

Excerpts From the Independent Redistricting Commission Public Hearing at the City Council Chambers, Glendale, AZ, September 12, 2001

1. Supervisor Jay Howe: "My understanding is the US Attorney General Department of Justice Guidelines have a five percent flexibility factor built into this to protect like interests, keep bordering communities with common shared interests together when possible. I believe this is possible in the case of La Paz and Yuma Counties. I believe communities of interest become a weighted factor. In our case, there are many common interests that La Paz shares with you, more so than the pure number idea for the same for each district, as much as possible. That's definitely an element.... La Paz County was an oversight to be corrected, and you can use flexibilities built into the directives. Only with the belief in splitting Quartzsite, La Paz was -- it was unintended in trying to meet a stated goal of an equal district."

2. Supervisor Jay Howe: "This current proposal disenfranchises Quartzsite, Wenden, and Salome. These communities make up the majority of my community, the most rural portion of the La Paz community, and they have shared interests, similar interests and problems with Yuma County."

3. Supervisor Jay Howe: "We'll be happy, accept and work with wherever we are placed, first and foremost, no question about it. We do share similar water issues along the river with Mohave County, one of the smaller sized districts, District Two. And we really don't have a problem with Mohave County. We have a great relationship with their board and can work well with them. We just feel as a whole La Paz County has more common interests, the rural, agricultural, Hispanic issues that tie us a little closer to Yuma County, in our opinion. We're not adverse to it, though."

4. Tom Voros: "Sun City Grand is a subdivision of Surprise. There's Sun City, Sun City West. Sun City Grand is an unincorporated subdivision in Maricopa County. There's a great difference in that. Are you -- I'd like to point out we are separated from Sun City West by a -- approximately four, five miles. A river gives us a natural boundary between the two communities. We are surrounded on three sides by the City of Peoria, on the fourth side by the City of Youngtown, all of which are unincorporated communities. Just a wee little bit is a piece of Surprise, the next slice of that is Surprise. We are two completely different developments, although both share similar names."

5. Mr. Garner: "We're not a walled-in community that isolates itself in. We're involved in West Valley issues, the west part, West Maricopa Coalitions, West Loop Council, MAG Loop, Maricopa Association of Governments, . A large number of residents volunteer time in neighboring communities' governments. What we are proposing is a compromise plan shift of 28,000 people in the southern section of Sun City south of Bell Road into the District Two, the east of Sun City, which is now, as I understand it, District H. In order to satisfy the required population count, or approximately 171,000 in this case, you have to shift some of the people from the area northeast of Sun City into District D. Again, as pointed out earlier, in the southern portion of Sun City, there are more common community interests in District H, the northern section of Sun City. In the

recommended compromise plan, there will be two State Senators and four Representatives along with two silver-haired Legislators representing the retirement communities, and as such, they would provide more voice on Legislative matters."

6. Mr. Garner: "Above Bell Road, stay in the district with Sun City West. What we're talking about is shifting south of Bell Road into the east district. You have to compensate the shift with some people northeast of that area back into the Sun City West district. To balance the district, those shifted back Sun City West, District B, you suggest the northern District, District H.

7. Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox: "And the Coalition recognized the Arizona State Constitution calls for the Commission to provide for competitive districts where possible. Our utmost goal is to present, is to protect voting rights, minority voting rights in Arizona. We realize if we do the two together, they are not mutually exclusive."

8. Aaron Kizer: "What we considered competitive is about a difference of less than eight percentage points between the two parties. In one district, it may have a Republican that has run very well. Another one Democrats. If you get within eight percentage points, candidates, we considered that to be competitive."

9. Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox: "One other point, we spoke of Legislative maps, have spoken to you several times and testified the Congressional maps we do support. Congressman Ed Pastor tonight is standing in strong support for that map. We realize Danny Ortega is right after us. Ed's map, we'd oppose the Central Phoenix District. That community disenfranchises many, many, communities, should the Central Phoenix district split communities."

10. Danny Ortega: "Congressman Ed Pastor submitted maps directly to the Commission by the deadline in July. The Congressman took several considerations, wanted to create three Democratic districts, one competitive district, to create two minority districts, three Democratic districts."

