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(The following is the continuation of the meeting which began at 6:30 p.m. this same date, contained in Volume One, consisting of the initial presentations and public testimony.)

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd call the meeting back to order.

We have other issues to consider, two, among them, the revised schedule, I believe, and also the second half of the consultant report on other portions of the state where work has been underway.

It seems as though we ought to continue with the consultant's report, hear that presentation. Mr. Johnson, are you prepared to do that at this point?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you. Proceed.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, we left off with the end of the northern section. Let me jump in with the next step here, a look at the
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southern portion of the state.

And just to briefly take up where we're coming up with these different areas, how different parts of the state can be laid out, each of the pieces of the statewide map, regional areas, focus in on key questions there, regional areas, the statewide maps, how pieces fit together.

The goal is interchangeable pieces. As you know, not everything is interchangeable in the state. Everything fits in with everything else, changes everything else, and hopefully we'll find out what it is for a map we want to get.

In the southern area there are five key areas, sources of considerable community interest, or as we drew maps, it came down as key points where AURs, communities of interest, or other criteria and principles overlap or come into conflict: Yuma, Casa Grande, the border district and Cochise are all southern particular interests, and EACO, on this list, as in the north overlaps both areas.

So, as you know, this is the adopted map. You can see, we drew it with Yuma and La Paz. We don't really have what we call a border district, more of Pinal and Tohono O'odham and a Nogales district, and a division of Cochise.
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Does someone have the laser pointer?

MR. RIVERA: You have to pay for it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: There's that bribe: breakfast.

MR. JOHNSON: So you are all fairly familiar with the map. This is the one posted on the web.

Let me go on to area two, another test map. You can see the notes on the side. This one has a border district. You can see it takes in all of Cochise, very similar to some of the scenarios presented in Cochise. The main difference, we tried to put Sierra Vista together as with Scenario Five, the Ortega proposal.

MR. RIVERA: Ruben Ortega, not Danny Ortega.

MR. JOHNSON: Not only put Sierra Vista with Tucson, but split it, put Sierra Vista and avoid the split. Put it with Santa Cruz and a considerable portion Pima County.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Majority-minority?

MR. JOHNSON: Majority-minority.

Casa Grande, Pinal, unifies, not having the Sierra Vista Tucson districts. They have to make up elsewhere. District Z, North Tucson, Saddlebrooke,
takes in North Pinal. Anything to take off Tucson has
to be picked off somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER HALL: W minority-majority?

MR. JOHNSON: W is not.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What are the
percentages, off the top of your head?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What is the letter
notation for the border district.

MR. JOHNSON: This is actually Y, hidden
in there. It's at the central point. I didn't notice
until you asked that, District Y.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on Y, if
looking at communities, of looking, minority
communities, border issues, all the way across, rural,
we've got some mining. I'm trying to think if anything
else really ties those together.

Are those the primary pieces that would
fit?

MR. JOHNSON: I don't remember all the
notes Mr. Baldenegro had. Those are the key ones. He
made a very detailed presentation. Those are key ones.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: His presentation
included Yuma.

MR. JOHNSON: His district was the
Congressional District.

MR. JOHNSON: The only real concern, this triggers the fact the Tohono O'odham expressed considerable concern about being included in a district, dominated, as this may be, by Cochise. Cochise has 117,000 people. The rest of this is 54,000 between the Santa Cruz and this area.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Any other Native American Reservations there other than the Tohono O'odham?

MR. RIVERA: The Pascua Yaqui piece, Tucson.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's it?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Pascua Yaqui are not in Y?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

MR. JOHNSON: When I show the zoom-in maps, it will show.

Let me jump in.

Test three is largely in response to both Mr. Baldenegro and the Tohono O'odham concerns. What we tried to do in this test is draw a border district that caught in the border communities, also the Town of Douglas that wanted the mining, or majority-minority
district without the border dominated district. One reaction.

None of the maps are perfect, I should note. None of the maps are ones we recommend. What --

COMMISSIONER HALL: Why a majority-minority district?

MR. JOHNSON: Minority-majority heavily, includes border towns.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Nogales.

MR. JOHNSON: Nogales as well.

MR. RIVERA: I think my cousin is there.

MR. JOHNSON: One small area, 30 percent Hispanic, 50 percent minority, turned out to be a prison.

MR. RIVERA: That's where my cousin was.

(Laughter.)

MR. JOHNSON: In response to Mr. Baldenegro, it was to make sure we take it into account.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I remind everybody, we're on the record.

(The record notes Mr. Rivera's previous comments were spoken with levity and laughing.)

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District E, echo district, the western part, western edge of the county,
you've taken out Cochise. Other than that, does it remain the same?

MR. JOHNSON: Up further, it includes Flagstaff, Gila, and comes down.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Can we look at what happens to the north?

MR. JOHNSON: We can show the statewide maps.

The other piece, essentially the western, northwestern, and southwestern Santa Cruz, it's part a Hispanic AUR put with the southwestern Tucson, CC, DD dominated districts.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Include Green Valley?

MR. JOHNSON: CC does.

CC includes the I-19 corridor, the I-19 corridor except Nogales and overlapping communities of interest, I-19, Green Valley, and Tucson.

Other things to point out on this map --

COMMISSIONER HALL: What did you do over there in Yuma? Holy moley.

MR. JOHNSON: This is an alternative. We mentioned a little bit about the north, you to need get 8,000 people to finish the Mohave Yuma districts. This area of Ajo, Gila Bend, the whole area totals 8,000
people. And so it stays out of the municipal parts, or
urban parts of Maricopa, takes Gila Bend to finish the
districts. The configuration is only Mohave County and
La Paz, a tradeoff, stick out here, stick out in
Maricopa, or stick out in Yavapai to finish the
districts, three trade-offs to look at.

