

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

Phoenix, Arizona  
August 2, 2001  
8:30 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 2, 2001,  
3       at 8:30 o'clock a.m., at the Double Tree Guest Suites,  
4       Salons I and II, 320 North 44th Street, Phoenix,  
5       Arizona, 85003, 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 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

ADDITIONAL APPEARANCES:

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

1

2 SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

3

4 ANDREA GONZALES

5 SHERRY L. SMITH

6 MARK FLEISHER

7 ANDREA GONZALES

8 DAVIS GASS

9 PAUL ECKSTEIN

10

11

12 AGENDA DESIGNATED SPEAKERS:

13

14 LISA HAUSER

15 JOSE de JESUS RIVERA

16 DR. ALAN HESLOP

17 DR. FLORENCE ADAMS

18 MARGUERITE MARY LEONI

19 DOUG JOHNSON

20 CHRIS HUTCHISON

21 ADOLFO ECHEVESTE

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  
Phoenix, Arizona  
August 2, 2001  
8:30 o'clock a.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

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

First order of business is public comment.

This is the time for consideration and discussion of comments and complaints from the public. Those wishing to address the Commission shall request permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip. Action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter or reschedulig the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date.

Are there members of the public that wish to be heard at this time?

Please, if you would --

Thank you very much.

Ms. Andrea Gonzales.

MR. GONZALES: I have a couple quick comments. I'm representing the City of Casa Grande.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
Phoenix, Arizona

1                   We turned in a proposal. There are a  
2 couple things I wanted to clear up for the Commission  
3 this morning. It's come to my mind there are questions  
4 why we kept Apache and Casa Grande together in same the  
5 county. The reason we did that in our plan, Apache  
6 Junction and Casa Grande are the two major communities  
7 in Pinal County that show growth, both in farming and  
8 agriculture, and are interested in having someone in the  
9 Legislature. We simply cut out the eastern area in  
10 Pinal, the mining area, and felt they would be  
11 represented better by someone from the northern area.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

13                   Are there other members of the public  
14 wishing to be heard at this time?

15                   If not, let me make sure it's clear to the  
16 public, the meeting this week is scheduled for today,  
17 tomorrow, and Saturday. It was done in this way because  
18 we have no idea how long the discussion, decision-making  
19 will take in this part of process. It's quite  
20 conceivable the agenda which you have on the table  
21 outside, and you are certainly free to look at, may be  
22 completed today, may run into tomorrow, may run into  
23 Saturday. But at this point, based on sort of agenda  
24 management, I'm not sure we will use all of the time  
25 allotted. Therefore, I just want everyone to

1 understand, we will go through the agenda as  
2 expeditiously as we can and finish at whatever point we  
3 come to the end of the agenda. If today, tomorrow,  
4 Saturday's meeting will not occur. If we go into  
5 tomorrow, move to the end of the agenda, we'll complete  
6 when we can.

7                   With that admonition, if we move to  
8 tomorrow, we'll have yet another public comment period  
9 when we start the meeting. If we're close to finishing  
10 the meeting, we'll reserve another public comment period  
11 at the end as is custom.

12                   Is there anyone else wishing to address  
13 the Commission at this time? If not, there will be  
14 another opportunity for comment.

15                   We'll close item number II.

16                   Item III, discussion and possible approval  
17 of the minutes of the July 6, 2001, public meeting.

18                   Have you had an opportunity, members of  
19 Commission, to review the July 6 minutes?

20                   Is there a motion?

21                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I move we accept  
22 the minutes from July 6.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

24                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion. All in favor,

1 say "aye."

2 (Vote taken.)

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

4 (Motion carries.)

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Item IV: Report by  
6 Executive Director regarding administrative matters,  
7 including an update on Commission staff.

8 Mr. Echeveste.

9 MR. ECHEVESTE: Commission members, you  
10 have in your packet a one-page update on staffing to  
11 date, which includes transition of a number of staff.  
12 Unless you have any questions, it's a one-pager. It's  
13 an update from the last time around. About the only  
14 change has been the one staffer went to work at the data  
15 center at the request of the Governor's Office and I  
16 replaced that individual with Susan Svitak.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any questions from the  
18 Commission?

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There are several  
20 new people. Can you introduce them, if any are here?

21 MR. ECHEVESTE: Actually, they are all  
22 working, doing outreach.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: As opposed to what we're  
24 doing.

25 MR. ECHEVESTE: As opposed to do what



1 we're doing, they're doing outreach. I asked them to  
2 stay at their posts.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything else?

4 MR. ECHEVESTE: The other item that you  
5 have is the second round of public hearings agenda. But  
6 I would like to pass to you individually identified  
7 agendas that I would like to have back whenever you have  
8 a chance, hopefully by the end of this meeting, not  
9 necessarily by today, but by Saturday, of this --

10 What I would like for you to do is  
11 identify which hearings you would be able to attend so  
12 we can then be able to undertake the logistical planning  
13 for transportation, and so forth.

14 With that, we have here Huntwork, and  
15 Lynn --

16 Let me just hand them to you. It has the  
17 names on there.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You forgot me.

19 MR. ECHEVESTE: No. It is in the file.

20 MR. ECHEVESTE: Lisa, Jose.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff will be  
22 attending all of them.

23 MR. ECHEVESTE: No, you are in the file.

24 Mr. Chairman, I have no other matters to  
25 bring up today.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.

2                   Any other questions or comments for the  
3 Executive Director?

4                   If not, you have this in front of you.  
5 Revisions, discussion, possible revision for the  
6 schedule of the second round of meetings. Any comments,  
7 questions for the Commissioners with respect to the  
8 schedule, locations, or the timing, so on, and so forth?

9                   I think it pretty well conforms to the  
10 discussion we had last time.

11                   A come things of note. We added a  
12 September 2nd meeting in Tuba City.

13                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 11th.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: 7th, I think.

15                   No, 11th, pardon me.

16                   I believe that's the only substantive  
17 change.

18                   If not --

19                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

20                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

21                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Have we gotten  
22 agreement for transporting from Yuma to Tuba City?

23                   MR. ECHEVESTE: Yuma.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Normal way to get to rural  
25 areas, Navajo Air.

1                   MR. ECHEVESTES: Normal ways to get you  
2 there and back.

3                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: My car is getting so  
4 its wheels are falling off. It would never make it that  
5 fast.

6                   MR. ECHEVESTES: We don't want you to drive  
7 there.

8                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Some have small  
9 wheels.

10                  MR. RIVERA: Is there any reason why not  
11 to go to Tuba City after Flagstaff?

12                  MR. ECHEVESTES: Mr. Chairman,  
13 Commissioners, we left September 11th vacant because  
14 throughout Arizona, the cities, it's election day for  
15 the cities. The only time available was the 11th. And  
16 the Navajos, the tribes up there do not have elections  
17 on that day. And --

18                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand your point,  
19 Mr. Rivera. I think, again, we have it set for the  
20 11th. If -- again, I open that to the Commission to  
21 discuss the choices. It seems to me Mr. Rivera's point  
22 of going from Flagstaff to Tuba City logistically is  
23 much easier and simply have the weekend before we begin  
24 the next week's meetings on Monday the 10th in Yuma.  
25 That way we would actually not need the Navajo Air

1 arrangement, because we would be fairly close from  
2 Flagstaff and could drive.

3 Without objection, we could ask  
4 Mr. Echeveste to investigate moving that meeting up the  
5 to the 7th with the idea it's logistically easier to  
6 accommodate.

7 MR. ECHEVESTES: That would be a Friday.  
8 We didn't utilize that. It was your directive you  
9 didn't want that, keep Friday for formal public  
10 hearings.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance it might  
12 make sense.

13 MR. ECHEVESTES: At your directive, we'll  
14 work on that.

15 MR. RIVERA: Sorry about that.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

17 Item VI: Discussion and possible  
18 direction or decision with respect to the process for  
19 timely payment for professional services and to critical  
20 vendors.

21 Is that an issue?

22 MR. ECHEVESTES: You'll find that issue is  
23 resolved. I have not had time to discuss it with any of  
24 the vendors, to any length. I can assure you that the  
25 process has been worked out and we will not see or they

1 will not have the kind of problems that held up payments  
2 up to that point.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

4 Any further comments or questions?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Since this does  
6 seem to be resolved, it's been quite awhile since we've  
7 seen a financial statement. I would request that at the  
8 earliest possible time, that one be prepared so we know  
9 where we are in terms of expenditures.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner  
11 Minkoff, we're in the process of reformatting that  
12 budget. And now that we have processed some backlog of  
13 payments, we anticipate that at the next Commission  
14 meeting we will submit a revised budget for your review  
15 and approval.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Also expenditures  
17 to date?

18 MR. ECHEVESTTE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions and  
20 comments?

21 Okay. Item VII: Executive Session for  
22 discussion or consultation with the Commission's  
23 attorney's pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

24 Ms. Hauser, counsel requests Executive  
25 Session?

1 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, yes.

2 The Commissioners received some written  
3 legal opinions from Jose and I. We have only a couple  
4 of additions or clarifications to that and just some  
5 further instructions concerning today's meeting.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you anticipate that  
7 that session, I'm doing this for the public, to be  
8 relatively short, to last perhaps less than a half hour?

9 MS. HAUSER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to go  
11 into Executive Session?

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So moved.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

16 All in favor, signify "aye."

17 (Vote taken.)

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

19 Motion carries.

20 Ladies and gentlemen, we expect this will  
21 take less than a half hour.

22 (Whereupon, the Commission recessed Open  
23 Public Session at approximately 9:10 a.m. to go into  
24 Executive Session.)

25 (Recess taken.)

1                   (Whereupon, the Commission concluded  
2 Executive Session at approximately 9:52 a.m. and  
3 reconvened Open Public Session at approximately  
4 10:02 a.m.)

5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I had an indication from  
6 a member of the Commission he would like to reopen Item  
7 V, second round of public meetings of the Independent  
8 Redistricting Commission.

9                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I'd like to  
10 discuss the meetings. It no makes no sense, the Tuba  
11 City shift. That makes nine straight days, or at least  
12 eight straight days away. I'd like to return calls to  
13 clients. I know I made a commitment, but --

14                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would agree.  
15 I think staff makes the call. I think  
16 staff needs a break. I would like to give staff a  
17 chance to do other things.

18                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I think we move to the  
19 7th. If there are those that can't attend, they can't  
20 attend. Make it more convenient for those that can  
21 attend.

22                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll take those comments  
23 for what they are worth.

24                   You'd like some direction.

25                   MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I sense that.

2                   I'll entertain a motion either to move to  
3 the 7th or keep it to the 11th, either one. I'll be  
4 there either way. I have no life. It matters not.

5                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I make a motion then  
6 to leave the published agenda as published.

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

8                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

10                  Hearing no discussion, all in favor of  
11 leaving the agenda the way it is with the meeting in  
12 Tuba City on the 11th, signify by saying "aye."

13                  (Vote taken.)

14                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

15                  (Motion carries.)

16                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave it the way it is.

17                  Anything else?

18                  Item VIII: Possible presentation,  
19 discussion and possible decision with respect to the  
20 adoption of any additional AURs.

21                  We'll turn to Dr. Heslop.

22                  I suspect the Commissioners may wish  
23 reposition themselves.

24                  This will be partially a Power Point  
25 presentation, correct?



1 DR. HESLOP: Yes, Mr. Chairman. That is  
2 our hope.

3 Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,  
4 the first thing you need to address, is additional AURs.  
5 There are three. We can display them, if you wish.

6 You know the source of these AURs. They  
7 are from the, let me say, abundant flow of CIFs from the  
8 residents of Scottsdale which I have been reading over  
9 the last two weeks. The Commissioners have seen a  
10 summary of these CIFs. And so in recognition of the  
11 volume of this testimony, our recommendation would be to  
12 recommend Scottsdale be undivided as an AUR.

13 The second source of proposed AURs are the  
14 hearings that came to us late from the Tucson area.  
15 These are the Green Valley and I-19 areas. There was  
16 substantial testimony at those Tucson hearings and  
17 supported also by CIFs that these areas constitute  
18 genuine communities.

19 It would be our suggestion, Mr. Chairman,  
20 that we add them. If you instruct us to do so, we will,  
21 we'll e-mail all commissioners with full detail on these  
22 AURs.

23 Mr. Chairman, that would be our proposal  
24 to the Commission.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that all you are going

1 to do with the Power Point, Dr. Heslop?

2 DR. HESLOP: Can I ask a question on this,  
3 Mr. Chairman?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Don't take it off.  
5 I want to refer to that.

6 MR. HUTCHISON: I want to not blind you.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What I want to  
8 refer to in the last two AURs is ask whether those are  
9 two distinct AURs, two representations of the same AUR,  
10 whether distinct, how they differ?

11 DR. HESLOP: Two distinct AURs. The area  
12 is one we could consider as an AUR itself, but they are  
13 reflective of testimony that came from two different  
14 perspectives, one with regard to the I-19 corridor.  
15 It's important, particularly with regard to  
16 transportation and trade, the other with regard to the  
17 Green Valley area, more specifically regarding it's  
18 particular character and the sense of people in the  
19 Green Valley, that they had a community. So,  
20 Commissioner Minkoff, we present them as two separate  
21 AURs.

22 It's clear we are dealing with some of the  
23 same general area. And there they are.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, I guess I

1 come from this area.

2 DR. HESLOP: You do indeed.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: This area, the San  
4 Xavier District, I've never heard of Summit. Is this a  
5 Census designation?

6 DR. HESLOP: I shouldn't refer to Summit  
7 in that designation. It is a Census designation. It's  
8 quite possible you haven't been there. The Census knows  
9 it to exist.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: My question then is,  
11 my comment is on the maps we present for the public, we  
12 really need to have references the public knows, that  
13 this is the San Xavier Mission, or something, so they  
14 know that's what Summit is --

15 DR. HESLOP: Excellent point.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Get rid of acronyms  
17 nobody knows, or get back to acronyms the public knows.

18 DR. HESLOP: We'll at the get back to what  
19 the public knows.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
21 don't see the point of making a city like Scottsdale, or  
22 a City like Tempe, which also appeared and argued  
23 strenuously in favor of keeping of keeping their city  
24 together, an AUR. Cities have their own status under  
25 Prop 106 and keeping AURs together for mapping and other

1 groupings of significance so we give them weight in this  
2 consideration. The City of Scottsdale, aside from the  
3 fact it has political boundaries surrounding it, is not  
4 different from other affluent areas immediately  
5 adjacent.

6 I'd defy anyone to explain to me what is  
7 different from land on one side of a Scottsdale area,  
8 residential areas of Scottsdale and another side in  
9 terms of being anything other than a political  
10 subdivision.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

12 DR. HESLOP: I need to tread carefully. I  
13 read all the CIFs. There is no doubt in my mind  
14 Scottsdale thinks of itself in very different terms from  
15 communities around it. Some make that point very  
16 bluntly. "We in Scottsdale are different." Sometimes  
17 they refer to themselves as the Beverly Hills of  
18 Phoenix. They make clear, detailed distinctions between  
19 their city and neighboring cities. So that's one thing  
20 to say.

21 The second thing to say is we have been,  
22 in the citizen process, responding to citizen testimony  
23 and comment, CIF communication in development of these  
24 AURs.

25 Given the simple volume and intensity of

1 Scottsdale CIFs, it seemed to us in line with other  
2 precedence, for example, Yuma.

3 Yuma is also a jurisdiction, but as  
4 Commissioner Minkoff and I heard it, Yuma thinks of  
5 themselves as a very special jurisdiction. They have a  
6 sense of county community.

7 I think it's true that in many rural areas  
8 of the state, cities and counties have this sense of  
9 community defined by jurisdictional lines. And that  
10 appears even here in Scottsdale.

11 People think of Scottsdale as particularly  
12 peculiar.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Are you saying then  
15 there are some communities that are not as cohesive with  
16 their boundary as Scottsdale in this instance is special  
17 or unique in the way they have presented themselves?

18 DR. HESLOP: Well, I should say that,  
19 reflecting on the CIFs, that there is near unanimity, or  
20 unanimity, that Scottsdale is peculiar, that it is a  
21 particular community that has a strong sense of its own  
22 community. There is something less than unanimity about  
23 whether it should remain whole.

24 There are some suggestions for lines,  
25 divisions. Some people say it's less than large enough,

1 perhaps it's appropriate to be divided.

2                   The point I was trying to make to  
3 Commissioner Huntwork, I think all members of the  
4 Commission will recognize this. When you went to large  
5 communities, the sense of community does diminish. The  
6 sense of importance of jurisdictional lines, of city  
7 lines, diminishes. But here in the case of Scottsdale  
8 there is an undiminished sense of city community.

9                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: My concern, I agree  
10 with Commissioner Huntwork, I categorize under 106 or  
11 even voter rights, have a category to keep city counties  
12 whole where practicable. There was a different sense  
13 when we went out to the public and asked what makes your  
14 community cohesive? What makes your community whole?  
15 What is the glue that holds it together?

16                   I guess I didn't hear that much saying the  
17 glue that holds me together is the bonds of Scottsdale.  
18 My neighbor across the street, Paradise Valley,  
19 Carefree, also is affluent, also has the general same  
20 socioeconomic based conditions. It doesn't seem -- I  
21 think in cross-categorizing, we're maybe doing it twice.

22                   DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, we're  
23 obviously here to take instruction.

24                   I would say when you look at all the  
25 cities and counties in Arizona, which are, you are quite

1 right, protected by Proposition 106, there are few where  
2 citizens have taken the trouble to say this city  
3 requires attention by the Commission because we are a  
4 special community. So Scottsdale, in that sense, in  
5 terms of the public process through which we've gone,  
6 distinguished itself, in my view, from these other  
7 cities and counties that are protected by Proposition  
8 106.

9                   That is true for some members, Yavapai  
10 County or Yuma County, they are protected by their  
11 citizens in significant numbers, and some intensity of  
12 testimony commented on the fact that they felt  
13 themselves to be communities as well as counties.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall and --

15                   COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population  
16 of the city.

17                   MR. HUTCHISON: 60,260.

18                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Larger than a  
19 Legislative District, so it would not remain intact.

20                   Our discussion is somewhat moot. We've in  
21 the past said we'd designate an AUR by whatever an  
22 individual constituency perceives them to be. Then what  
23 we do with an AUR, obviously, is something subsequent to  
24 that designation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I'd move we  
25 accept Scottsdale as an AUR and move on.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was about to say  
5 at worst this is a redundancy; therefore, it doesn't  
6 matter. Because the City of Scottsdale, like other  
7 communities throughout our state, already has  
8 significance we are required to take into consideration.  
9 AURs are essentially maps we are using to supplement  
10 that, and that we also will take into consideration.  
11 But I find myself disagreeing quite strenuously with the  
12 comment there is something unique and special about  
13 Scottsdale. I really disagree with that.

14 Testimony I heard throughout the state  
15 consistently raised the point: This is my city, my  
16 county, in more rural areas of the state, and it is  
17 important to me.

18 I think every meeting that I went to had a  
19 good number of people who stood up and made that precise  
20 comment.

21 So if the sense of this is that we're  
22 going to give some greater weight to Scottsdale  
23 because -- as a unit, because we created an AUR for it,  
24 than we are to other units throughout state, I'd oppose  
25 the motion. If the sense is just a redundancy get on



1 with it, I'd be in favor of motion.

