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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
My name is Steve Lynn and I Chair the Independent Redistricting Commission.
I'd like to call this meeting to order.
(Chairman speaks in Spanish asking if anyone needs a Spanish interpreter; Chairman indicates the interpreter. No one requests the interpreter's services.)
Ed, if you would, please.
(Navajo interpreter speaks in Navajo and asks in Navajo if anyone requires the services of a Navajo interpreter. No one requests the services of the Navajo interpreter.)
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also, I might ask a representative of the Hopi Tribe to ask the same question in Hopi, if we may.
Mr. Canty, thank you very much.
MR. CANTY: Scott Canty representing the ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE Phoenix, Arizona
Hopi Tribe.

There are several individuals from the Hopi Tribe here tonight; however, they all speak fluent English. There is no need of an interpreter.

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

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, the Commission is here to hear your testimony regarding the draft maps made public, Congressional and Legislative maps in draft form, that have been published and are the subject of the second round of public hearings around the state.

As is the custom, we'd like to begin this evening with a brief Power Point presentation to give you a kind of update of where we are, introduce the maps in a way which we'd like the discussion to go, then spend the bulk of the evening listening to the public.

So, if we may, my fellow Commissioner, Mr. Hall, will make a Power Point presentation this evening.

Mr. Hall.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. It's a pleasure to be with you tonight.

MS. REZZONICO: You went out.
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VOICES: It's off.

Use the podium.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thanks, Adolfo.

It's good to be with you again. I was

with you here a few months ago at a different location.

It's great to be back.

As you know, this is the second round of

public hearings. The first round, we held 24 public

hearings throughout the state. Now we're in the midst

of the second round. I haven't seen my home in a couple

of weeks. It's been a pleasure to go throughout the

state and meet a variety of citizens, hear their input,

hear their ideas, and hear what they would like. That's

really the purpose of this hearing today is for us to

try and understand your perspective and do the best we

can to hear that and balance that with all the interests

we hear. Therefore, we welcome you here.

As you know, the Commission has draft

plans for both the Congressional and Legislative

Districts. As you know, these plans were developed and

we're in the process, pursuant to Proposition 106, which

was established last year. Guidelines were established

under that proposition for all of our review which are

as follows: A through F. The first two are federal

requirements.
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First of all, to comply with the federal United States Constitution and the United States Voting Rights Act.

Second, we must have Congressional Districts of equal population, to the extent practicable, and State Legislative Districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable.

The rest are other areas that we -- goals we must try and accomplish and balance.

That districts be geographically compact and contiguous.

They shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable.

They shall use visible geographical district lines and Census tracts.

And finally, to the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no detriment to other goals.

That's our challenge.

It's no secret, many goals in a variety of areas on occasion compete with one another. Therefore, we're seeking your assistance in an effort to try and find solutions.

Proposition 106 required us to begin designing a grid. That's what we took to the first
round of public hearings across the state. The grid was based upon a -- created upon townships, which is a six-square mile of building blocks, and aggregating those townships in an arbitrary fashion only considering equal population in that design. It's clear, however, the grid did not meet many of the other goals which were previously discussed.

These are the two grids that were developed, the Legislative and Congressional grid. The Commission then has taken the challenge which is in the process. This is a work in process of us adjusting the grid to create draft maps and adjusting the draft maps as we go along in an effort to try and make districts that comply with all the goals that we have been given.

The citizens made it clear in the first round we should follow the following basic principles and priorities:

To respect communities of interest, the best we can.

To respect the integrity of cities, towns, and local government boundaries, the best we can.

And the citizens identified communities in their region they wish to preserve, and we called those communities of interest AURs, or Arizona units of representation. It's simply a term we have utilized to
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define what we heard from you are your communities of interest.

The three major communities of interest which were identified were Native Americans and Tribal Reservations, Hispanic communities of interest, and rural and urban communities. There was a very clear distinction, in most cases.

Because the Commission followed the mandates of 106 and principles expressed, the districts developed by the draft plans are very different from the existing districts of the Congressional map.

The draft plans have many fewer city and town splits. The Congressional District, existing Congressional Districts, have 16 split cities and towns. The draft Congressional Districts have only split less than half of those six cities and towns. The existing Legislative Districts split 39 cities and towns where our draft plan only splits about a third of those, exactly a third, 13 cities and towns.

Some cities cross city boundaries and tribal reservations. In such cases, county lines should be split but elsewhere an effort should be made to unite counties. Existing Congressional Districts have five split counties. Elsewhere, draft Congressional Districts, draft Congressional Districts only split one
more county.

Existing Legislative Districts, 13 split counties. Draft Legislative Districts only splits nine counties.

States, major communities of interest are respected. Tribal reservations are undivided. And in many cases they're unified with other tribal reservations to maximize the amount of Native American voice. Hispanic communities of interest are kept together. Rural and urban communities are distinguished. And most of the AURs which were established by reason of the first public hearings have been respected in the draft plans.

Proposition 106 did not allow the Commission to consider competitiveness of districts earlier in the process.

Under this proposition, the competitive districts should be favored where there is no substantial detriment to other goals. We're now in the process of making those considerations.

As we receive that data, that has become of variable consideration as we analyze input and make adjustments in an effort to achieve that also as an additional goal.

The Commission has designed the following
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draft plans for the Arizona eight Congressional
Districts. I'm sure you've seen them.

This is how the map looks on this screen.

However, the contrast is not the most effective.

We have lettered the districts in an
effort to avoid any confusion with respect to the
current existing six Congressional Districts. Of
course, when we finalize our plan they will be numbered
appropriately.

You can see where we sit today. We reside
ing draft Congressional District C, which is a totally
rural district.

Please.

This is a zoom-in on the Phoenix
Metropolitan area where you can see those districts in
more detail, F being primarily East Valley, E
Scottsdale, B the North-South West Valley.

Please.

This is a -- this is a zoom-in on the
Tucson Metropolitan area where the dividing line is for
the -- to the southern draft Congressional Districts.

We have also a draft plan, as you know, on
the 30 Legislative Districts.

They, again, are lettered. Since there
are only 26 letters of the alphabet, some have double
letters. This is a zoom-in version of the Phoenix Metropolitan area draft Legislative plan and a zoom-in version of the Tucson Metropolitan area.

We're here to hear testimony from you and welcome your input. You have copies of maps and opportunities to provide that input in writing, within the citizen kits, you should have had an opportunity to receive at the front table. You also can write us and mail your input or e-mail us at our website. And as we have these plans as they are, on our website, for your review, and last night we had other alternatives presented to us by our consultants as we continue to work on this work in progress. And soon they'll also be posted. Hopefully, our goal allow you, to the greatest extent possible, to follow the activity and make this activity as open as possible. Our e-mail website is www.azredistricting.org.

We now would welcome and appreciate the opportunity to hear what you have to say in an effort to help us to achieve that goal.

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

Ladies and gentlemen, if you do wish to speak tonight, we would ask that you fill out a yellow speaker slip. Mr. Elder is holding them up and
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Mr. Echeveste is holding them up. If you've already done so, we have them up here. If you'd like to do so at any time in the evening, request one, if you'd like to do so.

Let me show you who we are. I'll start to my immediate right. The Commissioners, Dan Elder, one of the five Commissioners, is from Tucson. Mr. Hall, Joshua Hall, is from Northern Arizona, St. Johns. And the three of us are the only Members of the Commission here this evening.

As you might imagine, we have a very aggressive schedule around the state. It isn't possible for all of us to make every one of the meetings. We're making as many as we can.

On the right of the dias is Lisa Hauser and Jose Rivera, our legal staff.

To their left, our consultants, National Demographics Corporation. Let me start closest to me, Doug Johnson, Dr. Florence Adams, Marguerite Leoni.

Adolfo Echeveste with our staff at the Commission, Executive Director.

Paul Cullor is working the AV tonight.

We have other members of the staff outside and will be available throughout evening.

Augusta Knight over in the corner.
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We have Amy Rezzonico, public information officer.

And Lisa Nance is our public stenographer. Some of you have been at many of the meetings and we can probably go around and introduce various members of the audience that have been with us so often during the process. I really appreciate that as well.

I would like to ask the consultants before we go forward this evening to make a brief presentation with respect to alternatives that we have already identified in the Northern Arizona area and what that presentation will do is allow the conversation for the remainder of the evening to focus not only on the draft maps but on other alternatives that you may find more or less acceptable than the draft maps suggested earlier this month or last month, actually.

But with that in mind, I'd like to ask Mr. Johnson and Dr. Adams to go through a brief presentation on Northern Arizona.

DR. ADAMS: Good evening, Members of the Commission, and members of the audience.

We would just like to make a very brief presentation.

On August 17th when the draft maps were...
adopted, the Commission charged National Demographics Corporation with looking at some possible alternatives at areas that they didn't, they weren't completely satisfied with. So we had a list of things to look at in various areas of the state. And as a result of that, we have come back with some scenarios for you to look at that cover this particular area. So I'm going to let Doug Johnson go ahead and make a presentation of those scenarios.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I'll show maps of the northern area of the state. These are maps we'll post on the website if the Commission notes approval.

As the Commission noted, this is the adopted northern area and a number of controversies have come up in citizen testimony as we've held the hearings. What we did is focused on a couple key areas. Number one, starting from the northwest, Kingman was a concern about inclusion in the Northern District input said had more affiliation with the river area. Yavapai County as we heard last night, there are considerable concerns about its region in there.

