

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

**Location:** Phoenix  
South Mountain Community College

**Date:** September 4, 2001  
6:30 p.m.

**In Attendance:**

**Commissioners:** Steve Lynn, Chairman  
Andrea Minkoff, Vice Chairman  
Daniel Elder  
Joshua Hall  
James R. Huntwork

**Commission Attorneys:**  
Lisa T. Hauser  
Jose Rivera

**NDC Staff:**  
Alan Heslop

A total of 48 persons attended the meeting at South Mountain Community College and ten of them addressed the Commission.

The first vice-chair of the Democratic Party spoke to the issue of competitiveness from the perspective of minorities. The primary reason for the passage of Proposition 106, she said, was competitiveness; and as a legislator, she had noted that competition can produce a balanced legislature from which better policy can result. It is only in the context of legislative balance that minority representatives can be effective; a lop-sided legislature hurts minorities most. Thus, the over-concentration of minorities -- for example, in districts packed with 80% minority population -- must be avoided in order to use minority votes more effectively (i.e., in neighboring districts that can be made competitive). In Tucson, minority candidates can be elected in 50-60% minority districts. She will provide information prior to September 16 on the methodology used in evaluating competitiveness and will provide, also, specific recommendations for adjusting district lines.

Spokespersons for the South Mountain Central Phoenix community and the Urban League, referencing the plan submitted by the former group on August 9, urged adjustment of the lines of the draft legislative map to use I-10 as a boundary in order to permit greater community of interest for African American residents. All these speakers endorsed the need for increased competitiveness; but one speaker suggested that, in some districts, competitiveness should be broadened to include competition among minorities.

A member of the Phoenix City Council, while generally supporting the August 9 submission and echoing the support of competitiveness, noted that there are considerable differences in issue orientation and voting behavior among registrants. Thus, some Republicans are relatively open-minded; others simply vote the party line. He expressed the hope that the Commission will seek to encourage greater openness to candidates and issues; and he urged the re-design of district lines to create urban competitive districts. He called attention, also, to differential growth rates in the metropolitan area. He promised that specific recommendations would be made at the Commission's hearing in Glendale.

Another speaker, focusing on the apparent lack of competition in most of the draft Congressional districts, said that an effort should be made to make all districts more competitive. Questioning the use of the 5% registration margin as a standard of competitiveness, he suggested that candidates can win against an 8 or 9% registration disadvantage, but that districts are hopelessly uncompetitive when the margin gets to 15 or 16%. Even if it is impossible to design a fully competitive district, an effort should be made to narrow the gap between the parties to a point where the incumbent finds it prudent to talk to registrants of the minority party.

A resident of current legislative district 20, although applauding the Commission for correcting some of its gerrymandered features, complained about the loss of territory in its northern portion. He commented, also, that restoring competition to districts would get politics back to where it is fun and worthwhile to do political work.

A representative of the Maricopa Farm Bureau asked the Commission to re-evaluate draft legislative lines in the Buckeye area and other primarily agricultural areas. She commented, also, that in both the draft congressional and legislative maps there is one "really odd looking district" that should be corrected.

**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.