2 So what is the sense of the motion?

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, it seems to  
5 me, there is an issue to deal with here. We're looking  
6 at Scottsdale saying Scottsdale, like here, the land  
7 isn't the difference. It depends -- parts of Scottsdale  
8 are nothing are like Greyhawk, nothing affluent, south  
9 Scottsdale, in terms of socioeconomics, northern parts  
10 of Scottsdale, and yet they're still saying we're a  
11 community of interest.

12 One was to add to Tempe to make numbers  
13 work. People were saying don't do that, don't separate  
14 us. We're a community, we belong together.

15 I think that is important at least to  
16 recognize.

17 Obviously when we draw Legislative  
18 Districts, Scottsdale will not be one Legislative  
19 Districts. It can't be. There are too many people. We  
20 need to recognize what they're telling us and what the  
21 concerns are did.

22 We not not hear similar intensity from  
23 other communities, you know, that are too large for one  
24 Legislative District. We did hear this from some  
25 districts. Chandler said please keep us together. We

1 may be too large to keep us together. If we are, here's  
2 where we suggest you divide it.

3 We should recognize that. We need to  
4 recognize what Scottsdale is telling us.

5 Certainly it's a Legislative area  
6 regardless of what they are telling us about not being  
7 able to comply because there are too many.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork, get your  
9 comment, then I'd like to add to the discussion.

10 My perspective, what is important here, is  
11 the integrity of the process. The process, we asked  
12 people to identify, self-identify communities of  
13 interest. It appears to have been a groundswell of  
14 community, to be a community of interest, and,  
15 therefore, would translate into an AUR.

16 On that basis, that basis alone, not  
17 necessarily my perceiving significantly different areas  
18 around it, on that integrity, I'm prepared to vote for  
19 the motion.

20 Mr. Huntwork.

21 MR. HUNTWORK: I can't recall, is Tempe a  
22 community of interest?

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Already designated  
25 Tempe.

1                   Throughout the state, people have made the  
2 comment that keep us together despite the differences in  
3 the area, keep my political subdivision together.  
4 That's a common theme throughout the state. It's the  
5 recognition of it in some places and nonrecognition of  
6 it in others that is concerning me. I'm, too, concerned  
7 about the integrity of it in the process. If we've made  
8 Tempe an AUR already, we've made Yuma an AUR already,  
9 there's no inconsistency in making Scottsdale an AUR and  
10 we should simply have to weigh it appropriately as we  
11 work with these and draw our maps.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
13 motion? If not, all those in favor of the motion  
14 signify by saying "aye."

15                   (Vote taken.)

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

17                   (Vote taken)

18                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries four to  
19 one.

20                   Further comment on Dr. Heslop's  
21 presentation?

22                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, do  
23 either of you southern residents have comments on those?

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's consistent with what  
25 we heard on the motions.

1                   Is there a motion to accept those two?  
2                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll move.  
3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?  
4                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.  
5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?  
6                   Hearing none, those in favor say "aye."  
7                   (Vote taken.)  
8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."  
9                   Motion carries unanimously.  
10                  Does that conclude the presentation?  
11                  All right.  
12                  Other discussion on AURs adopted or  
13 presented at this point before we move on.  
14                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Just a question.  
15 Since those are new, do we have them on our software?  
16                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: We will.  
17                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It needs to be  
18 updated?  
19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes. It needs to be  
20 updated, since not official until this morning. We'll  
21 get those.  
22                  All right. Let's move on to the main  
23 event, the presentation by NDC, discussion and possible  
24 decisions concerning instructions to NDC on  
25 modifications of the grids for development of draft

1 Congressional and Legislative maps.

2 I'd ask the Commission to get to a vantage  
3 point where they can see it.

4 Dr. Heslop.

5 DR. HESLOP: Commissioners, thank you. I  
6 apologize for the disturbance. Chairman Lynn asked me,  
7 to in the interests of informing the public, to, in  
8 short, cover some of the features of the agenda, what is  
9 the Commission's schedule. And here it is.

10 As we understand it, August the 1st  
11 through October the 1st, here is the schedule of the  
12 Commission.

13 On August the 1st, we received the last of  
14 the citizen input forms, the last of the written  
15 communications, last of the citizen input from this  
16 stage of the public input process.

17 I have completed reading many of the CIFs  
18 from the last week. I got some new ones today,  
19 Mr. Chairman, and some additional letters and maps, and  
20 we will summarize them over the weekend.

21 By August 4 we will have completed what  
22 the Commission has been calling the rough map stage.

23 Between August the 4th and the 8th, the  
24 Commission moves into district development.

25 On August the 8th, with a map to adjust,

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
Phoenix, Arizona

1 maps to adjust, for Congress and the Legislature, the  
2 Commission goes into the adjustment stage.

3           And then between the 11th of August and  
4 the 15th of September, you have further opportunity for  
5 citizen comment and the second round of public hearings.

6           September 15th through 26 is the time when  
7 the plans are fine tuned, when we go down to that one  
8 person deviation, if that's what it is going to be. And  
9 then between September 26 and October 1st, there's a  
10 final report. And I do not have, on this schedule, of  
11 course, an item that concerns the attorneys, the  
12 submission for preclearance. So, Mr. Chairman, that's  
13 the schedule. And I know that the Commission has  
14 published it, but in the interests of information here  
15 to the public, I have gone through it for them.

16           If you could now move into --

17           COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
18 think there is something missing from that, as I  
19 understood the process. At the end when we issue what  
20 we believe is a final report, it's my understanding we  
21 keep the record open for a week to 10 days to receive  
22 additional public input on the final product.

23           CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know about the  
24 specific timing on openness, but I think that point was  
25 agreed upon by the Commission. Once we had adopted

1 final maps, there would be a period for final comment  
2 before we sent it to the Department of Justice, if you  
3 would.

4 Mr. Elder.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, the only  
6 concern I had is if NDC would be able to produce the  
7 maps in relation to the first two or three meeting days  
8 in enough lead time, that Mr. Johnson will be able to  
9 print and be able to Fed Ex to various locations. Last  
10 time as we went out there one of the comments we  
11 received consistently was get us the maps so we can  
12 review them and be able to comment on them at an  
13 informed or educated level at the hearing rather than  
14 seeing them at the hearing for the first time. We'll be  
15 getting real close, at the 11th to 15th --

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's a month --

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The eighth and  
18 eleveth, start the hearing.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: August 25th is the first  
20 hearing. That's a two-week period.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Citizen comment is  
22 the 15th --

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Of September.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sorry. Never mind.

25 DR. HESLOP: There's a lot of time.

1 I have distinct recollection the  
2 Commission did commit to a period when the public would  
3 review. That should be added to the schedule.

4 Let's go to the Power Point presentation.

5 The purpose of this presentation is to  
6 assist the Commission in making decisions on grid  
7 adjustment. I'm going to say some things the Commission  
8 perfectly well understands and has in mind. I say them  
9 because there is a public audience.

10 The heart of the Commission's process was  
11 the equal population grid. The Commission took it to 24  
12 different hearings in all parts of the state seeking the  
13 reactions of the public. The Commission got reactions,  
14 not only reaction not only in the way of hearings but  
15 also in the way of a large flow of citizen input flows,  
16 in terms of written comments from which we derived AURs.  
17 There were also citizen plans and plans for use by  
18 different organizations.

19 So the Commission is how in possession of  
20 a very substantial body of citizen input and  
21 information.

22 Let's go on.

23 We are ending what we referred to as the  
24 rough planning stage of the redistricting process. And  
25 I hope is isn't redundant just quickly to remind



1 ourselves of what that rough planning stage has been  
2 composed of.

3           It began on July 17th with very specific  
4 discussions by the Commission, discussion on the  
5 principles that should form the redistricting process.

6           At that meeting the Commission did adopt  
7 principles for it's conduct and for the development of  
8 maps. Also at that meeting the Commission asked NDC to  
9 proceed with the identification of three major  
10 communities. We'll be saying a lot about them.

11           Just a quick reminder. We're talking  
12 about the Native American community, the Hispanic  
13 community, and the rural and urban communities of the  
14 state.

15           On the 20th of July, NDC presented a  
16 report to the Commission. Our effort in that report was  
17 to provide basic planning information. We made some  
18 recommendations for our grid adjustment. We discussed  
19 controversies, grid-wide controversies, and others. We  
20 developed a checklist, because we felt there were  
21 controversies we felt Commissioners would want to think  
22 through how they should be resolved.

23           We provided analysis of the maps that we  
24 had received, basic information, because we had not at  
25 that point received the political information. Indeed,

1 we still have not received full political information.  
2 And we provided an update to July 17 of the citizen  
3 input.

4 As of Monday of next week, you'll receive  
5 a further input of citizen input.

6 So those were the first steps taken in  
7 rough planning.

8 Let's go on.

9 These are, I suppose, self-evident points.  
10 But I wish to make them anyway.

11 The Commission is responsible for  
12 decisions. Perhaps this sounds a little bit defensive.  
13 Maybe I wrote it after reading one of the CIFs from  
14 Scottsdale that said "Don't let the consultants anywhere  
15 near the maps." So I say this because NDC is not the  
16 map maker, map drawer here, the Commission is. I should  
17 comment, also, that the maps that you will receive from  
18 others are not your maps, either. The Commission is its  
19 own map maker.

20 The second obvious point, the decisions  
21 that you make here today, and I hope you make decisions  
22 today, are not final decisions. They are preliminary.  
23 They can be undone. They will in many cases be undone.  
24 I would be unhappy if you thought they were in any sense  
25 other than a preliminary sense lines. Because we can,

1 we can make changes.

2                   And the final bullet there, and it's a  
3 point that the Commission understands very well, there  
4 are principles that guide the Commission.

5                   Proposition 106 provides those principles,  
6 but -- and you have principles, also, that you,  
7 yourselves, have developed and principles, too, that  
8 come out of the public process to the Commission.

9                   Let's go on.

10                  So I would refer to this as a principle  
11 redistricting. And without belaboring the point, most  
12 of the redistrictings taken on in the country are not  
13 principled, they are guided by partied interested, they  
14 are guided by self-interests. And members of the NDC  
15 team and I like to be involved in a process that is  
16 guided by such principles.

17                  The principles you adopt are two key  
18 principles in redistricting. The principles are the  
19 community of interest principle. And, you found, as you  
20 went around the state, that citizens are capable of  
21 identifying their own communities, that they do  
22 perceive, as Commissioner Huntwork was saying, the place  
23 where they live is special, they don't have to be in  
24 Scottsdale to have that sense.

25                  Proposition 106 says to the extent

1 practicable you should be respecting communities of  
2 interest. That's what comes from 106.

3           Much the same is true from respecting  
4 jurisdictions. You see the close overlap between to  
5 those two principles.

6           I make the point also that the citizen  
7 testimony and comment is, itself, a principle.

8           The Commission time and time again, it's  
9 obvious in the discussion just had on AURs, was guided  
10 by citizen testimony and comment.

11           So forgive me for rehearsing these  
12 matters, but I think they are important.

13           Now, what I'm seeking to do in this Power  
14 Point, what I'll ask Doug Johnson, our senior mapping  
15 analyst, who has in front of him a little paper packet  
16 on the Power Point to provide them to the Commission.  
17 And you don't have to follow this Power Point to see, I  
18 think, where I'm headed.

19           I would like to go through the items that  
20 NDC is suggesting for your decision, requests for  
21 instruction, our recommendations. I would like to go  
22 through them and then, if it is your wish, I would like  
23 to come back and look at them one at a time and suggest  
24 to you, that, as a Commission, you may want to  
25 deliberate and decide these maps --

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop, for  
2                   edification, go through all of them, give us a sense of  
3                   what the task is under the item, reconvene on Friday,  
4                   hit them one at a time and give us a sense.

5                   DR. HESLOP: That's the wish.

6                   Here are the principles. No news here.  
7                   These are principles already adopted.

8                   We will recommend, later, that you give us  
9                   an instruction to adjust the grid to respect Native  
10                  American Tribal Reservations. You have a map of those  
11                  you know that the grid offends. We believe that the  
12                  grid should be adjusted.

13                  We think that there should be an  
14                  adjustment of the grid to respect the Hispanic AUR that  
15                  we have developed with you. We think that the grid  
16                  should be adjusted to respect that rural urban community  
17                  line to the extent we can. And we think that the grid  
18                  should be adjusted to minimize those city, county  
19                  divisions. We think that's especially important in the  
20                  rural areas of the state. So here are some issues in  
21                  terms of general principle for grid adjustment.

22                  Let's go on.

23                  This slide was intruded in my Power Point  
24                  last evening by Marguerite Leoni.

25                  MR. RIVERA: Troublemaker.

1 DR. HESLOP: I'm not sure what her motives  
2 were, maybe trying to make me remember she's not  
3 imperfect or maybe trying to remind me I'm not perfect,  
4 it's an imperfect world, we're all going to develop a  
5 not perfect map, a sure-fire map, but keeping that in  
6 mind as we develop requests for the map and ask for  
7 instruction.

8 Go on.

9 We think you should instruct us to develop  
10 a Northern Arizona Congressional and Legislative  
11 District.

12 You know the situation here. It is the  
13 problem of the Hopi-Navajo separation. We have some  
14 thoughts on that.

15 My suggestion is that on this issue and  
16 all the other issues that we make some preliminary  
17 comment, comment that refers back to the testimony, to  
18 remind you have some of the issues, and that you then  
19 discuss it and, if you can, or will, give us an  
20 instruction on how you wish to proceed.

21 So that's one tough item.

22 Next, please.

23 We think that you should instruct us to  
24 develop two CDs in that Hispanic community area and that  
25 you should tell us to enhance influence in other

1 Congressional areas to the extent practical.

2 We think, too, you should tell us to  
3 develop Legislative Districts in that same area.

4 And we think that you should tell us while  
5 we're about it to respect other communities of interest,  
6 these other minority communities of interest throughout  
7 the state.

8 I'll ask Marguerite Leoni when we come to  
9 that issue to suggest come of the basic issues you may  
10 wish to address in your discussion.

11 Let's go on.

12 You'll recognize, perhaps, a pattern here  
13 which requests for instruction relate in each case back  
14 to the principles that you have determined should guide  
15 the redistricting, one of them, of course, is the  
16 development of rural districts.

17 We think you should instruct us to develop  
18 one entirely rural Congressional District and another  
19 that comes into the urban area but does so as  
20 unintrusively as possible linking, perhaps, with those  
21 exurbs that still have a strong rural feel or sentiment  
22 as expressed in citizen testimony.

23 We think that you should tell us to do  
24 much the same with regard to the development of rural  
25 Legislative Districts.

1                   Let's go on.

2                   I know that Adams is an expert on the east  
3 valley. It's a big, troubling area. Some things came  
4 out very clearly from it. We think a Congressional  
5 District can come out from it that gives voice to their  
6 sense of community, that respects their boundaries. And  
7 these are, of course, city boundaries, and you should  
8 instruct us to develop such a district.

9                   We believe that east valley districts for  
10 the Legislature can be developed in much the same way.

11                   Let's go on.

12                   We heard a lot of testimony, and we will  
13 be fair to the different aspects of that testimony when  
14 we come to this issue, but we are hoping that you will  
15 instruct us to develop an Eastern Arizona Legislative  
16 District that includes the Navajo and Apache Counties,  
17 Gila, Graham, and Greenlee, and uniting tribal  
18 reservations, and you'll tell us to do that and adjust  
19 the grid.

20                   Here's Yuma, and we think that Yuma  
21 deserves a legislative district in terms of the  
22 testimony that we heard. And we hope that you would  
23 instruct us to develop such a legislative district.

24                   Go on.

25                   Yavapai is the same kind of issue.



1                   Again, there is a volume of testimony to  
2                   which this request can be related.

3                   Go on.

4                   We think a West Valley Legislative  
5                   District is also supported by testimony and that that it  
6                   can be drawn in such a way as to respect local  
7                   communities of interest.

8                   And we think that a Legislative District  
9                   can be centered on the River Communities AUR we  
10                  developed. We know there's controversy, but we think  
11                  such a district can be developed, and we hope you'll  
12                  give us instruction in that respect.

13                  So, Mr. Chairman, members of the  
14                  Commission, we pause there.

15                  The second part of the Power Point can be  
16                  done on paper rather than on Power Point. We can go  
17                  through each of the issues one by one.

18                  Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,  
19                  if it's your will, we'll treat them in the order we  
20                  presented them here, because that is an order that seems  
21                  to us to reflect the hierarchy of principles that you  
22                  have adopted. And we will be responsive, of course, to  
23                  any questions you have.

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent, Dr. Heslop,  
25                  visuals might be useful in the discussion. I wonder if

1 might reposition screen that direction so we might see  
2 it in that direction, so we can see it as we discuss  
3 them.

4 DR. HESLOP: Certainly.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any general questions for  
6 Dr. Heslop or other consultants before we go through the  
7 list as presented and deal with each of these items?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did have one  
9 question.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where you talked  
12 about an East Valley District, Congressional District, I  
13 wanted to make sure of the population. A Congressional  
14 District is 641,000. Six Legislative Districts, that's  
15 a large area, six Legislative Districts.

16 DR. HESLOP: There is population -- the  
17 population is indeed there.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or  
19 questions for Dr. Heslop?

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Let's get down  
21 to business.

22 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, you'll see in  
23 the second half of our presentation. We bring up these  
24 individual matters.

25 As a way of assisting the public, we are

1 going to show some maps as well. And these maps have,  
2 of course, already appeared in your binder. And you  
3 can, of course, check them on your Maptitude.

4 Mr. Chairman, I don't think I need to say  
5 very much about general principles.

6 We had considerable discussion of them.  
7 It would be my hope the Commission would instruct us to  
8 make all of these changes to the grid.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Should there not  
11 be additional an item five on here for other AURs to the  
12 extent they're not redundant with the first four? When  
13 were we going to consider the other AURs? Or are they  
14 at a later step, stage?

15 DR. HESLOP: I thought, to this point,  
16 being that we would use those AURs in the district  
17 development process in these other areas. But we would  
18 not at all be opposed to the adjustment of the grid,  
19 bring it into line with all the AURs.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the process, as we  
22 look at various issues, like the very first one, adjust  
23 the grid with respect to the Native American Tribal  
24 Reservations, can we overlay the grid as we have it now  
25 on the process of the screen so we see what adjustments

1 on the grid would be?

2 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, that is  
3 available in your binder.

4 Can you do that?

5 MR. HUTCHISON: I can do that.

6 What is the item in the binder for that  
7 overlay.

8 DR. ADAMS: Number six.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Number six.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. Maps and  
11 statistics for AURs.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One other question  
13 while he's finding that.

14 The checklist in your report to us,  
15 questions you posed, some of which are addressed by the  
16 Power Point but some are not.

17 DR. HESLOP: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we also going  
19 to have an opportunity to go through those, give you  
20 answers to those not addressed in the Power Point.

21 DR. HESLOP: I hope you'll do that. I'd  
22 be very interested in that.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Original grids we  
24 approved.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: Which grid?

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Congressional, now,  
2 so we can see when we're looking at approving what the  
3 ramifications are. These, Dr. Heslop, we have the grid,  
4 like isolated areas. I want to see the gestalt, what is  
5 it doing to the whole thing.

6                   DR. HESLOP: Like I commented in my  
7 report, this is not the grid's strongest suit.

8                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I've been through  
9 that.