Navajo also expressed concern about the configuration about the district up north.

We've done a variety of tests. A number
of these are recommended tests, just tests to look at what are the various options in these areas.

The first is Northern Arizona, to get the two main areas, Yavapai united and the Kingman area into the river district. It succeeds in a united Yavapai and the succeeded in getting Kingman in the river districts. The result is bringing the Northern District further south and Coconino County and a small piece of the Flagstaff Northern District, the small piece north of 66.

I'll zoom in on where that division is in a moment.

You'll see, we'll do it quickly so we can get to public comment. That's the reason we're all here tonight. This is another test we did.

This is a different approach, Yavapai, an attempt to unify all of Yavapai except Sedona. Sedona and Flagstaff will end up with Gila. Again, a very small piece northeast of Flagstaff ends up in the Navajo District, primarily because when we look at the options to move Kingman out the Northern District, really the only place we get population to make up for that in the Northern District is in Flagstaff.

The fourth test we looked at is another approach to the two-way division of Yavapai, instead of
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a three-way division in this case, the Verde Valley, Sedona. The majority of Flagstaff would be grouped into a district, the try cities area would be grouped into a district on this side.

Again, Kingman would be placed with the river area and a small portion of Flagstaff north of 66, Route 66, in the Navajo District. These are, the colors are difficult to differentiate on the projector, the historic line border between the two districts.

Take one second to zoom in on Flagstaff. It's a little tough to see. Essentially the city border of Flagstaff is the edge of this map, and the two colors, this is one of the proposals for a division. You see it runs essentially along the 66 in this case. The other tests are very similar. The only changes are depending on the needs of population balancing. In some cases we do not include this farwest Northwestern portion of Flagstaff in the Northern District. In others we also take a portion that is west of the 17 into the Northern District and more of a fifty-fifty split of the city.

All the tests follow the 66 and we would welcome, see any input on that concept this evening. Again, all maps will be posted on the web as soon as we can get them.
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CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is now your turn to tell us how you feel about the work thus far.

What we would ask is when you come to the podium, that you would state and spell your name for the record and that because there are a number of people who have asked to speak this evening, we'll not put a stopwatch on anyone. Try to keep your comments within a three-minute time frame. If you're not able to keep your remarks in three minutes, if you'd fill out another speaker slip, we'll certainly get to you when the others have had a chance to speak and allow you complete your remarks, if that's your desire.

We would also like to ask that when you are at the podium, that instead of just telling us "Well, I like this or I don't like that," that's useful information, but what we're really looking for, if you are asking for a change of some kind, the how-to becomes very important.

So we would ask if you are suggesting something different from the draft map or the alternative, that you be as specific as you can be with respect to exactly how to accomplish that change. That will help us give that change, proposed change, full consideration as we develop our final maps next month.
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So with that, we'd like to begin public comment. And I would ask as your name is called, and what we've done historically is sort of use a baseball metaphor. We'll have somebody at bat and someone on deck, meaning you know who the next speaker will be. We'd ask you to come forward, state and spell your name, and give us your comments.

Also, when you are finished speaking, we may very well have comments or questions we'd like to ask relative to what you've said to us. And we would appreciate your indulgence to engage us in conversation, if that's the desire of the Commission, or of the counsel or consultants.

The first speaker this evening is Jed Jorgensen. Mr. Jorgensen will be followed by Alan Everett, the Mayor of Sedona.

MR. JORGENSEN: Good evening, Members of the Commission, consultants.

I want to thank you, really thank you for all the time and effort you've put in to creating the draft maps we're commenting on tonight. I also thank you for coming to Flagstaff this evening and the dedication you've shown in gathering public input during the redistricting process. It's incredibly important
and you are doing a tremendous job.

I want to spend my three minutes --

J E D, J O R G E N S O N.

I realize that with the current draft

maps, the Commission has not yet addressed the issue of

competitiveness within and between the districts. And I

am heartened to know that that task is at hand.

I have several comments and suggestions

regarding the draft Congressional Districts, and some of

my comments do address the issue of competitiveness.

First, my comment is contextual. The

current Congressional representation does not reflect

actual party registration within the state. By the

numbers published in your own citizen kits, there is

only a six percent difference between the Republicans

and Democrats registered in the state, yet we are

currently served by five Republicans and one Democrat in

in Washington.

The draft Congressional Districts do very

little to ensure that our congress men and women will

reflect our party affiliations on a statewide basis.

The draft map creates four bulletproof Republican

Districts, A, B, E, and F, two bulletproof Democratic

Districts, D and G, and one fairly competitive District,

C.
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In a perfect world, in a state where party affiliations were very nearly equal, every congressional district would be, at least, very nearly competitive. But in a state where many many communities are very nearly entirely Republican, I doubt that a map can be drawn to make every district competitive, especially while attempting to keep communities together. So, I will not ask you to do the impossible, but I will ask that we all look at the very difficult, but fair task, of trying to make this draft map as competitive as possible, not just for this election cycle, but for the next 10 years.

District C is a perfect example of what I'm talking about. Currently, District C is the most competitive district on the map. But because District C includes most of Yavapai County, it may not remain competitive for more than more than four to six years. Yavapai County is one of the fastest growing counties in our state. Currently there are almost twice as many Republicans in the county as Democrats. If current growth trends continue, Yavapai county alone could change the competitiveness of District C, much as we saw the competitiveness of District Six change in the last 10 years. In order for District C to change competitiveness in the long run,
something will have to be done with Yavapai County.

My last comment before I make some suggestions is a simple one. District C is just not compact. The communities included in a district of this size are very different from one another, and the lack of compactness will make it very difficult for a representative to see all of his or her constituents.

Now, the suggestions that I have very neatly address all of my concerns, but I need to preface them with two statements. First, I am not an expert at mapping, nor do I have the technology at my disposal to try to and make all the numbers I am grasping add up. Secondly, and more frustratingly for you, I have only looked at District C. My suggestions would make District C more compact and could help to ensure that it is competitive until the next redistricting process.

As you might surmise, I suggest moving most of Yavapai County, with the exception of Verde Valley, into District A. District A is already overwhelmingly Republican, so Yavapai's growth will not change the competitiveness of that district. Keeping the Verde Valley in District C helps to ensure that the votes of the Tribal communities located there will not be diluted.

I have several suggestions for regaining
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the population lost to District A. First, I suggest moving the Fort Mojave Reservation out of District A and into District C. I would also suggest incorporating the tribes of the Gila River Reservation and the mining communities of Eastern Pinal County, District G, into C. District G, which is currently bulletproof for a Democrat, might be able to recoup some of its population lost from District A without significantly changing the competitiveness of either district.

And that's it.

I want to thank you all for your efforts and time and dedication to this process.

I, for one, am very excited about the work you are all doing.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Jorgensen, thank you for all your comments.

One quick question. You spoke about competitiveness. You've obviously done some analysis of districts to arrive at the conclusions you've reached relative to competitiveness. Could you give us your definition of competitiveness or the definition used in arriving at your conclusions?

MR. JORGENSEN: The easy definition might be if you look at the spread of Democrats and Republicans of six percent. If in a district six
percent might be considered competitive, that's sort of
what I was using.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or
questions?

Thank you, Mr. Jorgensen.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker, Mayor
Alan Everett of Sedona, followed by Judith Cooper.

MAYOR EVERETT: Thank you, Chairman, and
Members of the Commission.

I want to thank you for the positive
changes since you started with the grid early on.

Early on the grid had the City of Sedona
separated because the county line goes through the
middle of the community and the changes made were
positive, I believe, in bringing the community back
together.

As a community of interest, I think
Sedona, I won't speak for all of Verde valley, but a
large majority of Verde Valley is considered associated
with the Flagstaff area. Of course that's the way you
have it right now.

I'd like to see it continue that way.

When I think of communities of interest, I
think of commerce. Verde valley is tied closely with
Flagstaff from a commerce standpoint. People come here
to go shopping. They are tied together from a standpoint of medical facilities. People come up here to go to medical specialists and go to the hospital. They are tied together because of Northern Arizona University. Professors live in Verde Valley and work up here. Students live down there and come up here. In addition, there are the athletic events and cultural events.

That's the way I explain, explain the communities of interest. It's the reason I think it's important to have the majority of the Verde Valley, anyway, tied in with the Flagstaff area.

Now, I live in Yavapai County. I do know that there's a situation on the other side of the mountain which you heard a lot about last evening, I'm sure, that's to get the Tri-Cities back together. I would also support that. I think that can be done just by moving maybe three communities. If you moved Prescott Valley into, I think, it's District B, move Bullhead City into District A, and Kingman into District C, which, and Kingman would be tied with the Flagstaff Verde Valley area, and Bullhead City tied with the Northern District, and you would have the Tri-Cities still all together there. So that would be one approach that maybe you could look at in the future.
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Again, I want to thank you for keeping Sedona whole and with the majority of Verde valley.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

The next speaker, Judith Cooper.

Ms. Cooper will be followed by Bruce Green.

MS. COOPER: As you have stated, one of the prime responsibilities for the Commission's consideration is communities of interest. I would also like to support the idea of keeping the Sedona and Verde Valley communities in a unified district.

I spoke at the first hearing in Flagstaff and was pleased to see the draft that you have presently accepted, draft C, which does keep Sedona, Oak Creek Canyon, and the Verde Valley Communities together.

