

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF ARIZONA

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona  
September 24, 2001  
10:00 a.m.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT  
REDISTRICTING  
COMMISSION

LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR  
Certified Court Reporter  
Certificate No. 50349

1                   THE STATE OF ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING  
2           COMMISSION convened in Public Session on September 24,  
3           2001, at 10:00 o'clock a.m., at the Double Tree Hotel  
4           Resort, Salons I and II, 320 North 44th Street, Phoenix,  
5           Arizona, 85008, in the presence of:

6

7           APPEARANCES:

8                   CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN

9                   VICE CHAIRMAN ANDI MINKOFF

10                  COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK

11                  COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL

12                  COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

2 ADOLFO ECHEVESTES, Executive Director  
3 LISA T. HAUSER, Commission Counsel  
4 JOSE de JESUS RIVERA, Commission Counsel  
5 TRACI RICCITELLO, Commission Counsel  
6 AMY REZZONICO, Press Information Officer  
7 LOU JONES, Administrative Assistant  
8 TIM JOHNSON, MC, Computer Consultant  
9 DR. ALAN HESLOP, NDC, Consultant  
10 DR. FLORENCE ADAMS, NDC, Consultant  
11 DOUG JOHNSON, NDC, Consultant  
12 MARGUERITE MARY LEONI, NDC Counsel  
13 MARION PORCH, NDC, Support Staff  
14 LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Court Reporter

15

## 16 AGENDA DESIGNATED SPEAKERS:

17 DR. ALAN HESLOP  
18 DR. FLORENCE ADAMS  
19 MARGUERITE MARY LEONI  
20 DOUG JOHNSON

21

22

23

24

25

- 1
- 2   SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:
- 3   JIM HARTDEGEN
- 4   EDWARD T. BEGAY
- 5   MAYOR NEIL GIULIANO
- 6   BOB FANNIN
- 7   NATHAN SPROUL
- 8   MAYOR JOSEPH DONALDSON
- 9   JONATHAN PEARSON
- 10  PAUL BABBITT
- 11  HERCEL SPEARS
- 12  MARK THOMPSON
- 13  PETER MORAGA
- 14  GARY RICHARDSON
- 15  CONNIE THOMPSON
- 16  COUNCILMAN HUGH HALLMAN
- 17  FRANK SEANEZ
- 18  TERRI LEIJA
- 19  PATRICE KRAUS
- 20  JACOB MOORE
- 21  MAYOR JOSEPH DONALDSON
- 22  MARK FLEISHER
- 23  JUDY DWORKIN
- 24
- 25

1 Public Session  
2 Phoenix, Arizona  
3 September 24, 2001  
4 10:11 o'clock a.m.

5 P R O C E E D I N G S  
6

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll call everything to  
8 order. Everyone take their seats.

9 The Independent Redistricting Commission  
10 will come to order.

11 Let the record show all five Commissioners  
12 are present along with legal counsel, IRC staff, and  
13 consultants.

14 First order of business this morning,  
15 ladies and gentlemen, is public comment. Before we have  
16 public comment, I want to just briefly go over the  
17 agenda today so there's no misunderstanding how the flow  
18 will be this workday. We will have public comment as  
19 the first item this morning. When public comment is  
20 completed, but not before 11:00 a.m., there is a notice  
21 of and anticipation of an Executive Session of the  
22 Commission. That Executive Session will commence  
23 following comments from the public and will last no  
24 longer than 2:00 o'clock this afternoon. At 2:00  
25 o'clock this afternoon, we'll reconvene in public

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
Phoenix, Arizona

1 session, continue with the agenda, and close the day  
2 whenever the day is over with another public comment  
3 session.

4                   So for those of you who are here to speak  
5 this morning and may wish to continue observing our  
6 process, we did this specifically so that you would know  
7 to come back at 2:00 o'clock. Nothing will happen  
8 before that time that you would be able to be a part of.  
9 And we did that primarily for your convenience. So that  
10 is the schedule for today.

11                   Mr. Hall?

12                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Ladies and gentlemen,  
13 can I ask you to stand, in light of today is the  
14 Chairman's birthday, and let's sing happy birthday to  
15 him.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, that will cost  
17 you later. Don't seek any recognition for the rest of  
18 the day.

19                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I  
20 don't think it's recommended, no two Commissioners can  
21 have the same zodiac sign.

22                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Quite possibly. I don't  
23 know. Quite possibly.

24                   (Whereupon Happy Birthday was sung to  
25 Chairman Lynn.)

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank all of you. Thank  
2 you all of you. I really appreciate it. Thank you all  
3 of you very much.

4                   Public comment. This is the time for  
5 consideration and discussion of comments and complaints  
6 from the public. Those wishing to address the  
7 Commission shall seek permission by filling out a  
8 speaker slip. Anyone that has not done so, please do so  
9 and submit one as quickly as you can, please. Action  
10 taken as a result public comment will be limited to  
11 directing staff to study the matter, rescheduling the  
12 matter for future consideration at a later date unless  
13 the subject is already on the agenda for this date.

14                   Ladies and gentlemen, it is now time to  
15 hear from the public. I have several slips already.

16                   I would ask the following: If you are  
17 making a presentation this morning and the presentation  
18 is similar to or perhaps identical to presentations that  
19 you have made in the past, I can tell you that every  
20 Commissioner understands the issues that have been  
21 presented to the Commission to this point. We are  
22 always interested in new information. We are always  
23 interested in different information. To the extent your  
24 presentation reiterates something we already know and  
25 already have, if you wouldn't mind just incorporating

1 that material by reference, to hear it one more time  
2 does not make it any more glorious to us. We get it.  
3 We've heard from various groups throughout the process  
4 and understand the comments clearly. Also, to the  
5 extent you can, limit your comments to three minutes.  
6 We'll not put a stopwatch on you. If you can do that  
7 and wish additional time at the end of the public  
8 comment period when everyone has had a chance to be  
9 heard, we'll return to you for additional comment.

10 Mr. Elder.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Also, to that end, if  
12 you have written material, if you submit that to the  
13 court reporter so we get it as part of the record,  
14 that's helpful.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: First slip for public  
16 comment is from Jim Hartdegen, City Casa Grande, Casa  
17 Grande Chamber of Commerce.

18 MR. HARTDEGEN: Thank you for coming to  
19 Florence. I think it was very helpful for you and also  
20 us.

21 Dittos on remarks I've made in the past.  
22 I won't go through that again.

23 But the -- I want to say this now, because  
24 I'm not quite sure what will happen later on in the day,  
25 just so it's on the record and you know that the



1 scenarios that the NDC had given you earlier on in the  
2 month on your web page, we had a meeting early this  
3 morning and we'd like to go on record saying that the  
4 southern area A2, is good. That's our number one  
5 choice, Ajo scenario on the deal. Whether those things  
6 still stay or not, who knows. Just so you know, that A2  
7 is our number one pick.

8                   And our number two pick, we spent a long  
9 time this morning talking about these two different  
10 scenarios, was the southern area 4B. That was our  
11 second choice.

12                   But we spent a lot of time debating both  
13 of those and looking at the information we had at hand.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hartdegen.

15                   MR. HARTDEGEN: 4B as in boy.

16                   First was 2A as in apple.

17                   I can tell you that 5D was not only a no  
18 but a "hell no."

19                   So I was supposed to, since I was the  
20 messenger, they thought you'd kill me not them. 3E also  
21 was a very strong no.

22                   We wanted you to know that early on.

23                   They may be scenarios that are old by now.  
24 That might give you an indication with what we have to  
25 pick from.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen.

2                   Next speaker, Edward T. Begay, Speaker of  
3 the Navajo Council.

4                   SPEAKER BEGAY: Thank you, Commissioners,  
5 staff, counsel, and guests. Thank you. It's my  
6 pleasure to appear before you again, because your  
7 meeting is also informational and sometimes it gets to  
8 be very exciting.

9                   Based on the -- based on the last meeting  
10 in Show Low, we have suggested to the Navajo Nation we  
11 need to revisit a proposal that was worked up by your  
12 consultants that looked very decent and looked very  
13 favorable. So we brought that back to the Subcommittee  
14 of Intergovernmental Relations Committee of the Council  
15 and then the Intergovernmental Relations of the Council  
16 took our Subcommittee's Recommendation. And in doing  
17 so, the Navajo Nation's supports scenario D statewide,  
18 which our adopted resolution is Exhibit A. And then  
19 also, scenarios F as developed by your consultants, and  
20 we revisit that and ran the numbers among ourselves.  
21 And we are very supportive of that proposal as your  
22 consultants have worked up in your work session and also  
23 that you suggested for us to revisit.

24                   So, in doing so, with that, if that's  
25 incorporated into your recommendations overall, as a

1 possible change that we're suggesting to the Commission  
2 on the Congressional redistricting plan as -- here as  
3 Exhibit C, in the proposal.

4 So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to  
5 present that as an update and a final position of the  
6 Nation at this time.

7 And I yield to questions, if there are  
8 any. Otherwise, thank you for your attention and the  
9 documentations are handed out so -- for your review.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Speaker Begay.

12 Mr. Elder. Speaker Begay.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: One quick question.  
14 Right after your Exhibit, part of Exhibit C, the blue  
15 area, two five fourteen, is this because in the analysis  
16 you were over and this would be an area you would  
17 exclude to get population in balance?

18 SPEAKER BEGAY: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

20 Next speaker, Mayor Neil Giuliano, City of  
21 Tempe. Mayor Giuliano.

22 MAYOR GIULIANO: Thank you. Tonight I'll  
23 be brief. Congress, districtwise, we're very  
24 comfortable where it's at. The Legislative information,  
25 some information comes to me, you may be aware, there

1 was an election in Tempe a couple Tuesdays ago. The  
2 interesting thing about the results of the election, not  
3 only did we have the highest percentage turnout, and the  
4 highest number of ballots ever cast in a city election,  
5 it went from 15,900 voters to 23,900 voters, which is a  
6 pretty big increase, 8,000 new voters participating on a  
7 local level, what was significant on the new numbers,  
8 all throughout the city, including the very southern  
9 part of the community, we actually had record turnouts  
10 of people from the southern part of Tempe participating  
11 in this recent election. I mention that because I want  
12 to go on record again stating the City of Tempe does not  
13 want to be split along the freeway for a Legislative  
14 District.

15 Our community may have a diversity of  
16 housing and diversity of people from north to south, but  
17 I think by evidence of the number of -- record number  
18 people participating in the local election held just a  
19 couple weeks ago, we all care about the community as a  
20 whole, and we want to remain a community of interest as  
21 a whole and participate as a community of interest and  
22 have our voice be heard as long as it can be by being as  
23 contained as possible and not split in half.

24 We understand the difficult job you have,  
25 and we understand our history is such that as a sliver

1 of our community, it has been in a different Legislative  
2 District.

3 We understand we may have to continue,  
4 slivering North Tempe in a different Legislative  
5 district, slivering it in a different Legislative  
6 District, we probably have to accept that. Splitting  
7 the community in half along the freeway corridor would  
8 not be a Legislative benefit for the state or  
9 Legislative. The people participating, we think it in  
10 the best interests to be as contained as possible.

11 We thank you very much for all the work  
12 and know you have a difficult job.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions, Mr. Mayor.

14 Ms. Minkoff.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A question about  
16 the comments for the Congressional District, capping.  
17 Talking about the draft map or talking about -- have you  
18 looked at various alternatives on the website? Are all  
19 acceptable --

20 MAYOR GIULIANO: Draft map, all the same  
21 Congressional District.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: There are other  
23 drafts available. I'm not sure any --

24 MAYOR GIULIANO: All Congressional drafts  
25 that keep Tempe as one Tempe.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: One for central  
2 Congressional unites Tempe with the Town of Scottsdale  
3 and Downtown Phoenix. Specific comment?

4                   MAYOR GIULIANO: I'm comfortable with  
5 that.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

7                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mayor, other citizens  
8 from your fair city indicated they prefer a split for  
9 double representation at a state level. Do you have a  
10 comment at all due to that?

11                  MAYOR GIULIANO: My understanding is a  
12 little different than perhaps some citizens. Doubling  
13 representation may be additional folks that have an  
14 obligation to interact with more citizens, but in terms  
15 of pure representation, the, you know, the R or D slash  
16 Tempe after the name may not take place depending on how  
17 many voters are in that district.

18                  We think holding the city together as much  
19 as possible is more in our interests, keeping more  
20 people in the piece of the community within the  
21 district. No disrespect at all to our Legislative  
22 Representatives from District 26 who have a sliver of  
23 North Tempe in the rest of the district right now, but  
24 they clearly, the priority clearly is to represent the  
25 overwhelming majority of their district, which is not in

1 the City of Tempe, although they have participated and  
2 come to events, been responsive. We clearly have not  
3 been their number one priority, and they've said on  
4 occasion, they are not, so to speak, speaking for Tempe,  
5 because we're such a small part the of community that  
6 was represented by them.

7 We fear if we're split in half at the  
8 US-60 freeway, those folks that represent us may have  
9 more of an interest in the part of the community in that  
10 district that votes more or may be more one political  
11 party or another rather than in allowing us to have a  
12 solid voice as much as possible within our community.

13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mayor.

15 The next speakers, Nathan Sproul and Bob  
16 Fannin representing the Republican party.

17 Mr. Fannin.

18 MR. FANNIN: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
19 Commission, I'm Bob Fannin, Chairman of the Republican  
20 Party, I share the situation you do, no compensation,  
21 and it's sad -- with what you've done, to save time, I  
22 want to make sure you have the comments. I will submit  
23 them in writing. I would like to read from it. I think  
24 you've done a tremendous job.

25 I appreciate very much the opportunity to

1 submit testimony to the Independent Redistricting  
2 Commission.

3           As Chairman of the Arizona Republican  
4 Party, I understand that the people of Arizona voted for  
5 an Independent Redistricting Commission rather than  
6 allowing partisan incumbents to draw the lines. As a  
7 result, we as a political party, have refrained from  
8 submitting partisan plans.

9           To this point we have supported the  
10 Independent Redistricting Commission in its efforts, and  
11 the draft plan you submitted for public comment. In my  
12 opinion, in all but a few situations, like the Prescott/  
13 Prescott Valley/Chino Valley Legislative District  
14 situation, you have fairly reflected extensive public  
15 comment and recognized constitutional criteria required  
16 by Proposition 106 and federal law.

17           However, the Arizona Republican Party  
18 feels compelled to comment on plans that have been  
19 submitted that disregard the Constitutional criteria  
20 elevating artificial competitiveness and partisan  
21 incumbent protection above the Constitution.

22           As you well know, competitiveness is the  
23 last of the criteria in Proposition 106, and was worded  
24 in such a way that subordinates it to all other  
25 priorities. The priorities of the Constitution are



1 recognition of long-standing federal precedent on  
2 redistricting.

3                   We simply ask you to do what you have been  
4 doing. Please meticulously follow the requirements of  
5 the Arizona Constitution and federal law. As the  
6 Commission has discovered, when this is done, it is  
7 virtually impossible to create artificially competitive  
8 districts by partisan gerrymandering.

9                   I want to be very clear on this subject.  
10 We're not opposed to competitive districts as long as  
11 the Arizona Constitution and federal law are complied  
12 with, and a roughly proportional number of Democrat and  
13 Republican districts are made competitive. Currently  
14 many plans that have been submitted keep Democratic  
15 districts bulletproof, and reduce the advantage of  
16 Republicans in Republican districts to create artificial  
17 competitiveness by disregarding one or more of the  
18 priorities of Proposition 106.

19                   It is rather obvious that the plans  
20 submitted by the Arizona Democratic Party are openly  
21 partisan plans designed to give their political party an  
22 advantage. However, there is one plan that is not  
23 openly partisan on the surface, but it has disregarded  
24 many of the requirements of Proposition 106 and federal  
25 law. As a result, I feel compelled to bring it to the

1 attention of the Commission. One plan submitted on  
2 September 12th at the meeting in Glendale has many  
3 components that disregard the clear intention of  
4 Proposition 106 and federal law. I have asked the  
5 Executive Director of the Arizona Republican Party,  
6 Nathan Sproul, to share those specific components with  
7 you.

8                   Again, I thank all of you for your  
9 service.

10                   This isn't in written the comments. I  
11 share the same situation you do in terms of public  
12 service, and thank you, thank you, thank you for all  
13 you've done.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fannin.  
15                   Mr. Sproul.

16                   MR. SPROUL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
17 Members of the Commission.

18                   Specifically the plan we're referring to  
19 is the plan submitted September 12th at the Glendale  
20 meeting. Democratic Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox deals  
21 with some issues before the Commission obviously in  
22 trying to make some of those districts more competitive.

23                   Our initial analysis in looking at the  
24 plan seems to indicate two primary criteria utilized.  
25 One criteria is not available to you, because you are

1 precluded from looking at incumbent addresses. We're  
2 not precluded from doing that. We feel an obligation in  
3 pointing out, the plan submitted by Supervisor Wilcox,  
4 out of 32 Democrats, based on our analysis of the plan,  
5 to be running again, Legislators, all 32 were protected.  
6 Out of 41 Republicans that seem to be running for  
7 reelection in the Legislature, only 14 are protected.  
8 Let me define protection, it's three basic criteria.  
9 First criteria, the district is basically the same as  
10 what the incumbent represents today, not dramatically  
11 displaced from the area. Second, the criteria,  
12 Democratic or Republican, stays the same, not multiple  
13 incumbents challenging each other in the election.  
14 Based on the three criteria, I emphasize of 41  
15 Republicans we believe running again, only 14 are  
16 protected as opposed to 32 Democrats that seem to be  
17 running, all 32, based on our initial analysis, seem  
18 protected.

19                   Based on the initial plan that has come  
20 out, some are a little obvious. In the area of Tucson,  
21 for example, I believe District DD, which is, I believe,  
22 lettering the same in your plan as Supervisor Wilcox'  
23 plan, wraps around Cochise County, Sierra Vista City  
24 Tucson, the northern part of Tucson along Saddlebrooke,  
25 Oracle Valley area, clearly in our opinion it's of

1 detriment to the communities of interest and  
2 compactness, took District Z, the northern Tucson  
3 district, and reduced the percentage Republicans from 15  
4 percent advantage to five percent advantage. To do  
5 that, you had to take out Saddlebrooke as far south  
6 below Rialta River. Overwhelming evidence suggests  
7 that's a natural barrier, should be a respected  
8 community of interest, as well as much of the river  
9 serves as the Tucson city boundary.

10 In our opinion, the City of Tucson, for  
11 numerous reasons, has significant detriment to the issue  
12 of compactness, communities of interest, and honoring  
13 city boundaries.

14 They, on district I believe W, which is  
15 the international border of Mexico, wraps into Cochise  
16 County, wraps into Buckeye, the area Maricopa County,  
17 did not solve one of the most pressing problems you  
18 have, which is how to do away with that district that  
19 stretches to the southeastern border of Arizona all the  
20 way into Maricopa County. What they did, the solution  
21 is they made more compactness of a problem. If you were  
22 to draw line around Buckeye, the northwest corner  
23 district, all the way to the southeast corner of  
24 Douglas, a 290-mile line, extended, as opposed to the  
25 current 288-mile line, and made compactness more of a

1 significant detriment.

2                   The third issue I'd like bring out is the  
3 Prescott-Prescott Valley issue I know you all are  
4 dealing with. We did not solve the problem for you.  
5 It's a violation, in our opinion, a significant  
6 detriment to communities of interest.

7                   North, the next area, I, Republican  
8 registration was lowered 11 points to seven points in  
9 order do this, an artificially competitive arm. I  
10 believe several drafters of Prop 106 wrote an editorial  
11 against doing this very concept. So they bring in two  
12 Democrat pockets in the area in an attempt to make it  
13 competitive and clearly violated the communities of  
14 interest along with the issue of compactness to instill  
15 competitiveness into the process.

16                   Northwest valley pointed out a few issues.  
17 Instead of following, for example, the Commission  
18 drawing north-south boundaries, in essence, drew  
19 east-west alignments. Doing this, Glendale had seven  
20 Legislative Districts whereas currently Glendale has  
21 four Legislative Districts. Peoria has four Legislative  
22 Districts. Currently there are two Legislative  
23 Districts. Clearly it seems a significant detriment to  
24 the communities of interest, compactness, honoring city  
25 boundaries.

1 M, Mary Rose Wilcox, your plan differed  
2 slightly in lettering. If I'm not mistaken your  
3 lettering, M, hers was L, but I think you know the  
4 district I'm referring to, one where the districts put  
5 out as truly competitive, a district with a two point  
6 registration difference as well as historical data,  
7 seemed a legitimate area as competitive, she changed to  
8 make an artificial bridge connected to Phoenix to El  
9 Mirage. In so doing, in that district, combined El  
10 Mirage, Phoenix, Surprise, Youngtown, Sun City, Peoria,  
11 and Glendale all into one district, clearly a  
12 significant detriment to the communities of interest,  
13 honoring town boundaries and compactness.

14 The last point I'd like bring out as a  
15 point demonstrating democracy protection, as such, in  
16 the Democratic plan, the letter Q, primarily the  
17 district of Tempe, what they did, in the lower southeast  
18 corner, if you notice the map, it changes ever so  
19 slightly the Commission's plan, changes it  
20 three-quarters of a percentage point. The northeast  
21 corner, drew three-quarter mile H, eliminated Senator  
22 Harry Michaels prime component. Clearly indicates modus  
23 operandi, Democratic. Although clearly enunciated, 14  
24 of 41 Republicans are protected.

25 One point the Chairman alluded to I'd like

1 allude to, most of the plans address issues of  
2 competitiveness. Almost in all cases it's Republican  
3 district lowering, Democrats gain advantage.

4 We're not opposed to competition. We're  
5 open and believe it's a fundamental responsibility of  
6 the Commission to consider natural competition where it  
7 exists in a community of interest, or priority.

8 To draw artificial arms, as supervisor  
9 Wilcox has in the North Phoenix District I think is  
10 clearly detrimental. The point I'm trying to make, one  
11 of the points I'm trying to make, when one looks at the  
12 competition, the proportional number of districts  
13 decrease with their advantage to be competitive,  
14 recognizing Republicans have the advantage. There's not  
15 one Republican, proportionality, which districts make  
16 competitive as opposed to automatically so many of the  
17 plans do reducing Republicans and giving Democrats  
18 advantage.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Sproul, do you have an  
20 analysis available in writing so we can put it in  
21 writing?

22 MR. SPROUL: I don't have it with me. We  
23 can submit it by the end of the day.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you would.

25 Other questions for Mr. Sproul.

1 MR. SPROUL: Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Joseph Donaldson  
3 representing City Flagstaff.

4 MAYOR DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
5 Members of the Commission. Thank you for the  
6 opportunity to speak before you.

7 I'd like to read three letters into the  
8 record stating our Council's position on redistricting.

9 Mr. Lynn,

10 On behalf of the Flagstaff Council, please  
11 accept our continued appreciation for the outreach  
12 efforts of the Independent Redistricting Commission.  
13 The opportunity for public review and comment is valued.

14 In its review of the initial grid, the  
15 Flagstaff City Council considered the process developed  
16 by the Independent Redistricting Commission and  
17 redistricting goals set forth in Proposition 106. The  
18 Council determined the district boundaries established  
19 by the community of interest criteria to be of the  
20 highest significance. The Council comment at that time  
21 was:

22 "We request Commission give strong  
23 consideration to maintaining the City of Flagstaff and  
24 its Regional Planned Use and Transportation Plan area in  
25 on Legislative District and one Congressional District.



1 The area of the Regional Plan extends, generally, from  
2 Humprey's Peak on the north to Kachina/Mountaineire on  
3 the south, Belmont on the west, and Winona on the east.  
4 This region includes 525 square miles of the Flagstaff  
5 Metropolitan Planning area.

6 In consideration of the August 17th draft  
7 maps, the scenarios presented at the September 6, Public  
8 Hearing in Flagstaff, and subsequent scenarios presented  
9 on the on website, this early position is maintained and  
10 further specified as follows:

11 The Council emphasizes the imperative of  
12 maintaining the City of Flagstaff and its Regional Land  
13 Use and Transportation Plan Area in one Legislative  
14 District and one Congressional District. Furthermore,  
15 the Council requests the Legislative District boundaries  
16 be established in support of our regional area community  
17 of interest that includes economic, natural resource,  
18 cultural and local government considerations.

19 Accordingly, the Council supports the  
20 configuration of District C as described 17 August Draft  
21 Legislative Map, because it closely meets criteria set  
22 forth in Proposition 106 and respects our community of  
23 interest and municipal/regional boundaries. With  
24 respect to the community of interest criteria, Flagstaff  
25 and its Regional Plan area most closely identifies with

1 the incorporated cities and towns in the Verde Valley.

2 I understand some of our Northern Arizona  
3 neighbors have requested inclusion in a Legislative  
4 District with Flagstaff. I ask that these requests be  
5 considered recognizing communities of interests we  
6 share; yet I understand the Commission's challenge in  
7 meeting Proposition 106 criteria and balancing the many  
8 requests it receives.

9 The Flagstaff Council also supports  
10 Congressional District C defined in the 17 August Draft  
11 Congressional Map.

12 Attached are two letters written in  
13 general support of the positions stated above. The  
14 first letter is from the Alliance for the Second Century  
15 and signed by the representatives of Coconino County,  
16 the City of Flagstaff, and the Flagstaff Unified School  
17 District. The second letter of support comes from  
18 Arizona Board of Regents member Kay McKay.

19 I thank your for this opportunity to  
20 comment, and request additional comments are considered  
21 should the Commission weigh other district  
22 configurations.

23 For the record,

24 The letter Alliance for Second Century in  
25 Flagstaff.

1                   Mr. Lynn,

2                   The undersigned members of the Alliance  
3 for the Second Century support the positions of the City  
4 of Flagstaff and Coconino County as follows:

5                   Number one, The Flagstaff Regional Plan  
6 area remains whole in one Legislative and one  
7 Congressional District.

8                   Number two, Legislative District C,  
9 defined by 17 August 2001 Draft Map most closely meets  
10 the criteria of Proposition 106 and the greater  
11 Flagstaff area.

12                   Therefore, we strongly support  
13 Congressional District C and Legislative District C  
14 defined by the 17 August 2001 draft maps.

15                   Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

16                   Signed Paul J. Babbitt, Chairman, Larry  
17 Bramblett, Superintendent, and myself, Mayor of  
18 Flagstaff.

19                   Also enclosed is a letter from Kay McKay,  
20 President of the Arizona Board of Regents and writes to  
21 me this letter.

22                   "Dear Joe,

23                   "I am writing as an individual board  
24 members and resident of Flagstaff.

25                   "In regard to the Commission on

                  ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
                  Phoenix, Arizona

1 Redistricting the State of Arizona, it is my position  
2 they should not divide our city between the University  
3 and other parts of the city. It is my opinion that  
4 Flagstaff, Williams and the Sedona area be kept  
5 together. It will certainly better serve the strength  
6 of the University from a Legislative standpoint. In  
7 turn, it will serve the areas I have listed in the  
8 strongest possible matter.

9 "Please consider this option when you  
10 advocate the commission. It is important to Flagstaff.

11 "With best personal regards, Kay J.  
12 McKay."

13 Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Donaldson.  
15 Mr. Elder.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: One quick one.

17 Reviewing limits, Belmont on the west?  
18 You said Winona on the east, I didn't catch the western  
19 boundary, the metropolitan transportation.

20 MAYOR DONALDSON: Humprey's Peak north,  
21 Kachina/Mountainair and Belmont on west, and Winona on  
22 the east.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does that  
24 metropolitan area encompass a school district from the  
25 gentleman that signed the letter as well as health care,

1 any other communities of interest, or just  
2 transportation only?

3 MAYOR DONALDSON: Entire area. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: One more question.

5 Doug?

6 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7 One more question. When we were up in Flagstaff, there  
8 were a number of questions wanting Flagstaff in the same  
9 Legislative District with the Navajo Nation. Is this  
10 statement, you are disagreeing with that view?

11 MAYOR DONALDSON: No, I'm not. I'm only  
12 making comments I'm prepared to make with the Council.  
13 The Council met, prepared what was good for Flagstaff,  
14 came up and agreed to what was good for and agreed on  
15 what to present today. We want to keep Flagstaff whole.  
16 We work well as a community, as we stated before.  
17 There's another Maricopa here. If you split the  
18 community, the interest, travel, we don't get it as well  
19 represented as we could.

20 MR. JOHNSON: I understand you prefer to  
21 be with Sedona and Williams rather than the Navajo  
22 Nation.

23 MAYOR DONALDSON: You asked if Navajo  
24 Nation. If that is what Commission decides to do in  
25 keeping Flagstaff whole, that's the way it goes. But

1 our main interest here as representing the Council is to  
2 speak before to you is keep Flagstaff as one entire  
3 unit.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Jonathan Pearson,  
6 administrator for the Town of Carefree.

7 MR. PERSON: Mr. Commissioner, members of  
8 the Commission, Mayor Morrison was out of town. On  
9 behalf of the Town of Carefree, I ask the draft  
10 Legislative maps be revised. Carefree requests we be  
11 moved Congressional E to B and Legislative F-2 District  
12 to G. These two moves put Carefree in the same  
13 districts with Scottsdale, Rio Verde, and Fountain  
14 Hills, similar communities with similar interests, water  
15 resources, desert preservation, and land use planning.  
16 Congressional land use splits in the town, from B and E.

