

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

STATE OF ARIZONA
ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC SESSION

Tucson, Arizona
August 16, 2001
9:30 a.m.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT
REDISTRICTING
COMMISSION

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

1 THE STATE OF ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING
2 COMMISSION convened in Public Session on August 16,
3 2001, at 9:30 o'clock a.m., at the Double Tree Hotel
4 Resort, Boojum Room, at Reid Park, 445 South Alvernon
5 Way, Tucson, Arizona, 85711, in the presence of:

6

7 APPEARANCES:

8 CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN

9 COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK

10 COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL

11 COMMISSIONER ANDI E. MINKOFF

12 COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

- ADOLFO ECHEVESTES, Executive Director
- AMY REZZONICO, Press Information Officer
- LISA T. HAUSER, Commission Counsel
- JOSE de JESUS RIVERA, Commission Counsel
- DR. ALAN HESLOP, NDC, Consultant
- DR. FLORENCE ADAMS, NDC, Consultant
- MARGUERITE MARY LEONI, NDC Counsel
- DOUG JOHNSON, NDC, Consultant
- CHRIS HUTCHISON, NDC, Support Staff
- TIM JOHNSON, MC, Computer Consultant
- LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Court Reporter

AGENDA DESIGNATED SPEAKERS:

- DR. FLORENCE ADAMS
- MARGUERITE MARY LEONI

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

SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

- REPRESENTATIVE MARION PICKENS
- SALOMON R. BALDENEGRO
- FRANK SEANEZ
- DORA VASQUEZ
- REPRESENTATIVE MARK CLARK
- CAROL SHEARER
- WALKER SMITH
- RICHARD E. GREEN
- RICHARD G. SALAZ
- RON KINGSBURY
- COUNCILPERSON BOB MITCHELL
- JIM PEDERSON
- STEVE GALLARDO
- CARLOS GALOUN SALAZ
- JIM HARTDEGEN

1

2

3 SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC (CONT'D):

4

5 ANNE MURRAY

6 GARY BOHNEE

7 CECILIA CRUZ

8 SALOMON R. BALDENEGRO

9 FRANK SEANEZ

10 BILL DUPONT

11 WALKER SMITH

12 PAUL MACKEY

13 STEVE GALLARDO

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

Public Session
Tucson, Arizona
August 16, 2001
9:30 o'clock a.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I could ask the
Commissioners to take their seats, we'll start the
meeting.

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

Mr. Turney, are you able to hear me well
in back? I'm not, we'll be able to tell.

Let the record reflect all five members of
the Commission are present.

Let the record reflect that Tucson has
shown a great deal of interest in our process. We have
a terrific gathering this morning.

We're very appreciative all of you have
come out. As is our custom, we'll have public comment
at the beginning and end of our meeting.

If you do wish to speak and have not yet
filled out a yellow speaker slip, I'll ask you to do so.

If you've not yet filled out that slip,
staff will pass them out.

1 Let me make a couple comments before we
2 begin public comment. I'd like to, for all your
3 information and the record, let everyone know where we
4 are in the process.

5 Today it is our hope, whether this meeting
6 ends sometime today or tomorrow, we will have adopted
7 draft maps, one Congressional and one Legislative. I
8 want to emphasize these drafts are drafts. They are not
9 perfect. They will not pass all the tests they need to.
10 That's not the intent at this stage in the process. The
11 purpose at this stage in the process is so the public
12 will have another opportunity to comment at this stage
13 in the process.

14 At the end of the process, the Commission
15 will again meet at the end in very lengthy session to
16 take all comment into consideration and take into
17 account all comment into account.

18 To that end, all those seeking to comment
19 this afternoon and at the end, because of the number of
20 people speaking, I'd ask you to try to limit your
21 comments to three minutes each. We'll not be strict
22 about that, but we have a lot of work today and we want
23 to balance public input at this juncture with the amount
24 of work we have to do with the Congressional and
25 Legislative mapping.

1 The second thing I have is if you have
2 specific comments about very small pieces of the maps,
3 that is this particular boundary should be one street
4 over or this particular line should go one other place,
5 that comment is perfectly fine; but understand those
6 kind of adjustments may not be made at this point in the
7 process. They will be taken into account to fine-tune
8 all of the districts we've drawn.

9 At the point we are satisfied as a
10 Commission we have taken all that comment into account,
11 we will then adopt final maps than then will be
12 submitted into the Department of Justice for review.
13 That is about a month away.

14 That being said, public comment: This is
15 the time for consideration and discussion of comments
16 and complaints from the public. those wishing to
17 address the commission shall request permission in
18 advance by filling out a speaker slip. action taken as
19 a result of public comment will be limited to directing
20 staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for
21 further consideration and decision at a later date
22 unless it is the subject of an item already on the
23 agenda.

24 MR. ECHEVESTE: I have a handout submitted
25 to me, submitted by Ken Bennett, State Senator. I'd

1 like to include this for the record.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.
3 It will be made a part of the record and made available
4 to each Commissioner.

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The first person wishing
7 then to, the person speaking first, is Representative
8 Marion Pickens, State Representative, and representing
9 herself.

10 Ms. Pickens.

11 REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would each speaker, for
13 the purpose of the public hearing, if you would, state,
14 and if it's not absolutely obvious, spell your name.

15 REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Representative
16 Marion Pickens, P I C K E N S.

17 I'm representing myself.

18 This is the first opportunity I've had to
19 be at a Commission meeting. I appreciate you all coming
20 down to Tucson so I can participate.

21 I'm really speaking for myself because I
22 have lived in Tucson now for 40 years. I feel I'm very
23 much a part of this community and have looked at and
24 been a part of the whole political process that has
25 taken place for a number of years, even having run for

1 office myself.

2 There is something very different about
3 Tucson and Pima County. We haven't gone through the
4 Baja Arizona revolt for nothing. Other than the fact we
5 view issues very seriously down here, we want people to
6 view the City Council, Board of Supervisors, and
7 represent the views we have here in this community.

8 Community is very important to us, to be
9 sure we have people elected that can represent our
10 issues, not necessarily parties, issues important here
11 in this community.

12 I believe you have done, as I have been
13 getting information from my staff as to how you are
14 dividing the Legislative Districts, you are certainly
15 taking into consideration Hispanic minority interests,
16 making sure that they have some geographical
17 compactness. I don't believe you really addressed the
18 whole issue on competitive districts.

19 It is the competitive issues down here
20 that allow us to elect people on issues.

21 I guess the old, now, District 13 is a
22 perfect example on that. That has not been particularly
23 Republican or Democrat. It's represented by people that
24 feel very strongly on issues in the community and feel
25 strongly on issues.

1 As you are looking now, as you are going
2 to fine-tune Legislative Districts, particularly here in
3 Pima County, please look at how we make sure the issues
4 of the community can be represented in the Legislature
5 through those competitive districts, which is how I hope
6 the district is now going to be drawn.

7 Thank you very much.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative
9 Pickens.

10 The next person I have wishing to speak,
11 Salomon Baldenegro, Chair of the Chicano Consortium for
12 Public Issues.

13 MR. BALDENEGRO: Mr. Chairman,
14 Commissioners, I want to address a couple things.
15 Congressional issues.

16 District G, on behalf of the Chicano
17 Consortium for Public Issues, I submitted a map that
18 argued the case that District G should be, what you call
19 District G, we call District Two, that the whole border
20 constitutes a community of interest. And the map we
21 submitted, substantively what is District G, your
22 District G covers now, except your District G does not
23 include the lower part of Cochise County, the Douglas
24 County, ours does. We argued, we'll argue, the entire
25 border from Douglas constitutes a viable community.

1 The Douglas border issues are extremely
2 important, a viable issue. To divide, somehow magically
3 say the Douglas border issues are separate from these
4 issues, or should have a different voice represent been
5 them, simply from our standpoint is not a viable thing
6 to do.

7 We continue to argue the case the entire
8 border should continue to be included in District G.

9 I think the statistical manipulations that
10 have to be done would be minor enough to not cause --
11 not be disastrous to the rest of the districts.

12 On the Legislative side of it, looking at
13 the Legislative side of it, what we call District 10, I
14 couldn't make out what you call them over here, we have
15 letters for them, I think District U, what we call
16 District U, I think you know what it is over here, the
17 south side of Tucson, south central part of Tucson.
18 Historically it has been, historically it's been a very
19 cohesive part of Tucson. That south central part of
20 Tucson should remain in what was District 10, what we
21 call District 10, you call whatever you call it.

22 A d the west side of Tucson is also a
23 traditional part, viable community part of interest that
24 should also be kept together.

25 The way it looks now, you've taken part

1 central part of Tucson and stuck it into the western
2 part Tucson. While there are some commonalities between
3 the two areas, historically, traditionally, it's a much
4 stronger part of the sense of the south central part of
5 Tucson and it makes much more sense to be in part,
6 District 10, than District 11. The south central part
7 of 10 has been small very cohesive community
8 historically, has been in District 10, an agra District
9 10, for that matter.

10 I see south Tucson, south central 10 in
11 11, and I think you should reconsider that.

12 Look at the south side of Tucson, south
13 central side of Tucson as a viable historically cohesive
14 part of Tucson. Look at those sides.

15 That would make better sense for
16 candidates running for office, people developing
17 historical voting patterns, voting patterns, race
18 issues.

19 If you do that kind of tweaking, again, it
20 would not be disastrous, not entail monumental changes
21 that have far-reaching ramifications. Tweaking can be
22 done and should be done.

23 Speaking from a community of interchange
24 point, I want to reiterate, the border should be one
25 continuous border of interest. It is that in reality.

1 Chopping it off Sierra Vista, or whatever the line is,
2 is an artificial boundary.

3 I think the border, which has been done
4 way before we have, obviously, the reality is those
5 issues are there. And to chop it off arbitrarily is
6 artificial manipulation and doesn't make sense.

7 To reiterate, go back and maintain the
8 south side of Tucson, south side the Tucson, what we
9 call District 10. Maintain the south central side as a
10 viable community of interest.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Baldenegro

12 Next speaker, Mr. Seanez, representing the
13 Navajo Nation.

14 Mr. Seanez.

15 MR. SEANEZ: Good morning, Chairman Lynn,
16 Members of the Commission.

17 The Navajo Nation is here again to speak
18 to the Congressional District and Legislative District.
19 The Navajo Nation is viewing the Congressional District
20 as an improvement over the original, the original grid,
21 as well as the first draft which was released on August
22 the 9th. However, the gerrymander which is indicated on
23 the draft map for the exclusion of Hopi from the same
24 Congressional District from the Navajo Nation has merely
25 changed shape. Now we have the flying giraffe there.

1 And the Navajo Nation is here to recommend the beheading
2 of the flying giraffe.

3 We don't believe the Navajo Nation should
4 be separated from Hopi Nation. It's diluted the Native
5 Americans from the voting population. It's innumerical,
6 and we're here to advocate with the Commission to make
7 that additional change before adoption of the
8 Congressional map.

9 The Navajo Nation as well is here to
10 address concerns with the Congressional District even as
11 it has been modified.

12 For discussion purposes, at the Phoenix
13 meetings, the percentages of 64 percent and considerably
14 less, and that assumes 12 percent Native American voting
15 ages is still a percent less than the bench mark of
16 Native Americans, less than the Native Americans in
17 District Three voting age.

18 We believe the Commission can address the
19 Americans voting age.

20 First, which Legislative District the Hopi
21 nation, 7,000 individuals, or approximately three
22 percent of voting district, we understand that there are
23 intersections of other communities of interest,
24 especially the southeastern part of the state; however,
25 the adjustment of what we refer to as the EACO district

1 may be required in order to increase the native
2 population, Native American voting Americans through the
3 White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe,
4 especially if the Commission is not to see clear to have
5 the Hopi Tribe to see clear into the Navajo Tribe,
6 especially for voting preclearance. Navajo sees other
7 alternatives available to address the percentage number,
8 one being possible exclusion of New Kingman Butler and
9 Kingman from the proposed Legislative District, high,
10 relatively high numbers of voters and very low numbers
11 of Native Americans.

12 We don't believe exclusion of Kingman by
13 itself will be sufficient. We believe it will also have
14 to be addressed primarily through the addition of the
15 Hopi tribe to the Legislative District. But also we
16 encourage the Commission to look at other options
17 involving San Carlos and White Mountain Apache Tribes,
18 if that becomes necessary, and the Commission does not
19 see it possible to redraft in the way we're suggesting.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

21 I ask, because the room is so small, if
22 you have a cellphone, turn it off or put it on stun, one
23 of the two.

24 The second thing, if anyone is standing in
25 the seats to the far side of the room, that would be

1 your seat.

2 Next speaker, Dora Vasquez, representing
3 the Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP.

4 MS. VASQUEZ: I'm here on behalf of the
5 Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP. I'm here for the
6 Pinal Coalition on Redistricting.

7 The Pinal Redistricting maps best
8 represents, in addition, the Pinal Legislative District
9 not only interests the Hispanic community, it also
10 interests the native communities. The City of Casa
11 Grande wishes to be kept in a district without being
12 divided into two districts. The coalition map does just
13 this. The Hispanic Coalition plan as submitted keeps
14 the City of Casa Grande within one Legislative District.
15 Even more important, it keeps the American Indian
16 Hispanic population within city in the district. It
17 reflects a community of interest, reflects the American
18 and Hispanic in the district, and reflects other
19 districts.

20 As you drive down Interstate 10, you'll
21 see the Casa Grande area is rapidly changing
22 traditionally. It's an agricultural community changing
23 to a bedroom community, new homes being built daily.

24 The Pinal Hispanic Community Forum and
25 Pinal NAACP want to assure this rapid development does

1 not infringe on the needs and developments of the
2 long-term residents that need to assure transportation
3 and social services are readily available to the elderly
4 and need to assure education needs of the children are
5 addressed at the Legislature.

6 We strongly support the Gila River Indian
7 requests that the district be drawn as it joins the
8 rural communities of Gila, the Fort McDowell
9 communities, Ak-Chin Indians, and also request Ak-Chin
10 not be divided at State Route 77, and the mining
11 communities be included.

12 The Arizona Independent Redistricting
13 Community plan increases retrogression for a planned
14 Commission to represent the concerns and not compliance
15 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Voting Rights Act
16 prohibits can't sell out and minimize the voting rights
17 acts which are minimized, specifically, to dilute the
18 voting rights of the American Indian Hispanic community
19 which historically existed and provided sufficient
20 registration to elect a party, the voting priority
21 Legislative district as submitted by the Hispanic
22 Coalition.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you have those comments
24 in writing, we'd be happy to take a copy, if you'd like
25 to submit them.

1 Thank you very much.

2 Next speaker, Mark Clark, representing
3 himself.

4 Representative Clark.

5 REPRESENTATIVE CLARK: Mark Clark,
6 representing himself.

7 To let you know, and the audience as well,
8 as well as you know, this is one of the first
9 opportunities we've had to make and have an opportunity
10 to make our districts competitive. I think that through
11 that, it is a unique opportunity.

12 In the past, we basically have had to
13 basically draw the lines, which I think has been okay.
14 But for this committee, one of the best opportunities
15 that we do have is to do just what I said, be able to
16 let more people have an impact as to which district,
17 instead of before, through what I've been able to see,
18 in my own campaign, I've had to basically go and ask for
19 votes. People generally tell me, you are Democrat, A
20 Republican will win. You are in District Seven. I'm
21 Republican. It's a Republican district. I'll win.
22 Redistricting this way, it's a better opportunity to
23 assure the best candidate will win. Through my eyes, as
24 a freshman in the Legislature this session, with an
25 opportunity to see a unique situation the Senate had, a

1 15-15 split, I think, you know, through that, we had
2 some good legislation passed. It was where not only a
3 certain group, the majority of the Senate was there, or
4 whatever, it wasn't a specific group of people making
5 legislation, all people. All senators were able to come
6 to the table and had a voice. That produced a lot of
7 good legislation.

8 If you take, for example, the House of
9 Representatives, we have a 37-23 split. In that, I
10 think that there was only certain people making and
11 passing legislation. I think it was one-sided at some
12 times. If we, through redistricting this way, we'll be
13 able to make our districts competitive, actually be able
14 to bring more people of either an equal amount of
15 Democrats or equal amount of Republicans on either side
16 of the table, give us an even balance, a better balance.

17 The main issue I have is basically
18 reassuring. Hopefully you reassure districts are
19 competitive, not lopsided. That's the major purpose,
20 hopefully the issue of redistricting this way. When on
21 the floor, it makes a huge difference, because we do
22 have an opportunity to come to the table and give our
23 input and feel like people are listening to you, how
24 laws are made in the State of Arizona.

25 Everybody, the team you have, everybody

1 has input. You have input on either side.

2 Hopefully the redistricting, we can have
3 that.

4 I think another issue that I see, through
5 my district, is we have a unique district, a lot of
6 small towns. And small towns generally have been
7 grouped together.

8 I think than during the map I saw, it had
9 my district as District Seven B, basically, in between
10 Phoenix and Tucson. Now my district would go into
11 Tucson taking Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke,
12 going back toward Manuel, Oro Valley, and going back to
13 Casa Grande, Apache Junction. If a person has part of
14 the rural area, it would be hard for them to legislate
15 because of factors. You would be passing legislation
16 trying to add road improvements, pulling money from one
17 side to the other. For people, and actually in the
18 interests of the people, it would be better served if
19 they had a representative basically representing a group
20 of people that had a set of interests. Shifting from
21 having two representing Tucson, representing a town like
22 San Manuel would be extremely hard. Not only the
23 people's interests, from the standpoint of interests,
24 that would be a consideration I hope you take into
25 consideration. I don't know what else I could tell you.

1 I don't know what else I could tell you, how policy is
2 set and policy is made. It will be interesting.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative
4 Clark.

5 Again, if you filled out a slip and want
6 to speak at the morning session, there will be another
7 session this afternoon. Please fill out a slip and hold
8 it up. If at all possible, limit your comments to
9 roughly a three-minute period.

10 Carol Shearer, League of Women Voters,
11 representing the Greater Metropolitan Tucson.

12 Ms. Shearer.

13 MS. SHEARER: Good morning.

14 My name is Carol Shearer, S H A E R E R.
15 I'm President of the League of Women Voters of Greater
16 Tucson.

17 I'd like to thank all the Commissioners
18 for doing a very difficult job. The League of Women
19 Voters was very involved in collecting signatures for
20 Prop 106. In collecting signatures, one of the most
21 appealing points was the competitive part of the
22 districts. I'd like to remind you, that was what the
23 citizens felt. I think that's what many other leagers
24 feel.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Shearer.

1 Next speaker, Mr. Walker Smith, principal
2 planner for the City of South Tucson.

3 Mr. Smith.

4 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
5 Commissioners.

6 At your hearing at Desert Vista Campus and
7 the Pima Community Campus, we asked you to consider the
8 community of interest for Tucson. I want to say a few
9 more words about that, considering a few more remarks
10 about Mr. Baldenegro.

11 The community of interests of South Tucson
12 go basically north and east. The current map for South
13 Tucson goes east in Tucson on an east line to 12th
14 Avenue and the Freeway. And historically south of
15 downtown it's the west side of the river. The east side
16 of the river tends to be a community of interest. It
17 would be more natural to go east, perhaps toward the
18 mainland of the railroad.

19 The railroad is the east boundary of the
20 Tucson, is a single track. Many years ago the railroad
21 families settled on both sides of that single line
22 railroad track and there continue to be families on both
23 sides.

24 South Tucson's relationship marks the
25 family, the urban league. This is more than just a

1 single ethnic consideration. And we would ask you to
2 consider those kind of factors in the community of
3 interest for South Tucson on the south side of Tucson
4 issue as you move forward in your deliberations.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is
6 Richard E. Green, representative of EAHEA.

7 Mr. Green.

8 MR. GREEN: Yes, I'm Richard Green. I
9 live in Superior, Arizona. I'd like to speak on behalf
10 of myself.

11 I'm a member of the KARA Board which
12 represents low income people from Pinal County. I'd
13 like to see the community of interest from Pinal County
14 be kept as whole as possible. The way they have it on
15 the latest map I see cuts Pinal County into four
16 districts. We've been cut up into districts before. I
17 don't think this serves the people of Pinal people very
18 well.

19 Mr. Kingsbury will have a map to present
20 to you. I support the map he presents.

21 Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Green.

23 The next speaker is Richard Salaz
24 representing himself.

25 Mr. Salaz.

1 MR. SALAZ: Thank you. Good morning.

2 S A L A Z.

3 I've been a resident of the City of Tucson
4 since my birth. I'd like to reiterate what
5 Mr. Baldenegro, Walker, and Green said, Pueblo Hills,
6 South Central, South Tucson, and the southern part of
7 Tucson are more a community of interest with us than the
8 west Tucson mountains. And I think, if I read your map
9 correctly, there is a little dog leg that goes all the
10 way up to Marana. I assure you there is not a whole lot
11 of community of interest with the Town of Marana, even
12 though we have a lot of good friends up there.

13 I would like to keep as much of District
14 10 that we have now. It encompasses all of District 10,
15 goes eastward and southbound. It has been there 30 some
16 odd years, I believe. I've been involved a little bit
17 in politics, am not a politician by nature. I follow
18 whatever concerns I have directly.

19 Consider keeping District 10 as much
20 intact as possible. Like in a walker, keeping it right
21 now, it's not a single ethnic group we're talking about,
22 it's a multi-ethnic community, South Tucson, the south
23 Air Park Council, South Air Park Gardens. We'd like you
24 to keep it as impact as possible.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Mr. Ron

1 Kingsbury, Chairman of the Pinal County Democrats.

2 MR. KING: I guess I'm down low again.

3 I'm Ron Kingsbury, K I N G S B U R Y.

4 I'm representing the Pinal County
5 Democrats, representing the Pinal County people, not
6 just Democrats.

7 One of the things that very much concerns
8 me, Pinal County has been a splinter of the State of
9 Arizona. We're the one being squeezed between Maricopa
10 and Pima County. What has happened through the history
11 of Arizona, Pinal County has been, if we need votes,
12 we'll grab part of Pinal County. We've really not had
13 fair representation through Pinal County.