I would also like to ask in your future modifications to please make an effort to keep us together.

I also agree that splitting the Tri-Cities is not a fair activity in order to do this. I would think with your creative minds you could come up with a way of keeping both communities perhaps without splitting the City of Flagstaff, a magic way of doing those three things.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Cooper.
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Next speaker, Bruce Green, followed by Bill Reilly.

MR. GREEN: Bruce Green, common spelling, no E on the end.

Real interesting on a Congressional District. I was there at the first meeting we had, and spoke about you stating unity in Northern Arizona. And I know there are other members of the Hopi community. I have concerns on environmental issues up here. I feel we need -- I know where the Hopis are coming from. I understand their concerns. I tell you, talk about gerrymandering, that's a gerrymander. And I'm just against that.

And to take any piece of Flagstaff out of Flagstaff when Flagstaff is the largest community in Northern Arizona, and this is one main, specific, tight-knit community of interest, a town of 50,000, and if we've got a boundary that one Legislator represents seven or eight precincts and another Legislator represents the rest, it's going to be real hard.

If I read your maps you projected correctly, my precinct, as a precinct committee person, my precinct is split in half in two Congressional Districts or a Legislative District. That's just a precinct that takes in from the north of the railroad,
just south the tracks railroad, to kind of over here on
the old town, south of the railroad tracks, and the
north end of the University.

The way you guys are using Route 66, my
precinct is in two pieces with two -- you go to the same
precinct and are voting on two separate ballots. Talk
about a great inefficiency on fine lines.

Cut any piece of Flagstaff out from any
other piece of Flagstaff, it has to be a worse idea.

I still like to go with Northern Arizona
staying together, because as the young lady that talked,
spoke about the communities and concerns both the Hopi
Navajo tribes have, education, health, utilities, and
other developments, as a community of interest, I feel
our community of interest is in Northern Arizona.

I know the concerns earlier on, the one
referred to that -- the Native Americans felt their
power might be diluted or that was a concern that was
expressed, that one I don't know how to beat; but it
seems to me that the way you've got the, our
Congressional Districts C is drawn, that -- a majority
of the tribes are in that one. And, you know, I'm just
curious, I know you guys have a thankless job. I
mentioned that before. I know it's probably going to
end up in court. It's just the nature of the beast.
But, you know, I can't see us going that far into Phoenix even though on Phoenix maps it's not a real developed part of Phoenix right now to get that area for our district.

Thank you.

And anybody that can get out of here without the kooks out on campus, that's why I was able to speak and get out.

Any response?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Green.

Next speaker, Mr. Reilly. Mr. Reilly followed by Teri Grier.

MR. REILLY: Bill Reilly, R E I L L Y.

Welcome to Flagstaff.

Being neither Democrat or Republican, I'm one of the 400,000 Independents up here in Arizona. I just wish them, God bless them. I'm up in the timberline district north of Flagstaff.

I'm here to offer two bold proposals.

While new districts will be formed, there needs to be a greater emphasis in two areas.

The first being federal trust lands being utilized as Indian reservations, and the second being a setting aside of rural Arizona from heavily populated urban centers such as Phoenix and Tucson.
In the first, I strongly urge this Committee/Commission to draft a binding amendment for its final presentation to the State Legislature and Governor that the following be adopted and that the State of Arizona will utilize its power to convince the US Congress to release entirely those present trust lands to the various Indian Tribes presently occupying them. This would effectively benefits Indian tribes thus:

One, allow for separate legislative districts.

Two, allow for true tribal representation within state and federal legislatures.

Three, real sovereignty.

In the second case, I again urge this body to form districts that will preserve and encourage the rural way of life in Arizona which is fast disappearing. Highly populated areas such as Phoenix, Tucson, and other communities with fast-growing populations should be in separate or combined districts that exclude rural Arizona.

While Arizona is fast becoming a second or third home to many out-of-state residents, it is also becoming a service-oriented economic base for rural residents. Present laws developed and voted on by city
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dwellers make rural residents unable to develop their own identity and economic base, whether ranching, timber harvesting, or a multitude of other industries that would better serve rural dwellers. Rural Arizonans and the Indian Nations need their own unique representation. Let's move Arizona in a positive and democratic direction through your actions and recommendations here tonight.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Teri Grier, followed by Bill Cherry.

Ms. Grier.

MS. GRIER: Mr. Chairman, Teri Grier, T E R I, G R I E R.

Governmental Affairs Manager for the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce.

Welcome to Flagstaff. It's no long haul, and I'm sure you are looking forward to getting back to family members.

The Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce is formed of Flagstaff businesses advocating membership of over 575 members. The Chamber provides proactive responsible leadership recognizing interests of the business community, Flagstaff residents, and the environment.

Flagstaff serves as the hub for Northern
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Arizona commerce and tourism because of the interest in
the economic stability of the community and the ability
to advocate of its members.

The Chamber Board of Directors would like
to ask the Commission to support both the Congressional
and Legislative draft redistricting maps. We sent a
letter to the Commission on July 31st, 2001, asking the
Independent Redistricting Commission to consider several
recommendations for the Congressional and Legislative
maps for the Flagstaff area. These recommendations
actually parallel the Commission's directives as
outlined in Proposition 106. Recommendations included
keeping both the Legislative and Congressional Districts
for the Flagstaff area, that it should include only
rural representation; that both the Legislative and
Congressional Districts for this area should encompass
the entire boundaries of Flagstaff. And I have to say
in looking at the proposals, my heart started skipping a
couple beats because I really believed had the citizenry
of Flagstaff known tonight you meant to have Flagstaff
split, you'd see three times the number of people here
tonight.

In addition, both the Legislative and
Congressional District representing the Flagstaff area
should be geographically compact.
I know that has been challenging, but you have done your best to address that issue.

And the primary and largest focus is that both the Congressional and Legislative Districts should preserve areas of similar interests recognized through cooperative interests. Flagstaff, Verde Valley, and the Red Rock country are closely tied to tourism and economic development.

Flagstaff, Williams, and Sedona have a cooperative development.

Flagstaff could funnel tourism through an area of tourism as a driving force for the Northern Arizona economy, which is important for the Commission to keep in mind.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Gier.

The next speaker is Bill Cherry followed by Rita Johnson.

Mr. Cherry.

MR. CHERRY: Bill Cherry, C H E R R Y.

I appreciate your efforts. I saw earlier in the program you were looking to find a way to unite Northern Arizona and find a more compact district.

I would argue very strongly for keeping all of Coconino County intact and argue with the Navajo
Reservation we approach, we're just somewhat over the
ideal of 171,000, roughly ideal for a district. The
non-reservation population of Coconino County is 93,000,
and reservation residents are a little over 104,000.
However, the Mayor of Sedona pointed out their affinity
with Verde Valley, and Verde Valley being closer to the
Tri-Cities, which is a larger city than Flagstaff, and
they are closer to, it's one of the places to find
closer more parity and the numbers you need.
I'd also suggest if let the Havasupai and
Hualapai tell you, they are people of the river and have
more affinity with the river and are not people of the
desert.
Numbers are not that far off.
Diverse, the school system is better than
20 percent Native American, which is fairly
representative of the community as a whole.
To not have Flagstaff and the Navajo
Nation in the same Legislative District, I'm speaking
Legislative District, would disenfranchise 11,000 people
from that Legislative District.
Ecologically we are linked to the Nation,
Navajo Nations, all in Coconino County.
When you get down off the high mountain
here, you're essentially in a high desert community.
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Economically and essentially, we are the trading center for the Navajo Nation, back and forth, historically. So by the fact of integration of the community, the fact of ecology of the community, and by our economics and history, I suggest we should find a way to create a district that will link these two communities.

Thank you for your good efforts. I know they are tough. And thank you for hearing me.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Cherry.

Rita Johnson is the next speaker followed by Jade Doggett.

MS. JOHNSON: RITA, Johnson.

I'd like to just briefly address the Congressional District and then talk at a little more length about the Legislative District. My concern with the Congressional District is that it is unrealistically large, an impossibility, I believe, for a representative to fairly represent, to visit with the individuals and communities across that district. I think it would be a nightmare.

Secondly, I would ask the Commission to revisit the proposal made at your June meeting here in Flagstaff where you suggested keeping Coconino County intact, combining us with lands to the north and northeast, including the Navajo Reservation, and echo
Bill Cherry's suggestion we share a great deal with lands north of the rim economically, culturally, educationally, as Bill has suggested, and we share some of the same environmental concerns as well.

I ask you to revisit those suggestions you made early on. And, finally, I have to echo what the lady from the Chamber of Commerce stated when she said you would have a much bigger crowd here if there had been the realization you were considering splitting Flagstaff. To me, that proposal is absolutely unthinkable.

Also, I thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN LYN: Thank you, Ms. Johnson.

Is it Jade?

MR. DOGGETT: Jade or Jack, Jack Doggett.

I'm a Flagstaff resident and had different thoughts from when I first came in here based on the consultants 2A, 3, and 4. Like most that have spoken, taking the University, split it from the center of government, that's shocking and unacceptable.

You'll hear a lot about Flagstaff's community of interest. We're quite unified and can't imagine anyone disagreeing.
I believe we're much like Ms. Johnson said, much more tightly tied to the Reservations and Mogollon Rim.