17 Thank you for considering our requests.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I didn't hear about  
20 the Legislative District. You wanted to be moved from  
21 and to?

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: F-2 and G.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: D?

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Same stuff.

25 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Any questions?

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that is it,  
2 Mr. Pearson. Thank you very much.

3                   Paul Babbitt, Chairman of the Coconino  
4 Board of supervisors.

5                   Mr. Babbitt.

6                   SUPERVISOR BABBITT: Thank you.

7                   I'd remind you also, I greatly appreciate  
8 presence. While Mr. Peru will discuss many of the  
9 following concerns of the board further resulting from  
10 the first round of public hearings, the board does not,  
11 the board has not seen any subsequent maps or scenarios  
12 resulting from the second round of public hearings. The  
13 board is not in a position as a Flagstaff community of  
14 interest, as defined by the Commission's guidelines,  
15 having proposed Flagstaff, being split anyway, the  
16 Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce, Northern Arizona  
17 University, Coconino County, the Unified School  
18 District, also support the position, as you heard in  
19 prior testimony to keep Flagstaff who. As stated in the  
20 letter to the Commission dated December 4th, the  
21 Havasupai Tribe communicated the Board of Supervisor  
22 their desire to be located in the same Legislative  
23 District. At the September 6 public hearing, testimony  
24 was given that raised questions about their position,  
25 however, a letter will be forthcoming from the tribe

1 confirming their desire to be as I stated in that  
2 district with Williams and Flagstaff.

3           In our September 4th letter we pointed out  
4 there is not a match in voting precincts of Grand Canyon  
5 and Tusayan. Currently the board of supervisors  
6 believes there is not. The communities of Tusayan and  
7 Grand Canyon, even though they border one another, are  
8 two very distinct communities with very different issues  
9 and concerns. They currently are in two separate  
10 Legislative and Congressional Districts, and the board  
11 supports this continued separation. The disparities or  
12 mismatched, as labeled on the attached match B, exist in  
13 the Fernwood and the eastern boundary of the Leupp  
14 precincts. The Fernwood precinct as shown on the  
15 adopted map would take in a part of the reservation  
16 precinct of Leupp.

17           The board of supervisors would like to  
18 clarify their position on the Congressional adopted  
19 maps.

20           At the September 6, 2000, public hearing,  
21 the board was asked what type of district they would  
22 rather have, a rural or compact district. At that time  
23 the testimony supported rural. The board would like to  
24 add to this statement. The boards supports a district  
25 that is predominantly rural. Also, as stated above,



1 while they support the adopted Congressional map, the  
2 Board feels that they have greater shared interests with  
3 the eastern and southeastern portion of the state as  
4 opposed to the Kingman and river communities.

5                   As stated in the Board's September 4  
6 letter, the area surrounding the Moenkopi precinct has  
7 expanded to include areas within Coalmine North and  
8 South. This creates five voting precincts in an area  
9 that has a voter registration total of less than 250  
10 people who reside in the same chapter of Coalmine.

11                   Also, the path to reach the Moenkopi  
12 precinct has been changed from Highway 264 to the  
13 boundary between the Tuba City northeast and Coleman  
14 North precincts. This path of the Moenkopi precinct has  
15 the effect of pulling in members of the Navajo tribe  
16 that live along the pathway boundary.

17                   Our suggestion is to keep the path as is,  
18 Highway 264.

19                   The county board of supervisors recognizes  
20 and supports the separateness of the Hopi Tribe and  
21 acknowledges that a path has to be created to take in  
22 the Hopi community of Moenkopi, however, they support a  
23 path that is less intrusive through a whole of Coconino  
24 County and would like to work with the Independent  
25 Redistricting Commission's consultants in identifying a

1 different path.

2 Thank you for allowing the Coconino County  
3 the opportunity to comment on the proposed Congressional  
4 and Legislative proposals.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: You get the award for  
6 best tie.

7 SUPERVISOR BABBITT: Does that mean I  
8 relieve the Chairman of his duties for the day?

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Trying get rid of me?

10 SUPERVISOR BABBITT: No. Just no  
11 objection to your taking the day off.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can't think of a better  
13 group of people to spend it with.

14 He must be running for something.

15 No, he's not.

16 Next speaker, Mr. Hercel Spears.

17 Mr. Spears.

18 MR. SPEARS: I appreciate the time and  
19 effort you guys are putting into this.

20 I wish there was some way we could see you  
21 compensated appropriately. I know it's a lot of hard  
22 work.

23 I own property in both north and south  
24 Tempe. Because I own property in both north and south  
25 Tempe, have tenants in both north and south Tempe, it's

1 very, very apparent, there are two distinct communities  
2 of interest in Tempe.

3 As the Mayor indicated, we are a very  
4 diverse city. And that's true, we are very diverse  
5 city.

6 You heard from the political Mayor, from  
7 state representatives, from state senators, all of them  
8 talking about how they wanted this, our city divided.  
9 I'm coming to you as a citizen, someone that lives  
10 there.

11 The reason I think it's important that we  
12 acknowledge that it is a diverse, two diverse  
13 communities, is that unlike city government, state  
14 Legislative government, and federal government that  
15 represents a different aspect of the peoples needs and  
16 desires, the city itself is governed in -- at the  
17 benevolence of the state, can take care of issues not  
18 convenient for the state to take care of.

19 Splitting the city into two different, as  
20 I mentioned earlier in comments back and forth with the  
21 Mayor, with two representatives and double the  
22 representation, I would also go one step further and say  
23 the city itself has hired a lobbyist, has had a lobbyist  
24 to the state for a number of years. So the city as a  
25 whole still will have representation from not only the

1 city, Mayor, and Council, but also from their lobbyist  
2 they send up there. And this would just enhance the  
3 representation the City of Tempe would have.

4 Here we're in favor of three splits of the  
5 City of Tempe, or splits at the freeway.

6 Thank you very much for your time.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Spears.

8 Next speaker Mark Thompson.

9 Mr. Thompson.

10 MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.  
11 Happy birthday. Let me reiterate that.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Thompson.

13 MR. THOMPSON: I'd like to thank you and  
14 the Commission for generating the alternative scenarios.  
15 I previously testified in favor of representing to the  
16 Commission, and subsequently they published different  
17 scenarios. This morning I would like to reaffirm my  
18 support for two representative districts in Tempe.

19 I've been a resident for 25 years and a  
20 Tempe businessman for 11 years. I'd like to show my  
21 support for Legislative a scenario for Maricopa 3E. As  
22 a concrete demonstration, manifestestation, like the  
23 public might, the Tempe phone book, let everybody and  
24 the Commission take notice, it says "Tempe Ahwatukee" on  
25 its front. When local consumers access business, this

1 what they use. "Tempe Ahwatukee," see this. The best  
2 is 3E.

3 The concern I have, or improvements or  
4 changes to the website, the difficulty or addressing or  
5 accessing graphic map data. Currently to view the  
6 Legislative, go to slides 18, 19, 20. The presentation  
7 in excess of 40 slides, and I had many friends, fellow  
8 businessmen, show support, businessmen show support  
9 through the website, look at that and change it, make it  
10 easier for individuals to access the website. So go  
11 ahead and see what scenarios are posted.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

13 If I remember the testimony, you appeared  
14 at the Mesa hearing. Your wife also spoke, if I  
15 remember correctly.

16 MS. THOMPSON: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Supporting separation at  
18 Highway 60.

19 MS. THOMPSON: At Highway 60. Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Peter  
21 Moraga.

22 Mr. Moraga.

23 MR. MORAGA: I'll be very brief.

24 I've spoken before the Commission before  
25 on behalf of the Central Phoenix Historic Districts.

1 Again, I thank the Commission for coming together and  
2 working on this very important issue.

3 I won't reiterate the importance or the  
4 importance of our community of interest. You've done a  
5 great job doing that.

6 The Northern Historic District was taken  
7 out of one of the previous maps. I'm here just to  
8 recommend that the Historic District remain with the  
9 other Historic Districts in Central Phoenix. I brought  
10 copies and circled the areas for you. I'll hand those  
11 out to you.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Identify the area.

13 MR. MORAGA: Windsore Historic District,  
14 the northern part of District O, northeast corner of it,  
15 borders up to Missouri, east of --

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that  
17 immediately, the area north and to the east of Uptown  
18 Plaza?

19 MR. MORAGA: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

21 MR. MORAGA: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

23 Thank you for the maps. They are always helpful.

24 Next speaker is Gary Richardson.

25 Mr. Richardson.

1                   MR. RICHARDSON: Good morning,  
2 Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. Thank you for the  
3 opportunity to give you input on this very important  
4 redistricting task before you.

5                   I was involved in the last redistricting  
6 of the State of Arizona that went before you. I was in  
7 the State House of Representatives at the time. I know  
8 the pressures brought to bear on the process.

9                   I've lived in Tempe since I was five years  
10 old, and that's almost 50 years. I've always  
11 represented District 27, Tempe, and parts of Ahwatukee  
12 while in the Legislature, four years in the House of  
13 Representatives, and four years as a State Senator.

14                  I would like to comment on something the  
15 Mayor said earlier, the fact we had a record turnout in  
16 our election recently I think argues to the fact you  
17 should not split Tempe up at all more than it suggests  
18 you should split Tempe one direction, street, or  
19 highway. The fact of a record turnout shows a definite  
20 community of interest and we would like to remain that  
21 way. However, I know there are 30 districts, millions  
22 of people to assign to their own district. I know that  
23 may be an impossibility to keep Tempe in one Legislative  
24 District. I think it would be the optimum.

25                  I would like to encourage you for a second

1 to keep communities of interest together. I'm speaking  
2 specifically of Kyrene School District.

3           If you adopt the plan, I don't know what  
4 number it is, the latest one, the one recently proposed,  
5 change the lines to Guadalupe and Elliott, you'll be  
6 splitting the school district right in half. You are  
7 going to be taking parts of it out of the Legislative  
8 District that should be been in, bringing it in the  
9 middle of one. Also, you are going to be putting people  
10 that live right across the street from neighbors in  
11 totally different Legislative Districts. I can't  
12 imagine a worse thing. You have to do it some areas.  
13 If you can avoid it, putting a line at Superstition  
14 Freeway, it would be far more advantageous.

15           Body language is very helpful, Mr. Elder.

16           COMMISSIONER ELDER: Everybody is a  
17 neighbor, wherever the line is.

18           MR. RICHARDSON: Everybody is a neighbor.  
19 Absolutely.

20           I think if you follow, not even the  
21 natural boundary, a man-made boundary, a freeway, follow  
22 the natural boundary the freeway has become, and do your  
23 best to avoid obvious political considerations in  
24 rewriting this district, I think you ought to not worry  
25 where incumbents reside, such as in 3E, where I urge you



1 to do through my presence today.

2 Thank you very much for the opportunity to  
3 speak. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you  
4 have.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Richardson, a couple  
6 questions.

7 Ms. Minkoff, Mr. Elder.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Your remarks tended  
9 to be focused on the importance of school districts and  
10 not splitting, specifically, the Kyrene School District.

11 If the dividing line of the Superstition  
12 Freeway unites the Kyrene School District, does that not  
13 then split the Tempe School District?

14 MR. RICHARDSON: Splits the Tempe School  
15 District. Either plan splits the Tempe Union School  
16 District. There are three districts in our city. We  
17 have tried for many years to try to get them to  
18 consolidate and unify. We've given incentives, if you  
19 will, some more overt than others. The last one  
20 practically said: Do this. Of course, we can't force  
21 people to do anything at the Legislature. We've not  
22 been able to unify and consolidate districts.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What is the  
24 dividing line between Kyrene and Tempe Elementary?

25 MR. RICHARDSON: Guadalupe.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm learning all  
2 kinds of things that I did not know before about the  
3 State. Kyrene School District includes part of  
4 Ahwatukee, Chandler, and Guadalupe.

5                   MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

6                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Guadalupe has been  
7 separated from the entire area in every plan.

8                   Are you asking us in unifying Guadalupe  
9 School District to take the southern part of Guadalupe  
10 and put south Guadalupe School District or --

11                  MR. RICHARDSON: My ideal scenario is to  
12 leave all Guadalupe and Tempe in the same district.

13                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Including the part  
14 of Kyrene School District that services Guadalupe?

15                  MR. RICHARDSON: Yes.

16                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: Several speakers  
17 mentioned the high turnout of the Tempe election. What  
18 was on the ballot that --

19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe you heard about it,  
20 Mr. Elder.

21                  MR. RICHARDSON: How long do we have room  
22 for?

23                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not a full analysis, just  
24 the issue.

25                  MR. RICHARDSON: It was a recall election

1 of the current City Mayor.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions for  
3 Mr. Richardson.

4 Thank you very much, sir.

5 Next speaker is Connie Thompson.

6 Mrs. Thompson.

7 MRS. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
8 Commissioners.

9 I wanted to bring up an issue before you.  
10 I wanted to bring it up the last couple times when  
11 you've been in Mesa. There has been hearings about  
12 dividing Tempe. I wanted to put it before you. I don't  
13 know how obvious it has been that people want to keep  
14 Tempe together that spoke at the last hearings, two  
15 citizens, six elected officials, five appointed board  
16 members, one elected, and the Democratic Chairman of the  
17 District 27. People would like to see Tempe have two  
18 strong voices in two separate districts that would like  
19 to have the division at US-60: Eight citizens and one  
20 elected official.

21 The Tempe Chamber of Commerce represents  
22 businesses. I think you can tell the citizens are not  
23 tied into the politics of Tempe, like Senator Mitchell,  
24 Councilman Mitchell, Representative Cahill, Councilman  
25 Cahill. People are more interested in what is going on

1 with Tempe, want two strong districts, want a voice, six  
2 voices representing us, not just three. We don't want  
3 to cut off a couple thousand people in South Tempe and  
4 take away their voice. We don't want to cut off a  
5 couple thousand people. Give us voice. Divide Tempe at  
6 US-60. I still want to be in the south group. If you  
7 do the boundary at Guadalupe, I'm stuck between the  
8 group. Do it at US-60.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is Hugh  
10 Hallman.

11 Mr. Hallman.

12 COUNCILMAN HALLMAN: (Speaker says hello  
13 in foreign language.) US-60, for the Council I won't --

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That's a joke. I hold the  
15 record as the only person on the Commission that spoke  
16 Russian, but that was some time ago, although some  
17 colleagues say when I open my mouth it sounds like I'm  
18 speaking Russian.

19 COUNCILMAN HALLMAN: I'm here today one  
20 last time for combining what I believe is the strongest  
21 community of interest in Tempe, Tempe itself. Tempe  
22 demonstrated clear, while diverse, unifying focus for  
23 our residents.

24 I understand that is going to be very,  
25 very difficult to achieve. The concept of community of

1 interest is rather murky. We can all perhaps talk about  
2 where differences may be even within the City of Tempe.  
3 If you are not able to accommodate that desire, I  
4 understand regularly, recently, the life of it is very  
5 small. I then ask you to look for secondary communities  
6 of interest. Make a final determination of the boundary  
7 between -- across Tempe. For me, the next best  
8 indicator of a community of interest, if we ignore or  
9 cannot combine the entire City of Tempe in one community  
10 of interest, is Kyrene School District.

11 I recognize the question with Guadalupe.  
12 Put Guadalupe, the most likely community of interest is  
13 the north part of the City of Tempe. If the Kyrene  
14 community has insufficient secondary, examining the  
15 socioeconomic indicators, I believe the City of Tempe is  
16 not exactly the right boundary. Baseline Road serves as  
17 a better boundary line through Tempe. The reason for  
18 that is twofold. The first kinds of homes, the kinds of  
19 occupants in homes between the area of US and Baseline  
20 to the areas north, immediately north of the boundary,  
21 those two areas of the community were created and built  
22 long before US-60 became the kind of dividing line that  
23 might conveniently become a basis for dividing the map.  
24 US-60 does not demonstrate a difference interest at the  
25 north boundary and south boundary. It's just the

1 opposite. People south of the boundary have the  
2 identical kinds of problems faced by the people  
3 immediately north of the boundary. In fact, the  
4 neighborhood association that represents the people in  
5 and around that freeway called the Price Neighborhood  
6 Association, the largest single neighborhood association  
7 we have in Tempe, represents people from north and south  
8 of that boundary line, being US-60.

9 I implore you not to use US-60 as a  
10 convenient dividing line. The people's interests would  
11 be ill-served. It would include quadrants northeast,  
12 southeast, northwest, northeast of their interests.  
13 They've been fighting ADOT together with a unified  
14 voice, fighting aviation over flights. Instead of a  
15 convenient line, at least use Baseline.

16 Arguments would be the preference: Tempe  
17 and Guadalupe be together. If we can't satisfy that  
18 Kyrene boundary, the next best secondary indicator  
19 interest, splitting Guadalupe untoward no voice in that  
20 community more powerfully connected through a city or  
21 community interest. Secondly, if Kyrene doesn't work,  
22 Baseline as a boundary road. Baseline is a much better  
23 indicator based on socioeconomic indicators and specific  
24 problems that arise from that corridor.

25 I do speak from a basis of background and

1 interest in this kind of problem, the current boundary  
2 line, the division of the City of Tempe. Six square  
3 miles, Tempeians more strongly identify with Tempeians  
4 than they do interests that might serve in the south.

5 I live in the area that for the last 20  
6 years has been carved off into Legislative Districts  
7 with no voice as a fairly active member of the  
8 community, have served as a precinct committeeman. One  
9 decade they carved off one small section, carved off  
10 small portion with an East Mesa District and we had no  
11 voice at all. Currently the District is north and  
12 participates with Scottsdale, Paradise, Phoenix folks.

13 As a precinct committeeman with no voice  
14 in District 26, my concerns go unheeded in District 27  
15 meetings. I'm also persona non grata, don't belong, in  
16 my district. They are not my representatives. I can't  
17 influence them in the way I would like to as an active  
18 member of the body politic.

19 Part of the concern is not to carve off  
20 such a small piece of Tempe as to assign them to no  
21 voice. A moderate dividing line, slight majority  
22 perhaps to the north that serves the city governments  
23 interests being represented providing folks south  
24 sufficiently that that group can, together, have a voice  
25 in the south district a semblance first to the other

1 members, other interest groups.

2 Any questions such that I can answer them?

3 Otherwise I'll allow you to get back to  
4 the birthday celebration.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Questions for Mr. Hallman?

6 (The Chairman and Mr. Hallman exchange  
7 fairwells in a Russian dialect.)

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Frank Seanez  
9 representing the Navajo Nation.

10 MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Chairman Lynn and  
11 Commissioners.

12 On September 15th, the Commission asked  
13 the Navajo Nation to do two things, specifically. The  
14 first was to submit additional detailed written comments  
15 and the second was to review the Navajo Nation proposals  
16 in accord with the alternate NDC scenarios which had  
17 been provided to the Commission in Prescott and first  
18 announced to the Navajo Nation in Flagstaff, to provide  
19 the Commission additional options acceptable.

20 The Navajo Nation complied on September  
21 19th. The Navajo Nation sent a supplemental packet of  
22 information to yourself and copies to the Commission's  
23 counsel and to NDC which covered additional comments by  
24 the office of the Speaker, Office of the President, Vice  
25 President, Navajo Transit, Transportation, Tourism, Four



1   Corners, Tuba City, Navajo Nation TANIIF Office,  
2   Division of Education, Tax Commission, and Navajo Hopi  
3   Land Commission. As well, the Navajo Nation provided  
4   detailed information to the Commission relative to  
5   support which Legislative Districts and Senators  
6   provided for Hopi bills in the 45th through 42nd  
7   Legislatures.

8                   The Navajo Legislature through  
9   intergovernmental subdivision committee acted to pass  
10   resolution wherein the Navajo Nation looked at scenarios  
11   D and F of the Legislative District and approved and  
12   recommended to the full intergovernmental relations  
13   committee both those scenarios, D and F.

14                   The Navajo Nation was a bit hampered  
15   because no detailed breakout of statistical information  
16   has been placed on the website for those scenarios.  
17   However, the Navajo Nation is confident that the  
18   Commission's consultants, NDC, have done full analysis  
19   of that, made sure that that scenario is within the  
20   deviations required for Legislative Districts by the  
21   Voting Rights Act, and the Navajo Nation is in reliance  
22   upon the Commission and consultants on that area.

23                   International area IGRS-253-01 the Navajo  
24   Nation provided to all the Commissioners and its  
25   consultants and legal counsel this morning at the same

1 time as Speaker Begay's comments.

2           The Navajo Nation as well provided within  
3 that document as an alternative for a small change to  
4 the Congressional District approved conditionally by the  
5 Commission, and that change would just remove a small  
6 portion of Yavapai County and certain Census places from  
7 the Congressional District, Yarnell, Peeples Valley,  
8 Wilhoit, Mayer, Spring Valley, and Cordes Lakes to  
9 accommodate the inclusion of the Hopi Tribe and corridor  
10 area which is currently within Congressional District A  
11 as provided by the Commission.

12           The Navajo Nation would like to point out  
13 again the inclusion of the Hopi Tribe to parts of the  
14 state we believe is essential for Voting Rights Act  
15 Section Two surviving initial review under Section Five.

16           The Navajo Nation reminds the Commission  
17 both the Tribal Councils of the White Mountain Apache  
18 Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe unanimously supported  
19 those tribes being in the same district as the Navajo  
20 Nation.

21           The Commission was presented with the  
22 White Mountain Apache Tribal Council resolution at its  
23 first round hearing in Hon-Dah on June 18th of this year  
24 and the San Carlos Apache Tribal Council resolution  
25 again passed unanimously, 9-0-0, passed on September

1 11th of this year. That resolution, SP-2001-185, a copy  
2 of that was provided to the Commission previously as  
3 well.

4 I would direct the Commission to the  
5 transcript of the direct testimony San Carlos Apache  
6 Tribal Chairman Dallas Massey, page 67, at the Heard  
7 Museum in the second round of public testimony.  
8 Chairman Massey conclusively, in so many words, said,  
9 "The San Carlos Apache wants to be in the same  
10 Legislative District as the Navajo Nation."

11 (Whereupon, Mr. Seanez says thank you in  
12 Russian.)

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

14 DR. ADAMS: Not a question, information.  
15 Data seeking. It's sent to be posted on the website.  
16 You should be able to see it by the end of today.

17 MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Dr. Adams,  
18 Chairman.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Terri Leija  
20 representing the Minority Coalition for Fair  
21 Redistricting.

22 MS. LEIJA: Since day one, the primary  
23 concern have been Constitutional concerns of Prop 106.  
24 We went to work diligently and developed a community of  
25 interest, and that is the basis of our maps. But

1 because 106 includes the requirement of competitiveness,  
2 we went ahead and drew another concern that includes  
3 competitiveness.

4 At the meeting in Glendale, we submitted  
5 the criteria that we used for our map, and that did not  
6 include incumbents' addresses. We specifically spoke to  
7 various districts that we had developed, but I think you  
8 all have heard from our community, our Commission  
9 members from throughout the state, Tucson, Pinal,  
10 Guadalupe, or Surprise. And based on their concerns is  
11 what we used to draw our maps.

12 Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Leija.

14 Next speaker, Patrice Kraus from City of  
15 Chandler.

16 MS. KRAUS: Good morning, Mr. Chairman,  
17 Commissioners.

18 I wasn't going to speak. You are quite  
19 familiar with the City of Chandler's position on the  
20 Legislative redistricting maps. However, because a  
21 number of speakers in Tempe talked about dividing Tempe  
22 at US-60, I thought it important I come up and say  
23 whatever you decide on the City of Tempe, it's hard to  
24 say what the majority wants not having access to all of  
25 the information that you are getting through the

1 website, through voters, and through, you know, speakers  
2 elsewhere, speakers who see you on the street, et  
3 cetera. But whatever you decide about Tempe, whatever,  
4 however it will be divided, please leave us alone.  
5 Please, please leave us alone. We like how we are.  
6 Find a solution that keeps us happy, perhaps make some  
7 people happy in Tempe, maybe not all. It looks pretty  
8 impossible to do that. But I know a couple of people  
9 have said that they support Maricopa 3E. We do not  
10 support Maricopa 3E.

11 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We appreciate your time as  
13 always.

14 MS. KRAUS: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The last speaker slip I  
16 have, I say that, anyone otherwise that wishes to be  
17 heard this session, there will be another session later  
18 today, I can't tell you the time, at the end of the  
19 meeting, the last speaker slip I have is from Jacob  
20 Moore, Salt River Pima Indian Communities.

21 MR. MOORE: Good morning, Chairman Lynn,  
22 Commissioners.

23 Coming together to face issues of the Salt  
24 River Pima Indians and coming to trying to appease  
25 everyone is not easy to do.

1                   I bring a letter signed by the President  
2 of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Ivan  
3 Makil, and also signed by the President of the Fort  
4 McDowell Indian Community, Clinton Pattea. We  
5 respectfully request the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian  
6 Community and Fort McDowell Community be put in District  
7 E, on the Congressional side, and taken out of large the  
8 rural District C.

9                   Before we go into that, I would like to  
10 also let you know that we also are content with being  
11 placed in District W, on the Legislative side, which  
12 does incorporate the metropolitan tribes, Salt River,  
13 Fort McDowell, Ak-Chin, and also the community of  
14 Guadalupe. We're very pleased to have that opportunity  
15 to stay together as rural metro tribes, which brings me  
16 to my next point.

17                   In fact, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
18 Indian Community and Fort McDowell Indian Community are  
19 the only parts of Maricopa County included in District  
20 E, in terms of being out of District C, that's the only  
21 part of District C out of Maricopa County, Salt River  
22 and McDowell.

23                   We acknowledge and applaud effort in terms  
24 creating a strong Native American District in District  
25 C. However, our concern is that our issues are

1 primarily metropolitan in nature. In fact, a lot of the  
2 issues we deal with in C, flight patterns, air quality,  
3 freeway transportation, are like metropolitan,  
4 intergovernmental agreements with City of Scottsdale and  
5 City of Mesa. For those reasons we find it appropriate,  
6 for federal appropriation, or good regional planning, we  
7 participate with metropolitan areas versus some issues  
8 which may be more important to rural districts.

9                   With that in mind, I want to try keep it  
10 short.

11                   The other comment, I think, usually that  
12 has been posed by the Independent Redistricting  
13 Commission is how do we fix that?

14                   Again, without trying to do your job, or  
15 our concerns about whether or not we have the technical  
16 skills or expertise you've developed over time in terms  
17 of hearing other concerns, one possible solution is the  
18 Arcadia District in District E, technically part of the  
19 City of Phoenix. That could be a possible solution,  
20 moving Arcadia over into -- into that district, District  
21 B, understanding there are some areas within district --  
22 to give you an idea, this is a small number, require a  
23 small change.

24                   The population of Salt River is  
25 approximately about 6,500. The population of Fort

1 McDowell is 800. So we're looking at in the range of  
2 7,000 that would be moved out of District C into  
3 District E with the suggestion to compensate that would  
4 be moving some from District A to District C and some  
5 from B into A, which again would be -- allow for part of  
6 Arcadia out of A into E.

7                   Beyond that I think the other question is,  
8 one other comment, also suggestion, might be possible  
9 that Salt River is considered to be moved into the Mesa  
10 District on the Congressional side.

11                   Our concern is there is a physical  
12 geographic boundary in terms of the criteria,  
13 Proposition 106, which is the Salt River, the riverbed  
14 itself. In fact, a lot of the deployment and businesses  
15 that go on, the interaction of intercommerce, so to  
16 speak, Salt River is primarily done with Scottsdale,  
17 buying groceries or employment, not the Navajo boundary  
18 that takes place with the City of Mesa and Salt River.  
19 There is commerce that takes place between the City of  
20 Scottsdale and Salt River Pima Indian River Community.

21                   Thank you for your time. And I'd  
22 entertain any questions. Otherwise that concludes my  
23 presentation.

24                   (The following is the written submittal of  
25 the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the



1 Fort McDowell Indian Community dated September 20, 2001:

2 "Independent Redistricting Commission

3 "1400 West Washington, Suite 10-B

4 "Phoenix, Arizona 85007

5 "Dear Commissioners:

6 "As Presidents of the Salt River

7 Prima-Maricopa Indian Community and the Fort McDowell  
8 Indian Community, we are writing to respectfully request  
9 that the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC)  
10 place our reservations in congressional District E. As  
11 you know, we have already testified before the IRC in  
12 favor of being placed in District E, as opposed to our  
13 current placement in District C. This letter will  
14 provide further evidence and credence to our arguments.

15 "First, as was stated in the IRC hearing  
16 at the Heard Museum on August 30, 2001, District C is a  
17 rural district. Maricopa County, where our reservations  
18 lie, is urban and suburban in nature. In fact, the only  
19 parts of Maricopa County included in District C are the  
20 two Indian communities that we represent. While this  
21 would seem discriminatory in nature, it also serves to  
22 perpetuate a myth that Indian tribes are rural  
23 communities. Nothing could be further from the truth.  
24 We are diverse, growing communities that are integral  
25 parts of Maricopa County. Some of our tribal members

1 live and work in the surrounding suburban areas of  
2 Scottsdale, Tempe, Mesa, and Fountain Hills and have  
3 important business and social ties to these surrounding  
4 communities.