14 Redistricting, I thought had been a goal
15 of bringing ahead, bringing the county together, so we'd
16 have voice in the legislature and everything. As we
17 had, we had six splits during the redistricting. When I
18 look at maps, it's down to three.

19 My question to the Commission is why are
20 we being split all together? We have 179,000 population
21 in Pinal County. We are diversified, all walks of life,
22 Native Americans, all walks of life, working together as
23 whole. Our County Commissioners sent letters to the
24 Commissioners explaining why the Apache Junction, Gold
25 Canyon, should be part of our Legislature instead of

1 being City of Mesa, or that end. We have always been
2 handed what is left or taken from us. And I think it's
3 time that Pinal County be recognized as a legitimate
4 entity to the State of Arizona instead of being a step
5 child of everybody that grabs us.

6 I have a map here that I would like to
7 present to you as to what I feel and we have been
8 talking about for the -- during the last part of
9 redistricting. I have a map I'll give you.

10 Nothing like getting them all mixed up.

11 On the map you will see, if I can point
12 out some of the things on the map, that what we have
13 done is included all minorities, the Indian nation.

14 I was talking to, just before I got a
15 chance and the meeting started, looking at our map, the
16 Hispanic and -- they are very agreeable with our map.
17 The only question they asked, what they add to the map,
18 if we could go above Apache Junction and take in the
19 Gila River Reservation, Fort McDowell and that, as part
20 of that. They would like to be part of that.

21 If you look at our map, we have the whole
22 Pinal County as a district. We have dropped out Oracle
23 on that map because of the figure of the -- the
24 population figure. But if you look at it, the Oracle
25 area is more or less part of the Tucson area and that

1 way.

2 If you look, we are including San Manuel,
3 everything. We are making our county a district or
4 everything, whatever it is, whether Democrat,
5 Republican, whatever Democrat, creed, whatever, so we
6 have a speaking in the Legislature.

7 My district, District Four, takes Gold
8 Canyon, not Supreme Valley, as put in the -- during the
9 report, all the way up to Utah, St. Johns, and
10 everything.

11 Our representation has always been from
12 that area.

13 District Seven comes into our area, but
14 more or less the southeastern part of Pinal valley.

15 What we'd like to do, our plans, and what
16 we were asking the Commission, please consider, we would
17 like to be whole instead of split so we have a voice in
18 the Legislature and state government.

19 Tucson, I came to Tucson in 1946. My dad
20 was stationed at Mammoth Air Base. Tucson was a resort
21 town, a mission, and growing in its right to ask for
22 representation. Pinal has the right to ask for
23 representation.

24 Thank you for listening.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.

1 We will take that map and make it part of the record.

2 The next speaker is Mr. Bob Mitchell, a
3 speaker for the City of Casa Grande.

4 Mr. Mitchell.

5 MR. ECHEVESTE: Excuse me, sir. Can we
6 have that?

7 A VOICE: Ron wants this one back.

8 COUNCILMEMBER MITCHELL: Excuse me,
9 Mr. Chairman,

10 Commissioners, it's a pleasure to address
11 you. I had an opportunity to address you when you were
12 in Casa Grande earlier in the process. While I'd like
13 to support the earlier map when you were in Casa Grande,
14 and looking at this map when I just saw of Pinal map I
15 don't know if it would be a bad map either. I don't
16 know if it would be bad to have the worst of all world's
17 in the map you now created, which includes the cities of
18 Florence, Coolidge, Eloy, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Tohono
19 O'odham, Eloy, Ak-Chin, those put together, many
20 communities of interest we originally talked about, 80
21 percent of dairies in state one area, most feed lots in
22 one area. It does create an agricultural area of
23 interest in one area, Gila Bend as well as Western Pinal
24 County. It does in fact keep all school districts in
25 Western Pinal County in one school area, and does keep

1 most Hispanics and Native Americans into a district,
2 which is a part of our minority-majority district at
3 that time. It also creates an industrial corridor for
4 the western part of Pinal County going down to the
5 south. So the areas of interest that have been put
6 together by this map that have been submitted, while
7 certainly not my first choice, is certainly a map of
8 merit keeping the western Pinal areas, communities of
9 interest, and as a cohesive map or Legislative District
10 that would represent Casa Grande.

11 As I indicated before, we've before been
12 split several different directions. I applaud the
13 Commission keeping these areas of interest together.
14 This is an improvement we never -- we haven't had and
15 certainly appreciate.

16 Again, I want to thank you for the job you
17 are doing and the opportunity to speak before you.

18 If there is some area of interest I've not
19 mentioned, I apologize. I think overall, the concerns
20 we have have been met by this map that was submitted.

21 Again, my first interest is to keep Pinal
22 County whole. Second, look at the map we submitted
23 originally in Casa Grande; and, thirdly, the map
24 submitted.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you Councilmember

1 Mitchell. Appreciate you being here today.

2 The next speaker is Mr. Pederson. I take
3 it from your slip you are representing yourself.

4 MR. PEDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are representing
6 yourself.

7 MR. PEDERSON: Yes. I represent myself
8 also. I represent Mr. Pederson and am Chairman of the
9 Fair Redistricting Campaign.

10 Those people came together for one
11 purpose, that's to insure every vote counts in Arizona.
12 We came out with a number of criteria for drawing a
13 number of legislative redistricting lines.

14 I want to compliment the Commission. If
15 this initiative would not have been passed, our
16 legislature would be doing this in the basement of the
17 Capitol, not in the open, in public, not subject to open
18 scrutiny. Thank you.

19 Mr. Chairman, thank you members of
20 Commission.

21 Involving the criteria as to how we
22 arrived at Congressional and Legislative Districts,
23 there were a total of five criteria. Certainly
24 compliance with the Voting Rights Act, certainly that's
25 number one. The Arizona history with regard to Voting

1 Rights Act, there have been many, many infringements of
2 the Voting Rights Act. Arizona is on the Department of
3 Justice Watch List, one of the few states on the watch
4 list at the US Department of Justice. Other criteria
5 are geographical compactness to respect communities of
6 interest. We have to take all of those into account and
7 come up with that definition, respect for natural
8 boundaries. You've heard testimony as to how counties
9 have been split up.

10 I went to my high school reunion. I was
11 born and raised in the city of Casa Grande. That city
12 was split three years ago into three Legislative
13 Districts, Jim, I live on one side of the street. My
14 neighbor on the other side of the street. And that
15 legislative line goes right down the middle of our
16 street. If you take into account respect for natural
17 boundaries, communities of interest, we all know that's
18 direct violation.

19 I'd also like to spotlight another
20 criteria we debated at some length when coming up with
21 specific language in 106, and that's competitiveness.
22 We've all heard the stories of people frustrated their
23 vote doesn't count living in lopsided district. I live
24 in a lopsided district. I'm sure most people in this
25 room live in lopsided districts. Either Republicans or

1 Democrats dominate that room. Most districts
2 congressional or legislative, are lopsided. Our basic
3 conclusion was as long as the other criteria were
4 satisfied, the main ones here, Voting Rights Act,
5 compactness, competitiveness, to raise that to the same
6 priority, as long as it has no detrimental effect to
7 that of the other criteria -- now there are a number of
8 ways, a number of opportunities throughout the state
9 where competitive districts could be formulated.
10 Naturally, we're not going to make North Scottsdale safe
11 for Democrats and we'll not make South Tucson safe for
12 Republicans. There are many parts of the state where
13 drawing of lines -- through drawing of lines they can be
14 made competitive.

15 What is competitive statewide?

16 Five percent differential through
17 Democrats and Republicans giving Republicans, current
18 Congressional, is favoring Republicans, Legislative
19 Districts has 19 percent difference. Now, in our
20 campaign, we emphasized everyone's right to vote. We
21 said when you go into a voting booth, you should have
22 more than one person to vote for.

23 We have a history of voting being decided
24 in primaries, voting being the coronation of the
25 election of the primary. We do not have to sacrifice

1 elections. Our party suggested how this can be done
2 with respect to rural interests, with respect to urban
3 interests, and at the same time have a minority map.
4 They are not mutually exclusive. It can be done. You
5 do not have to sacrifice the voting franchise of one
6 part of the community to achieve the voting franchise of
7 another person in another part of the community.

8 Our efforts during the year passing
9 Proposition 106 created promises. We feel the most
10 basic part of the proposition is to achieve each
11 proposition so we craft it such that it keeps the
12 promise we craft that when we make a promise, the
13 biggest promise is competitive campaigns, strong
14 discussion of issues.

15 Chairman Lynn mentioned, this is a draft.
16 We consider it only halfway through process. When the
17 Commission draft plan's complete, I expect we'll have
18 districts fair with one another. One without the other
19 is another broken promise without the other.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Pederson.

21 I have two more slips available. If
22 others wish to speak, get those to staff. We'll
23 accommodate you.

24 Next is Steve Gallardo representing the
25 Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

1 Mr. Gallardo.

2 MR. GALLARDO: Good morning, Chairman,
3 Members of the Commission.

4 First of all, the Coalition would commend
5 the Commission and the Commission's work they've done so
6 far, during the weekend's marathon, and commend you for
7 the work you've done so far.

8 The Coalition would like to request the
9 Commission refer back to the Coalition's map submitted
10 on July 16th. This map was based on 13 different
11 illustrations of communities of interest. These
12 illustrations were presented to you at the South Phoenix
13 public hearing, and we'd request the Commission look at
14 the Maricopa County districts, refer back to our map
15 when creating the Maricopa County districts.

16 We'd request the Maricopa County area be
17 created for a minority-majority district. This allows
18 us to maximize minority voting strength. There are some
19 concerns with Legislative District P, I believe, on the
20 proposed map. There are a couple areas that when
21 looking at the maps, or the illustrations of community
22 of interest, they do not fall on our maps as communities
23 of interest. And there are areas which are considered
24 communities of interest that do not fall on any of the
25 proposed communities of interest. We'd ask that

1 interest be looked at and be drawn up where it need full
2 phases on communities of interest.

3 Also, with respect to come District D, I
4 believe, the South Phoenix community of interest,
5 looking at communities of interest presented, the area I
6 believe of 24th Street and Camelback area, that does not
7 meet any of the 13 communities of interest. And we
8 would ask that changes be made to this congressional
9 area. There's a southern part of Glendale that does
10 meet communities of interest and ask you take a look at
11 that, and again, maximizing the strength of the minority
12 vote in the minority county.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gallardo.

14 The last speaker slip I have, Carlos
15 Salaz, vice president of an organization, SOAR.

16 Mr. Salaz.

17 MR. SALAZ: My name is Carlos Salaz.

18 I was born in South Tucson. As has been
19 mentioned a lot here, and my opinion is try to leave
20 District 10, District 11, as much as possible, the way
21 it is now. I believe with the comments of my brother
22 Baldenegro, and Walker, and Green, we're retired
23 brothers, steel workers, Hispanic retirees.

24 We're barely getting in the picture here
25 on redistricting. I have no idea what you are talking

1 about on redistricting. I'd like to get information,
2 maps, so I can make a good decision if you guys are
3 doing a good job or not. I believe you are doing a good
4 job, but I hear there's areas where they could be left
5 alone, maybe jump into another area. I don't know. But
6 as a citizen I'm asking information so I can make a wise
7 decision, so not just going on information, wise man,
8 like to have a fax machine, fax whatever you can.
9 This is my first meeting with the Commission. It's my
10 fault. I didn't know where your meetings were being
11 held and where. But I believe that the person that has
12 spoken on the area of District 10 and District 11, I
13 believe they should be -- if you could leave it as it
14 is, I would appreciate it, if you could have that into
15 consideration.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Salaz.

17 Are there any other members of the public
18 wishing to be heard at this time?

19 If not, we'll close public comment for the
20 early session. We'll again have public comment for
21 later in the meeting or again if public comment will go
22 to a later session.

23 Thank you again for the public comment at
24 a later time.

25 Item three. Item three is presentation by

1 NDC, discussion and possible decision concerning
2 development and adoption of draft Congressional and
3 Legislative maps.

4 I believe this presentation refers to
5 legislative mapping.

6 Is there any comment from the Commission
7 with respect to the Congressional maps.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would
9 like to make a motion we accept the maps on the
10 Congressional maps as they presently exist.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, in
15 passing this motion, are we saying this is only the
16 draft maps we'll send out for public comment?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct. I understand the
18 motion to mean every map we approve up to and during the
19 approval is a draft. This is the draft we'll use for
20 the purpose of securing the public comment period.

21 I might also point out under Proposition
22 106, there is a 30-day fixed public comment period when
23 the draft maps have been developed. Public comment
24 period will begin as soon as draft maps have been
25 developed and are made available to the public. The

1 public hearing schedule consists of 30 days. Public
2 comment period will be 30 days.

3 This motion, as I understand it, refers
4 only to the period the drafts will be made available to
5 the public for 30 days.

6 Mr. Hall.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: No question,
8 Mr. Chairman. There is no question we have work to do.
9 We welcome the opportunity for the public to react to
10 these drafts. I think we need to move to the phase of
11 the Commission accepting these as drafts, the Commission
12 accepting these as phase two.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

14 I don't know at what point he left the
15 motion on the floor except to accept the Congressional
16 maps as drafts for public comment.

17 Mr. Huntwork.

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One point I'd like
19 to bring up is the -- I would like to address
20 specifically the one line we have drawn connecting the
21 Hopi Reservation to the rest of that district. I noted
22 myself and heard numerous comments from myself and
23 outside that creates a somewhat comical appearance to
24 the district. And, in fact, we have done this for very
25 important reasons which are entirely serious and

1 sober-minded. But I've asked the question a couple
2 times and would like to ask it again whether it is
3 necessary for us to have a physical connection. It
4 seems to me to be an unnecessary embellishment if we are
5 not legally required to have it.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll ask whether or not
7 legal counsel wants to respond at that point.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
9 like to ask a question of Mr. Huntwork.

10 Is it because of visual appearance? I
11 believe that linkage only has population of four people.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Four people. The
13 comment from Mr. Seanez about the flying giraffe, the
14 comment in the Arizona Republic, the Arizona dinosaur
15 fossiles, all of those are unnecessary comments for
16 something done for entirely appropriate reasons. I
17 prefer not to if we have that option.

18 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner
19 Huntwork, the criteria includes a goal of making
20 districts that are compact and contiguous. There does
21 not appear to be a -- an exclusion of the possibility of
22 having a district that is noncontiguous; however, the
23 draft includes a string of zero population string census
24 blocks that although a little funny looking at least
25 makes it contiguous, in fact, even though they are

1 separated by this zero population string.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman,
4 aesthetics notwithstanding, I thought Mr. Seanez'
5 characterization was rather creative. I prefer to have
6 the Hopi Reservation physically connected with the
7 remainder connected. I think it does look strange. I
8 think it would also look strange as an unconnected
9 island. No matter what we approve, having it connected
10 or not will be a little aesthetically jarring. However
11 we achieve having it connected will be a little jarring.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Reminds me of the
13 discussion of the motion, again, this is for draft
14 purposes, jarring, because the connection is relatively
15 sparse population, could we at a later date decide to
16 make a change on this issue.

17 Further discussion.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur. At a later
19 date we could determine we could move it. Should it be
20 determined it can stay, we can have the opportunity.

21 I emphasize with you this is a draft.

22 I'm not sure by removing the small neck,
23 I'm not so sure the comical metaphors would stop.
24 They'd simply change to an additional metaphor to
25 represent a different type animal. I, therefore, call

1 the question.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been
3 called.

4 Additional discussion?

5 Mr. Huntwork?

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree with my
7 fellow Commissioners and encourage everyone to focus on
8 the substance of this.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.
10 Are you ready for the question?

11 On the motion to accept the draft
12 Congressional map for the purposes of public comment,
13 roll call.

14 Mr. Huntwork?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Chair votes "aye."

23 It might be appropriate, because we do
24 need public breaks so the public stenographer can stay
25 with us for the long hours we'll be needing her with us,

1 to take a brief break, to go through some history. Our
2 history has been for brief breaks to tend to take longer
3 than they should. I'd like to, in the interest of the
4 amount of work we have to do, the Legislative work we
5 have to do, take as close to a 10-minute break as we
6 can, reconvene as close to 11:00 o'clock as possible.

7 Thank you.

8 (Recess taken from 10:45 until
9 approximately 11:00 a.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will be in
11 session.

12 The next presentation will be a
13 presentation by consultants.

14 I should point out between the last
15 meeting in Phoenix and -- since the last meeting, the
16 individual Commissioners have had a chance to provide
17 individual input from the Commissioners. And hopefully
18 the consultants have incorporated that individual input
19 from the individual Commissioners and the public, and
20 we'll see how rapidly we can make that progress.

21 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
22 Commission, we have a short Power Point presentation to
23 explain the Power Point changes we've made and to bring
24 before the Commission some decisions.

25 I'd like to bring before the Commission a

1 small housekeeping matter. There's a small sort of
2 confusion, and I'd like to bring it up.

3 As you know, the current Congressional and
4 Legislative maps before Arizona use a numbering system.
5 Many citizens refer to those numbers. But the districts
6 we are drawing are very different from the current
7 Legislative Districts. So to signal that difference, we
8 have used the alphabet. We have lettered the districts.
9 So the original map we brought you on August 9th was
10 appropriately lettered from the north to the south.
11 However, as a result of the changes made, we are engaged
12 in a kind of -- maybe alphabet soup because these
13 districts are moving around and getting out of alphabet
14 order. It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, we continue
15 to use letters we have on the maps even though we know
16 their logic has become a little confused. And it would
17 be our intention when you instruct us to reletter the
18 map when changes have been made after this meeting of
19 the Commission to bring new logic to them. I apologize,
20 Mr. Chairman. That's where we are.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think anyone on
22 the Commission will be inextricably tied to a letter
23 versus some other designation as long as some confusion
24 with the districts we're dealing with today and changes,
25 that won't be substantive. I don't think anyone would

1 object to relettering once we have all 30 in position
2 where we think it will be made available to the public
3 later in a way for the public to comment and subsequent
4 changes can be made in the most expeditious way
5 possible.

6 Dr. Heslop.

7 DR. HESLOP: To assist in the Power Point
8 presentation, I'm asking if Marguerite Leoni would
9 comment on some screens involving voting rights and Doug
10 Johnson to comment on detail of the maps for which he is
11 predominantly responsible.

12 You will remember, Mr. Chairman, Members
13 of the Commission, it was August 9 we brought the first
14 draft Legislative map to you.

15 As a result of the hearings on August 9
16 through 11, that draft map, which you see an outline of
17 on the screen, was subjected to a number of instructions
18 for change and instructions to test alternatives. So in
19 the interest of reminding everyone and informing the
20 public here about those instructions, I'm going to
21 quickly rehearse them. You asked us to unite south
22 Yavapai, west Yavapai with river communities; south
23 Yavapai with topographical lines; linkage of Hopi with
24 Flagstaff; you asked us to look at the historic district
25 in Phoenix; moving District S southward; told us to

1 align Tucson districts closely with community borders;
2 did not keep the tourist districts, despite they
3 represented real community interests, asked us to
4 eliminate it; to unify Tempe; asked us to experiment
5 with EACO adjustments although seeking to preserve EACO
6 to the extent possible; create a
7 Glendale-Litchfield-Tolleson district; in Tucson told us
8 to move the university from the Foothills District; and
9 also in Tucson to put Flowing Wells in the Lower
10 Foothills District; also in Tucson, separate East Tucson
11 from mining communities; wanted improvement in the river
12 AUR unity. The district under most fire was Tucson
13 district L. Asked for elimination, perhaps
14 extermination; asked to turn the Central Phoenix
15 District from east-west to perhaps north-south and to
16 unify Westbrook Village.

17 Well, now, what have we done. There is a
18 lot of work, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
19 that has gone on on this plan since we left you on
20 Sunday. And we believe that we have followed your
21 instructions and that in doing so we have created a
22 significantly better plan. You can see the items that
23 we've done.

24 We united South Yavapai with Maricopa.
25 United West Yavapai with the river

1 Yavapais, South Yavapai divisions.

2 Hopi with Flagstaff.

3 Casa Grande and Southeastern Pinal.

4 We have spent, we calculated rather about
5 11 hours, dealing with the problem with the historic
6 district. We have tested, retested, and tested again,
7 and you'll hear more from us on that in a moment.

8 We have worked to align the Tucson
9 districts with community borders, made major changes
10 according to instruction. The Tucson border is gone.

11 We tested, retested unification with
12 Tempe.

13 We've looked at EACO adjustments. We've
14 worked very hard on that.

15 We have tested the creation of a
16 Glendale-Litchfield Tolleson district.

17 We have moved the University.

18 We have put Flowing Wells in the Foothills
19 District.

20 We have experimented with the East Pinal
21 mining communities.

22 We have changed the river AUR community,
23 the west unified district is gone.

24 And we unified the Westbrook Village, it
25 is unified.

1 The result is it respects Native American
2 communities, respects communities of interest of
3 Hispanic AURs, respects rural urban divisions, there are
4 few city and county splits, improves compactness,
5 respects AURs and other communities of interest.

6 So those are our claims about the maps.

7 Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do is ask
8 Doug to take you on a tour of the map quickly going
9 through these districts referencing the changes. What
10 we would then do is look at some of the remaining
11 problems. And we believe there are some problems that
12 the Commission would want to look at. And we'd bring
13 forward these problems but also suggest some ways of
14 improving them. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask Doug to
15 come to the podium.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Good morning.

18 We started looking in the north region.
19 This region we looked at is the tourist district and
20 other concerns in here. We have the spotter here so I
21 can point to specific areas.

22 You can see we've made the northern Native
23 American majority district much more compact, a much
24 more unified community, reaching from the reservations
25 in the west, the Navajo reservation in the east. It

1 also includes the Grand Canyon area and Grand Canyon
2 village in that district.

3 We are pleased with the compactness of
4 this district. It is much more focused in one
5 geographic area than the previous district was, and we
6 believe it complies with instructions of the Commission
7 as laid out.

8 We also should note as you clearly can see
9 we have retained the separation of the Hopi and Navajo
10 separation in this map as was the Commission's desire.