We're tourism first, surrounded by the national parks, forest, and national lands, if you assume that the Navajo and Hopi Reservations are classified as federal lands.

With all due respect to the Mayor of Sedona, I disagree about the Verde Valley community of interest. We have many, many different issues, substantially different patterns of growth.

Someone could characterize the Verde Valley as being more of a sprawling type development simply because they have land. Certainly there are different water issues. Anyone in this area could tell you.

Planning, City of Flagstaff and Coconino County has gone to great efforts to plan this community very tightly, very deliberately. I think that perspective has tremendous different interests. I do have a suggestion. The people recommended Flagstaff, all Coconino, all Coconino County parts within the reservation. As I read it, Coconino is included within the district. Unless I'm off base, the Hopi people disagree with grouping and want to be represented
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differently. Perhaps that's the way to make Flagstaff's
grouping with Coconino easier if the Hopi Reservation is
served with another area.

Thank you.

I applaud the process of the new
redistricting, even though I may be unhappy with the
current results.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Doggett.

Joan McClelland, and the next speaker will
be followed by -- I apologize for my inability to read,
not your inability to write. It makes it difficult.

Either Dick Ellis or Callus, on deck.

MS. McCLELLAND: It's Eallis.

I'm Joan McCLELLAND.

I'm speaking as a citizen that has lived
more than 20 years in Verde Big Park, V O C, the Sedona
area. In all deference to the last speaker, I feel
someone else previously spoke to the economic interests,
tourism. And Verde is the beginning of tourism for the
whole area and all other areas of the community which
are as involved as Sedona, Flagstaff, the Grand Canyon.

It all starts together, the Verde and
Flagstaff.

You've done, I think, a really good job
recognizing the community of interest when you put the
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Verde in with Flagstaff.

   Thank you very much for doing that. I attended last night's meeting, appreciate all concerns of the Prescott people.

   Even though I don't live there, I consider Tri-City an area that should not be split.

   I'd like to speak briefly about the Congressional Districts.

   I have a problem with the process. The four maps briefly shown last night and tonight, all Congressional maps, though it was not ever really said, have been done by National Demographics Corporation.

   You'll be considering them.

   We cannot, we haven't had time to consider them. They talk about splitting Flagstaff out of the blue at the last minute. I can see a lot of concerns. This hall would be just as packed as last night was with talk about splitting the Tri-Cities in Prescott. You don't need to have comments on the Congressional District. You need to think a lot more about that. I'm sure you will do that and listen to what we have to say, and I thank you very much.

   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. McClelland.

   Mr. Eallis, Dick Eallis is the next speaker.
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MR. EALLIS: E A L L I S.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, consultants, there's very little left to be said except I want to emphasize a few points, principles, priorities mentioned.

One of the key things I wanted to do was keep communities of interest together.

Sedona, Big Park, Verde Valley, all work very well together. They've worked well together in the past; and because of geography and other considerations, I think it's a natural area to work together. We certainly work, between the cities, more so than we work in areas otherwise.

It was mentioned Verde Valley is closer to Prescott. It may be a little of it closer to Prescott. Most of it is closer to Flagstaff. Because of that, I would like to approve plan C listed on the Legislative draft map. That's a compact map. It does a lot of things, does not adhere to county lines, thank God, because then Sedona would then be split.

You've done an excellent job in reducing the number of splits. I commend you for that. I commend all your efforts. You started out to do a thankless job, but as it turned out, here's one person thanking you for the job you've done.
To reduce the number of splits was very essential. It's good. It's a disservice to a community to be split. So I hope you would consider that, keep considering that fact as you go along.

The interaction of Verde Valley is very good. The interaction of Verde Valley -- between Verde Valley and Flagstaff is very good. And Flagstaff is very, very close to Verde Valley, just south of the city limits a short ways is the water drainage that starts in a southern direction. And because of that it's very, very close and it affects the economies of the Verde Valley.

Tourism is another commonalty, and it's certain we have a lot in regard to that.

I urge you to stick with your guns on plan C. It's a good plan.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Eallis, Mr. Hall has a question or comment.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Eallis, I appreciate your comments.

MR. EALLIS: I appreciate your comments.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I apologize. I didn't have my mike on.

One of the challenges we have in rural Arizona is there aren't enough people there, here.
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That's one of the challenges. So as we try to consider making adjustments, pursuant to the comments you just made, I'd like to ask your opinion of which priority would be more important. Would it be more important for you to maintain a rural representation, exclusively rural representation, or to maintain the unity of the Verde Valley as you just indicated with some urban represent -- urban influence within that district, also?

Is that question clear to you?

MR. EALLIS: Fairly clear except the definition of rural and urban. My feeling of Northern Arizona is it's all basically rural.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

As you can see, for example, the particular district you are referring to, it comes down close to Northern Maricopa County. In the event you consider a variety of adjustments, if you garner population in the northern area, consider more specific communities of interest, are you asking what preference I have to maintain the ruralness or combine communities as to whether I prefer to be -- to combine populations?

MR. EALLIS: Prefer a rural atmosphere, rural tendency? I think it's easier to get a representation of if that would serve an area in a decent manner, easier get a participation of the
residents, the voters, if there's a commonalty.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Eallis.

I'd like to make a brief comment, because I'd hate for the discussion this evening to focus too much on the presentation of the consultants this evening.

I think it's important that all of you here tonight understand how that presentation came to be, because it's the context which is so important on all the things we do.

First of all, no one is recommending Flagstaff be split. Please understand that. The presentation you saw this evening was as a result of questions that the Commissioners, individually or collectively, asked the consultants to consider as options and the ramifications of doing certain things. For example, you will note on the Legislative map that Kingman does not enjoy the same Legislative District with the rest of the river communities on the western part of the state.

One of the questions we posed to the consultants was how is it that we might be able to include Kingman in that district?

What you saw tonight is a presentation of
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one of the ways that that could happen, but it
necessitates the splitting of Flagstaff. No one
intended for that to happen. Certainly the result may
mean, based on not only testimony here, again, I don't
want anyone to think that this is some kind of last
minute thing where there should have been more of an
outpouring of support in Flagstaff. We did not know
until we saw the alternatives that that was the result
of the question we asked.

But to Mr. Hall's point, when you try to
move legislative lines around in a rural area, the real
issue is where do you find the sufficient population in
order to make the numbers work. You have to move from
population center to population center in order to make
that happen. The population centers in Northern Arizona
start on the west with Kingman, come to Flagstaff, with
a few stops in between, and there aren't many other
choices. So the less we misrepresent that alternative,
it was in response to a specific question.

In many cases the cure is worse than the
disease. We take that point, and we will consider that
as we move forward.

I did want to clear that up. I didn't
want anyone to think somehow I was trying to pull a fast
one on Flagstaff. That's simply not the case.
That said, Carlos Taylor.

Mr. Elder?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Just one in addition to that.

Excuse me. I got it in the eye, too. We also just saw those at about 7:00 last night. I apologize, or the Commission apologizes for not being able to get that out to you so you got a chance to look at it.

We asked the question and NDC was not able to get us the information before we started this second round. We scheduled that interim meeting where we could see what the ramification, what some of the requests or some ideas were. There was no intent in trying to blindside anybody up here Flagstaff or Prescott last night. This was our first opportunity to see the shifts made.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Carlos Taylor, consultant, followed by Peggy Toomey.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you and everyone else. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Taylor, pull the microphone up.

MR. TAYLOR: Friends call me Carl.

I have what I'm going to say here, and
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I'll give it to you.

In a nutshell, I take issue with draft Legislative C and would recommend instead you look at a unified Coconino County combined with the adjacent reservation.

Draft Legislative District C is detrimental to the greater Flagstaff area. It does not reflect a community of interest. In fact, it severs the natural economic, environmental, historical, and physical entity that exists north of the Mogollon Rim.

The following points should be considered in relation to the proposed district:

Coconino County was created in 1891 by taking two-thirds of the Yavapai County territory and one-third of its debt. This was because of the geographic and historic difficulty of Northern Arizona citizens in receiving equal and equitable service from the County Seat of Prescott. The current draft proposal would revisit this sensible decision and once again create a legislative district of divergent interests.

The proposal fractures both Coconino and Yavapai Counties. Flagstaff, the county seat of Coconino County, is separated from much of the county. The division of existing political entities would put a representative in a bind with the likely result that
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Flagstaff's representation would fall short.

The educational system is chopped up at a time when we are making strides in collaboratively sharing resources and addressing the needs of Northern Arizona.

Economically, Flagstaff is closely linked with the Grand Canyon. The Grand Canyon is the economic engine for most of this region. This plan severs this historic and economically crucial link.

Flagstaff has a historic, cultural and commercial relationship with the reservations to the north. Approximately one-fifth of Flagstaff's population is Native American, and over one-fourth of Flagstaff's retail business is attributable to the reservations.

Flagstaff shares water interests with the lands to the north and northeast. The entire area has little perennial flowing water except in the Grand Canyon and a few secondary streams along the Rim. The water issue is something we need to solve together. The water issues of Yavapai County stand in clear contrast to ours. Southwest of Mingus is a Water Management Area with specific rules. North of the Rim, we don't meet the qualifications or necessity for a Water Management Area for a variety of reasons. We must solve our
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problems differently from the residents of northeastern Yavapai County.