5 "Second, we believe that excluding our  
6 suburban communities from Maricopa County will make it  
7 more difficult to work with these communities that we  
8 have successfully worked with in the past. Our tribes  
9 have entered into many intergovernmental agreements with  
10 these local cities and we have partnered with many  
11 local, non-reservation communities to expand business  
12 development in the region. Unfortunately, by taking our  
13 tribes out of Maricopa County, the IRC may unwittingly  
14 punish our reservation communities by forcing us to  
15 fight with our surrounding local cities for federal  
16 appropriation dollars. This could fracture  
17 relationships with local communities at a time when our  
18 Indian communities and local cities have been forging  
19 positive, enduring relationships with one another.

20 "Finally, while we applaud the IRC's  
21 support for creating a strong, Native American presence  
22 in District C, the rural tribes concerns are far  
23 different than those of Salt River and Fort McDowell.  
24 We believe the rural tribes realized this when they  
25 submitted their maps to the IRC. As you will recall,

1 the Navajo Nation submitted redistricting maps that  
2 excluded our tribes. We don't think this was merely an  
3 oversight. We are convinced, as they apparently were,  
4 that the varying interests of the rural and suburban  
5 tribes made it easier to keep the rural and suburban  
6 tribes in separate congressional districts. We also  
7 believe that our two communities, which total slightly  
8 more than 7,000 people, would minimally change the  
9 Native American population in District C and very small  
10 changes would be needed to the other districts.

11 "We understand that by adding 7,000  
12 residents to District E, other congressional district  
13 will have to be slightly modified. We are prepared to  
14 help the Commission with this task. However, we aren't  
15 prepared to assume the expertise and knowledge that the  
16 Commission has developed of the affected communities  
17 whose districts might be altered. We think that the  
18 Commission may be better suited for this task.  
19 Nevertheless, we are prepared to be helpful in any way  
20 that the Commission sees fit.

21 "Thank you for your consideration of this  
22 request. If you need to contact us, we can be reached  
23 at (480) 850-8002 (President Makil) or (480) 837-5121  
24 (President Pattea). In the meantime, please accept our  
25 best regards.

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
Phoenix, Arizona

1                    "Sincerely, Ivan Makil, President, Salt  
2 River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community; Clinton Pattea,  
3 President, Fort McDowell Indian Community.")

4                    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Moore, very  
5 much.

6                    Other members of the public wishing to be  
7 heard at this time?

8                    The Chair would entertain a motion as  
9 follows: Following a 10-minute recess, that the  
10 Commission reconvene in Executive Session pursuant to  
11 the agenda and pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(4).

12                    MS. HAUSER: Also, the two provisions.

13                    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sorry, (A)(3) and (A)(4),  
14 both.

15                    MS. HAUSER: Sorry. The motion.

16                    COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

17                    COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

18                    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

19                    Those in favor say "Aye."

20                    (Vote taken.)

21                    CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries  
22 unanimously.

23                    Ladies and gentlemen, we'll reconvene at  
24 or after 2:00 p.m.

25                    Thank you.

1                   (Whereupon, the Commission recessed to  
2 Executive Session from 11:54 a.m. until 2:46 p.m.)

3                   (Recess was taken from 2:46 until  
4 approximately 2:56 p.m.)

5                   (Whereupon, the Independent Redistricting  
6 Commission Resumed Public Session at 2:56 p.m.)

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll reconvene the  
8 meeting of the Redistricting Commission at 2:56 p.m.

9                   The record will show all Commissioners are  
10 present along with legal counsel, staff, and  
11 consultants.

12                   The point is the Board a number of legal  
13 issues to discuss in Executive Session. No maps were  
14 discussed, no maps were present. No maps were discussed  
15 or recommended. You need to understand that the process  
16 we're going through publicly is that process. What we  
17 expect to discuss through the rest of the meeting is to  
18 take the options that have been either developed by the  
19 consultants, directed by Members of the Commission, or  
20 submitted by the public over the course of many weeks we  
21 have been reviewing the draft maps that we adopted last  
22 month and to begin to remove some of those options from  
23 consideration.

24                   The reason we need to do that is twofold:  
25 First, in order to fulfill our requirements under

1 Proposition 106. A significant amount of analysis and  
2 study needs to be conferred on those options that are  
3 under active consideration so that as a point when we  
4 decide to develop the final maps we have a full and  
5 complete understanding, statistically and otherwise, of  
6 the impacts of those decisions.

7                   The second thing is that there are so many  
8 variations on specific themes that have been developed  
9 one way or another that it becomes very confusing, both  
10 to the public and to, quite frankly, all of us how many  
11 of those are under active consideration and how many are  
12 still possible in terms of a final map.

13                   So the attempt, today, is to discuss, in  
14 an orderly fashion, if we can, the number of options  
15 that have been developed, one way or another, and for  
16 the most part to eliminate certain options as no longer  
17 being under consideration so as to get the number that  
18 will be fully analyzed down to a manageable number of  
19 options, including, of course, the draft maps that have  
20 been circulated. That's the attempt for the afternoon.  
21 And this is the first time today that we will be  
22 considering actual maps.

23                   So with that said, without objection, what  
24 I'd like to do is begin with the Legislative map which  
25 presents us not only more options to be considered but

1 has a number of areas of the state that are still under  
2 active consideration for potential change because of the  
3 amount of testimony that we have received, either at  
4 hearings or through other methodology.

5                   So if you would turn your attention to the  
6 Legislative binder. And I think maybe the easiest way  
7 to do it is to follow the binder as it exists and talk  
8 about specific drafts, or tests, or options that have  
9 been submitted and decide whether or not we want them to  
10 be under -- continue under active consideration. And we  
11 haven't talked about the methodology that we'll use to  
12 do that.

13                   I'm wondering what your pleasure is with  
14 respect to an option being presented and if there are  
15 not -- if there is not a consensus or not three votes --  
16 how would you like to proceed in terms of options being  
17 eliminated? What is your pleasure?

18                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Discussing them  
19 and -- are the mikes on?

20                   Anything with three votes, go through and  
21 consider them for now.

22                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Another point of view for  
23 now, another point of view, garner three votes,  
24 eliminate from consideration. All right.

25                   Let's move to Legislative options. Dan,

1 Mr. Elder.

2                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Before we do that, I  
3 would like to at least discuss whether two votes or  
4 three vote may be necessary to keep something on the  
5 table. If we have three votes, that's a majority of the  
6 quorum. I'd like to avoid that. Yes, voting on, yes,  
7 this point, looking like this one received three votes,  
8 a majority of the Commission. So if we make it a two  
9 vote, see how that runs?

10                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is your pleasure?

11                   Mr. Huntwork?

12                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would be more  
13 comfortable with that, two votes.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: So at least two votes  
15 keeps it in.

16                   Again, the goal here is not to eliminate  
17 one or two of these options. I'll tell you the amount  
18 of work we have to do next week and beyond is going to  
19 be simplified greatly and made much more focused by the  
20 number of options that can be taken off the table if in  
21 fact we can do that. So I'm fine with two votes. I  
22 just ask you to give your votes very, very sparingly  
23 to -- anything other than that you want to actively  
24 consider next week.

25                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Do possible two



1 tiers, see what we end up with two-vote process, four,  
2 five left, get down, go through the balance left again  
3 rather than -- rather than at least go through all eight  
4 alternatives, nine alternatives, whatever it is now,  
5 then come back and revisit them once left rather than  
6 hitting one and two, oh, maybe was good one by the time  
7 get to seventh or eight.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In fairness, we probably  
9 have eight or nine major alternatives. Each has  
10 permutations. We have a number of suboptions under some  
11 of the major tests.

12 At any rate, let's attempt to do that, go  
13 through, see which to eliminate. If too many, see if we  
14 can do a second round.

15 All right. I guess the easiest way to do  
16 this, Mr. Johnson, if you wouldn't mind, would you sort  
17 of take us through the book. I'll take over the  
18 discussion. You get us through the list, and we'll get  
19 them in order so you know what is in, what is out.

20 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, pausing after  
21 each one to discuss them.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: One at a time, still in or  
23 whether we have a enough of consensus to remove it from  
24 consideration.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, as you may

1 recognize, we adopted the Legislative map. There are a  
2 couple points as we begin I should clarify.

3           Number one, these are tests of concepts.  
4 When we get down to zooming in on streets and neighbors,  
5 things like that, obviously we've not worked out every  
6 last detail and matched every citizen request at this  
7 point. That's our goal to do with the maps at this  
8 point.

9           I should also note all maps are either on  
10 the web already, which is true in most cases, or being  
11 posted to the web, I believe, today. So they are  
12 accessible to the public and they can go back to them  
13 and add their comments.

14           A couple points I should also follow up  
15 from the citizen or public hearings earlier this  
16 morning. There were a couple of references to A2 and  
17 4B, things like that. And those were references to the  
18 Power Point presentation done in Prescott. Just for  
19 your reference, A2 referred to by the representative of  
20 Casa Grande, their favorite is very similar to what  
21 Cochise presented as scenario 5 included in tests A and  
22 G.

23           I'll try to note these as I get to the  
24 maps, run through quickly, 5 wanted to mention, 4B,  
25 representative Casa Grande okay with, wasn't his

1 favorite, statewide test B and H. 5D, the, as he put  
2 it, the "hell-no plan," is test D. And test F and F-2  
3 are similar to it. 3E he mentioned was a strong no is  
4 test E.

5 The number of Tempe speakers referred to  
6 Maricopa plan 3E. That is the plan that includes Apache  
7 Junction, Gold Canyon, in with urban districts included  
8 with tests E and B. I'll try to refer to that as we get  
9 to specific maps.

10 Jumping in with the first scenario here is  
11 test A. This is the one first shown, I believe, last  
12 week and posted to the web last week. Its primary focus  
13 in developing this was to draw the border district that  
14 we see down here, District Y, and to incorporate that  
15 with unifying the Prescott Tri-Cities.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, rather than go into  
17 detail, we know what each is. Go in order. And let's  
18 get them up on the board and see if we have concerns.  
19 What I would hope to do is ask the Commission to engage  
20 in conversation about each of the options. And if you  
21 have a reason to want to keep it, fine. If you have a  
22 reason to reject it, let's talk in some detail about  
23 what that reasoning is so it's very clear if a test is  
24 not left in for consideration next week, why it's  
25 eliminated.

1                   Let's start with test A.

2                   Is there conversation, comment, on test A?

3                   Mr. Hall?

4                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, there's  
5 another alternative very similar to this, does a better  
6 job, does not split Flagstaff as this one does, and it  
7 handles Yavapai County better. I think given all the  
8 variables, other tests forthcoming, it's probably  
9 better. I don't think this needs to remain in  
10 consideration.

11                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

12                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd weigh in in favor  
13 of keeping this in the mix until we get further on down  
14 the line. Things are happening in both central cities  
15 in Phoenix, Tucson. I'd like to take a further look  
16 when we get to that stage.

17                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other comments on A?

18                   Ms. Minkoff.

19                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I also have a  
20 problem with the Northern Arizona portion of this  
21 district in terms of splitting Flagstaff, in terms of  
22 splits occurs in Yavapai County. I'd not be in favor of  
23 continuing to consider this one.

24                   And I'd also, the way the La Paz County is  
25 split, I understand La Paz County has to be split, but

1 there are better ways of splitting it, better ways than  
2 going right through the middle of Quartzsite.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Which map, Joshua,  
5 is similar but preferable?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: I believe test G.

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Test G is a lot  
8 worse for Yavapai County.

9 I understand the preference. I'd like to  
10 keep this one in play for a while longer, too, if only  
11 for the reason we eliminated it is in comparison with G.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, let me  
13 ask a question on procedure here.

14 I think in reviewing the eight or nine  
15 maps that we've asked the consultant to give to us,  
16 there's probably a problem or three on every single map  
17 we have. And to go ahead and say we want to go forth  
18 with it as is, you know, maybe -- we may not reach any  
19 of our goals.

20 So how do we integrate, say this map may  
21 not be to good, or carry through the first round, see  
22 how many maps we end up with that are reasonably  
23 palatable? Here's what I see with each one of the maps,  
24 go through there?

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Great question.

1 I think the way you began answering it is  
2 probably the perhaps easiest way we do it. Let's take a  
3 fairly quick run through the maps, see if there are any  
4 we agree with out on the face of it.

5 Go back, take a look at what is left, see  
6 if with the modification we like to keep them in or if  
7 at present there's a sufficient problem or similarities  
8 we might combine a couple, are some similarities with  
9 other maps, and decide on one, two options, preferable  
10 options, thereby changes, thereby eliminating another  
11 one from changes, perhaps a quick run-through.

12 What I'm hearing, A is still in play.

13 Without objection, move to test B.

14 Comments on B?

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, B does a lot  
17 of good things. I think it divides Flagstaff. I think  
18 it breaks up EACO, which we have identified as an  
19 important AUR. And I am pointing out a very good reason  
20 for doing that, which is not necessarily apparent on the  
21 face of this. It also puts Apache Junction back into  
22 the Phoenix Metropolitan area and requires us to redraw  
23 all the districts in the East Valley, which is one area  
24 where we received almost unanimous approval for what we  
25 had done.

1                   We may end up doing that, and some of  
2 these alternatives don't look too bad in the East  
3 Valley, but I hesitate.

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I have problems with B as  
5 well in terms of the southern part of the state, some  
6 options it presents, as well as supporting comments made  
7 earlier.

8                   With this one, I don't have any great need  
9 to keep it in play.

10                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

11                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll  
12 take B out at this point.

13                  What we'll try to do is go through the  
14 entire scenario and ratify what we can. I want to be  
15 sure if we're clear on it, if there are any other  
16 deficiencies that need to be pointed out, be sure we do  
17 that, to the extent you want them on the record.

18                  I think we have better options to choose  
19 from for the reasons stated.

20                  At this point, B is out.

21                  Move on to option C.

22                  MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, option CC  
23 fails to get the option for equality.

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: C is out by definition.

25                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go straight to D.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Option D.

2                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's pretty much a  
3 minus. I don't like the fact Flagstaff is divided. We  
4 haven't unified the Tri-Cities. Flagstaff is divided,  
5 haven't unified the Tri-Cities. The way the Apache  
6 Reservations are connected, are less than wonderful.  
7 There just isn't a lot I like in this one.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any sentiment for keeping  
9 D?

10                  Without objection, D is out.

11                  Test E.

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Whatever advantages this  
13 district has in the northern part of state in terms of  
14 unifying some communities, and perhaps not dividing  
15 others, it loses appeal in the southern part of the  
16 state with some of the interesting configurations along  
17 the border. I find this one problematic. I'm not --  
18 I'm certainly not in favor of keeping it in the mix the  
19 way configured.

20                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's kind of ugly  
21 in the Phoenix Metropolitan area.

22                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: On a rating system,  
23 community interests for communities, two pluses, 13  
24 minuses. No opinion to keep it forward.

25                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, E is



1 out.

2 Test F.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, test F, in  
4 addition I gave you test 2. The two are closely  
5 related. Primarily differences in F is closely divided  
6 and then in F2 it's united with an impact that kind of  
7 goes through the state, eastern portion of the state.  
8 If you like, I can walk through the maps.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is F2 here?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

11 MR. JOHNSON: F2 unites -- will take 30  
12 seconds to run through it -- unites Flagstaff, ends up  
13 including Williams and Parks in there. A makes up for  
14 lost population picking up areas north of Holbrook, and  
15 I believe it takes in Winslow as well, and -- yes, by  
16 taking in Winslow. And then District E needs to pick up  
17 population, so it takes a portion of eastern Pinal. And  
18 then it includes -- let me put the label on there so you  
19 can see the label on there -- so it includes San Manuel  
20 but goes right up to but does not include Mammoth or  
21 Oracle. Then DD had Sierra Vista already, also picks up  
22 a portion of northern Santa Cruz and the Green Valley  
23 area, one of the goals. That's a nice side effect of  
24 the split there. It make up for that. W goes up north,  
25 goes into eastern Pinal, takes in Mammoth and

1 Dudleyville. Y goes north a bit giving up eastern Pinal  
2 and picks up -- here you see Fountain Hills is in both F  
3 and F2 and picks up more of Scottsdale as we try to  
4 ripple population through.

5                   It appears there are good goals.  
6 Flagstaff, Williams, Parks are together. Impacts on Y,  
7 picks up a portion of Scottsdale and the districts on  
8 the east.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

10                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Doug. Does C  
11 drop all the way -- seems like it goes below G there  
12 into the urban area of Maricopa even further down.

13                   MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

14                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Orange below and  
15 orange above are not connected.

16                   MR. JOHNSON: Separate districts.

17                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: K and G are separate?

18                   MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

19                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does the population  
20 end up having a Maricopa majority?

21                   MR. JOHNSON: In this case, Flagstaff is  
22 united, is not a majority district. The odds are not  
23 long before it will become a majority. In regular F, I  
24 believe it works out close to 50-50. Because if -- you  
25 have 40,000 people from Flagstaff instead of 50 and

1 don't have Williams and Parker.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Same question on D,  
3 Yavapai plus Western Maricopa, Western Maricopa and  
4 Yavapai.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Roughly 50-50. I can get  
6 the specific numbers, if you like.

7 It's probably a little more population in  
8 the Yavapai portion, but --

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think it will be an  
10 urban influenced district within the next election or  
11 two.

12 Scroll further so we see the bottom part  
13 of the state. Sierra Vista comes in even -- yes.

14 Mr. Chairman, based on the new F2, I don't  
15 see much there I'd like to have to continue on.  
16 Flagstaff continuing on appears the only benefit.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: F or F2?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I agree.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any sentiment for keeping  
22 F or F2?

23 Mr. Huntwork?

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to make  
25 sure I understand something.

1                   One thing, I think F2 keeps open the  
2 possibility that I have not eliminated in my own mind  
3 which is that we might choose to unite the Apache  
4 Reservations with the Navajo Reservation in a single  
5 district. Of the options for doing that, it's the one  
6 that looked the best to me. I don't think we have  
7 another option which provides a credible way of doing  
8 that. This one does break up EACO, but if we decided to  
9 do that, it would be for a reason that might be worth  
10 doing. It does leave the non-Reservation portions of  
11 Apache and Navajo Counties together with other rural  
12 counties, including Graham and Greenlee, and the rural  
13 areas in Cochise County.

14                   I'm not sure that the only way to deal  
15 with that District C is bring to it all the way down to  
16 Maricopa County. It seems to me that C and Y, parts of  
17 C and Y could be combined to make a rural district, that  
18 the metropolitan area portions where Y comes into  
19 Scottsdale could be minimized. That's not the only way  
20 to deal with those issues right there. As a starting  
21 point, this one does a fairly good job uniting the  
22 Tri-Cities, unites Flagstaff. And if we -- we're going  
23 to consider an option for uniting the Apache and Navajo  
24 areas, this seems to be, to me, to be the best  
25 alternative.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: But F doesn't --

2                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: F2.

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: F doesn't have the  
4 characteristics as well as F2.

5                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Consensus on F to leave it  
7 out?

8                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Talk about F2.

10                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: F2. Concern is the  
11 solution may be worse than problems. Cochise will not  
12 be a happy district. It's what Graham, Greenlee wanted  
13 all along. Graham, Greenlee don't want to be with  
14 Cochise.

15                   However unhappy if we've taken out Sierra  
16 Vista, which they see as the heart of the county,  
17 Cochise will not be happy with this.

18                   Flagstaff will be happy united, unhappy in  
19 a district such as this or soon, as it will be,  
20 dominated by Maricopa County. Same thing with the  
21 Tri-City areas. They very much want to be united. I  
22 don't think they'll be thrilled at the price of unity by  
23 being dominated by Maricopa County and losing their  
24 voice.

25                   You've got Fountain Hills, Rio Verde with

1 no connection to Scottsdale. They see that as a  
2 problem. That's their connection rather than a large  
3 district primar rural in character.

4 Other than it gives an option of  
5 connecting the Apache Reservation to the Northern  
6 District, I don't see much in the rest of District F2 to  
7 recommend it.

8 I would be in favor if we want to do that  
9 in looking at some modification of other scenarios.  
10 Rest of this district has too many problems in it.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask them.

12 Mr. Huntwork, go ahead.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The problem is  
14 other scenarios didn't have that connection with the  
15 Apache and Navajo Reservation. And the question was if  
16 we were to consider that at all, what approach would do  
17 the least, the least damage elsewhere. We can't -- you  
18 can't modify one of the other approaches to do that  
19 without encountering all the other problems. And this  
20 match suggests a starting point to dealing with it.

21 Two points. Number one, test the point in  
22 Yavapai that did recognize the central connection with  
23 the western Maricopa County and even West Valley. There  
24 was a good deal express testimony to that effect. The  
25 Yavapai, Tri-City area is growing fast enough, they were

1 not concerned, or many people were not concerned about  
2 being overwhelmed by growth in other areas.

3 Finally, I do think it's important, would  
4 be important, if we were dealing with this, to combine  
5 the rural parts of C and Y in order to keep a district  
6 there as out of Maricopa County to the extent possible  
7 and still be in there, that district be configured so  
8 overwhelmingly non-Maricopa, at least to start with.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For the moment, let's  
10 leave it in. For the moment, take those where there's  
11 pretty good consensus, see where we are when finished.

12 Move to G and G4.

13 Doug, highlight the differences on G and  
14 G4.

15 Starting plan G, quick overview, somewhat  
16 of a combination of the two, very early draft presented  
17 long ago before we adopted the current adopted draft  
18 plan. The northern piece of that draft, you first saw  
19 combined with a southern piece similar to test A with  
20 the border district, similar to Cochise scenario five,  
21 Sierra district included in the border district.  
22 Flagstaff is in fact and is unified with the Navajo and  
23 Hopi reservations and the Grand Canyon area, including  
24 Grand Canyon Village.

25 The difference with G4 is two-part. And

1 the two, two tests involved in G4 are independent, so  
2 accept one and reject the other, if you like.

3           The first piece is down in the south.  
4 There was a concern of eastern Pinal, southeastern Pinal  
5 being grouped with Saddlebrooke. So that area has been  
6 grouped, put into District W in order to make up for  
7 that. District DD presses in and takes northern Santa  
8 Cruz County, more of northern Santa Cruz County, Sierra  
9 Vista, creating almost exactly in that county Cochise  
10 District Y.

11           Cochise comes up, District Y already  
12 includes Tohono O'odham, picks up Gila River and Ak-Chin  
13 Reservations, does not pick up Gila River, stays with  
14 the rest of Pinal.

15           COMMISSIONER ELDER: Zoom in on Pinal  
16 south of Gila.

17           See that around --

18           MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

19           COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pinal County, part  
20 of District Y, only two Indian Reservations or three  
21 Indian, Gila River, Ak-Chin, and a finger of the Tohono  
22 O'odham.

23           MR. JOHNSON: Three Indian, and the  
24 population of the town of Maricopa, Ak-Chin, and Gila  
25 River Indian Reservation.



1                   Three, zoom in quick so you see where, the  
2 rest of the line here, the south edge of the Gila River  
3 Reservation down here, the Ak-Chin Reservation down  
4 here --

5                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's the only  
6 part.

7                   MR. JOHNSON: Only part.

8                   MR. JOHNSON: If you compare to G, G has  
9 the Tri-Cities unified, but the dividing line, let me  
10 show that.

11                   But the border of District G, C, is the  
12 southern edge of those two cities. So what the request  
13 was was to see if we rotate this, can we unify all of  
14 the Prescott region. We can. It does have the side  
15 effect of both instead of D being a West Valley district  
16 that picks up portions of southern Yavapai, both C and D  
17 becomes slight majority Yavapai, significant portions of  
18 Maricopa in both. Each one has a tradeoff. Again,  
19 neither one of the options, neither south or Yavapai can  
20 be traded with G independently.

21                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Where is Flag?

22                   MR. JOHNSON: Flag is unified with the  
23 Navajo reservation.

24                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So C district, can  
25 you briefly describe what is included there, in G4?

1                   MR. JOHNSON: In G4, it starts, in the  
2 northwest, essentially along the freeway with, let me  
3 zoom in, read those a little better, includes Ash Fork,  
4 Seligman and Ash Fork. Comes down and picks up Williams  
5 and Parks, goes south of Flagstaff, and you can see it  
6 goes right along the south border of Flagstaff, and then  
7 it comes down and picks up Sedona, the Verde Valley.  
8 And in G4, it continues down into Peoria, Cave Creek,  
9 and New River areas.

10                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Tri-Cities C or D.

11                   MR. JOHNSON: G4, Tri-Cities all in D.  
12 The advantage, it unifies all of Yavapai, not just the  
13 Tri-Cities above Dewey-Humboldt.

14                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: How far west of the  
15 interchange, the junction of Humboldt this morning, we  
16 heard testimony like to go to Belmont, I believe, on the  
17 west, probably accomplishes most of it, maybe not far  
18 enough on the south, somewhere between Munds Park you  
19 have there and the other.

20                   MR. JOHNSON: This really is almost  
21 exactly around the entire city border of Flagstaff. A  
22 couple places where the city border comes in for  
23 compactness, scared it, essentially follows exactly the  
24 city line.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Planning district, maybe

1 larger than the city border.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Yes, it is.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Therefore the question  
4 relates to that entire designation, just to note where  
5 it is, how much is in, how much out.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think it pertains  
7 to what was there with the original, in that we came  
8 right to the southern border of Prescott, and a  
9 tremendous amount of -- urbanized amount of southern  
10 Prescott. Same thing occurred in Flagstaff, the urban  
11 area extends out to the Museum of Northern Arizona, Snow  
12 Bowl, all the tourism type facilities we heard about in  
13 the meetings. A lot occurs in the area.

14 I'd like to see the ramifications of  
15 incorporating more of the Flagstaff area if we had to  
16 give up --

17 MR. JOHNSON: The challenge with this  
18 district is really -- it is a lot of area, population  
19 very focused, 53,000, I believe, in Flagstaff, a hundred  
20 some thousand in the Navajo Nation, and 7,000 in the  
21 Hopi Reservation. Right there you are at 175,000 plus.  
22 Then we have two western reservations and the Grand  
23 Canyon Village, really the only areas that drop off this  
24 district, trade off with something, the Grand Canyon  
25 Village area, which is a possibility, or pieces of

1 Flagstaff.

2                   The other significant comment on this  
3 district is District A does not include the City of  
4 Page, which is about 6,000 people, when we looked at  
5 ways to incorporate it, really, without taking on Hopi  
6 or some other -- 6,000 people from Flagstaff.

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Based on the conversation,  
8 I get the impression either G and/or G4 are worth some  
9 more discussion and consideration. The question is can  
10 you make a distinction between G and G4? Which would  
11 you like in or both?

12                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Probably both. I  
13 like G for Northern Arizona, and -- G is a better  
14 District. G and G4, pull the south, Cochise, like that.  
15 Keep improvements in G4.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

17                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Were those  
18 separate changes, northern and southern changes --

19                   MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

20                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mix and match?

21                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Northern part of  
22 G4, and southern part of G looked pretty good.

23                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Southern part G I  
24 saw problem. Southern part of Z I saw a nightmare.  
25 That has been improved, incorporating into W. Price of

1 doing that was pulling Sierra Vista out of the border  
2 district.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do this for the  
4 moment, leave both in for further discussion.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Leave both in for further  
7 discussion.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's move to H.

9 MR. JOHNSON: H is the last test. The  
10 other map we might want to look at is the Coalition 2  
11 map. This is the last of them all.

12 District H is another attempt at combining  
13 with the Navajo reservation.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Steve?

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This was done at  
17 my request. And I think it does some good things. But  
18 I also think when you compare this with F, which we've  
19 already discussed, that the relationships make more  
20 sense, to me, in F, so -- once I've seen this, it's  
21 interesting --

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Probably not worth further  
23 consideration.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, H is

1 out.

2 Next map you have is Coalition 2. This is  
3 the map presented at Glendale, I believe.

4 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. This map in many ways  
5 on a state wide level is very similar to the adopted map  
6 with two changes. Hopi is connected to C, not in  
7 District A, and down in the south it's redrawn to --  
8 color mix -- redrawn to include a border district.

9 Within Tucson, the Maricopa areas,  
10 however, it's been more significant. I can zoom in, if  
11 you like.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you zoom in,  
13 are the Tri-Cities and Yavapai County are all united in  
14 that district or are they split?

15 MR. JOHNSON: In this map, it's unchanged  
16 from the adopted map in the Yavapai, Prescott in one  
17 district, Prescott Valley in another, and Dewey-Humboldt  
18 in a third, not unified yet.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Prescott --

20 MR. JOHNSON: Prescott, Paulden, and  
21 Williamson are together.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What's your pleasure?

23 Mr. Hall?

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, in light  
25 of the fact I think there are some districts in the

1 metropolitan areas that merit consideration, at least  
2 temporarily, this ought to stay on the table.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would agree.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, we'll  
5 keep it in for this round.

6 Mr. Johnson, are there other permutations  
7 you and Dr. Adams would like consideration of in or out  
8 before we go back and revisit some we've included or are  
9 these the major divisions along with adopted drafts --

10 We also have a Coalition 1 map presented  
11 prior to the time that our draft came out, Coalition 2,  
12 and then we have other drafts submitted through other  
13 parts of the process. Are there other decisions you  
14 need from other --

15 MR. JOHNSON: I don't believe so,  
16 Mr. Chairman.

17 Dr. Adams.

18 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
19 Commission, I think if there are any of the other drafts  
20 that the Commission has seen to this point, they would  
21 like to review at this time, we would be happy to bring  
22 them up and have you take a look at them. If there are  
23 any that stand out in your minds, we would be happy to  
24 bring them up.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, could we bring  
2 up the adopted draft Legislative map, please.