10                  DR. HESLOP: With regard to the Tohono  
11 O'odham Nation in particular, the grid did not do well.

12                                So there is the --

13                  MR. HUTCHISON: Would you like me to go  
14 in?

15                                The Tohono O'odham Nation was split into  
16 three districts, Southern District, Pima County, this  
17 border, extends into Maricopa County, split this  
18 district, a noncontiguous portion in southeastern; San  
19 Carlos was split into three districts, northwest, not  
20 one -- southeastern, and the southern district. Gila  
21 River --

22                                Want me go through every Indian  
23 Reservation?

24                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: No. Going through  
25 discussions, the grid, for areas, where it's split,

1 jurisdictional, where it split the Native American  
2 Reservations, where it split AURs. I wanted it in  
3 background. Include the grid. Where adjusting things,  
4 if so, why so; if add to, take away, so we know what  
5 we're causing.

6 MR. HUTCHISON: See major revisions, the  
7 Navajo division, Fort Apache, Gila River split into two,  
8 and I believe Walapai split into two districts.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Havasupai --

10 MR. HUTCHISON: Kaibab is split.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kaibab.

12 MR. HUTCHISON: They are --

13 MR. HUTCHISON: Just to highlight, you  
14 have a Maptitude report in your binders that highlights  
15 divisions of tribal reservations by grid, which are  
16 split, what divisions, how many times.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. I'll try to  
18 keep on track so we know when we're finished with an  
19 item and ready to move on.

20 The question was raised by the initial  
21 restatement of the general principles we already  
22 essentially agreed to.

23 Any more comment on the question on that  
24 particular issue?

25 Mr. Huntwork.

1                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: My question about  
2 the other AURs really is when will we consider maps?

3                   I don't know, one of the points we  
4 discussed to some extent overlap and contradict each  
5 other. I don't know how you can really take it into  
6 consideration thoroughly without further input on how we  
7 want you to do that. When will we do that? Obviously  
8 it is our intention to take it into consideration.

9                   DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, my  
10 recommendation would be, if you let us, in the period  
11 between now and the eighth, to report to you on those  
12 AURs and on the impact of the development of different  
13 district configurations of AURs. Our intention would be  
14 to bring you a map on the 8th with a substantial set of  
15 notes on the implications of that map for AURs and  
16 alternative configurations of AURs that we must have in  
17 our mind for a map. And a rough general principle I've  
18 been thinking about as a map is developed and we seek  
19 those districts that respect best those AURs. But you  
20 will have not only a map but notations on alternatives  
21 that would respect AURs in different way or perhaps some  
22 cases better ways.

23                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think that's a  
24 good suggestion and how we ought to proceed.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, then,

1 can we reconfirm these, as a minimum, are directions to  
2 consultants to proceed in adjusting the grid using  
3 principles reflected in one through four?

4 Then let's move on.

5 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we will move  
6 on.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No, Chris, let's move on.

8 MR. HUTCHISON: I'm moving as fast as the  
9 Power Point will allow.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kidding. A little grief.

11 DR. HESLOP: If there is more troubling  
12 controversy in your binder, I don't know it if there is,  
13 partly pause it speaks directly to the Commission's  
14 major principle of community, partly also because it  
15 addresses a crucial voting rights concern.

16 We believe that the Commission should  
17 instruct us with regard to the development of the  
18 Northern California District -- Northern Arizona.

19 MR. RIVERA: We can give instructions on  
20 that, also.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: We can get them more  
22 messed up than they already are.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just sink it.

24 DR. HESLOP: I got it. It won't happen  
25 again, if I can help it.



1 DR. HESLOP: -- Northern Arizona District  
2 and the issue of the Hopi and Navajo.

3 Maybe we could look at that in graphic  
4 terms.

5 In order to give our perspective on this  
6 issue, let me just say that we have carefully read the  
7 testimony and the written comments. There aren't a  
8 great many CIFs on this issue, but there are important  
9 written comments. And it is clear there are both pros  
10 and cons on this issue of separation.

11 Paragraph to us it seems that the pros for  
12 separation involve first and primarily the fact that  
13 this community perceives itself to be very different  
14 from the surrounding community, and they are able to  
15 define themselves very precisely as a community in  
16 cultural, social, economic, and spiritual terms. They  
17 think of themselves as a particular and different  
18 community. And I begin there with the pros.

19 There are also clear interest differences.  
20 Why are we interested, why is the Commission using  
21 community? The issue of representation has to do with  
22 the issues represented and whether or not the  
23 representative will speak with a clear voice to the  
24 concerns of the community. And here, too, the Hopi,  
25 Navajo have their differences.

1                   At a Federal level, issue differences seem  
2 to be different.

3                   The third point for difference, Congress  
4 themselves and federal courts have given recognition for  
5 recognition of a separate identity. Indeed, speaking of  
6 courts, the Hopi have made claim with regard to  
7 retrogression.

8                   In all of these ways, a case has been made  
9 by the Hopi for separation. But there is a case against  
10 separation, too.

11                   The Navajo is the larger community. The  
12 Hopi is a very small community. The map design, if the  
13 Commission wishes, and indeed has the instruction from  
14 106 to develop compact districts, this is not a compact  
15 district. This map that would separate the Hopi.

16                   There is a Native American voice in  
17 Arizona. And the Native American voice has spoken in  
18 your testimony and in written comments about the  
19 importance of uniting Arizona Native American tribes.

20                   And then, finally, there is a voting  
21 rights case on the other side that to create a Hopi  
22 District could have negative effects on the Native  
23 American population in the Navajo prescribed districts.

24                   So here's an issue where there are real  
25 questions on both sides.

1                   It also has to be said that there is both  
2 a Legislative question and a Congressional question.

3                   Indeed, the Native American testimony is  
4 somewhat divided on the Legislative issue, as it is also  
5 on the Congressional issue.

6                   So, Mr. Chairman, I recognize the  
7 troubling character of this issue. But the  
8 Commissioners should also recognize that this is a very  
9 important starting point for any plan and that these are  
10 very different approaches that could have ramifying  
11 effects throughout the plan.

12                   So we would hope, Mr. Chairman, to receive  
13 instruction on it.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think before we enter  
15 into that discussion, any instruction given to the  
16 consultants today is instruction up to a point. We  
17 should be clear instruction given today is, too, in  
18 effect, test the ramifications of that instruction when  
19 you return to us with maps having followed instructions  
20 given today. Those maps may have created problems  
21 greater than those following instruction given to you.  
22 We'd have the opportunity to change instructions.

23                   DR. HESLOP: You stated that exactly as I  
24 commented to Commissioner Huntwork.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: What I'd like to do on

1 each of these, so as to control debate, what I'd like to  
2 do is entertain an affirmative motion on each of these,  
3 entertain discussion on each of the motions.

4 If someone is prepared, I'd entertain a  
5 motion for instruction with respect to Northern Arizona  
6 Congressional and Legislative Districts. I'd like to  
7 hear it.

8 DR. HESLOP: If I could have the  
9 indulgence of the Chair just a moment, the map we put up  
10 is, of course, not the only way of dividing the Hopi  
11 from the Navajo. We used it only to indicate the sort  
12 of separation that could occur.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's an excellent point.  
14 We're not at this moment giving you instruction either  
15 way to suggest we favor one of the two representations  
16 we've seen.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I  
18 have a suggestion. I think we're dealing with to  
19 separate issues here. We're dealing with Congressional  
20 Districts and we're dealing with Legislative Districts.  
21 I think rather than one motion, we should deal with them  
22 separately.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm happy to take them  
24 separately.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

2                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I have spent, had  
3 three separate meetings with the Navajo Nation, three  
4 separate meetings with Hopi representatives, and  
5 certainly Mr. Heslop has not understated the  
6 unreconcilable differences, if you will. And so there's  
7 no question that this is a very challenging issue.

8                   Therefore, it is my opinion at this point  
9 that we attempt to try and maintain on a Congressional  
10 level the separateness of these two entities.

11                   Therefore, I make a motion we instruct our  
12 consultants to draw a northeastern rural Congressional  
13 District with an attempt -- with an effort to separate  
14 the Hopis from the Navajos.

15                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I might, Mr. Hall, I  
16 take it your motion has -- actually deals with more than  
17 one of the recommendations the consultants are asking  
18 for. If we might just deal with a Congressional  
19 District with respect to the Hopi and Navajo,  
20 specifically. In terms of the rural characteristic,  
21 that's another issue we'll get to in a moment.

22                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Northeast or --

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Northeast or somewhere  
24 else?

25                   Ask you take "rural" out of there. That's

1 a different factor. We'd like to deal with rural versus  
2 urban separately. That's a separate issue to be dealt  
3 with differently in terms of -- there's some  
4 overlapping.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm just saying, to go  
6 back to the previous screen, the three major areas,  
7 adjusting the screen, rural Native American, rural  
8 versus urban, utilize the three, in that respect they  
9 do. There's Native Americans there. That's why I  
10 included the word rural in there.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you want to keep it in  
12 there.

13 Is there a second to the motion?

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's been moved and  
16 seconded.

17 Discussion on the motion?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: At the  
19 Congressional level, I'm in favor of the motion. I  
20 think there are solid reasons for putting the two  
21 populations in separate districts. I would like to  
22 suggest, however, removing that "rural" characteristic.  
23 I think it might add an additional layer which might be  
24 limiting to the consultants when they are trying to do  
25 what we've asked them to do. Later we'll tell them to

1 recognize rural interests, ask them to recognize rural  
2 interests. I wouldn't want them to mixup that up.  
3 Therefore, I'd ask, propose amending the motion to  
4 remove the section referencing rural sections.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There is an amendment to  
6 the motion. Is there a second to the amendment?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll agree to accept  
8 the amendment, pull that out, if that's okay,  
9 instructing the consultants to create a northeastern  
10 district that would keep the Hopis separate, Navajos  
11 separate from the Hopis.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
16 believe that the Hopis are unique and vulnerable and  
17 that we should make every effort, to the extent that we  
18 can, to provide them with the tools they feel they need.  
19 They made it very clear what they feel they need to  
20 insure their continued survival. That's really the way  
21 in which the Hopis have expressed this issue. I am  
22 concerned, however, about making this decision in a  
23 vacuum.

24 The -- I don't know that there is any  
25 single issue in this state that in and of itself drives

1 the entire layout of how these Congressional Districts  
2 get laid out. I think this is a critically important  
3 issue. I want to say, therefore, I think the separation  
4 of Northern Arizona between an Eastern District and  
5 Western District makes sense for other reasons as well.  
6 And I, just in supporting the motion, I want to make it  
7 clear that we have other important factors involved,  
8 too, in dividing in this manner.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.  
10 Mr. Elder.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.  
12 One of the things that concerns me, I want to make sure  
13 we keep categories separate if all possible. This will  
14 have effect on four, five, six other decisions along the  
15 line, if combining issues, rural to urban, whether it be  
16 social, economic, or something else, whatever.

17 I'd like to keep issues, categories, as  
18 clean as possible, so we don't set a precedence in  
19 effect here in the way we do it, then come down the line  
20 and do something totally different and there's not a  
21 really traceable process we went through to arrive at  
22 the process.

23 I agree with the removal of the rural  
24 aspect to keep it as clean as possible, do it from  
25 there.



1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

2                   Other comments on the motion?

3                   I'd like to weigh in on this one.

4                   I think Dr. Heslop characterizes this one  
5 correctly when he says this is probably the most  
6 difficult, at least the most overtly difficult decision  
7 we need to make in a preliminary instruction to the  
8 consultants.

9                   There are two principles that weigh very  
10 heavily on me in making this decision. Again, it's not  
11 irrevocable to the extent we need to proceed down one of  
12 these paths.

13                   It's clear to me if you vote in favor of  
14 separating the two tribes that you run the risk of  
15 violating the compact and contiguous nature of the kind  
16 of redistricting that we are trying to achieve. And  
17 that's troublesome. But on this issue, it's less  
18 troublesome than what appears to be a clear separation  
19 of communities of interest between these two tribes,  
20 particularly. And I don't believe it exists, at least  
21 to this degree, and it may not exist to much of a degree  
22 in any other part of the state. Here it is very clear  
23 those two communities do not share the same interests  
24 from the same point of view. To have them  
25 Congressionally represent by the same individual would

1 make it virtually impossible to have those two interests  
2 represented fairly, in my opinion.

3 I'm in favor of the motion. I'll support  
4 the motion, again, with the reservation I'd like to see  
5 what it does to the rest of the grid adjustment as we  
6 move forward.

7 In principle, I'm in favor of keeping the  
8 two tribes separate in grid support.

9 Any further discussion?

10 If not, all in favor, signify by saying  
11 "aye."

12 (Vote taken.)

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye.)

14 Motion carries.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Another motion, and  
16 I may need help from my esteemed legal colleague in  
17 terms of Legislative Districts.

18 In terms of a Congressional District, it  
19 was important to do what we did. For a Legislative  
20 District, the Hopis and Navajos see themselves as  
21 separate communities of interest. To the extent  
22 possible, I would like to accommodate them. However, I  
23 do not believe that the issues are as critical at the  
24 Legislative level as they are at the Congressional  
25 level. Most of the differences that they have are

1 issues that their representatives in Congress deal with  
2 rather than the Legislature.

3           The major differences in representing in  
4 the Legislature, Indian gaming, these two communities  
5 are in agreement.

6           I need help designing a motion that  
7 basically says: Do it if you can, but don't -- you  
8 know, don't have it create a noncontiguous, noncompact  
9 mess up in Northern Arizona.

10           CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you'll define it, we're  
11 pretty close.

12           COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Separate Hopi and  
13 Navajos.

14           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Respect Legislative  
15 Districts -- you are making motion that the attempt  
16 should be made to keep them separate Legislatively  
17 unless doing so would create a problem with other  
18 mapping in that area?

19           COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Exactly.

20           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second to that  
21 motion?

22           COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second it for  
23 purposes of discussion.

24           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

25           It's been moved and seconded.

1                   Mr. Hall?

2                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you. An  
3 attorney in Northeastern Arizona submitted an  
4 interesting proposal. Here's a proposal to the solution  
5 of Ms. Minkoff's motion. Again, I'm not sure any of us  
6 had a chance to analyze it or what the ramifications  
7 are.

8                   If you notice, the Hopis are there to the  
9 north. Legislatively, the corridor comes due south and  
10 connects it, among other issues, connects it with  
11 another district.

12                  Having some level of familiarity with this  
13 area of the state, there are some strengths and  
14 weaknesses with this proposal. It merits some  
15 consideration.

16                  Some strengths are in addition to Hopi  
17 lands, and Moencopi off to the west, looks like the  
18 little head on the bird, also the Hopis have made  
19 subsequent acquisitions, my understanding is at least  
20 five additional ranches. Most all of those ranches are  
21 located to the south within the brown portion indicated  
22 on this map. Four of those are around Winslow,  
23 Flagstaff, and one is located in Eager, the 26 Bar John  
24 Wayne Ranch, up in my stomping grounds.

25                  One of the things this proposal is

1     Legislatively, it includes all lands owned by the Hopis.

2                     Now, my understanding is four of the five  
3     ranches are in the application process, four further to  
4     the north; it's my understanding they've not submitted  
5     the 26 Bar further to the north.

6                     The Hopis made it clear to me as I met  
7     with the Chairman that on occasion there have been some  
8     divergent issues on a state level. One of the very  
9     critical issues affecting the Native Americans now, and  
10    Mr. Rivera could enlighten us, is health care. And  
11    because of those health care issues, there is, I guess,  
12    in some of the proposals made for support from the State  
13    Legislature, that there has been some efforts,  
14    inclusions / exclusions, depending on ones perspective.  
15    Therefore, gaming is not the only issue. There are  
16    other issues with respect to infrastructure, et cetera.

17                    So I think that that is an idea for the  
18    Commission to consider. And this is an idea for maybe  
19    NDC to pursue if it's the wishes for this Commission to  
20    vote in favor of the motion as indicated by Ms. Minkoff.

21                    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

22                    Other comments on the motion?

23                    Mr. Huntwork?

24                    COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Because of the --  
25    just the shape of the Hopi area, it is -- and the fact

1 that it is substantially surrounded by Navajo  
2 Reservation, creating the separation by definition will  
3 deviate from the compactness and contiguity standards.  
4 And it's that which concerns by about the motion. It's  
5 inherently what concerns me.

6 If it's that we'll tolerate that but not  
7 have it if it doesn't create good districts throughout  
8 the rest of Northern Arizona, the instruction should  
9 explicitly recognize we intend to do that, that we're  
10 going to authorize that in this case.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I take it it's a sense of  
12 Ms. Minkoff's motion we'll do that so long as it does  
13 not impair the ability to draw other districts in the  
14 rest of the state, that that was the spirit of the  
15 motion that was made.

16 Mr. Hall?

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Something else I  
18 thought of, Mr. Chairman, look at the map, other flat  
19 spots with respect to it, that's a whole other issue,  
20 but -- another idea of the strength of this particular  
21 idea, Hopis would also be included with the San Carlos  
22 and White Mountain Apache Tribe for an increased level  
23 of Native American influence in that southern looking  
24 district.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

1 Mr. Huntwork.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
3 had the impression the Hopi felt comfortable looking  
4 west instead of south. In this motion, I don't want to  
5 include a decision about which direction --

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It doesn't. This map is  
7 not included in that part of the motion. It's simply  
8 one of the ways it might be accomplished.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Exactly.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop included a  
11 western approach --

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Hopi said they  
13 like it identical to the way it is. Probably not have.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Except the current  
15 district, the entire reservation isn't in one district,  
16 just a small portion of it.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
19 motion?

20 If not, the motion, again, is to, for the  
21 purposes of the legislative districting in Northeastern  
22 Arizona, that to the extent practicable, without  
23 negative impact on other legislative districting  
24 efforts, the Navajo and Hopi should be separated.

25 All those in favor of the motion signify

1 by saying "aye."

2 (Vote taken.)

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

4 Motion carries five to zero.

5 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, the next  
6 request for instruction relates to the Hispanic AUR.

7 I'd ask Marguerite Leoni who is a post  
8 student of this issue to comment on it.

9 While she's coming to the podium, let me  
10 say one of the very few advantages of the issue you were  
11 just discussing is that the numbers involved are very  
12 low.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Unlike the issue  
14 we're about to discuss.

15 MS. LEONI: Good morning, Commissions.

16 Dr. Heslop has asked me to address the  
17 issue of the development of the Hispanic community  
18 districts. And there are two significant bits of  
19 evidence that recommend this approach to your rough  
20 draft of a plan. The first of significance has nothing  
21 to do with your testimony but has a legal status. And  
22 it has to do simply with geographic residential  
23 patterns.

24 And could you bring that up, Chris.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: Could we dim.



1 MS. LEONI: Could we dim the lights just a  
2 bit.

3 This is not a situation in Arizona where  
4 we have to guess where there are high concentrations.  
5 We do not need tentacles or leaps and bounds to find  
6 minorities. By shading the Census map according to  
7 densities, you'll find they are located primarily in  
8 South Phoenix, Tolleson, the Avondale area.

9 Help this along by simply placing the  
10 Census AUR over it, Chris.

11 Warm colors, high density, pink, yellow,  
12 and green.

13 Without an iota of testimony, this  
14 residential pattern can have significance from a legal  
15 point view under Section Two analysis. Now, it's not  
16 the only factor, but it is one of much significant.

17 Now, obviously, this area doesn't  
18 represent a Legislative or Congressional District. And  
19 there are little pieces that the Commission is going to  
20 want to address, maybe large pieces.