Flagstaff is currently the economic, cultural, educational, and commercial hub of Northern Arizona. Its inclusion with the burgeoning suburbs of Prescott and the Verde Valley marginalizes Flagstaff. The best redistricting solution is one that keeps Coconino County intact and reunites Flagstaff with the reservations in and adjacent to the County. This solution has the following advantages:

It recognizes Flagstaff as the center of economic activity north of the rim and allows for representation of the common commercial interests;

It encourages the collective resolution of shared water issues;

It follows a historical precedent set in the last century when Coconino County was differentiated from Yavapai;

It encourages the further development of links and working partnerships which are currently being established between Flagstaff and the reservations to the north;

It looks realistically at the challenge a representative faces in speaking for a district with common geographic, economic, educational and historic
ties.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you don't mind, we'd love to have that in written form. We'd appreciate that very much.

The next speaker is Peggy Toomey followed by Aresta LaRusso.

MS. TOOMEY: Peggy Toomey, I'm Chair of Democrats for Northern Arizona.

I'd like to address Legislative C.

The current draft, I don't believe, reflects or respects our community of interest here in Northern Arizona in either economic environmental or geographic arenas north of the Mogollon Rim. It also does not address the competitive district issue.

Competitive districts make competitive races, and good candidates work hard educating voters given a fighting chance in a competitive race.

In a competitive, in competitive districts, where there's a party race, candidates must address candidates in an opposing party and the growing number of voters in Northern Arizona managing good races.

This current draft that we are looking at fractures both Coconino Coconino County, cuts Flagstaff
out of Grand Canyon, and the Native Americans north,
both of which are crucial for the economy and county.
It's not competitive and does not serve the best
interests of Arizona or Northern Arizona.

I encourage the Commission to reconsider
this which ties us to the Native American communities.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Toomey.
The next speaker arrest is Aresta LaRusso.

Ms. LaRusso.

MS. LaRUSSO: A R E S T A, L a R U S S O.
Thank you for this opportunity to speak on
the issues of the Navajos and Hopis.

I've been following what has been said
from both sides.

My belief is both tribes are a community
of interest in terms of economically. We share a land
base, neighbors, are both Native Americans, and each
have Native American cultures but different ways. And
another concern is really for the future generation of
both tribes. And I, you know, when I think about young
people, they need to work together because they will be
the future leaders. And, I think, by splitting the
districts, legislatively and Congressionally, we would
be doing a disservice to them because of the separation
and it essentially would continue. I don't think it's in the best interests for them. So, you know, we just have to stay together so the younger generation can learn to work together and solve whatever is going on.

And last, I know the Hopis are pretty adamant about being separate. I guess as a Navajo person, I'm not really quite sure why. I'm not sure what we're -- what some of the dissensions might be to really cause us to be separated. That's really the only comments I wanted to make, because I think it's important to think about the future generation of 10 or 20 years down the road. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. LaRusso.

The next speaker is Linda Stratton followed by Liz Archuleta.

MS. STRATTON: Linda Stratton.

STRATTON.

My comments are particularly going to be addressed to Legislative District C, and I would like to tell you that I was at the Commission hearing when you came to Flagstaff on June 19th. And you didn't see me speak then because I was pretty happy with the map you were presenting. I did write comments down and submit them. I guess it was a mistake not to speak.

I guess you just hear a lot of criticism.
That's why I’m here now.

I urge you to go back and look at the map you presented in June. I think that there are several concerns I'm seeing with the current draft. I am concerned, as people have mentioned before, that the District C now divides communities of interest in ways that are economic, environmental, as well as political.

One reason that I liked the June map better is Coconino County unified. I thought then Coconino County would have a stronger political voice. I was happy, I have to say this now, happy the map did not combine Flagstaff in the same Legislative District with the Mohave County communities of Kingman, Bullhead, as experienced before in that Legislative District which had some real differences of interest.

I think one of the people mentioned that Flagstaff shares communities of interest to the north and east. And I would just reiterate that by pointing out that to a large extent Flagstaff economically as well as environmentally and culturally is defined by communities to the north and east. The Grand Canyon is the economic driver of this community as well as many of the communities of Northern Arizona, and it makes sense to include us in the same political district, especially for local communities having local control and a strong
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political voice as one.

Just to wrap up, since June 19th I know you've done a lot of thinking and we've seen a lot of changes of the map. I'm very hopeful you'll be able to tweak it some more, make some positive changes. I know you are listening to our comments, but things have changed a lot in the last couple months.

I'll just reiterate: Please don't change Flagstaff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Stratton.

The next speaker is Liz Archuleta followed by the Mayor of Cottonwood, Ruben Jauregui.

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: I'm Liz Archuleta, Coconino County Supervisor, and I'll be assisted by Kris Waite, Elections Coordinator.

ARCHULETA. And Kris Waite,

WAIT.

First of all, thank you very much for the opportunity to be able to present some views tonight. I'm here representing the Coconino Board of Supervisors.

On August 24th our County staff presented the County Legislative maps as proposed by you for review. We did have a board meeting on Tuesday. We have issues and concerns I'd like to outline for you this evening.
I'm going to present the issues we have that relate to policy, and then I'm going to ask Kris to present the more practical and technical issues.

First of all, in regards to the Legislative Districts, the Havasupai Tribe has expressed to us a desire to be located in same Legislative District as Flagstaff and Williams. With the population of the Havasupai precinct totalling 505, it appears given the relatively small population, this request could be accommodated if the Commission chooses to do this. We recommend the entire Havasupai precinct be moved from Legislative District A to C rather than moving a portion of the precinct.

In the Board's original position paper to the Independent Redistricting Commission, concern was conveyed over Coconino County being included in a district that would also include any Phoenix Metropolitan area. In reviewing maps, it appears the Legislative District does not extend into the Phoenix area, and we appreciate that.

In regards to what was proposed tonight, I know that was just an idea. We strongly oppose dividing Flagstaff into two Legislative Districts, and we expressed this at the first hearing. We request you respect the integrity of the City of Flagstaff. We
don't have any ideas in terms of what to recommend. We will be bringing this up at the next Board of Supervisors' meeting and perhaps will forward some practical ideas or solutions to help you in that manner.

Now I'd like Kris to talk about the Legislative technical issues.

MS. WAITE: My comments are based on the Legislative maps we've already seen, not the ones presented tonight.

In reviewing the maps, it appears to us that the proposed Legislative boundary between districts A and C don't match the precinct boundaries we have for the Grand Canyon and Tusayan area. We couldn't determine if this was intentional because of population or if this was just a mismatch or error in data. We are concerned if it is not corrected, that it would create confusion and inconvenience for voters in this area. We estimate there are about 240 residents that would be affected by this mismatch in the boundary lines.

There is another similar mismatch in lines down in the Fernwood precinct along the eastern boundary with the Leupp precinct. We would appreciate you taking a second look at that.

Finally, another proposed Legislative boundary creates a split for residents in the Leupp
precinct, specifically, the area north of I-40. The proposed map shows the boundary following the Navajo Nation boundary rather than the existing precinct boundary. Given the relatively small number of residents in this area, approximately 50 people, we would recommend the Legislative boundary follow the existing precinct boundary between Leupp precinct and Flagstaff 20, I-40. A lot of that is the distance these people have to travel to vote.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Good evening, Ms. Waite. I have a couple questions for you. We've had a couple issues come up with respect to precinct lines. Occasionally people ask us to draw boundaries, ask the Commission to draw boundaries based on precinct lines. Of course, precinct lines always end up being changed to conform to Legislative and Congressional Legislative boundaries. That's going to happen.

MS. WAITE: Correct.

MS. HAUSER: This time. The different issue, though, is one where because of, if draft maps or new Congressional and new district Legislative lines create mini precincts that create a problem. Is some part of your testimony related to that issue?

MS. WAITE: Exactly. When we get to the
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Congressional portion, yes. We'd have to renegotiate some lines and it would create pockets that would either be very small, administratively a nuisance, or also a situation, such as Leupp, Flagstaff 20, the Leupp and reservation land were people would have to drive into Flagstaff to vote.

MS. HAUSER: Some part of some of your comments were not addressed to that issue.

MS. WAITE: Some we believe we'd just -- we need to try make sure our maps are matching your maps.

MS. HAUSER: Let me ask this question: Did I understand you to say that unlike the typical situation where precinct boundaries get conformed to match district lines, you are suggesting if district lines end up in a certain way, you are forced to create precincts to conform to that that cause you some difficulties with respect to preclearance of precinct lines?

MS. WAITE: Possibly. Northern, I knew that's what I was suggesting.

MS. HAUSER: That's what I thought I was hearing.

MS. WAITE: Yes.

MS. HAUSER: Obviously the court reporter
has taken all of that down.

Do you have any particular map or other materials you can give us to better illustrate what you are talking about?

MS. WAITE: We sent a letter down. Supervisor Archuleta sent a letter she's reading and sent letters down the Supervisors had drawn up.

A lot depends on where lines end up and we'll keep making adjustments as you need.

MS. HAUSER: All right.

Thank you very much.

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: Now let me address the Congressional adjustments.

In formulating the Board's original position paper to the Commission, concern was conveyed over Coconino County being included in a district that would include of the Phoenix Metropolitan area. The proposed Congressional plan includes an area northeast of Scottsdale encompassing the Fort McDowell and Yavapai Nation. And in terms of a Congressional District, the Board of Supervisors, we had considerable discussion about it, and we certainly would like for it to be a rural district. We'd like for it to be more compact.