11. Danny Ortega: "District D, as drawn, very satisfactory really takes into account all the different factors outlined for you. We believe it needs a little tweaking, once again, on the basis of communities of interest. Voting Rights Act is paramount, paramount to preparation of maps. It takes precedence over anything else. If you simply looked at the Biltmore Estates, we do not believe the Biltmore Estates has any commonality with south and southwest Phoenix, and we ask that you consider taking that out of District D. We propose to you that you consider the area north on Bethany, west on Seventh Street, east on 32nd Street and Indian School to the south as an area that you could put somewhere else; and to make up for that to include, because of more commonalities, based on our research, the area of Glendale north, Camelback south, 59th Street Avenue west, 43rd Avenue east.

12. Danny Ortega: "The Congressman has looked at the Central Phoenix proposal that has been made, and he absolutely unequivocally opposes it. That map specifically does

what we have been trying to avoid, that does to split, divide communities of interest. You know, the voting rights on Section Two requires this Commission create districts minorities equal candidates of choice. If we argue that the map you drew is contrary to the concept of communities of interest because you included Biltmore Estate, we must also be consistent and say if you include a large Hispanic community with Biltmore Estate, with parts of Scottsdale, the north part of Phoenix, that's totally inconsistent and would disenfranchise another mostly large segment of the Hispanic community. Let me tell you what that segment is. If you take Camelback on the north, I-17 north and south, I-17 east and west, and 48th Street to the east, you are talking about a tremendous, a great number of minorities, particularly Hispanics in that area, who we believe have no commonalities with the other areas that have been proposed in the Central City of Phoenix District. Protecting communities of interest pursuant to the Voting Rights Act takes precedence over creating federal districts. Federal law preempts state law. Any division only creates a legal challenge. The Congressman is prepared to take on that challenge, if necessary."

13. Steve Gallardo: "The Latino Coalition for Political Action does not take a stand on the issue of competitiveness. We're opposed to the issue of competitiveness only if it violates any issue of the Voting Rights Act or disturbs communities of interest. Our Coalition has never taken competitiveness into consideration at any time during this redistricting process. Since the Commission has decided to look at competitiveness, we have decided to also look at competitiveness as well."

14. John Shaw: "I have a petition and a map submitted on behalf of Greenway Terrace and the Estates Neighborhood who, not like their neighbors, the Westwood neighborhood. Greenway Terrace and Estates want to be part of what I believe would be your district."

15. N. C. Slaght: "We're (Westwood) wanting to move from N into O because of the significance of our historic area and the amount of work we've accomplished already with ASU, the graduate students, now undergraduate students in the process of becoming the First Post World War 1950s historic region in the country."

16. Bob Rosenburg: "I look at a district that is skewed in favor of one party, and I think a candidate in that party, in that district, has a very nice time. And that's good perhaps, for that one candidate. That is bad for the State of Arizona. Where there is competitiveness in the districts, then it makes the candidates work harder to present their case to the voters, but it is much better for the State of Arizona."

17. David Ortega: "I do have a few comments on what is known as the Downtown Proposition.... It looks like a tree ring. If you have one growth, you'd been able to identify a core area. In terms of age, it would be pre-1970, and it is somewhat interesting because it seems to show a competitive balance. However, also, I heard, as far as whether or not the downtown plan would damage the Hispanic community, damaging the southeast corner of area D.... I would be a little concerned with breaking off the Hispanic element which the downtown corridor, or whatever it is called, appears to do."

And I think that we should not diminish that...for community of interest reasons.... I think I was clear in that last comment, you might be able to solve some compaction with a downtown core and still be able to have other spiral elements. That might mean Scottsdale might, possibly, be split in Congressional.

18. Tom Stahle, Sahuarita Town Manager: "The town of Sahuarita belongs in the same Congressional District as Green Valley. We are communities of similar interest and because we are immediately beside each other the Town Council feels that it is in our mutual interest to remain in the same Congressional District."

19. Fred Berkenkamp: "I think it's much fairer if that portion of Sun City below Bell Road would be added to Peoria as there's great commonality of interest, and, in turn, Arrowhead Ranch, or a chunk of that, added into District E."