21 For example, we have the Guadalupe  
22 appendage off to the east which appears to have at least  
23 a natural color affinity with geographic patterns here.  
24 But the nice thing about this approach is that your  
25 decisions in this respect are supported not only by

1 geographic residential patterns but by testimony. You  
2 had a cohesive group of minority representatives. Some  
3 at a community level tell you in explicit terms about  
4 why this group deserves recognition on a basis of then  
5 where they simply live, testimony having to do with  
6 culture, language issues, socioeconomic status,  
7 educational, concerns of unique concern to people of  
8 this residence.

9                   On that testimony we developed, in your  
10 binder, uncanny but natural reflections how that  
11 testimony coincides with geographic patterns.

12                   Our request, our recommendation, our  
13 request for instruction from you is this be one of the  
14 prime areas of the state where you consider creation of  
15 minority opportunity and minority influence districts.

16                   There are going to be adjustments to be  
17 made. We don't have perfect population here. There are  
18 other areas of population that are not adjacent but are  
19 close. And decisions are going to be made, need to be  
20 made by you. But we would like the general instruction  
21 to proceed, instruction to create general Congressional  
22 and Legislative Districts. There will be the need for  
23 obvious finetuning further on in the process, but the  
24 general location of districts isn't going to change.

25                   There is another sensitive area of state.

1 Chris, if we can look at that.

2 This one is a little more difficult to see  
3 because of the combined minority character of the  
4 southern part of the state. We do have warm areas,  
5 Hispanic areas highlighted. Those, Chris, residential  
6 AURs. This, again, is in your book, the South Phoenix,  
7 Tolleson, Avondale, Guadalupe area, to see the  
8 relationship.

9 We also gathered in this general AUR other  
10 rich concentrations of Hispanic community. And these  
11 are -- these concentrations are aided by the  
12 significance of -- by the presence of significance  
13 Native American concentrations which we believe, and  
14 we're studying this now, will reflect a strong community  
15 of interest on many issues with the Hispanic community.  
16 And these are, of course, the Tohono O'odhom  
17 Reservation --

18 Chris, do you have that?

19 -- Pascua Yaqui.

20 One option in this particular AUR,  
21 extension of this AUR into other tribal lands that are  
22 to the north between Phoenix and perhaps even in the  
23 Maricopa area, and bring them down into here.

24 Once again, we believe this is an area  
25 where a Congressional District is appropriate.

1                   We think creation of that Congressional  
2 District naturally locates for you the minority  
3 concentration on the legislative side.

4                   The number of districts, I think it is,  
5 from looking at numbers, you have numbers in the binder,  
6 we're looking at two, I believe, substantial total  
7 minority Hispanic Congressional Districts.

8                   The number of Legislative, at this point,  
9 I think is somewhat fluid, but we're certainly in the  
10 number of eight, at a minimum. And the actual number  
11 will depend on a number of other considerations that the  
12 Commission has to make.

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Leoni.

14                   May we then have affirmative motion with  
15 respect to this instruction on this portion of grid  
16 development?

17                   Mr. Huntwork.

18                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I so move.

19                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: May I take it from the  
20 motion we're talking both for the entire block, that is  
21 to say --

22                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I move all of the  
23 words on the screen.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Both Congressional and  
25 Legislative.

1 Is there a second?

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Question. When you  
5 talk about the two Congressional Districts, is it  
6 understood by this motion we are really talking about  
7 one centered in Maricopa County and one centered in the  
8 center part of the state?

9 MS. LEONI: Well, that's for you to tell  
10 me, Commissioner Minkoff. I'll tell you that's what I'm  
11 understanding. That's what I'm understanding from the  
12 residential patterns.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that's what the  
15 testimony and Census data suggests that's the location,  
16 in general terms.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we do it, we'll  
18 not find enough people anyplace else.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Anyway, Chris, put up  
21 again the original grid on each one of those options as  
22 well as maybe a couple of towns so we see the context of  
23 these, especially the southern areas, the Arizona grid,  
24 where the Southern Arizona AUR is.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: Grid, AUR, red is the AUR,

1 and cities over it?

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. As well as  
3 Indian, Native American, Tohono O'odhom?

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: We've seen three  
5 AURs, four AURs, not one geographical reference. Unless  
6 you have some good idea what the pattern of roadways  
7 are, you're lost. I have no idea what the pattern of  
8 roadways in Phoenix are.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: What do you call --

10 MR. HUTCHISON: Hispanic AURs.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: South Mountain in  
12 there, a geologic form, river, anything that tells us  
13 where those are.

14 MR. HUTCHISON: A lot of other AURs relate  
15 to South Mountain. Isaac School District is an AUR, is  
16 included in a general area, all wholly included.

17 MS. LEONI: If you'd pull up, it's easy to  
18 develop the geographic features.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: While Chris is doing that,  
20 Mr. Huntwork, do you have a question?

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd like to ask  
22 what is the percentage of Hispanic population in those  
23 two AURs, the wording we're about to approve, the  
24 reference to maximizing the effective remaining  
25 population in the other districts, how many people are

1 we talking about?

2 MS. LEONI: Could you give me a moment,  
3 Mr. Huntwork, give me a moment to calculate that for  
4 you?

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: While they're doing  
6 that, what I'd like to see, when we end up doing these,  
7 adjust the grid, we've not seen grid, I'd like to see  
8 the grid every time we have an AUR.

9 The red line is the proposed Hispanic AUR.  
10 And the X lines --

11 MR. HUTCHISON: Hatched lines are Indian  
12 Reservation.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The grid is the  
14 colored in area underneath everything, I see.

15 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Elder, those  
16 grid AURs are covered in the binder.

17 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, I'll  
18 use numbers to keep it simpler. There are 1,295,000  
19 persons of Hispanic origin in the state. These two AURs  
20 include 716,000, so close to 55 percent.

21 What we're looking at maximizing are other  
22 majorities, not -- other than American Indian, Native  
23 American, not large populations of other minorities,  
24 either Asian or African American. However, in  
25 combination, often communities have similar interests.

1 So we're looking not only at Hispanic, also combined  
2 minority concentrations.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Could you just  
4 also tell me how many Hispanic voters are in each of the  
5 two, separately as well.

6 MS. LEONI: Voters -- voting age or  
7 voters?

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No. Residents,  
9 total population. Total Hispanic population in each.

10 MS. LEONI: What page -- Doug, give us  
11 those numbers.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's in the binder.

13 DR. ADAMS: Red numbered six, in the  
14 binder, very first of the two AURs have the statistics  
15 right behind.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you. The  
17 numbers down here in red.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Hispanic persons in each  
19 of the enclosed areas.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can't see it.

21 MR. HUTCHISON: 416,437, 299,395.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: AURs agreed to  
23 earlier on, the Summit, and the Green Valley, and the  
24 Sahuarita, those get taken into account in how this  
25 balances, works as we do the process, that would work,



1 trying to get reference. The highway that runs from  
2 Yuma, red dots, is that Gila Bend, and where that  
3 freeway runs?

4 MR. HUTCHISON: I can throw in  
5 interstates.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. That works.  
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional questions on  
9 the motion or additional comments on the motion?

10 If not, all those in favor of the motion,  
11 essentially everything in the block that the consultants  
12 are asking for direction on, signify by saying "aye."

13 (Vote taken.)

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed say "no."

15 It's accepted unanimously and that  
16 direction is given.

17 Dr. Heslop.

18 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
19 Commission, rural Arizona, urban Arizona, I believe if  
20 one counted the number of references in CIFs to the  
21 importance of distinguishing rural Arizona from urban  
22 Arizona, they would probably exceed in numbers  
23 references to any other single subject.

24 Earlier I made the mistake to referring to  
25 Northern California. I know a lot about Northern

1 California, and I know you would not get that kind of  
2 response from California. I was surprised by it when we  
3 went through the evidence for Arizona.

4           It is testimony that comes not only from  
5 the rural area but also from the urban area, much more  
6 of it from the urban area than rural area. But urban  
7 residents, too, want separate representation.

8           Underlying this drive for separate  
9 representation is an understanding, a common sense  
10 understanding, that rural areas of the state have  
11 different needs from those of the urban areas of the  
12 state.

13           The emphasis that we've seen throughout  
14 the community suggests that rural communities have their  
15 own special needs and require their own special  
16 representation, to a degree, not the same degree, but to  
17 a degree you find rural residents expressing that same  
18 position.

19           Now, the Commission is already committed  
20 to the principle of exploration of rural and urban  
21 division.

22           We now recommend and request instruction  
23 to develop two primarily rural Congressional Districts.  
24 One we believe can be kept out of the rural areas.

25           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Urban.

1 DR. HESLOP: Excuse me, out of urban  
2 areas. The other cannot. This brings us into touch  
3 with one of the gray areas of this rural, the other  
4 areas, places beyond the suburban belt, places that  
5 integrate out of the urban belt that go to the rural  
6 belt, see themselves as rural, where people go to escape  
7 to the rural and all too quickly find others following  
8 them down the freeway with this intrusion. The second  
9 rural CD you should make, in our opinion, would be to  
10 embrace such communities to the extent possible. We  
11 don't know to what extent it is possible, but we would  
12 certainly explore it. That, it seems to us, to be a  
13 general principle you could admonish us to adhere.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative  
15 motion with respect to this recommendation?

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

20 Ms. Minkoff?

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a concern  
22 about the rural district that is going to have some  
23 intrusion into urban areas, because I'm concerned about  
24 what those urban areas might be. Our grid used Bell  
25 Road as the dividing line. We've seen a lot of draft

1 plans using Bell Road as a dividing line.

2                   If we truly want to keep a district that  
3 has significant rural influence, I'm concerned about  
4 that, because that is the fastest growing part of the  
5 greater Phoenix urban area. And if that is put in a  
6 district that is to be primarily rural in character, it  
7 won't stay that way for long. Far before the 2010  
8 Census, that will be an urban area. That's exploding.

9                   It doesn't have to be part of the motion.  
10 If you are going to do this, I'd encourage you look for  
11 another part of a rural urban area.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: We also had discussion of  
13 one AUR, one rural urban, in Southwestern Tucson.  
14 Instead of one intruding on Northern Phoenix, there may  
15 be some support for what we had previously done.

16                   Any further discussion on the motion?

17                   Mr. Huntwork?

18                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, it  
19 seems to me, especially with the initial decision which  
20 creates districts in Northern Arizona that divides east  
21 and west, that we may not -- this may be inconsistent in  
22 several ways. The idea of having one rural district  
23 that is purely rural and the other that can intrude, I'm  
24 not sure why we want to adopt that principle in such a  
25 pure way. Why not have two that are allowed to intrude

1 both to the minimum extent possible balanced that way  
2 with the result being two districts more rural than one  
3 purely rural and one purely urban? It gives  
4 flexibility, also gives flexibility, giving some exurbs  
5 in the west as well as exurbs in the east as well as  
6 creates districts. Thought this may be overly  
7 inflexible as currently stated.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: As indicated in  
10 abundant testimony referenced by Dr. Heslop, that's not  
11 what the rural community wants. Currently the  
12 population stage justifies almost completely rural  
13 districts.

14 I think in light of the wishes of every  
15 single city I attended in rural Arizona, from Flag to  
16 Prescott to wherever, to Safford, Thatcher, they all  
17 said: We want to be separate from the great state of  
18 Maricopa, if you will.

19 So in an effort to -- my opinion is in an  
20 effort to comply with and grant the wishes of what the  
21 public very clearly, most clearly, said, this is the  
22 issue that was most abundantly clear, what I read, of  
23 any issue we have, therefore, I think that we have a  
24 mandate, if you will, from the public with respect to  
25 this issue.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

2                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't think  
3 there's disagreement or inconsistency with these two  
4 opinions.

5                   Basically, what I think we're directing  
6 you to do is to concentrate rural populations into  
7 Congressional Districts. Since there isn't enough rural  
8 population in the state to create two full Congressional  
9 Districts, you'll have to put some urban areas into it.

10                  I agree with Commissioner Huntwork. I  
11 think what we're saying is yes, there will have to be an  
12 urban component to the two rural districts. There  
13 aren't enough people to do it otherwise. We don't want  
14 to tie your hands in terms of how you distribute this  
15 urban or suburban component, whether you put it all in  
16 one Congressional District or whether you distribute it  
17 evenly or unevenly between the two. I think you may  
18 need that flexibility. And that's why I would support  
19 Mr. Huntwork's proposal.

20                  We are still going to end up with two  
21 rural congressional districts. Somewhere there will  
22 have to be an urban component. I'd like to allow you to  
23 remain flexible where you put that urban component.

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

25                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to

1 assure Commissioner Hall and everyone else I heard that  
2 same testimony. I understand this -- I feel we have a  
3 mandate to create essentially two rural districts.

4           If I'm not mistaken, something like 20  
5 percent of the population was in -- is outside the  
6 Phoenix and Tucson metropolitan areas. That's certainly  
7 one complete district and the majority of another.

8           Strategically, how do we best implement  
9 the mandate we received? I did not hear any one person  
10 testify I want one entirely rural district and then you  
11 can sacrifice the other district. I heard people say we  
12 want to separate rural from urban as much as possible.  
13 I think the more flexibility to consultants gives the  
14 more opportunity to do exactly that.

15           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
16 motion?

17           For my part, I think the way this is  
18 worded to me reflects not only what we heard in  
19 testimony but the reality of the circumstances you are  
20 talking about. What I mean by that, there isn't  
21 sufficient population for two purely rural districts;  
22 but there is clear sentiment around the state for one  
23 that is purely rural. And to that extent, and to the  
24 extent we've heard that testimony, I think for me the  
25 way this particular instruction is worded seems to be

1 appropriate. I would support it the way it is.

2 Mr. Huntwork?

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
4 am -- I have tried to be -- to read the testimony and  
5 understand what it said. I don't remember a single  
6 comment that was that specific.

7 I do not remember any person standing up  
8 and saying: I want one entirely rural district. If you  
9 are aware of any such testimony, I would stand  
10 corrected.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I am aware of such  
12 testimony. In fact, we have map submitted by Mr. Platt.  
13 He submits two entirely rural districts, not one, two  
14 completely outside rural districts, not only testimony,  
15 maps generated by that testimony. So that's one of  
16 several. It can't be --

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Not completely  
18 rural.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we did --

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: He did.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we did hear in a  
22 variety of locations: When you district this part of  
23 the state, please do not include us with Maricopa  
24 county. That we heard over and over again. And it is  
25 clear that if we're talking about the northern half of



1 the state, if there's to be a rural district, really  
2 rural, and we comply with that kind of input, it would  
3 not include Maricopa County in it. This instruction is  
4 based on what we've done to date, cumulative  
5 instructions we've given. I'm comfortable with and I  
6 see great congruity between an encroachment district, if  
7 I can use that term, being in the southern part of the  
8 state, which allows the other part of the district to be  
9 more pure. I'm comfortable with that.

10 Ms. Minkoff.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One of the things  
12 I've learned since I've gotten involved with this  
13 districting that absolutely astounded me is that Arizona  
14 is one of most urban states in the country. Having  
15 driven through Northern Arizona, it doesn't look very  
16 urban. Population tends to be concentrated in Phoenix  
17 Tucson areas. Statistics I saw, it's not 80 percent of  
18 Arizona, more like five-sixths of the population is  
19 either very, very close to Phoenix or the Tucson  
20 metropolitan area. If that's correct, we have something  
21 less than a million people living in rural areas, around  
22 other communities, or around the state.

23 My concern with that proposal, what we'll  
24 end up with is one rural Congressional District and one  
25 temporarily rural Congressional District that will soon

1 become an urban Congressional District dominated by  
2 urban areas.

3 I'm not sure that's what we were hearing.  
4 I think that's a misinterpretation of the testimony. I  
5 think there's enough testimony out there to say we want  
6 more than one rural district. I don't think this will  
7 achieve it, at least in the long term.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

9 Mr. Elder.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I think  
11 70 percent of my hearings, they were in rural areas.  
12 And there wasn't equivocation on the feeling and the  
13 statements and the presentations in those hearings that  
14 said anything except rural. We did get the exact quote,  
15 "the state of Maricopa." Many times they did include  
16 Maricopa and Pima County.

17 We did get extremely strong bias out of  
18 Maricopa county. "We do not want to be attached to them  
19 in any shape or form," that adamant, that type of feel,  
20 pervasive over meetings, river communities, southeastern  
21 to central.

22 We did not hear -- I believe we did not  
23 hear anybody come up and say: Gosh, it would be nice to  
24 be part of Maricopa County.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

1                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
2 heard a few negatives about Pima County, too.

3                   I heard the same thing. I'm not at all  
4 disputing the arguments about rural versus urban.  
5 Again, the question is how to best implement that. Pure  
6 and simply, how do we best implement?

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

8                   COMMISSIONER HALL: The map best states  
9 that. People in audience probably want to make the 1:00  
10 o'clock Diamondbacks Game, therefore, Mr. Chairman, I  
11 say call the question.

12                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I gave up my  
13 tickets for the Diamondbacks this afternoon.

14                  MR. RIVERA: Me, too.

15                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Jose, we don't need to  
16 hear about your cross. It's not relevant.

17                  The question has been called.

18                  All those in favor of the motion, signify  
19 by saying aye.

20                  (Vote taken.)

21                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

22                  Opposed "no"?

23                  (Vote taken.)

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries four to  
25 one.

1                   It would be appropriate at this point,  
2 we're coming up on the noon hour, to take the noon  
3 break.

4                   What is the pleasure of the Commission.  
5 With the agenda, with this speed, we're proceeding  
6 through the agenda, take a full hour for lunch and come  
7 back at 1:00 o'clock and continue with the agenda?

8                   Without objection, we'll recess until 1:00  
9 o'clock and resume then.

10                   (Recess taken at 11:48 a.m.)

11                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand  
12 in session.

13                   Dr. Heslop, would you talk about the next  
14 set of recommendations for the East Valley, please.

15                   DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
16 Commission, as you know, there was a huge volume of  
17 testimony from the various East Valley communities. For  
18 the sake of convenience, I'd suggest you think about it  
19 in two categories.

20                   First of all, from the very big  
21 communities of Scottsdale and Tempe and Mesa, there was  
22 a volume of evidence that they did not wish to be  
23 divided. We've referenced this subject earlier. And  
24 then another even greater volume of evidence from  
25 citizens had to do with linkages.

1                   Some citizens, let's take a look at the  
2 map, some citizens want to be linked to Ahwatukee and  
3 Fountain Hills, take a look at Ahwatukee, others to  
4 Gilbert, Chandler, Queen Creek to the south, and others,  
5 still, to Fountain Hills, and Carefree, and Cave Creek  
6 to the north.

7                   So there are two problems that the  
8 citizens brought the Commission. One problem, division  
9 of communities. Second question of linkage of  
10 communities.

11                   I'm sorry Florence isn't here. She's been  
12 working 48 hours flat. She's very much expert on the  
13 East Valley area having redistricted a number of the  
14 communities.

15                   Mesa, for example, is a community with  
16 which she's very familiar. It's current population is  
17 300 -- is it 396,000, 400,000 people. That community  
18 will by 2010 have 550,000 persons in it, according to  
19 Mesa's own projections. These communities are very  
20 rapidly growing communities. They have an opinion about  
21 themselves, an opinion about their community that isn't  
22 always fully shared.

23                   There are some people in Mesa,  
24 particularly in East Mesa, who think primarily linkage  
25 to more rural areas, yet others in Mesa think of linkage

1 to Tempe. All these problems of linkage.

