

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

**Location: Flagstaff -- Northern Arizona University, College of
Behavioral and Social Sciences, Flagstaff, Arizona**

Date: June 19, 2001

In attendance:

Commissioners: Joshua M. Hall, James R. Huntwork,

Commission Attorney: Jose Rivera

NDC Staff: Florence Adams, Marion Porch

Forty members of the community actively participated in the discussion (31 with statements, 9 with questions).

Several representatives of the Hopi tribe noted that they differ significantly from the Navajo and fear being swamped by them. The Hopi in Moencopi feel "engulfed by the overwhelming presence of the Navajo" and urge that the lands now under the jurisdiction of the Hopi tribe (1996 Navajo/Hopi Settlement Act) be kept with the rest of the Hopi and with the Walapi, and Havasupi in a single district. Some other speakers, however, including members of the Navajo, emphasized that Indian tribes, which should be working together, should be kept together. A member of the Navajo said that the Navajo Nation of Coconino should not be split from Apache and Navajo County. One non-tribal speaker suggested that uniting the tribes in one congressional district might help them work together.

Residents of the Verde Valley proposed that it not be divided, but kept together, claiming that it is acting together increasingly as "a community of many municipalities and unincorporated areas." Some speakers believe that the Verde Valley is more aligned with the western part of Yavapai; others that it should be tied to northern Arizona and the Flagstaff area. One speaker warned against splitting the Verde Valley off from the Prescott area, indicating that separation from Yavapai County might cause further divisions; others disagreed.

Several speakers emphasized that rural communities and rural interests should not be diluted by connection with "the state of Maricopa." Rural issues, it was said, require rural representation. One speaker seemed to express a widely-held sentiment when he commented that, "All rural people have more in common with each other politically than they do with people in Phoenix." The emphasis of these speakers was on preserving

northern Arizona intact. One speaker specifically asked that Apache County, Navajo County, and Coconino County be kept together.

The City of Sedona, which is in two counties, should be in one district, according to several representatives; and a preference was expressed for keeping the Oak Creek Canyon area linked to Sedona. There was controversy, however, on whether Mingus Mountain should be used as a bridge or as a boundary in district formation.

Several speakers emphasized maintaining municipal boundaries; Flagstaff, Sedona and Page were all cited as cities that should be kept intact; and except in the case of Sedona, most speakers support use of county boundaries.

AURs: Navajo (including Hopi)
Hopi (separate from Navajo) including Moencopi, Walapi, Havasupi
Sedona across County line
Verde Valley

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.