But at the same time, we, once again, want to stress we want a district that would not include the Phoenix
Metropolitan area.

Now, if Chris can address the technical issues.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Before Chris does, Ms. Archuleta, can I ask you a question?

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: Sure.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Am I correct, the indication is the only inclusion of a Maricopa area is to pick up another Maricopa Tribe, but you'd prefer it not be included, though that's certainly a subject the Commission is considering presently. Other tribes prefer it be included, which is another example of competing interests.

With respect to the issue of compactness, however, the reason of size, and an exclusively rural district, it is, because, again, there aren't the numbers.

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER HALL: My question to you is, is it your preference this district remain conclusively rural and maintain its large configuration or that it would be reduced in its size and configuration and therefore have to include Maricopa County population to make numbers required to meet the goal.

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: We'd prefer an
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exclusively rural. We understand the dilemma and don't have a large number of comments. I believe the priority of the goal that it be a rural district.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

MS. WAITE: As far as the Congressional District goes, as a county, we believe that the path that has been created is to link the Hopi Reservation to the remainder of District A which poses a logistical problem from an elections standpoint. While Coconino respects the Hopi Tribe's request is to be in a separate Congressional District from the Navajo Nation, creating such a path forces the county to create new precincts each time an existing precinct is dissected by a congressional line.

Arizona Revised Statutes, Title 16-411, speaks to this issue. As a result of this, the county will need to create several new precincts with little or no population in them. In examining the impact of the proposed path, staff asked the Coconino County Community Development Office to review the area to determine if it is slated for future residential development.

Upon review of the area, staff has determined that very little, if any, residential development is planned for the areas included in the path at this time.
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Coconino County questions the logic in creating a path of Census blocks and wonders if it would not make more sense to use other features, such as road, highways, and interstates, to create that path.

Secondly, the proposed path area on the map indicates that the area surrounding the Moenkopi precinct has been expanded to include areas within Coalmine North and Coalmine South. As a result of this, residents outside Moenkopi precinct will be impacted.

Residents outside Moenkopi will be changed to Tuba City Northeast and Coalmine North precincts. Additionally, City Northeast precinct boundary does not agree with the proposed Legislative boundaries. Staff is not sure if this, again, is a data error or intentional deviation from the existing lines.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

If you'd leave with us in writing those comments.

MS. WAITE: We did send them down to your attention just this week.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you'd leave them so the consultants can review that and make appropriate adjustments this week.

MR. ECHEVESTE: Copies?

SUPERVISOR ARCHULETA: Thank you very much
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for the opportunity to address you. We will be
forwarding you maps and attach the letter so you can see
more clearly the information we had at our disposal and
also we will be again addressing the Flagstaff issue.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is the
Mayor of Cottonwood, Ruben Jauregui. And the Mayor will
be followed by Colonel C. H. Johnson.
Let me remind you, Mr. Mayor, before you
speak, I have four slips left in the cue. If anyone
else wishes to speak, please, either turn in your
speaker slip or fill one out and turn in a speaker slip
for us as soon as you can.
Thank you.
Mr. Mayor.
MAYOR JAUREGUI: Thank you very much.
I commend you on your Spanish there.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: I had help.
MAYOR JAUREGUI: Ruben, last name,
I'm here tonight to thank the Members of
the Commission for actually listening to the concerns
Verde Valley in keeping us whole. One of our main
concerns, we urge you to keep us whole. We urge you to
keep us in a district with Flagstaff and Sedona. I
won't go into what was said before in support of this,
just in interests of time, but we appreciate it. This
is something members of our community, I've polled
informally members of the counsel and they strongly
agreed upon be included in the district which includes
Flagstaff, Sedona, and understand you are up against an
awesome job of tweaking things here. I appreciate
you've listened to us up until this point.

Keep up with the good work.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

Mr. Elder has a question.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Mayor.

Given the juggling act we're trying to do
here, if given the option of being in part of the
balance of Yavapai or the Tri-Cities area, or being
connected through the Verde Valley on into Gila County
and the rest of the Verde watershed and on into what
we're calling EACO, or the eastern counties area, which
would be preferable, staying with the Yavapai Tri-Cities
or part of below the Mogollon Rim, Mayor, or Maricopa --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

The next speaker is C. H. Johnson followed
by LaVelle McCoy.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHNSON: J O H N S O N,

Johnson.
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Thank you for the opportunity to address you tonight.

As someone that served 27 years in the military, US military, and served 365 days in Vietnam, I address you as someone tonight being a member of the Hopi Tribal Council. So I have some interest in this matter.

Thank you for allowing me to appear before you tonight.

I had to leave the Council session at 5:00 o'clock to be here at 6:30, so I just barely made that. Like all Americans, I believe it is absolutely essential for retired military personnel to be active and have a voice in the decision-making and policy-making affecting our lives.

This principle is part of the bedrock formation of the American representative government. This principle forms the American character.

And the Courts of the United States have established constitutional guidelines for its protection. These constitutional guidelines are aimed at preserving, insofar as possible, the value of individual votes, selection of Legislative and Congressional representation to the greatest extent.
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possible, district boundaries must respect existing tribal interests.

Let me be absolutely frank with you, the Hopi Tribe and Navajo Tribe have historically been at conflict. And it is difficult for me to imagine a situation in which these two tribes can coexist in the same environment. The Navajo Hopi disputes go back to 1950 and historically to 1600 when Navajos first came into the area. We have a long history of conflicts just like civil war between North-South memories of conflicts will exist almost forever. And so we do not have any common interest. We are in conflict all the time. And so this must be recognized by those who create these districts. It would be like putting a cat and dog into the same room. We do not agree on many things, and we have conflicts constantly, in fact still going on HPL today between cattleman and cattle people had to have conflicts and still going on today.

I'd like to say that as an example of the conflict, the last five years, the Navajo Nation representatives in the US, in the Arizona Legislative halls, have entered 60 bills and none of them have been of any benefit to Hopi Tribe.

So we do not want to be in any district, be it Legislative or Congressional, which is controlled
by the Navajo people.

And also, I think that the criteria you should follow is common interests. Common interest is very important to these districts.

The Hopi Tribe has more common interests with Coconino County, particularly Flagstaff, than with anybody else.

We recently purchased 340,000 acres in Coconino County. That's of great interest to us. We hope that eventually that will become part of the Hopi Reservation.

So at some point, the Hopi Reservation will extend into Coconino County. And that would become part of C in the proposed maps.

We also purchased two malls in Flagstaff. So we have some great economic interest in the City of Flagstaff. And we recently bought a motel in Sedona, so we do have some interest in Sedona.

So I think we have more common interest with Flagstaff than with the Navajo people.

So I would suggest that, that the Hopi Tribe be a part of the Coconino County. That is sketched out in this area C.

I propose we be included in that proposal, because our interests are more in that district than
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with the Navajo Nation.

   As I say, I'm a member of the Hopi Tribal
Council, have been for the last eight years, and I am
very familiar with the interactions between the two
tribes. And I can assure you that these conflicts
aren't going to go away. We still have a lot of
conflicts, and this will last, I guess, forever.

   You must remember we Indians have long
memories. We're like elephants. We never forget
anything. Our children will not forget these conflicts
which began back in the 1600s when the Navajos first
came into the area. Our history goes back thousands of
years. We were the original people in this area. We
have 12 villages, and we have lived here for a long
time. I think that should be worth something.

   Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

The next speaker is LaVelle McCoy. And
the last speaker slip I have is for Frank Seanez.

Oh, holding out on me again.

MR. RIVERA: Just came in, honestly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. McCoy.

MR. McCOY: LaVelle, L a V E L L E,

McC O Y.

I'm reminded that the devil are in the
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details, and this is certainly no exception to try to arrive at a balance that is going to satisfy everyone. I'm convinced when everyone is unhappy with it, you'll have done your job.

Nevertheless, some of comments I've heard certainly I agree with. Some I don't agree with.

With respect first to Legislative District C, I would encourage the Commission to maintain intact, you know, respect to the communities of interest with the Verde Valley, Sedona to keep in Legislative District C.

I understand and believe I support the issue as far as the Tri-City issue. I believe that I hope that you are able to, you know, to define and respect the, you know, the concept or idea of keeping the Tri-Cities intact, also, as far as Prescott, Prescott area, and in that area.

Hearing, you know, hearing the communities of interest, you know, I am reminded, and as a third generation member of the Flagstaff community, and a local businessman, you know, as far as communities of interest, I do embrace the Navajo and Hopi Peoples as tribal members of my, you know, the economic community I serve. But -- you know, but I believe somewhere where you have to draw the line as far as districting, I'm
more in support of District C to the extent, you know, our communities of interest are kept intact and as compact as possible with the Verde Valley.

On Congressional District, and Congressional District C, I guess, you know, I certainly adhere to, and I believe, and certainly advocate the principle that we have a rural district, and, you know, that the interest of rural districts are better served by a representative who answers to that district and does not answer to a metropolitan area or metropolitan population, because there is such a divergence there.

And, you know, I'm sure you've heard there's always going to be that element of competition between metropolitan and rural areas, you know, as we generally refer to the valley as the State of Maricopa. And we find ourselves in constant competition for resources, you know, at the state level.

But having said that, I do strongly support the ideal and the concept thereof maintaining a rural district.

