to you.
24 We'll get you this in a printout form, go through all
25 the details.

1 Scenario B, another detail, aimed to
2 unite, Pinal is the border. The northern district in
3 this case did not come down into the area here at all.
4 EACO does go into Flagstaff to make up for Cochise being
5 unified here.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Does that put
7 Sedona with Flagstaff or Sedona with Yavapai?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Sedona with Yavapai. United
9 Sedona, a small piece of Maricopa. Sedona.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Is this map three
11 we were talking about earlier?

12 MR. JOHNSON: No. This is a united
13 Yavapai, I think two. I'll point out three. Number 3
14 does not include Sedona.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sedona is excluded.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Sedona, Yavapai in
17 this one.

18 MR. JOHNSON: In this case, Sedona is with
19 Yavapai. This is map CC and it comes down to Tucson and
20 takes all Santa Cruz County.

21 I'll skip through.

22 The next one I'll skip over.

23 Attempting to do the Cochise request,
24 Cochise, without going to Tohono O'odham, the population
25 is not there. Districts were 14,000 15,000 off. Tried

1 it. Skipped over it without being able to finish it.
2 Essentially population numbers, go all way in and take
3 in Tohono O'odham.

4 Statewide, the Apache Navajo border
5 district, it split Pinal, talking about here. This map
6 also, may be able alter this north-south division way
7 into Maricopa. At first glance it does divide the
8 Prescott Tri-City areas as well.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on the surface,
10 that is a ugly map. I'm sorry.

11 MR. JOHNSON: That doesn't surprise us at
12 all.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: It may mathematically
14 work out well, but it's ugly.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: I second that.

16 MR. JOHNSON: The scenario, second to
17 last, the narrow border district, EACO without Gila, now
18 you see the whole Flagstaff Gila urban reservations, a
19 little more of east Pinal, Gila, Ak-Chin, with the
20 Northern Districts. Tohono O'odham comes down.

21 This is option three we talked about in
22 Yavapai, the dark line cutting out Sedona. To make up
23 for that it takes in in Coconino the Williams area,
24 takes in just rural Maricopa there, not any of the
25 Phoenix cities.

1 Zoom in on Phoenix there.

2 District F, small changes here. Doesn't
3 correspond to the data sheets you have. Only districts
4 affected is B, D, and X.

5 Essentially what we changed in B, first
6 did this, coming way over to Yavapai. Talk about an
7 ugly district, we rotated around the two more
8 traditional river districts like this. So, this is the
9 split between the two areas in Yavapai. However, it has
10 less intrusion into the Phoenix cities. Area District C
11 now goes all the way up to Flagstaff, includes a portion
12 of Flagstaff.

13 This also has a plan for the Gila Apache
14 reservations split off from EACO. Apache goes with
15 Navajo, Gila goes with Salt River in east Pinal, also in
16 response to one of the Cochise plans they drew,
17 attempted to draw coming up here. That's what started
18 us coming off with the map.

19 Statewide plans go into more detail.

20 At another meeting or another hearing,
21 we'll get on the computers as soon as we overcome the
22 size issues.

23 I'll hand it over to Marguerite.

24 MS. LEONI: I'll be extremely brief. I
25 know people want to be on their way. It's quite late.

1 What we prepared for you is some
2 additional information on competitiveness. We promised
3 the last element of this -- the package, information
4 you'd get on competitiveness is the Judge It analysis.
5 What I'm giving you now is the registration, two major
6 party registration and third party registration for all
7 cities, designated places, counties, and the AURs. In
8 addition to that you'll be receiving the thematic maps
9 which shade the registration by Census tract and -- with
10 the districts and cities and counties superimposed. And
11 they are in these packets. I need to caution you about
12 one matter. When you see the map deeply colored for a
13 particular party indicating registration perhaps over 50
14 percent, be careful. There could be 10 people in a
15 Census tract. What you need to do is go look, use your
16 computers to find the population in the Census Tract.
17 This tool will tell you how those people are registered.

18 MR. JOHNSON: For the public here, we'll
19 work with Tim to get the information quickly up on the
20 website.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: While doing that, if
22 we could get the three scenarios used in this meeting on
23 the website, one, two, and three, or whatever it was,
24 there are several requests from the public it be on
25 there, so they could take a look at them and be

1 evaluating.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Yavapai alternative.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 3 and 4, really.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Want all statewide maps up
5 there?