20. Mark Fooks: "I'm here tonight for the citizens group, Coalition for Downtown Competitive Districts. We have a website, www.GDOCITIDS.com/azcdcd, and, Mr. Chairman, we're preparing a petition currently of individuals who think like we do. And we'll be presenting that to you at a later date.... People that support the downtown district. They are rapidly growing numbers. Word gets out, not one in five of the proposed districts in Maricopa County is competitive.... The detailed statistics, for your information, is that essentially the new District B encompasses all Tempe, downtown, south Scottsdale, east Phoenix, Sky Harbor Airport, downtown Phoenix, east of Third Avenue and north of I-10, the Sunnyslope area, and over to the City of Glendale's eastern border.... The top ten reasons to redraw District for you:

- 10, it would put together urban areas that need and want redevelopment and infill;
- 9, it would put ASU and ASU West in the same Congressional District;
- 8, it would encompass the area currently approved for mass transit proposals by Phoenix and Tempe;
- 7, it would encompass urban areas that are affected by similar types of crime;
- 6, it would utilize visible geographic features;
- 5, it would respect communities of interest;
- 4, it would be geographically compact and contiguous;
- 3, it would comply with the Constitution of the United States and US Voting Rights Act;
- 2, it would have equal population, as I said earlier;
- 1, the most important reason to redraw District B, Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners, is it would provide a competitive district."

21. Councilman Cody Williams: "The thing that this particular district (downtown competitive district) does without exposing the other districts' boundaries does this: For instance, we've heard there's a real desire to protect the status quo of the D boundaries. D currently has 70 percent minority population within its boundaries. The configuration of D reduces it from 70 percent to 65 while at the same time increasing the minority population of B from 22 percent to 40 percent. That then says that 62 percent in G and 37 percent in C, not only do we have the ability to say there are two majority-minority districts but we also have districts where minority populations can make a difference

and/or influence the outcome of elections.... There would still be three districts that would predominantly be Republican, or have a strong Republican majority, or strong majority, to have a stronger Democratic majority, and three that would then, 15 to 10 percent, 12 percent, three of them, which would be competitive."

22. Councilman Cody Williams: "Draft Legislative District P continues to only need to be rounded out by the fact that 51st Avenue on the western edge of it will one day be a freeway, part of a freeway that connects the southern half of the Ahwatukee area to the 10 freeway. And the land bodies, human beings that live in the area west of 51st Avenue, based on our calculations, would not increase the number of individuals in what you have in the Legislative District M, if they were included, and would not create the kind of -- a kind of imbalance that would prevent that kind of relationship from being successfully achieved."

23. Paul Hegarty: "We understand there is much discussion by the Commission and others on competition as the last criteria that cannot be considered until all other factors are taken care of first. I have to disagree with that. As law states, it says the competition issue should be considered if there is no significant detriment to the other factors. As you know, we did submit both maps, Congressionally and Legislatively, during the first stage of the public hearing process that demonstrated you can abide by all other factors of 106 and still provide competition issue, factor, that is used on the maps. One chart shows the competition issue, compared '92 maps, the recent proposal, and then to ours. It demonstrated we're actually able to increase the number of competitive districts in both maps and still abide by other factors."

24. John Keck: "I wish to propose you exchange a small area between Legislative District I and Legislative District N which will place District N completely within Phoenix, not split across Glendale and Phoenix as it is with that. Also Legislative District N will now be split across only two Congressional Districts, B and D, rather than three, as is now proposed. Legislative District A will still be split across Glendale and Phoenix. Also, it will still be split across two Congressional Districts as it is now. I propose to exchange area Roman Numeral I bounded on the north with 47th Avenue and Orangewood, 45th Avenue and Paltaire, and 43rd Avenue for area Roman Numeral II, bounded by 31st Avenue, Butler, I-17, and Northern. These two areas are similar in size, multiple dwelling units, single family dwelling units, and commercial area. They did not have a single tract figures to be any more in depth."

