P R O C E E D I N G S

(Whereupon, the public session commences.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Good morning, everyone.
We're going to call the meeting of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission to order.
The time is 11:11.
And would you please rise for the Pledge of Allegiance.
(Whereupon, the Pledge of Allegiance was recited.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, everyone. We'll take roll call.
Chairwoman Mathis.
(No oral response.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Vice-Chair Freeman.
(No oral response.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Vice Chair Herrera.
(No oral response.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner McNulty.
COMMISSIONER MCNULTY: Here.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Commissioner Stertz. That's
My name is Rick Stertz, from Tucson, Arizona. And I will be chairing today's meeting.

On -- via the web streaming right now we are recording. We are not live today because we do not have web streaming but between now and the meeting at 6:00 o'clock tonight in Globe I've been told that that -- that this meeting will be posted.

So during the course of that meeting, the three commissioners that are not here will be viewing today's testimony.

I'd like to introduce the staff that we have with us today.

On staff we've got Buck Forst, who is our audio, visual, and media.

We've got Shane Shields and Karen Herrman at the back table who are from the IRC staff.

We have Kristina Gomez, our assistant executive director.

To my right, we have Mary O'Grady. And we -- our legal counsel.

We have Marty, our court reporter.

And from all the way from the east coast, we have Bruce Adelson.

And to my left we have Korinne Belock representing
Strategic Telemetry, our mapping consultant.

We also have two interpreters with us today that I would like to introduce to see if we will be in need of any interpretation.

First, Francisco Menendez, would you please come up?

And request anyone in the audience that may help need help in interpretation of today's meeting.

(Whereupon, the interpreter made a statement in Spanish.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

And we also have Josephine Goode, who is an Apache interpreter.

Ma'am. Please come to the microphone and see if there's anyone that will be in need of your translations today.

(Whereupon, the interpreter made a statement Apache.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

This is -- I'm just doing a quick count. This is the -- either the 11th or 12th of a string of hearings that we've been having around the state.

The purpose of today's meeting is for you to give us your commentary and your thoughts on the legislative and the congressional draft maps as they have been approved by
the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, for you to
give testimony to place on the record.

And we are continuing to do this. Tonight we will
be in Globe at the, at the Gila County public works complex
in the Gila County Courthouse.

And tomorrow, Saturday, we're going to be at the
Westview High School in Avondale, Arizona.

If you would like more information regarding our
ongoing meetings, you should visit our website at
azredistricting.org, and you can go to agenda and schedules,
and it maps out the remaining meetings which carry us into
Sells, Tucson, Sierra Vista, and all points and corners of
the state of Arizona.

And the purpose of this is that during the -- part
of our constitutional mandate is after the draft maps are
approved, both the legislative and congressional designs in
their draft form, then we go out to the public, and we
receive 30 days' worth of comment from the public, so that
we can take that information back -- as commissioners we'll
be using this comment in our final deliberations for the
final designs of the maps.

We also have several dignitaries in the room which
will be speaking later, but just to acknowledge right now
that we have Pete Rios, who is the chair of the Pinal County
Board of Supervisors, Mark Harrington who is county
supervisor from Graham County, Richard Lunt, county
supervisor of Greenlee County, and Shirley Dawson, who is
the Gila County supervisor.

SHIRLEY DAWSON: I hate to start out by correcting
you, but the location of tonight's meeting is at the Gila
County Courthouse at the board of supervisors hearing room.
The public works building is a completely separate
building in a different location.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you. Thank you for
correcting me.

I'm looking at this. The overflow room is
actually in the Pima -- or the Gila county public works
complex.

I stand corrected.
The meeting tonight is at the Gila county
Courthouse board of supervisors hearing room, 1400 East Ash
Street in Globe.

Thank you very much for the correction.

And then the overflow room, if there are more
folks than can accommodate, we've got set up -- we have the
Gila county public works complex, which is at the Gila -- or
at the public works conference room, 745 North Rose Mofford
Way in Globe.

So thank you very much for the correction before
we get off on the wrong foot and send people to -- in the
wrong direction.

So, I'd like to begin -- first we also have many forks from the San Carlos Apache Nation here.

First of all, we'd like to thank you for allowing us to be within this facility. We feel honored to be here, and feel very respectful, and we are extremely excited about all of the folks that are coming here to speak.

We'd like to start with vice chairman of the San Carlos Apache, John Bush.

So if you would please come up to the microphone and spell your name for the record.

VICE CHAIRMAN JOHN BUSH: Spell my name first.

J-O-H-N, B-U-S-H.

Again, like Jo said here, dant'é, meaning how are you, I guess. And Apache language can be interpreted so many different ways, but I want to thank you for being here first of all.

I want to thank the Redistricting Committee. We thank you for your time and for being here, having this hearing here on our reservation.

Our reservation is -- we have almost 15,000 tribal members here, and we're very excited that you guys could be here with us today and we're glad to have you here.

I want to read you our support letter. You should have a copy of it.
Also we also intend to give you a resolution that was passed by the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council unanimously supporting the new maps. So you ought to get a copy of that also.

So I'll go ahead and begin.

This letter serves as notice that the San Carlos Apache Tribe officially supports the draft congressional district map entitled Commission approved congressional draft map and legislative district 7 map entitled legislative merge map of 10-19-11. On behalf of the tribe, I extend our grateful appreciation for the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, AIRC, to hold public hearings on lands of our reservation.

The mapping of the legislative and congressional district stands at the forefront of the protection of the core of democracy to vote.

For all their complexities, such maps serve to protect the basic maxim of one person, one vote.

Unfortunately our history has been rife with attempts to prevent citizens from voting based on race or to dilute competitiveness among political parties and interests.

Despite protection afforded by the U.S. Constitution, the Arizona Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, there are those among us who seek to
crush the elements of our democracy for their own political gain.

What many fail to realize, however, is that if one citizen's right to vote is denied, the very fabric of our democracy is threatened.

As late as 2002, the San Carlos Apache Tribe and other tribes had to file suit to prevent the dilution of our vote.

We must not repeat history. Instead we must be vigilant.

This is why the AIRC must ensure that when Arizona voting districts are drawn, the population within each district must be substantially equal for each person's vote to count.

We must be wary of efforts to require voter qualification or requirements of photographic identification and literacy tests.

The AIRC must also ensure that the new district maps are compact, contiguous, respectful of communities of interest, and competitive where competitiveness does not take from other factors.

To this end I respectfully remind the AIRC that the San Carlos Apache Tribe is an original community of interest, as each other tribe in Arizona, and that our population and boundaries be given consideration.
While each tribe is a separate sovereign, we share common interests with non-Indian citizens, which we express through our right to vote, whether the Arizona legislature or in congress, legislation affects our land, our natural resources, our culture and religion, our sacred sites, our reservation economy, our sovereignty, our right to self-determination, and our people.

Only through the power of the vote can we protect our interest.

Most importantly through the district maps provide for the opportunity for more Native American representatives to become elected officials.

For this reason we applaud the AIRC maps. For the first time in our history, the AIRC has proposed a congressional district map that provides for the opportunity for a Native American to be elected to the U.S. Congress.

The congressional map includes the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the Navajo Nation, Hopi Tribe, Hualapai, Havasupai, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Kaibab, Gila River Indian community and the Ak-Chin Indian community.

This map demonstrates a 20.5 percent Native American voting age population, which is well beyond other maps proposed to the Commission.

Similarly, the AIRC legislative map provides the opportunity for the San Carlos Apache and the other
Native Americans to be largely in a Native American district where 62 percent of the voting age population is Native American.

Prior to last redistricting efforts in 2000, Navajo legislative districts had a Native American voting age population of over 70 percent.

In 2000, the Native American voting age population decreased to 62.2 percent.

Currently the draft legislative map meets the 62 percent threshold.

Accordingly, on behalf of the San Carlos Apache Tribe, I respectfully request that the AIRC maintain the district lines in its congressional and legislative maps.

Thank you. Thank you for your time.

And, you know, we're -- we Native Americans, you know, we've -- although we've been here on this land for a long time, we just seem like we've never gotten equal representation.

Even in our county maps here, you know, we -- our reservation is broken up, between Gila and the Graham Counties.

And we're not -- we feel like our vote has always been diluted, there's always been a unfair opportunity for us, especially, you know, locally, speaking for my Apache people here, that the vote to -- for the state side has
always been lessened because of the way the lines have been
drawn.

And it's about time that we get some good equal
representation, statewide, nationally, county.

Thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you,
Vice Chairman Bush.

A couple of reminders, some housekeeping that I
missed before I brought up Vice Chairman Bush to speak was
the -- we have speaker forms in the back over at the back
table.

The yellow forms that look like this, please fill
them out if you wish to speak and turn them in to either
Kristina Gomez or the two people that are representing us at
the back table.

But if you do not wish to speak but you want to
make sure that you have your thoughts put into the record,
there are blue forms which you can fill out and you can put
all the information that you like.

There is no -- we're not looking at one more than
the other.

All the testimony that's given is being placed
equally part of the record, whether or not it's given at the
microphone or just given in writing.

You can also, for anybody that's watching this
online when this is replayed, you can go to our website at azredistricting.org and you can actually give your comments directly onto a prefilled out form on the website.

All that data is collected and collated and distributed to all of the commissioners for review.

So, before we go on to any of the other public speakers, we have a presentation that has been put together by our mapping consultants, Strategic Telemetry. And Korinne Belock is going to be providing that for us this morning.

Korinne.

KORINNE KUBENA BELOCK: Good morning. I am Korinne Kubena Belock with Strategic Telemetry. I'm happy to be here this morning in San Carlos to discuss the draft congressional and legislative maps presented by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.

The goal of these meetings is to hear comments from you about the draft maps, so thank you for taking the time to attend today.

The draft maps you will see today are currently under a 30-day review period so that the Commission can hear your opinion about these maps.

So before I get into the maps, I just want to give you a quick overview of the redistricting process.

So Arizona's redistricting process is governed by
the state constitution as amended by voters in 2000 with the passage of Proposition 106.

It is -- it stipulates that the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission redraw Arizona's congressional and legislative districts to reflect the most recent election results -- I'm sorry, to reflect the most recent census results.

Due to the 2010 census, Arizona gained a congressional seat, going from eight seats to nine seats.

So what are the constitutional requirements of the state Constitution via Prop 106.

The new district boundaries must comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act and they must have equal population. And criteria A and B are federally mandated.

And to the extent practicable, the districts must also be compact and contiguous, respect communities of interest, use visible geographic features, such as city, town, county boundaries, and undivided census tracts, and finally must favor competitive districts where no significant detriment to other goals.

So just a little bit about the Voting Rights Act as well.

So Arizona's congressional and legislative districts must receive preclearance or approval from the
Department of Justice or federal court under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act before they can be -- before they can take effect.

To get preclearance, Arizona must demonstrate that the new districts do not discriminate against minority voters in purpose or effect, which means there can be no intentional or accidental discrimination.

Under Section 5, Arizona's redistricting plans cannot be retrogressive. The plans cannot weaken or reduce minority voters' rights.

And the presence of discrimination can be determined by analyzing population data and election results.

So before I move on to some other parts of the presentation, we have Bruce Adelson today with us. He's an attorney with the Federal Compliance Consulting group, and he has been advising the Commission on matters relating to the Voting Rights Act and preclearance, so I'll give him a couple of minutes to speak.

BRUCE ADELSON: Thank you, Korinne.

Good morning.

Thank you, Korinne, and it's a pleasure to be here.

I thought that I could spend a couple of minutes with you talking about the federal aspects of redistricting,
particularly Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

Nine years ago I was the senior attorney for the United States Department of Justice. My job with Justice was reviewing Arizona's legislative and congressional redistricting plans.

In May, 2002, my team wrote the letter that objected to or blocked your legislative redistricting plan because we found the plan was discriminatory.

Under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, as Korinne was saying, if a plan -- if a redistricting plan is found to be discriminatory and reduces or weakens the opportunity of minority voters to elect who they want, the Department of Justice or the federal court in Washington, D.C., will not preclear or approve them.

Federal law requires such approval.

Without the approval of the department or the federal court in Washington, the lines will not go into effect, and you cannot have elections according to those lines.

I thought that it might be instructive to hear from my perspective as a former federal law enforcement officer the fact that federal law, the Voting Rights Act, is paramount, as well as the U.S. Constitution.

Communities of interest, contiguity, competitiveness, and all the factors under state law are
very important, but the federal factors trump them.

To the effect that if the state factors conflict with the federal ones, the federal ones predominate.

The federal ones must be satisfied in order for you to get that approval or preclearance that federal law requires.

So I appreciate your time today. It's a pleasure to be here.

And I hope that my perspective from being with DOJ nine years ago when we rejected the plan -- the legislative plan has been helpful.

Thank you very much.

KORINNE KUBENA BELOCK: Thank you.

Just a little bit more about the overall redistricting process and going into the timeline.

Earlier this year, step one, the Commission was established.

The commissioners were appointed following a thorough clean screening process and serve in a voluntary role for the state of Arizona.

Tonight, today, it's not evening, this afternoon, we have, of course, Linda McNulty and Richard Stertz.

And Chairman Mathis, as you can see, Jose Herrera, and Vice-Chair Scott Freeman are not present.

So going into the first round of hearings, which
was the next step after the Commission was created, before
drawing a single line the commissioners held 23 public
hearings around the state in July and August to get input
from members of the public about issues related to
redistricting, such as geography, communities of interest,
minority voting rights, and competitiveness.