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Who has the memorandum on
7 the new schedule?

8 It's not a rhetorical question.

9 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, I
10 actually -- actually I e-mailed that one to everyone
11 today and neglected to make copies of it. I have it
12 right here on Marguerite's computer because I also
13 e-mailed it to her.

14 Do you have a copy of it?

15 MR. JOHNSON: I can put it on the screen.

16 DR. ADAMS: We can put it on the screen,
17 if that's helpful.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: While Doug's doing that,
19 is your motion related to something other than that?

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Want to try that now?

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Hall, want to
23 make a motion?

24 I'd like to revisit the competitiveness
25 aspect of it, be able to direct the consultant as we go

1 through the various scenarios to use the 90-minute run,
2 not the two-week run, just to get an idea where we're
3 standing on competitiveness. And that was defeated at
4 the last meeting. I assume the consultants are not
5 doing that because I'm not seeing that. I'd like to
6 make a motion to direct the consultants to prepare
7 alternatives for review to include an analysis for
8 competitiveness.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

12 Ms. Leoni?

13 DR. ADAMS: I'd like Marguerite Leoni to
14 speak to the issue. It's something we address in the
15 memo just given you.

16 MS. LEONI: Yes, Commissioner Elder.
17 Thank you for bringing it up. I wasn't going to bring
18 it up due to the lateness of the hour. I thought you'd
19 see it in the memo.

20 During the paragraph of memo references,
21 the fact we're prepared to link our data base to what
22 we're calling the Quick and Dirty Analysis. We need
23 clarifications on how the linkages should occur. The
24 analysis initially given you is only a two-party
25 analysis. You may recall at recent meetings there has

1 been a good deal of testimony on the importance of third
2 parties. What we'd like to do is redesign, it would not
3 take much time, that analysis to include the third-party
4 vote, third-party candidates in races analyzed, see how
5 it would change percentages one way or the other. We'd
6 like Commission instruction, number one, on doing that,
7 do you want us to do it, and, number two, go ahead to do
8 it and to give you the analysis with changes.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Last time we
11 talked about it it was also very late. The problem
12 then, as now going, is to be able to try to understand
13 what we're saying.

14 What do we mean by competitiveness? If
15 the issue is simply providing us with a breakdown
16 between -- statistical breakdown between party
17 registration and whatever other column can you give us,
18 no problem at all. In fact, it's already in the stuff
19 on these statewide tests.

20 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, it's
21 slightly, slightly different. It simply is additional
22 data. It is not a statement as to what is competitive
23 or what is not. Do you desire additional data. But
24 what it tells you is how particular elections that were
25 run in this state in 1998 and 2000 would result if they

1 were run in the new districts.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay. Sounds
3 fine.

4 MS. LEONI: That's all it would tell you.
5 We're not making any recommendation based on that data
6 or any other data about what is competitive.

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Is that the sense
8 of the motion?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to find out
10 based on a statewide nonmarquee type of vote just where
11 we're going, if we had three, is that more competitive
12 than five? We'd have more information to be able to
13 make decisions on, the public also.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff --

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: My understanding is
16 we have our consultant nobody has control of that has
17 promised to have the '96 data on Thursday for
18 historical.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: EDS.

20 MS. HAUSER: Which consultant?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: EDS.

22 MS. HAUSER: Information from the racial
23 block expert, has that.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: My understanding,
25 that would be returned around Thursday.

1 MS. HAUSER: Not for '96.

2 Is she having '96 tomorrow?

3 MS. LEONI: The e-mail I got from her,
4 Commissioner Elder, at the beginning of this week, it
5 would be ready by Friday. This is on racial block
6 voting, not on competitiveness, racial block voting.
7 Three years of racial block voting analysis. We will
8 not have yet, I don't know data base, county election
9 and ballot measure elections.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: City Council Person
11 Williams during the night at our meeting, he referenced
12 that there was a great deal difference between an East
13 Mesa Republican and Ahwatukee Republican's voting
14 patterns, maybe a Tempe Republican. The analysis you
15 gave us, the Quick and Dirty Analysis, I think is a
16 better reflection of competitiveness statistics you gave
17 us tonight than party registration. If you can do that
18 factoring in third party votes, not registration, but
19 third party votes, I think that would be very, very
20 helpful in terms of analyzing alternative scenarios
21 which I'd like very, very much. That's my understanding
22 that's the sense of the motion.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