COMMISSIONER HALL: What is District D?

MR. JOHNSON: District D, roughly done,
figures the West Valley district. The goal of this map
in that area is to not intrude into the West Valley
cities from the outside. The configuration of this
district, it could use work, probably end up putting D
and L together dividing North-South. So the key thing
to focus on here is this is Maricopa, the urban Maricopa
area, and it doesn't have intrusion by Yavapai, La Paz,
or Yuma areas, and includes Apache Junction and Gold
Canyon.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Gold Canyon with
Maricopa or Pinal?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Is Casa Grande split?

MR. JOHNSON: No. There's a line right
there by the south border of the Gila River Reservation.
The Ak-Chin Reservation goes north. The communities of
Casa Grande are all unified and in, I think, Nogales are
probably the most urban part of the entire district.
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MS. HAUSER: Doug, do you have the demographics for each of the alternatives?

MR. JOHNSON: I have them for the statewide maps. I'll put the pieces together. I'll hand them out to you as soon as I can show them.

The fourth option in the south, this one is Casa Grande with Tohono O'odham, the urban reservations. There is no border district -- I should point out W and CC are showing up very similar. The border between them is that dark line and the county line. All Santa Cruz County is W. CC remains dominated, all the people, and it does take CC from a majority-minority to a solidly minority Hispanic district, which has appeal there. In a way, the offsets, the Santa Cruz Air Force Base, the immediately surrounding area is taken into the pink DD East Tucson District. So that's a tradeoff there. The --

Let me see. Tohono O'odham takes in an urban configuration. This picks up Buckeye, short, pure rural population, one place to go get it. That's all it takes to get it.

Oh, EACO. This one has nice compact districts, meets a bunch of goals of Tucson. Tohono disadvantages. AUR, EACO, is one thing to keep in mind. This is also one very close to the Cochise scenarios, as
well taking non-Reservation Graham and all of Greenlee.

The way this offsets it, you see the

statewide map taking in the portion Flagstaff and more

of Coconino up in north. I'll illustrate that in the

statewide map.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Some eastwide mining

communities.

MR. JOHNSON: Eastwide mining communities.

Dudleyville and Kearny. I'll go into what was EACO and

Superior and Top of the World, go in with Tohono and

Casa Grande.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Four Tucson

districts in this?

MR. JOHNSON: No, four, Z, A, DD --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is DD?

MS. HAUSER: I see five.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll zoom in for Tucson on

that. I'll come back.

Let me come back, zoom in on Tucson for

this.

The last southern configuration, the

ripple is taking Apache out of EACO, putting it up with

Navajo, which is one of the possible ripples that could

occur. This one maintains kind of an EACO tone as we've

been calling it. EACO loses reservations, keeps
everything else, picks up a considerable part of eastern
Pinal.

We also illustrate this map, another one
of the Cochise County proposals, and take all of
Cochise, all of Santa Cruz, and essentially just the
Tohono reservation here.

This one, it makes Cochise County happy,
their proposals. Its affects on Pinal are not what we'd
want to brag about, because Sierra Vista is no longer
included in portions of Santa Cruz, no longer in
included Tucson districts, we have to go up central
Pinal up to Florence.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put up Tohono up
again.

MR. JOHNSON: Tohono O'odham objections?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: What is the
population of the Apache White Mountain and San Carlos?

15,000 total?

MR. JOHNSON: About thirteen in one and
nine in the other. Roughly 22,000 or so. The tradeoff
is straight here, dropping 22,000, picking up 22,000.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Communities of
interest, the reason for pulling in those two
reservations is to take them back into the community of
native, the Hopi, Navajo, and other --
MR. JOHNSON: Right. This is a test of the request of one Apache tribe to be in with the Navajo.

MR. JOHNSON: Maricopa versions, Maricopa has seen larger maps. There are four key looks at the Apache Junction, Tempe, East Valley, all tied together. Bring Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, it ripples through South Mountain as well. We've only done one of the trade-offs. Every test, the Isaac School District AUR is separated slightly in the maps and also had a lot of the community area near Indian School separated east at 19th that wanted to be unified.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Westwood Village.

MR. JOHNSON: Westwood Village. It TURNED out to be identical population in the same districts. Just swapped them back and forth very easily. We love changes like that, very easy to do. It's possible to do in all tests. It's not illustrated in all you see.

The other two areas, four urban reservations in the West Valley, which are really the key focus, Maricopa, adopted the map, looking for key areas, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, out of Maricopa with the urban districts, Tempe is all but unified in District Q. Again, Isaac School, the switch we can make easily, and then South Yavapai District comes down and
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takes in a lot of the area of Peoria, the Sun Cities, El Mirage, Buckeye, and really the Maricopa district.

The first test we've run continues to keep Apache Junction and Gold Canyon not with the East Valley, out of the urban districts. So that means Tempe and the East Valley districts stay the same.

Changes here are this is where the two Yavapai County districts come down. One is Verde Valley, the Sedona Valley coming down into Cave Creek and Peoria, and the Tri-Cities Districts coming down into Surprise and Buckeye since all three, all these Maricopa scenarios are closely related.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me interrupt.

When done in relation to what we're doing, being done before the Phoenix meetings, done before -- these reflect --

DR. ADAMS: Ongoing.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Inter-tribal, South Mountain, Estrella.