11 One other thing to point out, the very
12 edge, you can't really see it on this screen, we did
13 improve the unification of the river communities.
14 There's not a lot of population in this area added on
15 the north edge here, but it does, it does extent the
16 river communities along the river while leaving the
17 reservation areas in the east here with the Navajo
18 reservation.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you answer a
20 question regarding Kingman in this regard?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Kingman in this map
22 remains in the Navajo to Havasupai tribal reservation
23 district.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Flipping to the other side

1 of the state, the border area, in this map we have, as
2 was discussed today in the public comment period, Casa
3 Grande, southeast Pinal, and unifying it together with
4 the tribal reservations, the urban tribal reservations
5 up here. The only change from some of the comments made
6 is in this area with the Tohono O'odham, we essentially
7 looked back at the community information we received,
8 and the Tohono O'odham received, the Ak-Chin requested
9 they be placed with them, the Gila River requested
10 Ak-Chin placed with them. Either can be done fairly
11 easily.

12 Yuma County is intact, unified. It takes
13 in a small, about half of La Paz County including about
14 half the river county here. Unites the southern river
15 into one district.

16 Over on the southeast county, it's again
17 intact.

18 The Nogales portion, Nogales county along
19 the west is divided along the areas here. It takes in
20 Tanque Verde and Vail, goes over to, I believe, Green
21 Valley and over to the edge of the Saddlebrooke areas,
22 not including Saddlebrooke to the west. A more detailed
23 map of Tucson will take that in.

24 A Tucson map will take in, more detailed
25 communities will take in, detailed communities

1 stretching down I-10, separated that in, a grid line
2 clearly between them, an airline base grid as we refer
3 to it, stretching along the northeast and south of the
4 base. Then the Saddlebrooke to Catalina Foothills base,
5 newer suburb regions north of Tucson.

6 And H, the district labeled H here is
7 south of the river district. It's very homogeneous with
8 communities south of the river between them and the
9 foothills areas.

10 One significant change to note is in the
11 previous map where concern was we did not match up with
12 communities of Tucson as well. An additional area of
13 Tucson, that's around areas here and wraps around Casa
14 Grande. It did result in removing a district from the
15 Tucson area.

16 Moving to the other heavily urban part of
17 the state, Maricopa County, when we met with you last
18 and reviewed in progress work, we did the change in
19 District CC, the dark orangeish valley district. We
20 looked at attempting to unify it, showed you in the work
21 in progress meeting, we were able to unify it, the split
22 of Chandler, the significant split of Chandler in the
23 area Chandler objected to, and the split of Gilbert as
24 well.

25 And following the directions of the

1 Commission at that time, we put District CC back in its
2 original configuration. It divides Tempe but divides it
3 along the city. It numbered a number of CIFs, and that
4 may be a logical place to divide it.

5 Other things, the District of Phoenix
6 previously went E to the west, reoriented west to south,
7 S, as you'll see in the historical district, did not
8 reorient a AUR, historical district, and Hispanic
9 contradict in that AUR. The other thing, the
10 Willowbrook District is unified.

11 Further, northern areas AUR, mainly the
12 Scottsdale district and mainly the north Scottsdale
13 district, and part of it is taken over into the western
14 district as well. One district isn't solely impacted by
15 growth, as we discussed in last meetings.

16 Those are the primary changes in Maricopa
17 County.

18 This is a better use of the river AUR. W1
19 District, previously the north edge of the reservation
20 of Kingman, the Kingman area, extended up the river to
21 unify the river community. There's very little
22 population in that area, not a significant population
23 change in the river area. New Kingman is still in the
24 reservation district.

25 Eastern Arizona Counties remains

1 essentially intact, did not make any significant -- I
2 don't think we made any changes from the Eastern Arizona
3 Counties' map.

4 Yavapai is an extensive change from the
5 previous map. My apologies for not having the cities on
6 here, but I can show you where each one is.

7 Essentially the key instruction that made
8 all the instructions possible was the Commission's
9 decision to decide what happens if we don't keep it
10 intact, don't make it intact, let other communities
11 around it affect Yavapai. The result around it is
12 Sedona remains united across the county line, Verde
13 Valley remains united around it, and Camp Verde remains
14 united around it, remained intact around it, intact.
15 Sedona remained intact with Flagstaff. The interest
16 in that area, same with Prescott, more or less needs to
17 be one or the other.

18 In this place, because of the interplays
19 with other communities around it, we reunited the place
20 with it.

21 Prescott is clearly impacted heavily by
22 the change. The communities on this map in the yellow
23 district coming over in the southeastern over is the
24 City of Prescott. And remaining within the yellow area
25 are other cities and towns north of Prescott.

1 The small blue arm that comes west
2 underneath the arm of the yellow district is the city of
3 Prescott Valley. Because of population numbers in the
4 same district as Verde Valley, the Sedona Valley area,
5 the pink district, western Maricopa, Sun City district,
6 where it comes along the city borders Prescott Valley,
7 city and towns of Prescott Valley, all in pink. This
8 was a source in a straight deal of efforts to unify the
9 valley as much as possible. When we did have to divide
10 it, the lines made some sense. The Commission had to
11 discuss, if had to divide some portions of the state,
12 some of the southern Prescott area does have a
13 connection with interaction with Maricopa Valley, a
14 logical place to group them, if we had to divide them.

15 Prescott Valley was one we weren't able to
16 keep with the rest of Verde Valley or with Maricopa.

17 That, the result of it is, primarily, is
18 an attempt to keep the Native American region AUR
19 together.

20 Also, the size of Flagstaff drives a lot
21 of this, and the AURs of the river and eastern AURs
22 impact this decision with this.

23 We are fairly comfortable with this.
24 Should the county have to be divided, we'd prefer to
25 minimize the division of Prescott Valley, any divisions

1 of Prescott as much as possible. Every city is
2 minimized. None of the cities within is minimized.
3 Cities as a whole is divided, it's as logical and in
4 compliance with Prop 106 as possible.

5 I'll step aside for this portion.

6 DR. HESLOP: On August 9th through 11th,
7 we identified several problems. Maybe we've created
8 some more as a result of solving them. It's been our
9 experience the last problems are always the hardest
10 problems. We bring you some problems we think require
11 very careful attention. Many of these problems involve
12 voting rights issues. I was very impressed very late
13 during the night to see Margaret Leoni, an attorney,
14 busy at work with the computer developing a historic
15 district. And so since it is her work, I'll turn to her
16 to explicate it.

17 MS. LEONI: Thank you.

18 He thought I was a computer dummy.

19 One of the instructions we received at the
20 last meeting was an attempt to respect, to a greater
21 degree, the historic district.

22 And as you know, there is flexibility
23 within Phoenix and in that portion of Maricopa County
24 for handling these sorts of problems. One of the
25 alternatives would have been to bring the historic

1 district south into the Hispanic AUR, South Mountain
2 AUR. The second alternative would have been taking the
3 historic district into the current district lettered S.

4 I think in looking at this current problem
5 there's an additional issue that needs to be looked at
6 in this area, and that is also the consideration for
7 Hispanic representation presented for you. We've had a
8 map out there for consideration of the Commission and
9 the public assigning five districts to portions of that
10 AUR. And I think it is very important that you be
11 paying attention to the testimony you are getting to
12 that AUR while you are considering realignment of the
13 historic district. I will remind you we had specific
14 input today, perhaps five districts, that realignment in
15 that district is not an appropriate one. I think we
16 should listen carefully to what we're going to hear from
17 here on out to this issue.

18 I will mention this is a Maricopa South
19 Phoenix Hispanic limited AUR problem and the flexibility
20 we have there does not need to affect other parts of the
21 state.

22 I think we have a map here, Doug.

23 This is an initial proposal focused on the
24 historic District AUR. And, as you can see, the gray
25 area up here -- let me get a pointer -- unites that AUR

1 by pulling it south into the area we have labeled as R.
2 This area is a central part of the Hispanic AUR. This
3 configuration of the representational interests of that
4 AUR. But it is at least one option for addressing the
5 historic district unification that you have instructed
6 us to proceed with. But once again, I would ask that
7 this be an area that is looked at as a whole and as a
8 result of interest you've received today and in the
9 future.

10 Do you have anything to add to that in
11 light of the demographics?

12 DR. HESLOP: Tempe. We've gone back and
13 forth on Tempe for good reason. The Commission was
14 interested to explore what the results would be of
15 Tempe's unification. We saw the effects on Gilbert and
16 Chandler. The Commission requests us to explore further
17 division.

18 This is not, in our view, a major problem.
19 The alternatives listed here, we, on the whole, having
20 read the testimony, think that the Highway 60 division
21 makes rather more sense. And it certainly coincides
22 with some recent community input. But the alternative
23 split is available for the Commission's review.

24 Here's our Tempe map. We can explore it
25 in more detail, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,

1 after the presentation.

2 Doug has done a pretty good job, I think,
3 on the Prescott Valley splits as he went through the
4 map. One of the facts to note here is that the
5 Commission established no AUR in this area. We have
6 very little testimony.

7 In the map as presented, each city is
8 unified.

9 We do have Prescott Valley with the Verde
10 Valley district, Prescott Valley with the Mohave
11 District, and Sun City with the Verde Valley District.
12 That's what one can say on its behalf.

13 We believe there's community justification
14 for a split which is, of course, an awkward one. There
15 are alternatives.

16 I think a line from Shakespeare: Nothing
17 is good or bad save the alternatives. Make it so.

18 Here are some pretty bad alternatives,
19 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. We could
20 divide Flagstaff. We have worked on that. We have
21 divided Flagstaff in different ways. That can be done.
22 You can certainly split up EACO. It would not
23 require -- it's not a small adjustment of EACO. It's
24 multiple splits.

25 In Tucson, the map responds to community

1 testimony and the Commission's instruction, and we are
2 convinced it does improve the Commission's instructions.
3 It's a good community-based map, and the Commission will
4 recognize it's handiwork here. But we have to underline
5 that there are some issues with this configuration. It
6 does reduce the number of Tucson districts. And it
7 redistributes Hispanic voting strengths.

8 There is Hispanic voting rights strength
9 here and we have to address it.

10 We have a proposal. It is a modification
11 of the original plan which addresses those two
12 difficulties and reserves, we believe, the best of the
13 two community lines that the Commission instructed us to
14 follow.

15 And leaving, in a sense, the most
16 difficult for last, we have the Northern Arizona
17 District. On its behalf it needs to be emphasized truly
18 it is a compact district. It united many tribal
19 districts, does what the district instructed us to do
20 with regard to the Hopi. Doug has brought you through
21 the map. I won't bring you through it any further.

22 Again, I'll ask Marguerite to take you
23 through it further.

24 MS. LEONI: Aesthetics is first. Though
25 artificially contiguous, does comply with 106. The

1 issue needs to be considered seriously as to
2 redistribution of Native American voting strength by
3 this configuration. Numbers up there tell you that
4 without much more.

5 That area currently enjoys a 75 percent
6 Native American total majority of citizens. Now that
7 district is underpopulated by a significant amount.
8 That number is subject to change. It is a flexible
9 number. The proposed district brings it into closer
10 compliance, not perfect compliance, the one person one
11 vote issue, recognizes significant redistribution, the
12 Native American voting strength. Highlighting that
13 again to the Commission, it requires careful attention.
14 One of the shall obligations of the district, the
15 Commission, under Proposition 106, the Voting Rights
16 Act, shall bring attention to this issue while
17 considering obligations of the Commission to that.
18 We'll have information of the voting rights pattern
19 which will be very important to the Commission in making
20 decisions to the Commission in considering these issues.

21 We have a proposed alternative to Northern
22 Arizona which addresses the numbers we need to be
23 looking at with regard to the numbers we'll be taking
24 in, if this is the alternative. I'll have Doug describe
25 it to you, let you know what it does in regards to

1 voting strength.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Just look at the geography.
3 Voting strength, unite the Hopi, Navajo, number two,
4 take Winslow, not so small, out of EACO, and merge with
5 the Navajo reservation area with the district. As a
6 result of the to changes, over on the west side, put
7 together more of our river AUR. Reunited Golden Valley,
8 Dolan Springs, and part of Kingman and New Kingman.
9 Those two are not enough to put together with New River,
10 but a portion of it.

11 This is focused. See the small change
12 here? This little arm reaching down does have
13 significant population, however. And then the
14 connecting arm, however you care to term it, is gone
15 because the Hopi are now included within the district
16 here.

17 MS. LEONI: I would mention we don't have
18 a slide on this. This modification is one the
19 Commission might consider changes to. The numbers are
20 about a 67 percent total Native American district.

21 Now, as we have discussed here, voting
22 rights is not a numbers game. It's a totality of
23 circumstances investigation. But this is, and so you
24 are going to need more input.

25 In so far as this is all we have before

1 us, it's a redistribution based on numbers.

2 The solution here, or alternative numbers
3 here, it raises the northern district from 62 percent
4 Native American to 67 percent.

5 DR. HESLOP: So, Mr. Chairman, we hope for
6 some instructions on these issues. We would recommend,
7 if we may, that they be discussed in terms of the
8 Maricopa problems first, because that can be confined,
9 the Tucson problems, and then the northern district.
10 That would be advantageous to us.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, if we
12 can use that order, unless the Commission like to start
13 elsewhere.

14 DR. HESLOP: Finishing with Northern
15 Arizona.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's then concentrate on
17 Maricopa County Arizona issues, specifically with
18 Maricopa county issues.

19 Mr. Huntwork.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I like the
21 motivation issues. I'm very concerned with another
22 piece of the puzzle. District P, I think it was, the
23 western district, connected up with R. That was a
24 district that seemed to me, on the face of it, to run
25 the risk of being a short term, of being a short-term

1 Hispanic district. I thought short term, if we did a
2 little rotation in that district, we could solidify the
3 areas on the outskirts of that. It was the testimony of
4 Richard Miranda last week there are three, four hundred
5 thousand dollar homes going in on the outskirts of that
6 district. So I'm wondering if -- how you have, whether
7 you have considered that as part of the area and whether
8 you would deal with that problem.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Commissioner, we have
10 looked at that issue and looked at some concepts for how
11 we can address that. Most of the efforts we have looked
12 at, how we look at that, it's definitely something we
13 will need to take into consideration, but --

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask it a
15 different way. Is this compatible with that, does it
16 move in that direction or move the other direction?

17 MS. LEONI: My preliminary -- first of
18 all, I agree with you. District P is a sensitive
19 district. We can work in a rotational way. This is a
20 rotational configuration. And there is work improvement
21 of this whole area here.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Seems to me my
25 concern, I have the same concerns for it.

1 It might be possible to look at that
2 district along with district V and the district that
3 includes the southern portion of Glendale, et cetera.
4 That may be where the rotation and change take place
5 with district rather than involving districts R and S.
6 We may be able to isolate this particular issue, the
7 Historic Districts, from our concerns with District P,
8 and maybe deal with that later on. I do have a concern
9 with the shift that you've made which I think looks
10 good. It certainly does what we asked you to do in
11 trying to unify the historic district. I'd like to know
12 if there are any voting rights implications in terms of
13 changes you made.

14 MS. LEONI: Yes. I'll give you the facts.
15 Voting rights implications. Redistributions, voting
16 rights, between the area R and area S, the northern part
17 of -- area R as it stood in the plan from this morning
18 was quite a strong district. This reconfiguration
19 redistributes some toward S. The counterbalance from
20 area S is somewhat counterstrengthened. We need to look
21 at that in terms of testimony in terms of ability to
22 elect. We should have testimony on that. There are
23 impacts on this move.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you believe
25 those impacts are going to threaten the ability of

1 communities to elect abilities of their choice? Do we
2 not have enough information? What we had, I thought,
3 originally, was a very strong minority-majority district
4 in R and sort of a marginal one in S. Do we now end up
5 with two districts that are comfortably
6 majority-minority districts or two marginal districts?
7 What do we end up with?

8 MS. LEONI: At this point, S is improved.
9 I don't believe it's improved to total voting age,
10 Hispanic voting age improvement. I think voting age
11 improvement. I think it's a movement. Initial reaction
12 is movement in the right direction, but there's more to
13 be done.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When I had the
16 opportunity to meet with you one-on-one, the suggestion
17 I made was to move back that district back south, to lop
18 off I suppose the central corridor portion of S, bring S
19 southward, accommodate that by bringing the other end of
20 R southward. Can you do that and achieve four solidly
21 minority-majority districts southward?

22 MR. JOHNSON: We did and looked at it. We
23 did not do it in the context of looking at four
24 districts. When we do E, we'll look at it looking at
25 four, four districts. In the of context at context four

1 districts, essentially we could not go far enough south
2 to make it worth it. We moved S south, and the
3 repercussions changed the configuration and nature of
4 all the districts.

5 Marguerite's brainstorm, the point, going
6 west was the work you see here. Again, that's the piece
7 of the puzzle we'll look at when we have more a in-depth
8 analysis here.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Would you take it
11 as a fairly high priority instruction to look at that as
12 soon as possible? I would regard that as a couple
13 reasons. Number one, you know, as we did with the rural
14 district in Northern Arizona, the intent was to create
15 districts that would be representative for over the next
16 10 years, as least as far as we could predict, not that
17 would pass today or change tomorrow, or not necessarily
18 so.

19 The four districts is more consistent with
20 the original minority plan, which I'm sure motivated
21 that same consideration. I'm sure we're talking about,
22 I'm sure parts of it are even reflected in that plan.
23 In any event, would you take that as a high priority
24 plan before we escape from today, if possible.

25 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we've

1 taken the historic district as a priority, as a
2 considerable high priority. We've taken 11 hours in an
3 effort to try that solution. This is a sensitive issue.
4 The movement of territory among them is not something
5 that can be done in a short recess. It's also our
6 general opinion that we can expect valuable testimony on
7 this arrangement and on alternatives from the members of
8 the affected community. And I think it may be better,
9 Commissioner Huntwork, if I may suggest it, to look at
10 that testimony in the second round of hearings.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I guess I'll
12 beat a dead horse here.

13 Can you show me where cities, towns, and
14 street edges are, Tolleson, Sun City?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Tolleson is here. Good,
16 here it is off.

17 This is almost entirely Phoenix, Guadalupe
18 is unusually shaped. This, the city line of Phoenix,
19 and Tempe is on the other side of it. Up here we get
20 other cities. This is the Glendale, Peoria area up in
21 this space here. These are all in Phoenix. We do have
22 the freeways coming around and the freeway square,
23 whatever you choose to call the square.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you have that
25 alternative map?

1 MR. JOHNSON: We don't.

2 In order to get all the different things,
3 we brought the desktop computer, an interactive map on
4 the desk top. We tried to get it on this in time for
5 the presentation, but we didn't have a chance.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I wanted to comment,
7 we had a giraffe. Now we have a bear district or
8 scottie district.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Looks like a place mat at
10 McDonald's. How many animals can you find.

11 Let's not go through that.

12 Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, I wanted to
14 address the point Dr. Heslop was making in context. I
15 know it creates a lot of work to create one of these
16 maps. I know how hard our consultants have been working
17 to carry out our instructions one at a time. At the
18 same time I have been trying to express this
19 configuration does not reflect, and the revised
20 configuration, does not reflect my understanding of the
21 way those central neighborhoods logically lay out. I'd
22 be reluctant to go out to the public, personally, with a
23 map knowing that. And I would certainly, before we do,
24 I would like to see -- personally I would like to see
25 that alternative.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me see the
2 alternative.

3 Are you saying, Mr. Huntwork, are you
4 saying there were some concerns with respect to some of
5 the designated AUR representations? Did I hear that
6 or --

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No. I think my
8 concern is this pattern does not reflect the AUR as well
9 as an AUR would, several AURs would, a Hispanic AUR and
10 Hispanic Historic District AUR.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Historic District
12 AUR, I'm looking at a map they have, looks like District
13 15 on their map, it does include those new areas that
14 have been moved from S into R. And while it's certainly
15 not exactly the same, it does appear to cover a lot of
16 the same area and not to be terribly different. As I
17 recall the Hispanic AUR presented to us was a large AUR
18 I'm not sure it would fit into one Legislative District.
19 I think here there was some overlap between the Hispanic
20 AUR and Hispanic District. I don't think this deviates
21 too far from the proposal presented to us. And it seems
22 to solve one problem without negatively impacting
23 another AUR.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would

1 recommend my colleagues make a motion to the effect of
2 what they are referencing so we give clear instructions
3 to our consultants with respect to the alternatives we
4 are considering.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'll attempt to do
7 that.

8 I'd like to make a motion we instruct the
9 consultants to show us what we could achieve if we
10 attempted to unite the historic district, or the essence
11 of the historic district, with a nonminority-majority
12 district, probably to the north, and consolidate the
13 Hispanic AUR in the South Phoenix AUR into four
14 majority-minority districts, period.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion,
16 Mr. Huntwork?

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second it.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Now let's clarify.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Exactly what we're talking
24 about.

25 In this part of the process, we cannot

1 have anyone misconstrue or be less than completely
2 understanding of a motion that is made since we expect
3 this change or any other change to result in something
4 we'll be able to vote on later today. Let's be clear.

5 Mr. Huntwork, explain that or ask the
6 consultants if they fully understand what the motion
7 goes to.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm having to
9 explain my thinking. My thinking is, number one, the
10 historic district, in large part, is not
11 minority-majority. It dilutes the minority strength in
12 the surrounding districts no matter where you put it,
13 unless you put it in a district that is not -- which
14 we're not trying to create a minority-majority district.
15 Secondly, I'm concerned as the Hispanic Coalition has
16 expressed about the fact that we have attempted to
17 create five minority-majority districts here; but at the
18 expense of assuring that we successfully achieve four,
19 so I would like to see how that option would lay out
20 best in the opinion of our consultants.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: My question: In the
23 opinion of our consultants, Doug, maybe you can respond
24 to that. We did hear from representatives from the
25 Coalition for Fair Redistricting. Mr. Huntwork is

1 correct, are they correct, does that strengthen four
2 minority-majority districts and strengthen them?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner
4 Hall, we've looked at this. One thing to keep in mind,
5 always we've looked at this, the move, we welcome, very
6 helpful, but such a move is not confined just to these
7 districts. In every scenario we've looked at in an
8 attempt to, up to this point, every district on the west
9 side of the district all the way up to North Phoenix is
10 affected by this change. It is an extensive analysis
11 and very hard to give a gut reaction to this until we've
12 done all the analysis.