3                   Mr. Chairman, down to the south, southeast  
4 part of the state, northern and central does not appear  
5 to be as too much of a problem. You run into problems  
6 as with District W and District DD, as I remember.

7                   If we can make a modification there, the  
8 balance of the plan was not all that bad. I'd like to  
9 carry through until we look at the other four, five.

10                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the drafts are a  
11 given.

12                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

13                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's not move away from  
14 the drafts, analyze those as a bench mark. We'll know  
15 when we deviate, what we'll be deviating from and why.

16                  Any other maps you'd like to be seen, to  
17 have be brought up at this time?

18                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman.

19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

20                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could I ask for a  
21 recap of what is in so far?

22                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if someone is  
23 keeping score.

24                  Dr. Adams, have you been keeping score?

25                  DR. ADAMS: Yes.



1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Refresh for us.

2                   DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, you voted,  
3 agreed to keep test A in. You kept test F2 in. You  
4 kept both G and G4 in, and you kept Coalition 2 in.

5                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And the draft maps.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: So that gives us six, six  
7 options with obviously some variations on a couple of  
8 the six.

9                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Five.

10                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Including our draft.

11                  Our draft A, F2, G, G4, and Coalition 2.

12                  Any further discussion on perhaps reducing  
13 that number further?

14                  Mr. Hall?

15                  COMMISSIONER HALL: Again, Mr. Chairman,  
16 tests A, F2, G, G4 I think are similar, while a  
17 continuing concern -- the Commission address concerns  
18 alluded to earlier in southeast Pinal and in Yavapai in  
19 light of the fact that -- in test A. Flagstaff is  
20 light, and while still working with Yavapai in F and F4,  
21 and in light of the fact southeast Pinal in test A is  
22 still a work in progress, there's still sufficient  
23 flexibility with the maps on the table to eliminate test  
24 A.

25                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the

1 possibility of eliminating test A.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't have a  
3 problem with that.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Main difference  
7 between A and G, I think, the A alternative, that leaves  
8 Flagstaff out of District A.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Part is divided.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Part is divided.  
11 I understand.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As an approach, if  
13 we work with A, we might be able to create a district  
14 where Flagstaff is out of District A, unite District A.  
15 Part of the process shown changes made in District F,  
16 between F and F-4. I think it may be possible to do  
17 that by working with the population around in that same  
18 general manner. But the -- I would just like to keep A  
19 alive for that reason. It's really the only difference  
20 between the two. I'm not quite ready to -- I think A is  
21 the only alternative that does not unite the Apaches  
22 with the Navajos and still keeps Flagstaff out of  
23 District A which we still have on the table, if I'm not  
24 mistaken. Well, the Coalition plan, obviously.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Doug, can you tell  
2 us on test A how much of Flagstaff is in the Northern  
3 District and how much is in District C, approximately?

4                   MR. JOHNSON: Most tests, numbers are  
5 10,000 people.

6                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 10,000 in the  
7 Northern District.

8                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Most in Flagstaff  
9 in District C?

10                  MR. JOHNSON: This one is higher than  
11 others, maybe 12,000 or so.

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: While looking for a second  
13 vote on keeping A in, Mr. Elder.

14                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: Let me ask  
15 Commissioner Huntwork, isn't G a work around with A to  
16 solve the problems with A?

17                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Commissioner  
18 Elder, G basically puts Flagstaff all into District A.  
19 What I was wondering was whether there was a A so  
20 Flagstaff is not in District A.

21                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess is the  
22 community interested in trying to get there? It almost  
23 seems there is testimony Flagstaff, like the northern  
24 area, tourism, like the relationship with Hopi, Page,  
25 houseboats, whatever it might be up there, included with

1 Grand Canyon City. Seems like it does put those all  
2 together where they're asking to be. I was trying to  
3 make sure I wasn't missing something in the analysis  
4 other than I would like to see a more urbanized area  
5 included in A, but I'm not so sure I know how to get it.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

7 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm trying about  
8 two things. Number one, I attended the first Flagstaff  
9 hearing and read the transcript of the second one.  
10 There was a good deal of testimony about connections to  
11 Sedona and the Verde Valley, as well. The second thing  
12 is that I am -- continue to be concerned about the  
13 demographics in A and would still like to continue to  
14 explore possible ways of keeping the Native American  
15 population in A as high as possible without the  
16 necessarily of combining it with the Apache Reservation.  
17 I suspect, at this point, I don't know enough to be  
18 sure, I suspect including that much of Flagstaff in A  
19 changes the percentage of Native American maybe by a  
20 couple percent, reduces it by a couple percent.

21 Doug, can you shed any light on that?

22 MR. JOHNSON: I don't have the specific  
23 numbers. I know there's a notable Native American  
24 population in that portion of Flagstaff. Taking that  
25 out would need to be offset somewhere. As you noted,

1 the Winslow area is probably the most likely. And  
2 Winslow is going to be essentially, I think, a Native  
3 American percentage. I can take a few minutes and  
4 figure that out if it would be helpful. I think it's  
5 roughly an even trade.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I looked at test A  
7 and G. There's one percentage point difference of  
8 Native American population.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With respect to testimony  
10 from Flagstaff, I don't think it was unusual, heard from  
11 several parts of the state, on the order of magnitude.  
12 Most communities are saying, number one, keep us  
13 together; number two, if you need to move us some  
14 direction, stated a preference. As is often the case,  
15 there are preferences on both sides. Some preferred  
16 north, some south. In other parts of the state, there  
17 are very similar patterns. Other stated other  
18 communities of interest. Clearly number one, most  
19 communities not having to be divided by numbers was to  
20 keep them whole or as whole as possible.

21 Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that we're all  
23 concerned about are the concerns you've alluded to,  
24 Mr. Huntwork. And I -- you can rest assured I'm  
25 intimately familiar with this area. We've spent a lot

1 of time trying to figure out what is the best way to  
2 keep intact the communities of interest, simultaneously  
3 maximize the voting opportunity of the Native American  
4 population. We looked at everything, the population  
5 center along the southern boundary new lands, Holbrook,  
6 Winslow, and Flag.

7 I guess what I'm trying to say, and maybe  
8 I didn't make myself clear, I don't see other options  
9 that preclude us from still looking at those  
10 opportunities or alternatives, but that this option  
11 wherein Flag is split, I heard unequivocal testimony in  
12 Flagstaff and today they do not want to be split.  
13 Therefore, that is why I said in an effort to try to  
14 minimize the number of targets we're trying to shoot at,  
15 I'm suggesting we take this one off the table since the  
16 majority of components are similar to those on the  
17 table, with the exception of those noted, and still not  
18 preclude us from making additional in the components  
19 southern line of A or northern line of A, whatever,  
20 maximize the best opportunities for all parties  
21 interested.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Also be clear I  
24 oppose A because Flagstaff would be split as well. I  
25 want Flagstaff to be united. The point, though, would

1 be that having Flagstaff united in A and then trying to  
2 figure out how to take it all out of A is a much bigger  
3 job than starting. District A, it's a much bigger job  
4 starting a plan A, trying figure out how to keep  
5 Flagstaff united outside District A. I'd like to keep  
6 it on the table. I had my weigh.

7 Does anyone agree with me?

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think that's the  
9 question. I believe you stated that very well.

10 I think you have your answer.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Okay.

12 Well, then, I would suggest, then, we, for  
13 the time being, take test A off the table leaving us  
14 with five choices.

15 Any further discussion on F2, G, G4,  
16 Coalition 2?

17 Again I ask the question if there's a  
18 distinction to be made between G and G4. Do we want  
19 them both to be considered in terms of further testing?

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Coalition 1 and 2  
22 in my mind are different animals than these other plans.  
23 In my mind they both have ideas in them that are worth  
24 considering and we should look at as we adjust some of  
25 the districts, particularly, I think in the metropolitan

1 areas. But I don't view either Coalition 1 or Coalition  
2 2 as an alternative plan for us to be considering. Is  
3 that -- am I on a completely different page here?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, it's in because it  
5 was analyzed to the point other plans were analyzed for  
6 us to review. Obviously it was formally submitted.  
7 Much of what was in, some aspects of Coalition 1,  
8 because it was submitted so early, are incorporated in  
9 draft mapping. Obviously not, not to the last line; but  
10 certainly a lot of the elements that were submitted in 1  
11 are included. Coalition 2 is a modification of that to  
12 achieve a different purpose, modification purpose in the  
13 presentation.

14 Did you want to consider that in the  
15 modification, or analysis of draft maps, or consider in  
16 reference in analysis of the maps? That's in fact the  
17 question on the table.

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, I think they  
19 are two different things. I would not -- I don't think  
20 Coalition Map 2 is in front of us, as a map, that is  
21 considered by the Commission. It has ideas in it we'll  
22 want to make sure are considered and ask the consultants  
23 look at and ask the consultants to look at as far as to  
24 elect collateral changes. The whole range -- there are  
25 quite different districts in the urban areas I would



1 need to have a lot better chance to look at closely and  
2 have a better understanding of before I could consider  
3 any of those changes on an individual basis. I think  
4 that's a reference map, if you will, not a map we're  
5 considering at this time.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on that  
7 issue?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The importance of  
9 keeping the Coalition 2 map on the table is not that  
10 this is the map that we will adopt. Obviously we're  
11 going to draw our own maps, our own districts. That's  
12 what was we've been charged to do by the people of  
13 Arizona. I believe there's a lot in there I'd want to  
14 keep on the table. First of all, it's the most  
15 competitive of all draft maps we've had so far. I want  
16 to keep it in there, see how they did it. I'd not be in  
17 favor of removing it, although obviously the lines we  
18 draw would be lines we draw.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Perhaps one of the options  
20 is to turn that map into a test and ask that it be  
21 incorporated and analyzed. The question is -- a test  
22 off which variation. I suspect the variation would be  
23 the draft, our draft map, and Coalition 2 variation to  
24 it.

25 Mr. Elder.

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Suggesting leave  
2 Coalition 2 alone and let stand as is, make adjustments  
3 we perceive as necessary with other maps as go forward.

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Taking Mr. Huntwork's  
5 point on all other tests, tests were directed by the  
6 Commission based on input, that is to say we either  
7 heard testimony or received information and asked  
8 consultants to specifically test certain options. What  
9 you see in the book are apples and oranges comparison.  
10 The Coalition was submitted and analyzed. The question  
11 is to put it on, I think is Mr. Huntwork's point, more  
12 equal footing. What need to happen is we'd need to turn  
13 Coalition 2 into a test with parameters we'd ask the  
14 consultants to look at. Then it would have more of a  
15 relationship to the others tests we're dealing with.

16                   Mr. Huntwork.

17                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: To be specific,  
18 some of the things about the Coalition plan I'd reject  
19 immediately. It doesn't do a thing for basically  
20 uniting Mohave County. It doesn't do a thing for the  
21 Tri-City area. It creates some districts down around  
22 Tucson that just run roughshod around some other ideas  
23 we've already discussed and rejected. On the other  
24 hand, I like the fact it combines -- takes the Hopi  
25 Reservation out of District A. I'm one of the

1 Commissioners that voted in favor of that.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did, too.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What?

4 Oh.

5 As a whole, it's not a test I'd be  
6 interested in pursuing. There are, I'm sure, some  
7 individual aspects I'm interested in and are worth  
8 seeing. I think it is worth remaining so we can put our  
9 finger on those things and ask our consultants to test  
10 those changes. And a lot will be specific changes  
11 within the metropolitan area. But, again, as a whole,  
12 this map does not appeal to me at all.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: If you look at that  
16 map, and if you take, in 106, sixth line, seventh line,  
17 that says competitiveness, where it does no harm or  
18 detriment to the preceding. There are very few  
19 communities of interest in the rural areas of this map  
20 that hold together based on what we heard in the first  
21 and second round testimony and submitted to earlier, the  
22 Commission, whatever. Maybe in the Phoenix urban area  
23 it may work. I haven't really looked at that one area  
24 T. Tucson, it's not a lot better than the rural part of  
25 the state, though we consider Tucson rural. I don't

1 know what the fix would be on this one other than you  
2 say using as a baseline for competitiveness. It really  
3 doesn't do anything for the rest of the state.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, the  
6 use I see of making of the Coalition 2 map is when we  
7 get to the issue of competitiveness. I'll have  
8 something to say later today after we deal with the  
9 Congressional maps. What we want to be able to do is  
10 look at our drafts and to look at this, which has been  
11 presented to us both by the Coalition and by our  
12 analysis of competitiveness. So I'd like to be able to  
13 look at districts and say well, okay, we have these  
14 districts. Can we make them more competitive, and look  
15 at this map as a guide to making them more competitive?  
16 Whether that means it stays on the table or whether it  
17 means it's a resource, I don't know. I just want to be  
18 sure that this map still stays with us so we can use it  
19 to assist us in adjusting the maps we're ultimately  
20 going to approve.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I agree  
23 there are significant, few redeeming values to external  
24 areas of the map.

25 Without objection, I'd simply instruct the

1 consultants as they're in the process of testing  
2 competitiveness, my perspective of the Metropolitan  
3 Phoenix area, utilize the suggestions and ideas that  
4 have been proposed in this map as part of the  
5 consideration process, and as far as a general map, I'd  
6 be in favor of removing this as a "quote, unquote" test  
7 map.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd agree with  
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sounds like a plan.

12 We want to retain those aspects,  
13 particularly in urban areas, address the competitive  
14 nature of the districts, analyze that as we go forward  
15 with respect to it being a draft, or a test that we  
16 would continue to analyze. We will take it off the  
17 table at this point, which leads us, ladies and  
18 gentlemen, to the draft, our draft, F2, G, G4.

19 I ask again, maybe the answer is you want  
20 both. Is there a significant difference in G and G4?  
21 Keep both as tests or do you have a preference?

22 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

24 MR. JOHNSON: The real differences between  
25 G, G4, the two of them, you can choose to accept the two

1 independently or the southern change or northern change.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: G4?

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to  
4 continue to look at both. There are things I like and  
5 things I don't like about both of them.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think  
8 that G4, in light of the fact Sierra Vista is segregated  
9 from Cochise County, in my opinion whatever fixes there  
10 are in Yavapai, the cure is worse than the ailment.  
11 Since now both districts in Yavapai are metropolitan  
12 dominated districts, certainly as we try to tweak some  
13 concerns we have, still have flexibility, again take G,  
14 say we want to try to see what alternatives there are, I  
15 suggest we work from G and still try situations more  
16 with specific feedback as we prepare to do so.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Up in the northern  
19 part of the state, there's not much problem with that.  
20 I'm not sure G4, C, D have much improvement, or plain G,  
21 C, D. My concern, the southern part of the state when I  
22 looked at G, the main problem I had with District Z, it  
23 included the north Tucson retirement community of  
24 Saddlebrooke and eastern Pinal County, which I think is  
25 a very dysfunctional district. G4 incorporates a change

1 and removes that. I would not want to lose that.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Tradeoff for Sierra Vista?

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Possibly another.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Between the two.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District Z in G4.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Andi, Commissioner

7 Minkoff?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You can call me

9 Andi.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Part of Eastern

11 Yavapai, Mammoth, San Manuel.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pinal.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Pinal, both where the

14 mine is shut down and started selling company housing to

15 retirement, recreational, that kind of aspect, Country

16 Club membership, redoing the town, redoing the street,

17 selling off properties to develop a retirement

18 community. Oro Valley, Oracle, Saddlebrooke, you don't

19 see the dysfunctionality until closer to Kearny.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. There it

21 starts.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Again, some tweaking

23 there, whether you trade areas north of Winslow to get

24 the population you need to expand Flagstaff, I think G

25 is something, not too bad a plan.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

2                   Mr. Huntwork.

3                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There was some  
4 testimony in Yavapai County, also in Coconino County,  
5 that split Yavapai basically along, now the revised  
6 Tri-City area in terms of the Tri-City area. Testimony  
7 was very mixed, but to the extent there was any  
8 testimony in favor of splitting Yavapai County anywhere,  
9 that was the spot. G4 comes closer to doing that than  
10 G. G divided Yavapai in a completely different spot.

11 Also there was testimony Yavapai south, a different spot  
12 was the logical connection. I'd be reluctant to take G,  
13 the northern part of G off the table, G4 off the table.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson, Dr. Adams,  
15 let me ask a question. Are there sufficient differences  
16 between the two, a number optimal, lowest number  
17 possible without redistricting choices beyond which we'd  
18 consider, enough differences or similarities of G and G4  
19 it's not burdensome to keep both on the table at this  
20 point or are they sufficiently different you would like  
21 us to make a choice?

22                   DR. ADAMS: I think, Commissioner Lynn,  
23 Members of the Commission, Mr. Johnson was about to  
24 speak to that issue before you got into conversation.  
25 I'll let him finish that.



1                   MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, it would not  
2 be overly burdensome to consider both, given the --  
3 really the two changes are really on or off without a  
4 lot of modification. We would start running into time  
5 issues if we started playing around both with the urban  
6 tests we've already discussed and a lot of tests in  
7 these areas. If you want to keep either options as an  
8 on off, no problem.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just recap where we are:  
10 Our draft, F2, G, G4, and elements of the Coalition 2  
11 map deals specifically with competitiveness in urban  
12 areas we want a further look at.

13                   Is there any further reduction or, dare I  
14 ask, are there other additions?

15                   Well, in full consideration of everything  
16 we've gotten, are you comfortable that further testing  
17 on these options will be sufficient to give you what you  
18 need to begin work next week, I guess is the way to ask  
19 that question?

20                   Mr. Hall?

21                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman I'm not  
22 sure we removed the number of targets. I think we need  
23 to get the type of analysis we discussed in effort to  
24 try to come back and make hard decisions.

25                   To that point, I, personally, do not see

1 any redeeming value to the test F2. In light of the  
2 fact we're wanting specific data, specific analysis, and  
3 specific feedback in an effort to try and come up with a  
4 finalized map, my count is F2 has I think three  
5 districts completely out of metropolitan areas, only  
6 three districts. I've -- tell me I'm wrong. Does not X  
7 not go into Maricopa County?

8 MR. JOHNSON: X does go into Gila Bend,  
9 not cities of the West Valley. Borders the Gila River  
10 Reservation.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. Two colors  
12 mixed there. Okay. So four? Four districts, one  
13 influenced by metropolitan area?

14 MR. JOHNSON: A, B, X, and E?

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. Y goes into Apache  
17 Junction and Scottsdale influenced.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Does not represent  
19 rural Arizona to the best extent possible. In addition,  
20 it's difficult count how many AURs are destroyed in that  
21 effort. I just don't think that's something fruitful  
22 for us to pursue.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Joshua, maybe  
24 create another rural district, primarily rural district,  
25 combining C and Y, and putting the more urban areas in

1 another District to the south. So that is another easy  
2 way to create another rural district. D, I think,  
3 depending on your definition, may or may not be rural,  
4 but a lot of people in Yavapai County were -- thought it  
5 was fairly ridiculous to consider them to be a rural  
6 district anyway. And there was a lot of testimony about  
7 combining with the Phoenix area.

8                   But aside from that, I don't think we do  
9 ourselves a service at this point by deleting the only  
10 map that would allow us to combine the Apache and Navajo  
11 tribe. We may come to the conclusion we can do that or  
12 may not. At this point, I, at least, have not come to  
13 that conclusion or heard any dispositive evidence as to  
14 what we need to do in that regard. I think it's  
15 important to keep the best option on the table until we  
16 have definitive information that allows us to make a  
17 full and informed decision. So really my answer would  
18 be unless you have a better way of combining Navajo and  
19 Apache tribes, I would like to keep this one on the  
20 table.

21                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments on F2?

22                   So far one in favor of keeping it, one in  
23 favor of eliminating it.

24                   Mr. Elder.

25                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, a question.

1 The difference between F and G in District A, what does  
2 it does to the majority minority and influence on the  
3 Native American?

4 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Elder, I have the  
5 numbers on G, not G4. I'll give you the G and -- a G  
6 and F2. And A and F2 has a Hispanic population of about  
7 three percent. This is voting age. It has a Native  
8 American voting age population of about 74 percent and a  
9 total minority voting age population of 74 percent.  
10 District G has Hispanic age population age, Hispanic  
11 voting age of 61 percent and voting age of 69 percent,  
12 that's VAP.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What is the pleasure on  
14 F2.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd say,  
16 Mr. Chairman, F is an ugly map, no doubt about it. I  
17 agree with Mr. Huntwork in considering bench mark  
18 information. Leave this on the table until we have  
19 further analysis we've taken a look at, maybe work  
20 arounds we can do in other areas of the state. Right  
21 now it's the lowest one on the list. Not very compact,  
22 barely contiguous, four districts considered rural. An  
23 awful lot of AURs don't fly with this. Same class with  
24 Coalition 2, baseline informational piece but not really  
25 considered as a map.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. For the  
2 moment, then, we are at our published draft, F2, G, and  
3 G4 with elements of other maps being looked at  
4 specifically.

5                   I think, I think, at this point, that may  
6 be the best we can do on the Legislative options, in  
7 terms of additional work that needs to be done.

8                   Mr. Huntwork?

9                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would just like  
10 to ask a question. In my own mind, with regard to G and  
11 G4, I mean, I would have a fairly clear preference for  
12 G4 in the northern part of the state, and even southern  
13 part of the state. I don't know if we have any sense of  
14 that or not. I'd suggest --

15                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Try to combine the two and  
16 deal with one?

17                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Deal with one on  
18 that basis.

19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I thought I heard  
20 Ms. Minkoff express an opposite view earlier. I wanted  
21 to double-check that against my memory. It's possible I  
22 might have misunderstood that.

23                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm sorry?

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess my point --

25                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Was there a

1 question there?

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes. Mr. Huntwork asked  
3 on the northern part G or southern part G4, or reverse.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Reverse.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Northern part G4 and G be  
6 combined, G as an alternative, rather than looking at  
7 two separate maps.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My only concern, I  
9 would echo an issue with District Z and in the southern  
10 portion of Z mixed in with G4.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand. As an  
12 option, not a map to be adopted, understand a draft to  
13 be further considered and modified, which comes closer?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If I had to pick  
15 between the two of them, G4 comes closer to me. It  
16 comes closer. It's problems as to which comes closer.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the Mingus  
19 Mountain split is easy, not a problem. D may well  
20 consider themselves metropolitan or more urban. Folks  
21 in Verde Valley do not nor do any other cities up there,  
22 Williams, Ash Fork, et cetera. And my big concern with  
23 that split is, again, that that is, in my opinion, and  
24 Doug clarify the numbers for me, has that not had a  
25 significant influence from northern Maricopa County?

1                   MR. JOHNSON: I don't know the  
2 significance number. It is definitely significant. It  
3 has to be over 30, 40,000, in my opinion.

4                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Which is also a high  
5 growth area in that area. So I don't concur that that  
6 necessarily is a better situation. I guess the  
7 fundamental testimony is G does do, keeps the Tri-Cities  
8 together. I agree it's not an ideal split in that  
9 neighborhood. My sense is, I could be wrong, those  
10 folks would rather have a rural district rather than to  
11 have -- Humboldt would rather be rural than be combined  
12 with Prescott Valley.

13                   With respect to the southern portion, I'm  
14 not sure that eastern Pinal is the situation, as  
15 outlined in G, not this map, G, is as problematic as  
16 taking the heart of Cochise out of it, being Sierra  
17 Vista. Those of us there at that lynching -- I mean  
18 meeting, we heard vehemently, and with volume,  
19 emphasized by bumper stickers, they do not want Sierra  
20 Vista outside Cochise County. I --

21                   Everybody wants everything. One has to  
22 consider what is the lesser of two evils.

23                   In my opinion, having been to all those  
24 town meetings, that that was certainly one of my most  
25 memorable experiences in Sierra Vista.

1 I suggest the southern portion here is a  
2 best case scenario, at least at this point, to move  
3 forward here, utilizing G to make adjustments,  
4 amendments, make ways to fix it. This isn't it. I'm  
5 saying in order to try to minimize the number of  
6 targets, I suggest we remove G4 and keep just G on the  
7 table.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doug, in this one,  
10 straight G, is Page in B or Page in A?

11 MR. JOHNSON: Page is in B in both B, in G  
12 and G4.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The southern part of  
14 the state, if we add the draft map and went out with  
15 Flagstaff split, went out, bumper stickers to?

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Flagstaff isn't split.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: City boundary,  
18 Flagstaff to the west, we're not picking up to the west.  
19 I'm not positive, one from Flagstaff tell me, the  
20 east-west road to miles west of the highway that runs  
21 along the city park, I think that city park on the north  
22 side of that, about the city limits of Flagstaff, and  
23 that --

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't think there  
25 are any differences between G and G4 in that area.



1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER:  Never mind.  We'll  
2 work out the northern areas and try to work out twice --

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Do we have a sentiment to  
4 work out G4?

5                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  No.

6                   COMMISSIONER ELDER:  Yes.

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  I heard both.

8                   COMMISSIONER ELDER:  Let's put it this  
9 way.  I won't go back Sierra Vista if we have G4.

10                  CHAIRMAN LYNN:  I understand that.

11                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Talking the  
12 northern part of the state more.  We can fix things in  
13 the southern part of state different ways.  Urban  
14 encroachment, we can fix that, separate that.

15                  Verde Valley, Sedona, et cetera, separates  
16 it from the Tri-City area, they asked for that pretty  
17 strongly.

18                  CHAIRMAN LYNN:  I think at this point, it  
19 is reasonable to keep them both?

20                  Ms. Hauser.

21                  Don't raise your hand.  You don't need to  
22 do that.

23                  MR. RIVERA:  Only has so many fingers.

24                  CHAIRMAN LYNN:  I grant you that.

25                  I was looking at one of them I thought

1 wanted recognition.

2                   What I'm hearing then, if at this is the  
3 list: Our draft, F2, G, G4, other maps to be analyzed  
4 as directed, four, three, three and a permutation of a  
5 third that we are looking at to move forward in terms of  
6 a Legislative map.

7                   Again I ask a question: Anything else  
8 want to add to the list at this point?

9                   Paragraph then my suggestion is we take a  
10 break. And when we return, we do the same thing for the  
11 Congressional map. And then once we are finished with  
12 the picture in total, we'll ask for a motion to move  
13 that forward.

14                   Let us take a 10-minute break at this  
15 point.

16                   (Whereupon, a recess was taken from  
17 4:32 p.m. until approximately 5:06 p.m.)

18                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Commission will come to  
19 order.

20                   The next order of business is the  
21 Congressional options and instructions to consultants.

22                   And I think here we have, Doug, correct me  
23 if I'm wrong, I think we essentially have three options  
24 to consider. Maybe there's actually a fourth, FF. Is  
25 that accurate? Maybe it's more than one.

1 I lied. It's a bunch of options.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Gave us three or  
3 four new ones today.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Why don't we do this. On  
5 the options that were delivered today, do your want to  
6 just recap those for us so we know what we're dealing  
7 with? Clearly we understand we have our draft; we have  
8 a downtown district that we're -- that has been  
9 presented. Why don't you go through the options for us.

10 MR. JOHNSON: One other one I cited, too,  
11 as the Commission stated earlier, the goals go to which  
12 maps we'll do a lot of competitiveness analysis on.  
13 Some plans are competitiveness alterations to plans on.  
14 You don't have to rule in or out competitiveness plans  
15 on this point. We're looking to rule out or in some  
16 other configurations.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Point that out so we don't  
18 miss that nuance.

19 Quickly running through the tests here.  
20 Test AA, triggered by the request of the Salt River  
21 Tribal Reservation and Fort McDowell Reservation be  
22 included with Congressional District E with Scottsdale,  
23 a relatively minor change with the adopted draft map,  
24 those two reservations, small population, small area,  
25 area into District E, rotates through, and small changes

1 in Yavapai with the addition of the Mojave River  
2 Reservation.

3 BB, CC are closely related. They are  
4 attempts to unify Mohave County. A, unify Mohave County  
5 in C, in this case.

6 CC, this is closely related in this plan.  
7 La Paz County goes with the border district. The main  
8 change in this is that Pinal, the majority Pinal County,  
9 including Casa Grande county, changes from D, BB, CC, C  
10 goes and picks up population, La Paz in or out,  
11 Avondale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, Tolleson area. In  
12 a very quick summary, that's BB and CC.

13 DD, if I could jump around a bit, another  
14 proposal in your pack, downtown C, D, Downtown  
15 Competitive Hearing District, that drawing is based on  
16 an adopted redistricting map. Request DD is a request  
17 to draw a similar Downtown Congressional District that  
18 would be a -- fit a more current definition of  
19 competitive, but to make it fit in with CC. That really  
20 doesn't change.

21 So DD is Pinal County with District C and  
22 changes what's submitted with D and changes around it.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Zoom in on that area.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Essentially we have the La  
25 Paz border District G in this case. C comes around,

1 picks up Casa Grande, Ak-Chin, and the Gila River  
2 Reservation.

3                   District G comes around picks up a portion  
4 of Buckeye, Goodyear, Avondale, Litchfield Park,  
5 Tolleson area, and a little of Southwest Phoenix. And  
6 we can go into detail on this as you walk through  
7 different discussions. As a result of that, those areas  
8 are picked up from District D.

9                   District D pushes into Glendale, South  
10 Glendale, South Peoria, Luke Air Force Base area to  
11 bring up El Mirage.