MR. JOHNSON: Directly driven.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: 17th?

MR. JOHNSON: Detailed information from the Commission hearings or from citizens where we could incorporate it, happened to be in area already, we would attempt to, from the most part addressing the
Commission's instructions.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Doug, in the presentation, for instance, I'm thinking of something we heard at the meeting yesterday, there was pretty consistent citizen input, probably need to test, can we also give you those suggestions so you can begin working on them in your next free moment?

MR. JOHNSON: Certainly. If you want to give us information at the end of this meeting, or e-mail "please look into it," call us, however you want.

DR. ADAMS: I'd add, Commissioner Minkoff, we were provided seven summaries of the meetings held last week. What we've done is taken a close look at the items as they've come up. We don't have the detailed transcripts from Tucson, so we can't look at some areas, are having to go by our own notes, and some of the draft notes. But what we're trying to do, as these things come up, at least test them as we know you'll probably be requesting tests of options.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One of the things I remember coming up out Estrella yesterday, the five West Valley communities all desiring to be in the same district, which would require radical redesign of the districts in Maricopa County. I think it's something enough people said it, we probably need to test it.
don't know whether it works or not, and obviously won't
know. Those are the kind of things that come up at the
meetings. There will be particular effort, like we
heard tonight, to do something different than what was
shown at the meeting.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, I know
for a meeting, having spoken to Alan Heslop earlier,
he's completed a summary for the meeting, and we'll have
information about that.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You are
automatically testing anything, any subject of
significance from the testimony?

DR. ADAMS: Correct.

MR. JOHNSON: One thing, posting different
scenarios on the web, now citizens say: Okay, I want to
move these five districts around. As long as we do it
in the context of any one of the scenarios, so we know
it will work on a statewide basis, hopefully we'll get
detailed direction as well.

This is good example of that, the question
on the West Valley district here. In part due to time
constraints, in part we haven't had a chance to look at
the detailed transcripts to address that valley area, we
drew the West Valley focus, the West Valley together,
didn't spend any time at all on D and L to go in this
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plan. Those districts can easily rotate around in a logical distribution.

What this test does show, if we include Apache Junction and Gold Canyon, we'll have population to make almost entirely Maricopa Districts without intrusion from the surrounding area except in the Scottsdale, Cave Creek area. Again, could rotate and be intrusion on the west side, if the goal is we needed to do it for some other purpose in Yavapai. But you can see, and this is a district where, my apologies on the color here, have a district with most of Scottsdale here, the neck of Scottsdale, and central district of the Salt River here.

Let me clarify that. Other results are putting Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and it ripples through East Valley. We did not change the Gilbert district, a small portion of the Mesa, Gilbert that essentially unified and does ripple through. It affects Mesa. Mesa maintains a significant portion of the Apache Junction and entirely Mesa in R, a third of the District in Q. Q, however, Tempe is no longer unified in this. If we bring in Apache Junction without going to reservations on the other side, then Tempe goes back to division at the 60 Highway with a small piece of Tempe split off Scottsdale.
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Three pieces.

MR. JOHNSON: The main impact is to bring Apache, Gold Canyon, with no options unless through the reservations north or south or through South Mountain district all the way through.

We attempted to divide, to distinguish, I should say.

The other piece of this, I should say, the division of Chandler is greatly reduced. Instead, the dividing line is through a middle of Chandler and now breaks off a small arm of Chandler.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: When Chandler spoke to us, they were comfortable with the division at Dobson Road. That's what they asked for.

In order to not chop up Tempe the way it was chopped up, if you could in this scenario redivide Chandler at Dobson Road and put it into District T, take the portion of District T, put it back with Q, put the Mesa portion in with, I guess, District U, if you do that kind of switch so you don't have to chop up Tempe quite so much, the Mesa portion is what it is, whether in Q or U. It's not with the rest of Mesa. That might allow Tempe to be more unified.

MR. JOHNSON: It is an option that would bring in more of Tempe. We looked at how much it spins.
around three districts. You could bring the divider further down and get more of Tempe together. You wouldn't be able to come down as far as we were before. The thing is Chandler would come up, take a portion of Mesa as an option. It was torn before the competing priorities all over the East Valley. Mesa didn't want a small sliver of Tempe, didn't want to be divided.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How much of Mesa is in this?

MR. JOHNSON: Mesa, 50, 60 thousand people. Most have to stay there. That's a bridge.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Couldn't put them in U, put the rest in T, and then the rest in Q?

MR. JOHNSON: Not enough people. Well, could go into Chandler here, further than we did before, to make it up.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Oh.

MR. JOHNSON: We could get halfway between the plans, if that's what we wanted to do. This test, the two lines, people liked the highway on the map. If they prefer that, we could do it.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on this one, looking at M, L, and D, what was the background or
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rationale for the wraparound and having such a long
north-south as opposed to trying to get three fairly
compact districts there?

MR. JOHNSON: District M, M is part of a
Hispanic AUR tied into all relationships for the
districts there. We didn't want to change M at all in
this test, because of those percentages being everywhere
people liked them, D and L not looking more appropriate
for a division, those were tied.

Definitely before we brought anything for
vote, certainly wanted to reconfigure those, in large
part looking at transcripts and more closely tying to
city borders, H could be figured in to work as well.

M has other issues.

Going to Tucson, the last area before I
get to the statewide pieces.

Tucson, four key points, south and central

Tucson, two points, discussion of the sliver,
 north-south sliver between AA and CC, where there was a
request to move that, to make a more logical community
border. I haven't had a chance to draw the tradeoff
yet. In the initial analysis there shouldn't be much
problem. Steps two and three at that meeting, had to
get into 20, 25,000 people, big issues.