After the hearing -- the first round of hearings,
the mapping process actually began.

And per Proposition 106 the Commission started
with a blank slate, which we'll talk more about a bit later.

They then divided the state into equal population,
in compact, grid-like districts. And the grid maps were
approved on August 18th.

Since adopting these grid maps, the Commission met
more than 25 times to consider adjustments to the grid, to
accommodate all of the constitutional criteria. During this
time they received additional public comment and draft maps
from the public as well.

Approval of the draft maps. On October 3rd, the
Commission approved the draft congressional map, which
you'll see today, that incorporated changes based on all of
the constitutional criteria.

It also -- the Commission also approved a draft
legislative map on October 10.

Which bring us to the second round hearings, which
are in process right now.

    The Commission's currently visiting 25 towns and cities to share the draft maps and to receive additional input during the month of October and November.

    The next step will be the final maps.

    So upon completion of the public comment period, the AIRC will adopt final maps.

    And then the preclearance process.

    Because Arizona, again, is subject to Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, the district maps must be approved by the federal Department of Justice or the federal court in Washington, D.C., before they can be used in Arizona elections.

    So moving on to the maps. To show you how the Commission came to the current draft maps, we're going to show you the progression of the maps.

    So, the map you see here was the congressional map that was approved by the last Redistricting Commission and was most recently used in the 2010 election.

    Per Proposition 106, which I mentioned, the Commission was required to start with a blank slate, not taking into consideration any previous election districts or incumbents.

    And then also for Proposition 106, the Commission started with a grid map which you see here.
The grid map, however, only takes into consideration two of the constitutional criteria -- two of the six constitutional criteria. Equal population and compactness are factored in here.

In August the Commission asked that two grid maps be drawn, and on August 18th they agreed on option two, again, which you see here on the screen.

So after more than 25 meetings, the Commission voted to approve the draft map that is on the screen now.

In addition to taking into consideration the six criteria, the Commission took into consideration public comment provided via public meetings, as well as comments mailed, e-mailed, hand-delivered, faxed, and given via telephone into the Commission.

Over 5,000 comments helped develop the draft map that you see here.

So as you can see, just to go through some of the highlights of the draft map for you.

The draft congressional map establishes two predominantly rural districts. It provides three border districts. It gives us three greater -- three districts in the greater Tucson area. Five districts that are entirely in Maricopa County. It avoids splitting Arizona's Indian reservations. And it creates two districts where minority voters have the opportunity to elect the candidate of
choice.

So moving into the legislative maps now.

Much like the congressional draft map, developing
the legislative draft map followed a similar process.

Here we see the legislative map used by the last
Commission -- developed by the last Commission which was
used for the 2010 elections most recently.

Again, per Proposition 106, the Commission started
with a blank slate.

The most exciting slide here; right?

The legislative grid map is the -- was approved in
August, and similar to the congressional map the grid map
took only into consideration equal population and
compactness.

Which brings us to the legislative draft map.

Arizona has 30 legislative districts, and each
district elects one senator and two house members.

Some points about the legislative draft map to
touch upon.

The Commission took into consideration population
growth and reduction.

And in the old districts, the population ranged
from 155,000 to 378,000.

For the current maps, the population ranges from
207,000 to 215,000.
To comply with the Voting Rights Act, the draft plan includes ten districts in which minority voters have the opportunity to collect -- to elect their candidate of choice.

And the draft map includes three districts wholly within Pima County and three additional southern Arizona districts.

It includes 17 districts which are primarily within Maricopa County and nine districts that are primarily rural.

As mentioned the Commission very much wants to hear what you have to say about these draft maps. So there are many ways that your voice can be heard.

You can fill out a request to speak form at a public hearing and provide the Commission with your input. Examples of input might include your thoughts on any of the constitutional criteria or any thoughts specifically on the legislative or congressional maps.

You can submit your input today by speaking at a hearing as well. You can fill out public forms at a hearing or on the AIRC website if you don't -- if you wouldn't like to speak.

And you can always visit azredistricting.org or call (602)542-5221, or toll free at (855)733-7478 to give any input on these maps.
So just to touch on another way you can stay connected, the Commission very much wants to make sure you can stay connected through this process.

The screen -- what you see on the screen here is a screen shot of the Commission's website.

The arrows highlight a couple key areas.

Under meetings you can find future and past meetings. In case you'd like to go back and see how the draft maps came to be, you can click on a certain date and view the hearings for those dates.

If you'd like to make comments, you can click on the public input form.

Or if you'd like to view the maps, which is probably what you want to do more than anything else, is you can click on maps.

And the arrow down at the bottom that you see there takes you directly to the draft maps, which an example of the screen that you get to next is shown here.

So finding the draft maps, most people, of course, are interested in viewing these. And this is the screen you'll be brought to.

The maps are just, like, in a number of different file types, which sort of makes this a little confusing when you just look at it, but the file types like PDF, JPEG, or Google maps.
The KMZ Google link which is circled in red on the screen will take you to the Google maps page of the draft maps, which I'll show you now.

So this is the view of the KMZ Google map. And we'll also have these on the screen following this presentation so you can see your area as well.

Google maps is a great way to view the maps because you can zoom in and out to your specific area to see the boundaries of your district.

Here you see a draft congressional map, from the zoomed out area of the entire state.

On the left you have the ability to turn on or off any of 15 filters for counties, or you have the ability to turn off different colors for areas you don't want to focus on.

Basically if you turn on and off the filters, it will help you to view the map more clearly.

I think it's is the biggest benefit of that.

So then you can zoom into the map.

This slide shows a zoomed in look on some of the districts around Maricopa County.

And, again, I'll pull up the zoomed in area around the areas we're in today.

You have the ability to zoom in or out down to city blocks or your neighborhood blocks, so you can see
exactly where the boundaries of the district falls.

So as I wrap up, I just want to highlight the Commission's website for you once again. Azredistricting.org, where you can access those maps.

And on the website you can draw maps, you can watch meetings, and you can find out details about future meetings as well.

You can also follow us on Twitter at the hash tag AIRC and friend us on Facebook for, you know, up-to-the-minute updates on Facebook.

So in conclusion, I just want to thank you for coming out today to be a part of this process.

A final note on the maps, copies can be found in the packets you received today. And we also have blown up versions of the map on the back wall to give you a much better view of the areas that you're interested in looking at.

And also I am available after the public comment period if you have any questions regarding maps.

And you can also talk to any of the staff here today that can provide insight on the maps, show you how to access them on the Commission's website, and anything else that you might have questions about.

So I look forward to speaking with you, and thank you for having us today.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Korinne.

Now it's time for public comment.

This is the time for the public where you can provide input with respect to the draft congressional and legislative maps.

As a reminder, when you come up to the microphone, speak clearly, speak into the microphone. If you need help adjusting it, Buck will come over and help you adjust the microphone.

This is the time when, if you've got revised maps of your own that you'd like to submit, please do so. If you've drawn maps, if you have it for us either in paper form or electronically, you can provide those for us today as well.

This is the time when we want to receive public comment and, you know, really try to get as much detailed modification as we can from you regarding the draft congressional and the draft legislative maps that we, that we are collecting comment on.

When you come to the microphone, also spell your name for the court reporter. And just -- if I butcher your name, I apologize, as I'm reading through these sheets.

Also say if you're with any particular organization or group, other than as you have recorded on your yellow sheets.
And if you have any particular materials that you would like to hand in for the record, you can do so by either passing them over to Kristina Gomez in the blue shirt in the side of the room at the entry table.

And just as a reminder for everyone, these beautiful packets that have been put together, which include the blue writing sheet, please make sure that you have one of these if you haven't picked one up at the entry table. They include an introduction letter from our chair, chairwoman Mathis. It also includes copies of the maps. It also includes data points in regards to the data that is the underlying data of how the maps were created, as well as some instructions on how to get to the website. Many of -- much of which you have just seen on the overhead Power Point presentation.

So without further ado, I'm going to go ahead and begin.

Before I do so, Vice Chair Bush, was there anything else that you had to present or make comment on today?

VICE CHAIRMAN JOHN BUSH: No, that's it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Very good. Thank you very much. And thank you for your other earlier comments and submittal into the record.

And I understand that there is a resolution that
will be presented to us sometime.

VICE CHAIRMAN JOHN BUSH: We'll give it to you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Very good. Thank you, sir.

Okay. Moving on. We're going to go to

Councilman Simon Hooke of the San Carlos Apache, San Carlos, Arizona.

COUNCILMAN SIMON HOOKE: Good morning.

Good morning. You want me to go ahead and spell my name?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Spell your name, please, and say where you're from and what city or county you're from.


From the San Carlos Indian reservation, Gilson Wash District.

Okay.

I am Simon Hooke, councilman of the Gilson Wash District, San Carlos Apache reservation, San Carlos, Arizona.

I am an Apache and enrolled in the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

I am also an Arizona voter and vote in federal, state, county, and Apache tribal elections.

I have lived all my life on the reservation except for my time in the service fighting in the Middle East war.
for the United States.

I feel that the elected representatives do not represent the Apache people, Apache government, or Native American interests.

If I vote for a United States congressman, he will not know or understand Native American issues.

From my experience, it seems inevitable that the congress person who is supposed to represent me, the interest of the voters, will go against Native American beliefs.

One example is sacred sites.

Many tribes and Native American people take very seriously this desecration of sacred sites, like the San Francisco Peaks, Cold Flats, and other sites located within Native American traditional lands.

However, there is no Native American person on the U.S. Congress who knows, supports, and advocates Native American religious, cultural, and use rights associated with sacred sites.

I want the opportunity for a Native American person to sit on congress who will care about Native American issues.

In the past I felt like it did not matter if I voted, because the representative did not address my issues or the issues of Apaches and other Native Americans.
If there is a chance that I can elect a person that will stand up for Native Americans' rights, I will go out and vote.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker, we have Dee Randall, representing the San Carlos Apache.

DEE RANDALL: Good morning.

My name is Dee Randall D-E-E, R-A-N-D-A-L-L.

I'm here representing the San Carlos Apache Tribe, natural resources program, and also I am a tribal member.

And I support the redistricting congressional map and also the legislative map.

I also feel that my vote is being diluted, especially during congress. As I work for the forestry program, San Carlos Apache Tribe is unique. We have the Tonto National Forest on our west side, we have the Coronado National Forest on our east side.

Our, our reservation is a federal trust land, but yet we're the only federal land where people actually live on the land.

The land, our forest provides shelter in the form of lumber and wood for our tribal members for home heating and for building.

Our forest provides employment for logging
industry and from our cattle industry, which we have on our reservation.

And we also have recreation from hunting, fishing, camping, and outdoor recreation.

And it also provides food.

We still provide -- we still gather food from our forest and we also gather medicinal plants from our forest still. And it's still done today. And especially water. Our reservation provides a lot of water to the state of Arizona and to the United States.

And that's why I feel my vote is being diluted in the congressional district.

An example, the Tonto National Forest, their funding is 24 million a year. The Coronado National Forest is 19 million in a year.

The San Carlos Apache Tribe, our forestry program, our the natural resources program, we get 1.4 million a year.

As far as employees go, Tonto, they employ 174 permanent employees, 200 temporary employees. The Coronado employs 200 temporary and permanent employees.

San Carlos, this includes all of our natural resources program, our forestry program, our range program, our archeology, and we only employ 64 temporary and permanent employees with our recreation, all of our
employees.

Area and size.

Tonto has it 2.9 million acres. The Coronado has 1.2 million.

San Carlos, our reservation, is 1.8 million acres in size.

And as far as timber harvest, the amount of timber we can cut annually, Tonto has 4.4 million, the area we're allowed to cut. And Coronado is zero. They don't allow us to harvest timber.

San Carlos, we harvest 5.6 million board feet of timber.

And breaking it down on a per acre basis, the Tonto has -- they get funding based on 48.35 per acre. The Coronado is $10.21 per acre.

And San Carlos is $2.35 per acre.

But yet I still feel that my vote is being diluted in congress because of the lack of equal funding.

We need to make sure that our forest where San Carlos Apache people live has funding so that we may manage our forest correctly and indefinitely for our people and the future of our people.

A good example about proper management is the Wallow fire. And we all know that was the biggest fire in Arizona. And it occurred this year.
It came onto the San Carlos Apache reservation. It hurt us, but it didn't hurt us as much as it the north, the Alpine district, and the Apache Sitgreaves district. We manage that area. We had a timber sell in there. We thin. And it was all ready for a prescribed burn. We were prepared.

If it would have been different, and we didn't have enough funds -- well, we still don't have enough funding for it, but if we didn't manage it correctly, our losses could have been greater.

So that's why I'm here to support this congressional redistricting map so that my vote won't be diluted and it would count for at least to make sure that our forest and our resources are protected and we have enough funding to manage it.

Thanks.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Randall. Next speaker is Vernelda Grant, director of tribal archeology, archeologist, San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Apache.

VERNELDA GRANT: Good morning.

You were close with my name.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

VERNELDA GRANT: How to spell it is V, as in Victor, E-R-N-E-L-D-A. Last name Grant, G-R-A-N-T.
Good morning.

Hach ch'i, in other words.

I'm Vernelda Grant. I'm the director and the tribal historic reservation officer and the tribal archeologist for the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

And I'm a 38 year old tribal member, and my clan is, on my mother's side, is Kaibtnagotel, which has to do with willows and growing in the valley. And although we're located and live here in San Carlos Apache, I was born and raised here, my clan stems from the Star Valley area just outside of Payson.