25. Chuck Ullman: "I encourage the Independent Redistricting Commission to retain the proposed Legislative District (d) (1) common interests, needs, and objectives that seniors need and have at the present time. Any division of this district reduces the voting power of seniors in each district and probably disenfranchises 28,000 seniors."

26. Malcomb Hubert: "Competition is necessary for effective democracy. 60 percent of the people vote in the general election, and about 13 percent vote in the primary election. This 13 percent is largely made up of the far right and far left."

27. Marjorie Mead: "I'm a member of the League of Women Voters, which was instrumental in the creation of the fair districts, the Fair Elections Initiative.... I and most League members participated in the creation of the Fair Districts Elections Initiative, there was a greater number of competitive districts. This is because the central goal of the mission of the League has long been to encourage full citizen participation in the electoral process."

28. Todd Lawson: "I'm speaking as somebody that circulated petitions for this initiative that is charged with protecting and putting this into practice, a very difficult task.... As we've seen here tonight, we need look no further than this room to realize the definition communities of interest is a double edged sword. We've seen minority groups, one group claiming it is meaning something else, another group claiming something else.... Look at competitiveness.... The intent of the act produced at this Commission was to produce competitive districts. However, districts as drawn create senseless divides."

29. Todd Lawson: "People participate, turn out competitive elections and produce a responsive, better government for people. To create a single concentrated district for a community of interest, I may ask with such community of interest, you've only ended up stifling another community of interest."

30. Todd Lawson: "If you look more towards producing competitive interests, minorities have a shot to be swing districts or a percentage of. That is more than just a token, like the districts presented by the Arizona Democratic Party to serve the communities of interest and serve interests created by the district you serve."

31. Manny Martinez, Glendale Councilman: "We believe Glendale has three distinct separate communities of interest: Far West Glendale, which is more rural in nature; Old Town Glendale, with its strong ties to the Hispanic community; and the area near south of Glendale and central/north Glendale with its ties to the Metropolitan Phoenix area.... We strongly request the Commission make no changes to District H. In regards to our other two communities of interest, the current map continues to divide these groups. Old Town Glendale continues to be represented by several districts, specifically N, M and L. We believe additional efforts should be taken to better unify this community. Finally, our third community of interest, Far West Glendale, is represented by Districts L and M. Again, we would like to see the Commission make every effort to unify this community. Regarding Congressional Districts, I would now like to share Glendale's concerns with the current Congressional district maps. After review of the latest maps, it is our strong preference that the earlier version dated August 8, by National Demographics be adopted. We believe that the new congressional district in which Glendale lies, Glendale A, fails to meet the criteria or intent of the initiative approved by the voters."

32. Caleb Soptelean: "All Yavapai County should be one Legislative District. If you must rip off any portion, only a portion of Sedona, split a portion of Yavapai County with a portion of Coconino. What I understand the people of Sedona said is they look more toward Flagstaff anyway.... I previously live in the Wickenburg area, Wickenburg and

Yarnell for 40 years. There is a move afoot in Wickenburg of annexing with Yavapai. If you chop off Sedona, you might consider putting Wickenburg in with Yavapai County."

33. Liz Farley: "My suggestion (regarding Glendale) is to take the line above Union Hills, currently known as the Arrowhead Ranch area, move it over to I, approximately the same amount of population. I believe those areas, the Arrowhead area is more in line with the North Phoenix area, and then the bulk of Glendale's interests are together."

34. Bill Feldmeier: "I worked very closely with my counterparts in the counties of Yavapai, La Paz, Mohave, and Northwestern Maricopa County on issues that were of really great concern and common interest to us, and I began to recognize in a short period of time issues in the counties, particularly the northwestern part of Maricopa County, had very much in common. Some issues I want to share with you briefly, water, water quality, recreation, the CaniMex corridor, landfills, air quality, and, almost more importantly than any of them, a very high growth rate. I also want to add to them, the territory is owned, if you will, or overseen by the federal government, more BLM than there is a Forest Service."