I was really in hopes and I looked at the issue as far as the issue of representation, and my word, you know, the newly elected representative of that district is going to have their work cut out for them to represent that district. Literally, it's almost like a
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horseshoe and the outsides of the horseshoe go border to border from western Arizona to eastern Arizona. I have some concern on that.

I was frankly in hopes that insofar as the western side of the state, it could be kept in a separate alignment in some fashion, that, you know, it would be more in line with the river communities and -- but, you know, I guess the dilemma there is I, too, would not be willing to say well, all right, I would accept we would have to redraw the lines and incorporate a part of the metropolitan area in order to balance out that population.

I guess I'd have to say well that is, you know, that fulfills our fundamental requirement as far as having that rural district, so, nevertheless, it will be a challenge.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you and for you to come back to Flagstaff.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. McCoy.

The next speaker is Frank Seanez.

Mr. Seanez will be followed by Monica Navamsa.

MR. SEANEZ: Good evening, Chairman Lynn, Chairman Hall, staff, and consultants to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, Commissioner
Daniel Elder from Tucson.

The Navajo Nation continues to advocate before the Commission for both the proposals made by the Navajo Nation relative to the Congressional District and the Legislative District.

The Congressional District, which is currently proposed, is not compact insofar as it contains a gerrymander that is created solely to allow the Hopi Tribe to exit its natural community of interest, its adjoining land base, the community which it shares in Northern Arizona with the rest of Northern Arizona in order to be attached to, to an urban and very dissimilar community.

The Commission heard down in Phoenix at the Heard Museum last week the wish of the Salt River Community to be joined in a Congressional District with what they consider to be a closer community of interest with Maricopa County.

Surprisingly, the numbers which are involved in a switch between the Salt River Community and the Hopi Tribe, including the ostrich neck corridor, is approximately the same number, approximately 7,000 individuals.

The inclusion of the Hopi Nation within the Congressional District, which also includes the
Navajo Nation, would join peoples who have much more in common than they do in dispute. And, and the Navajo Nation continues to advocate for that.

Of course, this will not be the last time that the Navajo Nation will appear before the Commission to address that matter.

With regards to the Legislative District, the Navajo Nation is pleased to see the Commission still being open to different ideas which are necessary to increase the Native American population within the proposed district to somewhere close to the percentage which is now contained in the last legally enforceable plan, that being the 1993 Legislative District as it means to the 2000 Census numbers.

As it shows with some of the numbers earlier in the evening, it's somewhere around 65 percent. That's 10 percent less in sheer Native American population numbers than the bench mark, the bench mark plan numbers of 75 percent Native American. And that simply is going to continue to be a very serious problem.

The Navajo Nation is not sure how those numbers can be made up absent the inclusion of the two Apache nations, White Mountain Apache and San Carlos Apache in the southeastern portion of the state.
The Navajo Nation is aware that requires inclusion of another perceived community of interest and retrogression of Native American voting numbers. And the Navajo Nation is heartened by the fact the Commission is looking at and demographers are looking at alternative ways to increase numbers.

The Navajo Nation, of course, is heartened by the presentation of an alternative tonight, and I guess last night, which involved an increase in Legislative District numbers to 78 percent. That kind of percentage can only be, can only be achieved in another way through inclusion of the Hopi Tribe and to Apache tribes I previously noted in the same district and Navajo District to seek to include both nations in the district.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

I have two speaker slips remaining. The first is from Monica Navamsa and the last would be from Scott Canty.

Ms. Navamsa.

MS. NAVAMSA: Good evening, Chairman, Commissioners Hall and Elder.

Again, I'm Monica, M O N I C A, Navamsa, N A V A M S A.
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I thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening.

My position is to serve as staff assistant to Chairman Wayne G. Taylor, Jr. I coordinate the intertribal affairs and state tribal efforts.

I wish to speak of the tribe's state Legislative efforts.

First of all, thank you for taking into account the Hopi's request at the Congressional level for separation between the Hopi and Navajo.

You've heard testimony from the Hopi Tribal Council and representatives of the Hopi community in the last several weeks of the 200-year discord between the two tribes.

The Navajo Nation speakers recently have asked you to include us in their district. Their rationale has included the notion of forcing both tribes to learn to live next to one another.

President Arthur drew an arbitrary boundary in 1868. It has not been the Hopi that have repeatedly moved onto the other's land where they've not belonged.

The Hopi now live on land one-sixteenth of our original lands and are totally surrounded by Navajo land.
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The Hopi agreed to share lands with the Navajo. The Navajo have overrun Hopi lands and villages and refused to share lands.

Left without voice, the Hopi resorted to the courts.

We simply do not believe we could ever possibly receive fair representation out numbered 10 to one in Arizona with another sovereign nation.

That the Hopi Tribe for the last 10 years have enjoyed separate Congressional and Legislative Districts is a record for the Hopis. We've had to resort to the courts for our rights. It wasn't until the land partition, known as the Bennett Freeze, until the Hopi received separate representation in 1992. Since then there's been a balance of political power through separate representation that has enabled the Hopi working Congressmen and Congressional delegation to achieve the 1996 Partition Land Settlement Act.

The Hopi continued to negotiate successfully to achieve the outcome of part of the Bennett freeze despite the fact the Navajos' Congressmen repeatedly introduced bills adverse to the Hopi at the request of the Navajo.

Members of the Commission, you have also heard in previous testimony regarding the Hopi tribe's
concerns on State Legislative issues, such as the senior
center.

On August 30th, the Navajo Nation
representative implied the Hopi's voice would not be
drowned in a request to be included in a district
largely represented by nonnative population. It has
been the Hopi Tribe's experience our needs have been
favorably supported by the current District Two
representatives. That's at the state level. This
exemplifies the Hopi Tribe has been successful, the
Hopi, in specific and nonspecific legislation leveraging
in obtaining specific support which only increases the
success of tribal issues respecting Navajo and Hopi
interests.

The progress we've seen in the last 10
years has indeed resulted in greater cooperation
legislatively and congressionally. Balanced political
power is pragmatic being for the Navajo to take Hopi
needs into account. Before this was not the case. We
learned a valuable lesson in the new political system
under which we find ourselves in the past 200 years.

We're a smaller minority and community.
And all the more important, it's our new voice and
representation. We cannot fail in securing continuance
of separate representation for the Hopi. It's a matter
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of survival.

I urge the Commission to take into serious consideration and to the greatest extent possible the legislative boundaries possible, the distinct natural cultures of the Hopi Tribe.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Navamsa.

Scott Canty followed by Stacie Wagner.

Mr. Canty.

MR. CANTY: Scott Canty, S C O T T, C A N T Y.

I'm the legal representative for the Hopi Tribe.

Chairman Taylor told me last time he met with you he was asked if there was legal precedent for distinguishing individual Native American Tribes as opposed to Native Americans as simply a minority class. Chairman Taylor asked me come to address that issue and outline our views on why we feel there is a strong legal basis for opposing inclusion in the Navajo dominated district.

We believe, first of all, the Constitutional interests under the Voting Rights Act always outweigh the neutral criteria the Commission apply: fundamental, fair representative. The Hopi have taken the position, not without substantial cause, they
cannot be included within a Navajo dominated district
and have fair and effective representation in such a
district. That's the heart of the Hopi case.

The Hopi does not wish to be fodder for
filling out minority numbers by helping create a Navajo
District. The Hopi have, therefore, decided to cast
their lot with a largely non-Indian district, believing
we will have fairer and more effective representation in
a non-Indian dominated district rather than a Navajo
District. When we look at the cases, the cases will ask
the question what are the effects of the districting
action taken by the Commission. Hopi looks to the past
to discern the future. And what will lie ahead for us
is amply demonstrated by 200 years of conflict which has
existed between the Hopi and Navajo history which is
well-documented.

If you would like to read more about that,
conflict, I would point your attention to a scholarly
paper written by Mr. Peter Whitley, a paper at Sara
Lawrence College titled on the history of the Hopi
Navajo relations, an in-depth article discussing the
long history of that.

MR. RIVERA: Do you have a site for it.

MR. CANTY: I'll give you a copy of it.

Anything you like, I'll provide, if not tonight,
tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Canty.

MR. CANTY: Historical, anthropological, it's replete, 40 years of litigation, and it continues today. I've personally been a part of that litigation, continue to be part of that litigation, so I have firsthand knowledge of the dispute and the underlying causes of that dispute.

Congress has recently recognized the competition between Hopi and Navajo over resources and divergent interests. Congress passed in 1974 an Act specifically intending to resolve some issues. Congress revisited the issues in 1996, passed a second act, aimed solely at the Navajo and Hopi issues.

Judicial recognition is equally replete, and there are many, many cases documenting the Hopi disputes.

The demographics of the proposed district speak for themselves. In the proposed district, the population is overwhelming Navajo.

The Hopi population is something like 8,000 people, among the voting population of 60,000 plus Navajo individuals they've never have a chance to elect a Hopi representative. We believe the Hopi voice is extremely diminished under those circumstances. The
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Hopi have no voice and no chance.

The point of the Hopi is this. The old adage is a rose by any other name does not apply to the Indian people. The Indian people are as diverse as any other group. This has been recognized by the United States, both the courts and the Congress for many, many years.