2                   So, in any event, sitting with Florence  
3 and Chris, we took another look at the citizen  
4 testimony. And we believe that the citizen testimony is  
5 such that if you follow it, if you follow the citizen  
6 testimony, it should be possible to create, let's go  
7 back to the recommendation, it should be possible to  
8 create one East Valley Congressional District which  
9 respects these local self-identifying communities. And  
10 it should also be possible, we believe, to develop six  
11 Legislative Districts which have the same effect of  
12 respecting community.

13                   Obviously, some decisions are going to be  
14 involved in developing these districts. And our  
15 thought, ladies and gentlemen, is there is a basis in  
16 the testimony itself for most of those decisions.

17                   As with all of these other requests for  
18 recommendation, our thought is if you give us this  
19 instruction, we'll away and do our very best with it.  
20 We'll also give you full notation, full detail on the  
21 choices that develop as the lines are drawn so you will  
22 know the alternatives.

23                   So, Mr. Chairman, Commissions, one East  
24 Valley Congressional District and six East Valley  
25 Legislative Districts.

1 We'd be happy for your instruction.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you put that --

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd rather do it that way.

4 If you have questions, let's answer those.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. I'm looking  
6 at the population figures you've got there. It appears  
7 to me that what you are really talking about is almost  
8 two Congressional Districts in this part of the valley.  
9 And so I'm wondering, when you are requesting a  
10 recommendation just for one, what happens with the rest  
11 of it?

12 DR. HESLOP: Well, the recommendation  
13 would be one, that would be very clearly most of the  
14 east valley. When people look at the map, people would  
15 say: Ah, there is the East Valley Congressional  
16 District.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: have you  
18 considered separating the Southeast Valley from --

19 DR. HESLOP: No, we didn't.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: -- from the  
21 northern portion? That might be a way to go about doing  
22 it.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions -- I  
24 prefer to have a motion, if you want to clarify anything  
25 first.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

2                   COMMISSIONER HALL: We heard public  
3 comment this morning from representatives of Casa  
4 Grande. They have proposed a Legislative District  
5 combining Apache Junction, Gold Camp, following the  
6 county line with Casa Grande. Can you -- do you have a  
7 comment, any comment on that, Dr. Heslop?

8                   DR. HESLOP: We're extremely interested in  
9 Casa Grande. There was volume of testimony. We had a  
10 citizen petition with regard to it. And we believe that  
11 it may be possible to accommodate all of the interests  
12 there.

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion?

14                   Ms. Minkoff.

15                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to  
16 move the adoption of the recommendations set forth on  
17 the screen.

18                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

19                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

20                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

21                   Mr. Huntwork.

22                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think along the  
23 lines Andi was saying, I don't know how we could do  
24 anything other than at least one Congressional District  
25 and at least six Legislative Districts in the East



1 Valley, doesn't come out even close to even. And it's  
2 what we do with the remainder that is the difficult  
3 question here.

4 I will say that particularly with respect  
5 to Congressional Districts and the sentiments expressed  
6 this morning about the Phoenix metropolitan area, in  
7 effect, I don't think those people weren't mad at the  
8 rural residents of Maricopa County, just the urban  
9 residents, probably.

10 The Phoenix metropolitan area contains  
11 very close to five-eighths of the population of the  
12 state. I don't know how statistics are put together,  
13 whether or not they included Apache Junction and Gold  
14 Camp. But if they did, you do have a very neat, clean  
15 allocation of five Congressional Districts, two Phoenix  
16 Congressional Districts.

17 MR. ECHEVESTE: Mr. Chairman, could you  
18 hold until tape is -- change in tape right now.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, the hatching.

20 MR. HUTCHISON: Distinguish city from  
21 unincorporated islands in the city.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Incorporated --  
23 unincorporated or nondesignated places.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Suggests the start  
25 of an extremity of an unincorporated area and start of

1 an incorporated area, end up with the most compact and  
2 contiguous districts that include that area and, in  
3 effect, free up the rest of the state from those -- from  
4 the crossover.

5 Now, I would also would like to say I  
6 attended hearing in Apache Junction, and there was quite  
7 a bit of testimony at that hearing to link Apache  
8 Junction and Gold Camp with the Phoenix metropolitan  
9 area, not the rest of Pinal County. We have some very  
10 strongly conflicting testimony in that area.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd say in support of  
13 that, also, both at the Safford and Thatcher meetings,  
14 both Globe meetings, and representative of that  
15 discussed at the San Manuel and Pinal County issues,  
16 they were pretty uniform in saying, yeah, keep Apache  
17 Junction, Gold Camp, keep it with the metropolitan area.  
18 It's not rural. If used rural, it doesn't have  
19 commonalty from a standpoint of mining, agriculture.

20 Two things were brought out, Gila Valley,  
21 mining along the San Pedro, San Manuel, San Pedro,  
22 urban, more resort, health care systems, gravitate  
23 toward the metropolitan area. I see that.

24 The problem I have here, to some extent,  
25 is that Apache Junction, Gold Camp, are in different

1 counties, different areas. If we respect those  
2 proposals from Chandler -- not Chandler, Casa Grande  
3 takes on more weight. I'd say no, give them guidance on  
4 the east valley, east Casa Grande option or tie in Casa  
5 Grande, not from a county sense but it's more  
6 appropriate.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff --

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The issue of the  
9 Apache Junction and Gold Camp request remained so  
10 united, and there are so many people in Apache Junction,  
11 Gold Camp, if we pull so many people out of Pinal  
12 County, we don't have enough people for a district.

13 It's an interesting juggling act.

14 Following up, as a place to start on the  
15 southeast, there is much more synergy between Mesa,  
16 Chandler, Gilbert, Apache Junction, possibly Tempe, than  
17 there is between those communities and Paradise Valley,  
18 Scottsdale, Fountain Hills.

19 I think probably that is your initial  
20 Congressional District, the southeast portion of the  
21 valley. Then as you move north and west, Scottsdale,  
22 Paradise Valley, Fountain Hills may very well fall into  
23 Congressional Districts, a Northeast District where they  
24 seem to fit a little bit better.

25 The other thing I suggest, when you have

1 to divide communities rather than unite them when you  
2 deal with Legislative Districts, we heard very, very  
3 strong testimony from Mesa, a number people suggesting  
4 the dividing line, I forget whether they wanted  
5 Ellsworth or didn't want Ellsworth. The grid had a  
6 dividing line. They suggested it be moved further east.  
7 Listen to that.

8                   The other thing I think you need to listen  
9 to, in dividing Chandler, there are too many people for  
10 one Legislative District. We had virtually unanimous  
11 testimony Dobson Road is the appropriate dividing line,  
12 the appropriate line in Chandler. Listen to that. I  
13 don't know what the implications are for the rest of the  
14 map. Where possible public testimony seems to be so  
15 uniform, you really need to try, as far as we can, to  
16 accommodate that testimony.

17                   DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, if I can, this  
18 comment is very useful. We'll take very careful note of  
19 it and we'll develop districts, again, reporting back to  
20 you on alternatives, noting in each case what  
21 adjustments are being made for this plan and what other  
22 adjustments have to be made following alternatives.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

24                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Can you overlay school  
25 districts?

1 MR. HUTCHISON: I can.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm  
3 wrong, in Pinal County, do not school district  
4 boundaries respect county boundaries?

5 DR. HESLOP: A couple don't.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my -- our  
7 direction, one principle, respect geographic boundaries,  
8 county boundaries. I guess -- I run numbers, everything  
9 on the map, Southeast Mesa, Gilbert, Chandler, Queen  
10 Creek, Gold Camp, approximately 730,000 people. There's  
11 too many people there anyway, correct?

12 DR. HESLOP: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm wondering, is it  
14 not a win-win to make -- keep Pinal together and still  
15 have 640,000, approximately? I'm asking. I don't know.

16 DR. HESLOP: Do it either way.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Queen Creek there,  
18 where is the school districts, county line?

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Shut down elementary  
20 schools.

21 MR. HUTCHISON: Elementary, secondary  
22 overlies.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Queen Creek western  
24 boundary is coming on --

25 MR. HUTCHISON: They do follow county

1 boundaries.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think that there  
4 are connections, important connections, between Apache  
5 Junction, and Gold Camp, and Pinal County, also  
6 important connections with Maricopa County. I'd want to  
7 see the alternatives to judge between them. I don't  
8 disagree with the point being made. I'm saying there  
9 are other factors, and you have to see them all before  
10 we can really make that decision. If they are  
11 necessary -- if they have to be included in the Phoenix  
12 Metropolitan area in order to preserve the rural  
13 district, I'm sure that's something we'd all want to  
14 take into consideration. This is where additional  
15 population to create a rural district, consider a very  
16 rapidly growing area quickly, to change the character of  
17 rural district -- there many things we have to consider.  
18 And I believe the comment we'll see will have both  
19 approaches and appropriate notations is about all we can  
20 say at this moment.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
22 motion?

23 If not, all in favor, signify by saying  
24 "aye."

25 (Vote taken.)

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

2                   Opposed, "no."

3                   Motion carries unanimously.

4                   Dr. Heslop.

5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Chairman, members of  
6 the Commission, perhaps the single most impressively  
7 documented and important submission was that by the  
8 Eastern Arizona Counties Organization. Their proposal  
9 for the development of an Eastern Arizona Legislative  
10 District that would include the southern portions of  
11 Navajo and Apache along with the counties of Gila,  
12 Graham, and Greenlee. It would be wrong to suggest that  
13 this submission was supported by all citizen comment.  
14 There were some citizens who raised questions about the  
15 separation of Navajo and Apache Counties. There were  
16 others who suggested that there was a better grouping of  
17 counties. But when you look at the submission itself,  
18 the number of resolutions, not only from counties and  
19 cities, and the quantity of citizen support, it is hard  
20 not to be persuaded that this seems to be the will of  
21 the clear majority of people in the area who perceive  
22 this to be a community, although multicounty community.  
23 So in those terms, Mr. Chairman, members of the  
24 Commission, we recommend and would request your  
25 instruction to create such a legislative district.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to that  
2 effect?

3                   COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

4                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

5                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

7                   Mr. Huntwork.

8                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was troubled by  
9 the words "Uniting all included Tribal Reservations."  
10 One of the effects of this, it seems to me, would be to  
11 separate some tribal areas from others. It divides the  
12 Navajo to the north, primarily. And that's -- that  
13 phrase gives me some concern. Or the problem behind it  
14 gives me some concern.

15                   COMMISSIONER HALL: What I think the  
16 intent was, correct me if I'm wrong, Dr. Heslop, all  
17 tribal areas within the area are -- they are not  
18 dividing within the designated AUR. The two  
19 reservations, being the White Mountain Apache Tribe and  
20 San Carlos Apache Tribal note little finger there in  
21 Pinal County is only there because of the reservation  
22 boundary.

23                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

24                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that's the  
25 intent of the wording, was it not?



1 DR. HESLOP: I believe it was.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What is the  
3 percentage of Native American in this district?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: And also, I believe  
5 Chairman Massie supported this proposal, did he not?

6 DR. HESLOP: That's true. We have a  
7 letter in the binder from him supporting the proposal,  
8 Chairman Massie from White Mountain Apache tribe.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 36 percent.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What effect does  
11 that have on the Native American population to the  
12 putative Native American District to the north of that?

13 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, the  
14 question is could we increase the Native American  
15 population of the district to the north as a result of  
16 not creating this Eastern Arizona County District?

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Essentially, yes.

18 DR. HESLOP: What, Chris, is native --  
19 I can't see.

20 MR. HUTCHISON: Okay. Just to clarify,  
21 Commissioner Huntwork, are you clarifying this to the  
22 Navajo proposed plan which unite --

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Not comparing, no.

24 DR. HESLOP: Let's find --

25 Does that screen show what the native

1 population is in the Eastern Arizona counties?

2 MR. HUTCHISON: Non-Hispanic percentage,  
3 16.22 percent population, in that district.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In that district.

5 MS. LEONI: Combined Hispanic population,  
6 it's a 34 percent plus minority district.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In combination.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork's concern, as  
9 I understand it, is as we have the northeastern part of  
10 the state with significant Native American population  
11 above the Eastern Arizona proposal. Taking this  
12 proposal into account will have an impact above it in a  
13 significant way. The Question was to be sure to analyze  
14 that in a way so we have the same kinds of choices here  
15 as we would in the other opportunity.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: However, the Navajo  
17 Reservation is a population in excess of 100,000 people.  
18 We have already made a decision that we're not going to  
19 be dividing any Reservations. Therefore, we are going  
20 to have a Reservation with a majority Native American  
21 population up north. There's no way not to do it.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
23 motion?

24 If not, all those in favor, signify by  
25 saying "aye."

1 (Vote taken.)

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

3 Opposed say "no."

4 Motion carries unanimously.

5 Dr. Heslop.

6 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
7 Commission, this was the first of the hearings, in fact,  
8 Commissioner Minkoff and I attended it, not a very  
9 numerous audience, no doubt of its single-mindedness.  
10 They wanted to know the division of their county, and  
11 the county is, in fact, let's take a look at it, how  
12 many people are in the county.

13 MR. HUTCHISON: About 165,000.

14 DR. HESLOP: In other words, about a  
15 pretty good Legislative District. They have a case.  
16 Given the weight of the district, given the county  
17 integrity, we recommend a Legislative District based on  
18 Yuma County, an undivided Yuma County, and would be  
19 grateful for your instruction.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a motion to that  
21 effect?

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

1 Mr. Huntwork?

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Once again, I  
3 believe this plays into the question of retrogression  
4 and balancing the various communities of interest in our  
5 state.

6 I recall from the standing AUR there is a  
7 significant Hispanic population that is not evenly  
8 distributed in Yuma County. Again, the question, or  
9 comment, really, relates to the interconnectedness of  
10 all these things. I have some concern if we do that, we  
11 might jeopardize our ability to create other districts  
12 that reflect the -- should reflect the voting strength  
13 of the Hispanic population. So I do this with just a  
14 certain amount of reservation, particularly because we  
15 have similar requests from Pinal County which also has  
16 somewhat the same situation, a couple counties that want  
17 to be kept together, continue to do this, Tempe that has  
18 some -- if we continue to do this, we lose track of  
19 other extremely important considerations and not -- so  
20 I -- really, I have strong reservation before we  
21 proceed.

22 I'd be interested in seeing this  
23 comparison for everything else.

24 Pinal County, I don't know if they pop up  
25 on this later or not. As we went through the first

1 time, is there a separate resolution to create a  
2 district that consist of Pinal County?

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not on the list. We can  
4 add that.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: See that 50 percent  
6 minority alone. I doubt that concerns --

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also, we have to remember  
9 that the concern of retrogression is statewide, not  
10 district by district.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That's what I'm  
12 saying, we need flexibility.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The other thing,  
15 Yuma County population tends to be somewhat  
16 concentrated. Over half the county is right within city  
17 Yuma, then Summerton is right near there, and some of  
18 the other communities along Interstate 8 fairly close to  
19 Yuma County. The rest is a gunnery range; and there are  
20 not too many people that live there, for good reason.

21 I don't think there's going to be an issue  
22 if we keep Yuma County intact that is going to  
23 negatively impact on our ability to create a  
24 majority-minority district, only because of where the  
25 population is located.

1 I have a concern we're trying to keep  
2 counties intact, trying to respect integrity county  
3 boundaries.

4 Yuma has a population of 160,000 people, a  
5 little too few. Mohave County also wants to stay  
6 intact, has population of 155,000. And right in between  
7 is La Paz with 25,000 for the entire county. They're in  
8 the uncomfortable situation of being between two areas  
9 where if they join either one, it's too many. Then we  
10 have the issue of what to do with La Paz 25,000 in the  
11 entire county. When keeping counties whole, we're  
12 creating other problems.

13 DR. HESLOP: I think Commissioner Minkoff  
14 doesn't want a response from me. It's a predicament.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think it brings up the  
16 interactive nature of each of these decisions. That's  
17 the point of giving instructions, to see how the  
18 interplay. We'll make additional decisions next week as  
19 to whether or not we've created something we're happy  
20 with or something that has yet work to be done in terms  
21 of making us happy.

22 Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, aren't we  
24 going to have a River Communities AUR, I think, that  
25 will resolve some of that, what do we do with La Paz, in

1 between La Paz and Yuma, that strength is there between  
2 Yuma, we have, how we divide between that, too? Both  
3 come down as -- who knows what numbers?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I thought the river  
5 community AUR --

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll get there. It's  
7 still to be talked about.

8 Further discussion on this one? If not,  
9 all those in favor of the motion, signify by saying  
10 "aye."

11 (Vote taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

13 Opposed "no."

14 Motion carries unanimously.

15 Dr. Heslop.

16 DR. HESLOP: You'll have sweet relief.

17 Florence was going to alternate with me in this  
18 presentation. I thought it might be interesting to the  
19 Commission if I called on Doug Johnson, our senior  
20 mapping analyst who will be working with the Commission  
21 to make a very brief presentation to you on Yavapai.

22 Doug is someone who started in the  
23 redistricting business 10 years ago doing exactly the  
24 sort of thing Chris Hutchison is today.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,

1 good afternoon.

2                   Yavapai is another one of those things  
3 with almost perfect population as Yuma talked about. In  
4 my briefcase I almost kept together a process that went  
5 through a lot of input, particularly with respect to  
6 Sedona. You see the northeast corner of the district,  
7 city, a letter from Mayor Everett who said he'd like to  
8 see Sedona unified. We also had a lot of input as well  
9 from the cities of Verde Valley, which Chris is  
10 indicating there. They all wanted to be unified. Mayor  
11 Everett expressed being unified with those cities as  
12 well. Others handed in input. Three county supervisors  
13 said they actually were interested in splitting the  
14 county so they'd have input with various representatives  
15 at different levels.

16                   So that's why it's on this list for  
17 instruction from you today, this division of opinion,  
18 supervisors interested in division, a lot of citizen  
19 input, guidelines in Prop 106 to some degree  
20 recommending unifying counties.

21                   The only AURs involved in this question,  
22 we've established so far, Verde Valley, Sedona ones.

23                   The recommendation we're putting forward  
24 for your instruction is to create a unified district  
25 with Yavapai County, add in part Sedona, unify Sedona as



1 that mayor requested, keep the population intact. The  
2 population as a whole might be slightly below the  
3 population, add in slightly above the Legislative size.  
4 That's our recommendation for an instruction.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative  
6 motion on the recommendation.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: So moved.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question.

12 It seems to make sense to unify Sedona. I  
13 seem to recall testimony from Sedona they link up with  
14 Flagstaff and the Northern part of the state.

15 Do you recall whether there was an  
16 overwhelming amount of testimony one way or the other?

17 MR. JOHNSON: The thought occurred, they  
18 did have that request at the Legislative level to be  
19 merged with Flagstaff. Mayor Everett of Sedona, at the  
20 Legislative level, requested to be with Flagstaff, if  
21 you want to divide communities one way at a Legislative  
22 level, another way at the Congressional level.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall then  
24 Mr. Huntwork.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: I was at both

1 meetings, Flag and Prescott. Flag, some said send us  
2 north, some said send us south. Some said make Mingus  
3 Mountain the dividing line.

4                   With respect to Prescott, on the whole,  
5 there seemed to be general consensus, from many, you  
6 know, just utilize Yavapai County. Of course, the  
7 Democratic party was rather unhappy with that proposal  
8 in light of the party registration of that particular  
9 county. So -- and wanted -- they had an alternative  
10 idea in an effort to make district more competitive,  
11 maybe down the road wanted to take a hard look at the  
12 competitiveness of this district.