24 MS. HAUSER: In Tucson we were provided,
25 Jose presented competitiveness on a chart, quick and

1 dirty proposed drafts for the existing districts, the
2 Democratic plan. Really all this motion, as I
3 understand it, would do essentially is add new columns
4 to the same analysis, running the same data on new
5 plans, each alternative, simply adding a new column.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Excellent.

7 Further discussion on the motion.

8 Ms. Adams.

9 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of
10 the Commissioner, my only concern in running the test
11 way run before is that it was clearly labeled simply a
12 two-party vote. If it is the Commission's desire, we
13 will, we're attempting to get data so we can have third
14 party information disaggregated so we can use it in this
15 quick and dirty analysis. And we're prepared to go
16 forward with that and then run analysis on all those
17 plans in that manner, if you so choose. Otherwise we'd
18 strongly recommend you label that that the percentage
19 reflects only a two-party vote.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fine.

21 Ready for the question?

22 All those in favor of the question,
23 signify by saying "aye."

24 (Vote taken.)

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ah posted say no.

1 Motion carries.

2 Schedule.

3 DR. ADAMS: Some discussion about
4 schedule, some discussion August 17th, talked about it
5 again at Mesa. My understanding is that than during the
6 night when Dr. Heslop at meeting South Mountain you came
7 to some conclusions he shared with me today we put in
8 memo form. So if this meets commissions approval this
9 is what we'd like propose opportunity first interim
10 report. Then September 17th we would like to come back
11 with a second interim report sharing with you, again,
12 various scenarios. These will all go out on web, all
13 data attached to them as they did this evening. And
14 then on September 20th through 22nd although prepared
15 adjust that to accommodate Jose I understand out of
16 country we suggest September 20th through 22nd go 18th
17 through 20th or 19th through 21st so Jose can be part of
18 those individual meetings or at least one day.
19 September 25th NDC's report come out, comprehensive
20 review all work performed together with clearly stated
21 results and options, so you would know what choices you
22 would have to make. Following September 25th IRC
23 attorneys report come out, cover our report, and also
24 include competitiveness and racial block voting block
25 analysis reports. October second public hearings would

1 begin.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask a
3 question. Does that mean we'll get no information on
4 racial block voting analysis until sometime after
5 September 25th?

6 DR. ADAMS: I'm going to let the attorneys
7 answer that question.

8 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, this is
9 a matter I was going to discuss later on today with your
10 attorneys. I'm concerned about the lateness of the day.
11 But we do have -- delays are out of our control. I want
12 to discuss with them whether it makes any sense to
13 prepare an interim report on what we have now.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would think that
15 potentially could be a very serious problem, if we've
16 gotten that period of time, examined scenarios with NDC,
17 made a suggestion, they've made a preparatory report,
18 and all of a sudden the racial block voting analysis
19 report blows everything we've done out of the water, we
20 have very, very serious problems.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

22 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, Members
23 of the Commission, my understanding is we could indeed
24 prepare an interim report. In fact, Ms. Leoni and I
25 discussed as driving up here it would probably be

1 important to go ahead and see if we could get a report
2 prepared. My understanding is that 1998 and 2000 are
3 complete. What we're missing is the 1996 full report
4 and local elections we think are important. If had an
5 interim report --

6 MS. LEONI: Balance measures.

7 DR. ADAMS: I agree with you. Do an
8 interim report, if that's agreeable. And we could, I'm
9 looking at all the attorneys here, I'm hoping maybe
10 report something on that on the 17th so we have that
11 information prior to the individual meetings. I would
12 say the same thing about the competitiveness report,
13 which I understand is going to be coming out, the Judge
14 It report, should be coming out by the end of this week
15 is my understanding.