And I just bring that up because I wanted to give you an example of how we've been from our previous history taken from our original homelands and brought here to San Carlos.

And, I'm -- I have a traditional upbringing, raised traditionally in learning our Apache ways, Apache language first, English second.

I was very fortunate enough to as long as many people here have had the chance to learn about our medicines and plants, our history, our culture, music, dance, and how important it is to know who you are and to use that to your advantage to live a good life in a good way with your family, with yourself, and your neighbors.

And a lot of this knowledge is acquired at
different stages, on different levels, throughout your lifetime.

So when you see our elders, they get to the level of knowing all these, all these things that are really holy and sacred and very special.

And when you're among our elders, you really feel their wisdom, you really feel it, and their presence and their knowledge of the years that they have acquired this knowledge.

And so that's my traditional Apache side.

My -- I guess my other side of me, if I have two people here, is I really proud of who reinforced me to be successful to achieve this is my educational side.

I am a product of the San Carlos Junior High School on the reservation, graduate 1987.


And I'm a product of also Northern Arizona University in Flagstaff. I received a -- earned my, actually, bachelors of arts in anthropology and minored in English and music, and I have also a master's in arts in applied anthropology focusing on southwest and archeology database management, the class of 1999, also in Northern Arizona University.

So I share that with you because it's, you know, a
role. It enables me to be here with my people and to work
with other native people es. It's a role that's enabled to
me to address culture resources, management issues, from the
grassroots level to the state level, to the national level,
working with nonprofit organizations, the private sector,
and the federal agency, state agencies, the
intergovernmental affairs, the White House, as well as
United Nations.

And I think it's really important, because, you
know, kind of see a lot of things that go on outside of the
state of Arizona and different situations that we're all put
in.

And I'm here to speak on specifically on the
geographic features and sacred sites. And just, you know,
for the time we have, I just want to share some things.

As Apache people, you know, as far as geographic
features is concerned, we -- our connection to the land is
very important to us.

It's very personal. It's a thing that, I
mentioned before, takes a lifetime of knowledge to achieve.

You know, it's a continuous process of learning.

And, you know, since we believe that since time
immemorial we have been here in this area, and what we refer
to as our traditional cultural territories.

We're surrounded by mountains, springs, areas
where we gather food and medicinal plants where we harvest, 
traditional hunting areas, traditional burn sites, 
ceremonial areas and holy places.

For the purpose of the redistricting hearing, I 
wanted to let you know that our geographic traditional 
cultural territory extends from the Grand Canyon from the 
north to three fourths of the eastern boundary of the state 
of Arizona and New Mexico, and down to about half of the 
southern boundary of the state of Arizona and Mexico.

And as far west as Bagdad -- well, Phoenix, 
Wickenburg, and Bagdad.

So when we are consulted with -- by the federal 
government or state agencies, these are areas if a proposed 
construction project occurs they consult with our tribe. 
And, you know, ensuring that sacred sites and holy sites and 
ceremonial areas are addressed.

And that's primarily my job. Sixty percent of the 
mail that comes to the tribe to the chairman's office for 
signature and review is rerouted to my office.

And I really don't say that proudly. I wish it 
wasn't.

But, you know, I just wanted to, you know, provide 
that information, because it's really important to us -- you 
know, these places are sacred to us. They're holy. You 
know, holy meaning that these places, if we don't have
connections to these areas, it really has an effect on our well-being. It has an effect on our identity. It has an effect on the well-being of our people now, our people in the future, and, you know, obviously the things from the past. It's all connected.

And we've -- as a tribe and as a people and as Indian people, we've always had issues with protection of these important places to us. You know, we've disclosed information in hearings, in testimonials that were really hurtful, that were really emotional, because we disclosed information that was really, you know, something that was sacred to us that shouldn't be put in public, that shouldn't be written down on paper.

You know, that's part of our oral, oral history process.

And, you know, for the sake of, for the sake of having these areas protected, and, you know, to keep it from being further desecrated, and -- you know, it was very -- you know, I witnessed many times our people just having emotional, you know, emotional situations, and, you know, really -- things -- actually something like this really, really we take it to heart.

I know that it's very difficult for us to publicly go out to vote, and it's very difficult for us to look at things that are in black and white, because we're such a,
you know, face-to-face people, you know.

And, but I just wanted to mention that -- you know, it's really important natural and cultural resources to our people.

And in my role I wanted to, I could go in and really name a lot of specific situations and projects and really interesting things that we deal with, but I just, you know, for the sake of the hearing, and the many speakers behind me, I just wanted to conclude that I support the proposed redistricting of the legislative and congressional district maps.

And I thank you, and I welcome you, and hope that each and every one of you has a nice visit here today. Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Mr. Stertz.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ma'am, ma'am, Vernelda, would you please come back up and spell the clan?

VERNELDA GRANT: Can I write that down?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Sure.

VERNELDA GRANT: Okay. Where do I . . .

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: While she's doing that, I'd like to welcome Terry Ross, director of social services, from Gila County.

Not knowing what SCAT stands for, I'll let you take that.
TERRY ROSS: Good morning.

My name is Terry Ross, T-E-R-R-Y, R-O-S-S. And I currently serve as director of social services for San Carlos Apache Tribe.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ah, thank you.

TERRY ROSS: And mine will probably be a reiteration of what my colleagues have said, but I think it's a good time..

I support the draft. I think it's a good opportunity for Native Americans to participate in democracy and also to be -- to have that challenge of representing Indian country.

Mine is short and sweet, and I think it also supports the minority voting strength and to also keep it intact. I think that's what the feelings of Indian country is, is that sometimes our votes don't count because of how lines are drawn.

And also preserves our community, our culture, our society.

And working with tribal social services, you know, I see it as an opportunity for someone that can know our issues of Indian country that can represent us, and also be our voice, and to also advocate on our behalf.

And, you know, not drawing the lines to carving up our community, and it also keeps intact with our jobs and
our schools and transportation.

So I fully support it, and thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Ross.

Next we have Annette Ayze, administrative assistant, San Carlos Apache Tribe, from San Carlos, Gila County.

ANNETTE AYZE: Good morning.

My last name is always mispronounced. It's a Navajo last name, but I'm a member of the San Carlos Apache Tribe. My name is A-N-N-E-T-T-E, A-Y-Z-E.

Like I said, my name is Annette Ayze. I am a member of the San Carlos Apache Tribe and a registered voter in the San Carlos Apache reservation and Gila County.

I vote in the tribe, state, and federal elections.

My concerns deal with the lack of information regarding the candidates and issues involved in state and federal elections.

In prior elections, when I went to the polls to vote in state or federal, I was overwhelmed at the number of candidates and propositions listed on the ballots.

I did not know most of the candidates or the issues referred to by the propositions.

I did not know who to vote for because I had never heard of any candidates, and I am sure that the people of the San Carlos Apache Tribe and many Native American
communities have experienced this as well.

   Especially being confused when reading the
proposition languages, where I thought I had a yes vote, but
in reality turned out it meant no.

   In conclusion, as a registered voter, I support
the most recent congressional map, and thank you for your
time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Annette.

   Next to speak is Lynnia Kidde.

LYNNIA KIDDE: Good morning, members of the
Commission. My name is Lynnia Kidde, spelled L-Y-N-N-I-A,
last name K-I-D-D-E.

   I am a tribal member enrolled with the San Carlos
Apache Tribe. I was born and raised in San Carlos with the
exception of leaving the reservation for my education.

   I work in the office of the general manager, as
the special projects manager.

   Today I'm here simply to support both the current
maps.

   I believe that it gives, it gives us an
opportunity to have a stronger native voice at both the
legislative and congressional levels, and it also gives
tribes within the districts that my reservation would fall
under, it gives us a chance to unite, to unite on many
similar fronts that involve issues that a lot of tribes can
probably find a lot of commonalities.

And it affects the impacts and -- the impacts that the tribes experience dealing with some of these issues are similar. And we can -- what I'm trying to say is we can unite and show that, that strength at those levels.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next to speak is Flora Howard, education director, San Carlos Apache Tribe, Gila County.

FLORA HOWARD: Good morning. My name is Flora Howard, and I am the education director, and I welcome you here to San Carlos.

I'm also a tribal member with the San Carlos Apache Tribe and a registered voter.

I vote for the San Carlos Apache tribe, state, and federal elections.

And my concern deals with the education that we provide for our community. I think that education is very vital to our tribal members.

And one of the -- as our tribal leaders who are elected and also those of us who hold these positions as directors, we believe that education is a major issue because of the fact that we want to be able to see our younger generation be able to get the education they need to be able to support themselves and their family in
futures to come. And also that one day they can also maybe
stand before you and, say, you know, run for one of these
big elected positions.

And, you know, and I think that this is all around
the state, the United States itself. We always look for
more funding within our tribe to be able to meet the needs
of our children, not just children from the elementary age,
but those that want to attend college and the universities.

Funding is so limited that we're not able to send
our students off to college and be able to pay for the cost
of tuition and room and board and, you know, all the
additional costs that pertain to education.

Just knowing that, you know, that we're able to --
again, I, I am in support of this draft, the two draft maps
that are -- have been presented to us.

And, I think this also will allow us to be able to
have our needs known and to be able to have somebody there
representative who understands what our community needs,
especially with education funding. We always are, again,
like a say, we're always in need of funding.

And I think that to be able to have a
representative who knows what our -- who knows and
understands what the community needs, you know, they'll be
able to provide more funding, which means that they'll be
able to provide the services needed for our students.
So I just would like to share with you, and, again, I do support those maps, and, again, I welcome you here today.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Next to the podium is Steve Titla, general counsel, San Carlos Apache.

STEVE TITLA: My name is Steve, S-T-E-V-E, last name is Titla, T-I-T-L-A.

Good morning, commissioners and esteemed attorneys for the Commission. You're in good hands with the attorneys here.

But I can give them a helping hand if you need down the road.

I'm an attorney of record also.

I'm general counsel for San Carlos Apache Tribe, and we thank you for coming to San Carlos and Apache land.

These are -- this areas are aboriginal Apache lands. If you look at the maps that are in the back over here, we have a treaty with the United States from 1852. And you know that treaties are recognized by the U.S. Supreme Court, and they're recognized internationally, international law. Treaties are made between sovereign entities. And in 1852 the United States viewed Apache tribes as sovereign entities, and so it made a treaty with the Apache tribes.
This treaty was ratified by the Senate, the senators at the time. I don't know how many there were back then in 1852. I wasn't around. But whatever they were, they the ratified the treaty.

And they did this across the nation. They did treaties with Indian tribes all across the nation, the Navajo Nation, the San Carlos, and other tribes in the nation.

And in one of the treaties in the northwest, they said that the United States said that the treaty would be good as long as the grass grows green and the river flows, is what they said in the treaty.

In that particular situation, the next year I think the United States broke that treaty.

So it doesn't bode well for United States and treaty making.

But here I just want to let you know a little bit of our history and our background in Apache land.

Our treaty lands on the east side goes all the way to the New Mexico border.

That's our treaty lands down there. So Morenci, Clifton, all of those areas, are our lands.

But when they discovered copper, and they produced a copper mine, that land was taken from us.

And then we had treaty lands all the way to
New Mexico. You have Safford, Thatcher, Pima, Duncan, all that area there is Apache land also.

They found the farming interest in there, and they took that land also.

Then down on the southwest here, you have Hayden, Winkleman, Dudleyville, Kearny, all that, that's Apache land also.

When they discovered copper and different minerals there, they took that land also.

On the west, we have Globe, Miami.

And those areas here on the west side, six miles from here, and that was Apache land also.

But when they discovered copper and the minerals there, they took that land also.

So on the northwest they discovered asbestos mining by the Salt River. They took that land too.

So we are left with what we have right now.

And the tribe is very -- is interested, and we want to maintain whatever little piece we have now.

The other lands were taken from us. We can't get it back.

And, but this is our aboriginal Apache lands.

Now, what the people here have been talking about, I note, is a community of interest. They talked about the we feel that San Carlos is a community of interest along
with other tribes and the surrounding communities where San Carlos has an interest.

The tribes, especially San Carlos Apache, we feel is the original community of interest.

I know that whoever brought up the term community of interest probably wasn't thinking about Apache tribes, but, within that definition, I think that you have the San Carlos Apache Tribe, because these are -- these mountains and hills around southeastern Arizona, that's all Apache land where different Apache groups had their community of interest.

This goes in often to reservation lands.

Now, with regard to sacred sites, we have Vernelda Grant and some of the other Apache speakers talk about sacred sites.

Now, these are sites within our aboriginal Apache lands also. We want that to be within our district.

Because if you have sacred sites within Apache land district, our representative, whoever that is, will know that that is sacred site to Apaches as well as other tribes.

Sacred sites are sacred to other tribes too in the district. And in the congressional proposed map I think you have 11 tribes, and that's good, Commission. I commend you for doing a good job on having that proposed initial grid
In those 11 tribes, those tribes have their own sacred sites also.

In Apache right now we are in conflict with the mine up here on the west side, Oak Flat, and Gaan Canyon, they call it.

So we view that as a community of interest area.

I think that the Navajo Nation and other tribes are fighting the San Francisco Peak issue, and those are community of interest areas we feel.

We would like them to be within the reservation, within the district that in the congressional, in the state legislative district. And the people that are within those district are represented. There's one of our Apache speakers here a while ago. I heard her say that she doesn't know the candidates, she doesn't know who they are, she never sees them. So when she comes to vote, she doesn't know who to vote for.