The other piece, other question in that
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area, the Pascua Yaqui request for communities in the
Tucson area to be united. We have the reservation
united, a good description of kind of the northeast
tucson piece of that, but marana and south Tucson areas,
we are waiting for a map and requested that from them.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can I ask a question
from counsel for them? Had the principle to keep tribal
areas together, primarily reservation areas, there are a
lot of communities, a lot of areas where Native
Americans do reside outside traditional lands. The
incident of the Pascua Yaqui is one community with an
internal area of 50 residents, another 115 miles away,
Marana, 100, 200, for all I know. What is the feeling
of either, you know, rejecting, let's not keep them
together because it's a gross gerrymander if we tried to
tie them all together? I'm trying to find out what are
the rules of the game.

MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Elder, you
are the ones that established the AURs, Native American
communities. Unless you get to the point of violating
Section Two or Section Five, there are no other criteria
to keep them together. In this situation, I don't think
you are violating Section Two or five.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue here, it
seems to me, we don't have reservation land. What we
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have are members, subscribed members of a tribe, just as
we would with Flagstaff, living in Flagstaff off
reservation area still subscribed members of the Navajo
Nation.

MR. RIVERA: To a large extent Hopis have
substantial amounts of land outside the reservation, and
it's similar to that aspect.

You as Commissioners establish the AUR,
determined what AURs were, what the principles were.
It's not a solid, hard line. This does not violate
Section Two or five. You can.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Jose, my remembrance
is what we discussed were tribal lands. They were not
communities, areas outside tribal lands. There is not
something here, even a need to have the test done to see
how we link all these -- it's four different areas,
probably 40 miles apart.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think -- I agree,
Mr. Elder. I don't know that it would prove
particularly useful in testing. I do think, however,
knowing that there are pockets of Pascua Yaqui in Tucson
and where they are is useful in terms of drawing the
interior boundaries of Tucson districts, that is to say
as those districts may be reconfigured, either bullet
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area, knowing those concentrations exist can be useful and instructive in where lines might be drawn.

An attempt to unify them I think is counterproductive in terms of the entire configuration of the Tucson districts.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think individual tribes making specific requests of which tribes they prefer to be with, would prefer to be with, follows the same parameters. We have principles, we all have preferences, and to accommodate all of those at the expense of a variety of other more significant issues would be prohibitive.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sorry to interrupt.

MR. JOHNSON: No problem.

The other key point I point out, the testimony from the Tucson area, three point, area connections to Tucson as opposed to the Tohono O'odham issue. We looked at it, connect to AA in all tests without issues coming up.

This is the adopted plan.

One thing, the Pascua Yaqui, the only reason we think we might be able to do it without too much trouble once we get the maps for the areas generally described is right at the northeast border here, South Tucson --
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One up in Marana.

MR. JOHNSON: I have no idea of Marana, where it is.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It is west of the freeway.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'll show you. They have one area just about the A of Marana. You have the one area referred to right there at the convergence of I-10, I-19, and Grant Road right there on the east side within the first half mile of Grant Road, right in the center core. Trying to run a leg up to connect something there, connect something there, heck --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is the main part of the Reservation?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The main part of the Reservation, this little piece of Santaveer District, Tohono O'odham, Pascua Yaqui, this little area here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Put that in AA.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: That is taken out, Pascua Yaqui and Tohono O'odham are together on tribal lands.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Unify the Pascua Yaqui in AA, rather than the Tohono O'odham. There's no way with all that territory.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Theoretically, expand AA, bring all the folks together would be problematic.
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part about reaching up to Marana to take the Ruin Pueblo
into same the district.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Separate Tohono O'odham, unify Pascua Yaqui and Tohono O'odham.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: The area here, AA,
expand the area here through AA.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In order to reach.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: C could come back.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: In order to do that, reach into South Tucson, a one-mile square of incorporated city, and you would have to extract 50 people. And it would make no sense to do it.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if I'm wrong, we still basically have five Tucson dominated districts there, right?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: On that map, yes.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Adopted by --

COMMISSIONER HALL: This is adopted.

Sorry.

MR. JOHNSON: I should point out, as the Commissioners note, District DD in this case goes down and takes in the northeastern corner of Santa Cruz and Sierra Vista.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sierra Vista.

COMMISSIONER HALL: This is the adopted
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MR. JOHNSON: The first test we ran, you can see if this focuses a little bit. District DD, in this case, this is a district where it comes out of Sierra Vista, Cochise County is unified, DD is not in it, the north half of Santa Cruz as opposed to northeast corner. As a result of DD coming out of Sierra Vista, more Catalina Foothills District Z, more Lynn Valley, Saddlebrooke district goes north into east Pinal County.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: How far does it go, Doug?

What does it take?

MR. JOHNSON: Takes a lot. This one goes up to Florence. Not including Florence, but a lot.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Kearny.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Kearny and Mammoth.

MR. JOHNSON: All tests, Three Points is with AA. Some strange lines on the border, all are done to make sure it works from a population equality standpoint. We'd clean these up in the final map.

This is the next test we did in the Tucson area, in this case Santa Cruz County. This is the skinny border district, I should say, the Tohono O'odham District, that comes across and picked up Douglas. DD, EE stretches across Santa Cruz, remains --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do the numbers correspond?
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Does Southern Arizona two correspond with Tucson two?