12                   District B goes from Tempe down in the  
13 southeast, comes up through Phoenix and ends up in a  
14 portion of Central Glendale.

15                   I can go into more detail if you wish.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

17                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Backing up a bit,  
18 trying to figure it up for myself, when La Paz County  
19 was switched into District G, I'm talking about test BB,  
20 CC, BB, AA, CC has in G, I'm trying to figure out what  
21 other changes were made. Where did you put 20,000  
22 people in A you took out of La Paz County? I looked and  
23 can't find it.

24                   MR. JOHNSON: Look at Phoenix. Zoom in  
25 the detail map.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I did.

2 MR. JOHNSON: It's not a big area.  
3 Litchfield is in the center of it.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's what I  
5 thought. Litchfield Park, G in both scenarios. I  
6 thought I had it. It is less of Litchfield Park.

7 Doug, test CC, let me see if I can  
8 highlight, test CC, Litchfield Park is in A.

9 Here we go.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And Tolleson. Part  
11 of Tolleson is in G.

12 MR. JOHNSON: G, right.

13 In BB, where La Paz is still District A,  
14 Litchfield Park, Avondale, Tolleson area, what citizens  
15 commented on keeping together is kept together. Once  
16 you put La Paz into --

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: CC is kept  
18 together.

19 MR. JOHNSON: CC is separate.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Looked like CC is  
21 separate. Looks like identical.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Looks like is right on --  
23 should be right on the border.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I see.

25 MR. JOHNSON: A little piece of Litchfield

1 Park. A number of city lines, slight splits, BB looking  
2 closely like Litchfield Park is divided. Those are just  
3 because these are concept maps.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Thank you.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Quickly summarizing the  
6 other two, FF is a twist on what was CC. In CC, put all  
7 of Yavapai into District A. Test FF is a test to see if  
8 Verde Valley, the Sedona areas, some comments have a  
9 more rural flavor than the Prescott Valley Tri-City  
10 areas did. See what happens if put those back into C.  
11 As you see there, we split off Mohave.

12 Test GG is essentially our adopted plan.  
13 You'll only see, from the Tucson map in your binders,  
14 the only changes in test GG were in Tucson.

15 Essentially District H comes over, picks  
16 up Green Valley, Sahuarita, the surrounding population,  
17 and more of Santa Cruz population in exchange for  
18 District G, and picks up more of the University  
19 neighborhoods.

20 So that's -- GG is fairly basic. GG is  
21 also the only test that changed that anything in the  
22 Tucson area.

23 Changes in Tucson, done in GG, can be done  
24 in any of the other maps.

25 Other tests. There should be the test

1 that excludes Yavapai.

2 Oh. I skipped over that. Let me add that  
3 back in.

4 One moment while I get this on the screen.

5 This test, EE, is a twist on CC. Instead  
6 of uniting Yavapai County in District A, it unites  
7 Mohave County in District A. Let me fill in the  
8 districts.

9 I'll bring it up on the screens. You have  
10 in your binders test EE. I'll try to go through this.

11 The main difference in Yavapai County is  
12 back into the rural district. And all Mohave County is  
13 into District A and then the Hopi connection. Because  
14 Yavapai is no longer there, the Hopi connection goes  
15 west through Moenkopi, through the north rim of the  
16 Grand Canyon, to connect to Mohave County.

17 That, in a quick summary, is the various  
18 alternatives. I can go into more detail if the  
19 Commission has questions.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Let's go back  
21 through the first option, which would be AA.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman,  
23 before we go through these I have a request. We  
24 received a number of requests just today, also received  
25 a few Legislative tests just today, earlier once,



1 received a very short one-page sheet, just one, bullet  
2 points, changes to each one. If you could get those to  
3 us on tests you got to us today, I think that would be  
4 very helpful.

5 MR. JOHNSON: We intended do it but ran  
6 out of time.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand.  
8 We've been pushing you pretty hard.

9 When you could, if you get them to us  
10 tonight.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: The AA test, is that  
13 incorporated with all the remaining tests or no?

14 MR. JOHNSON: I believe it is, yes.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Basically AA is  
16 redundant.

17 MR. JOHNSON: It could be done on its own.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any objection to removing  
19 AA?

20 AA is out.

21 Mr. Huntwork. I'm sorry.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to catch  
23 up. AA is our plan by bringing in the Salt River and  
24 Fort McDowell Reservations.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Right. It's also done in

1 every other alternative.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Nothing unique about AA.  
3 Elements are reflected elsewhere.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you didn't want  
5 to make any other changes, AA shows us other minor  
6 changes you have to make in order just to do that.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Personally, that's  
9 exactly what I would want to do, so I don't want to  
10 eliminate AA. All others are interesting that we will  
11 discuss later. This is the only one I really was in  
12 favor of. So --

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, BB does the same  
14 thing.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: All do the same  
16 thing.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Huntwork's point  
18 he's saying, AA only moves the tribe, leaves the adopted  
19 draft in place, correct? BB does the same thing,  
20 provides other alternatives.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Does a lot of  
22 other things.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Which you may or may not  
24 like.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then I'm wondering if --  
2 maybe considering AA as a separate draft, that may be  
3 one thing. It perhaps should be an alternative to our  
4 adopted draft with one change in place, the adopted  
5 draft and version A, or double A, because it's that a  
6 singular change that is affected. I understand your  
7 point in preserving discussion on that change.

8                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

9                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me  
10 saying, then, the original draft should probably not  
11 still be on the table, replace this with the original  
12 draft.

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe.

14                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I don't have a  
15 problem with that.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Maybe.

17                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't have a problem  
18 with that.

19                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Call it draft AA. That  
20 way we'll consider it as an alternative to the draft  
21 map.

22                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fine.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. BB.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, BB and CC are  
25 both attempts to achieve the same result, which is to

1 unify Yavapai County, take it out of the rural district,  
2 put in a unified rural district.

3 CC does a better job, unites La Paz with  
4 Yavapai County, which they asked for recently in a lot  
5 of different testimony. And that seems to be the major  
6 difference between the two. In looking at the two of  
7 them, I favor keeping CC on the table rather than BB.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

9 Mr. Paul.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with that.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree. CC I  
14 think CC has real problems with it. I do not like the  
15 fact that it is basically makes both District A and, I  
16 believe, District C less competitive than they are now.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, let's go one at  
18 a time.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are you objecting to --  
20 the point I think has been made, as between BB and CC, I  
21 think the point was made that we would like to continue  
22 to consider CC for analysis purposes, at for the moment,  
23 eliminating BB. That's the point.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fine. Two  
25 Commissioners both wish to do that, that's what we'll

1 do.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. BB is  
3 eliminated at this point.

4 By elimination, process of elimination, CC  
5 is in at this point.

6 Let's go to DD.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Actually the next one in  
9 your booklet is the downtown CD.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: DD just incorporates  
11 that into CC.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: DD takes the  
13 concept of the Downtown Competitive District and  
14 superimposes it on that.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Our map or CC?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: CC is our map, one  
17 of the maps we generated.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: "We" being --

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Commission.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not Commission.

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's not our map.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: DD is a combination  
23 of CC and the Downtown Competitive District. Is that  
24 clear?

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: CC remains the same

1 in the rural areas. And what option DD changes is in  
2 the Phoenix Metropolitan area, it changes, I guess,  
3 probably, E, F, D and V.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's ask Mr. Johnson to  
5 weigh in on that.

6 MR. JOHNSON: The concept is correct.  
7 Both are correct. The concept configuration, both are  
8 significantly different in DD because of bringing in  
9 District C.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Configuration of  
11 district -- configuration of which district?

12 MR. JOHNSON: The Downtown Competitive  
13 District as referred to.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct me if wrong,  
15 the external District DD, G, H, C and A are essentially  
16 the same. Is that correct?

17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Minimal change in  
19 A?

20 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The one district runs  
22 around?

23 MR. JOHNSON: You are talking about the  
24 change in District A between the two plans? G gets  
25 Avondale.

1                   COMMISSIONER HALL: The point, if we keep  
2 DD on the table and CC, is that redundant?

3                   MR. JOHNSON: A good example, what we're  
4 referring to earlier, DD competitiveness is an example  
5 to CC, what we want to test over the next week.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

7                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Why didn't do that  
8 on the draft map? Why combine with CC?

9                   They are alternatives. It's not a serial  
10 thing. We don't have to do --

11                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I made the request  
12 that this alternative be tested. And in looking at it,  
13 had the options been presented to us up to that point,  
14 the one that seemed to me to have the most positives was  
15 option CC. So I asked them to see if they could  
16 superimpose a competitive district in Maricopa County on  
17 option CC. However, it could obviously be picked up and  
18 put on any of them. It doesn't make a lot of changes on  
19 the donut, if you will.

20                   This is the whole, and the rural districts  
21 are the donut. It doesn't make a lot of changes. It  
22 has minor changes in District A, as it goes through  
23 Maricopa County. So the reason I asked it not be  
24 superimposed on our draft map is because I liked some of  
25 the things done in adjustment C better than the draft.

1 This might come closer to something I would like to see  
2 as a finished product.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't like CC.  
5 And I also don't like the central district. I dislike  
6 them for different reasons. It would certainly be more  
7 informative to me if I could see them separated rather  
8 than together.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner,  
10 similar to the Legislative with Coalition 2, the  
11 Commission is welcome to consider the downtown CD term  
12 on the computers as another alternative, turn it into a  
13 test, if you like.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Downtown district  
15 or test DD?

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork is talking  
17 about something a little different than a comparison of  
18 the two.

19 Mr. Huntwork?

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right. You know,  
21 the idea of the Downtown Competitive District was a  
22 separate idea proposed by a separate group of people.  
23 It stands on its own, has its own arguments for it and  
24 against it. Those arguments have nothing whatever to do  
25 with the argument of changing A or not changing A as had



1 been proposed. It seems as if we're going to go forward  
2 with the map that considers a downtown district, it  
3 ought to be variation on our proposal, not a variation  
4 of some other proposal we haven't reviewed, considered,  
5 or acted upon.

6                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I guess what we're looking  
7 for, or I'm looking for, because we just got these test  
8 results today, and because we just looked at the maps  
9 today, what I'm trying to do is get down to the lowest  
10 common denominator without losing the concepts involved,  
11 by that I mean what is the fewest number of tests moving  
12 forward we can keep in play without losing the concept,  
13 some of which is redundant in the tests as we go  
14 forward.

15                   One of the redundant tests is the downtown  
16 district different from the way Phoenix was drawn in  
17 draft map I which ripples through a couple of these  
18 tests. I don't want to lose the concept of a downtown  
19 district. Concept and execution, per se, are different  
20 to me.

21                   We need to deal with the concept before in  
22 light of some execution sent to Judge It. But I don't  
23 want to lose that concept as we move forward.

24                   I don't want it permeating three, four  
25 different maps unless the solution is significantly

1 different and we need to look at them separately for  
2 that issue alone. It changes too many things, too many  
3 variables in the test, to give it you clear and  
4 directly, I guess is what I'm saying.

5 Mr. Minkoff, then Mr. Hall.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could we test DD,  
7 the downtown area, the Maricopa area can really stand on  
8 its own, superimposed on CC, just because that's the way  
9 I asked for it? It could really be included in any of  
10 the rural configurations, with some minor adjustments.

11 So maybe when we talk about DD, what we  
12 ought to talk about is letting it stay on the table in  
13 the greater Phoenix area configuration and eliminate the  
14 rest of it, because that's just picking up from one of  
15 the other alternatives.

16 Want to do that?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's get Mr. Hall's  
18 comment and ask you to respond.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Where this  
20 conversation started was in light of the fact that DD is  
21 essentially a Downtown Competitive District put into CC.  
22 Why don't we say we'll leave DD on the table which  
23 addresses both, make their life easier, and eliminate  
24 CC, and try to minimize the number of maps under  
25 consideration. And the same principles and issues are

1 being considered. And, therefore, we can reject or  
2 accept any of those items or considerations yet be  
3 minimizing the choices. We'd eliminate the downtown and  
4 eliminate CC, keep DD, which has both, look at it.  
5 Whether we agree or disagree I don't think is the  
6 subject at this particular time.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just want to ask  
9 the question of whether in creating CC it made  
10 significant changes in the portion of the Phoenix  
11 districts not affected by this proposal? Did any of  
12 those lines change?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. District D, test CC,  
14 changed. It gave up it's western extremes, the  
15 Tolleson, Avondale area instead moved up and picked up  
16 South Glendale into CC, shifted even into there. Is  
17 that -- does that answer your question?

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, it does. It  
19 raises another question.

20 That was not -- that was just an  
21 incidental part of the change. It wasn't necessary to  
22 make that change in order to -- the basic change. It  
23 was -- was it?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Right. That wasn't one  
25 of -- the focus of the test. But it was, essentially,

1 the inevitable ripple.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You needed to add  
3 population to District G, once you took out all of Pinal  
4 County or most of Pinal County. Wasn't that what caused  
5 the change, you had to go in Maricopa County and pick up  
6 population from District G?

7 MR. JOHNSON: Correct.

8 This wasn't what we went in aiming to do  
9 but was the obvious result or forced result.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right. So it's  
11 needed.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would suggest,  
14 really, over the course of the next week I have to do a  
15 lot of thinking about CC. I have also got to do a lot  
16 of thinking about that central district. To my mind  
17 they are two completely different issues. And to the  
18 extent that they've been combined in a map, it concerns  
19 me we're more or less uniting them.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: What, keep both on the  
21 table, eliminate DD?

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's more  
23 appropriate to eliminate DD. Create a map that shows a  
24 central district on our draft.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: On our draft. CC on

1 its on own?

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: CC on its own.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: How does that sit?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Are we talking  
5 about something similar to a central configuration on  
6 test DD?

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That could be the test.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Applied to the draft map,  
10 as I understand the compromise.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So we'd take the  
12 metropolitan area of test DD, or superimpose it, both on  
13 CC as it is already and draft map? I'm confused.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC, as I understand the  
15 compromised proposal, CC looked at on its own,  
16 attributes looked at on its own. Then ask that that  
17 downtown district shown in District B in test DD, that  
18 that map be applied to the draft and looked at separate.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. It could  
20 also be applied to CC, which it's already been done.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC has other changes  
22 already in there.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm saying I don't  
24 want to lose the option of a downtown district being  
25 superimposed on CC. In other words, it seems to me you

1 are saying downtown district goes into a final map, that  
2 it's going to be on our draft map rather than CC. And I  
3 happen to think that CC has a lot of good things in the  
4 rural areas. And I don't want to lose the opportunity  
5 for the downtown district by supporting a lot of options  
6 of CC. It seems to me it's creating a situation I have  
7 to choose between the two of them. I'm not sure I want  
8 to do that.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I was  
11 concerned about, the situation I have to take both or  
12 neither. I'm not sure I have to do that. Let's get an  
13 extra test of the downtown district its on own. We  
14 don't have to throw away the work already done,  
15 officially or unofficially. I would like to know what  
16 kind of district you get on its own.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: On the draft.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're adding a test.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not eliminating CC or DD,  
21 adding a test.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: We have our new  
23 draft, draft AA and CC. Maybe what we're saying, both  
24 of those should have a downtown district option.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

1                   MR. JOHNSON: Just to clarify one point,  
2 the group submitted a downtown CD, did draw that map  
3 onto our draft. So it's not really -- it's already  
4 drawn, and it's in the back of your binder. That's  
5 maybe not the best place to put it, the back of the  
6 binder. So that's drawn.

7                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You are absolutely  
8 right.

9                   MR. JOHNSON: Very similar to the  
10 Coalition approach.

11                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Given that's the case, is  
12 it the sense of the Commission we want to include CC and  
13 DD?

14                  COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe it would be  
15 fruitful for all of us to have a sense of history.

16                  Tests are run to make District C more  
17 compacted. Started with CC and DD, and agreed CC looks  
18 better than BB. Following that, those that liked CC and  
19 wanted to test Downtown Competitive and wanted to  
20 incorporate that into CC. Fact of matter, it really is,  
21 if you look at DD, it is simply a continuation, an  
22 evolution of the very same test we started with.

23                  E is -- EE is a continuation of the very  
24 same test, if I understand correctly, basically inspired  
25 by the previous alternatives placed out on there where

1 attention again was to increase compactness of C. And  
2 Mohave was taken out of C instead of Yavapai.

3 So they are all, essentially, mutations,  
4 if you will, of the same alternative, as is FF, where  
5 Yavapai is included with A. But northeastern Yavapai,  
6 Mingus Mountain, if you will, Verde Valley, is put back  
7 into C.

8 To that point, then, in light of the fact  
9 that basically all these alternatives start with the  
10 same basic premise, what I was saying was I don't think  
11 we're precluding from adding or subtracting any of the  
12 alternatives proposed. That's why I thought it simpler  
13 to just look at DD which incorporates the two of those  
14 and minimize the number of maps our consultants will  
15 provide us feedback on as they already have the downtown  
16 district separate with the adopted draft and go through  
17 the remaining options here and say what other of these  
18 other options that are essentially -- come out of the  
19 previous options we'd like to continue to consider.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

21 Mr. Huntwork.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, that's fine.  
23 It doesn't reduce the number of issues, reduces the  
24 number of maps.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doesn't reduce the number



1 of issues. We're not dealing with issues directly. It  
2 limits discussion of issues around the fewest number of  
3 maps possible, whatever that number is, just so we can  
4 concentrate on those issues more fully in maps depicted.

5 So to that end, what is your pleasure?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Be comfortable  
7 keeping the draft AA and DD, so far.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Meaning eliminating CC.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: And BB.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And BB.

12 All right.

13 Speak up. There's a proposal to keep AA  
14 and DD and eliminate BB and CC.

15 You know, for anybody that comes in late,  
16 they are going to think we are absolutely beyond  
17 redemption.

18 Hearing no objection?

19 I do think that covers our options. I  
20 think it reserves the options.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: BB and CC are out.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: So far, our draft, DD and  
23 AA.

24 We haven't finished.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: DD is the only one

1 that leaves the river area in two districts. All the  
2 others are splitting the river in three.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. EE has it in  
4 one. No, two. DD only has two river districts.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I support EE and FF --  
6 some concerned about the future, I. Don't want to pull  
7 the trigger on the present because concerned about the  
8 future.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll go back through the  
10 list. Find out if something is missing. The list  
11 through once, we can add it. Let's, for the sake of  
12 argument, consider we've eliminated BB, CC. DD and AA  
13 is in, and we're up to EE as the next option.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think this district  
15 ought to say in.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Double E.

17 Not what you have up there?

18 Doug is not following us. Although if --  
19 for the public it might be interesting concept, since  
20 you don't have a binder.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think Mr. Huntwork  
22 could explain EE.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's appropriate  
24 as I suggested we look at EE.

25 After the hearing in Bullhead City, there

1 was a lot of testimony about keeping the river districts  
2 together. EE is one of the plans that leaves the river  
3 in two districts. There was a lot of discussion about  
4 the cities, particularly the cities in Mohave County,  
5 not feeling that they were part of a rural district.  
6 Testimony was they considered themselves urban because  
7 they had industry located there. They were a major  
8 transportation corridor of various kinds, warehousing,  
9 fabrication, a lot of industry, very rapid growth, and  
10 truly identified and requested if they had to be  
11 combined with something, it would be with the rural  
12 area. So this accomplishes some of that. It also  
13 accomplishes, perhaps, still a major line to connect  
14 with the Hopi Reservation which is no longer than it was  
15 before. That was the thinking.

16                   The other point about this was I was  
17 concerned about CC. Frankly, I'm also concerned about  
18 EE, making both districts less competitive. And I don't  
19 see any reason for, this is pointing out a way to create  
20 two districts less competitive than the ones we have  
21 now. But I must say this one does it less than CC. So  
22 I suppose you'd say it does some of that.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The suggestion is EE be  
24 left in. I would like to keep it in if for no other  
25 reason, whatever other attributes it has, it is the only

1 alternative we've looked at that actually reduces the  
2 size of the rural district to any great degree. The  
3 connection between Hopi and the River District A in this  
4 example, I mean artificial regardless to separate Hopi  
5 and Navajo, artificial, wherever the connection is, I  
6 understand that. If kept separate, it doesn't matter  
7 whether it goes west or south. If it goes southwest,  
8 it's to the next available district.

9 We also understand from the Hopi, in fact,  
10 they're somewhat less concerned where separated. It's  
11 if separated than where separated. If separated, or an  
12 urban district as opposed to rural district, Maricopa  
13 County, West Valley on A?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, predominantly  
15 an urban district, 155,000 from Mohave, I have, I  
16 believe, 19,000 from La Paz, so 175, and about 7,000  
17 from Hopi, so still over 400,000 from Maricopa.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Jim, the only thing  
19 about this one, we did go to Yuma, found out all around  
20 the state, thou coven they neighbor's property type  
21 thing, varies distinctly. Mohave wanted to be with  
22 Yuma, Bullhead City really want to be with Mohave. The  
23 river district water issues, the same. This one, wow,  
24 you know, being the urban district makes it difficult to  
25 support.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

2                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A, always on the  
3 river district, some portion of the river community, on  
4 the draft maps, La Paz, and the southern portion of  
5 Mohave, is predominantly the river district. Based on  
6 the population of the state, we'd figured we'd create  
7 not quite two rural districts.

8                   Did that. C is essentially a rural  
9 district. And C is still predominantly a rural  
10 district. A is always a rural district, putting  
11 different population in it. My only issue, it puts  
12 Yavapai in and Mohave out.

13                   I'd note we heard from Yavapai they are  
14 not rural, urban. Their issues are attracting industry  
15 much more strongly than Mohave and the river  
16 communities.

17                   The only thing is looking at this, Mohave  
18 and Yavapai, which ones are pulling in Mohave.

19                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I misspoke. La Paz,  
20 not Mohave.

21                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

22                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Look at the  
23 transcript, Bullhead City and Kingman, see a lot of  
24 testimony. Mohave, not Eloy, are ones that fit the  
25 rural district. A small sense of that, Mohave County.

1                   Mr. Chairman, what I was going to say, the  
2 only plan I looked at makes a connection to the  
3 reservation, Hopi Reservation.

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that too, but I'm  
5 trying to look at the bright side.

6                   Are we in agreement it's in for the  
7 moment?

8                   Move on to FF.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, refresh my memory.

10                  COMMISSIONER HALL: Moves Verde Valley  
11 out.

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: FF is CC minus Verde  
13 Valley.

14                  Enough change to keep in or take out?

15                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think putting  
16 Verde Valley the Northern District is commendable.  
17 We've done serious damage to Mohave County.

18                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm hearing it out to be  
19 excluded.

20                  FF is out.

21                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: GG.

22                  COMMISSIONER HALL: GG affects the Tucson  
23 area. Real positive changes in this district. I,  
24 similar to what we did in AA, I'd like to see this as  
25 part of draft of AA, if you will, if that's possible, to

1 try to minimize the number maps. I'm only looking for  
2 simplicity. This affects one single area. If we take  
3 that, draft AA, make the change to both draft AA, that  
4 would be easier for us to analyze.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not really  
7 happy with test GG. And the reason I'm not, one of the  
8 things we have yet to do and really need to do is make  
9 districts more competitive. This change actually makes  
10 both G and H slightly less competitive. I don't think  
11 we should be looking for adjustments to do that.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The University in H, less  
13 competitive --

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought made it more  
15 competitive.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I think the  
17 University is in G. I get -- even though living there,  
18 I don't know where it is.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I can't tell.

20 Essentially what it does, because the  
21 University properly is in G, what it does, essentially  
22 it adds the adjoining neighborhood east, Sam Hughes, to  
23 G. The University neighborhood extends eastward in  
24 terms of location and proximity to University.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The statistic --

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: And what it trades for  
2 that, Sahuarita and Green Valley, consistent with  
3 testimony we heard in Southern Arizona.

4                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Statistics  
5 consultants gave us is the change were more competitive,  
6 slightly more competitive.

7                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Which one?

8                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: H.

9                   G goes from a 52 percent Democratic  
10 registration, 28 and a half percent Republican, to 55,  
11 almost 66, and 26. And H goes from 38 and 42 and  
12 three-quarters to 11 and little over 43. The change  
13 made it less than competitive.

14                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: The first set of figures  
15 don't square with mine. Tell me where you are getting  
16 the first set.

17                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Demographics on the  
18 various tests.

19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the adopted draft?

20                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Not the adopted  
21 draft, the Tucson area.

22                  Actually I don't have a problem witness.

23                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: We could reject it, but  
24 I'd like to look at it as one of the options. We don't  
25 have a problem. One of the small things, it's an



1 adjunct adopted draft with a variation as we did with  
2 AA.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: One or other two  
5 options, interchangeable, either option --

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance, it's a  
7 straight trade for population, doesn't affect anything  
8 else.

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: We can change. We  
10 can insert GG into it.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other map you want and  
12 it works out.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Probably take a look  
14 at --

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Irrespective of  
16 competitiveness and other issues.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In terms of population  
18 effect on other districts, no impact on any other  
19 district.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. I almost defy  
21 anybody to figure out where it is. Probably the poorest  
22 map we've had. I really --

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not a poor map. The scale  
24 is wrong to figure out where it is.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: If you didn't know

1 where Vail was and Tucson --

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We could zoom in, if you  
3 want to see --

4 I'm fine with it just being an adjunct to  
5 AA and looking at a variation.

6 The last test, our draft, two variations,  
7 two variations incorporating changes AA, GG, then DD and  
8 EE.

9 Are there any additions or deletions that  
10 we can continue to make today?

11 Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I've been just  
13 trying to think about what we've done. And I'm  
14 concerned that somebody might get the wrong idea from  
15 looking at this map DD. I really think there are  
16 arguments related to CC, arguments relating to the  
17 central district, completely separate from each other.

18 People reading the tea leaves, if you  
19 will, could get the wrong idea from the fact we've  
20 combined them on the same map. They are really separate  
21 adaptations. I would like to suggest we do either CC  
22 and a separate one provided by the central district  
23 coalition, as separate maps, rather than combining it  
24 into a single map in order to avoid confusion about that  
25 issue.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Asking to add a map back  
2 in, as I understand.

3                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: EE out, CC in, and  
4 the central district --

5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Central district test  
6 becomes a replacement for DD.

7                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The advantage of  
8 DD, it superimposes the downtown district with our  
9 drafts. The downtown district submission we received at  
10 the Glendale public hearing doesn't fit our maps. It  
11 fits the draft map. It doesn't fit CC.

12                   Here's another way to draw the downtown  
13 district that fits into District CC. And I would like  
14 to keep it on the table.

15                   If we decide we want to go with a downtown  
16 district and decide we want to go with version CC,  
17 they've got to mesh with one another. I have a lot of  
18 faith in people who look at our draft maps.

19                   When they comment on them, they generally  
20 comment on the areas of their concern. I don't recall  
21 receiving an awful lot of comments when people began at  
22 the top, went through the bottom, commented on every  
23 area of the map.

24                   I was in Yavapai County, the Tri-City  
25 area, you satisfied my community, please fix it. I live

1 in Tempe, don't divide my Community. I live in Sierra  
2 Vista, put me back with Cochise County. Those are the  
3 kind of comments we get.

4                   Look at DD, people commenting on the rural  
5 aspects of DD. People commenting on the way a  
6 competitive district changes a competitive district.  
7 We'll get kind of feedback we want without confusing  
8 people. I think having too many maps is confusing to  
9 people, because it's rather difficult to get through all  
10 of them on our website and see the differences between  
11 them.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

13                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Seems to me the  
14 fact we get comments from rural areas and urban areas,  
15 they're separate maps. One comment I don't want to be  
16 receiving is in favor of an urban area, but not an urban  
17 area, not a rural area. Those are separate in mind. No  
18 reason we should invite that comment or leave ourselves  
19 open to receiving it. They are really completely  
20 separate issues.

21                   The fact is we're going to consider them  
22 on separate maps whether on separate maps or not. They  
23 really should be on separate maps.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to ask --

25                   Let me take Mr. Elder's comment. I wanted

1 to ask the consultants, maybe think about it while  
2 Mr. Elder makes his comment. I wanted to get a sense of  
3 the workload and ability to test the variables on these  
4 maps.

5 Many of the attributes of the maps are  
6 similar. There are, however, some differences test to  
7 test. What I want to be sure we try to do, as said in  
8 Legislative, is preserve the differences in testing, not  
9 overload the work in the next few weeks, so we have good  
10 data on each of the attributes we're looking at very  
11 closely. That's the goal.

12 Mr. Elder.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: One of the things I  
14 wanted -- one of the four maps look like a carry  
15 through, does not give us an alternative to bring Hopi  
16 into the Navajo. Is that something we can take a look  
17 at and have the numbers where it would, say, combine the  
18 Hopi and Navajo so we still can?

19 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, that could  
20 definitely be a test you could instruct us to do,  
21 involves 7,000 people. We could run it.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm wondering,  
24 trying to avoid confusion about the maps. We want to  
25 have as few as possible to test and work with, and so

1 on.