And to me that means that our community of interest is not adequately represented by congressional or state legislative staff.

If they were -- but, and Apaches, we really vote, we come out and vote probably over 90 percent for tribal elections.

And the reason that is is because our community of
interest, our tribal election is where people know the candidates and they know the issues and they know our land.

That is not true for congressional or state legislative races.

If we knew in the congressional district that we have -- if those candidates were native, or if not native, if they were somebody else that understood our issue, if they came to us and understood sacred sites and the culture and the tradition of the Apache tribe, then we would know those people and we would know who to vote for.

So the point being that if we can get enough percentage in the congressional and state legislative district, where we have a chance of voting somebody into office, then we feel more a part of the United States as citizens.

Because we are citizens of the United States, as well as citizens of the state of Arizona, as well as citizens of our tribes.

And so if we have enough percentage in those districts, in the congressional state districts, and we know those people, and they come out to see us, and we know them, then we have -- we feel that we're part of this process and we can vote somebody in.

I think that's what she was saying, this sort of community of interest in this type area.
And then with regard to -- this is Apache Gold Casino. This is our casino here. We negotiated a compact with the State of Arizona in 1993. And governor -- I can't remember the name now. When you get a little older, this is what happens, you can't remember anything, you can't remember these names.

I'm not that old, but John Bush, vice chairman, is older than me.

But, anyway, the governor at the time would not sign our compact or negotiate with us in good faith as written under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, so we had to sue the State of Arizona at the time. Several tribes did.

And finally we got a gaming contact. We renewed that compact recently in 2003 for 23 years.

But the gaming dollars we here, we contribute to the local economy.

Under the compact there's a thing called Section 12 funding, and what we do is tribes in Arizona, we put some money aside, and what we do is local communities off reservation like Globe -- Globe, Miami, and on the east side Thatcher, Morenci, all those groups, they, they request for funding.

And so what we do is we select a certain entity and, for example, we might fund their Little League ball
field or their parks or their recreation, whatever. So we help the local community out.

And San Carlos Apaches contribute a significant amount of their economy to the local area, to Globe.

Over here, the Hualapai, they call that Apache heaven, because every payday apaches are -- flock to that area.

And we buy cars, and we are part of the community there.

We just want an equal share in the return of whatever, because we contribute a significant tax base over there.

And so we have people in our community of interest that can represent us adequately, and then that's part of the community of interest is what I feel, the gaming dollars.

Also, I think that in the districts you were drew here in the congressional and state legislative districts, we wanted to be a rural district also.

We wanted to have enough Indian native vote in a rural district so that we can, we can have a chance of voting somebody in.

Our dream, I think the dream of many Apaches, is to have a native congressman in congress someday. That hasn't happened.
Our dream is to have a native in the state legislative district from our area that will understand our issues.

And that's our community of interest.

Now, with regard to the rural district, we don't want the district that snakes into Phoenix or Mesa or Tempe or Tucson, because those districts have huge populations.

And what that would do is overshadow our small vote.

And the city people sometimes do not understand the native vote or the native people because they stay in the city a lot. So we think that it should be a rural district with enough native vote in there.

With regard to the voting requirements over here, I think somebody is going to talk about this later. But I don't want to -- I be able to say it a little bit.

When I go vote, we have to vote in different places.

We have to vote in the -- for federal elections, for state elections, for tribal elections, for county elections, all the votes are in different places.

Someone is going to talk about that. Somebody. Okay. I don't want to -- I'll let her cover it.

But, anyways, as an Apache, that happens to me.
And I was confused last time.

I thought you could vote in one place but I had to go to a tribal vote to tribal district first, and then you have to travel to the federal district for the federal vote, then you go to the state vote.

Apaches won't -- the likelihood of Apaches going to all these places is going to be difficult for them to vote in all the areas. Because on our reservation we have unemployment anywhere from I heard 75 percent to, BIA told me, 81 percent.

Whatever it is, it's so very high that it's sort of a sin in the United States, I think.

In the United States we have a current unemployment rate of, I don't know, 10 percent, 9 percent.

In the state of Arizona, it's like 9 or 10 percent.

What do you think would happen to the state of Arizona or the United States if we went to unemployment of 75 percent? What do you think would happen?

What would happen is that we as citizens of the United States would throw those bums out, the congress, the state legislature, the president. We would throw them out and get somebody else.

And you know that would happen.

Maybe a revolution would happen with that kind of
percentage.

But live under those kind of situations on the reservation constantly.

So, sometimes it doesn't matter whether it's a Republican administration, under President Bush, or under President Obama, President Clinton, sometimes doesn't matter to us. What does it matter if I vote when we have constant 75 percent unemployment, when seven out of ten people are unemployed.

And from that you get the social ills on the reservation. You get -- when these people aren't working, they get into trouble. They get into drinking, alcoholism, drug abuse. Then you get into the social ills of people in their homes, the married people, they get domestic violence.

Then you have the children born with FAS, FES, drug babies. That's the plague of poverty. We are a cycle of poverty.

So how can we help break the cycle of poverty?

I think that the voting requirements, if we can get native people there that can understand situation in our community of interest, I think that will help us out as Apaches.

So the voting requirements, I think, are discriminatory to native voters, all the things that we have to do.
Now, with regard to the congressional -- the state legislative maps, the benchmark that our honorable Vice Chairman John Bush talked about, he talked about maintaining the 62 percent and the 20.5 percent threshold.

We would like to recommend to the Commission that you maintain that threshold as a benchmark for future years.

Because we as Apaches do not want to regress from those numbers. We want to improve upon those numbers in future years.

Because right now in the tribe, John, John Bush, the vice chairman, and Simon Hooke, the council members, are working to provide a permanent homeland for our tribe.

As we go into the future, the next 10 or 20 or 30 years, we want to be able to provide a good homeland for our Apaches with good employment, good employment benefits, and the protection of our natural resources, the protection of our sacred sites, to have enough water for these people in future years, people that are going to come after us, our descendents.

And so that's what we want to do. That's why we want to maintain a benchmark now.

So I would urge the Commission that it's important not to decrease the percentage threshold as seen in the past.
Arizona, as the vice chairman so ably said, is a Section 5 state due to past discriminatory practices in our state.

We don't want to maintain that.

Ideally we should not be a Section 5 state, except for things that happened in our state in the past.

Now, we weren't involved in that. I'm sure that you were not involved in that.

So it is our chance, this is our time, and I'd like to sort of quote our honorable president, President Obama.

He said that this is our time.

And I believe him.

Now, Obama, our president, is another one that I thought would never happen in our history of the United States.

I know the economic situation in the United States.

I thought that in my lifetime we would never see an African American, President Obama, be president.

But he became president. Thought I'd never see that, so I'm really glad to see that happen.

Now, the next step is to see a native in the congress, or the vice president as a native, or even the president.
If President Obama can be elected into office, then why cannot a native person get into the same office. We would like to see that opportunity.

We would like to see equal opportunity, truly equal opportunity, because that's what it says in our constitution. The United States Constitution talks about equal opportunity, equal political rights. That's what it says.

I think the United States should once and for all live up to all those promises that it says in the constitution.

It says we the people. That includes me. That includes the Apache people here. That includes us too.

And we want to be part of -- an equal part of the political process and the congressional and the state legislative races as we go forward here.

Thank you.

I don't want to talk too much. I could go on and on, but I'll leave it.

Thank you for that.

We support, in the end, the final analysis, we support the congressional district map that you produced. We support the state legislative map that you produced.

Don't regress, don't discriminate, and don't violate the Voters Rights Act of 1965.
Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next up we have Robert Clark, Jr., San Carlos Apache Tribe member.

ROBERT CLARK, JR.: Good morning.

My name is Robert Clark, Jr., R-O-B-E-R-T, C-L-A-R-K.

And I'm representing the San Carlos Apache Tribe. I'm a tribal member of that tribe, so I'm representing them.

And I work with the planning -- planning and economic development department of the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

Thank you, chairman, for giving us the opportunity to have our -- have us address our concerns.

I am going to mention the fact that most reservations are what you would call rural areas.

We get all our mail at the post offices. There's no such thing as homestead mail delivery.

The new proposed -- the new proposal covers a huge area, but people population is very, very scarce in the rural-type situations.

And the proposal covers a lot of the rural areas, which we like.

This proposal -- we like this proposal because rural area life is completely different from the
metropolitan type of life.

Rural area have a, a lot of unique issues.

With this proposition, we have more support for our issues. Whereas a rep from a metropolitan area would have no idea what a rural area life is.

So our issues are completely different.

And by going this route, you know, we -- our -- the people in the rural area would have a voice in our tribal government.

I'm a registered voter for, for the -- all the different districts and for the tribe.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Next up Dee Randall, forester from the San Carlos Apache.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: He spoke already.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Oh, he did.

Francie Brown, grant writer and planner for the San Carlos Apache.

FRANCIE BROWN: Good morning. Francie Brown, F-R-A-N-C-I-E, B-R-O-W-N.

Chairman and members of the Commission, thank you for making time to hear my concerns as I voice my support for the current maps as presented -- or the current draft maps as presented.
I work for the San Carlos Apache Tribe as a grant writer within the office of planning and economic development.

In terms of funding and funding allocations, the redrawing of congressional and legislative lines may allow for heightened awareness of our tribal needs as they pertain to funding streams and non-funding availability.

As a tribe we apply for federal, state grants.

The majority of our funding that we receive is from grants, namely federal grants.

And if the chance that we may elect an individual that understands and reaffirms our tribal issues and needs, then the funding that we may receive or that's available to us may be streamlined to meet the needs of our people.

And as a grant writer, that's one of my priorities, main concerns, is that we may elect someone that can lobby for more funding for us.

On a separate note, I understand that the tribal elections are held in conjunction with state and federal elections.

In keeping that in mind, I also understand that the polling sites may not be located in the same area.

To ease the challenges and inconveniences of traveling to two separate sites, in my case I'm San Carlos Apache, and I am registered to vote here for the tribe, but
I am registered to vote in the Navajo County for federal and state elections.

So the new maps would allow a person like myself to register and vote in just one site. So the new maps would allow me to register and vote here for tribal and state and federal.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Sherrie Harris, tourism planner, San Carlos Apache Tribe.

SHERRIE HARRIS: Good afternoon. It's Sherrie, S-H-E-R-R-I-E, last name Harris, H-A-R-R-I-S.

We hope that you will enjoy your brief visit to our beautiful reservation.

I am -- I work within the planning and economic development department as a tourism planner for the San Carlos Apache Tribe.

The tribe supports the current map which aligns us with ten other Arizona Indian tribes in one district.

Tourism is a major draw for many Arizona tribes, and tribal tourism including recreation and gaming activities are major contributors to our local economy.

The proposed lines would also allow native people to have a greater and unified vote and increase the chances of a Native American from a rural and reservation community...
Such an individual would be more aware of tribal sovereignty, Native American rights, and other issues that are important to the Native American populations.

This would allow our people to feel that they have more of a voice, to make sure that their vote counts, and not have someone just come and visit us, soliciting our votes, when its election time, and we never see them the rest of their term.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Harold Nofchissey, director, San Carlos recreation and wildlife department.

HAROLD NOFCHISSEY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and commission members.

My name is Harold Nofchissey. It's spelled H-A-R-O-L-D. Nofchissey is N-O-F-C-H-I-S-S-E-Y.

I'm employed with the San Carlos recreation and wildlife department, San Carlos Apache Tribe, but I'm actually an enrolled member of the Navajo Tribe. I was born and raised -- I was born and raised in Clifton, spent most of my time growing up there.

I've been on the San Carlos reservation for about 40 years.

I think that experience has thought me something,
because I've been able to see how laws apply in both sides of the fence.

Then off the reservation, growing up there, I learned how communities work, how the county works, cities and stuff and the laws work.

Work for the tribe, I see tribal law work.

Also I've been in law enforcement for over 30, probably 40 years now. And I was a law enforcement officer. I also had to learn and enforce tribal, state, federal laws, had to understand how the laws -- all the different laws affect the tribes. And the laws pertaining to the state, how they -- how the state works with their laws and how the tribal -- what the differences are, is what I'm trying to say.

I understand the differences between them and how they, how they work with different cultures and different traditions.

And so a good background of what I want to talk about when I speak about these districts, these districts that are being proposed today.

I support these districts. I do that for a reason.

Knowing, knowing how the laws work, like I said, I guess the best way to explain this is to give you some examples.
Federal law made at the federal level impact the reservations. Certain laws would be like threaten endangered species act, those kind of laws.

The tribes are sovereign nations, so we have to -- we try to protect what happens in the tribe, our own species here in the tribe.

We try to make sure that we follow the guideline of the federal laws, and federal threatened and endangered species laws, because we don't want to oppose their laws on reservation what we need to do down here.

And the difference between a federal law and the state are totally different.

The threatened endangered species act protected by law on their side by the reservation, of course, and the threatened endangered species act protected on the reservation are more traditional.

They serve the same purpose but are two different ways of approaching the same problem. Protect the species. And just one idea.

Some of the other speakers before me spoke about sovereignty and issues of protecting our land, and have proper representations to protect the land.

I wonder if we shouldn't declare ourself threatened endangered species because maybe that way we will get some of the moneys that entities off the reservation get
for pig males, Mexican gray wolf, and such.

From my department, recreation and wildlife department, we get funds from the federal government, under -- because of the trust responsibilities that the federal government has in tribes.