There was a case recently, Dawavinwa, D A W A V I N W A vs. Salt River Project, and in this case. The federal district court decided that based upon national origin arguments. It was possible that one tribe could discriminate against another tribe based on national origin. The court went back and looked at the case Chief Justice Marshall wrote in 1832, the Wirster vs. State of Georgia case.

In that Justice Marshall pointed out Indian Nations always considered as distinct, Indian, political communities. Note, he didn't say all Indian Nations are together a political community. He said they individually are distinct, independent political communities of retaining their original natural rights. That principle has survived to today. The principle Hopis are arguing today and continue to argue in the future.

In summary, we believe the cases, White
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vs. Register, and numerous other cases that support the
proposition the current plan minimizes, cancels out the
voting strength of the Hopi Tribe.

Fair, effective representation cannot be
had in the proposed plan. Dilution occurs based on
location of the Hopi Reservation within the Navajo
Reservation, and there is insufficient chance of
electing or influencing a political party as a result.
The plan has less opportunity for the Hopi to
participate in the process as a result of the plan.

As a lack of responses, there will be a
lack of responsiveness on the part of the Navajo
representatives elected.

In District Two, the needs of the Hopi
people, as demonstrated by the numerous testimonies, as
demonstrated by the Hopis in hearings, we believe we can
put on a strong case toward that end. Inquiry will be
fact intensive. We understand that. We believe we have
presently facts to back up those plans.

That, Jose, is the basis of our legal
position.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Canty.

Some questions, if you don't mind.

MR. CANTY: I do not mind.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Canty, one question I had
based on the comments that you just made is given the
fact that you referenced vote dilution and knowing that
under Section Two, a minority group, needs to be
sufficiently large and geographically compact enough to
be able to influence or have the opportunity to elect
representatives of their choice, do you believe that the
Hopi Tribe, separate from the Navajo, and placed in
another district, would be sufficiently large to have an
influence in another district?

MR. CANTY: Yes, I do. I think I can
concede 7,000 people are not sufficient to be successful
to elect, in not successfully electing a representative,
one of their own; but they will be successful in
influencing what occurs in the political process. They
will be successful in influencing what happens in the
state legislature. That's the key focus of this
redistricting effort, to make sure no one's right or
ability to influence what happens in the State
Legislature is undercut or canceled out or placed in a
worse position during the last bench mark plan we are
currently operating under.

I do not believe the principles
enunciated, which I believe are the Gingles case, we're
talking about.

MS. HAUSER: The Gingles case.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona
MR. CANTY: Have been to the fullest explored.
I believe it can be fully looked at at court.
Look at the courts, what happens when a smaller minority is submerged in a larger minority, two minorities exploring the same space and time, the Hopi are much smaller minority than the Navajo. What are the rights of the much smaller minority? That question has not been fully answered by the court. It is a question eventually that will have to be answered. It's been partially answered. There have similar conflicts. The black Latino conflicts, or black Asian conflicts, in California or Florida.
So this is not an issue that is completely new to the court. It's simply occurring now in the context of Native Americans, one tribe in opposition to a smaller tribe.

MS. HAUSER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Canty, thank you very much.

We would appreciate at least the written citations for the documentation you've referred to.

MR. CANTY: I'll provide a complete list of the citations referred to to Jose, if that's
acceptable.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's perfectly acceptable.

The last speaker slip is from Stacie Wagner.

Ms. Wagner.

MS. WAGNER: Stacie Wagner, S T A C I E, W A G N E R.

Thank you for being here this evening. I do appreciate making the time, effort to come to our community. I'm here to speak on some concerns on Congressional District C. This district is very large. It is much too large. This violates the requirement of Proposition 106, and now the state constitution. Districts must be geographically compact. The grid was just the beginning of Proposition 106, letter C, in your own packet. District C has more than half of 60 square miles by a conservative estimate. The entire state has more than 14,000 square miles. District C is more than half the State of Mississippi, including New York, Florida, Michigan, and Illinois, et cetera.

The size of District C makes it impossible for a Congressperson to effectively represent the district and provide services to it of all areas of the district. District C is roughly twice the size of
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District Six, and persons in District Six rarely see
their Congressmen now. They'll rarely see their
Congressperson. They'll have very little in common.
People in the western area have very little in common
with the eastern area, especially along the river. Most
if not all of Mohave and rural are excluded in District
C, placed in Maricopa County, which is still
overwhelmingly of rural population. The district is
also much smaller, more compact, and more competitive
politically.

District C's population will soon be of
lopsided with the rapid growth of Mohave and Yavapai
counties. The other counties in the district are
growing slowly, if at all, if Yavapai and Mohave
counties are removed from District C to balance out the
population growth in this district.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Wagner.
Ms. Wagner, the question from Mr. Elder.
COMMISSIONER ELDER: Ms. Wagner, it's
almost occurred to me the devil you know as opposed to
the devil you don't know.
On one hand you say like you see urban
areas in Maricopa County be used to bring the population
mass together so that the density becomes greater and
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area becomes smaller. With that, though, you take the
risk of urban areas in Maricopa County in effect
expanding and diluting the vote in the rest of the
district.

And you then came back with Navajo and
Yavapai expanding so quickly they in effect dilute the
rest of the district. Which do you prefer and why?

MS. WAGNER: I always felt like Maricopa
County needs to be cut out across these districts and my
reasoning for that is populationwise to keep the
district smaller, going to allow representation within
those districts.

Simply, and look at population balances in
those. You know, overwhelmingly, I think it's three to
one out of Maricopa vote wise or something. You know,
yeah, that's a lot for a rural area to deal with.

Unfortunately, we do fall by the wayside. When you have
very different areas developing, it is, it's sort of
better the devil you know.

We understand the agenda of Maricopa
County is going to be. And if we buy out Maricopa
across the state, I feel like it gives the rural
counties a better opportunity to have their voice.

If you put us together in this,
unfortunately, you have a lot of rural areas with a lot
of different needs that aren't going to be heard because
they have to compete against each other to be heard,
very different, here in Flagstaff. I've been born and
raised in pine trees. That's not what the Colorado
River is, and -- it's necessary to keep Flagstaff as
beautiful as it is. And looking at this, I just do not
see where we're going to see representation. If we
can't get a Congressman to come here with the district
looking like it is now, and then looking at this, I just
don't see that chances are very fair.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Wagner.

There other members of the public wishing
to be heard at this time?

If not, we'll turn to the Commission and
ask if there are any comments from of the Commissioners.

Mr. Hall?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I wish
for to summarize what I thought I've heard today and
maybe highlight some of the challenges we have.

What I've heard is we should unify
Coconino County. I've heard others say keep Legislative
C as it is. Others said combine Sedona with Flagstaff.
Others said put Sedona and Verde Valley with Flagstaff.
Others said put Sedona and Verde Valley with Prescott.
Others said put Sedona and the Tri-Cities and Verde,
Verde Valley with Flagstaff. Others said separate the Hopi separate. Others said don't separate the Hopi. Some said combine the Apache and eastern tribes, move the eastern tribes with the river community.

Ladies and gentlemen, anyone want my job?

This is one example.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Wagner is volunteering.

MS. HAUSER: And don't divide Flagstaff.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

One week, you'd be calling me.

One community, and I'm listening to at least 14 conflicting statements. And, therefore, as the Chairman indicated early on in this process, folks, is like my favorite motto: Bank One, we're looking for solutions, not problems. And if anyone has ideas of how to find some common ground among all of these separate issues, of course, I didn't list some conflicting issues we heard with respect to the Congressional District, we welcome those.

As the Chairman indicated, it's throwing a rock in a pond that ripples. The ripple effects are clear to Tucson, clear to Cochise and Tucson.

We'd welcome anyone here with specific suggestions of what we have for the best situation, the
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best situation for those of us that live in Sedona, Flag, Verde Valley, whatever it may be.

To close, I'm saying I appreciate you folks taking the time and giving the input and the messages you have given us.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

In summary, then, ladies and gentlemen, here is one big difference. No matter how many statements conflict, no matter how many problems are created, no matter how many of those choices have to be made, they are all being made in public, being made in public for the first time in this state's history. They are being made in public by five people not elected but selected to do this job on your behalf.

I can tell you the five of us take that responsibility very seriously. That's why we had over 24 hearings the first round, 18 or 19 hearings -- I guess maybe it's up to 20 hearings if you count some of the extra hearings we've tacked on. That is unprecedented in this process, and it's as a result of the passage of Proposition 106.

We thank you very much for the input this evening. It's been very valuable, useful. I'm confident you will see it reflected in the final choices that are made.
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I cannot guarantee you all those choices will meet with your individual approval. Someone said here tonight and said before: About the time we make everyone just a little unhappy we may have gotten just about right. Hopefully the reverse is true: Just about true. By the time we make most of the people of Arizona reasonably happy, we'll have gotten it just about right. Our goal is to get it just about right.

You have until, at least, the middle of this month, if not a couple weeks beyond that, to continue to communicate with us in any of the ways on the Power Point presentation on your comments tonight, through the website, regular mail, phone calls, any other way you wish to communicate.

At this stage, however, the comments most apropos are we need solutions. Your ideas, how to make things better.

We very much appreciate you being here, appreciate your participation in the process.

We hope when finished you'll see we did indeed listen and took very careful note of what you came to tell us.

Thank you very much.

And we appreciate you being with us this evening.
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(Applause.)

(Whereupon, the meeting adjourned at approximately 9:00 p.m.)

* * * *
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