13                   From a practical standpoint, ignoring that  
14 issue, it certainly makes sense, I think, as far as  
15 combining, generally, communities of similar interest.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

17                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, once again,  
18 I was at the hearing in Flagstaff.

19                   The Sedona and Verde Valley contingent  
20 came and testified. I don't know if they came to  
21 Prescott or not. That could be some indication of where  
22 they relate to. But the point overriding is I don't  
23 know how to make this decision without looking at how  
24 these relate to other areas.

25                   Once again, we have this -- reasons to go

1 one way and good reasons to go the other way as well.

2 The physical boundary with Mingus Mountain  
3 is another factor to consider, same basis as uniting  
4 political subdivisions.

5 And so we have -- we have our criteria not  
6 leading to any definite conclusion in this area.

7 In my mind it's certainly premature to  
8 handicap one outcome or another without seeing how they  
9 relate.

10 I think I'm going to support the motion in  
11 the sense I've supported a number of the others, too. I  
12 want to see this, need to develop, need specifics next  
13 time we meet. We need to see alternatives as well.

14 In voting for the motion, I don't mean to  
15 suggest that there's more than a 50 percent chance that  
16 this is going to be the outcome. We just don't know.  
17 At least I don't know.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know we can make  
19 that statement on any of the recommendations we've made.  
20 We need to look at them, analyze them, see what they've  
21 done.

22 Further discussion on the motion?

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with  
24 Mr. Huntwork, in many of the areas. Take some of the  
25 southern cities, relate more with metropolitan Phoenix.

1 Black Canyon, or something, seems to me your point is  
2 well-taken, Mr. Huntwork. It seems to be -- the  
3 southern portion seems to be more a community of  
4 interest to the metropolitan area, and the northern  
5 seems to have more of a community of interest with the  
6 northern.

7 I agree they seem to look at it, see how  
8 it measures with other recommendations, and look at it  
9 there.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Consultants,  
11 notwithstanding the vote we'll follow, what you are  
12 hearing from the Commission, this is an area, as with  
13 other areas of the state, that really do play  
14 differently depending on a number of variables. Even  
15 though we are giving you preliminary instructions to  
16 attempt to keep Yavapai County whole, Yavapai County  
17 presents a number of interesting options in terms of how  
18 it might be districted that impact on that which is  
19 around it. I know you take that, but understand that  
20 these areas where we'll be making specific comments, the  
21 number of choices we'll be looking for are more numerous  
22 than simply: Here's Yavapai County.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before we vote on  
24 this motion and move on, Chris, could you just put the  
25 communities to cities up there?

1 MR. HUTCHISON: Those are the communities  
2 and cities.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: White areas are  
4 incorporated areas.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You don't have  
6 names up.

7 MR. RIVERA: He's all over it.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Need to see better.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For the benefit of  
10 everyone, Chris Hutchison, who is working the computer  
11 today, he's a student, going to be a senior. I wish all  
12 of our children were as facile and bright as Chris is in  
13 terms of doing thing. He'll not be with us in terms of  
14 the entire process as he'll be going back to school.  
15 We'll have some of his time but not nearly as much as  
16 over the summer. He's really terrific at what he does.

17 MR. RIVERA: And he's all over it.

18 MR. JOHNSON: One city is split at the  
19 bottom there, not labeled, that's actually Peoria, down  
20 on the screen. It's a piece in the Yavapai population.

21 MR. HUTCHISON: Just annexed.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Peoria annexed?

23 MR. HUTCHISON: Actually a park.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
25 motion?

1                   If not, all those in favor of the motion,  
2 signify by saying "aye."

3                   (Vote taken.)

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

5                   Motion carries unanimously.

6                   Dr. Heslop.

7                   DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we have a  
8 proposal from communities. It's not as well-supported  
9 as the Eastern Area Counties proposal, but it is a  
10 proposal that has the support of many communities within  
11 it. And that speaks also, so it seems to us, to some or  
12 all of the testimony that we had on that area.

13                   And so we request instruction to develop a  
14 West Valley Legislative District.

15                   Chris can bring up the area of interest  
16 here and perhaps put some city names on it.

17                   While he's doing so, I should say Doug  
18 Johnson, 10 years ago, was just as quick as Chris  
19 Hutchison was, just as quick with a much slower program.

20                   Chris will be just as old 10 years from  
21 now.

22                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wait until the city names  
23 come up so we know exactly what we're proposing here.

24                   MR. HUTCHISON: I can zoom in.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wickenburg to the north

1 and a significant portion to the middle and south.

2 MR. HUTCHISON: It follows out back along  
3 the boundary. Peoria now annexed this area here, by the  
4 way.

5 Nobody lives up there, either. It follows  
6 the Surprise boundary, excluding Sun City West, El  
7 Mirage, and continues down, takes in Luke Air Force  
8 Base, a western piece of Glendale, strip annexation, and  
9 goes around. Don't have any area here.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris, it includes  
11 Surprise but excludes El Mirage?

12 MR. HUTCHISON: Excludes the Sun Cities,  
13 not Sun City Grand.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is Surprise?

15 MR. HUTCHISON: I can highlight it.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we know what Sun  
17 City Grand is?

18 MR. HUTCHISON: I actually got on Dell  
19 Webb's website to figure it out.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It abuts Sun City  
21 West.

22 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The issue is do you  
24 divide a city or retirement community with common  
25 interests.

1 DR. HESLOP: As you know, there was a huge  
2 volume of testimony with regard to the retirement  
3 communities, a large volume of testimony that made a  
4 distinction between Sun City Grand and the other Sun  
5 Cities. Since they are wholly included within the city  
6 boundary, that would be testimony for it not being a  
7 problem.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What would this do  
9 for El Mirage and -- I think they called it the original  
10 mile for Surprise inside or --

11 MR. HUTCHISON: Since all Surprise is  
12 included, it's not a problem.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: El Mirage --

14 MR. HUTCHISON: El Mirage is not included.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is that line,  
16 that line, a road?

17 MR. RIVERA: Grand Avenue.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Grand Avenue.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: This is one of the more  
20 problematic areas for me. I'm not sure -- if someone  
21 wants to make a motion on this particular  
22 recommendation, I'll take it and discuss it, but I'm --  
23 let me just pause and say:

24 Is there an affirmative motion on this  
25 one?



1                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm still trying to  
2 understand the motion.

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand the  
4 difficulty here is that this West Valley proposal is not  
5 as well-supported as some of the other proposals by  
6 public comment as we've had. It's problematic as far as  
7 I'm concerned. Let me share what those are.

8                   We heard a significant amount of testimony  
9 about differences among communities. To the extent Sun  
10 City West, Sun City Grand, and Sun City are quite  
11 similar, regardless of whether they fall in incorporated  
12 areas, clearly they have some affinity. We also heard  
13 El Mirage and Surprise, at one and the same time, are  
14 older communities, vacant land has grown up around them  
15 in a way not very consistent with their communities of  
16 interest, those two communities in particular.

17                   And it's difficult for me to support this  
18 particular recommendation insofar as one of those  
19 communities is in boundary, one outside boundary, and it  
20 also splits Sun City Sun City Grand. In that respect, I  
21 find this one difficult to support. That may be the  
22 reason we don't have an affirmative motion.

23                   That's my two cents.

24                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

25                   MR. HUTCHISON: Further down it takes in

1 Tolleson and Avondale.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think the issue  
5 here, what we've approved up until now, in terms of  
6 guiding you to develop districts, while there wasn't  
7 unanimous testimony, the preponderance of testimony was  
8 really in favor of what we have authorized you to do. I  
9 don't think that is the case here. This was a proposal.  
10 I remember the Estrella meeting, that it was presented  
11 by officials from some of these communities, but it  
12 doesn't have the same level of support that the others  
13 do.

14 I agree with Chairman Lynn, putting this  
15 aside for now, work with districts, see where they lie.

16 I did get a pretty overwhelming sense  
17 Avondale, Tolleson, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, those  
18 communities, smaller communities, very, very close  
19 together, they want to remain together. They're going  
20 to be a small portion of whatever district they end up  
21 in. None are large communities. That makes some sense.  
22 To extend across all other communities I'm not sure  
23 makes sense because they're conflicting communities.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With respect to the  
25 communities of Surprise, El Mirage, even though not

1 contiguous, they're similar communities of interest.  
2 They are communities probably closer in character to a  
3 community like Glendale than they are to the immediately  
4 surrounding communities.

5 Take a look at ways in which they might be  
6 linked because of that commonalty.

7 That's a suggestion, not direction.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: We have to give some  
9 direction for the whole west valley.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: They'll do the whole  
11 state. We're picking specific things.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: We made motions thus  
13 far, have given specific direction regarding --

14 What I heard you folks saying, you don't  
15 want to follow this motion. What is the motion?

16 MR. RIVERA: There is no motion.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No motion.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Leave it blank?

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave it blank for the  
20 moment. Discussion is taking place.

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There are a lot of  
22 areas in the state. They'll be dividing the City of  
23 Phoenix. City of Phoenix is enormous. Tucson they'll  
24 be dividing. We haven't told them where to divide  
25 Tucson. A lot of that we're not doing. I suggest --

1 I'd be prepared, if you want a motion, to  
2 make a motion to keep the smaller communities together.  
3 Beyond that, I don't think that this is something we  
4 want to do at this point in time.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, I'd like you  
7 to put up the original grid here.

8 I think where I'm coming down from, this  
9 doesn't appear, though it's an overriding AUR, to adjust  
10 the grid. Wherever the grid falls, leave grid be until  
11 there's another reason to adjust the grid at that point.  
12 Right now there doesn't appear there's a enough strength  
13 in terms of continuity, cohesiveness, whatever, to  
14 justify adjusting the grid in this instance.

15 I'd like to see where that grid falls.

16 MR. HUTCHISON: Straight down. If you  
17 remember, the meridian line cuts straight through the  
18 City of Peoria, went all along here this way.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent we have  
20 other direction about keeping communities intact, and so  
21 on, adjustments might be made to that line. Mr. Elder's  
22 line, the grid there doesn't have an impact on that area  
23 at the moment.

24 Again, I don't want to characterize the  
25 fact you don't have specific direction in this area as

1 not taking these comments into account. Our comments  
2 are along a different line than the specific direction  
3 you've said.

4 DR. HESLOP: I hear the Commission saying  
5 NDC is to develop an alternative.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: What it is we don't  
7 know but do it.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing I'd like  
9 to suggest, and maybe not put it in the form of a  
10 motion, because I don't know what to do with Sun City  
11 Grand, it is part of another community you'd have to  
12 divide, but I think it makes a great deal of sense to  
13 unite the retirement communities.

14 Once again, public testimony we heard,  
15 while not unanimous, seemed to be overwhelmingly in  
16 favor of keeping Sun City, Sun City West, and Sun City  
17 Grand together. It may be that concern overrides the  
18 concern to keep communities undivided. That might be a  
19 reason to divide that portion of Surprise, put Sun City  
20 Grand with Sun City West and Sun City.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: At one meeting I  
24 attended there was actually some testimony in favor of  
25 dividing Tolleson from Avondale. I believe the Agua

1 Fria river runs right between and is a natural dividing  
2 line. Tolleson, I believe, is in old District 22, is  
3 very logically sized. I believe 22 was a very logically  
4 sized district with very excellent demographics. Even  
5 that general of a suggestion may not be -- may be  
6 premature in this area.

7 Also, the other thing I wanted to add was  
8 I don't remember overwhelming testimony of keeping the  
9 Sun Cities together.

10 I'd respectfully suggest there was at  
11 least as much testimony in favor of dividing them up,  
12 from the people in Sun City.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It was mixed, and at the  
14 Glendale hearing in particular.

15 The testimony as I recall it, Ms. Minkoff,  
16 I think you were in attendance.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Was Sun City, Sun City  
19 West, be kept together. Sun City Grand was the one  
20 shifting.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Maybe a dozen  
22 people attended that meeting and spoke about Sun City.  
23 We subsequently received some written communication from  
24 a representative group that purports to represent the  
25 Sun Cities, an umbrella organization elected and highly

1 representative of all the citizens in Sun City who said  
2 exactly the opposite, said we are currently divided up  
3 into three different areas, are just as happy with that  
4 arrangement as anything else, leave us that way.

5 In my mind, that was, if anything was  
6 overwhelming as to the sentiments of the people in Sun  
7 City, it was that rather than the relatively small  
8 number of people who provided conflicting testimony, as  
9 it were.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If I recall  
12 correctly, there was a resolution from an association  
13 out in that area in support of keeping them together.  
14 Then there was another group that said we disagree with  
15 them. So it wasn't just individual testimony talking  
16 about the Sun Cities. There were homeowner association  
17 resolutions, I don't remember the exact name, I'm sure  
18 we could go back and find out, that basically said the  
19 three Sun Cities belonging to, another group said we  
20 disagree with that group. We maybe need to do research  
21 to find out the validity of various groups that have  
22 conflicting resolutions.

23 MR. HUNTWORK: I may have overstated it if  
24 I suggested overwhelming testimony either way, just  
25 trying to rebut.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's conflicting, no  
2 question.

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

4                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you,  
5 Mr. Chairman.

6                   I guess now is my time. I need to talk a  
7 little bit on frustration over philosophy. Because one  
8 of the things I've looked at in the redistricting  
9 process is giving opportunity and access to the general  
10 public and population and citizens of the state.

11                   With that said, and starting to realize  
12 after we went through the communities of interest and we  
13 went through a lot of things, instead of bringing a  
14 bunch of people together, it seems like we're getting  
15 direction that says rancher wants ranchers, farmers want  
16 farmers, Hispanics want Hispanics. We're building  
17 barriers, edges. This area is an area that doesn't have  
18 defined edges. I don't think we should put edges in if  
19 they don't have overriding conditions.

20                   With that -- you know, if Sun City West  
21 and that, yes, retirement to retirement. If there are  
22 reasons why they want to stay separate, or other  
23 considerations there -- I would like to see diversity.  
24 I would like to see a lot of things going on, a lot more  
25 discourse between all entities.



1                   I have no objection to splitting up some  
2 of the areas, and it would seem to be valuable.

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: It may be another one of  
4 the areas, as we discussed with Yavapai County, where,  
5 because the testimony and public input has been varied  
6 in terms of how they see that community of interest,  
7 that it may be one of those areas where we use other  
8 criteria that we've either already established or need  
9 to establish throughout the process to help us determine  
10 which of these decisions we make. It doesn't seem clear  
11 it should be one or the other at this point.

12                   So we choose not to give you a West Valley  
13 AUR recommendation at this point.

14                   DR. HESLOP: I know we've listened very  
15 carefully, Mr. Chairman, and taken notes. We'll follow  
16 them.

17                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

18                   DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
19 Commission, our final request for instruction involves  
20 the river. I think we all know there was strong  
21 testimony on the importance of the border, border  
22 issues, trade, and strong testimony about the river,  
23 special problems, sewage among them, many others related  
24 to the river communities. This substantial testimony  
25 with regard to the river was described by one person as

1 great again for western Arizona development and led us  
2 to the development of a river communities AUR.

3 Review of the map suggests that it is  
4 possible to create a River Communities Legislative  
5 District. And so it is our recommendation that you  
6 instruct us so to do.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an affirmative  
8 motion?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would make that  
10 motion, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From the map you  
15 have up there, it appears there's Indian Reservation  
16 that is divided.

17 MR. HUTCHISON: You are correct. This is  
18 the current district. There's the River AUR I can draw  
19 on top of it.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The River AUR all  
21 the way down is in conflict with the proposal just  
22 approved a short while ago to create a unified Yuma  
23 County. So if we approve both of them, you'll have a  
24 lot of fun.

25 DR. HESLOP: Interestingly enough, this is

1 the grid district on the northwest portion. And I may  
2 be -- I may be incorrect, I believe of all the areas  
3 where we visited in the state, there was more support  
4 for this grid piece than in most other portions of the  
5 state.

6 This portion of the state was quite  
7 pleased with that Legislative District, felt it captured  
8 their concept of community of interest, and they were  
9 more than happy to let it be that portion of the map and  
10 let it go forward.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Be lucky.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You would be with random.

13 Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I didn't attend  
15 the hearing. From reading the transcripts, it appears  
16 there's more than enough people for one district, not  
17 enough for two complete districts along the river.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Including Yuma.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Including Yuma.  
20 Need two and combine one with something else. Seemed  
21 the middle piece wanted to be more the north than the  
22 south.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, not necessarily  
24 true.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Middle piece fought over

1 north and south.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Middle didn't want  
3 them. Mohave didn't want them.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I stand corrected.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It was interesting.  
6 Almost had an auction.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: La Paz County. The  
8 issue there, three counties, La Paz, Mohave, Yuma,  
9 almost the size for two Legislative Districts. Poor  
10 little La Paz County, they're in the middle. That's  
11 where they'd have to be split.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue with the  
13 Yuma AUR, it's border concerns as not opposed to, in  
14 addition to, or apart from river concerns. Two concerns  
15 are quite clear. One related to water and sewer issues,  
16 the other related to along the river; similarly have  
17 issues Congressionally and Legislatively. Yuma is in a  
18 unique position, not only occupies the river to the  
19 extreme southwest, also occupies that portion of the  
20 border that begins the border issues beginning at Yuma  
21 all the way over to Douglas, although there are some  
22 differences among the major major communities along the  
23 border, Yuma, Nogales, and Douglas. There are many  
24 similarities as well.

25 We find ourselves, at least from my

1 perspective, I think this is supportable. I think it's  
2 supportable from the standpoint this particular  
3 instruction meets with the sense that I think I got from  
4 attending those hearings and the feedback on the grid  
5 itself.

6 Mr. Huntwork.

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What is the  
8 population of those two counties combined?

9 MS. SMITH (FROM THE FLOOR): 334.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Ms. Smith from La  
11 Paz.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: You have to cut it up.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Either have to  
14 separate Mohave, La Paz, cut-off --

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have it, 134,747.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is what?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: La Paz, Mohave  
18 together.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: So we're -- the  
20 river connection between -- it's sounding like we're  
21 almost inevitably going to find a logical point to  
22 divide La Paz County.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm wondering if we  
24 pull out the Indian Reservation and put it with the  
25 Walapai, Havasupai, Coconino County, if that takes

1 enough population out.

2 MR. HUTCHISON: Walapai --

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Kaibab.

4 MR. HUTCHISON: Walapai are split.

5 Two persons live in this tract.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put them with them.

7 MR. HUTCHISON: Query this.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we also, by  
9 doing this, splitting the Arizona strip, the area north  
10 of the grand canyon.

11 MR. HUTCHISON: The strip all over to  
12 Page?

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Consider it to go  
14 to the area impossible to get to from anyplace else,  
15 accessible from Yuma but anyplace else. Two people  
16 representing that area, both have to get in there, they  
17 never see anybody.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: There is the Grand Canyon.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah. We have  
20 pretty well split that.

21 Where is Fredonia?

22 MR. HUTCHISON: Here.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Coconino or Mohave?

24 MR. RIVERA: Coconino.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Joseph City,

1 Coconino.

2 MR. RIVERA: Colorado City.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I've never been up  
4 there either.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Aren't we shorting  
6 Yuma?