However, our budget for the department runs about close to $2,000,000. $1.3 million of that is -- well, actually 1.8 million of that -- dollars of that budget we have annually comes from the tribe, what we sell ourselves, permits and stuff. $200,000 comes from the federal government.

And without proper representation at the federal level, we don't get the funding that really is required to protect what we need on the reservation, to protect our natural resources here.

I think Mr. Randall expressed that earlier and explained that earlier.

The funding is a lot less here on the reservation. We don't get as much as the states do.

The states are concerned -- I'd like to speak a little bit about the Heritage Grant and the indian promotion acts.

Those funds come from the federal government, through the states, and once in a while to the tribes. So it's a long process.
However they formulate to give out grants to
develop federal rule courts doesn't include tribal lands.
But statistics to come up with those, how much each
jurisdiction is going to get, includes what goes on in
tribal land or hunts, how many hunts do we sell, how much
gas do we use on the reservation. Those statistics comes
off the reservation. We turn that over to the state, and
the state uses that to get the federal money away from the
federal government.

So I don't believe we're getting true
representation in that kind of -- those kind of things.

So that's why I say I really truly -- let me back
up a little bit more.

I'm starting because I was told this morning that
to come up here and say some things, so I'm doing it from my
mind, and just he told me to speak from my heart, and so I
will.

Another issue I had with misrepresentation of
tribes, or lack of representation from tribes, again,
involving federal dollars, the Homeland Security Act.

Again, that goes -- that flows down from the
federal government, flows down to the states, from states to
counties, from counties to the reservation.

And even when it gets to the reservation, what
little bit gets to the reservation, our recreation and
wildlife department don't get any of it because we're not considered law enforcement.

We do have law enforcement officers in our department. We have game rangers, state certified police officers and BIA certified police officers, but that is not recognized as such, so they don't get those fundings.

With this district being organized the way it is, I think we get more representation from the native perspective.

I think more reservations represented in this district the way they're drawn out, maybe we'll get more support from congress telling them, hey, look, this is not fair, you'll need to divide this money equally. We're a sovereign nation here, but we're treated like we're not. We're treated like second class citizens.

A long time ago we should have declared ourselves threatened endangered species, we'll get more money that way.

That's just -- I'm sorry. I'm not doing a very good job today. I can just stand up here about.

I just want to cut it short and say I want to support this district, both the state district, congressional district, and also the legislative districts.

I think it's very important, I'll just get back to that, I think it's important that the tribes are represented
adequately and to the federal and state level, and with this, the way this district is drawn up, I think we'll have that.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Marty, we're about halfway through. Take a -- five minutes.

We're going to take a five-minute adjournment so we can sort of give our court reporter a break.

It is 12:45. We'll be back here at five minutes to 1:00.

(Brief recess taken.)

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: We're going to come back to order after our break. That was a long five minutes so thank you very much. I appreciate it.

We're going to go to our next speaker.

And by the way, thank you for allowing me the latitude, I think it was very important, to allow folks to give their thoughts this morning and this early afternoon. We're not using a timer, but I want you to be cognizant. We've got about 15 folks to go through, and it took us about an hour and a half to go through the first 15.

So we're not going to time anything, but I do want you to be cognizant that there are other people behind you, so be as concise and appropriate as you can.
Just as a reminder to everyone, if you've got maps that you'll be presenting, please turn those in, either in paper or in electronic. And if you -- when you come to the microphone, make sure that you spell your name clearly for the record.

So next up is Gail Haozous? Maybe.

Oh, dear.

GAIL HAOZOUS: Good morning -- or afternoon, I guess, chairman and committee. This is a perfect example of not knowing the people, because on the reservation everyone's name would have been spoken correctly.

So that is Gail Haozous, G-A-I-L, last name H-A-O-Z-O-U-S.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Looked like a D. Sorry.

GAIL HAOZOUS: Like the plural of house.

Welcome to our beautiful reservation made up 1.8 million acres of land. 15,000 estimated members here. Also we do have a 67 percent unemployment rate. We have lack of transportation. Lack of infrastructure. And of course we are in fear to vote in the state and national elections, because we have no clue what we are supposed to be voting for. Even I, myself, tribal member, graduated from Globe High School, got my AA degree from Scottsdale Community College, got my bachelor's degree and my master's degree from the University of Phoenix, and I
still dread going to your elections.

In our elections, we just have a face and draw a line across to the one that we want to vote for.

And so we're very political when it comes to tribal elections. We want to make sure that that person that we put in there is the right representative and knows our needs.

However, when we go to the state, we guess. I mean, really it's almost an eenie meenie miney moe pick, because we have no clue.

The propositions, do they pertain to us here in the rural areas, here on the reservation?

Probably not.

So I just want you to know that my name is Gail Haozous. I am the executive director for the planning and economic development representing the San Carlos Apache Tribe, and I am here speaking in -- I'm here in support of the new redistricting lines.

The lines that put 11 tribes together, then we also have a line that puts in eight tribes together.

You know, in aligning the tribes, it brings about a stronger voice for our people. Since there are -- there still does exist in the state and federal level representatives that lack the understanding of tribal sovereignty and believe that tribes should follow state law,
and that tribes not -- that tribes do not contribute to the
state economy through taxation. The tribe alone with a
78 million dollar budget, and the casino, plus the casino,
makes over $123 million. Then let's add IHA, BIA,
San Carlos School District, telephone, all of the entities
that are existing on the reservation.

Where will we spend our money when we get paid?
Who do we need help from when it's time? Where are our
businesses?

We lack the infrastructure to develop businesses.
We have to run to Globe to spend our money or to
Safford on the other side of town to spend our money.

On Friday evenings, Thursday evenings on payday,
there is nothing but a red line of lights heading to Globe.

So our money is left off the reservation.
We pay the state taxes off the reservation.
But every time we have representatives that sit
there and they think we get everything free.

Which is not true. We don't get everything free.
Come to our reservation.
You can always tell when you're driving through
the state of Arizona when you leave Indian land and come on
to -- off the reservation land.

The infrastructure happens. The guardrails are
there. You know, we fall off the road all the time, but we
don't have the guardrails for our transportation.

But leave Miami, and there's a guardrail every single length of the way.

But we do have large drops in our transportation on our highways.

There's a lot of things that we lack here.

So we do make a significant contribution to the state in both jobs, which is about, what, over 2,000 jobs. And those -- a lot of those jobs are, like, teachers.

We don't have educated tribal members that make up majority of teachers. We don't have doctors and nurses.

Those jobs are there.

We don't have people that are experts in top fields. So we have a lot of laborers. We have a lot of lay people that don't qualify for the jobs that we need.

And, again, you heard our education director tell us that we don't have funding for education.

Those tribes are still years behind in developing infrastructure to support development due to the high cost.

We've had a house put down. We built a house just to have the post -- the electricity post run from here to the house and charge $3,000.

The tribes cannot afford $3,000 for these homes.

We could build many, many more homes if we didn't have to provide all that infrastructure.
There aren't paved roads. There aren't sidewalks on our reservation. We don't have the -- those are luxuries for us.

We don't have that.

Who is speaking for us? Who is out there that can say we don't need to give them that money because they have it already.

Because we don't.

You know, Globe is busting at the seams there. They have developed everything that they're now breaking down hills so they can live on it, because they've taken care of every inch of the land.

However, here we have a lot of open land, but no money to develop it.

And so I just wanted to say that to change the district lines would create new representation in both levels, the federal and state level.

All tribes are unique. They're all different. They all speak different languages. They all have different cultures. Their sites, their cultural sites are different than ours, yet we support them.

We live, I would say, very different from non-native people.

When Hillary Clinton said it takes a village, well, we have that village. It is my grandmother, my aunt,
my uncles, that my kids are being watched over by.

We have all of those things in place.

We live with bare necessities.

We don't know what it means to be rich. We don't know what it means to live in a nice house. Our homes built by our housing authority look all the same.

There's no water fountain in front showing you come to these estates. None of that. It's just a home out there.

Education. You know, it's hard to trace back and say very important to read to your children even before they are born.

One educator who came to our reservation, non-Indian, said you can tell the education level of a family by the number of books in their home.

Let me tell you. We are trying to feed our families. We are trying to provide transportation for us. We have no time for books. So it's so different.

And I tell my daughter now, who is expecting, read to your baby, sing to your baby, do these things, let's see what happens with your baby.

You know, because we don't have time, we're so busy trying to survive.

In all our lives, ever since we have been named
Apache, we have been trying to survive.

And so we are still here. We are still here today. Who would have thought generations ago that we would still be standing here, that we would still be wanting our part.

And Steve just told you, our attorney, what we have given up. All the lands that were taken from us. Who stood up for us then?

Who stood up for us when they drowned us out at the San Carlos lake and put the dam there.

We were living right there in the middle of that lake.

Nobody stood up for us.

You know, it's really sad when you get used to having no one stand up for you.

So in this redistricting, and we look at these 11 tribes, we look at these eight tribes, it makes me feel good that maybe, just maybe -- you know, I looked at New Mexico's redistricting, and they didn't quite do it the same way.

They have a really nice redistricting.

The Navajos will be represented. The Pueblos will be represented. And the Jicarilla Apaches on this way will be represented.

That makes three districts of native
representation. And I'm over here saying we support you putting 11 of us together and eight of us together.

I hope that when my children are standing here or my grandchildren are standing hearing, we can say we applaud you for giving us Apaches a district so that we can have representation. And that you've given the Navajos their representation, and the Tohono O'odhams their representation.

We are all unique tribes. We are all looking for representation in this redistricting.

So I want you to know that us, as a San Carlos Apache, we don't really care about Republicans and Democrats.

We don't really know about them.

When our people run for office, they don't run as Republicans or Democrats.

They run as who would best be our best leaders.

That's it.

We never know what they are.

Even Dr. Bush, sitting -- he was sitting here earlier, even Steve, I don't have a clue what they are. All of our council members, I have no clue. Are they Republicans or Democrats?

I don't know.

We don't run like that. We just run who would do
the best job.

So I know that the Republicans are angry about the redistricting.

Democrats have concerns about redistricting.

Those things are, like, we're color blind to it.

We don't even know what a Republican -- a lot of people don't understand what a Republican represents and what a Democrat represents.

You know, when I turned 18, it was so exciting to register to vote. It really was. I turned 18 years old.

Years ago I registered to vote.

Here we don't have to register to vote. All you have to do is be 18. They accept us at the polls.

We have -- you have to register to be a member of the tribe. Automatically your name goes into the voting.

So we register to vote.

But, you know, my little daughter, she turned 18. She was excited because at school they had a registration. She registered to vote.

But she would not vote in the national and state elections. She was too afraid. Because I showed her the pamphlet of what she had to vote. You have to read these, see what they say.

She didn't want to vote. She didn't know anything. She didn't know anybody.
So, again, I think that for our tribe, strongly, we need representation.

Not only from those people who represent our district, but from those other districts also that somehow our legislators, our senators, our representatives, know what our problems are here on the reservation, and that they support our representatives, because one person is going to have a hard time representing us.

At least we have one person, but they're still going to have a hard time because we need more people to understand.

Casinos are not helping us 100 percent. We're in a rural area.

We're not like Gila River, who has built all of the justice center. I went by there and I was, like, this is so wonderful. They can put this on TV and everything. They live right by the suburban area.

But us, we can't see it. A police car drives by, and guess what, our casino paid for that.

But you wouldn't know.

So more students went to school for a while. Guess what, our casino paid for that, but we don't know.

So ours is different. It supports the operational costs and very little cost that we can actually brag about,
like the casinos near the cities.

So I think the tribe has made it clear that we support the redistricting.

They had come with a resolution that I would like to read that would go on record, even though I'm supposed to be watching the time.

But the resolution to support the Arizona Redistricting Commission proposed congressional and state legislative maps.

Whereas the San Carlos Apache Tribe is a federally recognized tribe pursuant to the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934, and whereas the San Carlos Apache Tribe is authorized by its constitution to make decisions in the best interest of the Apache people, and whereas the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council has monitored the current redistricting meetings and maps that have been produced by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, and whereas the San Carlos Apache Tribe desires that the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission adhere to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, by representing communities of interest, minority-majority districts, and to ensure that the tribal vote is not diluted in violation of the act, and that the maps are not regressive, and whereas the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council has reviewed the current maps as produced by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission in both the
congressional and legislative maps, and finds that eight tribes are in District 7 of the legislative draft map and 11 tribes are in district draft map -- in the congressional draft map, and they'll therefore be resolved that the San Carlos Apache Tribe hereby approves the congressional and state legislative maps as chosen by the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission on October 10, 2011. And be it further resolved that the tribal chairman and vice chairman or their designee are authorized to sign all documents regarding this project.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much. And we do have a copy of the resolution. We do have a copy of the resolution that we'll be putting into the record as well.

Next to speak is county supervisor from Graham County, Mark Herrington.

GAIL HAOZOUS: This is the correct resolution.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Yes, we have a copy of it.

COUNTY SUPERVISOR MARK HERRINGTON: Good afternoon. My name is Mark Herrington, M-A-R-K, H-E-R-R-I-N-G-T-O-N.

It means exactly what it says. The town that is built where they fish for herring.

I want to speak today specifically -- first of
all, I want to thank you for the opportunity to be here. And in all due respect, and all that's been said, I'm going to share my opinions here, but I especially want to thank you for coming to Graham County, to Eastern Arizona College in next few weeks, and really appreciate you making that effort.

As far as the legislative districts are concerned in -- I want this -- I want to say this, and I want to say it sincerely. That in our rural counties, our communities, our culture, and our tradition, are as important to us as they are to the Apache Tribe or any other group.

And therefore it's imperative that we speak to those maps so that they will represent our interests.

The legislative draft map puts Greenlee County in with Navajo and the Hopi tribes.

These communities have little or no interaction or physical -- are physically isolated for hundreds of miles.

The legislative map draft splits Graham County into two different districts and does not keep Graham and Greenlee County together.

Graham and Greenlee County are nearly identical in their communities of interest. They both have significant agriculture, mining, and water issues, and they actually cooperate with each other in providing some county services.

No two counties in the state are more independent than these
two -- interdependent than these two, and they stand to lose the best representation that they have ever had in the state of Arizona.

We are, what they call us often, sister counties. Greenlee was developed from Graham County, and we do cooperate in many ways and do not want to be separated from them, either in the legislative or the congressional maps.

The legislative draft map puts Gila County into three districts. And Navajo County into three. While this configuration may supply population numbers, it does not lend any credibility or confidence to the competitive voting strength of our citizens, and it devastates our voice in Phoenix.

The distance that separates Flagstaff and our Native American neighbors to the north from the rest of this region cannot be rationally justified as a strong community of interest or competitiveness if not all of the population that would satisfy the requirement for a legislative district comprising Flagstaff and surrounding areas and the communities in Navajo -- in the Navajo Nation are literally next door to each other and make more sense.

We continue the Eastern Arizona Counties, as I've mentioned here, have -- have separate legislative districts that reflect -- these counties in common reflect the true representation of communities of interest, contiguous
principles, and competitiveness.

And we do object to the map the way it's currently written.

We continue to support the original Legislative District 5 map that was first submitted with the addition of the Verde Valley folks.

The five counties, Graham, Greenlee, and Navajo, and Apache, we designed congressional maps and were able to show effectively that we can have two rural congressional districts in the state of Arizona.

And feel like we are entitled to those districts. There are -- 22 percent of the state is rural. We refer to ourselves in rural Arizona as the greater Arizona. We constantly have our own issues and so forth that we need to address.

Rural areas, we believe, are justified in this. These districts are large, but they're large because of population numbers it takes in order to come to the numbers to make them consistent with all of the rules and regulations of this process.

Our issues are more critical than the size of the district.

And to mutually have our interest and our issues addressed are the most important thing to us.

The -- there are fundamental differences in the
rural versus the city.

For instance, forest issues of concern to a rural area are primarily safety and economics. But to the metro, the consideration of the issues is recreational and environmental.

There are fundamental differences in working in a city or a rural area.

There are different values. There are different resources, different needs, different economies, different revenue streams, and different priorities.

Rural Arizona needs to be represented by someone who lives in rural areas and understands rural people and their requirements.

Political party is not as important as a vision of the needs of rural Arizona.

We have had leaders in the first congressional district from both. We have had representation by a Democrat. We've had representation by a Republican.

Now, out of nine districts, we would have two congressional districts that would address our concerns.

Which are very important to us.

We continue to ask for these two rural districts as were presented by the five eastern counties.

We totally appreciate all of your work and see the magnitude of what you are doing. It would be overwhelming.
And appreciate the opportunity to come and to specifically speak to these maps.

And thank you very much for your time.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next we have Pima County Board of Supervisors Chairman Pete Rios. From Pinal County, excuse me.

CHAIRMAN PETE RIOS: Pima, you moved me south.

Good afternoon, my name is Pete Rios, R-I-O-S. I'm chairman of the Pinal County board of supervisors.

And I thank you for the opportunity to say a few words.

Let me first say to the IRC, thank you for your outreach and continuing your outreach to Indian country.

We appreciate that you're reaching out to our Native American brothers and sisters. It is long overdue that we put together some congressional district that at least allows or presents the opportunity for them to elect a tribal member to represent their concerns.

Let me also say thank you for the break that we just had.

I walked into the other room with 20 bucks and walked out with 300. So thank you very much.

Does the Internal Revenue Service review these tapes?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Mark the tape.
CHAIRMAN PETE RIOS: I better report it.

But, let me also say that I want to thank you, and I know there are some other supervisors that are not as happy with the congressional districts as probably I am at this point, because Pinal County initially was divided into five different congressional districts.

We are down basically to two.

In reality it's three because there's a corner of the Tohono O'odham Nation that goes to another district, but in terms of -- and there's only like 100, I think Native Americans in that particular section. Most of Tohono O'odham is in Pima County.

So I appreciate that Pinal County now is in two congressional districts.

Let me also mention I'm also one of the co-chairs for one of the Hispanic groups on congressional maps. And I am not speaking for them, nor am I here speaking for Pinal County.

I am speaking for self.

Need to get that on the record.

Let me just say that what I'd like to see obviously in the congressional maps, there still needs to be some tweaking, from my perspective, that needs to be done. From perspective of others, there's major overhauls that they would like to see. But I think by and large from
people that I have talked to in the Latino Hispanic community, they're fairly satisfied with the congressional mapping.

I did want to express a concern that I have on legislative maps, particularly Legislative District No. 8, which is part of Pinal County.

And the good thing is you put it in Globe, Miami, Claypool, some of Gila County, and make them part of the copper corridor. That is good.

And I think that they -- they're interested in being part of a copper corridor, at least that section of Pinal County, unless we hear different from Supervisor Dawson in a few minutes.

But, the concern that I had is that you reach way down into -- beyond Pinal County southern line, and pick up, in Pima County, Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke, which is part of Pinal, but for all practical purposes, they identify with Tucson, they have a Tucson address. And I remember reading in one of the papers that one of the IRC members indicated that she had received a lot or scores of letters from people in Oro Valley in particular that said they had nothing in common with Tucson and hardly ever went to Tucson.

And I just have to say that that played over with a big laugh with a lot of people from the mountain area that
I represented in Pinal County, because in Pinal County, the mountain area, the copper corridor, we view anything south of -- Catalina and south as Tucson.

So for somebody to claim they don't even go to the city of Tucson was kind of a, a joke.

Let me just say that there are no community of interests with the copper corridor, with the rural communities of Superior and Coolidge and Florence, with those parts of Pima County.

We just got through in Pinal County doing our supervisorial redistricting maps about 48 hours ago.

So those are just being packaged now to go to Justice Department. And hopefully they will be precleared. And we have some good consultants, as you do. So we suspect that we'll probably get the good seal of approval, but you never know.

But during some of those hearings at the very beginning, in one of our hearings in Florence, I had a gentleman testifying. And he represented a group from Saddlebrooke. His last name was McKenzie.

And he basically said, you know, when you all do your redistricting, board of supervisors, consider moving Saddlebrooke somewhere else, because we have nothing in common with the copper corridor. We have nothing in common with the mining communities.
That is code. That is code to say, we have nothing in common with copper mining Mexican Latinos. That is basically the message that we were getting from this group representing Saddlebrooke.

That is basically the same message I suspect from Oro Valley.

So we have really no community of interest.

I looked at the map, and I am looking at the western part of Pinal County, where you all are putting Apache Junction, Gold Canyon with the east valley.

Does Apache Junction identify with the east valley to some extent? Yes.

Do they also identify with Pinal County? Yes.

Is Pinal County and Gila County part of the same council of governments? Yes.

Both counties, Gila and Pinal, belong to CAAG, Central Arizona Association of Governments.

Pima County does not.

We work together as sister counties to try to help each other out. And I would rather see -- I never thought I'd be saying this -- but I would rather see Gold Canyon and Apache Junction as part of this legislative district as opposed to Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley, or Catalina.

And I would ask that you all please take a long look at that, and please consider tweaking some of these
districts. Because I think if you do what I'm suggesting, you'll find that it even makes that particular district more competitive.

And I know that there are some board members of the IRC that still want to make districts more competitive.

And with that, I will conclude.

And I thank you for all your hard work, your many, many, many hours of work that you have put in, because I haven't attended as many hearings as I did last time around, but let me tell you, I do pick you up on the Internet. As I'm doing other things, I still have you on. So I know you put a lot of time into this.

On behalf at least of the constituents that I represent, to the IRC, thank you for all the work you do.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Mr. Rios.

We're going to go next to Gila County Supervisor Shirley Dawson.


And I too thank you for being here, and I thank you for being open minded and listening to concerns and seeing how things cannot be put into ironclad lines that are not supportive of the local area.

I represent the San Carlos Apache reservation, part of it, because the county line divides that
I represent the White Mountain Apache Tribe, part of it, because the Navajo County line divides it.

The thing that we have in common is a common interest in rural issues. And if you look at what has happened with this map to Gila County, you've taken away San Carlos from Globe, the county seat.

So now San Carlos ends up in a separate district from the county seat.

You take the northern part of Gila County, throw it into another district.

You take the southern part of Gila County and throw it into a separate part.

We end up in three legislative districts.

Earlier a speaker said not real sure about federal and state issues, often they aren't interested out here because they don't have representation, and this will effectively give them no representation.

If you divide Gila County into three sections, we will not have a voice and we will be lost.

We're asking that you honor Prop 106 that outlines six requirements that you're required to respect. And those includes respecting county boundaries.

We are a rural county. Do not divide us and dilute any influence we have on our legislative and
congressional representation.

    We believe that you should respect the desires of unification among the Native Americans.

    We also believe you should respect the united effort of rural counties to be -- have a voice. We are a minority group. We do have a right to a voice. And don't divide us.

    We're not metropolitan. Don't throw us there. It does not work.

    The five eastern counties presented a map to you. We feel that until politics got to playing in this issue, that map stood.

    Please do not dilute the voice of the Native American and do not dilute the voice of rural Arizona.

    Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you,

    Supervisor Dawson.

    Next we have Greenlee County Supervisor Richard Lunt.

    SUPERVISOR RICHARD LUNT: Thank you very much.

    Most of you know me, and I was one of those that that -- I'm Richard Lunt, R-I-C-H-A-R-D, L-U-N-T, as in Thomas.

    Once again, I'd like to thank you.

    I -- what, what a task you guys have put upon
ourselves, but we appreciate it.

    And believe me, we can joke about it, but we, we know the battles that this Commission must be fighting.

    But, like I say, you know me. I was one of those that helped introduce those maps. There was a lot of research put into those maps. The political pressures were thrown out the door with what we truly wanted. We wanted a map that would -- congressionally would give us rural representation.

    And we -- in your presentation, you know, you said some of the things that you had, what you believe two rural districts.

    You know, any time you go into the metropolitan areas and pull population so that you can meet your criteria, you are diluting the rural voice.

    We've been there, done that. It just doesn't work.

    We have -- as Supervisor Mark Herrington emphasized, we look at things differently. And we will always look at things differently.

    The way we look at land, people from the metro areas look at it as a place to recreate. We look at it as a resource, a place, an economical viable entity.

    And all I can say is, you know, on your presentation you said that there was two Latino districts.
That was, that was part of our proposal.

We had five of the districts that were metro. And, you know what, let them have their representation at the metro.

But please let us have our representation at the rural.

Finally, you know, to me your map makes one of the border represented -- the districts, it's just a token district.

Because I believe that you have gerrymandered around Bisbee and Douglas. And, you know, yeah, it goes down and touches the border, but it really -- there's no population there.

So, once again, I would just please consider what the eastern county organization presented to you the first part of October.

I think on the CDs district, we did it showing you that it would work. We hired consultants. They meet your six criteria for the most part, and we did a lot of the work for you.

Of course it was at our interest because we wanted the two really rural districts.

Now going to the legislative districts.

As you know, I think, at least what you've done to my county, and I'd have to agree with Supervisor Dawson, you
know, the rural counties have learned to work together. And us and Graham County, we do. We share services. It's a way that we can be conservative and yet provide the services to our constituents that we need to provide.

And we do that by reaching out, providing services that -- in an economically viable way.

And so, first of all, I don't want to be split from some of the eastern counties.

I don't want to be split from Graham County. We work together right now.

And as you know, in 1909 Greenlee County was split off from Graham County. And Phelps Dodge at the time assumed the debt of Graham County, which was about $50,000. And you don't need a history lesson, but that's how Greenlee County was formed.

And we worked together. We have a lot of the same resources. We're basically ranching, farming, tourist, and natural resources counties.

But I think that what your map has done is it is shutting our voice down, the rural voice.

The legislative map puts Greenlee County in with the Navajo and Hopi Tribes.

To me, that is unacceptable to my constituents. I know we're small, but we will have no voice.

And we are, we are a donor county to the state.
We have the second largest open pit mine in the world. And the state reaps a great benefit from that.

I can go on forever.

You know how I feel. Like I say, I think we presented maps, we -- but the five eastern counties of Gila, Navajo, Apache, Greenlee, and Graham, we've proven that we can work together. We've proven by working together we can have a voice, and that's what we want.

Once again, thank you so much. You guys have a daunting task. You know, it -- and don't think we don't appreciate it.

But our job is to look out for what our needs.

And that's why we're here.

And, you know, somebody has to make the decisions, and we realize that. But I think I've told you this before. You'll find I'm very agreeable as long as you agree with me, so, anyway, thank you very, very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Next speaker is Lynne Pancrazi -- Pancrazi.

I should say that with immediate apologies.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNNE PANCRAZI: Some people say Panloco.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Crazy.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNNE PANCRAZI: I'm Lynne Pancrazi. You spell Pancrazi, P-A-N-C-R-A-Z-I. I am
Arizona state representative for District 24, which is Yuma and La Paz Counties. And I am up here today for my constituents.

The proposed map that you guys have drawn up divides Yuma County. It also connects Yuma county to Maricopa County.

And when they say primarily rural counties, primarily rural counties aren't rural counties.

Maricopa County will dominate those rural counties and will dilute the voice of rural Arizona with us being connected to Glendale, Avondale, Litchfield Park.

I'm here asking the committee, the IRC, to please look at some other arrangements, some other mapping that meets all the criteria, but does not connect us with Maricopa County.

We need a rural voice at the legislature.

Right now there are only 15 of us at the legislature, and we work together as a team.

And we need to keep that number alive.

And with you connecting us to Maricopa County, my fear is that Maricopa County will dominate and the voice of rural Arizona will be diluted or even completely shut.

So, that's why I'm here, for my constituents, for Yuma and La Paz Counties, which is who I represent now.

Our district was a competitive district with the
previous IRC committee, and I would like to keep it as a competitive district and keep us together.

Like somebody said earlier, 22 percent of Arizona is rural. And rural issues and rural needs are completely different than Maricopa County.

The first meeting I went to when I was a legislator for ag and water, one of the legislators from Scottsdale said -- raises, he goes, well, you know what, Yuma has all kinds of water, we'll just take some water from Yuma.

I went, wait.

So that's, that's kind of what I'm talking about.

Maricopa County legislators, Maricopa County and Pima County are both very metropolitan, and they have no idea what rural is about.

It's about agriculture. It's about tourism. It's about natural resources.

And we need to keep those rural counties and those rural representation at the legislature.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

And just as a reminder to anybody that might be watching and for the folks in Yuma, we will be in Yuma Saturday, October 29th.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNNE PANCRAZI: I'll there too.
COMMISSIONER STERTZ: At the Yuma City Hall at 1:00 o'clock.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNNE PANCRAZI: I made a statement this morning that said the IRC is going to be so tired of seeing my face.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE LYNNE PANCRAZI: That's what it's been.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I appreciate that.

Our next speaker will be Sam Moorhead, speaking on behalf of himself, from Globe.

SAM MOORHEAD: Thank you. First name is Sam. The spelling of the last name depends on the branch of the family. Our branch is M-O-O-R-H-E-A-D.

It all boils down to vowels. Two O's, one E, one A.

First of all, I have some, some what I would call side comments. One of the first of the side comments is that Thomas Jefferson and John Adams once had a discussion about who was going to write the Declaration of Independence.

And John Adams explained several reasons why Jefferson should do it. And one of the -- or a couple of the reasons that Adams cited was that Adams said of himself that he was obnoxious and disagreeable.
I will try to hold the obnoxious way down, but I do have some disagreements. And I'll get to those disagreements in a moment.

But the side issues, your website, when I first learned about the proposed congressional district map, I went online, got to your website, filled out a comment sheet, and tried to send it.

It wouldn't go.

I said, well, maybe they're not accepting categories of, you know, about the criteria of compact and contiguous, so I'll change my comment to another.

I did that. Send it.

No. Wouldn't go.

I have talked with other people who have said the same thing. They fill out the comment form, try to send it, and it sits there. Won't go.

I have no idea what the thing about that is.

The second side comment, the map. I looked at the large map in the back of the room, and I was kind of appalled to find out that Payson has fallen off the face of the earth.

Heber is there. Gisela is there. But I don't see Payson anywhere.

I guess it's gone.

Okay. Now to the main thing.
Congressional District 1.

Prior -- the prior -- or the Congressional District 1 that we have right now is one of the largest congressional districts in the nation. Any time I contact CD 1 office, they remind me and give me a geography lesson about how big CD 1 is.

And that's what we have right now.

What the proposed map shows it is getting bigger. How in the world does that ever fit into compact and contiguous?

Next, on CD 1, communities of interest.

There seems to be a wide variety of communities in CD 1. Some of which have absolutely nothing in common with the other.

Someone can look me in the face, I think, and tell me with a straight face that Marana, a bedroom community cheek and jowl with Tucson, a major metropolitan area, has a community of interest with Heber or Globe.

I don't think so.

Now onto the legislative districts.

The county supervisors have spoke here today, gave a really good analysis as to why the proposed map about the legislative districts needs to be redrawn, reworked.

Gila County gets chopped up into three separate districts. Where I live at, all of a sudden I'm going to
end up in Legislative District 8 where I have no community of interest with some of the folks in Pinal County that we're talking about.

Coconino County, is that the favorite child?

They're not cut up into anything.

Greenlee gets cut up. Graham gets cut up. Gila County gets cut up into three pieces.

One of the criteria I thought was geographic features, political boundaries.

I strongly urge, back to the drawing board, redraw the legislative district maps. Redraw CD 1 so CD 1 is actually compact, smaller than what we started out with.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, sir.

Our next speaker is Karen MacKean, representing self, from Show Low.


I thought I knew what I was going to talk about until I sat here for the last two hours listening to everybody.

First of all, put me on record, I strongly disagree with both maps.

The second comment I have is after listening to the San Carlos Apaches about their concerns, I wonder why
the United States government and the Department of Justice has not created individual districts for the tribes. It seems to be the only and the right thing to do.

These people are not being represented apparently.

I live now in Show Low, Arizona. Huge congressional district. Our representative just came to see us after nine months of having been in office.

Yes, it's a huge office, and, yes, the district, and, yes, when you call the office and talk to the people who try to represent us, it's much too large an area. And how is this, how is this representative growing to be able to represent communities of such disparity, disinterest as the Native American tribes and those of us who are not.

And then it's put into much more rural or metropolitan areas.

I lived in Tucson. Oro Valley has nothing to do in congressional district with our rural concerns and interest. Nothing.

Flagstaff is bad enough.

But Tucson and part of Maricopa County.

No, no, no, no, no, no.

This is -- these are crazy maps. Crazy maps.

I don't know who did them.

The input, we've all put them in. We've all put lots of input in.
The gentleman who just spoke about not being able to submit these maps online is absolutely correct. It's happened to all of us.

Now, I thought it was just me when I did it, but then I talked to others. And it seems to be consistent, so there's a problem. There's a huge, huge problem.

Now I want to speak directly to my town where I live now. I live in Show Low.

The concern that we have is that on the legislative district map that you've taken Lakeside Pinetop out of our district, out of our legislative district.

They're our sister community. They are a community of interest.

You've thrown them into Apache County.

They need to be in Navajo County. They need to be in legislative district -- I guess 6 now. It used to be five.

Just take it away.

The people in Pinetop Lakeside are livid, as they should be.

You've eliminated Graham County, Greenlee County.

We have wonderful representatives there who represent us there in LD 5. Wonderful representatives.

Everybody was pleased and happy with it.

Then you put Flagstaff in there.
What we wanted was to go west and go to the Verde Valley.

We have -- that's a much more accurate community of interest.

We are the White Mountains of Arizona. We are rural. That's in legislative district.

The congressional district I think I already spoke to that. It seems to have enlarged.

I mean it was 58,000 square miles before this.

Now, I can't figure it out. Maybe you can tell me. 58,000 square miles and you add to it?

Who's going to be able to represent the people?

It's a representative government that we have. There's no representation there.

One man or woman cannot do it all.

I understand the criteria. I understand it's based on population.

But this is based on a number of other things.

And the lady who spoke earlier in from Yuma, I believe, spoke clearly about the fact that because part of our rural community is now in much more urban community we will not be represented at all.

Much less the tribe or the tribes.

They'll have no representation. Yeah, they've got a lot bigger area.
Yeah, they've got 11 tribes in there, eight and 11, but they'll have no representation.

So that's, that's, that's what I have to say.

And I would hope that this Commission -- I don't know, we could look into this, but the Department of Justice, that these Indian tribes need to be represented better and individually.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Ms. MacKean.

Next speaker is Janeh Reynolds, representing self, from Show Low.

JANEH REYNOLDS: Yes, I am also from Show Low.

This is the third hearing that I've attended, and the one theme that I hear repeated over and over and over again is community of interest.

And we've heard it in one form or another today.

And to keep my comments brief, I want to speak to the Show Low, Pinetop, Lakeside division.

We are one contiguous community.

If you were to start at the casino up in Hon Dah, and start driving down White Mountain Boulevard until you came to Deuce of Clubs, which is the Main Street in Show Low, you would not know if you were in Pinetop, Lakeside, or in Show Low. We are one contiguous community.

Our churches are mingled throughout that -- those
three communities.

Our businesses are mingled throughout those three communities.

And I am just so hard put to understand why there would be a division between Pinetop, Lakeside, and Show Low. It doesn't make sense.

We are a community of interest, which is one of your criterias. We are a big criteria -- a community of interest.

We're also in the mountains, and we have unique interests of our own.

And the last thing I want to say is I have not been able to find on the Internet the documentation or any documentation that substantiates the kind of decisions that have been made by this Commission.

And I hope someday there, when all is said and done, there will be a good rationale for what the Commission has done, because there is a lot of concern regarding the way that we have split up the state of Arizona.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Judy Moorhead, representing herself, from Gila County.

JUDY MOORHEAD: Thank you.

My name is Judy Moorhead, J-U-D-Y,
Thank you for being here and thank you for giving me this opportunity to talk with you.

Like my husband, I had tried to put my comments online, but I wasn't able to do that, so I came out here to talk with you.

I am most concerned that how, it seems to me anyway, that things that were considered in legislation districts that were so important, because I was in favor of keeping Gila County, obviously, one county, one group, and that seemed reasonable to me, and yet people, oh, we have to be compact, you're too big, we need to split things up, and as such the legislative district that you have approved did that.

We need to split Gila County. We now have three districts.

Speaking for just myself, being in Globe, I think I'm better off maybe than some of the people in northern Gila County. But because I have interests with them and have worked with them for the last number of years, I understand their concern and why they were not kept with us and why we could not use the maps that we showed you to make it work so that we could stay together.

But then I look and I see what you've done with the congressional district and I wholeheartedly disapprove
of the congressional district map.

You wanted to make us more compact, and yet when you did the congressional district that wasn't an issue.

It spreads from the northern boundaries to the southern boundaries.

You're very, very quick to give us population numbers and legislation districts to show why you did that, but there's no population numbers in congressional.

Why aren't there? Why don't see those numbers?

It implies, I think, when you look at this congressional map, that you kept Indian reservations by them -- their own entity.

And yet they're not.

There are many communities that you have put together with the Indian reservation that are not Native American, they, some of them, many of them, are also minority groups. They're Hispanic communities. Who do not -- will not have a voice in that congressional district if it is overwhelmingly all Native American.

The lady talked about her district, Yuma, being split up. And she's going into Maricopa County. She's concerned that some of her people are not going to be able to have a voice in the congressional legislation district.

This particular map, the congressional one, needs to be reworked.
I don't like the legislative one. It's not my first choice. But I could live with it.

I am not particularly -- I think it could have been done better, but at least I see some reason why it was done.

I don't see any reasonable explanation for what you did with the congressional map, other than Native Americans certainly do have a vote, a bigger voice, but you have totally eliminated the voice of the Hispanic communities and other smaller communities that you have lumped in with that Native American district, and they will have no vote.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ma'am, ma'am, Ms. Moorhead.

In your packet -- you had mentioned something about not having the statistics.

Right behind the map, but maybe in your packet it's missing. You might want to pick up another packet, right here the congressional maps there are the population numbers.

JUDY MOORHEAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: It's the chart here, so --

JUDY MOORHEAD: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: -- it's quite possible that your packet was missing that.
And thank you for your comments.

Okay.

Next to speak is Sharon Watson from Graham County.


And I want to thank you also for your hard work and the things you've done to put this together.

I am very involved in our -- my community in Graham County.

And I don't -- I want to go on record opposing the LD map, because I would like to echo what Mark Herrington has also said that because Graham County and Greenlee County has been split up, I think that's -- we won't get represented well there. And I feel our voice won't be heard.

And I would like to be represented in a district with similar interests as well.

And I don't feel that that new map is going to do that for Graham County.

And I appreciate your time, and thank you for all you do.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Our next speaker is Jenna Mason, representing self, from Graham County.

She wanted to be specific. She's representing
herself as a citizen of Arizona. Appreciate that.

JENNA MASON: And a concerned one at that.


I'd like to thank you for giving me an opportunity
to let my voice be heard. Last I checked we are Americans,
and that's what it is all about.

I wanted to address things, bit by bit. That's
how I work best.

I wanted to approve -- or to address the approved
legislative draft map. Like the sentiments of others that
have expressed their feelings, I do express the same
feelings.

Although I am from Graham County, I do feel like
much of the other counties, Gila being split into
three different districts and how can your voice be heard if
you're only 33 percent of the vote all the time and you have
different voices of the 33 percent.

And our sister county, the Greenlee County, we
have a lot of shared interest with agriculture, and the
water, natural resources, is being taken away from us.

Graham County, we're very rural.

In the past I felt like my voice was heard, even
in the rural area.

We have, this past election, let our voice be
heard and got three great representatives in who will be --
it's just going to rip that election apart, and we're going to have to revote for new representatives.

And putting us in metropolitan areas, you know, towards -- more towards Tucson, and towards Sierra Vista, which is an Army -- you know, there's a lot of the Army and the base is there.

They don't share the exact same interests. We have a mountain between us and them.

I drive by cotton farms all the time. We need our water there.

We need to have that resource to have our water so that we can not only survive but try to thrive.