13 While we certainly welcome the input, this
14 morning we certainly expect additional input on exactly
15 where the lines should be put.

16 The Coalition plan mentioned before is a
17 useful guide and actually was used as a definition
18 extensively in drawing lines. In one way, as it was
19 considered extensively from their plan city splits to
20 reduce the number of city splits is part of the reason
21 it's difficult to analyze all the changes.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
23 motion?

24 Ms. Minkoff.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Commissioner

1 Huntwork, could you explain the areas of the map your
2 motion deals with?

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This map clearly
4 does not depict everything that would be depicted by
5 this motion. I need a map of the Hispanic AUR.

6 Zoom out a little bit.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'm
8 sorry. I really need to get some context, something,
9 another computer, hookup, anything, roads, towns,
10 something on there.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Until we make a map
12 interactive, we don't have that capability on the nap
13 that is up there.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And the question was
15 can we get to that place in a fairly quick manner so we
16 can deal with that.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we definitely
18 share the interest in making these maps more
19 descriptive. Given the time frame, the number of
20 instructions, focusing on the maps, or the focus as
21 complete, the priority of completes and getting
22 interactive on the computer for the presentation, we
23 have not been able to do so at this time.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm just concerned if we
25 take these in isolation, we're not going to be able to

1 see it in a manner that would be useful. And I'm
2 worried about not only from a time standpoint,
3 understanding standpoint, the issue of going back and
4 forth. I want to minimize the back and forth in terms
5 of making adjustments, being able to see adjustments as
6 we wish to make them, and the impacts of each.

7 Is there a configuration we can look for
8 how long to get there? I sense on both Mr. Huntwork's
9 part in understanding changes in the motion, do we have
10 something that will affect it beyond the area itself,
11 Mr. Elder's comments, his frustrations I share.

12 We need that position to understand the
13 totality of the change before we can really decide
14 whether it's a good thing or not.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, may
16 we table the motion until we do that this afternoon?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that acceptable?

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you have additional
19 staff in the back rooms working?

20 DR. HESLOP: No.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: If was the consensus
22 of the Commission, if people were working simultaneously
23 while working on this mission, if that's not possible,
24 I'd certainly table it.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, Dr. Heslop,

1 from that point of view, how did you expect this
2 interaction to proceed with respect to making
3 Legislative changes to this point? I want to understand
4 what your expectations were to find out?

5 DR. HESLOP: I did not understand the
6 desire for the Commission for further map detail. I
7 thought we outlined the detail previously and the
8 concepts alone would be a basis alone to proceed.

9 If further detail is needed, I'd request a
10 recess in order to access the detail and bring it to
11 you.

12 I wonder whether that necessity for detail
13 is required for all the problems brought to you.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I assure you it will apply
15 to many, if not all.

16 What we may do, if in it's in the opinion
17 of the Commission some changes for the Commission don't
18 require the detail, we might move to those. I think
19 specifically with respect to both Maricopa and Pima
20 Counties, the interactive nature of those districts,
21 that it is going to make a big difference.

22 Ms. Minkoff and then Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it
24 seems that the reworking of Districts R and S, in terms
25 of unifying the historic neighborhood worked when you

1 just took those two districts in isolation, you told me
2 you thought I would like it, and I do. I think the
3 issue has been brought to the table, which is an
4 important one. It primarily involves five districts, R
5 and S, as well as P, which is that western district
6 referred to earlier, where Representative Miranda had
7 some testimony at our last meeting. And of necessity
8 doing anything with District P would have to do with
9 District P and District T. We're really talking about
10 five adjacent districts. And there may even be others
11 that are brought into the mix. If we're looking at the
12 Hispanic AUR, certainly District P is certainly very
13 much involved, the eastern part is very much part of the
14 Hispanic AUR and is not reflected in the current
15 configuration of District P. I think that really that
16 entire area needs to be dealt with, unifying the
17 historic district, respecting the Hispanic AURs, looking
18 at Goodyear, Litchfield Park, whether to keep them there
19 or out or in another district.

20 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, I
21 understand everything you said. You are describing not
22 work for a recess. You are describing days, days of
23 redistricting work.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It may be something
25 that will have to respond to public comment. If it's

1 possible to look at it in any way to look at it today.

2 DR. HESLOP: Take 90 minutes,
3 Mr. Chairman, get detail on the map. It may be --

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For all options?

5 DR. HESLOP: Yes, all options, so you can
6 interact with the map, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is the map that you
9 have up there a layer that we can give to Mr. Johnson
10 and plot as an overlay or transparency we have? We've
11 gone through this in two, three meetings, having a
12 reference or something people can reference on the map.

13 I'm having a hard time in all the areas we
14 discussed, from Kingman, the Prescott Valleys, Navajo,
15 going on down into this area, the Tucson area.
16 Understanding, I can't, I've been doing my homework, the
17 isn't no way the public can have comment, or be able to
18 evaluate and see what they are doing. I have to have
19 this reference.

20 DR. HESLOP: As you know, Mr. Elder, we've
21 developed an interactive map. I can add a zoom
22 capability, do that, if you wish. I'm prepared to do
23 that, if you wish. I'm also able to provide to Tim
24 Johnson, materials to Tim Johnson, materials so we can
25 provide plots. We'd be very happy to do it. It will

1 take 90 minutes. We may be looking at problems in
2 detail. It isn't required if we're not prepared to move
3 forward.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure the
5 Commission has a position on all five of the areas you
6 raised.

7 I think it's very important to Mr. Elder's
8 comment to see the interactively, see however the work,
9 whichever changes are working, the 90-minute opportunity
10 to work at.

11 Are there areas this morning that
12 capability is less important for that we can move
13 forward with on any of those?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm thinking
15 through the issues Dr. Heslop raised to see if we can
16 deal with them. Some, I think we can deal with those
17 now. After we've done that, take the break.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sound reasonable?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur.

20 I guess as we do that, I want to
21 reemphasize the point, maybe I'm missing that, we're in
22 the draft phase. Are these concerns or issues so
23 significant, we're unwilling to stamp draft on it and
24 say to the public now we have concerns; we want to hear
25 your concerns, allowing all the feedback to be

1 incorporated in order to accommodate all the concerns?
2 I think regardless of whatever we try to do in our
3 efforts to perfect our draft, if you will, that we're
4 still going to get into significant comment on every
5 facet. I don't know where the line is on the continuum.
6 I'm not sure whether I fully comprehend all the
7 interaction on the concerns with respect to Central
8 Phoenix. I'm wondering, would it be prudent to list
9 what we have as concerns and add to whatever the public
10 has and come back with a more cohesive solution.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopefully we get whatever
12 the cohesive solution is before we go out. It's an
13 interactive look within a 90-minute time frame.

14 If you would, look at the five issues you
15 raised. Let's see if any of those, that interactive
16 look is not necessarily needed for us to give you
17 instruction. If there are some that we can deal with in
18 the absence of that action, we should make progress at
19 that point.

20 The first I take it you have up there is
21 Tempe.

22 DR. HESLOP: Yes, sir. And alternatives
23 we have considered, in light of your instructions, are
24 listed on the screen.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, do you have

1 the representative map of that change?

2 How many districts does Chandler find
3 itself in as a result of that change and the same
4 question as to the City of Gilbert?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Changes, to give you a
6 sense, the city border between City of Mesa, Gilbert,
7 this side of this district, go into the Mesa District.
8 Look here, the Mesa District.

9 Tempe, District CC, come below the city
10 line. We don't have the exact distance it would go to,
11 nothing all the way to unify the city, a significant
12 distance to the south.

13 The effect on Chandler, Chandler is split
14 slightly to the arm that reaches westward to the city.
15 There would remain some split. The split line would
16 remain west of Dobson Road. The key dividing line, the
17 representatives of that city indicated is their
18 preference. So Gilbert would remain unified.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Without locating
21 precisely where Tempe would be split, can you give us
22 some idea where -- more of Tempe in the northern
23 district than the southern district. Approximately what
24 is the split?

25 MR. JOHNSON: A small sliver of Tempe is

1 left in the southern district, 10, 20 percent of Tempe.
2 That's in the real ballpark.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to see
4 how that looks.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Interactively?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. I think
7 something is to be gained from moving Mesa. There's one
8 less community in that particular district, perhaps one
9 less split of Mesa. It obviously has to be split many
10 times.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's hold some comments
12 until we look at it.

13 Look at the second area, see if we have
14 some agreement.

15 DR. HESLOP: Here is the issue of Prescott
16 Valley. Here is our Prescott Valley map, and here are
17 the alternatives, the only ones we can see to the
18 Prescott Valley split.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any reason to believe we
20 don't need to see it interactively?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I do.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we need to see
23 that one.

24 Go to number three. Keep going. That one
25 we need to see.

1 DR. HESLOP: Northern Arizona District,
2 Mr. Chairman. Here is our map, and here are the issues
3 with it.

4 Ms. Minkoff.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seemed to me the
6 solution Doug was proposing was not only incorporating
7 the Hopi Reservation but incorporating Winslow and
8 removing portions of Kingman that involved population
9 with it. One has to come out somewhere else. It takes
10 out population Y, AV1, a lot of changes. We need to see
11 that interactively.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fifth and last --

13 DR. HESLOP: That is the last,
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the changes to
16 the northern district may have some ripple effect. I
17 think we will analyze the ripple effect. I think the
18 specific issues in the northern district and those in
19 and of themselves are pretty self-explanatory. In
20 effect we take some issues, those are ones that can be
21 addressed prior to a break.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think one issue
24 we perhaps can address is the concern about whether we
25 should revisit the issue about the Hopi Reservation

1 being inside or outside of that district. Obviously if
2 we change our earlier position, that does have a ripple
3 effect. If we keep the issues separated, there's not
4 many changes.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd remind everyone of
6 Ms. Leoni's comments on changes. It seems clear we need
7 to make some changes about the district. The only
8 questions are changes that are recommended are once
9 without a further interactive look.

10 Mr. Elder.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Excuse me. A couple
12 questions. I know in my mind why I separated the Hopi
13 from Navajo on a Congressional level. I don't know as
14 well the issues on a Legislative level from the
15 standpoint of how the Hopi and Navajo stand on
16 Legislative state issues. The Hopi Legislative may not
17 have a great effect on the Hopi. I'd like to take a
18 look at the percentages. I think on percentages, with
19 that inclusion, it brought percentages to where DOJ,
20 we're at least in the ballpark; correct?

21 MS. LEONI: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And then that
23 gerrymander, if you will, or tongue, coming down to
24 Winslow, coming down to get Winslow?

25 MR. JOHNSON: That area is all of Winslow.

1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Are there tracts
2 around that? I have problems in four of the five areas.
3 We have an urbanized area that doesn't reflect that city
4 boundary. This is taking in enough of the Winslow
5 urbanized functional area, the city limits, the
6 periphery around the city limits which is
7 disenfranchised.

8 MR. JOHNSON: I wouldn't say
9 disenfranchised, the area around the freeway, some
10 around Winslow, some around here.

11 The reason we did not include it, make it
12 probably better looking, a little more compact, is
13 because of expressions from that area, that community,
14 to not be included with the Navajo reservation.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I don't know how big
16 the tracts are. Something that only expands four, five
17 miles outside Winslow, so long as the area remains
18 contiguous, remains contiguous, whether they live in a
19 truck stop along the freeway, whatever, along the
20 outskirts, if you keep it whole, not necessarily go into
21 the Navajo, Apache counties, take enough, four, five
22 people, that group, the metropolitan area, if you will,
23 of metropolitan Winslow.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other question, the
25 metropolitan side of the map, splitting areas around

1 Kingman from Kingman itself, the area sees itself as a
2 community. To the extent there's population along the
3 southern boundary, any of this district might be picked
4 up to unify Kingman. That's of interest to me as well.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure why
6 Winslow was proposed to be brought into the Northern
7 Arizona District. It seems to me if you put the Hopi
8 Reservation into this district, you are adding about
9 7,000 people. Without splitting Kingman, the New
10 Kingman, Butler area, going into Dolan Valley, Dolan
11 Springs, splitting those areas, putting them with the
12 river district, you might accomplish what you need to do
13 without going into the river district, leaving Navajo
14 County, if Hopi is brought into Navajo.

15 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, the test
16 is with regard to voting strength. Winslow has Native
17 American population and we test for voting population.
18 We test it for voting population.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure
20 Winslow does.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: 10,000.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I look at it,
23 10,000 does. Winslow has 9,520, 25,004 white, 4,003
24 black, 2,234 are Native American.

25 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, I'm

1 pleased to test it for you. Winslow is about a third
2 Native American.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, less than a
4 quarter.

5 MS. LEONI: When that area is traded to
6 the area to the west, in the Kingman exchange, the net
7 result is an increase in voting strength for the
8 American Indian. But what we can do is give you the
9 exact difference that it makes.

10 I do agree with you, it's not a majority
11 American Indian area. But the trade is what boosts that
12 district somewhat more. We can bring that back. It's
13 not a difficult thing to bring back to you.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: While looking at
16 that, I just have to mention you could take out, add
17 essentially all Mohave County south of the Mohave --
18 Colorado Mohave River in exchange for the reservation.
19 I think obviously that would vastly enhance the Native
20 American concentration in that district, not make it
21 necessary to combine the Hopi Navajo. The testimony
22 from the Hopi is clear and consistent, absolutely
23 unequivocal, they do not wish to be combined at either a
24 state or federal level. The reasons for that are less
25 clear to me as well as other Commissioners. But the

1 expression of desire, interest, and concern was
2 absolutely clear and unequivocal. I think that is an
3 issue or alternative that we also need to take a look
4 at.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: There's no question
7 that their testimony is clear and unequivocal. And
8 we've heard testimony as clear and unequivocal on a
9 variety of other issues of separation. There's also
10 testimony on the challenge to the federal issue. That's
11 also clear my mind.

12 I make motion make for adjustment of the
13 inclusion of Hopis within the northern district and
14 excluding Golden Valley and Dolan Springs.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

18 Ms. Minkoff.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I strongly
20 supported separating the Hopi from the Navajo.
21 Conceptually I still do. I don't know how to make this
22 district work otherwise. I'm not sure there's a way
23 that we can come down, pick up the White Mountain San
24 Carlos Reservations and make it work. I would like to
25 make this change, send it out for public comment. I

1 have a lot of confidence in the people of Arizona and
2 see if maybe they can find a solution we have not found.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To understand the motion,
4 just so I'm clear, Mr. Hall, the intent of your motion
5 is to include the City of Winslow as well as include the
6 Hopi or not?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Inclusion of Hopi,
8 exclusion of Dolan Springs, exclusion of Golden Valley.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Inclusion of Hopi,
10 exclusion those two communities.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In other ways,
14 mean changing of the EACO District.

15 I personally feel before we send out a map
16 we need to look at options.

17 I think we need to look at keeping
18 together Yavapai County or most of the Yavapai County
19 and solving some of the other difficult problems that we
20 are facing. Obviously because of the highly interactive
21 nature every change we make, it is impossible to say,
22 without having it studied, but if that were the case, I
23 certainly might be persuaded that the best solution is
24 to solve problems in three or four other places in the
25 state and find a solution in the EACO area that allows

1 it to remain rural, relatively compact, and with the
2 communities of interest that are not defined by the
3 county boundary but by other factors to remain intact.
4 In fact, most of the other county boundaries could
5 remain intact. I don't see any reason why Graham and
6 Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact. I don't see why
7 Graham and Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact with
8 the exception of rural valleys. Those could remain
9 intact in parts of Cochise Valleys. Make a rural
10 district. The essence is trade-offs in parts of the
11 state. I.

12 Want to make a point, was going to make a
13 statement before we talked interactively.

14 I didn't say we should solve problems by
15 carving up by carving up Yavapai elsewhere. I said keep
16 EACO together if you could. Consider it either way, if
17 you had to. It is an AUR no more important than
18 anything else. Don't consider ranking it above Yavapai
19 County or keeping Yavapai County together. You said no
20 there was Yavapai County AUR. I do recall -- I seem to
21 recall we did have a Yavapai AUR. Even if we didn't, I
22 remind you counties have express priority under Prop
23 106. AURs, in our way of defining 106, we don't create
24 license to break up one county to break up other
25 counties.

1 It's a long speech. I think we should
2 consider what happens if you made adjustments to that
3 Eastern Arizona District in order to solve some of these
4 other problems.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

6 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
7 Commission, we were picking up on a comment that you
8 made about Yavapai County, that counties have no special
9 status as AURs.

10 We do have an AUR for Yavapai County. I
11 agree it has no less a status than other AURs that the
12 Commission has adopted.

13 But if I may speak to the issue of
14 dividing EACO, we have looked at that. We have looked
15 at the idea of bringing the line south. We know
16 perfectly well that you would produce not an adjustment
17 to this map but a new map, an entirely new map of the
18 State of Arizona. And I have to tell you that it was
19 the impression I had, and I think the other members of
20 the NDC team had, as a result of the hearings on August
21 9 through 11, that it was the Commission's sense that
22 the map with the changes you wished would bear good
23 witness to the principles the Commission adopted that
24 the map with the adjustment would be the map the
25 Commission would consider for adoption. Now if we are

1 to look at the EACO splits, this will develop design of
2 a new Legislative District map. As you well said, sir,
3 there are 30 districts on this map. The change to some
4 involves change too many, indeed to all. Just this
5 morning, Doug and I looked at an EACO split alternative.
6 I said how many work. He said several days, because
7 we'd be designing 30 new districts. I did wish to say,
8 we felt we're following transcript testimony from you
9 with regard to Yavapai. Secondly, on the EACO split we
10 felt it anathema to the district which involves such
11 wholesale change.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to remind
14 my fellow Commissioners, public hearings begin in nine
15 days. We have to have a map to the people of Arizona
16 long before that time. We cannot expect the people to
17 come to a public hearing tell us what they think unless
18 we look at them, let them review it with them, consider
19 it with them. If what Dr. Heslop is telling us is
20 correct, I think the best we can do at this point is
21 make modifications to the maps presented to us rather
22 than wholesale changes that involve wholesale changes.
23 There is time enough after the public comment for the
24 wholesale changes that need to be made. At that point,
25 there's time enough if they need to be made,

1 instructions need to be made, if wholesale changes need
2 to be made.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: As additional changes,
5 we'll be addressing Yavapai and EACO. The Motion is
6 very specific, speaks to specific issues. In order to
7 move forward, eat the sandwich a bite at a time, I call
8 the question.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question is called
10 for.

11 Further discussion?

12 If not, roll call.

13 Roll call.

14 Mr. Huntwork?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Elder?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye"

23 Motion carries.

24 At this point we'll take a break, a
25 90-minute break, to allow the consultants to take

1 an interactive look the state.

2 The Commission will stand in recess until
3 that time.

4 (Recess taken from 12:33 until
5 approximately 2:10 p.m.)

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will go
7 back into session.

8 Let the record show all five Commissioners
9 are present as well as counsel and consultants.

10 We all have the capability to see
11 interactively the maps interactively. However, to do
12 that we'll have to see the screen behind us. We tried
13 to turn it around, but it's not big enough, so we'll
14 have to turn our attention around to the interactive
15 map.

16 Based on the conversation this morning, we
17 probably ought to turn our attention to the Phoenix area
18 and look at the area we started talking about this
19 morning.

20 MR. JOHNSON: We' want to focus on the
21 larger area or four, five areas.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Have you done
23 anything on the larger area?

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about the
25 historic area.

1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes, Mr. Elder.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could we have NDC
4 describe changes peripheral to this, looking at the two,
5 three other districts peripheral? I wanted to know
6 about the two, three areas peripheral.

7 MS. LEONI: Could I make two, three
8 comments?

9 In this area, the only change made is the
10 change we were instructed to make to the historic
11 district.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance, the
13 unification of the last better term in the historic term
14 only occurred between Districts S and R.

15 MS. LEONI: That is correct.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could you describe
18 for us the demographic impact had on those districts,
19 where they were before where they are as drawn.

20 MR. JOHNSON: The map we're looking at
21 here with the botched district lines are the previous
22 district lines. Look at District S. It is -- before we
23 made the change, it was 51 percent Hispanic origin and
24 44 percent Hispanic voting age. When we make the
25 change, the district is now 54 percent Hispanic

1 population and 47.2 percent voting age.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What was the other
3 voting age, approximately?

4 Lisa, can you read it back to us?

5 (Read back.)

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So both have gone
7 up about three percent.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District R.

10 MR. JOHNSON: District R, we have done an
11 equivalent amount. However, it started, 62 -- it
12 started at 59 percent Hispanic,

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 59? I have 62.

14 MR. JOHNSON: 62.

15 MS. LEONI: 62.

16 MR. JOHNSON: And 53 -- about 53 percent
17 voting age. So it still remains.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From 62. And what
19 voting age?

20 MR. JOHNSON: I think about 53 percent.
21 It may have a couple blocks in it. That's why it
22 altered a bit from earlier numbers. It was the most
23 heavily -- the strongest Hispanic percentage.

24 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, if I may
25 intervene, it originally started from 62.63 percent

1 Hispanic. Hispanic, 63.1, 63.17 Hispanic, let me
2 correct that. I need to correct that. Voting age was
3 56.15, almost 57.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to make a
6 motion we adopt changes reflected.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second that
9 motion.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In and of itself,
13 as an isolated change, I think it's desirable. I'd
14 support the motion.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Question, call the
17 question.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been
19 called for.

20 Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

4 Let's move to the next problem area
5 identified.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Does the Chair have a
7 preference?

8 Tempe is probably the most convenient to
9 go over to.

10 In this case, let's see if we have this
11 drawn.

12 I believe in both cases it's showing the
13 split of Tempe. I can zoom in and give more detail if
14 you like.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Please.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Currently, if you
17 see, you have the north part of the district is
18 Scottsdale.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Uh-huh.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Then we have Tempe following
21 the city lines on the west edge down to the 60 Highway.
22 The only place where it comes down a little bit from the
23 60 Highway was -- there we go. This will help. This is
24 to balance population equality right there. It
25 essentially still the highway. Over in Mesa, this

1 district currently encompasses this district in Mesa.
2 Currently zooming in, to give you a little detail on it,
3 I drew the street, 18th and I think Second Avenue. Let
4 me scroll over. Yes, it's Second Avenue in there.