7 MR. HUTCHISON: 1,000.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: High on this one,  
9 shorting Yuma.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Almost 1,000.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Cutting Yuma if you  
12 want to cut an entity that small in half.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, they cut Yuma County  
14 in half first. They made La Paz.

15 I know, I'm sorry. I meant that to be a  
16 flip comment.

17 There is a way to do it. Parker, in the  
18 north part of the county, and Quartzsite, the only other  
19 concentration with any kind of population in the  
20 southern part county. That's a way to do it, if we want  
21 to.

22 What you are hearing, see alternatives as  
23 well.

24 The La Paz County area population are in  
25 play in those options, because it's clear we have the

1 dilemma of having too much population in both  
2 configurations without some tradeoff and don't have  
3 anywhere else to go, so to speak, no other  
4 concentrations along this strip other than ones we'd  
5 have to go into the state a fair distance in order to  
6 pick up any meaningful population.

7 DR. HESLOP: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: An alternative  
10 addressed, looked at, Yuma, maybe pick up to the east  
11 population there, which might be going into the Gila  
12 Bend area. I guess that's Maricopa County. I guess on  
13 the northern reaches, the Colorado tribe, you have the  
14 strip across the north, pull that out so then you go  
15 from, whatever, Colorado City, or Bullhead south, and  
16 pickup all of La Paz, and the Bullhead --

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Might work.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: -- take Yuma further  
19 to the east, and put the northern part together with  
20 whatever happens in that central northern area.

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put the Arizona  
22 strip with Coconino.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The Arizona strip  
24 with Coconino, or Native American tribal areas, and  
25 this.



1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris, say something?

2                   MR. HUTCHISON: Say something. I was also  
3 going along with the Commissioner, the idea of uniting  
4 the Walapai, Havasupai, they identify themselves as a  
5 community together.

6                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The \$64,000  
7 question: How many live there, two, three thousand  
8 people?

9                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is this a  
10 demonstration where you go click, click, click?

11                  MR. HUTCHISON: Label the population.  
12 6,221. Tract comes down. And this tracks. 4,450.

13                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: Getting close.

14                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Take out the  
15 reservation at the top, the Arizona strip, and the  
16 reservation down there, how much all together, the three  
17 areas.

18                  MR. HUTCHISON: 13,000, 12,000.

19                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Too many.

20                  MR. HUTCHISON: The other option, whole  
21 Census tracts. Proposition 106, you could use the  
22 Indian Reservation boundary and take blocks out, make it  
23 more.

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: You're getting a sense of  
25 what you might look at there to solve this problem.

1 DR. HESLOP: We have that sense,  
2 Mr. Chairman, indeed.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Without reinventing a  
4 gerrymander.

5 With that discussion, background,  
6 explanatory notes, is there further discussion on the  
7 motion?

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Call the question.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All those in favor of the  
10 motion, signify by saying "aye."

11 (Vote taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

13 Motion carries unanimously.

14 DR. HESLOP: That's the end of the  
15 presentation.

16 I thank the Commission.

17 We'll take careful note of the  
18 reservations expressed on each.

19 As I noted at the beginning, we'll prepare  
20 the map with substantial documentation allowing you to  
21 see the alternatives and consequences in considerable  
22 detail.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Before you leave the  
24 podium, Dr. Heslop, I have a feeling there will be other  
25 instructions that may be coming from Commission.

1 DR. HESLOP: We'd be very grateful.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments as well?

3 I think everybody wanted to get in. Let  
4 me start with Mr. Huntwork who I believe I heard first.

5 Mr. Huntwork.

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd like to make a  
7 motion to instruct the consultants to make a Legislative  
8 District centered on Pinal County based on the plan  
9 presented at the Casa Grande hearing, one which includes  
10 Apache Junction and Gold Camp and another which excludes  
11 them, and finds ways to add population to Pinal County  
12 that is more of the rural agricultural community of  
13 interest that was expressed at that hearing.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

17 Mr. Elder?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: To that one, we had  
19 in two different meetings discussion on Pinal County,  
20 that Saddlebrooke related more to the, what is it --

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sun City.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sun City Vistoso  
23 area, V I S T O S O, area, that again, health care,  
24 medical, shopping, social relationships, all of that, so  
25 close together, across the border, this might be an area

1 that would break away from county line designations as  
2 having priority.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They are more like  
4 Pima County, Gold Camp, Pima County, Maricopa County.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Were you saying all  
7 Pinal County, Mr. Huntwork?

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Casa Grande  
10 proposal.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Excluded some  
12 portions of Pinal County,

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Superior, Signal  
14 Mountain.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Asking for a  
16 proposal.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Direction, alternative.

18 Further discussion?

19 All those in favor, signify by saying

20 "aye."

21 (Vote taken.)

22 Motion carries.

23 Ms. Minkoff.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Dr. Heslop, in the  
25 report sent to us earlier, there were a number of

1 questions, many of which we've already addressed. I'd  
2 like to make sure you don't need answers on any others.

3 Native American we've addressed. Native  
4 American was addressed; Western Valley we addressed;  
5 East Valley. Could you go through them, see if you need  
6 answers on any of those others?

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other way to put it is  
8 do you have sufficient instruction on the others to  
9 proceed?

10 DR. HESLOP: That was our judgment, these  
11 tenets then allow us to develop a map which would  
12 highlight the difficulties facing the Commission, and  
13 the map would bring to focus some of these other areas.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you have enough  
15 information on where we stand?

16 DR. HESLOP: I think we do indeed.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to, not cutting you  
18 off, get to Mr. Elder and Mr. Hall, to the extent he  
19 wants to be heard, also.

20 I want to caution everyone here, what this  
21 is is a process. A process has a number of facets to  
22 it, each building on the next.

23 Any of the directions that we've given the  
24 consultants today are a part of the process but not to  
25 be taken as a final adoption of any of these AURs in the

1 form of a map which we will see later on next week. And  
2 all of them are subject to further discussion, further  
3 interpretation, further review and analysis before such  
4 adoption takes place. This is in fact a process.

5 We've given consultants direction so they  
6 can move forward in map preparation. We'll not approve  
7 maps until the end of next week at which time all these  
8 issues will have been revisited, all possibilities will  
9 have been reviewed, and all ramifications will have been  
10 identified prior to ramifications analyzed. I want to  
11 make that clear to all present so there is no confusion.

12 Mr. Elder.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dr. Heslop, take a  
14 look at, where I'm having trouble, I don't know the  
15 Phoenix area that well, there were several proposals  
16 that came in as proposed AURs. The north boundary here,  
17 north boundary there, one central city, historic,  
18 somewhat overlaid with the southwestern, you know, how  
19 to resolve those. I should know where my mother grew  
20 up, the Willow District, designated a Historic District.  
21 I'm kind of at a loss where the central part of the  
22 district fits in, east, west, Hispanic.

23 I'd like a little more look at where the  
24 edge is geographically, the limits of the proposal made,  
25 and citizens' comment.

1 DR. HESLOP: Perhaps the easiest way to do  
2 that, Commissioner Elder, is show the historic  
3 preservation AUR and then to overlay the proposal,  
4 perhaps, the South Mountain proposal that we had.

5 Both proposals had substantial testimony  
6 in support. There is very significant overlap.

7 Obviously with regard to the Hispanic  
8 community proposal, there is voting rights concern. I  
9 think we need to take that concern perhaps more  
10 seriously than the issue of Historic concern. We need  
11 to gratify both groups. One of the concerns, in our  
12 concern, one of the questions we proposed to the  
13 Commissioners, we believe as we develop this map we'll  
14 explore the implications of both approaches in that  
15 division of the area.

16 Our machine has gone cold and we may have  
17 to warm it up.

18 That would be our approach, Commissioner,  
19 in this mapping process, to not only relate districts as  
20 they relate to the grid and tell you what adjustments  
21 are being made as they relate also to AURs advanced and  
22 tell you in each case what the impact on AURs is.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd appreciate that.

24 In one of the proposals, there's an  
25 increase of four, five percent Hispanics from where we

1 are now. That may be where you get flexibility to make  
2 sure we hit retrogression. Is there any other issues  
3 there the when data base comes there, how it fits others  
4 together so we have continuity of community there?

5 DR. HESLOP: Believe me, there is no  
6 subject we'll approach with greater care than the voting  
7 rights issue.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: For my clarification,  
10 and maybe the benefit of everyone here, can we look at  
11 the time line so you'll make recommendations to us for  
12 adjustment of the grid in the metropolitan areas when?

13 DR. HESLOP: How do you mean "metropolitan  
14 areas"?

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: We haven't talked  
16 about Phoenix, per se, and Tucson.

17 DR. HESLOP: They'll be part of the plans  
18 we bring forward to you.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

20 DR. HESLOP: Districts in metropolitan  
21 areas have to be justified to you both in terms of the  
22 original grid and the impact on principles the  
23 Commission has endorsed.

24 We believe that the outlines of the map as  
25 you have instructed us today will give us a basic start



1 on those metropolitan areas.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: The second question  
3 then is have you had an opportunity to analyze the  
4 variety of proposals in identifying areas of similarity?

5 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Hall, one of  
6 Doug Johnson's primary task this weekend is to do  
7 exactly that. He will be looking at all proposals  
8 brought before us, comparing them with the grid,  
9 comparing them with the instructions given by the  
10 Commission, and comparing them among themselves. We'll  
11 have a dossier of information on those plans and citizen  
12 proposals.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: I was afraid we were  
14 going to run out of reading material.

15 DR. HESLOP: Kill another tree; need  
16 another binder.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Looking at the  
18 overlay, see the areas of overlap? If there's an  
19 attempt made to satisfy both requests, I don't think  
20 it's too difficult to do. The areas contiguous to the  
21 South Mountain plan both to the east and west are very  
22 similar in makeup to the district they have. So if  
23 we're, for instance, to go with a historic district, and  
24 it pulled population out of that plan, as requested, I  
25 think it would be very easy to pick it up on either side

1 of the plan.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Rather than discuss plans  
3 submitted, not appropriateness, let's talk about  
4 communities of interest submitted.

5 In that particular instance, we do have an  
6 ability to take into account both communities of  
7 interest in an appropriate way.

8 Other comments or direction to the  
9 consultants at this time?

10 I think we're all just sort of  
11 anticipating next week's reading material and choices  
12 that will be ultimately ours to make next week.

13 I think it's clear we're off to a good  
14 start. Hopefully you feel you are off to a good start  
15 in terms of direction given to you.

16 Ms. Minkoff.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a procedural  
18 question about what happens now.

19 You'll present a report present next  
20 Wednesday which we'll read, digest, and memorize before  
21 we come on Thursday. That, I presume, will not be one  
22 Congressional plan, one Legislative plan, but a series  
23 of options.

24 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, it's  
25 our intention to have two plans.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: One of each.

2                   DR. HESLOP: You'll like some, not like  
3 others. Part we'll detach. Parts will be exchanged.  
4 We'll do everything we can to give you prior to  
5 Wednesday parts.

6                   I think Doug Johnson can produce analysis  
7 of some citizen plans prior to Wednesday, and we'll  
8 provide them prior to you.

9                   The question is when we reconvene prior to  
10 Wednesday with a Congressional and Legislative plan  
11 before us, and we look at them.

12                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And we want to  
13 suggest modifications, don't like the line drawn here,  
14 believe does this to this community, that to that  
15 community, let's see if we can move it here, we will do  
16 that as group on Thursday at the meeting?

17                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thursday, Friday, and  
18 Saturday.

19                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And we will be able  
20 to do this in steps? Once you change a line, it has a  
21 domino effect on 29 Legislative Districts and seven  
22 Congressional Districts. We may feel real comfortable  
23 moving this line here, adjust this district, then adjust  
24 this district, and we may not be able to do it all at  
25 once, have time to have all that done. Somebody else

1 will have another suggestion, do all over again. We'll  
2 do that --

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We will.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We'll be able to  
5 conclude that by Saturday --

6 DR. HESLOP: Today's work will look very  
7 easy compared to then.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We've told the  
9 public, it's been in the newspaper, we're going to  
10 finish by the 11th, a week from Saturday. I want to  
11 make sure the meetings Thursday, Friday, Saturday,  
12 you've done it before, we haven't.

13 DR. HESLOP: We will, God willing, the  
14 chair remaining strong, the sun high.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Someone can step in my  
16 stead next week.

17 DR. HESLOP: Talk about ramifying effects,  
18 you'll see things you don't like in the plan and what  
19 happens when you do something else, we'll show you. In  
20 some cases, you'll see something happening you like even  
21 less you don't like.

22 Yes, that's exactly what we anticipate.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. Other comments  
24 for Dr. Heslop and NDC?

25 Thank all of you for all your hard work.

1                   It's a very ambitious time schedule.

2                   We appreciate what you have done and will  
3 do.

4                   Paragraph item X: Return to public  
5 comment.

6                   This is the time for consideration and  
7 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.  
8 Those wishing to address to address the Commission shall  
9 request permission in advance by filling out a speaker  
10 slip. Action taken as a result of public comment will  
11 be limited to directing staff to study the matter or  
12 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and  
13 decision at a later date.

14                   I have one speaker request. Are there  
15 others in the audience that wish to be heard?

16                   If not, let me call on Sherry Smith,  
17 private citizen from Yuma County.

18                   MS. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
19 didn't realize I was the only one. I'll keep it short.

20                   Thank you very much for the time today.  
21 All these issues are very important to all of us. And  
22 whatever happens is going to be with us quite a while.

23                   We're really trying to, in Yuma County,  
24 where I'm from, we're trying to work together to do the  
25 best thing we can. We'd really like to have some

1 concerns -- I would. I'm speaking as a private citizen.  
2 I have in the past -- I would like to apologize for that  
3 outburst. I was following along and forgot what I was  
4 doing a minute.

5                   First of all, the main premise in Yuma  
6 County is the Congressional District should not be  
7 divided.

8                   As the Commission had discussed, it is a  
9 unique county in Arizona. It has a numerous amount of  
10 issues that are compounded even though is has a smaller  
11 population, 165, 166 thousand. You have the river  
12 issue. You have the water issue with California. You  
13 have all the close proximity of Indian tribes. And you  
14 also have a large Hispanic population.

15                   You are looking at some of the many  
16 principles Proposition 106 has laid out that you have as  
17 a community of interest.

18                   And I believe, I've been involved with  
19 politics since I was in sixth frayed. Nobody likes to  
20 listen to that. I won't go into it. All of us know  
21 these Congressional Districts will have a huge impact on  
22 the welfare and well-being of the people Arizona.

23                   When you look at water issues, the big  
24 fight we're having along the river to hold onto that  
25 water, all the Indian tribes involved, Fort Mohave,

1 Coshawn (phonetic), Pago (phonetic), Tohono O'odhom, and  
2 you go on down -- there's one down there I forgot.  
3 Anyway, I understand now Hopi is needing to be in a  
4 district, I think that would be great. But the amount  
5 of population for Mohave, La Paz, and Yuma is 334,000.  
6 When you have half a district in three large counties,  
7 or two large, one small county, I still think of La Paz  
8 as Yuma County, really, looking at something, we do have  
9 a large land mass, but it doesn't really affect the  
10 issues so much, because it is a similarity of issues.

11           When you speak of rural issues, it is very  
12 important to the people who live in those areas. The  
13 distance between services, looking at health issues,  
14 looking at the kind of thing where you have road  
15 maintenance and less taxes to maintain longer expanses  
16 of road, I could go on and on, and different issues of  
17 schools, schools of various cultural backgrounds that  
18 have to -- you have special needs or programs, you have  
19 to address those needs and programs.

20           Basically, to end, I don't want to sit and  
21 talk -- don't want to -- okay, that's it. But I think  
22 if we -- you know, I think -- I'm really impressed with  
23 the Commission. I think you are very astute. You've  
24 studied the issues. And you are well-aware of the  
25 impact of these districts and what it will do to the

1 state. And it is a hard job. It really is. You have  
2 my -- I'd like to say vote of confidence.

3 I know we're looking, like I say, there  
4 may be some things we don't like.

5 Primarily I think Yuma County should not  
6 be divided and it should be primarily in a rural  
7 district.

8 Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Smith, very  
10 much.

11 MS. SMITH: You are welcome.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next person to speak is  
13 Mark Fleisher.

14 MR. FLEISHER: I have a couple comments  
15 I'd like to make.

16 First of all, I'd like to talk about the  
17 fact most people in the community are very impressed  
18 with what you people are doing. As the Former Chairman  
19 of the State Democratic Party, deal with political  
20 activists, most people feel you've worked in a  
21 nonpartisan, sincere manner. I'm real pleased with the  
22 progression, a neutral grid. You didn't have  
23 preconceived grids laid out.

24 It looks today like most of what I've  
25 seen, the criteria setting will not come up with any



1 predetermined results. You're letting it fall wherever  
2 the lines fall. There are certain criteria, which I  
3 think are certainly relevant to the Justice Department  
4 and voters of Arizona. I'm real pleased with the way  
5 the Commissioners are handling that, not figuring where  
6 people live.

7                   One thing I'd like to discuss, see if  
8 there is any feedback, the criteria in Prop 106,  
9 competitiveness, I missed a little bit here after lunch,  
10 and I apologize for that. Was there any discussion  
11 about making districts competitive? Did I miss some of  
12 that?

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's been discussion  
14 all along.

15                   I can't engage in dialogue with you during  
16 public comment. The only thing I can tell you is  
17 competitiveness has always been one of the criteria  
18 we'll be using to judge the efficacy of the maps we put  
19 together. And it will be used along with other criteria  
20 when judging whether or not maps are acceptable to us  
21 and ultimately acceptable to us for submission.

22                   MR. FLEISHER: I don't see any relevance  
23 to Democrat, Republican registration. I'm not sure if  
24 you'll have that by next Thursday, Friday, Saturday. If  
25 don't have it by then, it's already in soft cement, so

1 to speak.

2                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's be clear as to what  
3 level of cement it's in by the end of next week. That's  
4 an important issue. I want to be clear to everyone, the  
5 maps that are produced at the end of next week's meeting  
6 are draft maps which will be the subject of a series of  
7 public meetings for the next month. There is nothing in  
8 those maps that wouldn't be subject to additional change  
9 or additional modification during that period of time  
10 based on input from the public on those drafts. To  
11 suggest those drafts are in any kind of cement is simply  
12 not correct.

13                   What we will be doing, as those maps are  
14 being reviewed, are all of the kinds of continuing  
15 analysis that need to be done with respect to all of the  
16 criteria that we wish to accomplish.

17                   Understand something, just as an example,  
18 the districts you'll see drawn by the end of next week  
19 won't be exactly even population. They'll be close, not  
20 exactly even. We're hopeful by the time the process is  
21 completed we'll be exact or as nearly close as we can,  
22 clearly close on Congressional, as close to exact as we  
23 can in terms of Legislative. That kind of adjustment  
24 will still be going to be done during the period public  
25 of comment and at the time the Commission will take the

1 final look at all districts before we ultimately give  
2 final approval to the plans which will be in October.

3 MR. FLEISHER: My issue of concern was  
4 that the criteria in 106, some of the issues being  
5 looked at now, certainly communities of interest, and  
6 some other criteria there, not criteria on  
7 competitiveness, I know you're discussing the issue of  
8 contiguousness, the Hopi, how you look at those things,  
9 no issue of how to make competitiveness. When is the  
10 appropriate time? After the maps come out on the 11th?

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Because Prop 106 is clear  
12 about the competitive portion of criteria,  
13 competitiveness is to be done at the expense of none of  
14 the other criteria. Therefore, analysis of  
15 competitiveness, necessarily, needs to occur once other  
16 criteria is attended to.