2                   When we post them on the website, post  
3 some kind of statement explaining that many of these  
4 maps incorporate different changes in different areas of  
5 the state and that you may like the urban areas as one  
6 map, rural areas as another map. That's okay. Just  
7 tell us what you think, phrasing it better. Only I  
8 am -- right now, put it as something like that. And  
9 somebody looking at it would understand, they like the  
10 rural part of it, can't stand Maricopa County, or vice  
11 versa, phrase comments that way.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other aspect,  
13 Congressional maps, unlike Legislative, there are  
14 options here. Because the districts are much larger in  
15 population, and fewer of them in the state, that they  
16 may be, in many cases, more easily combined, features of  
17 one map and features of another, with the idea you get  
18 one area of population, those lines get quite different  
19 as a combination of various ideas. At least you are  
20 capable of doing it without the entire ripple effect for  
21 the entire state.

22                   I agree with you in concept we want the  
23 fewest number of options available, so comments directed  
24 to those features tested, someone could make the  
25 distinction between what they really like and don't.

1 Mr. Huntwork.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. Exactly.

3 My concern is somebody looking at the  
4 central district, I look at the central district, talk  
5 about whether I'm in favor or not, I want to be able to  
6 identify exactly what the central district does. If  
7 that combined several changes, it's difficult to isolate  
8 here is what the central district did, as opposed to  
9 here is what Yavapai County District did.

10 What we should present should make it  
11 possible for us to send it out and anybody who wants to  
12 comment on our proposal to see what the proposed things  
13 do in and of itself.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Also a situation, the  
15 proposal is made, however it is made through the  
16 process. Our obligation, it seems to me, is to take the  
17 essence of the proposal, attempt to perfect it, perhaps  
18 beyond what the proposer is able to do, has resources to  
19 do, or whatever, consider the essence of the concept  
20 being proposed, preserve that, make it work in terms of  
21 those ideas we think have real possibilities. It's with  
22 that in mind we're trying to make this happen in a way  
23 that we can keep track of it.

24 Mr. Hall.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Hall, I propose

1 you add CC back to the equation, delete DD from  
2 consideration, add the central metropolitan  
3 configuration as it currently exists in DD as a separate  
4 map alone considering the metropolitan changes with map  
5 HH. I don't know if anybody heard that, especially you  
6 and the consultants. I think that solves all the  
7 problems.

8 Marguerite, did you hear that?

9 MS. LEONI: I heard that. I'm one always  
10 listening.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Delete DD, add CC  
12 back, take Metropolitan Phoenix configuration in DD,  
13 make a separate map only considering the metropolitan  
14 lines, name that map HH, since I like the letter H,  
15 whatever, since about down there.

16 Everyone in agreement with that?

17 Mr. Huntwork, Ms. Minkoff?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Sure.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Great.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Have AA, right?

21 What I propose, make a change in the  
22 Northern Native American District, and change located in  
23 GG, put on one map. I propose take DD off the table,  
24 and therefore you have EE, and CC back on the table, and  
25 add another map called HH, which, in essence, takes the



1 current lines as drawn in Metropolitan Phoenix on the  
2 map DD and only considers the metropolitan ramifications  
3 of those lines.

4 I'd like you have a map GG in Tucson, a  
5 map HH, Central Competitive District as it's configured  
6 in DD in only Phoenix.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, the only  
8 concern I have, the reason it worked in Tucson GG, a  
9 straight --

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: All you are doing is  
11 zooming in on DD. Zoom in on DD and print it.

12 MR. JOHNSON: But anything you change with  
13 DD impacts District G.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: We understand that.  
15 We're just saying we want that map considered. What  
16 other changes we make is another issue.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me ask a  
18 question and clarify the point Doug is trying to make.  
19 It's possible something HH, you are calling it, the  
20 metropolitan area, might say G, that looks good to me,  
21 not realizing it, does have implications on rural areas  
22 of the state, which the switch between G and H does not.  
23 You might say they like the downtown area, looks good to  
24 them, and write positive comments, and find out what  
25 you've inadvertently done has also supported changes to

1 rural portions of the state.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that the concern  
4 you have?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maybe what you do,  
6 don't use HH at all, just put DD on there. Explain DD  
7 is essentially CC in rural areas, changes in the urban  
8 area.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, this  
10 now, as I understand it, has not accomplished what I  
11 hoped to do, which is to isolate the changes from our  
12 proposal, from the current draft proposal, that would  
13 result from the central district, not from another test  
14 that we've done, but from our current proposal. That's  
15 the purest way to understand the kinds of changes of  
16 that test and that test alone causes to the overall map.  
17 In order to do that you have to base it on the existing  
18 proposal, not on some variation of the proposal. Sure,  
19 it's compatible with CC. It's compatible with EE. You  
20 could do both. But in order to understand what impact  
21 that has, or what impact it alone has on the draft, you  
22 have to compare it to the same baseline as all other  
23 tests that have been compared, our current draft.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only problem,  
25 then, it is done in a map District G, coming into G into

1 Maricopa County. Our current draft doesn't have  
2 District G coming into Maricopa County. Changes G quite  
3 a bit, District A quite a bit.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I realize it does  
5 that. Of course it does. The idea is for us to  
6 understand, and the public to understand, so they can  
7 comment on it, exactly what the central district, by  
8 itself, does. Those are things the central district  
9 causes. And I think we need, owe it to ourselves and  
10 the public, to identify exactly what the consequences  
11 are of this district all by itself, just like we've done  
12 with other changes we were considering.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: Those are two separate  
15 issues, Mr. Huntwork.

16 I understand what you are saying and agree  
17 with it. That's a test you want accomplished. DD is a  
18 test someone else wanted to accomplish. As I understand  
19 Ms. Minkoff's position, they're two totally and  
20 completely different tests. And given -- what I hear  
21 you saying is you want a different test, different  
22 downtown competitive test, different configuration. I  
23 understand you folks have already done that or the  
24 presentation itself did that. We have that on the  
25 plate, I think.

1 All we're trying to do at this point is  
2 keep things on or off the table. DD combines CC and an  
3 alternative for a downtown district. And I think the  
4 map itself does that and allows for a response as  
5 appropriate.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other issue, I think,  
7 we need to bring up is regardless of how many maps or  
8 permutations we come up with when we're finished,  
9 there's a certain amount of time required to finalize  
10 each one of them. And the concern is that if, if the  
11 number of alternatives still under consideration are  
12 significantly different, one from another, that the  
13 amount of time necessary to do the full analysis is  
14 going to, I think, jeopardize our schedule for next  
15 week. Not that that is the worst thing in the world.  
16 We need to be aware of that. We may need, it will push  
17 the schedule back. We need to be aware of that. Each  
18 of the maps will require multiple days of analysis to  
19 get us the analysis we're looking for. And that is the  
20 purpose of the process, to try to get down to most  
21 manageable number we can with the fewest number of gross  
22 changes so that, to your point, Mr. Huntwork, each  
23 individual change on a map gets it's due and is analyzed  
24 appropriately but that we really need to, in my opinion,  
25 consider only those alternatives for further analysis we

1 actually think we might vote for and, by doing that, get  
2 the number down to a reasonable, as small a number as is  
3 feasible.

4 I don't know whether the consultants want  
5 to comment on what I just said.

6 DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the  
7 Commission, there are significant differences to the  
8 alternatives that you have on the table. We will  
9 require sufficient -- we will require sufficient time to  
10 analyze all these. I think our hope coming in that we  
11 would get down to possibly two. We already have more on  
12 the Legislative side than we had anticipated. I can  
13 tell you it will add to the time we will need to give  
14 you a full analysis. If we could get this down a bit  
15 further, it would be very helpful. If some, you know,  
16 would not have sufficient votes to continue, that would  
17 be helpful.

18 If we need to take more time, we'll take  
19 more time and just push the start date back a little  
20 later.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman and the  
23 consultants, I ask, AA is an adjustment of the Northern  
24 Native American and adjustment of GG. That's really  
25 minimal. Am I safe in saying that? Correct me if I'm

1 wrong. We still have DD and EE technically on the  
2 table.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And CC as well.

4 DR. ADAMS: Possibly CC.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: DD. CC isn't. As a  
6 working premise, DD. CC, have all information on the  
7 adopted draft, correct?

8 Any additional information?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner, we've not yet  
10 addressed the adopted map, how to make the districts  
11 competitive or implement suggestions from the community.  
12 We really are looking at three fairly significantly  
13 different base maps to work off of, adopted map CC, with  
14 or without DD, and EE. If narrow down from those three,  
15 it's a great benefit. You can kind of set aside the  
16 question of the downtown district, north-south district  
17 in that approach. But really looking at those -- it's  
18 not radically significantly different in the base maps.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to suggest  
21 if trying to narrow it down that, at the very minimum,  
22 we include what we're now calling draft AA with GG, and  
23 DD, and then if time allows us that you had a EE.  
24 However, if that is going to push us beyond the October  
25 1st starting date, then I suggest we just go AA and EE.

1 I guess what I'm asking, can we begin on  
2 October 1st with three Congressional options, and we  
3 have three-and-a-half Legislative options? Because one  
4 of them is just a variation.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me get an answer to  
6 that, Mr. Huntwork.

7 DR. ADAMS: If I could, Members of the  
8 Commission, confer with Ms. Leoni and Ms. Hauser for a  
9 moment.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then we'll take  
11 Mr. Huntwork's comments.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think my  
13 comments were addressed to my fellow Commissioners more.  
14 We're talking about making two very major changes to our  
15 proposed map. One is the Central Phoenix District. The  
16 other is the, if you will, shift of Yavapai or Mohave,  
17 consolidation of the river, on the river district. Each  
18 one of those changes, separately, has major implications  
19 for our process. That and I think we need to know what  
20 the separate implications are. The combination of,  
21 essentially, we already have. But in order to really  
22 debate and a couple, two plans, I think, have integrity.  
23 We need to -- we really need to take each of those  
24 separately, because they are entirely separate.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with that.

2 But DD is already a map that is drawn. And what I'm  
3 hearing you say, Jim, is zoom in on DD.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: DD combines the  
5 two, but --

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Addresses both of  
7 them.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Not both.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Sequentially.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Not sequentially.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Combines them.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Variables. Isolate  
14 variables, isolate variables. If we add two variables,  
15 the same map has multiple effects. One variable isolate  
16 it's effect.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: May be something I  
18 want to do, or that is something I don't want to do, or  
19 may be one thing you can do with a combination. Say you  
20 want to do something like it or not?

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: Luxury of 15  
22 variables. Luxury, no luxury. Five maps. Three is  
23 pushing it. I'm hearing you say going to four.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: We don't have the  
25 luxury.



1                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There may be  
2 pieces of that I'm interested in, but the combination is  
3 something, personally, I'm not interested in it. I  
4 might be persuaded differently, but certainly that's my  
5 thinking.

6                   The meeting today was supposed to be  
7 simplifying things. The meeting today, why, those  
8 things, supposedly we're not talking about today. I  
9 don't want to on subroads. We're supposed to be making  
10 a decision, or suggest to the public we're making  
11 decisions about those issues.

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

13                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it  
14 seems to me one reason we scheduled so many days for the  
15 meetings next week is the maps we're keeping on the  
16 table today will undergo further changes and  
17 modifications as we discuss some of the issues we have  
18 before us. I really believe that DD works because  
19 although there are slight changes in the urban districts  
20 that are created in what has been done in outlying  
21 areas, it's the concept we're talking about, not  
22 specific lines, half mile this way or quarter mile this  
23 way, or unite this neighborhoods taking this small area.  
24 Those are all changes we can make.

25                  We are nearing the end of the process. We

1 need to start next Monday and finish rapidly or we won't  
2 finish the maps until November, because there will be a  
3 three-week break, assuming I can get back at the end of  
4 it.

5                   We need to simplify it. That's why DD, it  
6 includes two important changes, both of which may be  
7 considered independently. Just like any other map we  
8 are looking at, we may look at it and say: Well, I  
9 really like most of this map; however, I want to put the  
10 Hopis in with Navajos, take Hopis out of the Navajos, do  
11 a switch in GG, undo a switch GG. We will be doing a  
12 switch. We need as few maps as possible.

13                   I recommend there's not a single map here  
14 I like every single thing on. Some are closer than  
15 others. I'm willing to go with just really AA and DD.  
16 I'm willing to eliminate EE. The reason is you can't  
17 put both Mohave and Yavapai County in District A.  
18 Yavapai is a better fit than Mohave. One needs to be  
19 there. That's why I feel comfortable going with two  
20 maps that cover most of the issues we'll be dealing  
21 with. If the consultants can handle EE as well without  
22 delaying the calendar, I'm willing to leave it on the  
23 table.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Recommending double A and  
25 double D.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With permutations we're  
3 talking about. If time, EE.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Double E has  
5 already been done. Double C has already been done.  
6 Central Phoenix --

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Central Phoenix  
9 has apparently already been done, based on our maps. So  
10 you're talking about creating additional work for the  
11 consultants must be about something else, because it's  
12 not about that.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's not the mapping, it's  
14 the analysis: competitive analysis, racial block  
15 voting, all the other things to be done in order to make  
16 a judgment on alternatives at the final hour.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In that case,  
18 Mr. Chairman, I cannot tell you how important I think it  
19 is to have a separate competitive analysis of that  
20 Central Phoenix District all by itself.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree. Every  
22 district, every map, in fact combined, does not preclude  
23 separateness of analysis or ability to extract the  
24 separateness of analysis.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: You know, we all

1 know, as we take a step back, the analysis of a single  
2 district is meaningless in the overall scheme of things.  
3 I'm talking about the effect of that central district,  
4 not the competitiveness of the entire map. In order to  
5 understand that fact you have to look at an analysis of  
6 just the change resulting from that district. That's  
7 the only way to know the effect of the change resulting.  
8 Also, the way to know the result of the change is do a  
9 separate analysis of the change. But the one that I'm  
10 mostly concerned about is, in my own mind, that central  
11 district.

12 I would like a sophisticated  
13 competitiveness analysis done that shows not only  
14 whether that district is competitive, how it affects all  
15 other districts.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Several. Mr. Elder,  
17 Mr. Hall, then Ms. Minkoff.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I don't  
19 want to take an alternative off the table, one the  
20 Commissioners believes wholeheartedly we should take a  
21 look at. I'd like to see if we revise the schedule,  
22 Andi has time constraints the following week, a week  
23 away, we have the week away, start Wednesday morning,  
24 running Wednesday through Saturday, coming back, going  
25 Monday to through Wednesday of the following week, A

1 gives the effect of three, four more days to do  
2 analysis, allows us to have the range of alternatives  
3 Mr. Huntwork is looking for and still fits the schedule.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think we can  
6 co-process, Mr. Elder.

7 Even if additional alternatives, we can  
8 start work on the Legislative, work in the earlier  
9 morning while members of the staff are still doing  
10 analysis on certain parts of the Congressional. It's  
11 probably be later in the week before we get to  
12 Congressional, anyway. I think there's an opportunity  
13 to still make all the considerations versus discussing  
14 forever a motion on the DD alternative for the  
15 consultants to consider it.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I second it.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Moved and seconded  
18 consultants consider it.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Comments not  
21 necessarily on the motion. First of all, analysis of  
22 the downtown area of Maricopa County area of DD has  
23 minimal impact on the rest of it, certainly on the  
24 competitiveness of the rest of the map. It does fit in,  
25 dovetails what was done with CC, doesn't really change

1 it.

2 Changes in the downtown district are to B,  
3 to E, to F, and some to D. Those are areas we're  
4 looking at. Not a lot of impact on A, C, G, H, on  
5 competitiveness, virtually none. I'm not concerned  
6 about that, even though part of total map.

7 It really needs to be, to be given the  
8 credibility, needs to be part of overall map, that that  
9 analysis proceed. If we decide want it as part of the  
10 overall map, it's not part of a major problem. I'm  
11 concerned about delaying the start. As long as draft  
12 districts, for heaven's sake, we voted for District W.  
13 If a final decision, we'd be thinking. Drop dead date  
14 is October 12. If not dead done October 12, we recess  
15 until the middle of November. We may very well be done  
16 long before that, hopefully I have time to get a few  
17 things done before I leave. If we are not, then we have  
18 pushed the entire process past the first of the year in  
19 terms of Justice Department approval. I don't think  
20 that that is a risk we want to take.

21 I suggest we go with what we have, AA, DD,  
22 and possibly EE, depending on what the consultants have,  
23 and move ahead.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's a motion on the  
25 floor to add EE to the test. Let's stick with the

1 motion, notwithstanding comments relevant otherwise.

2 I'd like to dispose of the motion first.

3 Mr. Huntwork on the motion.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the  
5 central competitive district is being proposed solely  
6 for one purpose, and that is a purpose to create a  
7 competitive district. Yet we're considering a motion  
8 that fails to test that separately and independently for  
9 its effect on competitiveness. I just consider that to  
10 be ridiculous. And I would suggest if the sense of the  
11 motion is to present a separate test of competitiveness  
12 of that district, it should be defeated. If there is  
13 room for an additional test, then, you know, fine. But  
14 if this is to the exclusion of that test, this needs to  
15 be defeated because the sole purpose and sole  
16 justification of that district is to conclude  
17 competitiveness of that district.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can the consultants  
20 can assure us the maps and plans will have all the data  
21 detail we've requested on Monday if we add in additional  
22 tests?

23 DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the  
24 Commission, it isn't totally depending on NDC. You need  
25 to understand that. We do have some competitiveness

1 testing coming from another source. Therefore, we are  
2 attempting to contact that person to see what he would  
3 be able to accomplish.

4           As far as NDC is concerned, it depends on  
5 what the Commission wants us to do with each of these  
6 maps. If you want us to take each one of these maps,  
7 provide you the information as you have seen to date but  
8 also offer suggestions for changes to them, based on the  
9 analysis, also to take a look at, if you noticed in your  
10 binder, we have been developing a list, based on  
11 testimony, at the hearings, we took excerpts of specific  
12 changes citizens wanted, one example I can tell you at  
13 Phoenix Union High School we heard testimony about the  
14 exchange of a piece of Isaac School District for  
15 Westwood Village, would this be possible. There are  
16 many little tests like that. Are these all things you  
17 are expecting to see in each of these tests? And  
18 that's -- that's the kind of thing we are hoping  
19 ultimately to do with whatever plan or plans are adopted  
20 by the Commission.

21           If you had a couple plans, we could  
22 probably test some of these things, tell you about it:  
23 This doesn't affect it a bit. This little citizen  
24 request we can take care of.

25           There is a lot of work in it, a lot of



1 citizen suggestions we need to take into account as we  
2 take a look at these final maps.

3 So it is -- two things, not only dependent  
4 on us, how much of that kind of testing you want  
5 involved in each one of these maps.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: There's a statistical  
8 data base we're working with for racial voting block  
9 regression, competitiveness, then a graphical, I pass  
10 out the letters, standards. The next round we need to  
11 be there or cannot make reasonable decisions and cannot  
12 debate the issues. So if we can't have those, there's  
13 no reason to meet or we need to reduce the number of  
14 plans, if you can meet that.

15 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Elder, Members of the  
16 Commission, the kind of detail that we provide in the  
17 adopted plans where we had a zoom-in map of each of  
18 districts for the adopted maps that went out in the  
19 citizen kit is the expectation we have, one of those  
20 zoom-in maps for every single one of these tests. Those  
21 are very time consuming to create. If that's what you  
22 want, yes, we'll need significant additional time.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We're raising a  
25 lot of important issues; but with regard to what we have

1 here in test EE, there are only two things I'm am  
2 personally concerned about on the issue on the table.  
3 Number one, I want to know what the effect is on  
4 competitiveness of A and C by virtue of the changes  
5 we're making there, and I -- my understanding, I guess  
6 this surmises we'll have made both those districts less  
7 competitive. And I want to know what the effect is of  
8 creating that central, on competitiveness, of creating a  
9 central district. My suspicion is we'll be creating a  
10 district there that is competitive at the expense of,  
11 number one, impinging on the Hispanic community of that  
12 is interest currently well-recognized in D and, number  
13 two, making other districts, and particularly District  
14 E, less competitive by simply packing more Republicans  
15 into it and, thereby, creating an even more  
16 noncompetitive district, which I think is exactly the  
17 opposite of what we should be doing.

18 I feel that is extremely important, to  
19 have those two steps, to have them done in a way so we  
20 understand the effect of each one of those decisions and  
21 understand it clearly.

22 Ms. Minkoff has made the argument that  
23 even in test DD there's minimal overlap between the two.  
24 I don't know if that is true or not. If it is true, it  
25 seems to me we serve our purpose by doing them

1 separately. Ms. Minkoff will know, essentially, the  
2 results of test DD, by her hypothesis of minimal  
3 overlapping. I'm not smart enough to look at the map  
4 and tell you if it's a great disservice to it by not  
5 running the test separately.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, on the motion.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: The motion itself  
8 provides for us an opportunity to have our consultants  
9 do tests on every single district, as you just outlined.  
10 They'll do a detailed analysis on the competitiveness of  
11 C, and A, and the downtown district, and tell us if it  
12 makes others less competitive. And I might suggest the  
13 idea of making the alternative map, Mr. Huntwork, if  
14 we're going to then put that out there for about a week,  
15 I'm going to guess, going out a limp, I'm guessing,  
16 folks in this room that will provide additional  
17 information, negative or positive, depending on one's  
18 perspective relative to that map.

19 All I'm suggesting by this motion, this is  
20 an alternative we want additional analysis on in  
21 intimate detail of ones we want to do that, make a  
22 decision on every one of our fears or suspicions. It  
23 may well be confirmed, and then we have that  
24 information. That's all I'm suggesting. Make it an  
25 alternative for additional consideration. Doing two

1 maps is more time than one is my perception.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One, doing one  
4 wrong takes more time than two right.

5 The logic here is it affects no difference  
6 two separate or one together, but the answer is until we  
7 know that, the only safe way to proceed is do two  
8 separate.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional discussion on  
10 the motion.

11 I'm concerned about the motion, not  
12 because of the motion itself, I'm concerned about how  
13 we're getting to where we're getting. And my concern is  
14 this: If I can oversimplify the response on the  
15 Congressional draft map through the process, it was as  
16 follows: Notwithstanding one person's small concern  
17 about this line or that line, the overriding concerns on  
18 the Congressional draft map were as follows: First, the  
19 rural district is too large; two, that the river  
20 district goes too far into Phoenix; three, that the map  
21 is not as competitive as it could be. Beyond that,  
22 there were very small, in my opinion, changes that were  
23 asked for, generally, in the Congressional area. There  
24 were in fact lots of other things that were said. But I  
25 know that's an oversimplification. And my concern is

1 that given we have the downtown district as a potential  
2 option in terms of competitiveness, it and its  
3 ramifications need to be looked at. I think we agree on  
4 that conceptually. What we disagree on is how to get  
5 that done. That to me is one difference from the draft  
6 map that needs to absolutely be looked at. The other  
7 things we've been talking about, essentially, in many  
8 cases, are simply a line here and a line there, other  
9 than the draft that we started with. And to that  
10 extent, with the exception of I think double E, affords  
11 us a different look at the rural district and different  
12 configuration along the river. That's a significant  
13 difference.

14 I tell you if there aren't at least three  
15 of us to vote for that map in total, I'm not sure we  
16 ought to have it analyzed, because it goes far beyond  
17 the map in terms of the changes would be made, and it  
18 may well get to that point.

19 I am concerned about the way we're getting  
20 to what is in and what is out. I'm not sure I'll vote  
21 in favor of the motion just because I'm not sure it's  
22 the right way to get there, not because I don't support  
23 the motion and concept.

24 I do think what we need to get to is a  
25 complete analysis, number one, of the draft. Number

1 two, significant alterations of the draft either improve  
2 it, improving overall competitiveness of the draft or in  
3 some other way having a significant positive effect on  
4 the draft we drew. I don't -- I'm not sure I know how  
5 to get there. I know we have more work in this list  
6 than we'll be able to accomplish this week.

7 On the motion, further discussion.

8 Ms. Minkoff.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd  
10 like to suggest three major issues you just suggested:  
11 The river district coming into Maricopa County, the size  
12 of the rural district, and competitiveness of the  
13 downtown district are all addressed in DD.

14 MS. HAUSER: Sorry?

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They're all  
16 addressed in D.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: How so?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No river district  
19 in Maricopa County. All Mohave, La Paz, and Yuma  
20 County, none of those three come in, significantly --  
21 actually, La Paz and Yuma are in district G.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Dominated by Maricopa  
23 and Pima.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yeah.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Rural district,  
2 some Maricopa and Pima in it. Primarily a rural  
3 district. Configuration of the rural district has  
4 changed, and there's exclusion of Yavapai County and La  
5 Paz County, I believe. Those are the three things done  
6 in DD. So in effective it includes all three tests and  
7 changes from the original draft district.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion, roll call.  
9 Mr. Huntwork?

10                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."

11                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

12                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

14                   COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."

15                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

16                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: "No."

17                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "no."

18                   Motion fails two to three.

19                   Let's take a ten-minute break.

20                   (Whereupon, a recess was taken from 6:50  
21 until approximately 7:23 p.m.)

22                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The record will show all  
23 five Commissioners are present along with staff.

24                   The issue under discussion is essentially  
25 an issue of scheduling and workload.

1                   Currently the four Legislative options  
2 we've agreed to preliminarily, on the Legislative side,  
3 AA with a couple modifications. And still on the table,  
4 the rest of DD and EE. Not off the table, incorporated  
5 by motion. Still under consideration to be included.

6                   My point is that that, essentially, is for  
7 and eight maps, at a minimum. And there are  
8 permutations beyond the eight. If we expect full  
9 analysis of those eight maps, we are not going to begin  
10 our final mapping process a week from tonight. I can  
11 guarantee that, based on conversations with the  
12 consultants who are going to be doing the work. If we  
13 are unable to reduce the list significantly, we will  
14 simply have to delay the start of the process. So those  
15 are the options.

16                   Now what I'd like to do is continue with  
17 the Congressional discussion, to get that list to  
18 whatever we think we can deal with, and then perhaps go  
19 back and revisit Legislative.

20                   Mr. Hall.

21                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, maybe  
22 take a piece at a time. I'd like to instruct  
23 consultants to create a Downtown Competitive District  
24 without significant detriment to the other goals.

25                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you change that



1 from Downtown?

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Phoenix Metropolitan  
3 Congressional District, Competitive Phoenix Downtown  
4 Competitive District without significant detriment to  
5 other goals for analysis purposes only.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that a motion?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: That's a motion.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think I can  
12 readily agree with this approach.

13 I do want to say that think it minimizes  
14 damage to goals that can't be prevented. I personally  
15 think some damage can't be prevented. We should  
16 minimize damage, and then have analysis of the concept.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Full analysis.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Test analysis of the  
19 Downtown Congressional analysis as it relates to an  
20 improvement of the competitiveness of the districts in  
21 the draft. Otherwise there's not much reason to do it,  
22 in my opinion. That's the point.

23 Mr. Elder.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: In lieu of one of the  
25 motions, AA, BB, or EE?

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: That's my intention.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My hope.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I presume if it's  
4 something the Commission wants to proceed with, it will  
5 be superimposed on whatever map you lean toward for the  
6 rest of the state. Is that correct?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right, which is phase  
8 two.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Since we'll already have  
10 an analysis of our draft, superimpose on that, isolate  
11 the variable.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Unless you decided  
13 to go with another map rather than our draft, then  
14 superimposed on that.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

16 Discussion on the motion.

17 Roll call.

18 Mr. Elder?

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chair, eliminate  
3 DD and EE from consideration.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second it.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I presume CC is on  
8 the table.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: CC has already been  
10 removed.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: I was going to add it  
13 in.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm telling you at the  
15 present time.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I withdraw my  
17 second.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You can add it back in.  
19 It' currently not on the table.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me amend my  
21 motion.

22 I make a motion we delete DD and EE from  
23 consideration and add CC.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second that  
25 one.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Already did.

2                   We have an amended motion on the floor.

3                   Discussion.

4                   Mr. Huntwork.

5                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK:  I agree this is  
6 what we should do except the elimination from  
7 consideration is so final.  I don't think we should  
8 analyze them, don't think we should test them, but there  
9 are -- it's very possible we may come back with them as  
10 compromises for other reasons.  With that clarification.

11                  COMMISSIONER HALL:  From consideration and  
12 full analysis by the consultants at this time.

13                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK:  Right.

14                  CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Further discussion on the  
15 motion.

16                  Ms. Minkoff.

17                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  I have a  
18 discussion.  Is our draft AA, also, approved or -- I'm  
19 suggesting --

20                  COMMISSIONER HALL:  I think that is still  
21 on the table.

22                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Maybe add that to  
23 the motion.

24                  COMMISSIONER HALL:  Fine.  Leave AA on,  
25 remove DD, EE, add CC.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second to add that.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Adding AA in lieu  
3 of the current draft plan?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: No.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Adding with GG.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Correct.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Self-contained. Either  
10 buy it or you don't?

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Haven't analyzed  
12 it.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion.

14 Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I need to ask the  
16 consultants, how much work is there in testing AA  
17 separately from another plan?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Not very much. The speaker  
19 this morning gave population totals. It's like 6,000  
20 people.

21 DR. ADAMS: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Roll call.

23 Mr. Elder?

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."  
2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.  
3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."  
4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?  
5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."  
6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."  
7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman?  
8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.  
9 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd move we eliminate  
10 G4 from the list for analysis on the Legislative plan.  
11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, I'd ask you hold  
12 that motion. I like that a lot. Hold it. Let's just  
13 finish up the Congressional before we jump back to  
14 Legislative.  
15 Is there anything else we either wish to  
16 eliminate, combine, or dare I say add to the  
17 Congressional list for testing? And again, let's be  
18 very clear to the public. None of the options you see  
19 in the book tonight are totally off the table. What we  
20 are doing is asking for additional analysis on specific  
21 options so that we have a full understanding of the  
22 impact of those options on the changes to the draft that  
23 has been circulated.  
24 Anything else Congressionally you'd like  
25 to do?