16 Also, we'd move very quickly forward to
17 add third party to the Quick and Dirty reports, we've
18 run all those reports, add them to the various scenario
19 reports as well as add them to the individual meetings
20 to make adjustments prior to the final report.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

22 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
23 Commission, our understanding is what you are looking at
24 here is a schedule that references competitiveness and
25 racial block voting very specifically with respect to

1 what is on table at that moment and related to specific
2 plans. But as soon as we have the reports on
3 competitiveness and racial block voting in general, that
4 information would be presented to the Commission. It's
5 just when you are close to adopting a final plan you
6 would take the previous reports and tie it in. That's
7 really all it ties into. As soon as the actual report,
8 you have the preliminary data, I think -- I mean -- Jose
9 would probably agree with me on this -- we have stuff we
10 could turn out that would be unintelligible without a
11 written report to go with it. I mean, it's just very
12 difficult to make heads or tails of it. We need a
13 written report with it. As soon as we have that, it
14 goes right to the Commission.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: About the schedule.
16 September 17th, I stated previously I have a problem
17 that day. We'd have to be through, I'll push back, but
18 seriously, at 2:00 o'clock I'm out the door. Is that a
19 meeting that can be finished?

20 MS. HAUSER: What day?

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The 17th.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can I have an
24 answer?

25 THE COURT: Dr. Adams.

1 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, Members
2 of the Commission, I think if we start early on that
3 day, that we certainly should. Say, start at 8:00
4 o'clock, we should be able to in six hours cover the
5 remainder of the issues.

6 As you can see, we've covered with many
7 options a lot of areas of the state. We realize that
8 some other things are going come up as we go through and
9 finish the hearings, some of which we may have already
10 addressed as we have this evening prior to this meeting.
11 So I think we should be able to finish in that time
12 frame.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, can
15 I make a motion we adopt the schedule.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You certainly can. It's
17 been moved and seconded.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: For the purpose of
20 discussion, the purpose of the September 17th is to
21 receive information.

22 If September 17th is to receive
23 information, provide instruction, let's be clear, none
24 of the Commissioners need an additional meeting to
25 receive information. What we do need is a schedule

1 which accommodates receiving information at a time of
2 day when we can deal with it. Part of issue tonight, a
3 significant amount of information just transmitted, I'm
4 in no position to respond to it this evening, so it
5 builds up.

6 I guess the question is: What is the
7 purpose other than receiving an interim presentation
8 such as we received tonight?

9 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of
10 the Commission, basically it's to receive information as
11 you did this evening.

12 What we can do, alternatively, as we test
13 things, with permission of Commission, if you feel we
14 can, in our judgment, determine those important issues
15 out of each of those hearings as they come up, we'll
16 test those things and pass them to you. It may not
17 always be in the context of a statewide map. It may be
18 in the context of one of six options we've already shown
19 you and talk to you about implications of those. We
20 would not be in a position to produce a new statewide
21 map with every small change.

22 We'd be happy to do that, send you the
23 maps and send you data or send it to Tim and have him
24 put it on your computer and you can analyze it.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The last time we had a

1 public hearing scheduled with all five present, is there
2 another meeting, Phoenix, next week --

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Glendale? Only one
4 missing Wednesday night.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Glendale might very
6 well be.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This is it.

8 MR. ECHEVESTE: This is it.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, to your motion,
10 Mr. Huntwork, I'm concerned about adopting the schedule
11 as is because I think there are some unanswered
12 questions about the 17th, also coordination issues
13 between counsel and the consultant need to occur. I'm
14 concerned about adopting it this evening.

15 There is a motion on the floor for
16 discussion.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we don't adopt
18 it this evening, what do we do?

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I suggest if issues are
20 worked out, I think you see the sense of the schedule
21 here. They asked a question about the 17th. The 17th
22 is still at issue in terms of whether or not we need a
23 formal meeting. If there are other things we need do
24 that day, it may be a day to schedule a meeting. What I
25 suggest, rather than vote on the schedule this evening,

1 that we ask that counsel and the consultant get
2 together, make sure they are clear on the purpose of
3 each of the dates on this, that they poll the Commission
4 and we vote on it individually --

5 Can't do it.

6 MS. HAUSER: No, Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ratify at a later meeting?

8 With all due -- the problem, we cannot
9 vote tonight, I don't believe.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: You'll have a quorum
11 at one of the meetings.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Certainly, we will. I'm
13 trying to be respectful of everybody's ability to adopt
14 this.