5 The change that we were making, it has
6 been suggested, would be to trade off the Mesa portion
7 of this district. So that is the City of Mesa
8 highlighted there. So take this portion that we saw
9 before out of the district. It would join up with the
10 blue district. The blue district border would now come
11 up along the Mesa city line. What that would enable us
12 to have the pink District CC and pick up additional
13 population to the south.

14 When we looked at it, it is not sufficient
15 population to reach all the way to the city line, but it
16 would be all but the city line down there.

17 The swap that would then take place,
18 because this district, the Ahwatukee district here would
19 then be short on population, we'd pick up additional
20 pieces of Chandler.

21 When we looked at it, we determined we
22 could stay west of Dobson Road, which was Chandler's
23 concern. Great.

24 The circle, here, going in four districts,
25 chandler going north, and then pick up the Dobson Ranch

1 portion of Mesa right here.

2 Somebody is trying to help me. Additional
3 computer power.

4 Four districts are affected.

5 Primarily Mesa is the primary city
6 affected. We'd unify the northern portion affected and
7 divide the southern portion of Mesa affected.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a
10 motion we adopt that change and include as much of Tempe
11 in one district as possible.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to ask one
15 question, if I may, Ms. Minkoff. I want to be clear.
16 An area of one concern last week, which was answered
17 this morning, though I want to be clear, ask a couple
18 things:

19 Number one, this is unifying more of Mesa
20 by this move?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Actually the population is
22 divided, would stay the same. It's an even trade of two
23 sections of Mesa.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mesa stays the same in
25 terms of division.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's more of Tempe in
2 terms of the district?

3 MR. JOHNSON: It's significantly closer.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's reducing the number
5 of districts in which Chandler is divided, two, except
6 for a very small bit of population to the extreme south.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Right. The split of
8 Chandler would remain at the far western arm of
9 Chandler. The portion of Chandler they testified is
10 very important for them, the eastern portion of Chandler
11 remains together.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The impact other than
13 those three communities is zero?

14 MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think this makes
17 some sense. I think that the portion of Mesa that is
18 put back into Mesa really fits much better there than
19 with the district that has so much of Tempe in it. I
20 think the Dobson Ranch area of Mesa is a very good fit
21 with Chandler. It's not that much different, a newer
22 portion of Mesa, seems to fit with a community like
23 Chandler. I also think that the benefit of unifying
24 most if not all of Tempe is very, very positive. I
25 think that we're trying to split communities as little

1 as possible. And Tempe is unique among communities
2 among our state. Demographically it's a very, very
3 diverse community that has requested to be together.
4 Some individuals obviously disagreed, and we've received
5 a fair amount of input. The majority of input at public
6 outreach meetings, Maricopa and City of Tempe, is to
7 keep us together. Even though we haven't been able to
8 accomplish all of it, I think this is a positive change.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
10 motion? If not, roll call.

11 Mr. Huntwork?

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

20 Motion carries five-zero.

21 Next area of concern.

22 Doug?

23 MR. JOHNSON: The Commission voted on the
24 Northern District. Is there interest in looking at it
25 interactive?

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the sense is we
2 looked at it earlier this morning, or this afternoon, by
3 the time we voted on it.

4 MR. JOHNSON: There was discussion earlier
5 about the area of Winslow involved. I can pull that up
6 here. I already changed it here.

7 Census blocks here are what you see, and
8 the reservation line here is in red. The numbers that
9 are showing is population lines of each census block.
10 To the level of information this provides we can roughly
11 estimate the area of Winslow.

12 Let me darken the city lines so you can
13 see that a little better.

14 This is the incorporated City of Winslow.
15 As you can see when I zoom in, there are census blocks
16 nearby that have census blocks in them.

17 What we were attempting to do by making it
18 contiguous along here, and the question we faced, are
19 these areas people that live near Winslow, when we
20 consider that portion, the 160 people in this block or
21 that happen to be geographically close to that, really
22 the only way is to get somebody close to the community
23 to know where that line should be drawn.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I recall, the
25 instruction I gave before the break did not involve

1 Winslow, the Hopi Reservation into the northern, and
2 taking out --

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Dolan Springs and
4 Golden Valley.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Something like
6 that. If Winslow were to stay or go, that might have to
7 wait until public comment during the hearings.

8 Can we see the changes that putting Hopi
9 Reservation in and taking out those two Mohave County
10 communities have may?

11 MR. JOHNSON: My apologies for any
12 confusion, the questions about that at the time.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Did that keep the
16 district in balance or come up more less somewhere to
17 keep it conceptually somewhere to keep it in the right
18 number?

19 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Elder, the
20 numbers we're looking at this morning included the
21 Winslow switch. We now eliminated that which was done
22 on the lunch break. We're about to see the numbers now.

23 MR. JOHNSON: The details, when I zoom in,
24 are on the other side. The details, as Marguerite said,
25 are just about there. The details, we're about 1,300

1 people short. A little of the blue area here will need
2 to return, also. But you can see the area of Dolan
3 Springs, Golden Valley, and then down here, this is
4 actually, we're still working on getting that part out,
5 is unified in the river district.

6 You can see how this follows the city
7 border around, around the edge of Kingman, and around
8 the edge of New Kingman here. When we complete the move
9 we'll follow the edge of New Kingman.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I understand, all
11 incorporated Kingman and all New Kingman will be in a
12 new district. The two communities are in the western
13 district.

14 MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. The 1,300
15 people we need to still move for population equality we
16 have actually looked for in the blue unincorporated
17 area.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You think that can
19 be easily done without impacting on the two communities
20 we just moved out?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fine.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let's look at the
24 numbers.

25 MR. JOHNSON: These are the numbers for

1 the northern district. Let's go down to the percentages
2 here.

3 The Native American percentage is now
4 66.03, and the Native American voting age percentage is
5 now 61.027.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Say that again?
7 Voting age percentage.

8 MS. LEONI: Voting age percentage is
9 61.027. So this is now an improvement over the district
10 which you saw this morning.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Believe you started 62
12 percent.

13 MS. LEONI: This is an improvement of four
14 points. The Winslow margin left 62.087. We rounded it
15 up to 267. This is 66.03 total without the Winslow
16 switch.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Ms. Leoni and counsel,
18 do you have recommendations or would you like to
19 maybe --

20 MS. LEONI: Can you give me a moment to
21 talk with your counsel?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Please. While doing
23 that, would you mind going over by Flag?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Census tract,

1 there seems to be a Census tract to the east of Flag not
2 part of Flag. My understanding is there's a thousand
3 Native Americans that live there.

4 MR. JOHNSON: This one? That's correct,
5 1,052.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is that my
7 understanding, that would affect the City of Flagstaff?

8 MR. JOHNSON: It just barely touches the
9 northern pieces here, working on the block level, and
10 would affect all --

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a
12 motion we add that northern portion to the block line.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that but
14 ask it be identified.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's moved and seconded we
16 add that Census tract.

17 Is there any other way to identify the
18 area?

19 MR. JOHNSON: I can give you the tract
20 number.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I make the motion
22 simply for the point of discussion, Mr. Chairman. I
23 realize the ramifications. I feel it's the most
24 expeditious manner to move through this. I would like
25 to, quite frankly, adopt the motion of the Northern

1 Arizona District and receive feedback from all
2 neighboring communities relative for that.

3 Here is another example of a potential
4 adjustment area.

5 I think, you know, if you do this
6 adjustment, for example, somehow find another
7 alternative way to reduce population another way, I
8 think there are other opportunities for the potential
9 Native American voice to be properly heard. I simply
10 site one example. There are probably others, several
11 others.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, I would suggest,
13 again, this level of change at this point may not be the
14 appropriate time to make it. But the motion has been
15 made and seconded, so we are in discussion on the
16 motion. Frankly, I would prefer to just note that this
17 is not a unique situation but rather a situation that we
18 will find ourselves in throughout the map where minor
19 adjustments of this kind can create effects that we are
20 trying to achieve whether it's in voting strength,
21 competitiveness, or whatever the issues are, the kind of
22 changes that can allow us to give impact on the map as
23 it can.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: With that, with
25 Ms. Minkoff's permission, I'll withdraw the motion.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll withdraw the
2 second.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni, now you've had
4 a chance to consult with counsel.

5 MS. LEONI: We agree this is a
6 configuration that can go out for public comment
7 recognizing public input will be crucial to finetuning
8 final changes made. We are also anticipating in the
9 near future additional voting pattern information to
10 help make that information.

11 Have I misstated that, Ms. Hauser?

12 MS. HAUSER: Pardon me?

13 MS. LEONI: Have I misstated that?

14 MS. HAUSER: No.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: To that, from
16 Flagstaff, Tuba City, we'll hear ample information
17 regarding that subject wherein we'll have ample
18 opportunity to make an intelligent decision.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. We've already
20 voted on the northern district as modified.

21 MR. JOHNSON: The next area to look at
22 would be Yavapai, a similar area, actually. There is
23 some interconnection between these issues.

24 The particular area we're focusing on here
25 is the Prescott Valley portion.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Doug, zoom out so I
2 get a little perspective and zoom back in one or two
3 more clicks.

4 MR. JOHNSON: If I highlight the county
5 line, it might help here, too.

6 There's a lot of information on this map,
7 obviously. The Yavapai, Maricopa line is right along
8 the south here, and Yavapai County comes up. Sedona is
9 right here, southwest of Flagstaff. The county line
10 comes up. The county line continues up into the
11 reservation, slow growth of the county map.

12 The districts we're looking at are here.
13 The blue is the river district coming over a little bit.

14 One thing I should note, this blue piece
15 coming in shrinks as we pick more of Kingman up into the
16 new district. There's a tradeoff as it comes around.

17 What we're looking at here is actually a
18 more recent version as we work on the map.

19 Let me go back. It's a little clearer.

20 Nope. That's too old.

21 The slide I showed you this morning,
22 Paulden, Chino Valley, these all trigger around. That
23 was under the scenario where Winslow was included in the
24 northern district, blue district. Winslow would have to
25 come around and take part of one of these.

1 We are, as we mentioned this morning,
2 working hard to not split any one of any individual
3 cities.

4 Taking Hopi into one, and Kingman, get out
5 one of these two, one remains. I'll read the names.
6 Williamson is in blue. Prescott in the blue. Prescott
7 Valley in the green and Dewey Humboldt in the pink.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I ask again, ladies and
9 gentlemen, turn your cellphones off.

10 MR. JOHNSON: This is a key area of influx
11 for a lot of reasons. Actually changes to be discussed
12 in Tucson may impact the Maricopa district to some
13 degree as well. So I think, in fact, correct me if I'm
14 wrong on this, I think we wanted to be sure to inform
15 you on this, there's a lot of impact on this area, and
16 get direction from you if this was acceptable or one of
17 the alternatives proposed more acceptable such as
18 dividing Flagstaff.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: I like all of this,
21 whenever central areas seem to be divided, and referring
22 to some of the comments that have been made previously,
23 I think, however, there are a couple perspectives one
24 must take on the subject. One must be, certainly I
25 would be interested to hear, effectively this area would

1 have tripled it's representation. In light of the
2 massive amount of representation, per se, relative to a
3 rural area, that certainly may be a situation that would
4 give increased clout to this particular area.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For clarity, would you
6 again go over the alternatives you are again asking us
7 to consider, one of which you alluded to in terms of
8 dividing Flagstaff?

9 MR. JOHNSON: The Flagstaff question:
10 What are the driving complications, other population we
11 have to work with outside Yavapai, to make that a
12 complete district, which is overwhelmingly centered in
13 the City of Flagstaff?

14 As you know, the city is very large and
15 areas around it are almost uninhabited except for
16 smaller towns along the road. There is not a lot of
17 room to work to try keep different communities separate
18 and unified, unified within themselves, separate from
19 each other, which means to try to get to the right
20 population number.

21 Looking at this, one option would be to
22 divide Flagstaff, get flexibility on population, move
23 around these districts, perhaps the river district, come
24 up to the north. We haven't developed exactly how that
25 would work. Perhaps the Native American majority

1 district up north would come up allowing us to pick up
2 Flagstaff, allowing us to pick up Kingman. I guess that
3 was one alternative.

4 Oh, that's right.

5 The other alternative, and one the
6 Commission had asked us to look at when we ran into this
7 Yavapai problem back with the tourist problem back with
8 EACO, we did look at problems there. Because EACO
9 counties are smaller, did divide multiple counties of
10 EACO. Obviously there are options there.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just for perspective's
12 sake, what is the current situation with respect to
13 Legislative Districts in Yavapai County?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, I can pull this
15 up.

16 I think I have the maps and data here.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Currently districts
18 one, two, and five.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In this district,
20 would it do things terrible? If we do things we should
21 do, it's all been a good education, we can't achieve
22 perfection everywhere. This area has been sliced and
23 diced into three pieces to solve problems that arise in
24 other areas. This is intimately connected to the
25 situation in Kingman. As we've talked about, that's an

1 area added that's onto the extreme western end of that
2 northern district. Demographics are different.
3 Demographically it's far removed from the political
4 center of that district where it's going to be, and I
5 think that's part and parcel of this same problem. I
6 don't think either of those are acceptable situations.

7 Now, as a quote from Shakespeare was
8 indicated, it does depend on what the alternative was,
9 as indicated.

10 Before I could vote conscientiously in
11 favor of this, which, by the way, so we understand each
12 other, I don't criticize the consultants for putting
13 this on the screen. This is a logical outcome of some
14 of the other decisions we have made. And we have
15 painted ourselves into a corner. This graphically
16 illustrates how this appears on the map. I would like
17 to see the alternative.

18 You say it would involve some splitting of
19 EACO. But I would like to know exactly -- I would like
20 to know what that entails.

21 We've discussed several alternatives that
22 would involve, have some effect on EACO. But I think we
23 have the obligation to look at that. I want to clarify
24 just one point. I think there was a misunderstanding.
25 And I want to say again to the consultants again what my

1 understanding is regarding counties and AURs.

2 I think I said this correctly before. I
3 may have misspoken so I'll say it again. Counties are
4 already given priority by proposition by 106. It is
5 therefore a redundancy to call them a community of
6 interest. Community of interest is a redundancy of
7 106.

8 There's a political entity calling
9 themself a community of interest under 106. No way did
10 I mean a system, nor did I think political entities
11 unimportant or shouldn't keep them in mind, as well. I
12 think this configuration appears to me to reflect a
13 misunderstanding on that point.

14 We have divided this political subdivision
15 into three pieces in order to keep a political
16 subdivision, AUR, intact. That priority does not arise
17 from Proposition 106, certainly does not arise from any
18 decision I intended to take. I personally feel before I
19 could vote for this, if we compromised a bit over on the
20 other end to solve some problems on the other end over
21 here.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Almost surprise
24 surprise.

25 Could you zoom out and pick up the

1 southern part, also. Now maybe zoom in. What is it
2 further south.

3 I'm sorry, actually picking up like the
4 Maricopa County edge. I want to see what is at the
5 bottom of this.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Coming up here, this is
7 Peoria, New River, the Sun City area.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could you drag into
9 that Sun City area. I want to zoom in to that area.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Sun City, Sun City West,
11 Peoria, Surprise, Buckeye, following around. This point
12 up here is the Phoenix line, coming over to the edge of
13 Cave Creek.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess my comments,
15 some in held pieces, some pieces, some pieces we could
16 manage or micromanage, don't affect micromanagement. If
17 you took Sun City and dropped it down into the T2, take
18 it out there, add Prescott Valley, and make more it
19 contiguous with Yavapai, the T2 compensate, or reverse
20 that, in any case, I think quite a few edges needs to be
21 taken a look at.

22 I'm in agreement with Mr. Hall, we
23 probably ought to go ahead in this instance and go out
24 and find out. We did hear correctly, Mingus Mountain,
25 the original, unifying the community, hearing other

1 things, look at the public, get more information, go
2 ahead with it as it is there.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we need a motion
5 to leave it as it is?

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're dealing with each
7 with motions as it is. As the consultants raised, they
8 need direction as to each of the areas. Maybe if not
9 making changes, we can move on, deal with it all at
10 once. That would probably work just as well.

11 If there isn't a motion for any change at
12 this time, let's move on to the next district.

13 Mr. Hall.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: We need to summarize a
15 point. The consultants said two options. One is a
16 division in Flagstaff. The other is annihilation of
17 EACO. The consultants have looked at that. I can say
18 personally, I've had personal sessions and on my own
19 looked at it, what is driving the cart, looking at it,
20 what is driving the cart is strict compliance with the
21 Voting Rights Act. That's what is driving Northeast
22 Arizona. We are able to accommodate communities of
23 interest to the best extent possible.

24 There are a variety of options, if we look
25 at them. The ramifications, if you look at the other

1 options, most especially the division, the ripple
2 effect, as stated earlier by the consultants, is a
3 completely new map which I think does not represent any
4 communities of interest. So in light of that, I would,
5 I feel like we do need to have a motion.

6 I want to make a motion, present this
7 portion of the plan as it is shown as part of our draft
8 map.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

12 Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's very
14 important to me, if there is something that shows what
15 the ripple effects are, that I have the opportunity to
16 see it. What I am hearing is a contradiction. I'm
17 hearing we don't have anything and it would take a long
18 time to create it. But what I thought Mr. Hall said is
19 we do have something and we've seen it.

20 Could someone tell me if we do have
21 something? If so, I'd like to look at it.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

23 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we
24 have at a conceptual level, not once, but at a
25 conceptual level looked at ways to adjust EACO, replace

1 EACO. We've never drawn a complete map to reflect
2 either the adjustment or dismemberment of EACO.

3 We could share with you, with a little
4 preparation, at a conceptual level, what we see as the
5 major change.

6 We could perhaps in a little longer show
7 you some of the results of detailed adjustments to EACO.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, if this --
10 Number one, I think it's important to say
11 that the obligation is on us as Commissioners to see
12 this information and understand it. It's not the
13 consultants as the gatekeeper and we are to take their
14 word for this. I need to see that information at least
15 before I can vote on this motion.

16 Secondly, the implication is at the
17 conceptual level you must have seen something so
18 devastating I will be able to see it, too, and,
19 therefore, we will not need to go to the more detailed
20 level. I will be interested in seeing the presentation
21 up to that point and then presumably we would all
22 reasonably agree that is as bad as you seem to be
23 implying and adopt this with a clear conscience. I
24 can't delegate the responsibility for making that with a
25 clear conscience. I need to see it for myself.

1 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, I need
2 to make it clear, we've never been instructed to break
3 up EACO. And we have not done so for that reason. This
4 testing that occurs is in response to other changes that
5 are made. We look at a variety of options to accomplish
6 the directives of the Commission. Many have led to
7 EACO. We've not brought them back here because we've
8 not been instructed in that direction.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

10 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, I
11 should also say that really, to understand, at the level
12 that I think you are asking for understanding, the
13 consequences of a major change to EACO, we would have to
14 draw a completely new map. It would be a very different
15 map from the one that you now have.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I
18 understand that. I believe that is the correct answer.
19 I also believe it is inaccurate to say, and we should
20 correct the record to make it clear, no one has checked
21 what would happen if we did go into EACO. And no one
22 has verified that would indeed not result in an overall
23 satisfactory map for the State of Arizona. We haven't
24 done it. The consultant has not done it because they've
25 felt they've not been instructed not to do it. We

1 haven't done it.

2 Is that not correct?

3 DR. HESLOP: That is correct.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think

7 we have the capability to play whatever "what if"

8 questions with our computer.

9 I call the question.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been

11 called for.

12 Mr. Huntwork?

13 MR. HUNTWORK: I want to respect it's

14 called.

15 I think there's a broader question here.

16 In my mind, has to do with the schedule, the immediate

17 schedule and long-term schedule. If there is a

18 significant possibility that we're going to change our

19 own minds and make substantial changes to the maps, big,

20 substantial changes, not fine-tuning, changes that

21 affect the overall scope of the map in broad detail,

22 then we might have to schedule another whole round of

23 hearings in order to obtain public input on changes in

24 addition to the round we have coming up at this time.

25 As long as there is such a possibility, I

1 would personally prefer to delay the upcoming hearings
2 by a week, if that's what it takes, in order to flush
3 out the alternatives so that we can really choose
4 between them and make our own best decision as to what
5 we think we're going to do.

6 I don't want to send out a map for that
7 much public comment at this point that has a substantial
8 likelihood of being radically changed.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Whatever map we
11 send out has the likelihood of being dramatically
12 changed. Whatever likelihood it has has the likelihood
13 of being changed. With the amount of publicity the next
14 round of hearings has received, it's a serious mistake
15 to the public if we change them. We have to be
16 committed to going ahead with them. We have to
17 understand, bite bullet, and understand at the end of
18 the public hearings we'll be making significant changes.
19 If we go out to a third or fourth round of public
20 hearings, unless we're unwilling to listen to people, it
21 always changes at public hearings. It's a more open
22 process than ever before. Ultimately the decision is
23 ours.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion, the
25 question has been called.

1 Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?
2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."
3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?
4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."
5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?
6 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."
7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?
8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Yes."
9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "yes."
10 Motion carries four-one.
11 Next area, please.
12 MR. JOHNSON: The next and final area does
13 end up affecting Pinal County.
14 Let me focus first on Pinal County.
15 We described issues and concerns this
16 morning. Really there are two approaches to take to
17 addressing these concerns. I'll open it up to the
18 Chair, if the Commission prefers, or whatever the
19 Commission prefers.
20 There are two sets of concerns in this
21 map, the previous districts and the ones we came back
22 with from the latest set of instructions with. And we
23 could attempt to alter this area. And working from
24 either one as a starting point, I think what we're
25 specifically looking at, from the Commission on, and

1 looking for any direction they have, is on this
2 direction of moving the district back into Tucson.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Which district?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni.

