

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

**Location:** Tucson  
Pima Community College  
Desert Vista Campus

**Date:** June 18, 2001  
7:00 p.m.

**In Attendance:**

**Commissioners:**

Steven W. Lynn  
Daniel Elder

**Commission Attorneys:**

Lisa T. Hauser

**NDC Staff:**

Ralph A. Rossum

Seven speakers addressed the Commission at a lightly-attended hearing. They addressed several topics.

Two speakers urged the Commission to take into account “geographic and historical corridors.” One example offered was “a geographical figure . . . called the Memorial Rim.” “Anybody that’s driven Route 191 knows it takes about as long to go from Morenci Clift up to Alpine as it does to go from Tucson to Flagstaff. The point being that anybody that has to represent that whole district is going to be unfair in their representation.”

One speaker expressed concern that the Tohono O’Odham Nation was divided into two districts. Two others complained that the Tohono were joined in the same legislative district with the wealthy communities of north Tucson when they, in fact, are part of a community of interest, based on economics and language issues, with western and southwestern Tucson.

One speaker complained that the legislative grid split midtown Tucson (defined as “Menlo Park, A Mountain, all the way to . . . San Clement, out to . . . Wilmot, and then south of River down to the air force base”), an area of “common cultural and sub-cultural experience,” thereby depriving it of its political cohesiveness and effectiveness. Another noted that Apache County has little to do with Tucson and, therefore, they should not be included in the same congressional district. Still another noted that South Tucson has less of a sense of community of interest with municipalities to the north and west and more of a sense of community of interest, based on “economic, ethnic, and Hispanic” issues, with the population to the south.

One speaker warned the Commission against interpreting low public turnout at this public hearing to respond to the legislative and congressional grids to mean “the people are not interested”; once communities of interest have been identified and actual maps have been drawn, “there are going to be other issues coming up.”

Two speakers addressed the issue of creating competitive political districts. One speaker argued that creating districts based on communities of interest was far more important than creating competitive districts. Another speaker, however, offered the opposite point-of-view and challenged what the Chairman had said during his opening presentation, namely, that Proposition 106, in fact, established a hierarchy of criteria and placed the construction of competitive political districts at the bottom of that hierarchy. The Commission Attorney responded that “the proposition lays out a number of different criteria, and at the very end of most paragraphs says do this to the extent practicable. With respect to competitive districts, it says competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals. It is the only one of the criteria that specifically says don’t do violence to the other goals.”

No AURs

**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.