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman,  
2 I'd like to make sure the consultant assures me we take  
3 a look at Hopi in or out on any of these plans.

4                   Is that what I heard last time I asked  
5 that question, Mr. Johnson?

6                   MR. JOHNSON: The response last time, if  
7 that's the instruction, we can certainly do that, if you  
8 want to give us that instruction. Or it doesn't have to  
9 be a motion.

10                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd make a motion,  
11 then.

12                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second.

13                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: The motion is to make sure  
14 we have sufficient analysis to consider the Hopi either  
15 in or out of any of the Congressional options we're  
16 analyzing so we understand the impact of that decision  
17 on any of the decisions.

18                  Mr. Huntwork.

19                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the  
20 only concern I have of this motion is I think the impact  
21 on the overall map, demographics, competitiveness, and  
22 so on, it's already pretty well-understood, at a  
23 minimum. The impact of the change is not something that  
24 is really only reflected by numbers on the page. So, in  
25 my mind, I would -- you could either -- I neither oppose

1 nor approve this motion. I just -- I just think that  
2 the demographics are not going to be the issue with the  
3 Hopi.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I was just --

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would withdraw my  
8 motion as long as by your previous statement we have the  
9 ability to modify, or as the term twink was, knowing  
10 what demographics most likely are.

11 I'm concerned we won't have a reasonable  
12 analysis to be able to do that from either  
13 regression, retrogression.

14 I see Ms. Hauser saying yes, we will, or  
15 no, we won't.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser, want to  
17 clarify your body language?

18 MS. HAUSER: I was talking to the other  
19 end of the table.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Oh.

21 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, I was talking.  
22 The concern Jose and I have at this point is that there  
23 are so features in play that we are not going to be able  
24 to give you a legal opinion, a legal opinion with  
25 respect to is this plan good or bad until you are



1 finished adopting it, at which point you are going to  
2 need to have a break for us to be able to do that and  
3 come back and us tell you there's a problem. There's an  
4 infinite number of things you might end up doing in the  
5 final meeting. That's our concern.

6 As far as competitiveness and other  
7 analyses done, as you know we're waiting for some word  
8 on a time estimate, depending on the number of  
9 alternatives you have going. So we will get that  
10 information to you as soon as you get it.

11 If you want from us a legal opinion that  
12 says this is good to go, it's going to be awfully hard  
13 to get that to you based on the fact you want to have  
14 everything in play up to the very end. It's a concern.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman --

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser, that was even  
17 more responsive to the question than the question, but  
18 that aside, Mr. Huntwork.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I just wanted to  
20 restate the question. I think the question was: In  
21 your opinion, do we need to have a separate analysis on  
22 each of these tests of the effect of including or  
23 excluding Hopi at this time?

24 MR. RIVERA: Here's -- if you want have it  
25 before this plan comes up, we can't even look at it

1 until NDC and the other consultants have come up with a  
2 draft plan. So if it takes them two, three days to do  
3 it, we can't look at it until that point in time. If  
4 you look at a time line right now, the time line of  
5 October 1st, we're not going to get it until right  
6 around October 1st.

7 If you want preanalysis before you look at  
8 every one of these, you are not going to get it, to be  
9 blunt with you, from legal analysis.

10 Whether it would be better for you to have  
11 it, of course it would be better for you to have it to  
12 make a determination, something you want to discuss or  
13 you don't want to discuss based on what some of the  
14 legal ramifications are.

15 If you insist on going, you'll get it at  
16 the tail end rather than prior. Is that simple enough?

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, one  
18 more time?

19 MR. RIVERA: I guess it wasn't.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How likely is it  
21 the demographics of 7,000 Native Americans on the Hopi  
22 Reservation are going to affect our analysis of  
23 different plans in different ways? In other words, is  
24 it likely at this time this test is going to be of  
25 significance benefit to us?

1 MR. RIVERA: You are isolating one  
2 incident.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

4 MR. RIVERA: Isolating one incident, not  
5 how you take into effect, how you take into effect each  
6 plan, just Hopi, Navajo, yeah, isolate that alone,  
7 overlay the Navajo Hopi on every draft coming through?

8 MS. LEONI: Jose.

9 MR. RIVERA: There's more than just that  
10 issue to look at. I think it's the second we had of the  
11 table from the right-wing party.

12 MS. LEONI: For clarification, we're  
13 speaking only of the Congressional plan. The motion  
14 goes only to the Congressional plan.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

16 MS. LEONI: I would like to ask Doug how  
17 big a demographic difference, how big a demographic  
18 difference 600,000 --

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: 600,000, 40,000 --

20 MS. LEONI: How big a swing?

21 MR. JOHNSON: One percent. Depends what  
22 you switch with.

23 If I may, if there is a potential change  
24 the Commission is seriously interested in, I'd ask you  
25 mention it. Is it something your interested with,

1 please mention -- I'd much rather have it at least in  
2 the computer, if not fully tested, this week. As hectic  
3 as this week will be, next week will be worse. I'd  
4 rather have us forewarned.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: You are forewarned.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The point of Mr. Elder's  
7 comment, as I understood it, was to be as clear as we  
8 can be, as we review the options still on the table for  
9 us, as to what the impact is of separation or inclusion  
10 of the Hopi in the Northern District for removing it  
11 from another district on either the Congressional -- I  
12 took it to mean Legislative as well. Maybe his intent  
13 was just Congressional at this point, Congressional  
14 options. Currently they are out on the options still on  
15 the table. They are separate. And the issue was what  
16 is the impact of inclusion on each of the options.

17 Mr. Hall.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: To Mr. Huntwork's  
19 point, give them the maps identified. Do a full-blown  
20 analysis when we whittle to one map, say at one map  
21 phase, show us in or out.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Makes sense to me,  
24 try to isolate.

25 Do any learned counsel see a problem with

1 that methodology was really the question? We're only  
2 talking about one, very few -- I keep getting the  
3 feeling we're answering questions about all myriad  
4 variables, and we're not.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And the ripple effect is  
6 minimal, an exchange between two districts.

7 Get an answer on that.

8 MR. RIVERA: I'm sorry. You know, I guess  
9 in an absolute world without taking any other factors  
10 into consideration, that alone would not take very much  
11 time, that alone, that real world without any other  
12 considerations.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The substance of  
14 Mr. Huntwork's comment that alone.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Say that. If we  
16 wanted to run a test, see what the variable is, run AA,  
17 the easiest one to isolate it, and we go from there.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is the consensus from the  
19 consulting group that's reasonable and can be done?

20 DR. ADAMS: Yes, Chairman Lynn, Members of  
21 the Commission, amending this to ask us to run this test  
22 on AA, with the changes. And I think that is  
23 reasonable.

24 I think it does make sense to go ahead and  
25 at least test that option in one plan, because it will

1 be somewhat time consuming.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay. Without objection,  
3 let's order that, direct the consultants to do that test  
4 in AA.

5 Are there any other suggestions,  
6 reductions, comments on the Congressional list?

7 So what we have at this time is we have  
8 our draft, AA, and CC. And there were some small  
9 variations --

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Maricopa.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And downtown Maricopa,  
12 Central Maricopa District for competitiveness purposes.

13 DR. ADAMS: Right, right.

14 MS. LEONI: And the Hopi test on AA

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Both in and out.

16 MS. LEONI: Right.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Anything else that we can  
18 do on Congressional?

19 Any other instruction on Congressional  
20 mapping?

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have instruction  
22 on both.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's finish the list of  
24 Legislative and go for general instructions on both.

25 Return, then, without objection, to the

1 Legislative list.

2 We currently have our draft, F2, G, and  
3 G4, and then the aspects of competitiveness in the urban  
4 areas from the Coalition 2 map as submitted.

5 Are there any changes wish to make to  
6 that.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I renew my motion to  
8 remove G4.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would second that.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Moved and seconded to  
12 remove G4 from the list.

13 Discussion?

14 Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, G4  
16 is one that deals with Yavapai County and is the one I  
17 think in a much more preferable way to G. I think it's  
18 important for us to leave that on the table. I'm  
19 perfectly -- I actually prefer G in Southern Arizona,  
20 and I would love to combine G and G4 by taking the  
21 Northern Arizona and Yavapai portion of G4 and southern  
22 Cochise County of G. But I don't want to remove G4  
23 because it's the only thing we have on the table that  
24 even comes close to taking care of Yavapai County.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering if there

1 isn't a consensus or at least the makings on part of the  
2 Commission for, essentially, combining aspects of the  
3 two maps, as Mr. Huntwork suggested, of a single test on  
4 the whole map rather than testing both for components we  
5 have in each.

6                   If there isn't, there isn't. But the  
7 motion currently is to remove G4 from the list.

8                   Ms. Minkoff.

9                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My only concern  
10 about the Southern Arizona situation with G, we have  
11 that one district --

12                   (An odd noise is heard from the convention  
13 facility background.)

14                   MR. RIVERA: One of the consultants.

15                   (Laughter.)

16                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: -- with Z,  
17 replacing that. We replaced another district that  
18 doesn't work, which is DD. So while I'm certainly not  
19 advocating for the Southern Arizona configuration in G4,  
20 I would like to make sure that there is still room to  
21 adjust and do something about District Z, at least the  
22 northern portion of it.

23                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

24                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'm sorry. We've  
25 been through this. I don't see Z as a problem, and rest



1 of southern area is far Superior than G4.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think you would  
3 if you lived in Kearney or Hayden.

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: How many people are  
5 there? We can still twink that area.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm asking that.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Four, five hundred,  
8 shift it one way or another.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, a few thousand.  
10 If you take all the mining communities in that area  
11 adjacent to Gila County, talking about several thousand  
12 people. And maybe that's not as many as in Phoenix, but  
13 to those few thousand people, that's an important  
14 district, like splitting Quartzsite.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The alternative, G4,  
16 is ridiculous.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not suggesting  
18 G4. Make sure the options for dealing with that portion  
19 of Pinal County in District G.

20 I'm asking the consultants, without  
21 accepting the configuration on G4, if we're talking  
22 about -- I don't really know what the population is of  
23 the small mining communities in eastern Pinal County,  
24 but is there flexibility and are there options for  
25 putting them in different district than north Tucson?

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Does that include all  
2 mining communities?

3                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Active mining  
4 communities, not once selling off to developers.

5                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay. Two.

6                   MR. JOHNSON: We definitely are aware  
7 concerns exist in each of the alternatives and will be  
8 looking for other approaches.

9                   What you are seeing in the test is what  
10 we've come up with to this point. Should we find a  
11 better approach we can make people with happier, we'll  
12 be including that in our proposals to you.

13                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion to remove  
14 G4.

15                  Mr. Hall.

16                  COMMISSIONER HALL: My concern with G4,  
17 looking now at the Yavapai split, while some of those  
18 lines up in the northern portion may be more favorable,  
19 there's now Verde Valley, Peoria, and Cave Creek and the  
20 Tri-Cities, et cetera, with west -- the western valley,  
21 if you will. While the left district, whatever letter  
22 that is -- I'm concerned that basically both of those  
23 now are metro districts and the expansiveness of those  
24 districts. So while the dividing line up there, I  
25 agree, Mr. Huntwork, it's more ideal. I'm not sure that

1 the cost of that line is worth the benefit. Therefore,  
2 I think that the division, as specified in G, is  
3 probably better, at least keeping a portion of that area  
4 in a rural district.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering if we  
6 can't -- I take it from the last comment we certainly  
7 could ask the consultants to address the issue of a  
8 dividing line in Yavapai, for example, on a map that  
9 still does not satisfy that particular feature as far as  
10 we're concerned and explore other options. So, in other  
11 words, if we eliminate G4 from consideration but make a  
12 specific instruction on map G, that feature of G, along  
13 with perhaps some others, needs to be refined and  
14 options presented. I know that that creates more  
15 problems in terms of ultimate review, but I guess the  
16 sense here is we still have to solve some of the  
17 problems that have been identified through public  
18 testimony and our own discussion.

19 Mr. Huntwork.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, we  
21 passed over the issue of Yavapai County last time. But  
22 I don't think we can do it again today. If we are going  
23 to do anything, I think we need to give a clear signal  
24 as to where we're headed with this. And I don't think  
25 that B, as it stands, is a satisfactory map. So -- and

1 B4 is really a pretty good map.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: G and G4.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I apologize, G and  
4 G4. By making that change, I think we're again sending  
5 the wrong signal. I think that the rural urban  
6 distinction is important. I certainly supported it as  
7 much as possible.

8 There are, in this map, there are a number  
9 of good rural districts. But the people in Yavapai  
10 County made one thing very clear: They wanted to be  
11 together. If the way to do that is to bring them down  
12 into Western Maricopa County, they would prefer that to  
13 being split at all or split in the wrong spot. I think  
14 it's important for us to move in that direction at this  
15 time. And G4, the northern part of G4 does that.

16 The number of people -- I might also point  
17 out, I think C in G4 ends up being a pretty strongly  
18 Metro dominated district. What are the demographics?  
19 How many people in C, in G4, are outside the Phoenix  
20 Metropolitan or inside?

21 MR. JOHNSON: I haven't run the exact  
22 numbers. I think it's somewhere between 30 and 50  
23 thousand are in the metropolitan area. So we're looking  
24 at 120 to 140 outside of it.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: My problem with the  
2 split, G4, Sedona and Verde Valley made it clear they'd  
3 prefer to be in a district that severed them from  
4 Prescott, Prescott Valley, and Chino Valley. They said  
5 they'd prefer to be in a district with Flagstaff, not  
6 prefer to be with G4.

7                   It's another one that puts Sedona with  
8 Flagstaff, a small incursion into Maricopa, separates  
9 Prescott, et cetera. If trying to meet the express  
10 concerns of that part of the state, G doesn't do it at  
11 all and have to go back to F2. That's why I think we  
12 take G4 off the table. I'm not sure it's any better for  
13 that area. It doesn't put them where they want to be.

14                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think F2 is a  
16 very important map. It does something else far  
17 different than this. That is the map that unites the  
18 Navajo and Apache Tribes. It also breaks up EACO. And  
19 EACO on this map, G, any variation of G there is still a  
20 very strong rural district, and it has been  
21 well-protected. Now, I think that, you know, if we just  
22 count -- what we need here is an alternative that  
23 doesn't put the Navajo and Apaches together and still  
24 protects the interests of Yavapai County, which were not  
25 only strongly expressed, not only strong feelings, but

1 there were very strong persuasive reasons for respecting  
2 that community of interest that I just -- I think we  
3 have to give that equal weight to.

4           The combinations that are left in C do  
5 work, communities of interest we want to have combined,  
6 and it sounds as if that's primarily, at this time, a  
7 rural district. Maybe when we look at how it comes down  
8 into Maricopa County, we can put some portions of  
9 Maricopa County into the tail end of that district so it  
10 will remain rural longer. Maybe that's the way we can  
11 try to address some of those concerns. But overall, the  
12 northern part of G4 seems to be what comes closest to  
13 what we need to do.

14           COMMISSIONER HALL: Would it contemplate  
15 the consultants having a full-blown analysis on test G  
16 and in addition to that give an analysis on certain  
17 components of G4, specifically the components in Yavapai  
18 County that Mr. Huntwork has alluded to and/or  
19 referenced? And I understand that will ripple down into  
20 Maricopa County.

21           COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Two districts.

22           COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm trying to take  
23 something off the plate for you. Is it possible,  
24 Mr. Chairman, to ask your consultants, have them give us  
25 an analysis on the key components of G4 that seem to be

1 still an important consideration for some while  
2 providing a full blown analysis on all of G?

3 Does that make your life any easier, Doug,  
4 or have I made it worse?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Let me add two  
6 which may clarify some.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me ask my  
8 question.

9 MR. RIVERA: Doug, you need a lawyer  
10 standing next to you.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Related to the  
12 question.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Gives you more time to  
14 think about the answer.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The difference  
16 between, dealing with the D and C2 maps, the external  
17 boundaries of the two districts are identical. All  
18 we're talking about is the dividing line between D and C  
19 that changes on the two maps. So does that simplify the  
20 analysis between dealing with the two, in two districts.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't think they are  
22 in Maricopa.

23 MR. JOHNSON: They are. That's why G, G  
24 more to C.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: Then that doesn't make

1 life any easier.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Not much. Maybe a little.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No. To the extent --  
4 if -- we're trying to deal with Mr. Huntwork's concern  
5 about Yavapai County, not just Mr. Huntwork's concern,  
6 one he raised. If we're saying that the solution to  
7 that problem is wholly contained, could be wholly  
8 contained in the reconfiguration of DC, this map,  
9 analysis, analysis configuration, specific  
10 reconfiguration issue, this one whole map has to be  
11 analyzed. The only variable is the way DC is  
12 reconfigured. Sounds like progress to me. I could be  
13 wrong.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: Four columns, D, D1,  
15 C, C1, whatever, instead of -- instead of having to do  
16 the other 20 columns on a separate map, right?

17 Doug, your lacking enthusiasm is  
18 disconcerting.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The difference is  
20 the change in Southern Arizona. G, H is swapping  
21 population, a small amount of population. Still the  
22 same concept.

23 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. Straight trade  
24 between the two. Could look at G, swap them out, redo  
25 it later.



1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Would you amend  
2 the motion to that? I'll lend it support.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. K

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: District K we're not  
5 dealing with.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: I would move that we  
9 would remove the total G4 map from consideration with  
10 the exception of the Yavapai County component of C and D  
11 to provide full analysis on those districts in addition  
12 to complete analysis of G.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Second.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Who seconded the original  
15 motion?

16 Mr. Elder, is that acceptable?

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We have an amended motion  
19 on the floor.

20 Amended motion.

21 Mr. Elder?

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

5 (Motion carries.)

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We've taken G4 off. We've  
7 added the District C and D analysis variable to test G.

8 Any further items for Legislative mapping?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Doing F2, G with  
10 variables C plus D, and we're using C2 as an evaluation  
11 background basis, but we're not doing a full-blown test  
12 on it.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Essentially our draft, F2,  
14 G with two changes -- or one change we asked to be  
15 looked at in Yavapai, and the competitive elements of  
16 the Coalition 2 submission, the Legislative package as  
17 it currently exists. Any further reductions.

18 Mr. Hall.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm not so sure that  
20 I'm convinced that given all of the flat spots of the  
21 total configuration of the map, F2, that it is prudent  
22 for us to have our consultants to do analysis of the  
23 map. I guess there are interesting features there. I'm  
24 just concerned about the level of work that we're  
25 loading upon them that may not bear fruition.

1 I'm wondering, is it possible in, simply,  
2 with respect to that map, maybe identify specific  
3 components or is that an unrealistic expectation?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Seems to me it is. F2 is  
5 a significantly different map, significant ripple  
6 effects because of a couple key components. G and G4  
7 are essentially the same with the exception of the  
8 treatment of -- isolating the treatment of Yavapai. In  
9 this instance, because we have Apache in with Northern  
10 District A, that ripples significantly through the rest  
11 of the map. It's not a minor change. It's a  
12 significant change.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Then I'd ask, is it  
14 still the desire of the Commission, pleasure of the  
15 Commission of maintaining this alternative for full  
16 consideration?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Couple ways to find out.  
18 One is a motion to remove it.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I was just curious,  
20 were Commissioners feeling it, go down emotion road.  
21 Interested for input.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Three maps, legislatively,  
23 asking to be tested, with two small -- one small  
24 variation in one map, issue of competitiveness in the  
25 metropolitan area relative to the Coalition 2

1 submission.

2 We have now narrowed down the tests on the  
3 Legislative side as well.

4 I need to double-check with the  
5 consultants and legal counsel on workload vis-a-vis  
6 where we are at the moment versus fewer options.

7 Mrs. Minkoff.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Seems to me, the  
9 reason F is still on the table, there is still  
10 separation, inclusion of Apache Reservations in the  
11 Northern District. As I look through it, while it does  
12 achieve that, there is so much in this map I think  
13 problematic, District D, pulls Sierra Vista out of  
14 Cochise, C, D go into Maricopa County, problems all over  
15 this map. I can't see any way I would support any kind  
16 of configuration of this as the final map. So if the  
17 only purpose is to allow for the inclusion of the Apache  
18 Reservations in the Northern District, I think what this  
19 map shows creates so many problems elsewhere in the  
20 state it really doesn't work.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And that would be  
22 discussion on the motion no one made.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Well, I think it  
24 might be a motion then to take it off, which I'll be  
25 happy to do.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion to remove F2 from  
2 consideration.

3                   Is there a second?

4                   COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second that.

5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion.

6                   Mr. Huntwork.

7                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, you  
8 know, the Navajo Nation has made its legal position and  
9 its preference very clear to us. The Navajo Nation is  
10 unquestionably protected by the Voting Rights Act. And  
11 the Native American communities are unquestionably a  
12 community of interest that we must honor and reflect  
13 under the terms of Proposition 106.

14                   The inconvenience, and some of the  
15 concerns that have been expressed about issues in other  
16 parts of the map certainly don't take priority over the  
17 Voting Rights Act issues we've recognized from the very  
18 beginning, which we recognized are the highest priority  
19 we have to deal with. So we can't really remove from  
20 consideration the only option that the Navajos are  
21 willing to condone at this point and the only option  
22 that comes close to the bench mark they've told us is  
23 the appropriate level, at least, unless, and until we  
24 have some factual basis for doing so. At this point we  
25 don't have, in the record, such a basis. And I do not

1 know and have no reason to believe that we ever will.  
2 But unless and until we do, I don't believe we can  
3 remove this map from consideration unless we replace it  
4 with another map that accomplishes the objective.

5           Perhaps a compromise would be to say that  
6 there are clearly a number of changes that -- appear to  
7 be a number of changes that appear to be made with this  
8 map, take into consideration some other improvements  
9 that have been made in some other maps, detail in  
10 Tucson, Cochise County consolidation, for example, the  
11 history that goes on north a little further. All those  
12 things seem to be not inconsistent with this map.

13           Maybe instead of authorizing a full-blown  
14 map, what we've been asking to do would be to review  
15 this map, see if there are ways to incorporate some  
16 other refinements that we have been able to make in some  
17 of the other maps we've looked at and then perhaps do  
18 the competitive analysis after we've made some of those  
19 fine-tuning improvements.

20           MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman.

21           CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Rivera.

22           MR. RIVERA: Just to add on to what  
23 Commissioner Huntwork said, you don't have to look at  
24 this map, a map somewhat similar to this, until you make  
25 a determination of the bench mark and Navajo and Native

1 American district out there. If you take off and make a  
2 determination later, you need a certain bench mark to  
3 meet the determination. I think -- you may not have to  
4 keep this map in mind, but you want to have an option at  
5 some point in time when you get to that point in time.

6 The other thing, if I can go on,  
7 Mr. Huntwork, I think you have to do the whole map.  
8 There are so many ripple effects, you can't isolate just  
9 the Apache aspect of it. You have to look at the whole  
10 map because of the ripple effects that go all the way  
11 through.

12 MR. HUNTWORK: I agree.

13 MR. RIVERA: I thought maybe you could  
14 isolate.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I said perhaps  
16 because of the problems in other portions of the map you  
17 shouldn't do a full-blown competitive analysis that are  
18 mainly going to affect other portions of the map but  
19 rather instruct the consultants to start with this and  
20 come back to us see what of the other refinements that  
21 we have made could be incorporated so we then have an  
22 improved version of this map and then do a competitive  
23 analysis.

24 MR. RIVERA: Ask her what is in front of  
25 the Senate Subcommittee right now, Mr. Johnson. It may

1 be more difficult to do that aspect than to do the  
2 full-blown.

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One concern is  
4 competitive, a full-blown competitive analysis on this  
5 map could be a wasted effort. We'll soon start looking  
6 in detail saying change this, or we want Cochise County  
7 united just the way it is on test G, and so on.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

9 DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the  
10 Commission, it would make sense to analyze that entire  
11 map rather than incorporate it into another map. We  
12 would be basically drawing another map and then it would  
13 have other consequences. You've already seen this one.  
14 I think it just makes sense to go ahead and do an  
15 analysis of this map.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll withdraw my  
17 motion.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does the second withdraw?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any more Legislative  
21 changes?

22 If not, other instructions to the  
23 consultants in preparation for our deliberations,  
24 whenever they begin?

25 Ms. Minkoff?



1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This has already  
2                   been discussed extensively tonight. I want to make sure  
3                   we get it on the record. I'd like to instruct the  
4                   consultants as they are doing analysis of all of the  
5                   maps that we have forwarded on to them tonight that an  
6                   analysis be made to see how the districts, some of the  
7                   districts in each one of those maps, could be made more  
8                   competitive without undermining any of the other  
9                   criteria mentioned in Proposition 106.

10                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

11                  COMMISSIONER ELDER: All motions or --

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think they better be at  
13                  this point. What we are doing is creating workload.

14                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

15                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: To the extent any of these  
16                  create additional workload, it impacts the schedule. We  
17                  better have a clear majority in favor of each of the  
18                  motions.

19                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I make it in the  
20                  form of a motion.

21                  COMMISSIONER HALL: Mind restating?

22                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I make a motion to  
23                  instruct the consultants in doing analysis and testing  
24                  of each of these maps to determine if there are ways  
25                  that additional competitive districts can be created or

1 districts can be made more competitive, according to the  
2 requirements of Proposition 106.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my concern is  
4 the word "determine."

5 Lisa?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Want a different  
7 word? I'm happy.

8 MS. HAUSER: Well, Mr. Chairman and  
9 Commissioners, the fact of the matter is that the  
10 consultants, who you are drawing the maps, do not do the  
11 competitiveness analysis. We have moved beyond into an  
12 area using a more sophisticated analysis that has to be  
13 run, and there is some information you've been presented  
14 in connection with that and some of the challenges that  
15 would be faced in trying to do what you are suggesting.  
16 But suffice it to say that it would really have to be a  
17 plan run under the competitiveness test that we have  
18 been using.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand that.  
20 But the people who are doing the competitive testing are  
21 not charged with the task of modifying the districts.  
22 That's our task with the assistance of our consultants.

23 I'm trying to find out then how we get to  
24 that point. It almost seems like a catch .22 you are  
25 describing to me. And, you know, I -- I don't find that

1 acceptable. There has to be a way.

2 Tell me who analyzes districts for  
3 competitiveness and who will make recommendations to us  
4 for adjustments in the districts that might make them  
5 more competitive.

6 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner  
7 Minkoff, our expert would be able to analyze in terms of  
8 competitiveness and make recommendations along those  
9 lines, if the Commission chooses to have the expert make  
10 those kind of recommendations. But if what you are  
11 talking about is not substantially redrawing districts  
12 for districts but making changes around the edges, then  
13 it seems like it doesn't get you there.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maybe I  
15 misunderstood. When I met individually with the  
16 consultants last week, and as we all did, I was told  
17 they were prepared to do that, if they were given  
18 instructions by the Commission. I'm just trying to --

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, Ms. Leoni.

20 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
21 Commission, it is indeed around the edges. And once we  
22 have the competitiveness analysis of the expert, I --  
23 you have to understand, it's a very complicated issue  
24 and not simply a matter of the Quick and Dirty we've  
25 been using. A lot of issues affect competitiveness.

1 Once we have that analysis, then we can make some  
2 recommendations for changes, but they would be around  
3 the edges. It would not be a dramatic change. You  
4 already have districts fairly competitive, according to  
5 the analysis. And to increase that competitiveness  
6 would be simply working at the margins.

7 So, yes, indeed, we would be prepared to  
8 do that, prepared to make recommendations; but after we  
9 get report from consultant working on this specifically,  
10 not a wholesale change of districts, not a dramatic  
11 change of districts.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Except with the one  
13 you've been instructed to do in the greater Phoenix  
14 Metropolitan area.

15 DR. ADAMS: We have indeed been instructed  
16 on the coalition plan in terms of the Downtown Metro  
17 area, been instructed to look at the Competitive Metro  
18 District in the Congressional. And we certainly will do  
19 that. And those will be tested for competitiveness by  
20 the expert as well. So we will be looking at those.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, that was my  
23 point. I think we're already there, Ms. Minkoff.

24 I think they are already doing that with  
25 respect to the metropolitan areas on the Legislative

1 level and Congressional level.

2 As a practical matter, from a Legislative  
3 standpoint, whatever we come up with in outlying areas,  
4 to address a multiplicity of issues, it is what it is.  
5 Try to solve as many problems as we can try to solve,  
6 that's where it's going to be what it is.

7 Competitiveness, there may be  
8 opportunities downtown. We instructed them to do that  
9 for Legislative, competitive, and we're okay in that  
10 department.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Additional instructions to  
12 the consultants?

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Now that we've, I  
16 think, finalized the fabric we're going to try to work  
17 with over the next week, are we comfortable, I don't  
18 know whether Lisa had a response back from the outside  
19 consultant that we're going to have credible, both  
20 graphical as well as data information to actually  
21 proceed on Monday?

22 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Elder, Members of  
23 the Commission, under the circumstances, I do want to  
24 hear back from the additional consultant. I think it  
25 would be possible to start with the Congressional

1 Districts on Monday. But that is based on hearing back  
2 from the consultant. We do have time to post. But --  
3 so that might be a possibility. I won't know until we  
4 hear back how much time it will require. We need to let  
5 the IRC attorneys weigh in on this. They may also need  
6 to weigh in on these, may not feel they're sufficiently  
7 prepared.