5 MS. LEONI: I want to remind the
6 Commission on two points made on this morning's Power
7 Point. This modification did result in loss of the
8 Tucson district, number one. Number two, we highlighted
9 for your attention a rearrangement of the minority
10 voting strength and asked you to consider that in future
11 decisions you made in regard to decisions here. This
12 arrangement includes two districts.

13 Can I see numbers? Is it I and H, Doug?
14 Yeah, right, they are approximately 50 Hispanic
15 minority.

16 The other alternative we brought back to
17 you this morning rearranged that voting strength so one
18 voting district is at around 50 percent and one is
19 around 30. In a moment I can give you precise numbers.

20 Can you give me the numbers on the voting
21 district? Is it H and I?

22 The rearrangement of voting strength is in
23 TT and in J. And TT is now significantly higher. And
24 obviously this is not the only issue in Tucson. We want
25 to continue to note for your consideration the loss of a

1 Tucson district.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

4 MR. JOHNSON: When talking about a
5 district moving from Tucson, it's obviously a place
6 where a district went to, or the flip side of that, to
7 illustrate from two sides of the maps, one for the
8 Tucson area maps, or three in and one up to
9 Saddlebrooke. Where the other went is Casa Grande,
10 Pinal County, up to the -- up into the Fort McDowell and
11 Salt River Reservations.

12 In the other approach, this is a little
13 older than the most recent version other I showed you at
14 the last presentation, the green comes over and takes in
15 Gila Bend and Ajo as well.

16 This is an area we received considerable
17 public comment on, including some very helpful comment
18 today to help guide us in this.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: This, we have a macro
20 issue, a configuration in the southern part of state.
21 Tucson has predominantly three, four core issues, core
22 issues of interest. The other is where lines are drawn,
23 communities of interest, as defined in earlier testimony
24 today, or previous testimony before the Commission in
25 one form or another.

1 The difficulty I'm having, and I live
2 here, so I can imagine how others are feeling, is that
3 for the first time I feel we have far too many maps and
4 far too many changes to contemplate without being able
5 to see in detail what we're talking about in order to
6 give you appropriate instruction. It's very clear to me
7 that District L in the previous map are unacceptable
8 districts for a number of reasons. Changes made in
9 support of the motion resulted, in part, in the map
10 shown earlier today. You refer to it as a map that had
11 the District E, or whatever it would be, in that map,
12 the green district to the west, configured slightly
13 different from this one, insofar as it would take --
14 that's a more correct representation.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Kind of puts it in here.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can we get to something in
17 between? I'll tell if I like it or not. Show me
18 something in between. I can't tell if I like it or not.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we're
20 currently developing a plan that put out addressing a
21 fifth district into Tucson and accommodating the
22 concerns in the macro area, as you put it.

23 I think what we're looking for is
24 confirmation of the Commission's desire to return that
25 district to Tucson, not forgetting the concerns with the

1 earlier version, and trying to find a way to bridge the
2 two, a direction to bridge that approach and develop the
3 map in detail.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

5 Mr. Hall.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: So for my edification,
7 I'm wondering if we can kind of summarize, if you will,
8 in just a tad bit more detail, when you say the previous
9 concerns, middle concerns, the last concerns, what we're
10 saying.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Let me start with the first
12 map. This is the dreaded L.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

14 MR. JOHNSON: I don't think anyone
15 foresees returning. The Casa Grande community also
16 expressed concerns about this map, not only the Maricopa
17 portion, how their concern was divided, how their
18 community was divided.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

20 MR. JOHNSON: The second map was similar
21 to this except E, the green district, had less of a
22 piece of Tucson. It was still taking in the Tohono
23 O'odham, and a little bit of southern Tucson, but it
24 dropped some of that reservation and picked up the Ajo
25 southern Maricopa sections, which is what we had as an

1 in-progress map last time we presented this to you.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

3 MR. JOHNSON: On the L side, we've taken
4 this out of Maricopa. Part of the reason for this being
5 in progress, we had not determined where it would go in
6 there. The latest version --

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Hold it. I'm
8 interested in the reaction regarding E, where we
9 configured at as regards this one. Is there some
10 feedback or --

11 Mr. Chairman, did you have feedback on
12 that, not this version of E, later feedback of E?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not specifically until I
14 determine how it interacts with everything else.
15 Interaction of everything, one part of E, absent one
16 portion of E with everything else. I can't do that.
17 Again, to put a point on it, if you are developing,
18 along the lines of everything you've already been given,
19 the direction you've already been given the Commission
20 and from testimony, when might we see that alternative?
21 And let me help your discussions.

22 My intent, because of some specific needs
23 of members of the Commission, is to call a dinner recess
24 at about 5:00 p.m. and to reconvene at about 7:00 p.m.
25 Or let me it this way, if I were to do that, how would

1 that help?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe we
3 could get it done following a dinner break, along those
4 lines.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we extended that dinner
6 break sooner, would that accommodate it sooner? I'm
7 trying for a lot of reasons to get as much done today as
8 soon as possible, not the least of which are the public
9 hearings we've committed to. The sooner we have the map
10 drawn, the sooner people can analyze it and give us the
11 benefit of information on it.

12 I think it's difficult, speaking only of
13 myself, it's difficult to give more direction than you
14 have, without seeing a map in progress that might
15 resolve more of the issues important in this part of the
16 state.

17 MR. JOHNSON: I think we could get you
18 something with four, five issues.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You need four, five hours
20 to create that alternative for us, to create that
21 alternative?

22 MR. JOHNSON: We should be able to do it
23 in four.

24 This will actually, the northern issues of
25 this, impacts into the northern Yavapai area. We

1 anticipate minimal impact. Yes, we should be able to do
2 it in four hours.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure we have four
4 hours at this stage of the process. That's your good
5 faith estimate of what it would take, so that's fine. I
6 don't know what discussion we can give you on Tucson
7 without looking at that alternative.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing I've been
10 relatively silent on, deferring to people from Tucson,
11 the University of Tucson issue.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the revised map,
13 some of those changes are in progress.

14 Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I've
16 been told we need to make those requests in the public
17 form. I'd like to at least take a look at, and I pose
18 this question primarily to Marguerite and our attorneys.
19 It almost makes a lot of sense whatever it turns out to
20 be, trade with the Casa Grande area, where you end up
21 with the area horizontally, end up going around before,
22 green, going around. The problem is not going to end up
23 matching with the Hispanic numbers and the Native
24 American numbers.

25 I'd like at least to take a look at it.

1 It does have Hispanic in it, whether close to
2 balancing -- not Yavapai, yeah. Pinal County, including
3 Casa Grande County, plus areas up in here. I think that
4 is one area that we should look at. I don't know
5 whether we can make the Voter's Rights Act and all that
6 work, look at it and say here's why it won't or will
7 work.

8 And I think after that, Doug, if we zoom
9 in, give more, or my perceptions and more of the Tucson
10 area, zoom in from about there to about there. We
11 had -- Tucson is considerably different than the Phoenix
12 area in that I want to say we have more geographical
13 boundaries that somewhat match district populations than
14 Phoenix does, it seems like. We heard testimony this
15 morning that the area from, you know, I-10 and the
16 railroad, in there, that this part is a fairly strong
17 community of interest. So that's from I-10 north and
18 the railroad south. I'd like to take a look at, I don't
19 know which way it makes sense with the voting numbers,
20 or whatever, see what happens with that central
21 district.

22 Right now we have an area, just like
23 Phoenix, the historic area from the Presidio, almost
24 I-10, Baronito, fairly old communities, to the
25 University, a designated historic community, south,

1 Broadway, my mother-in-law was born in, from 1912, 1913,
2 I'm not quite sure what her birthday was. That area
3 runs south, that area, keep the historic area, various
4 boroughs and that together would be helpful. Outside of
5 that, the other thing I have, areas of the river that we
6 have two miles, a mile and a half, two miles, no
7 crossing, as the corridors would have it, one to one
8 can't climb up it or down it, no social communication
9 from one side of the river to another.

10 If we look at areas south of the river and
11 bring them into the mid part of town and areas north of
12 the river that, you know, stay north of the river, it
13 seems like that would probably be good from the numbers
14 situation.

15 Outside of that, the only other thing in
16 the newer plan is a very long, cigar-shaped area. The
17 freeway does link, but the freeways do function.

18 If the rivers give us edges that would be
19 helpful, also. Those are comments on Tucson.

20 Last one, the mountain range, Catalina,
21 the area in held here, forest land, Saguaro National
22 Monument, Tanque Verde Monument, Sabano Canyon, that
23 Tanque Verde area is almost a contiguous piece of
24 Tucson.

25 We heard many times from Cochise, the

1 outlying areas did not want to be with Tucson. We
2 figured we were rural. They were rural, not urban, that
3 we would remove them from rural-urban issues of Cochise,
4 take them out of social economic issues of Cochise.
5 Those are areas I'd like to take a look at with NDC with
6 NDC on revisions with NDC and why on that issue.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that square in the
8 main on areas you were intending to look at anyway in
9 terms of alternative anyway for Tucson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Appreciate the
11 information.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there further input on
13 this particular issue, Tucson issue? Are there other
14 areas of the state that we have not yet addressed, or is
15 this the last one?

16 MR. JOHNSON: This is the last of the five
17 we presented this morning. Then let me make a
18 suggestion. It's 3:30 this morning. If we were to give
19 you until 7:30 to finish the Tucson portion, and please
20 correct me, members of the Commission, if I'm wrong, but
21 I believe once having dealt with this part of the state;
22 we'll have dealt with five problem areas that were dealt
23 with by the five consultants that might be prepared to
24 prepared to talk about adoption of draft legislative
25 districts. There might be other things to talk about,

1 given that's generally the case.

2 Would it be appropriate to ask the
3 consultants to discuss their work, for us to take care
4 of any other business that does not involve the
5 consultants, to complete our work for the afternoon,
6 break, and reconvene at 7:30?

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Excellent idea.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

9 MS. LEONI: Commissioner, it will take a
10 few moments to mobilize upstairs.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's time to take a
12 10-minute break anyway. We can do that while you do
13 that and then proceed.

14 Let's stand in recess.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Did you not say we
16 were going to stand in recess?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's take a 10-minute
18 break and we'll be back.

19 (Whereupon, a recess was taken from
20 3:30 p.m. until approximately 3:45 p.m.)

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come
22 to order.

23 Let the record show all five members of
24 the Commission are present along with legal staff along
25 with Commission staff.

1 I'd like to take other items.

2 I'd like to take other items, and the
3 public comment period, a third public comment period.

4 If there are no other items, we'll break
5 until 7:30, reconvening, and then take up the five other
6 areas we're dealing with.

7 Let's take item V.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Commission is
9 aware there's been an issue with Mr. Echeveste.
10 Therefore, we had some additional personnel issues to
11 work out with respect to his personnel matters in that
12 regard. Therefore, to date he had not received a pay
13 adjustment under his new responsibilities as the
14 Executive Director of our Commission.

15 Therefore, I would like to make a motion
16 that as those other issues have now been addressed and
17 taken care of, we would adjust Mr. Echeveste's salary to
18 \$95,000 a year annualized.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you clarify the
21 effective date of that motion?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Effective date of that
23 motion would be, I think that's today, is it not,
24 Adolfo?

25 MR. ECHEVESTE: Whatever the whole pay

1 period is.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Retroactive to the
3 current pay period.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Retroactive to August
5 1st.

6 MR. ECHEVESTE: Next pay period.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: This is the first of
8 the pay period.

9 MS. HAUSER: The next first pay period.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Annualized first full pay
11 period. It's moved and seconded.

12 Any discussion?

13 It's moved seconded. Any discussion?

14 All in favor, say "aye."

15 (Vote taken.)

16 (Motion carried.)

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd move that legal
18 counsel is instructed there be additional compensation
19 for additional expenses he's incurred by reason of the
20 rapid pace and extreme distances that his job requires.

21 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, before there's
22 a second on that motion, I think there needs to be some
23 clarification that we're talking about a manner of
24 reimbursement rather than compensation.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: That's correct. I

1 apologize, Ms. Hauser.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: An expense reimbursement
3 mechanism.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All commensurate with the
8 appropriate governing laws and regulations.

9 Discussion on the motion?

10 If not, all those in favor say "aye."

11 (Vote taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries
13 unanimously.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Still under item
16 III, I guess, of the agenda, I'm wondering what we
17 expect to come out of tonight. Are we going to have a
18 presentation by the consultants, I guess, a conceptual
19 plan by the five districts centering on Tucson, but will
20 they have an opportunity, tonight, to actually draw
21 those districts, or are we merely going to see this
22 concept in more detail and have a map developed to the
23 same degree as the rest of our map, adoption at a later
24 time.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My understanding, with the

1 break, we're going to take the map we will see tonight
2 which will have sufficient detail to compare with the
3 rest of the map we've looked at. That's my
4 understanding of what we're going to see tonight.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask. I
6 tabled the issue for minority-majority districts in
7 Phoenix. In my mind, that was as important, it is a
8 comparable issue and comparable decision to the one we
9 are thinking about making with respect to Tucson. And I
10 would like to see that issue explored before we put out
11 a map for public discussion. I'm not quite sure why,
12 but the consultant indicated it would take days to
13 produce that map yet only hours to produce a new map
14 with comparable detail focusing on Tucson. I'm not
15 quite sure why that was, in any event. The issues in my
16 mind are very comparable. I don't want to -- I really
17 don't want to put out a map that fails to give our best
18 analysis to central regions of Phoenix.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And, therefore?

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think I'm just
21 discussing what we're about here right now. What is the
22 timing?

23 Are we really -- are we really looking at
24 putting -- at adopting a map tonight for presentation to
25 the citizens of the State of Arizona?

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we're looking at
2 adopting a map either tonight or tomorrow, either of
3 which, if the information from consultants, as you
4 describe it, would allow for a complete remapping of the
5 districts in Phoenix for discussion purposes prior to
6 that time.

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There really,
8 there's another area of the state, as indicated earlier,
9 where I also have grave doubts about whether we have
10 fully considered all of the options. And that also
11 would take some time to really evaluate. I have looked
12 at options to that on my computer as best I can. But as
13 the consultants have pointed out very emphatically, it
14 takes even them days to flesh out that plan, and it's
15 not something that it's feasible for us to do.

16 My feeling is it's very important for us
17 to do it. So I would like to, personally, delay things,
18 be given the opportunity to really prepare the plan for
19 Tucson in detail, be given the opportunity to develop
20 the alternative plan for Central Phoenix in detail, and
21 be given the opportunity to explore alternatives that
22 might solve the problems in Kingman and in Prescott
23 Valley, at least to the point of seeing what other
24 problems that might lead to before we put a plan out for
25 consideration by the citizens of Arizona.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. I'll make it
3 a motion.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

5 Hearing no second.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I was going to
7 respond to it. If there's no motion on the floor, I
8 don't need to.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there any other matter
10 we need to discuss before call to the public?

11 This is the time for consideration and
12 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.
13 Those wishing to address the commission shall request
14 permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.
15 Action taken as a result of public comment will be
16 limited to directing staff to study the matter or
17 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and
18 decision at a later date unless it is the subject of an
19 item already on the agenda.

20 First is Mr. Hartdegen.

21 MR. HARTDEGEN: I know you are probably
22 getting tired of me for public speaking.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You should get college
24 credit.

25 MR. HARTDEGEN: It would look good on my

1 high school diploma.

2 I feel like an inch worm across the road.
3 In Pinal, the Pinal County plan, Mr. Kingsbury, I'm glad
4 you asked for public comment, I'm afraid if later it
5 would be too late. The little piece between south,
6 western Pinal County south in Gila Indian River
7 Communities north of Tohono O'odham, the little piece of
8 the pie that touches the western south of the pie that
9 touches south.

10 In some way, I know you have to deal, if
11 you haven't already, with the Ak-Chin community. If you
12 put that slice back in Pinal County to the Maricopa
13 County line to the west. I think most of us would be
14 very happy. Not unless the consultants come back with
15 another rendering of what they are doing. We'd be very
16 happy. That little slice taken out on the map earlier
17 today, you cut the Casa Grande elementary school
18 district, and cut the Santa Cruz, and Casa Grande union
19 high school district, and people in Maricopa, Stan
20 Fielding High School, those people in the part of the
21 county do have a lot common with Casa Grande, go to
22 hospitals there. If unlucky enough to die, they go to
23 the mortuary, if unlucky enough to get pregnant, they
24 are lucky enough to go to the hospital, not in the city
25 limits. Have tremendous Tucson ties, have more ties

1 than the citizens on the east side of Scottsdale than
2 consultants asked to be put in the districts, cousins,
3 and whatnot. If you think about that when the
4 information comes back, I'd appreciate it.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hartdegen put it,
6 define the slice.

7 MR. HARTDEGEN: If I looked at the map,
8 right south of the Gila River Indian Community north of
9 Tohono O'odham, north of Borrow Road, Casa Grande city
10 limits, the Ak-Chin Reservation, an odd pie-shaped.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker, Anne
12 Murray, vice president of the Broadmoor Broadway
13 Village.

14 A VOICE: She thought you would not have
15 testimony until tonight.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I did tell her that.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll save her and she'll
18 have an opportunity later.

19 Any other business until what will turn
20 out to be a lengthy dinner break?

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Kingsbury, if that's
22 your wish.

23 MR. KINGSBURY: I'd like to thank the
24 board for the consideration -- excuse me. My voice, for
25 the consideration, you've done an excellent job, and

1 it's a fair job. One of the things you and I just
2 mentioned, bringing the communities together.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.

4 MR. KINGSBURY: We'll always have time for
5 comments like that.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand
7 in recess until 7:30 this evening.

8 (Recess taken at 4:14 p.m. until
9 approximately 7:57 p.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come
11 to order. Let the record show we finally have five
12 Commissioners present.

13 May we have a report from the consultants,
14 please.

15 Dr. Heslop, please.

16 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the
17 Commission, as we promised, we have worked on the Tucson
18 problem since you recessed. We have failed to produce a
19 complete map. We're sorry for this. But the problem is
20 complex. And as we have all been learning, the
21 problems, the big problems, affect all parts of the map.
22 So we come before you with the Tucson districts in
23 outline form. We cannot produce a complete map this
24 evening. We are confident if we work through the night,
25 we will have a map for you tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m.

1 I realize that this imposes a great strain on the
2 Commission, and it is a matter of our sincere regret.
3 There is nothing that we can do about it.

4 Our suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is that you
5 let us show to you the outlines of the Tucson districts
6 so that we can be sure that we are on the right track,
7 and if we are, we then go away and work that plan up and
8 go into final form.

9 We are confident we can not only do that
10 but that at around 7:30 we can have a diskette for our
11 associate, Tim Johnson, who can run the data for you so
12 that you will have a map and the data almost
13 simultaneously.

14 So, Mr. Chairman, what we'd like to do
15 with your permission is show you the outline of our
16 Tucson configuration, get that from you. If you may,
17 we'll get your reactions to that, and then also present
18 to you findings that we have in response to other
19 questions that were posted to us with regard to district
20 P and Districts E and L.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection?

22 Proceed, Dr. Heslop.

23 DR. HESLOP: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

25 MR. JOHNSON: As we discussed earlier

1 today, micro macro issues on Tucson, micro macro
2 dependent, haven't spent on macro in Tucson. Roughly,
3 very roughly, working on rough issues of Tucson, clearly
4 staying out of urban areas and working to keep the Casa
5 Grande at least with Gila Bend, we were unable to keep
6 it with eastern Pinal. Let me keep it with where the
7 main focus of work where was this evening. You can see
8 similar to the original map. Zoom in on the downtown
9 map, where we discussed a number of features.

10 You can see a number of streets and things
11 here. This is the University area, we've been unified
12 with the district coming in from the west, have the
13 freeway coming in here. We discussed with the
14 University District and railroad tracks and University
15 area.

16 This is the ugly inlet still being worked
17 on. The main goal was to get the railroad track
18 identified. Up to the north, this the area that has
19 been significantly revised. Let me zoom a little bit so
20 you have a bit of a sense where we are here. You have
21 the foothills district, foothills area which is back
22 essentially to Casas Adobas and Catalina Foothills,
23 coming to where Catalina Foothills comes together.

24 And District H, the green district, comes
25 together only where the City of Tucson comes across the

1 river. It comes together where the river comes across
2 the river.

3 One thing we're trying, we're not sure how
4 it will balance, where numbers balance, we talked about
5 Tanque Verde, how it balances, those things, Cochise.
6 Those things, Tanque Verde belongs more with Cochise.
7 It's difficult to balance. While we can't put in
8 Catalina Foothills without splitting, we're trying to
9 put it in with Saddlebrooke Foothills. It fails the can
10 you drive from here to there. We can't promise it will
11 remain once we're equalizing population on the map.

12 To give you a sense of the current
13 challenges we've been wrestling with, a majority of the
14 population, voting strength we discussed earlier, we're
15 well on the way to being addressed with.

16 This district has been strengthened,
17 currently 20, 25 thousand people overpopulated. Those
18 will come off the western parts. And those will be more
19 populated into the Tucson city area which will improve
20 cohesiveness and community flavor well, communicating
21 well in almost suburbs up here, and the agricultural
22 town, from the town here.

23 Otherwise in the town, population needs to
24 move, space is the east end of what is District H.

25 This is -- we worked so hard to focus on

1 getting H to have cohesiveness around communities around
2 the river, this part we need to address because now it's
3 significantly overpopulated as well. Trade-offs around
4 this, the district is coming around Saddlebrooke, or the
5 Air Force District still needs to be done. This gives a
6 sense of where the areas need to end up.

7 This area will be south of the river. The
8 Air Force Base will be south of here. The Air Force
9 Base as we discussed as well has moved over to 12, in
10 this area. This actually worked out fairly well. The
11 tradeoff portion below the freeway here, in exchange for
12 the University and Historic Districts over here, moving
13 in with the district from the west. So that is working
14 towards the goals that have been described, gives you a
15 sense of the progress we've been able to make so far.
16 We're fairly pleased with it. This path will get us
17 toward communities in Tucson and voting rights
18 questions. Obviously those two are clearly related.