15 Dan, you will be the one missing at
16 Glendale. If you don't mind for of us doing it.

17 Who's in Flag?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Everybody but me.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I won't be either.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think also,
21 Mr. Chairman, I think we're missing a step in here. At
22 some point prior to the marathon meeting in October, we
23 have to provide instruction to our consultants with
24 respect to adjustment for competitiveness, analyzed
25 data, at some point say to them: You know what, test

1 these considerations. If, based upon what we've
2 received and based upon what we understand, see if in
3 reality they work. So I don't see that step in there
4 anywhere at all.

5 To think somehow we'll show up on October
6 2nd and digest all the information we've received after
7 the individual meetings and consider all the options
8 we've seen tonight, the problem will be there will be
9 another five, 10 more options, and we haven't instructed
10 them to consider competitiveness issues. It's not
11 realistic.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

13 MS. HAUSER: One of the things it's
14 important to note about the 17th, I heard Dr. Adams say
15 it was primarily to present information on the results
16 of testing options. You will have more competitiveness
17 information at that point.

18 I do think, just given the history
19 developed with the Commission and consultants and the
20 way interaction has seemed to occur, that even though
21 being presented with options, you'll give additional
22 instruction and it will be a different take on a
23 different form and different tone, if you will, if it is
24 done collectively as opposed to each of you individually
25 receiving information and issuing your own set of

1 instructions to the consultants.

2 Correct me if I'm wrong, we will have
3 additional competitiveness information at that point.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion?

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the
6 key sense of this, a lot of what being said here doesn't
7 seem important to resolve now, necessarily, due to the
8 time. It seems as if it's certain important, and
9 there's an informality to the process. We're really
10 describing after today a process of getting additional
11 information as it's available from our consultants and
12 attorneys on a variety issues and alternative plans,
13 competitiveness, you know, block voting data, and other
14 matters that are going to be important. The important
15 thing is that essentially by the 17th, we have to have
16 that process pretty well along and that information in
17 our hands. By the 22nd, the 20th to 22nd, we have to
18 have those individual meetings, have to be in a position
19 to discuss all of that intelligently. We have to have a
20 final report about then, about the 25th, and have to
21 start hearings on October 2nd. There's a big area from
22 the hearing, between the 25th and -- maybe we shouldn't
23 try to pin it down so much. In general, I don't know
24 that we need to adopt any motions. Let's proceed on
25 this basis.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Move the 17th down to
2 the 20th? Why the gap?

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure we
4 need the 17th.

5 Can we just authorize the Chairman to
6 schedule the meeting on the 17th should it be necessary?

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Perhaps what --
8 September 5 through September 20th, develop information
9 and detail as rapidly as possible.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We may need additional
11 meetings noticed and scheduled in order to do that.

12 Want to withdraw the motion?

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, want to
15 withdraw your second?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't know.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Only if we want to get
18 home.

19 What we're saying is the sense of the
20 schedule is appropriate, the flow is reasonable. The
21 orderliness is reasonable. And the interval, at least
22 in the beginning, is reasonable. But again that area
23 from the 17th to the 20th needs to be thought through.
24 And I'll work with you on getting something done.

25 Further business this evening.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to suggest
2 any meeting scheduled, any meeting during that time,
3 everybody be contacted by e-mail to make sure we're all
4 available.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

6 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of
7 the Commission, also know there is a holiday of concern
8 to Ms. Minkoff and Ms. Hauser during that time. We need
9 to avoid rescheduling the meeting if we don't have it on
10 the 17th. We can't have it on the 18th.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Or 19th.

12 DR. ADAMS: We would have to move to the
13 20th, if we decided to have a meeting to give
14 instruction.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Understand.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further business, counsel?

17 MS. HAUSER: No.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Be sure to keep in mind any
19 registration data in Gila County is incorrect. They
20 don't have data for anyone but Republicans, which is a
21 source of confusion.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No Democrats?

23 MR. JOHNSON: No data indicating where
24 they are. We don't know where they are.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the woods hiding.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Meeting adjourned.
2 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at
3 approximately 1:49 a.m.)

4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

* * * *

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
COUNTY 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 taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 56 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