8 MR. RIVERA: Depends on when we get the  
9 maps from NDC before we can do an analysis. Depending  
10 on the date and time we get it from NDC, and from the  
11 other experts, we start doing our analysis at that point  
12 in time. It's kind of like, get it quickly, we get it  
13 quickly. Don't get it in to Saturday or Sunday, it's  
14 almost impossible.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Since we don't have a  
16 response from the competitive consultant, that's a piece  
17 we can't fill in tonight.

18 MS. HAUSER: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand we're trying  
20 real time to get a response. We're not able to get that  
21 response.

22 The question, then, and again, it relates  
23 not to this item, per se, but the next item on the  
24 agenda which is scheduling.

25 I guess what I'd like to do is complete

1 this item by indicating any other changes we have to  
2 consultants before we move to scheduling. In other  
3 words, is there anything else we're asking of the  
4 consultants before we begin the next phase of the  
5 process? Any other instruction to them at this point?

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I have to say the,  
7 NDC, balance of the consulting team, attorneys, experts,  
8 whatever, we really, this time, coming up, is when  
9 making final decisions, have to have the information.  
10 So please do not hesitate, coming up Wednesday, we don't  
11 have the window, or daylight. We need to know so we  
12 renote the meetings and get on. I don't want to come  
13 in here and find we're sort of going through the motions  
14 for a couple days because we don't have the information  
15 to deal with it.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any other instructions to  
17 consultants?

18 If not, is the record clear --

19 Let me ask the -- let me ask the  
20 attorneys. We have created a workload out of the  
21 Legislative and Congressional maps and permutations. Do  
22 you have a clear enough record or would you prefer  
23 summarizing the motion in terms of the alternatives?

24 MS. HAUSER: I think we would like a  
25 summarizing motion and then one of our famous 10-minute

1 breaks so we can confer about what time we think we'll  
2 need.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: On schedule.

4 MS. HAUSER: Yeah.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's do this, then, the  
6 Chair would entertain a motion that reflects our  
7 workload to the consultants as follows: On the  
8 Legislative maps, analysis should go forward on our  
9 draft, on F2, on test G, with the Legislative Districts  
10 C and D reflecting the change in Yavapai County analyzed  
11 both ways, as existing G and the alternatives, and the  
12 competitive aspects of the interior metropolitan  
13 districts of the Coalition 2 map, that the Congressional  
14 workload be our draft, test double A including our --  
15 incorporation of the alternative in AA, and GG, and test  
16 CC. That's my list. And I think --

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: And the  
18 competitive --

19 DR. ADAMS: Downtown.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm sorry, and the  
21 metropolitan district for Maricopa County on  
22 competitiveness. And included in this is the  
23 alternative on Congressional that, on those tests, we  
24 would like to know the impact of inclusion or exclusion  
25 of the Hopi in the Northern District.



1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Correction,  
2 Mr. Chairman, AA only.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sorry. We agreed to test  
4 that AA only. Thank you. That is the workload, a  
5 motion that effect.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

10 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, a question.

11 When you stated that, you said "our draft."

12 Congressional, our -- test AA, including our  
13 alternative in AA and GG, the Hopi issue you mentioned?  
14 It's a different thing.

15 See, different, Jose.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopi testing on AA only.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Three issues on AA,  
18 Right?

19 MS. HAUSER: I think so.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Inclusion of northern  
21 tribes into the metropolitan areas, the GG new division  
22 of GG, and the exclusion or inclusion of Hopis.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

24 Roll call.

25 Mr. Hall?

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork?

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."

7 (Motion carries.)

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Two more items agenda, one  
9 which is call to the public. We'll take a 10-minute  
10 break for purposes of discussing the item on the agenda,  
11 scheduling. I hope to have that completed shortly.  
12 After the break, if you have not filled out a speaker  
13 form and wish to be heard later this evening, we'll take  
14 that later.

15 Please try keep this to a 10-minute break.  
16 We'll reconvene at 25 minutes of.

17 (Whereupon, a recess was taken at  
18 approximately 8:25 p.m.)

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come  
20 to order.

21 On the issue of scheduling, I'll be happy  
22 to here from any of the consultants or counsel on the  
23 scheduling issue.

24 Who wishes to be the barrier of news,  
25 whatever it is.

1                   MR. RIVERA:  Whoever is closest to the  
2                   exit.

3                   MS. HAUSER:  Just remember, don't kill the  
4                   messenger.

5                   The expert will be working through Friday  
6                   to complete the balance of racial block voting, then we  
7                   can start doing the tests for competitiveness of the  
8                   other plans, all the tests we're sending.  And based on  
9                   our calculation of how many hours it will take to do  
10                  those tests, which is about 50, 50 hours of work, and he  
11                  can't -- yeah, and he can't work Monday, that's the one  
12                  day that he is unavailable, so he said he can start on  
13                  them this weekend as soon as he finishes the racial  
14                  block voting.  So that takes us through the end of next  
15                  week.  At that rate, then, we get those reports and,  
16                  Jose --

17                  I like to share with co-counsel.

18                  MR. RIVERA:  We get the reports and review  
19                  them, obviously we review them, depending on how much  
20                  work is involved and stuff, will take us some time.

21                  Any estimate, Lisa?

22                  Two can play this game.

23                  MS. HAUSER:  I don't want to work with  
24                  Jose, anymore.  I don't want to.

25                  I take that back.

1                   The worst part, if in meetings and getting  
2 reports at the same time, it's just an unworkable  
3 situation to do that.

4                   MR. RIVERA: Two, three days.

5                   MS. HAUSER: I'd say we're talking.

6                   MR. RIVERA: You are talking about  
7 possibly Friday by the time he gets these things done,  
8 Lisa and I looking at them over the weekend.

9                   MS. HAUSER: We can start that following  
10 Monday, I would think.

11                   MS. HAUSER: NDC is very quiet. Let's  
12 hear from them.

13                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The date of that following  
14 Monday is --

15                   MS. HAUSER: The 8th, a state holiday.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that mean we're  
17 precluded from meeting?

18                   MR. RIVERA: No. Staff may be.

19                   MS. HAUSER: Sunday is state holiday also.  
20 I think we can swing that.

21                   DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the  
22 Commission, we can get materials very quickly to the  
23 consultant. The problem, as Ms. Hauser stated, the  
24 consultant will need time to go through these materials.  
25 Therefore, I must defer to the attorneys' schedule on

1 this. And they will need to see these reports before we  
2 can come back and meet again, is my understanding.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Did I understand you  
5 correctly, by the end of week we'd have a written report  
6 for items they've already have worked on?

7 MS. HAUSER: At the end of the week, the  
8 written report items he's about to start to work on.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: The question is items  
10 he's already worked on and completed.

11 MS. HAUSER: No.

12 MR. RIVERA: The items.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: What do you mean "no."

14 MS. HAUSER: I mean "no."

15 MS. HAUSER: Items he's going to report to  
16 you on at the end of week, racial block voting with  
17 respect to local election issues which are critical in  
18 certain parts of the state and ballot propositions.  
19 What you, what you've got -- what you have seen from  
20 Dr. Handley is with respect to the statewide races, so  
21 this is something that comes back to data problems, data  
22 received now on local races, and he's committed to turn  
23 that around for us.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought analysis had  
25 already been completed.

1 MS. HAUSER: Not on local races and not on  
2 ballot measures.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: The earliest we can  
4 get any report is Friday.

5 MR. RIVERA: Not in any districts you've  
6 drawn up. Only --

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: In general.

8 MS. HAUSER: Keep in mind racial block  
9 voting analysis is not district -- not draft dependent.  
10 Existing patterns around the states.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: In your opinion, with  
12 that report, in writing, would we not, on Monday, the --

13 MR. RIVERA: The first.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: -- be able to analyze  
15 certain aspects, probably reduce some options.

16 MS. HAUSER: You'll not have  
17 competitiveness, not one bit more information about  
18 competitiveness than you do today.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Certain questions on  
20 the table are more contingent. There are some issues I  
21 see coming in the report you are alluding to on Friday.  
22 Correct me if I'm wrong.

23 MS. HAUSER: I think that is theoretically  
24 true. I'm not optimistic.

25 MR. RIVERA: I'd be surprised if the

1 information you have on Friday changes.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: What?

3 MR. RIVERA: After we run the ballot  
4 propositions, that local election changes anything from  
5 your knowledge you have now, or if it changes anything,  
6 it would be minimal.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand. Written  
8 documentation what we perceive to be preliminary  
9 analysis.

10 MR. RIVERA: Preliminary analysis, racial  
11 block analysis. Written report, addresses additional  
12 decisions, can we not?

13 MS. HAUSER: If the Commission is willing  
14 to do that, it's hard to predict. The expectation is  
15 what's coming today, more stuff is coming off the table  
16 today than can easily handle, in all candor. It's hard  
17 to say what will happen next week. Keep in mind, also  
18 you'll want to take information back to Dr. Handley with  
19 respect to percentages in certain districts and get  
20 information from --

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand that. We  
22 could take back, basically, two instead of four, is what  
23 I'm saying, Lisa.

24 With that report, it appears to me, it's  
25 my sense, we can go, for example, Legislatively from

1 four alternatives to thereby expedite what they'll  
2 analyze in intimate detail some information forthcoming  
3 at the end of this week which would be critical to some  
4 decisions pending.

5 MS. HAUSER: Again, it's entirely  
6 possible. I can't predict how the Commissioners vote.  
7 If you want to proceed, your premise is logical.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Worthy of exploration?

9 MS. HAUSER: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go back to something  
11 Mr. Elder said several hours ago. I'm surprised I  
12 remember it.

13 Mr. Elder said earlier, a reasonable  
14 point, that it would be ill-advised to get together  
15 unless we could make real progress with whatever  
16 information is available. So the issue becomes what we  
17 think we can accomplish with material available to us by  
18 the end of the week and the on basis of what we think we  
19 could accomplish, whether we're reducing the number of  
20 options from four to two, or some other reasonable  
21 expectation. If, however, it's the sense of the  
22 Commission there would be no appreciable progress that  
23 could be made until more information is forthcoming and  
24 more analysis is done, I don't think it would be prudent  
25 for us to try to get together and simply be frustrated



1 not having the information we think we need to make  
2 decisions, and clearly neither counsel nor consultants  
3 can get what we might have in our heads in terms of what  
4 we're willing to do or might do or what decisions we  
5 might make with that information.

6 Mr. Elder.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sounded as though the  
8 schedule went we'd get some Friday, then competitiveness  
9 would take the majority of the week. If we met on  
10 Monday, the 1st, and if we could reduce two to four,  
11 four to two in each category, how that would affect 50  
12 hours identified, what it would take to do the analysis  
13 from competitiveness and block voting by Dr. whatever it  
14 was, Handley.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Handley and McDonald.

16 MS. HAUSER: Total number plans of to be  
17 examined and competitiveness.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Linear 50 hours  
19 whether we do one or four, or is it something sequential  
20 whether he does analysis, get down to only 25 hours  
21 instead of 50 hours?

22 MS. HAUSER: Takes approximately five  
23 hours per test.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you.

25 MS. HAUSER: And based on the list we

1 have, add this up, various configurations, 10 tests to  
2 run.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To Mr. Elder's point,  
4 reduce the number of tests by some percentage.

5 MS. HAUSER: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: One would expect the  
7 analysis to take that much less time.

8 MS. HAUSER: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I can't think of  
10 any decision on the Congressional maps that would be  
11 made solely on the basis of racial block voting. I can  
12 only think of one that might be made on that basis, on  
13 the Legislative maps. And I think having all us get  
14 together for a meeting just for that is probably not  
15 worth it. But we could just leave the day noticed  
16 and -- leave it noticed, get together. It seems pretty  
17 bleak to me.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Currently scheduled to  
19 meet Monday at some point. Haven't decided on a time.  
20 We have still two days plus to notice that meeting and  
21 have it be official.

22 What seems clear, if we schedule for  
23 Monday, we shouldn't schedule Monday through Friday at  
24 this point next week, but rather schedule Monday  
25 sometime for the purpose of at least reviewing where we

1 are if there's the opportunity to reduce the workload.

2 To Mr. Huntwork's point, if others on the  
3 Commission are simply are inclined to not think we're  
4 able to reduce the workload based on analysis done by  
5 the end of week, it would not make sense to get together  
6 until we have the data to pass on that analysis,  
7 competitive analysis and other material. That is sort  
8 of where we are.

9 I'll take any suggestions anyone has.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Bottom line is we need  
11 to meet on the 8th. Is that what we're saying? Start  
12 meeting on the 8th, meet that week, and hopefully do it  
13 in one week? Right?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Or --

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: -- go to four Members  
16 of the Commission?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Oh, no we don't.  
18 We can meet in Beijing.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm not so sure it's a  
20 good time to fly, Andi.

21 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: May not be.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't think we  
23 have any real options. We have to get prepared for the  
24 8th. We have to get -- urge the consultants to make  
25 sure that they are ready. We need to get -- clear our

1 calendars so that we are ready, and to the best we can,  
2 I don't think we have other options.

3           CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if the only other  
4 option we may have, to Dan's point about linear or  
5 sequential, I'm wondering if some of this could not be  
6 completed in a fashion if it isn't Monday or a week from  
7 Monday. I'm wondering if there are items that could be  
8 produced we could get started on as other work is being  
9 done outside the Commission meeting itself and have it  
10 if we catch up to us as we go through it.

11           COMMISSIONER ELDER: It leads to a comment  
12 if four, five hours, 20 hours, might be able to meet  
13 starting Wednesday or Friday or Thursday, something like  
14 that, and follow in on Monday the 8th with the next set,  
15 Congressional or Legislative.

16           COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm concerned  
17 counsel can't analyze the reports and sit here and  
18 participate in hearings at the same time.

19           CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand that part.  
20 But it may very well be, again, it may very well be that  
21 what we might have to do, and the tradeoff is -- look,  
22 in my mind we start on the 8th. The likelihood that  
23 we'll finish by that Friday is an interesting bet. I  
24 have no idea what the odds are. If we can by some extra  
25 time, even if it means beginning at some point in the

1 week earlier, and if by that I mean let's say we start  
2 on Thursday or Friday, or someday earlier, the week  
3 earlier, and even if it means meeting for several hours  
4 and then not meeting for several hours while the  
5 attorneys catch up, some modification of the schedule  
6 whereby we are doing both, meeting and review work but  
7 not at the same time, obviously, it's still better than,  
8 perhaps, than waiting until we have everything on Monday  
9 the 8th and than hoping that we complete the work.

10 I'm only exploring options. I don't know  
11 it works.

12 Mr. Hall.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur with that.

14 Be realistic. We spent two, three hours  
15 tonight on District DD.

16 I think that, from a practical standpoint,  
17 there is going to be significant discussion relative to  
18 a downtown competitive district long before we need to  
19 analyze the intimate details of how competitive that  
20 district is.

21 I think that if our consultants come back  
22 with some alternatives or proposals relative to that  
23 particular district that the configuration of which,  
24 trying to address the other goals, there's going to be a  
25 significant amount of time invested long before anyone

1 on this Commission is going to be prepared to analyze  
2 the data table and detailed analysis.

3 I would agree that would be, for example,  
4 one area where we could make some progress in the  
5 preceding week and try to possibly give more focus to  
6 all parties involved.

7 I think additionally legislatively there's  
8 some other areas with possibly some initial information  
9 and with some initial consideration of alternatives that  
10 we can make some progress on and try and fine-tune, if  
11 you will, and reduce the number of targets prior to the  
12 8th.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The example there  
15 is exactly what concerns me. I know I'm not going to be  
16 able to talk about the central competitive district  
17 without competitive analysis. The whole point of it is  
18 competitive analysis. So that's one that just -- it's  
19 on hold until we have that information.

20 I think -- Mr. Chairman, I guess I  
21 encourage us to hold the door open to a more accelerated  
22 process, encourage our consultants to try to think of a  
23 way to do it, by either Congressional or Legislative  
24 separately first, isolating those tasks with a couple  
25 days in between from additionally work being done in

1 background, or the weekend, or something. The lawyers  
2 do those, and Monday be ready to do the other one we  
3 didn't do the end of last week. Maybe there's a way --  
4 we need to -- the need to push it is clear. And  
5 possibly we can meet Wednesday --

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think most of us cleared  
7 our schedule at the beginning for the first two weeks.  
8 There may be some exceptions to that for blocks of time  
9 here and there. By and large, all of us thought at  
10 least for that first week and probably into the second  
11 week there would be considerable amounts of time that  
12 would be Commission time.

13 What if in working with the consultants  
14 and counsel you allow me to try to work out a schedule  
15 that makes sense based on the work that is being done,  
16 needs to be done. I draft a schedule and circulate it  
17 to you for some period during that two weeks with the  
18 idea that we will begin at the earliest possible date  
19 where we have meaningful data and can make progress. It  
20 may mean some of those days working portions of days so  
21 that continued analysis can also occur at a time at  
22 least contemporaneous with our meeting.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: When you do that,  
24 suggest to us what the schedule would be for that day,  
25 when we meet a day.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  When I can, I will.  What  
2  it's predicated on -- the fall-back position is the  
3  start date.  If we start earlier, the 7th, Sunday, 6th,  
4  Saturday, any day prior to the 8th, count them  
5  yourselves, try to do so given what we expect to be an  
6  end date that we have to try to meet.  And I would -- I  
7  would want to have the flexibility to try to put a  
8  schedule together that makes the most sense in terms of  
9  accomplishing the task.

10                   Without objection.

11                   All right.

12                   Is there anything more on scheduling?

13                   Item VI, public comment.

14                   If anyone wishes to speak to the  
15  Commission this evening that has not filled out a yellow  
16  speaker slip.

17                   MR. RIVERA:  Too late.

18                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  I invite to you do so.

19                   This is the time for consideration and  
20  discussion of comments and complaints from the public.  
21  Those wishing to address the Commission shall seek  
22  permission by filling out a speaker slip.  Anyone that  
23  has not done so, please do so and submit one as quickly  
24  as you can, please.  Action taken as a result public  
25  comment will be limited to directing staff to study the



1 matter, rescheduling the matter for future consideration  
2 at a later date unless the subject is already on the  
3 agenda for this date.

4 First speaker, Joseph Donaldson, Mayor,  
5 City of Flagstaff, representing the City Flagstaff.

6 Mr. Donaldson.

7 MAYOR DONALDSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
8 Commissioners. Thank you for sticking in there. This  
9 is quite a job.

10 There may be a misunderstanding of the  
11 official position of the City of Flagstaff and its  
12 communities of interest. I hope by the following to  
13 provide additional clarity to our official position and  
14 suggest there is opportunity for some configuration,  
15 refinement, by holding our communities of interest  
16 together and maintaining Flagstaff and its defined  
17 region whole.

18 Its important to state Flagstaff continues  
19 to stand on the importance of remaining whole and  
20 combining its communities of interest. Flagstaff is in  
21 the Northern Arizona Regional the hub. Flagstaff is the  
22 city with the greatest population. Flagstaff is the  
23 northern education center made up Northern Arizona  
24 University, Coconino Community College, Lowell  
25 Observatory, United States Geological Survey Institute,

1 the Internationally Renowned Museum of Northern Arizona.  
2 I don't tell you this as a tourism commercial, but to  
3 point out and emphasize the importance of Flagstaff to  
4 the region as an economic center, a rural economic area,  
5 the center of major natural resources, and home of  
6 cultural and local government considerations.

7                   When applying the rule of communities of  
8 interest in rural areas, not only must communities of  
9 interest be taken into consideration, but also the  
10 strength of a community when seen as the center of rural  
11 activity and unity.

12                   We respectfully request the Navajo Nation  
13 remain whole in and their request of Indian Nations to  
14 remain whole and united.

15                   The City of Flagstaff in applying the rule  
16 of communities of interest respectfully does not include  
17 the Navajo Nation as community of interest. The Navajo  
18 Nation respectfully does not include Flagstaff as a  
19 community of interest.

20                   Flagstaff considers communities of  
21 interest to include those communities that do not have a  
22 designation of a sovereign nation.

23                   Adopted District C continues to be the  
24 best configuration that might be able withstand some  
25 modification to meet other rules of Proposition 106 and

1 is certainly a configuration Flagstaff supports.

2 I think one of the overriding perspectives  
3 necessary for the Commissioners to apply is a view as a  
4 member of that configured group. When asked am I joined  
5 with communities of interest, if I am a small community  
6 of interest, does the configured group I'm joined with  
7 have political power to accomplish my communities needs?

8 On behalf of my City of Flagstaff, and as  
9 a representative of the citizens and Council of my  
10 community, and acting as a official voice of  
11 governmental leadership for our community of Flagstaff,  
12 I wish to reenter into the record my previously entered  
13 statements as a further clarification.

14 The Council supports the configuration  
15 figure of C from the 17 August map which closely meets  
16 the criteria of Proposition 106 which respects  
17 communities of interest in municipal regional  
18 boundaries.

19 One of the communities of interest the  
20 Flagstaff plan areas most closely identify with are the  
21 cities and towns of Verde Valley.

22 I thank you for the opportunity to comment  
23 and request additional comments are considered should  
24 the Commission weigh other district configurations. If  
25 the Commission should wish any clarification beyond

1 today, please call me.

2 Thank you. Have a nice evening.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mayor  
4 Donaldson.

5 Next speaker is Mark Fleisher. Mark  
6 Fleisher.

7 MR. FLEISHER: I want to speak on three,  
8 four issues in particular.

9 I requested at South Mountain, submitted a  
10 map, made comments.

11 The existing grid, first map put out,  
12 would make things more competitive, keep things  
13 bulletproof. One more competitive district.

14 I submitted a map on the 15th. On that  
15 map, there are three competitive districts, A, C, and H.  
16 Now, we also have three Republican districts, A, E, F,  
17 two Democratic districts, D, G, and E. When I submitted  
18 the map, all the districts, with footnote make changes  
19 with G and F, would continue to be -- G and F, would  
20 continue to be less than 50 percent if you took a  
21 majority party for every district. That meant minority  
22 parties, and the independent party, would equal 50  
23 percent or greater. That was one criteria for keeping  
24 them from being bulletproof. The cover letter had more  
25 fine-tuning, kept it under 55 percent. Fine-tuning kept

1 it from bulletproof.

2                   Map I submitted, all districts were less  
3 than 50 percent majority party. Two majority districts,  
4 D and G. And as I said, they became more competitive,  
5 70 percent. Some say not competitive. Some say it is.

6                   At a Congressional level, the problem I  
7 had in creating a new district, it's clear from the  
8 discussion today, personal agendas and some concepts  
9 have not been brought to this issue so far. And the  
10 fact there have been lots of criticisms in the way  
11 districts have been drawn, criticisms from the  
12 Commission, nobody said the Commission had one agenda  
13 from one party or another, or candidate, maps from one  
14 predetermined criteria set in place, not what results  
15 would be. People appreciated that and press appreciated  
16 it.

17                   To create that, people wonder what is the  
18 reason to change the district drastically, like the  
19 downtown district.

20                   I also think if want to try get this  
21 process done much quicker, I think it would be better if  
22 you guys talk, even in front of us, tell the consultants  
23 not what you're looking for, feel like you describe you  
24 want a cat. Like tell them to put Yavapai together.  
25 What everybody here is saying, not do a map with Yavapai

1 together, do an analysis. It takes so long, you  
2 probably would not support or want to have that  
3 discussion now. What you're leaning towards, you still  
4 have two, three alternatives, if that's what you need.

5                   Downtown interest, from somebody, see what  
6 effect that has. It makes sense to have that. Do  
7 analysis. There are a lot of things not to give  
8 consideration to.

9                   Really want them to spend 20 hours on  
10 competitiveness, 10, 20 hours considering something not  
11 appropriate?

12                   I was a little surprised, talked before,  
13 when talked before about competitiveness after the next  
14 round of discussions.

15                   Today the discussion, the only time here  
16 talking about competitiveness, talking about the  
17 downtown district and also coalition maps. There  
18 doesn't seem to be discussion on trying to make the  
19 districts competitive. Issues last on the map should  
20 have been cleaned up before, put out. I'd like to know  
21 when you'll actually be talking competitiveness. When  
22 looking at the final map a week from next Friday?

23                   It takes so long to do an analysis. I  
24 spent a number of hours. I sat down for probably 10  
25 hours total in front of maps, drew maps I haven't given

1 to you, maps on criteria I think answer problems.  
2 They're not perfect, could be changed, existing maps you  
3 supplied, moved boundaries, particularly using I-17 and  
4 10, reasonable boundaries to make decisions. Got all of  
5 500 votes, 500 registered, 500 population being within  
6 fine-tuning, maybe more than that, 500 population. Fit  
7 other criteria gave you. I think it can be done.

8 Say design a horse, committee comes out  
9 with a camel. Perhaps that's true. Come out and give  
10 instruction openly. What it accomplishes, maps might  
11 give better -- fewer maps to look at and have analyzed.

12 Final comment. I'm curious why the maps  
13 you determined today, looked at, mine was not one of  
14 them. I asked during break. It was one given. She  
15 said it was distributed to members. I'm concerned it  
16 was not one being considered. I'm not saying it was one  
17 that should be passed, should be considered, voted up or  
18 down. Nothing up there is one I submitted. I was  
19 discouraged by that.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Fleisher.

21 Last speaker, Judy Dworkin representing  
22 the Navajo Nation.

23 Ms. Dworkin.

24 Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and  
25 Commissioners.

1                   There are a number of points regarding the  
2 process which the Navajo Nation wishes to bring to the  
3 Commissions' attention this evening. The first point is  
4 that the maps that have been placed on the website,  
5 particularly most recently, scenario D, are not clear  
6 enough for members of the public to be able to make a  
7 determination whether certain particular communities are  
8 within or without districts.

9                   For example, in scenario D, it's not clear  
10 to the Navajos whether Flagstaff was in or out of the  
11 northern A districts. That's point one.

12                   Second point is that the Navajo Nation is  
13 very concerned about the consideration of the Navajo  
14 Hopi issues. This is, of course, not something that you  
15 haven't heard from the Navajo Nation before, but we are  
16 concerned, the Navajo Nation is concerned with comments,  
17 for example, of the artificial corridor, or that the  
18 Hopi does not care where they are placed. Navajo wants  
19 to be sure the Commissioners all understand that the  
20 Navajo Nation does care about the plans and does care  
21 about where it is placed and where other Native  
22 Americans are placed. The Navajo Nation feels that this  
23 is an opportunity to provide a strong Native American  
24 voting influence on their district and is concerned  
25 about efforts by the Commission not to support that



1 proposition.

2           In particular, as a previous speaker has  
3 noted, the Navajo Nation very early on in this process  
4 provided to the Commission maps on both Congressional  
5 and Legislative Districts, and to be honest, is very  
6 disappointed its maps were not selected, at least to be  
7 tested on these various alternatives, so that the  
8 Commission would have, as a whole, an opportunity to  
9 consider the Navajo Nation's proposals with all the  
10 testing that would be done for these other proposals.

11           The Navajo Nation is very respectful of  
12 the Commission and its tests, but it believes this  
13 should have been done with respect to the proposed map  
14 for each of the Legislative and Congressional Districts  
15 you have from almost day one.

16           The Navajo Nation is also disappointed the  
17 meeting that had been canceled because of the very  
18 tragic events of September 11th scheduled in Tuba City  
19 could not have been rescheduled. The opportunity for  
20 you to be able to hear what the Navajo people have to  
21 say about the redistricting effort is something that the  
22 Navajo Nation would have hoped the Commissioners would  
23 have reached out to do, particularly given the Navajo  
24 Nation and the members' difficulty of them to come to a  
25 location. That Tuba City meeting should have been

1 rescheduled.

2                   The Navajo Nation believes that the  
3 Commission has paid more attention to efforts or  
4 statements made by individuals and groups including some  
5 other Native Americans to remove Native Americans from  
6 the Northern District; for example, it seems to have  
7 paid more attention to Hopi, Salt River, and Fort  
8 McDowell being taken out of a district than it is with  
9 interests of Navajo to keep them in a district.

10                   In the situation of the efforts to remove  
11 Native American tribes, the removal of Salt River, Fort  
12 McDowell, and Hopi is removal of 10,694 Native  
13 Americans. Replacement was Fort Mojave Tribe,  
14 replacement of 360 Native Americans, a big tradeoff in  
15 Native American population by that movement. Navajo is  
16 interested in improving Native American influence.

17                   We believe only, on the Legislative front  
18 only, Legislative front attempts to do that, keeping  
19 Apache in, as Commissioners pointed out, F2, we  
20 certainly are glad that did not come out tonight and  
21 look forward to analysis that will be done on that.

22                   Thank you all for listening to my  
23 comments.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you very much.

25                   Any other member of the public wishing to

1 be heard at this time?

2 Any other Members of the Commission?

3 Consultants?

4 Legal counsel?

5 Commission is adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

6 (Whereupon, the hearing concluded at

7 approximately 9:29 p.m.)

8

9

\* \* \* \*

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF ARIZONA )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona, Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 243 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all done to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any way interested in the outcome hereof.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 25th day of October, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_  
LISA A. NANCE, RPR  
Certified Court Reporter  
Certificate Number 50349