19 The larger question of Casa Grande, again,
20 we're attempting to go to the proposal that was fairly
21 warmly received by just about all parties, keeping Casa
22 Grande with Ajo, Tohono O'odham, if not possible to keep
23 with Pinal; also the question before the urban
24 reservations, and whether they and the group were
25 separated. That will be very difficult to tell before

1 we get more population balancing in districts.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This looks like the
4 return of District L now labeled E and the problem
5 before if coming back is still the problem.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Definitely a concern. No
7 plan can take any metropolitan problem before we keep
8 out of Maricopa keep out of Apache Junction and --

9 DR. HESLOP: Gold Canyon.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Then you have an
11 issue if trying to unite for urban reservations.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The way you have to
14 do it is through Apache Junction.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

16 If we -- this is all very theoretical at
17 this point.

18 If we do unite them, my suspicion is it
19 will be through the Tohono O'odham District coming
20 around, and somehow the Pinal District will spin down
21 and pick them up. It's all very theoretical.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How do you connect
23 them to reservations east of Scottsdale, which is what
24 they were asking for.

25 The Gila River Indian Community is asking

1 to be with the Salt River Pima River Reservation, not
2 down towards the Tohono O'odham, but east of Scottsdale.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Again, it's very theoretical
4 at this point, if that were the scenario to happen.

5 This district is more or less, have the Tohono O'odham
6 piece in Tucson. Virtually nothing else in Tucson, that
7 conceptually allows us to swing around Apache Junction.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Apache Junction can
9 entirely be within Maricopa County.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Within Maricopa
12 County District.

13 MR. JOHNSON: That's the goal. It has its
14 own complications.

15 MR. JOHNSON: That's where we're aiming to
16 be with this area. It's completely dependent, the end
17 result of balancing out populations. It can't go south.

18 Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

21 Let's take a look back at Tucson a little
22 bit, from about that size and perspective.

23 I think we're probably moving the right
24 direction from this morning's map. I think there's a
25 couple things we look at like the Casas Adobas. With

1 the exception of people that passed petitions for
2 incorporation, I wager not five percent of the
3 population can describe where Casas Adobas, where that
4 is. It's not incorporated and is almost homogeneous. I
5 guess I'd like to take a look at it. I don't know the
6 population of Tanque Verde is, the whole area slid east,
7 Tanque Verde slid up, put Tanque Verde, slide it up,
8 have it more contiguous, more uniform. That would be
9 one thing to look at. I asked before the break to look
10 at the area coming around, pick up the eastern area.
11 And I believe Marguerite Leoni did that. Or do we have
12 any numbers or does it work is the question.

13 MS. LEONI: Commission Elder, we have that
14 on a separate one.

15 Commissioner Elder, we've taken a look at
16 it.

17 Chris, can you put it up on here?

18 If you can wait until we finish, we've
19 tested it, have comments. We have a picture of it.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And I think probably,
21 zoom in a little further in through here. Do we know
22 what the cross streets are. 22nd Street, Broadway --
23 now we know about where we are.

24 I think you are on the right track there.
25 I think the only piece, like you mentioned, and it's a

1 work in progress, is that area. If you look at the
2 areas immediately south of that area, immediately south
3 of Broadway, not as heavy a line, I don't know which
4 district, the purple district here, 25,000 over on, so
5 adding in population there, where would we take it out.

6 I don't know. Maybe this northern area,
7 Flowing Wells, matches the demographics pretty well,
8 strong in H, green, also for population?

9 Good luck.

10 A couple comments, couple edges. The
11 numbers, getting better, Presidio, Baronito, Boroughs,
12 the area on west of town, Main and Broadway, down over
13 to, oh, Pueblo, the neighborhood center, some
14 neighborhood centers west of town into those areas, this
15 does, west of the freeway, talking about edges and
16 railroads, I think there's enough crossings in this area
17 of the freeway, very similar freeways of Phoenix,
18 crossculture. The eastern portion in through here, a
19 lot of forties, fifties, maybe even thirties
20 neighborhoods that if they're not Historic Districts,
21 they have very strong homeowner's associations, very
22 strong cohesiveness, seem to stick together, community,
23 glue, libraries, that sort of thing.

24 In general, in some way take a portion
25 here, take that off, move it down, put the Tanque Verde

1 population over, get the numbers on this purple. I
2 think that works fairly well.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you for the
5 analysis.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you move back
7 up to the Pinal County portion of the map?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Assuming you tried
9 to unite the four communities you tried to unite, how
10 many districts would we have in Pinal County?

11 MR. JOHNSON: It's very difficult to say.
12 Probably, the assumption is in that case Saddlebrooke
13 would come up into east Pinal. We wouldn't have that
14 come up into Pinal. The question is is Apache Junction
15 split off. Probably Apache Junction would go one way.
16 Apache Junction, eastern mining, number three, is very
17 hard to predict.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand E is a
19 work in progress. Show me the demographics as it
20 currently exists. I can't see the population.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Population as drawn is
22 185,000, 14,000 over.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

24 MR. JOHNSON: 28,260 of Hispanic origin
25 and 5,500 of Native American origin, so maybe one-sixth,

1 math in my head is done poorly, 33, 34,000 combined
2 Hispanic population out of 180. That district would
3 need to change.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand from
5 people who know Tucson more than I do this is an
6 improvement in Tucson, which is a good thing.

7 We need to be very, very careful we don't
8 create problems in other areas by solving problems in
9 Tucson, Phoenix, or anyplace else. We need to be very,
10 very careful about making sure that it's not at the
11 expense of Pinal County, that we create a better
12 situation in Tucson.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As I understand
15 it, you have -- you have District I almost out of the
16 Tucson, almost out of the Tucson metropolitan area.

17 MR. JOHNSON: As it's currently
18 configured, it still has some numbers down here in
19 the -- this would be to the east of the edge of the
20 reservation. Let me zoom in a little with it.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sahuarita.

22 MR. JOHNSON: This edge is to the edge of
23 the Tohono O'odham Reservation.

24 I don't have it highlighted. This is the
25 edge of the reservation. We have some highlighted,

1 Sahuarita and East Sahuarita.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that the airport
3 at the top, the white?

4 MR. JOHNSON: The reference coming
5 completely out, the reference, if we try to unite the
6 four Maricopa reservations, this would be an area we'd
7 drop off, the non-Reservation portions.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I'm
9 wondering, I can't see how many Tucson districts there
10 are, with the colors being so similar. It's hard to
11 tell. Are there five Tucson districts there or only
12 four?

13 MR. JOHNSON: There are four centered
14 entirely in Tucson from the foothills, below the
15 foothills. The Air Force base, and west side, then the
16 Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley District, and then the District
17 I. Five definitely dominated by Tucson, possibly six
18 with influence, depending on influence.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Saddlebrooke is
20 one that goes all the way up.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you consolidate
23 more in Tucson, you wouldn't have to go all the way up.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Right. Definitely looking
25 at how to do that. It's preferable to stay in the area.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is South
2 Tucson, in the light blue area now?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes.

5 MR. JOHNSON: It is just -- let me
6 highlight the line so you can see a little better. It
7 is just in the purple here.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It is not what we
9 heard in public comment earlier today where they said
10 there interests lie to the southeast rather than to the
11 west.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Right, focused down by 12th
13 and to the 12th. There was testimony related to the
14 historic areas, and rather to the railroad, the trying
15 to get to where they were speaking to this morning.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What would happen
18 if you just set out to create the five districts in
19 Tucson without regard to what was around, made that as
20 logical as possible, then you would have -- simply have
21 to look around for additional population to complete one
22 district, something like you did with the Congressional
23 Districts in Phoenix? That would seem to be the way
24 that would make the most sense out of the Tucson
25 metropolitan area?

1 MR. JOHNSON: In general, that is somewhat
2 the approach we're taking on internal Tucson districts.
3 The two factors that kind of affect our ability to do
4 that, one, the Tohono O'odham Reservation to the west is
5 a very large geographic feature affects Tucson
6 regardless of how we draw the districts there and, two,
7 the Hispanic community AUR that includes Tohono O'odham
8 and actually goes up along Casa Grande. So we're
9 somewhat coming out of Tucson two ways, one, through
10 Saddlebrooke --

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

12 MR. JOHNSON: One through Tohono O'odham.
13 The two sides directly affect how we draw these.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I see that. One
15 is if you combine some reservations really up in
16 Maricopa County, you could get the area south of Tucson
17 out of that district all together, leave you back in the
18 position that was no longer a factor in the Tucson
19 metropolitan area, and then you could set about to do
20 five Tucson districts without that influence.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Right. The complication we
22 wrestle with in that case is population numbers kind of
23 in that circle. Once you've enclosed it from the north
24 and the west and somewhat to the east, Cochise is very
25 solid population. That is a significant factor in its

1 district, and we're trying to avoid affecting it's
2 percentage as well. So that's -- we really can't
3 encircle ourselves completely, as you know, or we'd
4 start combining Saddlebrooke with Eastern Arizona County
5 areas which is tough to justify as well. So there's no
6 easy out.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can we zoom out a
8 bit? Both blue and purple are overpopulated now?

9 MR. JOHNSON: The green and purple are.
10 The blue Air Force district is
11 underpopulated by about 4,000.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's difficult to know how
13 much progress we're making, in my mind. If you go out
14 at least one more generation, and maybe -- let's start
15 with that, and then I'll go further.

16 There's no question that this area,
17 Mr. Elder is quite correct that this area, as well as
18 into Oro Valley, and in fact, even up as far as
19 Saddlebrooke, it could be dealt with in almost any
20 manner, because it would be hard to make many
21 separations in that whole area in terms of community of
22 interest. The only difference would be that the further
23 north you get in Pima county, and then the southern end
24 of Pinal County, the only real difference is one of age,
25 because there are significant retirement communities,

1 such as Sun City, Sun City West.

2 In the north end of Oro Valley, Sun City
3 Vistoso, and Saddlebrooke.

4 Now, as you move further north into Pinal
5 County, the differences become distinctly clearer. If
6 you curve around the Catalina Mountains, we've already
7 heard the cities of Oracle and San Manuel tend to think
8 of themselves as associated more with Tucson than with
9 the northern end of -- either the northern end of
10 eastern Pinal County or certainly Maricopa.

11 As you move north through Pinal, that
12 changes dramatically.

13 The further up you go, the worse it gets,
14 from my perspective, in terms of affinities.

15 I think in terms of the interior
16 districts, in Tucson, I've already talked about this
17 one. This district, which comprises much of central
18 Tucson and eastern Tucson down curving around to the
19 bottom of -- or side of the Air Force Base. Again,
20 there, it's relatively the same. And I think -- I think
21 that works.

22 We have had, continued to have testimony
23 about the dividing line. And there's an argument to be
24 made either way between the interstate creating a
25 dividing line between neighbors or, as Mr. Elder said,

1 there are some historical ties that obviously predate
2 the freeway that connect neighborhoods on the east and
3 the west side of the freeway.

4 I think -- I think I'm comfortable enough
5 with this general direction to allow it to go out for
6 public comment, because what I think we'll hear much
7 more refining comment about how these lines individually
8 should be drawn.

9 As you come across the southern part of
10 Tucson, say even with the air base, and come across what
11 at that point is, I-19, again, you have some natural
12 barriers that you are dealing with. But I understand
13 that some of the distinction there is going to be on the
14 basis of not only even population but percentages of
15 subpopulations within the district that we need to keep
16 balanced as well. I understand that distinction.

17 I think the biggest difficulty you've got
18 at this point is solving the north end of this problem.
19 The south end of the problem, I think through public
20 testimony and revisions that we will subsequently make
21 will resolve itself. And I'm relatively comfortable to
22 let that go. But I certainly am not comfortable unless
23 there's a better solution of what is now called District
24 E, which is L revisited, until we get that resolved. It
25 really does not -- it does not solve the problem that

1 we've been talking about. So clearly concentrate on
2 that area. And to the extent that either some
3 arrangement, such as suggested by Commissioner Minkoff
4 earlier, or there's some other logical solution, we've
5 certainly had enough testimony from enough people in
6 Pinal County how that area of the state relates to one
7 another. We ought to be able to figure out how to make
8 that thing work.

9 The thing I don't like about this
10 configuration, we have this meandering wraparound
11 district that goes around the edge of Tucson.

12 One of the districts that the current
13 districts in Tucson is reminiscent of, this is the big
14 semicircle around the city. It's something that we had
15 hoped to correct through this process. And I certainly
16 don't want this result to revisit that, if we can avoid
17 that.

18 I do think there's some natural divisions
19 that we've already addressed that are layered as you
20 come down from the foothills area to the center part of
21 Tucson and into the west and south portions of Tucson
22 that do make natural divisions that make sense. I would
23 certainly respect those, if you could.

24 Mr. Elder.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I make one comment.

1 We heard testimony at the Amphitheatre that the
2 superintendent indicated he would like to have that
3 district whole. That might give us a line. I cannot
4 tell you, I think probably the Amphitheatre goes through
5 B on Adobas, Casas Adobas north to south. I can't tell
6 you. If something comes up, we need a line, that may
7 work for you. Other than that, I don't know of any
8 lines of demarcation for you.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about that a
10 moment. The southern boundary is the principle road in
11 Tucson. The northern boundary is, I believe, north of
12 Marana. So it is a significant district in terms of
13 geography. And -- I heard the same point. But it is
14 enormous.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Looking east-west,
16 vertical, that's the only line that makes any sense
17 there.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Matter of fact, the
19 northern boundary is all the way up in the City of
20 Catalina. There is a middle school in Golder Ranch,
21 G O L D E R.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Unless there is
25 something else on this map, some questions may be

1 answered in the answer done on the request I made of
2 let's look at trying to rotate Pinal County
3 horizontally. The northern part represented what one of
4 the plans was, and the southern part then wrapped
5 around, made an ugly looking district but it seemed as
6 though we might look at some of the issues.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There may be one more
8 comment before we move on.

9 Mr. Huntwork?

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I certainly
11 wouldn't, don't mean to presume to know as much about
12 Tucson as you gentlemen do. I do want to say the
13 problem we're grappling with is there are too many
14 pieces of Tucson broken off, the south is probably going
15 into somewhere else. That's why the northern district
16 has to break off so far.

17 In a nutshell, the only way to solve that
18 is to bring all the pieces of Tucson into the
19 metropolitan area back in and try to keep them as close
20 to the center as possible. That would bring the Pinal
21 County back down into, probably, to work the numbers,
22 probably back into the Saddlebrooke area. But you have
23 to keep Tucson together, start keeping the pieces
24 together. That goes off to the north because there's
25 nowhere else to go.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm curious, what is
3 the total population? Short? Long?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Total population, Pima,
5 Cochise, Pinal, 30,000. Full set of districts, set
6 districts.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: 50,000 short?

8 MR. JOHNSON: 30 to 50,000 short.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Plus or minus 20.

10 That's why you figure in an effort to kill
11 two birds with one stone, as it were, the desire is to
12 combine the reservations, pursuant to their wishes, in
13 an effort to garner more population.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Not necessarily our desire.
15 There's so many factors in here, we're running through a
16 whole bunch of scenarios that could work. That's one
17 we've had, community testimony, interest in that, and
18 we're considering that.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: The other alternative
20 is Western Maricopa, or is that not going there. I
21 can't tell if that's a line there or not.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Right now we're looking at,
23 seem to have had fairly favorable testimony from the
24 community on including Southwestern Maricopa, an
25 extremely rural portion of the county. That is a fairly

1 homogeneous community with the Pinal, Pima area, makes
2 us get some of the 30,000 there, or however many we
3 need, regretfully not enough to get all of them there.
4 So that is a start.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: And in your opinion a
6 combination of two of those areas, is that sufficient
7 population?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The scenario we drew
9 yesterday, or when I wrote the proposal we had this
10 morning, we did take exactly that approach, taking in
11 roughly the line you see here in Maricopa, the west, and
12 then it took a different approach than what I described,
13 came up through the Indian Reservations, and the
14 extremely far Eastern Maricopa as well. Got us to the
15 set of population we needed to complete districts.

16 We know it can be done in essentially the
17 approach. Now we're wrestling with the configuration of
18 the districts in that area.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
20 Tucson map, per se, before we look at the alternative
21 analysis?

22 All right.

23 If you proceed with the analysis of the
24 alternative in the Pinal area.

25 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the

1 Commission, we'll move machines. Margaret Leoni has
2 worked with the analysis and Chris Hutchison will assist
3 her in explaining what our findings are.

4 MS. LEONI: At this afternoon's session,
5 Commissioner Huntwork asked us to look at District E.
6 This is rough. Work with District E, and then draw
7 District L, over into the Gila River Reservation, taking
8 in the Ak-Chin and leaving Casa Grande in the Pinal
9 District but uniting the Tohono O'odham with the
10 Saddlebrooke area.

11 I want to advise you, we did this on the
12 map, not the current map Doug is working on. To
13 transfer from one to another takes 90 minutes or more.
14 That was not time we had. We have numbers on it and can
15 tell you in a nutshell with this configuration we lost a
16 minority district in E with the loss of population in
17 the Casa Grande area and Gila River.

18 Chris, can we put some numbers up there?
19 District E is lacking slightly, 18,000
20 people.

21 Hispanic origin population dropped to 33
22 percent and slightly more. So we've gone, total
23 minority population is now about 44.23.

24 When we looked at this on August 4th, and
25 we did this on the August 4th draft, the ugly L

1 District, we were approaching 64 percent minority. So
2 this is something that needs development. It needs
3 population. And I'm going to ask Chris to speak to
4 this. We would naturally on this one move further east
5 into the San Manuel area. That would take in a Census
6 tract, rush up into eastern Pinal County, only gather
7 about 8,000 people, bringing in population we have
8 available to us, or so, into the district, is not such
9 that it would recover the minority percentage.

10 As you can see, we have the San Manuel
11 area, the one highlighted, 8,000 people, which brings us
12 far north. With San Manuel, about four, bringing in
13 change, about 13,000, but not enough to put our numbers
14 up, changes to 34.3. Makes movement. Then have to move
15 over to west to the Census tract. Has about 13,000
16 people there. We're going to have to split that.

17 Can we get the number on that, Chris, for
18 the Hispanic percentage.

19 We're just not going to be able to get
20 enough minority to establish an AUR that the original
21 District E was built on.

22 Commissioner Elder, did you have any
23 further question on this experiment?

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Ms. Leoni and
25 Mr. Chairman. I wanted to take a look at that as a

1 concept or idea to see what we'd pick up, the southern
2 half of what was the old L district. It's becoming
3 quickly obvious to me we can't get back enough of the
4 population distribution we're looking for to maintain a
5 majority-minority district on the west side there of E.
6 I guess -- my frustration is I like the east-west
7 orientation. We can't achieve our goals doing that. I
8 appreciate the efforts for getting me the numbers so we
9 can make the evaluation, and that, but I think it's not
10 working.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think there's any
12 reason to pursue that.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: No.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next point.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree. Yes, there
16 is no reason.

17 MS. LEONI: We have a number of tests on
18 the machine, not that particular test.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go ahead.

20 MS. LEONI: Once again, the test does not
21 include the plan. We worked on side-by-side plans.

22 This experiment, test we're about to
23 describe to you now, does not include the
24 reconfiguration of S and R to include the historic
25 district, the historic -- Phoenix historic AUR, pulling

1 it south and west into R. But the test we did does not
2 affect that. I ask you to ignore that. That has been
3 approved by the Commission on motion. It will appear on
4 the map that goes out for public comment.

5 We were asked to experiment with
6 reconfigurations of P and T.

7 As you can see, P has become quite
8 compact. T remains an elongated district that includes
9 Goodyear and Litchfield.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you go on,
11 is the district next to it the same color?

12 MS. LEONI: I'm looking at it on the
13 screen. It's more distinct, Commissioner Minkoff.
14 Excuse me.

15 Has that helped at all?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. Thank you.

17 MS. LEONI: Is that helpful? On the
18 screen I'm looking at it is yellow.

19 T, it's light green on that. Yellow is
20 what I'm looking at. P is light blue. I apologize.
21 The colors don't appear true.

22 Does that -- I apologize.

23 There it is. That's T.

24 We don't consider this a finished product.

25 We're able to report to you, we believe

1 this rebalancing of the population has distinct
2 possibilities in observing more closely the
3 five-district configuration of the AUR that had been
4 adopted by the Commission. If we get some numbers up
5 there for T.

6 T has now become a district with a total
7 Hispanic origin population of close to 39 percent. This
8 is a change from the 44 percent that was literally
9 neither here nor there under the five-district option.
10 By making these changes, as I said, they are not
11 completed, but populations are close.

12 District P -- Chris -- has been
13 significantly strengthened. When we started this test,
14 P was 50 and a half percent, 50 and a half total
15 Hispanic population. We now have P at 55 and a half
16 percent total Hispanic population, that's Hispanic total
17 population, Hispanic voting population of 50.5 percent.
18 We achieved Hispanic majority voting age population with
19 this. We're not satisfied with all the lines. We think
20 the extension of what is now T over the top of that
21 bears a closer look. We were forced to take Avondale
22 into the west side for population purposes. By the time
23 when we left Avondale on the side with P, the west side,
24 we were overpopulated 50,000.

25 We want to look more closely at

1 arrangement of districts move in this direction. We
2 believe working between P, V, and T, we can achieve a
3 better configuration.

4 So our report to you is we think this is a
5 positive move, but our report is not finished. Our
6 report is this test is not completed. We'd like to
7 bring this back first thing in the morning with a
8 completed proposal.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a step in the
11 right direction. The thing I suggest you look at
12 between now and tomorrow morning, P and V, divide them
13 horizontally, not vertically. That would address some
14 issues, school district boundaries and communities of
15 interest that seem east-west rather than north-south.

16 MS. LEONI: We think that's very
17 perceptive and a good approach to this.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

19 MR. HUNTWORK: I agree. And this was one
20 of my major concerns I expressing earlier today. I
21 think if there's a good test of this by tomorrow
22 morning, it would help make me a lot more comfortable,
23 probably help make me more comfortable with the map.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, then,
25 if you finish that overnight and give us the benefit of

1 that analysis in the morning.