MR. JOHNSON: No. We'll see them put together --

CHAIRMAN LYNN: It would be really helpful on a map labeled to zoom in on Tucson and also be to maybe put them together.

MR. JOHNSON: The trap between -- many maps are the same.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're trying to be instructive.

MR. JOHNSON: After the presentation, I'll show statewide map references.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe go statewide, zoom in. I'm completely confused. One in the north.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Keep going.

MR. JOHNSON: There's only one more.

This is to show you Santa Cruz County split up. Z only gets Saddlebrooke. This is where EACO comes down into Cochise.

This map is the major change, Tucson area zoom-ins.

This is one where CC comes into Santa Cruz County, it's out of the Air Force area. That's entirely DD. CC, however, remains dominated by the Tucson area. Population is extremely dense, a hundred thousand people.
from the Tucson area.

Commissioner Huntwork, to return to your question asked earlier about the map, we still do get the five Tucson dominated districts even though this one small area of Tucson population is still there.

This is the Cochise united Santa Cruz map. District DD is entirely within Pima County, shows how much more Pima County picks up. This where District Z goes up into central Pinal and takes in all of that area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Central Pinal like --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Includes Casa Grande.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This one really is chopped up.

MR. JOHNSON: Four significant pieces as opposed to four corners. Chopping up.

COMMISSIONER HALL: That is where Cochise is taking in Graham and Greenlee.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, and Santa Cruz.

Now statewise, the maps put the pieces together. The principles in each of the maps, they start out saying two, three of the goals had in drawing the statewide map. You know the key areas now.

The current LD gives, since that's where you were coming from, you see the statewide map. It's
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lines how divide areas, the current districts in Tucson, current districts in Maricopa. It's the adopted and you know well. I'll skip through it quickly. Scenario A, started in the Cochise counties, Ortega districts, unified Sierra Vista and put it with the statewide map.

What is the impact statewide? Able to preserve EACO, the Kingman river district, unified Prescott and the Verde Valleys.

This is scenario A, the statewide map.

Key points, here's the border district. Split Santa Cruz. Each of the Yavapai Valley areas is unified and each comes down into Maricopa.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Phoenix /rea.

MR. JOHNSON: Deeply into the Phoenix area.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Yavapai is split on Mingus? I'm confused there.

MR. JOHNSON: Keeping to --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Split at Verde Valley, right in the middle?

COMMISSIONER HALL: Unify Verde?

Splitting Verde?

MR. JOHNSON: It follows essentially the Census tract and Census tract divisions of the population. All population of Verde Valley is here.
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COMMISSIONER HALL: Split at Mingus Mountain.

DR. ADAMS: Basically.

COMMISSIONER HALL: Over here on whatever the right district is, C.

MR. JOHNSON: C.

COMMISSIONER HALL: C comes down.

MR. JOHNSON: C comes down to North Phoenix, the valley area, a piece of Flagstaff.

COMMISSIONER HALL: And C.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Florence, is there another one of those?

MS. LEONI: We're passing those out.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Everybody but me.

MS. LEONI: Strange.

DR. ADAMS: Strange. I believe I passed one to the Chair but not the other Commissioners yet.

MS. LEONI: What you just received is the demographic data for the full maps.

MR. JOHNSON: The top stapled the maps and the letter.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I apologize. I'm not able to absorb any more information. Further participation in the meeting is pointless. I'll excuse myself and study this at length when I have the ability.
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to. I now have the breakdown, which will be helpful. Hopefully in a day or two it will be on computer.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll be there myself. Just go through quickly.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: There is a scheduling issue you may want to participate in.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If it's okay with the rest with you, go through quickly. No questions. I'll study them. I'm where Jim is.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The scheduling issue, is it helpful to me?

MR. JOHNSON: I could wrap up in five minutes.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I have a motion. I'd like to have the full Commission, if we could, later on.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Move expeditiously through this, and see what we can about scheduling.

MR. JOHNSON: I'll point out I'll point out different pieces. A Northern District takes in pieces of North Holbrook, not Holbrook, splits Yavapai in half, and creates a Northern District here. You've seen scenarios here now probably very familiar to you. We'll get you this in a printout form, go through all the details.
Scenario B, another detail, aimed to unite, Pinal is the border. The northern district in this case did not come down into the area here at all. EACO does go into Flagstaff to make up for Cochise being unified here.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Does that put Sedona with Flagstaff or Sedona with Yavapai?


COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Is this map three we were talking about earlier?

MR. JOHNSON: No. This is a united Yavapai, I think two. I'll point out three. Number 3 does not include Sedona.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sedona is excluded.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Sedona, Yavapai in this one.

MR. JOHNSON: In this case, Sedona is with Yavapai. This is map CC and it comes down to Tucson and takes all Santa Cruz County.

I'll skip through.

The next one I'll skip over.

Attempting to do the Cochise request, Cochise, without going to Tohono O'odham, the population is not there. Districts were 14,000 15,000 off. Tried
it. Skipped over it without being able to finish it.
Essentially population numbers, go all way in and take
in Tohono O'odham.

Statewide, the Apache Navajo border
district, it split Pinal, talking about here. This map
also, may be able alter this north-south division way
into Maricopa. At first glance it does divide the
Prescott Tri-City areas as well.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, on the surface,
that is a ugly map. I'm sorry.

MR. JOHNSON: That doesn't surprise us at
all.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: It may mathematically
work out well, but it's ugly.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I second that.

MR. JOHNSON: The scenario, second to
last, the narrow border district, EACO without Gila, now
you see the whole Flagstaff Gila urban reservations, a
little more of east Pinal, Gila, Ak-Chin, with the
Northern Districts. Tohono O'odham comes down.