17 MR. FLEISHER: After the 11th might be the  
18 appropriate time, not before.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll discuss  
20 competitiveness soon as we have maps. We don't have  
21 maps. We can't look at a district and make a judgment  
22 whether or not it's competitive at this point.

23 Mr. Huntwork.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think -- I just  
25 wanted to raise a question. Maybe counsel should, or

1 whatever. We're really engaging in dialogue here. I  
2 don't believe it's something we should be doing.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you are right.

4 MR. FLEISHER: I apologize. I didn't mean  
5 to. I didn't realize. To the extent it's public  
6 comment, my comment on when competitiveness would be  
7 done, if I was missing the opportunity to do that, I  
8 didn't want to do that. I was thinking August 11th  
9 would do it. If it was too late to do it, if you  
10 already would have maps, I wanted to make sure the time  
11 frame was still open.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're thinking we do want  
13 to engage in dialogue.

14 It's not too late for any issues until the  
15 final end of the maps at the end of the process.

16 MR. FLEISHER: What --

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Fleisher, I will not  
18 answer any more questions. If you would like to make a  
19 comment, I'm happy to listen. I'll be happy to talk  
20 after the meeting. We have had enough talking back and  
21 forth.

22 MR. FLEISHER: Thank you for talking,  
23 Steve.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My pleasure.

25 MR. FLEISHER: Like, you think on the

1 11th, very shortly, we'll get copies, like you think  
2 working maps, some adjustments made while you're doing  
3 it, so we see the adjustments, while you're moving it,  
4 what the result is, all the different districts? I  
5 think Ms. Minkoff, when you move one, all 29 other  
6 Legislative Districts will change. It would be a nice  
7 public meeting, get feedback. What I was thinking is  
8 when we see lines move, see what the effect would have  
9 and see the maps actually be drawn and have the public  
10 here at the public meeting. Rather than them moving,  
11 have the maps be interactive while we're here and see  
12 the work while here, displayed and discussed.

13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fleisher.

15 Next, Andrea Gonzales.

16 Ms. Gonzales.

17 MR. GONZALES: Good afternoon.

18 I just wanted to reiterate a couple points  
19 I made earlier, especially after hearing the comments  
20 and discussing the Casa Grande plan, the first of which  
21 is it was mentioned Apache Junction has more in common  
22 with the metropolitan area than it does with the rural  
23 community.

24 Maybe I didn't make myself clear when I  
25 said the reason we included Apache Junction is because

1 of the similarities it shared with Casa Grande in that  
2 they both are the two major metropolitan areas of Pinal  
3 County that do share interests in growth, also share  
4 interests in protecting the agricultural and farming  
5 industries and mining in Pinal County.

6 If Apache Junction is picked up by a major  
7 metropolitan area, such as Mesa, it will have been  
8 sacrificed by being represented in the Legislature.  
9 They'll only be numbers in the Legislature.

10 The second point, if the plan did not  
11 include Apache Junction, maybe go west, we don't think  
12 there's any way to make up for the loss in numbers. If  
13 we lose Apache Junction, we lose the Pinal County plan.  
14 There's no way to make up for the numbers going west.  
15 That's all.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

17 The next speaker is David Gass.

18 Is that a G, sir?

19 MR. GASS: Gass, yes, G A S S.

20 I'll just take a moment of your time.

21 There's something, I've been to a number  
22 of your hearings, and it struck me personally. I live  
23 at 17415 North 6th Avenue, just North of Bell Road.

24 Five years ago you might have called it  
25 rural. It isn't anymore. Bell Road wouldn't be an

1 appropriate dividing line for dividing rural and urban  
2 sections.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are saying "wouldn't."

4 MR. GASS: Would not be appropriate.  
5 We've grown significantly since then.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gass.

7 Paul Eckstein representing the State  
8 Democratic Party.

9 Mr. Eckstein.

10 MR. ECKSTEIN: Mr. Chairman, members of  
11 the Commission, I'm Paul Eckstein, a lawyer in Phoenix  
12 and long-time representative together with John Frank at  
13 Lewis & Roca.

14 I'm counsel for the Democratic Party on  
15 redistricting matters.

16 We have submitted a Congressional packet  
17 and a Legislative packet with maps and explanations.

18 I hope all of you have had an opportunity  
19 to look at our maps, our numbers, and the rationale that  
20 is set forth therein.

21 But I do want to take a moment to  
22 summarize the major points we hoped those maps  
23 accomplished, to talk about a second thought we have  
24 with respect to two Legislative Districts, Legislative  
25 Districts on our maps, 15 and 17 in Southwest Phoenix

1 and Maricopa County.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Eckstein, I don't mean  
3 to interrupt. What I'd like to have happen, do you have  
4 a written submission you wish to add to that we've  
5 received or are we just receiving oral testimony today  
6 on those two thoughts?

7 MR. ECKSTEIN: Oral testimony. I have a  
8 map that constitutes our written submission.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can you leave that?

10 MR. ECKSTEIN: Yes. I have numbers to  
11 submit with that. I don't know that it's complete. I  
12 was just given it about an hour ago.

13 I think it useful, though, to talk at the  
14 outset that when coming up with what we used in coming  
15 up with this, we, the lawyers, members of the Democratic  
16 Party, Legislators, and others who had an interest in  
17 making comments to us, we met a number of times, at  
18 least a half dozen, maybe a dozen times, to come up with  
19 the maps we came up with.

20 We started meeting, I think, sometime in  
21 May, had meetings in June, and they accelerated in July.  
22 So it was a process that involved hearing from a lot of  
23 people in our meetings as well as attending your  
24 meetings.

25 I think representatives from the



1 Democratic Party attended, if not every single  
2 Commission meeting, most of them, and started to report  
3 back to us as to what citizens around the state thought  
4 was important to them. And we did our best to  
5 incorporate these disparate views into our  
6 presentations.

7                   This is the ultimate zero zone game. You  
8 can't take something from someone else without giving it  
9 to someone else. And we understand that. And we  
10 understand that the lines that we have suggested are  
11 susceptible of different interpretation and can be  
12 moved, and we think slightly, to achieve similar  
13 results. But we think what we have done is in faith  
14 with Proposition 106, in faith with the Constitution of  
15 the United States, with the Voting Rights Act. And we  
16 think we've done that with, maybe, and some Democrats  
17 aren't particularly happy with this, maybe to the  
18 detriment of the Democratic Party in trying to make more  
19 competitive districts.

20                   We understand that the notion expressed in  
21 Proposition 106 that there be competitive districts is  
22 at the end of the list. And it says "without  
23 significantly impairing the others interests." But it  
24 is a significant point. And I think when the people  
25 voted on Proposition 106, one of the things that really

1 motivated them was the fact that they could have  
2 competitive districts.

3           At most, in the current system, we have  
4 four, maybe five Legislative Districts that are  
5 competitive and maybe one of the Congressional Districts  
6 that were created in 1991, '92, and, as I say, four or  
7 five of the Legislative Districts. We've done a lot  
8 better job.

9           Let me go through the points very briefly.

10           We started with the grid that the  
11 Commission came up with, and that was our starting  
12 point, because we wanted to deal with the lines and  
13 numbers that you were most familiar with. We tried to,  
14 as I said earlier, adhere to the Constitution, to both  
15 the Constitutional provisions in the Arizona  
16 Constitution, Proposition 106, Article One Six Oh Two,  
17 and the 14th Amendment to the Constitution.

18           We have improved majority-minority  
19 districts. And we believe that we have fully satisfied  
20 the requirements of the land grants of 1965. And we  
21 have protected communities of interest, broadly defined.

22           I understand you had some votes earlier  
23 today. I think our communities of interest are aligned  
24 fairly well with the communities of interest that you  
25 expressed in your votes.

1                   Indian Reservations have been in one  
2 Legislative and one Congressional District since  
3 redistricting, since 1972. Our firm was actually  
4 involved in litigation that established that principle.  
5 And I think -- I know we, in these maps, recognize the  
6 integrity of Indian Reservations. But now with  
7 Proposition 106, the kind of recognition of Native  
8 American communities of interest have been extended to  
9 others. We realize those in our presentations.

10                   On the Congressional side, we've included  
11 detailed justifications for what we have done. And I  
12 just want to make five points.

13                   Number one, the number of  
14 majority-minority Democratic Congressional Districts is  
15 increased from one to two. Currently District 2 is the  
16 only majority-minority district. Under our numbering  
17 system, Districts 2 and 4 are majority-minority  
18 districts with more than 50 percent minorities in the  
19 majority. And we have two districts that are minority  
20 influence districts, districts 6 and 8, which include  
21 between 40 and 50 percent minorities. If one assumes  
22 that the minority population is growing quickly, then --  
23 indeed, more quickly than other parts of the population,  
24 it is not unreasonable to expect that at the end of the  
25 period, that if they will not be majority-minority

1 districts, they will be greater majority-minority  
2 districts.

3                   It's like Wayne Gretzky's comment about  
4 his success. He says he skates the way the puck is  
5 going to be, not to where it is. The Supreme Court  
6 ought to adopt that as a principle. Unfortunately, they  
7 say look at the numbers where they are today. And I  
8 think that as a matter of law you are obligated to do  
9 that. But you have to recognize that the population is  
10 growing.

11                   When you have a state like Arizona, when  
12 it is growing by as much as 40 percent in a 10-year  
13 period, you have to not, if not skate to where the puck  
14 is going to be, where the numbers are going to be, you  
15 have to understand where the numbers are going to be.  
16 We've done that as well.

17                   The second point on the Congressional map  
18 is that we have only split Mohave and Pinal Counties,  
19 other than Maricopa and Pima, and the remaining 11  
20 Counties fall within one Congressional District, except  
21 where they might cross a Reservation.

22                   You can see our proposed District 8 starts  
23 in the Northwestern part of the state and comes down,  
24 picks up Walapai, Havasupai, Navajo. In our map the  
25 Hopi Reservation is excluded. I understand one of the

1 principles you've adopted is to separate the Navajos and  
2 Hopis. One can debate that until the cows come home.  
3 But to accept that, for the cows to come home is less  
4 important to the Legislative map. We have them together  
5 there. Hopis could be easily removed with, I think,  
6 10,000, 9,000 population. Accommodations can be made.

7 Mohave, Pinal Counties, are the only  
8 counties we've split.

9 I think we've done the best we can given  
10 the fact that we have one of the most urban states in  
11 the United States with 76 percent of the people living  
12 in Maricopa and Pima Counties. That's just another  
13 reality we have to live with.

14 The third point is in an effort to provide  
15 the most competitive map, we've created two districts we  
16 believe are Democratic Districts, 2 and 4, three  
17 Districts that are Republican Districts, 1, 5, 7, three  
18 districts we believe are very competitive, 3, 6, and 8.

19 When one tries to label a district, saying  
20 Democrat, Republican, you know, you look at the  
21 Legislative history for the last 30 years, the last  
22 years' election. They demonstrate things that are true.  
23 Sometimes it's demonstrated not to be true.

24 Based on numbers, we think we've created  
25 three very competitive districts. And that's three more

1 than -- at least two more than -- probably  
2 two-and-a-half more than we have today.

3           The fourth point on Congressional,  
4 Congressional lines, are that four of our districts have  
5 a significant rural population influence, 1, 2, 3 and 8.  
6 The two that are greatest are one on the west side of  
7 the state, and it does pick up population in Maricopa  
8 County, and 8, which is the district I just described,  
9 which picks up population on the east side of Maricopa  
10 County, but I believe no more than 150,000 in each of  
11 those out of 641,000.

12           I understand that at least one of those,  
13 Maricopa County Northwest, is fast growing. But I still  
14 think that the rural component of one will have the  
15 majority vote and have the most significant vote in that  
16 district. So we've recognized that community of  
17 interest.

18           And finally, number five, with respect to  
19 the Congressional lines, in line with population growth  
20 of the state, we've created a new district, really two  
21 of them are new, 8 is kind of a new district, 6 is one  
22 on our map really new. It is one that picks up the  
23 central parts of Tempe, Phoenix, and I believe goes over  
24 to Glendale, to recognize the communities of interest  
25 that exist in central cities that we think are more

1 alike than they are different. And that is a very  
2 competitive district, as we have drawn the lines.

3           With respect to the Legislative maps,  
4 we've also included justifications in -- they are  
5 detailed. You can read them at your leisure, if you  
6 haven't. These are key points.

7           Number one, increased the number of  
8 majority-minority Legislative Districts from seven to  
9 nine.

10           Just to recapitulate, with respect to  
11 Congressional Districts, increased from one to two;  
12 Legislative Districts, from seven to nine. That more  
13 than satisfies the Voting Rights Act requirement without  
14 violating those provisions in packing minorities into  
15 districts to dilute the overall influence in the state.

16           We think we've made the proper  
17 accommodation required by law and certainly in terms of  
18 public policy.

19           We think our lines and our numbers achieve  
20 all of what Proposition 106 is designed to achieve.

21           The second point on the legislative map is  
22 that in an attempt to maintain urban and rural  
23 integrities, our proposal has 17 districts in the  
24 Phoenix area, four in Tucson, and the remaining nine are  
25 rural-based districts.

1                   We think that given the numbers in the  
2 state, that pays pretty significant attention to rural  
3 districts. If you say 76 percent of the population is  
4 in Maricopa and Pima Counties, and you have nine of the  
5 districts as rural districts, it's almost 30 percent, 38  
6 percent. So we think we pay more than significant  
7 attention to the rural interests.

8                   Finally, with respect to the Legislative  
9 map, we think we have created a very competitive  
10 situation going from four, or at most five, to eight  
11 competitive districts. Nine would be districts that we  
12 identify as likely Democratic Districts, and 13 would be  
13 districts we identify as likely Republican Districts.

14                   We understand there may be issues with our  
15 map. Since we had our meetings and submitted our  
16 proposals, we've heard from people in the northern part  
17 of our state. Coconino on our Legislative map is  
18 divided into three districts. Certainly that bears a  
19 lot of additional thought. We couldn't think of any  
20 other way to do it to achieve all the goals of 106.

21                   I mentioned with respect to Prop --  
22 Districts 15 and 17, what I have here is a map -- and I  
23 will leave it with you -- that shows the original lines,  
24 this line here being 17, the pink, 15 being the pink. A  
25 map here we believe is a better recognition of



1 communities of interest.

2                   When you look at the maps, you'll see  
3 what's being seen as initially proposed, it being moved  
4 into 15, essentially the Laveen area and a little west.  
5 We now recognize and believe that this, 15, represents,  
6 in a better way, a community of interest, that South  
7 Phoenix and South Mountain Village concept and, at  
8 least, up to around here, is closer to the current  
9 existing District 23.

10                   We think this substitute map, I'll leave  
11 the numbers with you, is a better rendition and better  
12 achieves the purposes of Proposition 106.

13                   Those are my comments. I apologize for  
14 being late and taking as long as I have.

15                   We think our proposals reflect an awful  
16 lot of thought.

17                   I'd be happy to meet with any of the  
18 Commissioners individually to further explain what we  
19 did and why we did them.

20                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Eckstein,  
21 very much.

22                   Are there other members of the public  
23 wishing to be heard at this time?

24                   If not, we'll close the public comment  
25 period.

1                   The next item on the agenda is future  
2 meetings.

3                   As all of you know, we have the rest of  
4 the meetings outlined for the schedule as we've now  
5 adopted it. The next formal meeting will be next week,  
6 beginning Thursday. And we are again scheduled for  
7 potential meetings Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

8                   Whereas this week's meetings went very  
9 smoothly and fairly rapidly, my guess is next week will  
10 be a different matter. We'll use all of the  
11 two-and-a-half day schedule.

12                   Any other issues?

13                   Next week's meeting, Mr. Echeveste, in  
14 this room, in this configuration, slightly different  
15 head table, which we'll talk about later.

16                   MR. ECHEVESTE: Yes.

17                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next week. It seems to  
18 work out well. We appreciate all your efforts.

19                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: We're going to give  
20 Mr. Echeveste here recognition. It was well-organized,  
21 everything worked, we had water, and everything was  
22 wonderful.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

24                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Are you suggesting we  
25 start the meeting Thursday morning?

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We are.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is there any way to  
3 delay that?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No, unless you want to  
5 meet Sunday.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: I just have an  
7 unavoidable conflict down here Thursday morning at 9:00  
8 a.m.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We can talk about the  
10 starting time on Thursday.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I can't start until  
12 noon.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Noon is tough.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there something  
15 we can do on the agenda that doesn't relate to drawing  
16 districts?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There will be, but it  
18 won't take a lot of time. The primary matter on the  
19 agenda will be the presentation.

20 MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, heaven forbid I  
21 support Mr. Hall, but one of the things we wanted to  
22 talk about is if we get the report from NDC, the next  
23 project from NDC Wednesday, there might be some needed  
24 legal review on this. It might be nice to start at noon  
25 to give some leeway to do legal review on Thursday

1 morning.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My only concern, and let's  
3 be very clear, everyone, if we start at noon Thursday,  
4 my best guess is we'll be at this Saturday evening. I  
5 want to be clear about that.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: No problem.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If that's not a problem,  
8 it's not a problem with me, there's no problem.

9 MR. RIVERA: My only fear, and it's  
10 Ms. Hauser's fear, we'd not get through the legal  
11 analysis to give you a good legal analysis.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand your point.

13 Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, at this  
15 stage, we're going into now the most critical stage. We  
16 need to have everything here. If one of our colleagues  
17 is unable to attend, if something were to come up that I  
18 couldn't be here for an hour, I think we need to extend  
19 the courtesy to each other. If that means meet Sunday,  
20 Saturday evening or Sunday, I say we extend the  
21 courtesy.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: I appreciate that. I  
23 cannot think of any meeting I would rather reschedule.  
24 This is a judge-set meeting, and he won't listen to me.

25 MR. RIVERA: Do I have a retainer on that

1 one?

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll  
3 begin our Thursday meeting at noon. We'll be  
4 prepared --

5 Do we have a facility conflict on  
6 Saturday? We do next week as well. We have to vacate  
7 the room Saturday afternoon.

8 What we may need to do is prevail upon the  
9 hotel to change their accommodations or we may need to  
10 meet elsewhere. Certainly we'd prefer to try to change  
11 the hotel, change their mind rather than change --

12 MS. HAUSER: Like this week, it's probably  
13 a wedding.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is more important, as  
15 long as it's not my --

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is there no other  
17 facility that can accommodate us?

18 MR. ECHEVESTE: As soon as we adjourn,  
19 I'll talk to management, see what we can do.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tuesday. We have to post  
21 Tuesday to have a sufficient amount of time to do our  
22 work.

23 The next meeting is the most important  
24 meeting in the series. We should not give it anything  
25 but our full attention for as long as it takes to do our

1 work. Make whatever accommodations in that regard.

2 MR. ECHEVESTES: If I cannot get this room  
3 past 3:00 o'clock, we'll look for another facility like  
4 this that can accommodate us through the evening near  
5 the freeway.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: This session of the  
7 Independent Redistricting Commission is adjourned until  
8 next Thursday at noon to a location, either this one or  
9 one to be determined.

10 The Commission will stand adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at  
12 approximately 3:16 p.m.)

13

14

\* \* \* \*

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

STATE OF ARIZONA )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona, Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 166 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all done to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 7th day of August, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
LISA A. NANCE, RPR  
Certified Court Reporter  
Certificate Number 50349