2 MS. LEONI: We'd be pleased to do so.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm beginning to
6 feel much more comfortable with the way the northern
7 part of the state and Phoenix are developing. I still
8 have real, real concerns with the southern part of the
9 state. I don't suppose to know what works best with
10 Tucson. I suppose I know less about it than other parts
11 of the state. I ask other Commissioners, you expressed
12 comments to my mind, comments which created real
13 problems Pinal County and Metropolitan Phoenix. Are the
14 improvements in Tucson sufficient enough and important
15 enough to do that? And I'm not proposing to say they
16 are or aren't, whether they are worth, in a sense, the
17 collateral damage that has occurred to some of the other
18 districts. If they are I'm prepared to support them. I
19 don't know.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not prepared to
21 answer. We don't know the collateral damage on the
22 damage to Pinal County. It's our hope and direction to
23 the consultants to minimize that damage, to the extent
24 either through Mr. Huntwork's observation to draw
25 districts back into Tucson and begin anew, put all the

1 pieces together so you have a full complement to draw
2 from, or whether you continue on the basis that the
3 layout in Tucson, in general terms, is reasonable to
4 begin with. But to the extent you still have to make
5 adjustments in Pinal County, to pick up that last 30 to
6 50,000 population to make a district, that you do that
7 in the most benign way possible, consistent with either
8 AUR, testimony, or something else that we can hang our
9 hat on, it's something that makes sense. I'm not sure
10 we can give a definitive answer on that until we see it.

11 Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think you
13 minimalize collateral damage in other areas but also
14 Tucson, start with Tucson, putting those districts in
15 order.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fanning out.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fanning out with a
18 small piece has to be put somewhere else rather than a
19 big piece.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, the issue this
21 evening is is there sufficient direction to make
22 substantial progress overnight. That is the key. If
23 you feel you are lacking in any way in that direction,
24 now is the time to get it. There will only be one
25 overnight.

1 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we feel we have
2 indeed the direction and will work the next 10 hours to
3 produce a better map.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other areas
5 you'll report on tonight we need to address?

6 DR. HESLOP: No, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there further
8 directions to consultants?

9 Mr. Hall?

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Dr. Heslop, we are
11 grateful to you and your staff for their efforts,
12 grateful you hired staff that have no need for sleep
13 whatsoever, and we want to express our confidence and
14 appreciation for efforts you guys are doing, your
15 diligence and hard work.

16 DR. HESLOP: We reciprocate our gratitude
17 to the Commission for their understanding.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd only say, Dr. Heslop,
19 when you next report to us, if you say "we have failed,"
20 I think you should change it to "we have not yet
21 succeeded." We will succeed.

22 DR. HESLOP: In our lexicon, "fail" is a
23 temporary word.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Very well.

25 Any further direction to the consultants?

1 If not, I think, if you'd like to get a
2 head start, I don't know if it will help you, we'll will
3 entertain one more round of call to the public.

4 You may want to continue to have a
5 consultant, some member of the team to be here to hear
6 the call to the public as well.

7 Those who wish to be heard would need to,
8 as usual, fill out a yellow speaker form and we'll be
9 happy to entertain call to the public as our last item
10 this evening.

11 (Discussion off the record.)

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, this
13 is the last item this evening.

14 This is the time for consideration and
15 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.
16 Those wishing to address the Commission shall request
17 permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.
18 Action taken as a result of public comment will be
19 limited to directing staff to study the matter or
20 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and
21 decision at a later date.

22 Being as we've been at it about 12 hours,
23 let's try to keep it to a three-minute time period, if
24 we can. We don't have a watch on it. If you'd do your
25 best.

1 The first speaker is Anne Murray, vice
2 president of the Broadmoor Broadway Village Neighborhood
3 Association, I assume.

4 Ms. Murray.

5 MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
6 Commissioners. I appreciate the chance to speak.

7 The issue I wanted to speak to is a macro
8 type issue, that is the use of Broadway Boulevard as a
9 boundary dividing north-south districts. And as I
10 understood the most recent map, District H, and the
11 southern boundary, it would be the boundary for what
12 they are calling the Air Force District. Northern
13 boundary would be the boundary, do I have that
14 correctly, with the use of Broadway as an east-west
15 boundary between the districts. Broadway functioning as
16 a corridor is a significant corridor impacting
17 neighborhoods adjacent both north and southwest of
18 University. Broadway goes into downtown with a
19 different kind of population business mix. East of
20 University, going east, probably as far as Wilmot,
21 certainly as far as Swan, we have a network of very
22 cohesive, strong neighborhood associations with a long
23 history of working together on issues which we share on
24 both sides of Broadway. Broadway functions to us as an
25 organizing factor. For example, currently

1 transportation on Broadway is being considered.
2 Broadway carries a great deal of transportation.
3 Consider the amount of transportation on Broadway. My
4 transportation is on Broadway. My neighborhood is
5 anchored by the Broadway Village Shopping Center, the
6 first shopping center designed by Jose O. Johnson.
7 That's also an identity point for all four neighborhoods
8 north, south, east, and west of Country Club.

9 Another feature of this is that Broadway
10 runs kind of in between Speedway and 22nd Street. When
11 you go from the University east to Wilmot, the schools
12 all inter-relate. So the middle schools and the high
13 schools in that swath of neighborhoods all receive
14 feeders from the elementary schools all between 22nd and
15 Speedway.

16 So to divide this very cohesive community
17 that has worked together over a long period of time and
18 put some of it south of Broadway in one district and
19 another part of it north of Broadway in another district
20 really divides what is a very close community of
21 interest.

22 So that basically is the point I wanted to
23 make. Please do not see Broadway as a boundary. But
24 actually 22nd Street would be a better boundary.

25 Thank you very much.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Murray.

2 Next speaker is Mr. Bohnee, public
3 relations speaker for the Gila River Community.

4 MR. BOHNEE: Mr. Chairman, members of the
5 Commission, thank you for the opportunity to say a few
6 brief words.

7 I wanted to reiterate a few words made by
8 the Lieutenant Governor of the community and echoed by
9 Ms. Minkoff, and really that is, if at all possible, to
10 look and consider combining the four metro area tribes,
11 which would be Fort McDowell, the Navajo Nation, Salt
12 River Indian Community, Pima River Indian Community, and
13 Ak-Chin Indian Community into what would be the same
14 district. One of the iterations I guess I see to my
15 left over here I guess accomplishes that goal.

16 The iteration that was addressed last week
17 by the Lieutenant Governor had the Tohono O'odham
18 Nation, Ak-Chin Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation in one
19 district. Cultural relations, there are many
20 distinctions the bind the metro area tribes together,
21 both culturally, but also a number of issues that the
22 communities address as -- both as Indian communities,
23 the four metro tribes, and economic development issues.

24 In that context I just wanted to reiterate
25 that that would be a strong recommendation from the

1 community.

2 With respect to the compactness issue,
3 this may have already been provided to the Commission.
4 The reiteration we have over here, pretty much most of
5 Pinal County in one district, which also includes the
6 four metro tribes, I think gets to that particular issue
7 in terms of having compact districts, also looking at
8 the communities of interest.

9 I hope as the map drawers and Commission
10 consider viewpoints, that would be one strong
11 consideration you take into consideration.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Bohnee.

13 The next speaker, Ms. Cecilia Cruz, Latino
14 Self-Help Network.

15 MS. CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
16 Commissioners.

17 I know it's a difficult task tonight. I
18 did appreciate that.

19 There are two points I'd like to have you
20 consider, to be very brief. I know you received a map
21 considered by the Chicano Consortium Border Map, I
22 believe, that takes into consideration strong
23 considerations and all considerations shared by the
24 issues in that map.

25 Second, issues looking at Legislative

1 issues what is identified by TT and J in Tucson,
2 primarily, areas in West Tucson and South Tucson, I
3 would like you to consider natural boundaries that
4 occurred along the interstate and including South Tucson
5 into what is identified on the map as J, that has been
6 historically South Tucson, which has been, the dividing
7 area has been the interstate, where it does merge into
8 I-19 and I-10 going south. It does address the issue
9 25,000 in population, gives District J added population,
10 and keeps historically what has been represented before.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Cruz.

13 Salomon Baldenegro, Chicano Consortium for
14 Public Issues.

15 MR. BALDENEGRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
16 Members of Commission.

17 This morning I talked, fixated on some
18 issues on South Tucson, the same issues she talked about
19 and border issues I talked about, and forgot some things
20 I think are important to mention. One is what the
21 previous speaker referred to: I want to thank you for
22 your work. You are doing a lot of work, hard work, and
23 a great service for our state. I know how hard work is.
24 I want to make sure you are aware we appreciate the
25 work. Some may not agree with it. We appreciate the

1 effort. You are doing good work.

2 The second thing it's important for you to
3 know, from the standpoint of citizen involvement, it's
4 political important from a democracy point to know the
5 border map I submitted for Chicanos Consortium for
6 Public Issues was looked at, reviewed by about 400
7 people. I distributed it to 258 people in Tucson and 68
8 people in Phoenix. I got feedback from people I did not
9 distribute it to, people got it passed to. It was
10 passed on to other folks. From that I calculate about
11 400 people looked at the map we submitted and many
12 commented, either called me or sought me out personally
13 and talked to me. I mention that to impress upon you
14 that the map we submitted and the border district we
15 argue was not created in a vacuum.

16 The third thing I forgot to talk about
17 this morning was to make sure you understand that those
18 of us in Tucson working here on issues, Chicano
19 Consortium for Public Issues that supports issues for
20 fair redistricting are very active, appeared before you
21 many times, and will again want to reiterate their plans
22 and their comments. Be aware we do support and
23 conceptually endorse their comments and their plans.

24 And fourthly, I forgot this morning to
25 talk about, after I spoke, a lot of speakers talked

1 about the competitive aspect of redistricting. I know
2 that Prop 106 was devised and passed and has as -- at
3 its heart the notion of competitive districts. And
4 that's important. When you juxtapose the competitive
5 aspect with Section Five Voting Rights, and things,
6 sometimes those things have a way of getting in the way
7 of each other when you wind up with the final product.
8 I know you will, and you'll make sure it's in the
9 record, juxtapose it, based on the fact with voting
10 rights and other things driving this.

11 Thank you for your time, patience, and
12 work.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

14 Frank Seanez, attorney with the Navajo
15 Nation.

16 Mr. Seanez.

17 MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Chairman Lynn,
18 Members of the Commission.

19 I wanted to, on behalf of the Navajo
20 Nation, thank the Commission for its diligent work,
21 especially today in considering some of the very
22 difficult issues involved in redistricting.

23 All the Commissioners at one point or
24 another have led to discussions within the public
25 hearing of some of the very real concerns which affect

1 not only other communities of interest but the Navajo
2 Nation as well.

3 In particular, the Navajo Nation is
4 appreciative of the fact the Commission is willing to
5 revisit again its support in separation of -- separation
6 of the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe. We believe it's
7 much more defensible, much more reasonable, and much
8 better Legislative, better than one, than the prior
9 iteration, NE1.

10 There are changes in support for various
11 ideas, as the discussion winds up. The Nation as well
12 wants to express its appreciation for some of the
13 discussions and initiatives which did not go forward,
14 particularly Commissioner Huntwork's keeping in play the
15 idea of the combination of the White Mountain Apache
16 Tribe and the San Carlos Tribe in the same Legislative
17 District as the Navajo Nation.

18 One thing the Navajo Nation reminds very
19 concerned about is the drop of Native American
20 population between the bench mark plan and even that
21 which is now before the Commission in M1.

22 We're still talking about a Native
23 American population which is topping out at somewhere
24 near 66 percent. And we can't let the Commission forget
25 what we're looking at from the bench mark plan is 77

1 percent.

2 The Navajo Nation still very much
3 concerned about that drop.

4 Some of the discussions did not come all
5 the way through fruition or passage of fruition of the
6 motion.

7 There are Census tracts out there which
8 would not involve splitting census places or
9 municipalities which would increase Native American
10 population. They surround municipalities, like
11 Flagstaff, and are contiguous with other portions of the
12 Legislative District which is now under consideration in
13 the Legislative District map.

14 As well, the Navajo Nation would encourage
15 the Commission to still keep under consideration other
16 Census places and municipalities that have large Native
17 American populations, specifically Winslow and Holbrook.

18 The Navajo Nation does not give up its
19 position that a Legislative District with a Native
20 American population of 77 percent can be obtained by the
21 unification of Apache County and the unification of the
22 White Mountain Tribe and San Carlos Tribe in accord with
23 the Navajo Nation's Plan first set before this
24 Commission on June 25th of this year.

25 Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

2 Next speaker, Mr. DuPont.

3 Mr. DuPont.

4 MR. DUPONT: I'm here as regards the
5 dividing line on Broadway. As Anne Murray stated,
6 Broadway and its cohesiveness is a community of
7 interest. We've studied using the Broadway corridor.
8 Most of us share the Broadway line. There's a balance
9 in the neighborhood plan. I sit in a building on
10 Alvernon, a plan that is inclusive on this side of
11 Broadway and the other side of Broadway which is
12 inclusive of businesses on Broadway, which I've done for
13 four years.

14 I'm one of the organizers of the Central
15 League of Businesses which is inclusive of both sides of
16 Broadway.

17 We'd ask you to reconsider moving that to
18 the 22nd corridor so it keeps us together. It is a
19 major part of Tucson, that being considered, Broadway.
20 There are several historic buildings on Broadway that
21 need to be together on Broadway.

22 Thank you for your time.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. DuPont.

24 Next is Mr. Smith.

25 Mr. Smith.

1 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 This day has given me my first real window
3 to what you all have been going through. I want to say
4 I appreciate it. I'm reminded of an analogy to making
5 sausage. I won't go any further than that.

6 I hadn't intended to speak tonight.

7 I particularly appreciated the comments
8 and questions by Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff, and the
9 Chairman.

10 I associate myself with your comment of
11 the progress made, probably talking about some small
12 lines in Tucson, South Tucson, which I was talking to.
13 However, as I looked at the map, it appeared to me the
14 consultants were perhaps trying to be responsive to the
15 testimony of several of us from South Tucson,
16 Mr. Elder's comments, but maybe they didn't quite
17 understand what we were saying.

18 I'd like to take a quick crack at it. We
19 said we have communities of interest, in particular
20 south and east. I think I may have confused them when I
21 said east to the railroad, because there was an area
22 associated with South Tucson with this new map north
23 between the freeway and the railroad which is a
24 different area. I'm trying to be helpful to the
25 consultants, and they are looking at this.

1 I would mention a comment Mrs. Cruz made,
2 I also noticed that.

3 Without the maps, I'm not sure. There was
4 a purple district in which South Tucson appeared on
5 tonight's map. And that district wound up west. And
6 what we had been asking is that portion of the district
7 on the southeast part of that district that was on the
8 east side of the freeway be associated with the pale
9 blue. We also noticed that you commented that the
10 purple was overpopulated and -- in a very heavy
11 majority-minority district. It sounds like, as you
12 indicated, Mr. Chairman, there may be kinds of things
13 can be worked out, perhaps in public comment after you
14 do the map.

15 I thank you for the opportunity to restate
16 what I was saying, and thank you again for all your
17 work.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

19 The next speaker is Paul Mackey.

20 Mr. Mackey.

21 MR. MACKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
22 members of the Commission. I intended to talk on
23 another comment. As I sat during the day, certain
24 things developed, particularly the last item dealing
25 with the Tucson area.

1 I was concerned initially when I came in
2 this morning hearing talk of only four districts in
3 Tucson. The phraseology of the consultants, I was
4 concerned Tucson was totally screwed in terms of
5 districts. Seems now there's consideration of five
6 districts.

7 Talking of population of 583,000 in
8 Tucson, Tucson and Eastern Pima County, 171,000 in each
9 district, it would work out, roughly, using one man one
10 vote thinking, to roughly five districts for Eastern
11 Pima County, or Pima County as a whole, with the
12 intended focus on that.

13 After watching the map and the work done
14 during the recess, I guess, let me speak to one of the
15 concerns, and that had to do with the green area in
16 Tucson, or what I'm referring to as District H. I wish
17 we still had the maps. I could suggest adjustments.

18 Some of the previous speakers, Bill and
19 Anne Murray, some involved the central part of Tucson,
20 central Tucson leadership. It's 30 associations, covers
21 an area roughly on the East of Wilmot Road and extending
22 roughly to Stone Avenue, east of I-10, and extends north
23 to Grant roughly to 22nd.

24 Now this is a relatively cohesive area of
25 the Tucson central area. I say that, having been in

1 this community a long time working a lot of data in the
2 area. I also chair a group that is neighbors the
3 University of Arizona and 10 neighborhoods there. We
4 don't think in terms of us being in the purple area. If
5 anything, I would suggest this area, area H, or the
6 green area, that be shifted eastward.

7 I know a couple members of the Commission
8 from the Tucson area said it seemed to make some sense
9 to you. I differ in the sense the central part of the
10 city doesn't begin to associate itself, think of itself
11 with the Wilmot area, part of the southern part of
12 Sahuarita. We're talking a totally different part,
13 orientation, voting patterns. And you begin to see real
14 cohesiveness in that part of the city.

15 I suggest the area perhaps be dropped to
16 the south, south of Broadway, perhaps down around 22nd.
17 You'd have to play with it somewhat. I think the
18 consultants said the blue area, airport district, excess
19 population, something be done with it there.

20 The main concern is it be shifted somewhat
21 eastward, part is the airport district, and that it be
22 shifted.

23 What is the organization for the
24 districts? There is different criteria. The Foothills
25 District extend in Oro Valley, a relatively homogeneous

1 area. This not a competitive area. It's a safe
2 district. It's like what are we using here as an
3 organizing base in the Tucson area, criteria? We're
4 beginning to get very questionable about it.

5 So, in the absence then of defining better
6 the criteria, I'm going to suggest then if nothing else
7 we have a strong central district, a cohesive district.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mackey.

9 If others wish to speak, I'd ask you get
10 speaker slips filled out. Raise your hand.

11 The last slip I have of those wishing to
12 speak this evening is from Steve Gallardo for the
13 Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

14 Mr. Gallardo.

15 MR. GALLARDO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I'm with the Coalition for Fair
17 Redistricting. I'm Steve Gallardo.

18 I know it's been a long day.

19 I want to reiterate the points by
20 Mrs. Cruz and Mr. Baldenegro, support the changes in I
21 and U. We feel it would maximize the minority voting
22 strength in those two districts, and we support that
23 wholeheartedly.

24 We have made a change and plan on
25 submitting a proposal to the Commission in regard to our

1 suggestion regarding Tucson as well.

2 Also, in regards to Pinal County, we also
3 support Mr. Bohnee with the Gila River Indian Community
4 with regard to the Pinal County Legislative lines. We
5 feel this is minority-majority district and feel the
6 Indian Reservations should be put together.

7 Also, the Coalition also would ask the
8 Commission please look at the Yuma County District. I'm
9 not too sure what number or letter that is. That's
10 currently a minority-majority district. Although we're
11 a little hesitant to call it a strong majority-minority
12 district, we'd ask the Commission, as far as minority
13 voting right interests, look at it to make it a stronger
14 minority-majority district.

15 Finally, as regards Maricopa County and
16 district P, the West Phoenix District, I did see the
17 draft the consultants have created with some
18 corrections. We again have submitted a map I'd like to
19 submit to the Commission for their consideration.

20 One thing I want to point out for your
21 consideration. I understand the population problem. I
22 feel if we could add Avondale, maybe have the district
23 go as far west as Litchfield Road and I-10, I-10 being
24 the northern boundary, going eastward to 83rd Avenue,
25 83rd Avenue north to Glendale, Glendale east to 51st

1 Avenue, 51st Avenue down south to Buckeye Road. And if
2 you look at that particular district, again, if it's
3 overpopulated, have the northern boundary currently cut
4 off at Glendale Road, have it keep continuing down until
5 the population is where it needs to be at, I believe 171
6 plus, I feel that would be a strong minority-majority
7 district.

8 We've also outlined three other districts.
9 I know there were concerns early on in the hearings in
10 regard for minority-majority districts. We outlined
11 them. And we hope the Commission takes them into
12 consideration.

13 With that, good night.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other members of
15 the public that wish to be heard this evening?

16 Any final comments from the Commission?

17 I'd simply ask the consultants as they are
18 doing their work this evening, the public comments this
19 evening are very apropos, and they continue to define
20 things, particularly in the Tucson area.

21 It seems to be problematic as we move
22 forward. There are natural divisions that have been
23 suggested. I'd suggest you take those strongly into
24 account as you move forward as you are trying to solve
25 the greater macro issue of Southern Arizona.

1 As we move through the southern area, the
2 comments made this evening and earlier in the day have
3 been very instructive and I think can be very helpful in
4 making some choices easier for the consultants to select
5 where lines go, so I'd actually take those into account.

6 Further comments from anybody on the
7 Commission?

8 If not, we'll stand in recess until 8:00
9 o'clock in the morning.

10 (The following is a letter for submission
11 to be included the record:

12 Arizona State Senate

13 August 15, 2001

14
15
16 Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission
17 1400 West Washington, Suite B-10
18 Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

19
20 Dear Commission Members:

21
22 I'm writing to encourage the Commission to preserve
23 Yavapai County intact as a Legislative District.

24
25 Our population is within 3% of the required number.

 ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
 Phoenix, Arizona

1 Including all of Sedona brings us precisely to the ideal
2 population and meets the City boundary goal. The County
3 is clearly a community of interest and is geographically
4 compact. We obviously fulfill the Proposition's stated
5 intent to use county boundaries to the extent
6 practicable.

7

8 These are the very criteria identified in Proposition
9 106. We are the perfect example of what the law asks you
10 to carry out. Thank you for preserving Yavapai County
11 intact.

12

13 Sincerely,

14

15 (Signature in original on file with the Commission)

16

17 KEN BENNETT

18 State Senator

19 KB/jy.

20 (Whereupon, the Commission adjourned for
21 the evening at approximately 9:29 p.m.)

22

* * * *

23

24

25

1

2 STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
3 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

4

5

6 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was
7 taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified
8 Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona,
9 Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were
10 taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to
11 typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 192
12 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all
13 proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all
14 done to the best of my ability.

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

18 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 5th day of
19 October, 2001.

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona

