

**Summary of Public Hearing  
of the  
State of Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission**

**Location:** Phoenix,  
South Mountain Community College

**Date** June 12, 2001  
7:00 p.m.

**In Attendance:**

**Commissioners:**

Steven W. Lynn  
Andrea Minkoff  
James R. Huntwork

**Commission Attorneys:**

Jose Rivera

**NDC Staff:**

Florence Adams  
Alan Heslop

A total of 23 speakers addressed the Commission. The public comment session began with a coordinated presentation by six spokesmen for the Hispanic Coalition for Fair Redistricting Process. After a PowerPoint presentation by one member of the Coalition, seven maps were displayed and discussed by other members to establish that South Phoenix, Guadalupe, Avondale, Tolleson, and Surprise constitute a community of interest based on party registration, food-stamp recipients, cash one-time assistance recipients, opposition to Proposition 203 (ending bilingual education), primary home language, cash-value per parcel, and voter turnout. The members of the Coalition argued that these communities constitute a community of interest different from that found in Tempe, Chandler, and Ahwatukee, and that they should not be included in the same congressional or legislative districts with them.

The members of the Coalition advocated the creation of two Hispanic congressional districts (one in Maricopa County and one in southern Arizona including Pinal, Graham, Pima, and Santa Cruz Counties) and possibly one Native American congressional district. Seven subsequent speakers affirmed the recommendations of the members of the Coalition.

Two speakers criticized the absence of any minority members on the Independent Redistricting Commission. Eight speakers attacked the grid as failing to comply with the requirements of the Voting Rights Act, contributing to retrogression, breaking up communities of interests and municipalities, and ignoring geographic features. (Another speaker did, however, praise the grid for keeping downtown Phoenix whole.)

Two speakers urged that the Garfield Neighborhood not be divided. One speaker urged that competitive districts be created, while another attacked competitive districts as having a discriminatory effect and making less likely the creation of majority-minority districts. One speaker argued that water needs and usage constituted a community of interest and urged the Commission to keep urban and rural interests separate and to treat Nation Americans as a separate community of interest. One pleaded with the Commission to ensure that the interests of African Americans are protected. Still another urged the Commission to provide minorities with more voice by not following the same boundaries for both senate and house districts.

AURs: South Phoenix, Guadalupe, Avondale, Tolleson and Surprise  
Two Hispanic Congressional districts (one in Maricopa County, one in southern Arizona, including Pinal, Graham, Pima and Santa Cruz counties)

**NOTE:** These summaries and excerpts were developed for the Independent Redistricting Commission by its consultant, National Demographics Corporation, and have not been reviewed by the Commission prior to posting. They are not official statements of the Commission and represent only the consultant's best effort to identify major themes and highlights of each public hearing. The excerpts were chosen by the consultant in an effort to identify common themes and especially noteworthy statements.

These materials are placed here for citizen review and with the hope that they will encourage comments. Comments can be made on the form provided.