35. Bill Feldmeier: "I want to share a couple of those issues (affecting North East Arizona) right now: timber cuts, grazing allotment cutbacks, increasing elk populations, the loss of jobs, and the need for growth, Indian nation issues from two large tribes, Navajos and White Mountain Apaches, declining populations in several communities impact revenue streams, more recently because of the Census and in these areas, there is more Forest Service than there is BLM. The issues were entirely different than what is occurring on the other side of -- western side of Arizona."

36. Bill Feldmeier: "We are in Yavapai County being put into an area where they have significantly rural issues which are entirely different than the urban issues we've been dealing with over the last 10 years. My suggestion to you is that you move us back to western Arizona and Northwestern Maricopa County, much like the consultants' map originally recognized, and I suggest to you also that the consultants' map more accurately reflects the community of interest we have with western Arizona as opposed to those in northeastern Arizona."

37. Marsha Presley: "When I voted in Proposition 106, I understood voting in favor of competitive districts. If you do not consider competition an issue, nobody wins. Without competitiveness, people get the message their vote doesn't count. People stop voting. When people stop voting, people stop running for office. You don't get candidates any more. Without competition and with voter apathy, they don't have to start and they can do whatever they want."

38. Jo Marie McDonald: "Two reasons, one we feel the downtown district is competitive, and secondly, and very briefly, is serving a community of interest that is critical to the future of the entire community with the broad spectrum of urban transit, the complexities of brown fields and blight and crime, we need to have a voice in

Washington. It is critical to our future. And over the years, it has been drastically under served."

39. Kevin Clayborn: "District A as it is drawn includes the entire City of Glendale. And contrary to city leaders, I'm in favor of that, like the City of Glendale being in one Congressional District, not being divided in two. City Legislative Districts M and L currently have the City of Glendale in four districts. We already have heard comments that other citizens would like to see that reduced. So would I. The southern part of Glendale is divided, L and M. I would like to see you change the northern boundary of M to Camelback Road."

40. Dorothy Schulz: "I have seen the respect for our political institutions, the respect for those we elect, indeed respect for those that step forward to serve as you have, diminished and been subjected to all sorts of accusations, usually unfounded."

41. Dave Braun: "I am somewhat disappointed with the First Draft Legislative Districts, disappointed for two reasons. The totality of the districts created, I do not believe that the Commission results comply with the competitiveness requirement of Proposition 106. Second, I do not believe that the ethnic packing that was done by the Commission will ever comply with the Voting Rights Act.... I do not believe there is the slightest evidence, however, to indicate that the six goals listed in the amendment were to be weighted less or considered in decreasing order of importance."

42. Dave Braun: "For instance, I suggest you create four competitive Congressional Districts consciously moving dividable communities of interest that tend to be heavily Democratic or Republican in any way into the other legislative or other Congressional Districts. If that makes those four Congressional Districts actually less competitive, those results are both appropriate and legal. It is better four out of eight districts be competitive rather than one or two out of eight. And similarly, at least 10 of 30 Legislative Districts could conform to this policy. Again, it's better 10 Legislative Districts remain competitive, even if the other 20 are not as theoretically competitive. Going from 15 percent one party 17, 18, 20 percent one party, really doesn't change reality."

43. Meg Burton Cahill: "One is the idea of a downtown competitive district. I think that's very important for my part of Maricopa County. My community of Tempe is in support of this idea."

44. Shirley McAllister: "Many of us in Sun City and Sun City West are opposed to the proposition presented at the beginning of the evening that parts of Sun City should be divided out from the proposal that you have presented for District D."

45. John Mills: "I have lived in the Arcadia area and would like to rise in strong opposition to the plan presented by some people tonight regarding the new Congressional Districting plan. I believe the Democratic party presented this plan. This plan completely eviscerates the Arcadia area, cuts us into several different pieces. I think that is completely wrong. Just from looking at the map, at least my little portion of it, District

C, it seems you sacrificed a community of interest on the alter of competitiveness. And this sacrifice is completely unwarranted given the wording of Proposition 106. Any time that you are developing legislation and have multiple competing interests in different items in this legislation, the most important is listed first and least important is listed last. If any other, unless there is some specific keynote which denotes the priority of these things, you have to take them in order of importance from first to last otherwise how could you possibly balance the different communities of -- different competing interests."

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.