This is option three we talked about in
Yavapai, the dark line cutting out Sedona. To make up
for that it takes in in Coconino the Williams area,
takes in just rural Maricopa there, not any of the
Phoenix cities.
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Zoom in on Phoenix there.
District F, small changes here. Doesn't correspond to the data sheets you have. Only districts affected is B, D, and X.

Essentially what we changed in B, first did this, coming way over to Yavapai. Talk about an ugly district, we rotated around the two more traditional river districts like this. So, this is the split between the two areas in Yavapai. However, it has less intrusion into the Phoenix cities. Area District C now goes all the way up to Flagstaff, includes a portion of Flagstaff.

This also has a plan for the Gila Apache reservations split off from EACO. Apache goes with Navajo, Gila goes with Salt River in east Pinal, also in response to one of the Cochise plans they drew, attempted to draw coming up here. That's what started us coming off with the map.

Statewide plans go into more detail.
At another meeting or another hearing, we'll get on the computers as soon as we overcome the size issues.

I'll hand it over to Marguerite.

MS. LEONI: I'll be extremely brief. I know people want to be on their way. It's quite late.
What we prepared for you is some additional information on competitiveness. We promised the last element of this -- the package, information you'd get on competitiveness is the Judge It analysis. What I'm giving you now is the registration, two major party registration and third party registration for all cities, designated places, counties, and the AURs. In addition to that you'll be receiving the thematic maps which shade the registration by Census track and -- with the districts and cities and counties superimposed. And they are in these packets. I need to caution you about one matter. When you see the map deeply colored for a particular party indicating registration perhaps over 50 percent, be careful. There could be 10 people in a Census tract. What you need to do is go look, use your computers to find the population in the Census Tract. This tool will tell you how those people are registered.

MR. JOHNSON: For the public here, we'll work with Tim to get the information quickly up on the website.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: While doing that, if we could get the three scenarios used in this meeting on the website, one, two, and three, or whatever it was, there are several requests from the public it be on there, so they could take a look at them and be
evaluating.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Yavapai alternative.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: 3 and 4, really.

MR. JOHNSON: Want all statewide maps up there?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Who has the memorandum on the new schedule?

It's not a rhetorical question.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, I actually -- actually I e-mailed that one to everyone today and neglected to make copies of it. I have it right here on Marguerite's computer because I also e-mailed it to her.

Do you have a copy of it?

MR. JOHNSON: I can put it on the screen.

DR. ADAMS: We can put it on the screen, if that's helpful.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: While Doug's doing that, is your motion related to something other than that?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Want to try that now?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Hall, want to make a motion?

I'd like to revisit the competitiveness aspect of it, be able to direct the consultant as we go.
through the various scenarios to use the 90-minute run, 
not the two-week run, just to get an idea where we're 
standing on competitiveness. And that was defeated at 
the last meeting. I assume the consultants are not 
doing that because I'm not seeing that. I'd like to 
make a motion to direct the consultants to prepare 
alternatives for review to include an analysis for 
competitiveness.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

Ms. Leoni?

DR. ADAMS: I'd like Marguerite Leoni to 
speak to the issue. It's something we address in the 
memorandum just given you.

MS. LEONI: Yes, Commissioner Elder.

Thank you for bringing it up. I wasn't going to bring 
it up due to the lateness of the hour. I thought you'd 
see it in the memo.

During the paragraph of memo references, 
the fact we're prepared to link our database to what 
we're calling the Quick and Dirty Analysis. We need 
clarifications on how the linkages should occur. The 
analysis initially given you is only a two-party 
analysis. You may recall at recent meetings there has
been a good deal of testimony on the importance of third parties. What we'd like to do is redesign, it would not take much time, that analysis to include the third-party vote, third-party candidates in races analyzed, see how it would change percentages one way or the other. We'd like Commission instruction, number one, on doing that, do you want us to do it, and, number two, go ahead to do it and to give you the analysis with changes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Last time we talked about it it was also very late. The problem then, as now going, is to be able to try to understand what we're saying.

What do we mean by competitiveness? If the issue is simply providing us with a breakdown between -- statistical breakdown between party registration and whatever other column can you give us, no problem at all. In fact, it's already in the stuff on these statewide tests.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, it's slightly, slightly different. It simply is additional data. It is not a statement as to what is competitive or what is not. Do you desire additional data. But what it tells you is how particular elections that were run in this state in 1998 and 2000 would result if they
were run in the new districts.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay. Sounds fine.

MS. LEONI: That's all it would tell you.

We're not making any recommendation based on that data or any other data about what is competitive.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Is that the sense of the motion?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to find out based on a statewide nonmarquee type of vote just where we're going, if we had three, is that more competitive than five? We'd have more information to be able to make decisions on, the public also.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff --

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My understanding is we have our consultant nobody has control of that has promised to have the '96 data on Thursday for historical.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: EDS.

MS. HAUSER: Which consultant?

COMMISSIONER ELDER: EDS.

MS. HAUSER: Information from the racial block expert, has that.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: My understanding, that would be returned around Thursday.
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MS. HAUSER: Not for '96.

Is she having '96 tomorrow?