Our unemployment is 12 percent. And without a voice, it's only going to go higher.

We have mining communities in common, which gives a lot of people jobs.

And without that, the mining representation, we would lose a lot more jobs.

There's been a lot of layoffs in these economic times. I don't think that we need to quash our voices.

I know that the Apache and the Navajo have talked about letting their voices be heard and letting them be represented. However, these new maps, especially in the congressional draft map, would give them their 100 percent voice in any national election.
And all of the rural areas are thrown in with the metropolitan areas.

And I just want to have my voice heard.

They talked about competitiveness. And it's anything but competitive, which is what they're striving to want.

If they put forth a great candidate for, for, you know, the Navajo Nations, I would -- and the Apache, I would definitely take a look at them. And, and if they shared the same values and beliefs, I would vote for them.

There's nothing -- no bias on that. I just want our voice to be heard.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Alexander Ritchie, representing self.

ALEXANDER RITCHIE: Good afternoon. I'll be brief.

I am an attorney and an economist, and I've looked at maps probably for the past 20 years.

The IRC has lived up to its name. It's independent. It's created by government.

And this is at a time when government is being vilified.

With that independence comes the duty to look at
the facts.

What we've heard today are anecdotal, feelings, and a desire to set the boundaries according to county lines.

Those aren't the facts.

The facts are what's in the data. The data is what drives the entire process.

There's a T shirt I saw today which talked about without democracy, I guess falls apart unless you vote. But it's not just the vote.

What we've heard today from members of the tribe is that that vote is meaningless unless it's one man or one woman and one vote.

That's the core, I believe the speaker said, of what is democracy.

There are two others.

One is equality, and the second is representational government.

The map as it stands represents the population. It represents the communities of interest. And it meets and I think it would withstand judicial scrutiny all of the other five requirements under the Prop 106.

And as an independent commission, independence requires that we avoid and be wary of political interests, which have been expressed today.
Those political interests have run this state and run the counties for a long time.

And I am astonished that at this date in 2011 you can go to the county governments, you can go to the city governments, and you do not see equal representation of the population that's in the state.

That's the fact.

It's appalling.

In this state we have one senator who is Native American.

We had a representative. She's no longer there.

We have Hispanics. We have African-Americans.

There are more Mormons and Christians in our government today than there are Native Americans.

I think the Commission has met its duty, it has read the data, it has examined the data and analyzed the data, and the data speaks for itself.

That is independence.

That is equality.

That is representative government.

I represent myself as an Independent, registered voter, as a citizen of both of Globe, and I work in Globe and Tucson, and I came from Tuba City yesterday.

And I got to tell you, even though your statistics showed District 1, Congressional District 1 as a percentage
it is, there is a way to look at those numbers and you can come up with 27 percent for Native American for Congressional District 1.

Twenty-seven percent.

That's the statistic. And that statistic is available through the census tracts. And that's why I think there's a level of frustration.

Now, the other thing I've heard today, and I think it was misrepresented, is, oh, I guess it was heard the tribes were separate.

They did say they were separate. But they did also say that they are communities of interest that have a similar combined interest that has not been heard in the history of the state for -- which is just, you know, it's unspeakable.

And I think that that's the test of independence. That's the test.

And I think the Commission has met that test, and thank you.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Nathan Nash, land use and energy planner, representing self, from Peridot, Graham County.

He's already departed? Okay.

Our next speaker is Heather Anderson, legal
HEATHER ANDERSON: Good afternoon.


I'm legal counsel for Mr. President Ben Shelly of the Navajo Nation.

I spoke with you guys before. Mr. Shelly wanted us to go ahead and continue to follow along just to make sure everything is taking place and to add additional comments if necessary.

And I appreciate you guys being here and listening to everything and all the comments that are taking place and really taking them into consideration.

By just sitting in the full hearing, as I did today, I can understand the difficulties that you guys do have in making sure that you hear everybody and making sure that they feel comfortable in making -- being able to make their comments. And you guys have done that, so thank you so much for that.

I just want to go ahead and do a little bit of follow up on some of the comments that I did here.

One of the things that actually struck me very hard is one of the tribal member's comments where she said it's not right when the people get used to not having
representation.

And I think that really stuck to me.

Because I can understand that nobody should have to feel that way as well.

I've also listened to some of the rural comments, that they feel that they want -- they don't want their voices drowned out with urban communities as well. And they want their interests to be heard, and they want to be represented.

So I can understand as being a Navajo person and from a rural community that really wants to make sure that both of those issues are taken care of.

I think we're here on -- listening to the Navajo Nation and listening to the rural communities is that the morals and values of tribal communities and rural communities are the same.

We have that, quote unquote, hometown values and morals within our community. Those interests are the same.

I think one thing that's distinct though is that one of the rural testimonies made mention that some of the rural communities do have little or no interaction with the Native American -- their surrounding Native American communities.

That's the issue, and that's the difference of it.
Because a native person that may not be able to represent those maps that are -- the draft maps right now, does understand rural communities.

Our people go there every weekend, every paycheck, as you heard. We're part of those communities.

I believe that I'm a part of our surrounding communities within the Navajo Nation.

Because we interact, we go to the movies, we interact with the people there, we listen to the issues there, because those issues affect us.

So we are very involved with the community levels.

I can understand some of the Indian members who may say that they're kind of afraid of that. And sometimes they're afraid to go in there, but we still interact very much.

So I think us Indian communities and Indian members understand what's going on in those rural communities.

But vice versa, you can't say that. And that has been heard here today. They don't understand, have little or no contact with their Indian communities.

So how can one person coming from those rural communities really represent a Navajo or Apache or any of the Tohono O'odham people when they have never stepped foot in those reservations themselves? How can they go there and
say that they represent us?

Even though our morals and our values are the same, they may be able to represent that, but will they know how to represent Indian communities' interest?

No.

But a native person could represent the rural population interest. We have farmers. We have those who are concerned about water issues. We have those that understand small community businesses.

Native people have those same interests as those in the room.

A Native American person, if voted in for congressional or representative, can properly represent the rural community, but you cannot say that for vice versa.

So, again, we'd like to go ahead and just make another formal that we do agree and would like the draft maps for both congressional and legislation to be promoted and to be approved.

And, again, thank you so much for you guys sitting here and listening to, I can understand. And I think it's a blessing for us as Indian communities to be able to step forward and represent our concerns, no matter how harsh those concerns could be, but as a Navajo people and Native Americans, we live those realities every day.

And with an opportunity to express that to you,
even some of the emotions as harsh as it may seem, I truly thank you for listening to them and allowing them to speak their own mind and bodies. And it helps us to heal and become one, one people.

We've also made mention here that we all are Americans. We really truly are all Americans. But Native Americans have not always been treated as Americans until recently. And I think that's the difference between that.

So, thank you again for your time. I appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

And our last speaker, unless anybody else has turned any slips in, is Naomi White, attorney for Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

NAOMI WHITE: Good afternoon, commissioners.

I would like to also express our gratitude from the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission for traveling throughout the state and listening to all of our concerns and all of the testimonies and statements that were provided by the indigenous people of Arizona.

I would like to talk about the Voting Rights Act, and the purpose of the Voting Rights Act was to avoid discrimination in voting.

I would like to follow up on one of the other
speaker's tones about facts.

The facts are that sovereignty of tribes has been recognized, not only by tribes but by state entities, federal entities, and also under international law.

The UN declaration on the rights of indigenous people recognize the traditional aboriginal lands of Native American and indigenous communities.

Native American human rights have been violated throughout history through the assertion of congressional plenary power. The U.S. unilateral abrogation of treaties, limitations on jurisdiction, and also the disenfranchisement of Native American voters.

The indigenous people today voice their concerns that their issues are rarely addressed at the federal and state level, because many unelected -- many elected officials are unfamiliar with tribes.

Being a voter and a citizen of the United States since time immemorial and not having representation is a violation of human rights.

Secondly, when -- as the Navajo Human Rights Commission, our office investigates on matters of discrimination. And in my office what a lot of times we hear is that Navajos are disenfranchised because of their Navajo citizenship, and a lot of the testimony we've heard throughout the state have echoed similar concerns raised by
Navajo people.

That when people say they don't want to be with Navajo, they don't want to be with Hopi, they don't want to be with tribes or any indigenous people, it sounds a lot like discrimination.

And what the reasons are, whether it's a rural voice or that the people don't share the same concerns about natural resources or mining or coal or other forms of economic development, that that's discrimination, especially when indigenous nations share the same the rural concerns.

We have concerns about economy. We have concerns about infrastructure. We have concerns about natural resources, our lands. And also concerns about employment.

The Voting Rights Act is intended to address this kind of discrimination, and Arizona has not been opted out of the Section 5 requirements.

So, as we stand here today, the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission strongly urges the compliance with the Voting Rights Act Section 2 and Section 5.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else that would like to speak today?

If not, Commissioner McNulty, would you like to say any closing words?
COMMISSIONER McNULTY: Thank you for hosting us here.

Thank you, all of you, for coming from near and far and taking the time to talk with us and putting together such detailed and thoughtful comments.

It's a treat to spend the time touring the state and hearing from people. It really is. We've heard so much about the state of Arizona, and we appreciate it.

And we'll take your comments into account.

It's a difficult job.

I guess one comment I would make about the specifics of what we heard today is to observe the real challenge between trying to create truly rural districts and at the same time creating small districts.

But I don't think you can do both things. And so I hope you do understand that we are trying to do both. So thanks again.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you, Commissioner McNulty.

Ma'am, was there one thing that you wanted to speak on? Please come up to the microphone and give your name and spell it and --

KATHRYN HANCOCK: This is not on the subject.

It's on --

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Please speak into the
microphone and give your name and spell it, please.


I too had trouble getting my map and comments sent on the Internet.

I wondered have you got that taken care of or were you even aware that it was a problem?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Ma'am, as to the question of when you experienced that.

KATHRYN HANCOCK: Right at the beginning. It's been a month maybe.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay.

MARY O'GRADY: That did come up at the Payson meeting. And at the meeting itself, they tested it, live, to see if it was working.

And it was certainly working.

So, and we have continued to get public comments through that, so I urge folks to try again.

I see our staff nodding in the back. We're getting lots of public comments --

THE WITNESS: It is working again.

Well, it's probably too late now because you've created -- is it too late?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: No, ma'am. The process that we have here is that we're in one of the steps of the
process.

And the draft maps are simply that. They are draft maps.

We accumulated data, by doing our first tour of 27 cities throughout the state.

And then the Commission got together over a eight-week period. It seems longer. But a long period of time. Where we gruelingly poured the information into those maps, and then these maps were created as draft maps.

We then, as a constitutional mandate, we then distribute those maps throughout -- through various different mechanisms, including online, through meetings such as this, through tours around the state, and through publications. And you'll find these maps. They've been published in almost every major newspaper or minor newspaper throughout the state.

Then we've been travelling around the state, and we got another 14 cities to go, as we are collecting a 30-day comment period.

So during -- all of the data that you'll be providing is still being culled in, is still being catalogued. So up until the date that we are done with our comment period, all of that data is coming in.

And it is voluminous.

We have a very competent staff that's been going
through it.

And there have been, there have been, and as technology goes, there have been Internet issues. There have been website issues.

We couldn't get a live streaming feed today, so we're recording it. And then Buck is quickly going over to Globe where he can find a place where he can upload this, what we're hearing right now.

So we are working -- we have an outreach that has been pretty dynamic right from the very beginning.

And there have been flaws.

And I appreciate you bringing it back up again.

Try it again. If it kicks back out again, you can go to info at azredistricting.org and just send an e-mail and say still doesn't work.

KATHRYN HANCOCK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Okay. Those go directly to Kristina Gomez, our assistant executive director, as well as to our executive director. And they are getting barraged with e-mails of various different kinds.

KATHRYN HANCOCK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: And, please, if you do have anything -- if it doesn't work, that means that something has happened.

And we are, we are, we are not trying to not get
data. We are trying to get as much data as possible. Because the more data we get, these attorneys over here, get real, real happy, because they've got a great big pile of stuff that they can go to the Department of Justice with.

KATHRYN HANCOCK: Do you send the maps to the various papers or do they request them?

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I believe that we handle distribution, but . . .

MARY O'GRADY: We been getting the word out. We have a massive list of public officials and press outlets that we get the information to. And we'd be happy to discuss our outreach more with you —

KATHRYN HANCOCK: I've just been very disappointed because our local Eastern Arizona Courier has not had one thing about the redistricting in their paper.

Hopefully they will now that there's going to be a meeting down there.

But it's only just been by the network that we've heard about it.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: I know that you've got friends and neighbors, and we've got lots of chairs in the room, and we've got time that -- we're here to collect as much information and as much comment, good, bad, or otherwise, okay, about what we're doing.

So we truly appreciate the time. As you all come
out, you've all taken time away from whatever you're doing today to come out and do this. We're going to do the same thing tonight in Globe and we're going to continue to do it tomorrow in Avondale.

And, again, we're traveling the corners of the state to collect this information.

KATHRYN HANCOCK: Thank you for all you do.

COMMISSIONER STERTZ: Thank you very much.

And my final comment is I just wanted to thank staff and public and everybody representing and I think that even Korinne who's not feeling well is come out here today who to help us, help us along.

Other than that, we'll see you tonight in Globe at 6:00 o'clock.

And as of 2:33 I call this meeting of the Arizona Redistricting Commission adjourned.

(whereupon, the meeting adjourned.)
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