MS. LEONI: The e-mail I got from her, Commissioner Elder, at the beginning of this week, it would be ready by Friday. This is on racial block voting, not on competitiveness, racial block voting. Three years of racial block voting analysis. We will not have yet, I don't know data base, county election and ballot measure elections.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: City Council Person Williams during the night at our meeting, he referenced that there was a great deal difference between an East Mesa Republican and Ahwatukee Republican's voting patterns, maybe a Tempe Republican. The analysis you gave us, the Quick and Dirty Analysis, I think is a better reflection of competitiveness statistics you gave us tonight than party registration. If you can do that factoring in third party votes, not registration, but third party votes, I think that would be very, very helpful in terms of analyzing alternative scenarios which I'd like very, very much. That's my understanding that's the sense of the motion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: In Tucson we were provided, Jose presented competitiveness on a chart, quick and
dirty proposed drafts for the existing districts, the Democratic plan. Really all this motion, as I understand it, would do essentially is add new columns to the same analysis, running the same data on new plans, each alternative, simply adding a new column.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Excellent.

Further discussion on the motion.

Ms. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of the Commissioner, my only concern in running the test way run before is that it was clearly labeled simply a two-party vote. If it is the Commission's desire, we will, we're attempting to get data so we can have third party information disaggregated so we can use it in this quick and dirty analysis. And we're prepared to go forward with that and then run analysis on all those plans in that manner, if you so choose. Otherwise we'd strongly recommend you label that that the percentage reflects only a two-party vote.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fine.

Ready for the question?

All those in favor of the question, signify by saying "aye."

(Vote taken.)

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ah posted say no.
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Motion carries.

Schedule.

DR. ADAMS: Some discussion about schedule, some discussion August 17th, talked about it again at Mesa. My understanding is that than during the night when Dr. Heslop at meeting South Mountain you came to some conclusions he shared with me today we put in memo form. So if this meets commissions approval this is what we'd like propose opportunity first interim report. Then September 17th we would like to come back with a second interim report sharing with you, again, various scenarios. These will all go out on web, all data attached to them as they did this evening. And then on September 20th through 22nd although prepared adjust that to accommodate Jose I understand out of country we suggest September 20th through 22nd go 18th through 20th or 19th through 21st so Jose can be part of those individual meetings or at least one day. September 25th NDC's report come out, comprehensive review all work performed together with clearly stated results and options, so you would know what choices you would have to make. Following September 25th IRC attorneys report come out, cover our report, and also include competitiveness and racial block voting block analysis reports. October second public hearings would
COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask a question. Does that mean we'll get no information on racial block voting analysis until sometime after September 25th?

DR. ADAMS: I'm going to let the attorneys answer that question.

MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, this is a matter I was going to discuss later on today with your attorneys. I'm concerned about the lateness of the day. But we do have -- delays are out of our control. I want to discuss with them whether it makes any sense to prepare an interim report on what we have now.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would think that potentially could be a very serious problem, if we've gotten that period of time, examined scenarios with NDC, made a suggestion, they've made a preparatory report, and all of a sudden the racial block voting analysis report blows everything we've done out of the water, we have very, very serious problems.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, Members of the Commission, my understanding is we could indeed prepare an interim report. In fact, Ms. Leoni and I discussed as driving up here it would probably be
important to go ahead and see if we could get a report prepared. My understanding is that 1998 and 2000 are complete. What we're missing is the 1996 full report and local elections we think are important. If had an interim report --

MS. LEONI: Balance measures.

DR. ADAMS: I agree with you. Do an interim report, if that's agreeable. And we could, I'm looking at all the attorneys here, I'm hoping maybe report something on that on the 17th so we have that information prior to the individual meetings. I would say the same thing about the competitiveness report, which I understand is going to be coming out, the Judge It report, should be coming out by the end of this week is my understanding.

Also, we'd move very quickly forward to add third party to the Quick and Dirty reports, we've run all those reports, add them to the various scenario reports as well as add them to the individual meetings to make adjustments prior to the final report.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, our understanding is what you are looking at here is a schedule that references competitiveness and racial block voting very specifically with respect to
what is on table at that moment and related to specific plans. But as soon as we have the reports on competitiveness and racial block voting in general, that information would be presented to the Commission. It's just when you are close to adopting a final plan you would take the previous reports and tie it in. That's really all it ties into. As soon as the actual report, you have the preliminary data, I think -- I mean -- Jose would probably agree with me on this -- we have stuff we could turn out that would be unintelligible without a written report to go with it. I mean, it's just very difficult to make heads or tails of it. We need a written report with it. As soon as we have that, it goes right to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: About the schedule. September 17th, I stated previously I have a problem that day. We'd have to be through, I'll push back, but seriously, at 2:00 o'clock I'm out the door. Is that a meeting that can be finished?

MS. HAUSER: What day?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The 17th.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can I have an answer?

THE COURT: Dr. Adams.
DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, Members
of the Commission, I think if we start early on that
day, that we certainly should. Say, start at 8:00
o'clock, we should be able to in six hours cover the
remainder of the issues.

As you can see, we've covered with many
options a lot of areas of the state. We realize that
some other things are going come up as we go through and
finish the hearings, some of which we may have already
addressed as we have this evening prior to this meeting.
So I think we should be able to finish in that time
frame.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, can
I make a motion we adopt the schedule.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: You certainly can. It's
been moved and seconded.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: For the purpose of
discussion, the purpose of the September 17th is to
receive information.

If September 17th is to receive
information, provide instruction, let's be clear, none
of the Commissioners need an additional meeting to
receive information. What we do need is a schedule
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which accommodates receiving information at a time of
day when we can deal with it. Part of issue tonight, a
significant amount of information just transmitted, I'm
in no position to respond to it this evening, so it
builds up.

I guess the question is: What is the
purpose other than receiving an interim presentation
such as we received tonight?

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of
the Commission, basically it's to receive information as
you did this evening.

What we can do, alternatively, as we test
things, with permission of Commission, if you feel we
can, in our judgment, determine those important issues
out of each of those hearings as they come up, we'll
test those things and pass them to you. It may not
always be in the context of a statewide map. It may be
in the context of one of six options we've already shown
you and talk to you about implications of those. We
would not be in a position to produce a new statewide
map with every small change.

We'd be happy to do that, send you the
maps and send you data or send it to Tim and have him
put it on your computer and you can analyze it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: The last time we had a
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public hearing scheduled with all five present, is there
another meeting, Phoenix, next week --

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Glendale? Only one
missing Wednesday night.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Glendale might very
well be.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This is it.

MR. ECHEVESTE: This is it.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, to your motion,
Mr. Huntwork, I'm concerned about adopting the schedule
as is because I think there are some unanswered
questions about the 17th, also coordination issues
between counsel and the consultant need to occur. I'm
cconcerned about adopting it this evening.
There is a motion on the floor for
discussion.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If we don't adopt
it this evening, what do we do?

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I suggest if issues are
worked out, I think you see the sense of the schedule
here. They asked a question about the 17th. The 17th
is still at issue in terms of whether or not we need a
formal meeting. If there are other things we need do
that day, it may be a day to schedule a meeting. What I
suggest, rather than vote on the schedule this evening,
that we ask that counsel and the consultant get
together, make sure they are clear on the purpose of
each of the dates on this, that they poll the Commission
and we vote on it individually --

Can't do it.

MS. HAUSER: No, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ratify at a later meeting?

With all due -- the problem, we cannot
vote tonight, I don't believe.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: You'll have a quorum
at one of the meetings.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Certainly, we will. I'm
trying to be respectful of everybody's ability to adopt
this.

Dan, you will be the one missing at
Glendale. If you don't mind for of us doing it.

Who's in Flag?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Everybody but me.

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I won't be either.

COMMISSIONER HALL: I think also,

Mr. Chairman, I think we're missing a step in here. At
some point prior to the marathon meeting in October, we
have to provide instruction to our consultants with
respect to adjustment for competitiveness, analyzed
data, at some point say to them: You know what, test
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these considerations. If, based upon what we've received and based upon what we understand, see if in reality they work. So I don't see that step in there anywhere at all.

To think somehow we'll show up on October 2nd and digest all the information we've received after the individual meetings and consider all the options we've seen tonight, the problem will be there will be another five, 10 more options, and we haven't instructed them to consider competitiveness issues. It's not realistic.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

MS. HAUSER: One of the things it's important to note about the 17th, I heard Dr. Adams say it was primarily to present information on the results of testing options. You will have more competitiveness information at that point.

I do think, just given the history developed with the Commission and consultants and the way interaction has seemed to occur, that even though being presented with options, you'll give additional instruction and it will be a different take on a different form and different tone, if you will, if it is done collectively as opposed to each of you individually receiving information and issuing your own set of
instructions to the consultants.

Correct me if I'm wrong, we will have
additional competitiveness information at that point.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the
key sense of this, a lot of what being said here doesn't
seem important to resolve now, necessarily, due to the
time. It seems as if it's certain important, and
there's an informality to the process. We're really
describing after today a process of getting additional
information as it's available from our consultants and
attorneys on a variety issues and alternative plans,
competitiveness, you know, block voting data, and other
matters that are going to be important. The important
thing is that essentially by the 17th, we have to have
that process pretty well along and that information in
our hands. By the 22nd, the 20th to 22nd, we have to
have those individual meetings, have to be in a position
to discuss all of that intelligently. We have to have a
final report about then, about the 25th, and have to
start hearings on October 2nd. There's a big area from
the hearing, between the 25th and -- maybe we shouldn't
try to pin it down so much. In general, I don't know
that we need to adopt any motions. Let's proceed on
this basis.
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COMMISSIONER HALL: Move the 17th down to the 20th? Why the gap?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure we need the 17th.

Can we just authorize the Chairman to schedule the meeting on the 17th should it be necessary?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Perhaps what --

September 5 through September 20th, develop information and detail as rapidly as possible.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: We may need additional meetings noticed and scheduled in order to do that.

Want to withdraw the motion?

COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, want to withdraw your second?

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't know.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Only if we want to get home.

What we're saying is the sense of the schedule is appropriate, the flow is reasonable. The orderliness is reasonable. And the interval, at least in the beginning, is reasonable. But again that area from the 17th to the 20th needs to be thought through. And I'll work with you on getting something done.

Further business this evening.
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COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to suggest any meeting scheduled, any meeting during that time, everybody be contacted by e-mail to make sure we're all available.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of the Commission, also know there is a holiday of concern to Ms. Minkoff and Ms. Hauser during that time. We need to avoid rescheduling the meeting if we don't have it on the 17th. We can't have it on the 18th.

COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Or 19th.

DR. ADAMS: We would have to move to the 20th, if we decided to have a meeting to give instruction.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: Understand.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further business, counsel?

MS. HAUSER: No.

MR. JOHNSON: Be sure to keep in mind any registration data in Gila County is incorrect. They don't have data for anyone but Republicans, which is a source of confusion.

CHAIRMAN LYNN: No Democrats?

MR. JOHNSON: No data indicating where they are. We don't know where they are.

COMMISSIONER ELDER: In the woods hiding.
CHAIRMAN LYNN: Meeting adjourned.

(Whereupon, the hearing concluded at approximately 1:49 a.m.)

* * * *
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