

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

Tucson, Arizona  
August 16, 2001  
9:30 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 August 16,  
3       2001, at 9:30 o'clock a.m., at the Double Tree Hotel  
4       Resort, Boojum Room, at Reid Park, 445 South Alvernon  
5       Way, Tucson, Arizona, 85711, in the presence of:

6

7       APPEARANCES:

8                   CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN

9                   COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK

10                  COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL

11                  COMMISSIONER ANDI E. MINKOFF

12                  COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

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

APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

- ADOLFO ECHEVESTES, Executive Director
- AMY REZZONICO, Press Information Officer
- LISA T. HAUSER, Commission Counsel
- JOSE de JESUS RIVERA, Commission Counsel
- DR. ALAN HESLOP, NDC, Consultant
- DR. FLORENCE ADAMS, NDC, Consultant
- MARGUERITE MARY LEONI, NDC Counsel
- DOUG JOHNSON, NDC, Consultant
- CHRIS HUTCHISON, NDC, Support Staff
- TIM JOHNSON, MC, Computer Consultant
- LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Court Reporter

AGENDA DESIGNATED SPEAKERS:

- DR. FLORENCE ADAMS
- MARGUERITE MARY LEONI

1

2

SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

3

4

5

REPRESENTATIVE MARION PICKENS

6

SALOMON R. BALDENEGRO

7

FRANK SEANEZ

8

DORA VASQUEZ

9

REPRESENTATIVE MARK CLARK

10

CAROL SHEARER

11

WALKER SMITH

12

RICHARD E. GREEN

13

RICHARD G. SALAZ

14

RON KINGSBURY

15

COUNCILPERSON BOB MITCHELL

16

JIM PEDERSON

17

STEVE GALLARDO

18

CARLOS GALOUN SALAZ

19

JIM HARTDEGEN

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3 SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC (CONT'D):

4

5 ANNE MURRAY

6 GARY BOHNEE

7 CECILIA CRUZ

8 SALOMON R. BALDENEGRO

9 FRANK SEANEZ

10 BILL DUPONT

11 WALKER SMITH

12 PAUL MACKEY

13 STEVE GALLARDO

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

Public Session  
Tucson, Arizona  
August 16, 2001  
9:30 o'clock a.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I could ask the  
Commissioners to take their seats, we'll start the  
meeting.

I'd like to call the meeting of the  
Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

Mr. Turney, are you able to hear me well  
in back? I'm not, we'll be able to tell.

Let the record reflect all five members of  
the Commission are present.

Let the record reflect that Tucson has  
shown a great deal of interest in our process. We have  
a terrific gathering this morning.

We're very appreciative all of you have  
come out. As is our custom, we'll have public comment  
at the beginning and end of our meeting.

If you do wish to speak and have not yet  
filled out a yellow speaker slip, I'll ask you to do so.

If you've not yet filled out that slip,  
staff will pass them out.

1                   Let me make a couple comments before we  
2 begin public comment. I'd like to, for all your  
3 information and the record, let everyone know where we  
4 are in the process.

5                   Today it is our hope, whether this meeting  
6 ends sometime today or tomorrow, we will have adopted  
7 draft maps, one Congressional and one Legislative. I  
8 want to emphasize these drafts are drafts. They are not  
9 perfect. They will not pass all the tests they need to.  
10 That's not the intent at this stage in the process. The  
11 purpose at this stage in the process is so the public  
12 will have another opportunity to comment at this stage  
13 in the process.

14                   At the end of the process, the Commission  
15 will again meet at the end in very lengthy session to  
16 take all comment into consideration and take into  
17 account all comment into account.

18                   To that end, all those seeking to comment  
19 this afternoon and at the end, because of the number of  
20 people speaking, I'd ask you to try to limit your  
21 comments to three minutes each. We'll not be strict  
22 about that, but we have a lot of work today and we want  
23 to balance public input at this juncture with the amount  
24 of work we have to do with the Congressional and  
25 Legislative mapping.

1                   The second thing I have is if you have  
2                   specific comments about very small pieces of the maps,  
3                   that is this particular boundary should be one street  
4                   over or this particular line should go one other place,  
5                   that comment is perfectly fine; but understand those  
6                   kind of adjustments may not be made at this point in the  
7                   process. They will be taken into account to fine-tune  
8                   all of the districts we've drawn.

9                   At the point we are satisfied as a  
10                  Commission we have taken all that comment into account,  
11                  we will then adopt final maps than then will be  
12                  submitted into the Department of Justice for review.  
13                  That is about a month away.

14                  That being said, public comment: This is  
15                  the time for consideration and discussion of comments  
16                  and complaints from the public. those wishing to  
17                  address the commission shall request permission in  
18                  advance by filling out a speaker slip. action taken as  
19                  a result of public comment will be limited to directing  
20                  staff to study the matter or rescheduling the matter for  
21                  further consideration and decision at a later date  
22                  unless it is the subject of an item already on the  
23                  agenda.

24                  MR. ECHEVESTE: I have a handout submitted  
25                  to me, submitted by Ken Bennett, State Senator. I'd



1 like to include this for the record.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Echeveste.  
3 It will be made a part of the record and made available  
4 to each Commissioner.

5 Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The first person wishing  
7 then to, the person speaking first, is Representative  
8 Marion Pickens, State Representative, and representing  
9 herself.

10 Ms. Pickens.

11 REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would each speaker, for  
13 the purpose of the public hearing, if you would, state,  
14 and if it's not absolutely obvious, spell your name.

15 REPRESENTATIVE PICKENS: Representative  
16 Marion Pickens, P I C K E N S.

17 I'm representing myself.

18 This is the first opportunity I've had to  
19 be at a Commission meeting. I appreciate you all coming  
20 down to Tucson so I can participate.

21 I'm really speaking for myself because I  
22 have lived in Tucson now for 40 years. I feel I'm very  
23 much a part of this community and have looked at and  
24 been a part of the whole political process that has  
25 taken place for a number of years, even having run for

1 office myself.

2                   There is something very different about  
3 Tucson and Pima County. We haven't gone through the  
4 Baja Arizona revolt for nothing. Other than the fact we  
5 view issues very seriously down here, we want people to  
6 view the City Council, Board of Supervisors, and  
7 represent the views we have here in this community.

8                   Community is very important to us, to be  
9 sure we have people elected that can represent our  
10 issues, not necessarily parties, issues important here  
11 in this community.

12                   I believe you have done, as I have been  
13 getting information from my staff as to how you are  
14 dividing the Legislative Districts, you are certainly  
15 taking into consideration Hispanic minority interests,  
16 making sure that they have some geographical  
17 compactness. I don't believe you really addressed the  
18 whole issue on competitive districts.

19                   It is the competitive issues down here  
20 that allow us to elect people on issues.

21                   I guess the old, now, District 13 is a  
22 perfect example on that. That has not been particularly  
23 Republican or Democrat. It's represented by people that  
24 feel very strongly on issues in the community and feel  
25 strongly on issues.

1                   As you are looking now, as you are going  
2 to fine-tune Legislative Districts, particularly here in  
3 Pima County, please look at how we make sure the issues  
4 of the community can be represented in the Legislature  
5 through those competitive districts, which is how I hope  
6 the district is now going to be drawn.

7                   Thank you very much.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative  
9 Pickens.

10                  The next person I have wishing to speak,  
11 Salomon Baldenegro, Chair of the Chicano Consortium for  
12 Public Issues.

13                  MR. BALDENEGRO: Mr. Chairman,  
14 Commissioners, I want to address a couple things.  
15 Congressional issues.

16                  District G, on behalf of the Chicano  
17 Consortium for Public Issues, I submitted a map that  
18 argued the case that District G should be, what you call  
19 District G, we call District Two, that the whole border  
20 constitutes a community of interest. And the map we  
21 submitted, substantively what is District G, your  
22 District G covers now, except your District G does not  
23 include the lower part of Cochise County, the Douglas  
24 County, ours does. We argued, we'll argue, the entire  
25 border from Douglas constitutes a viable community.

1                   The Douglas border issues are extremely  
2 important, a viable issue. To divide, somehow magically  
3 say the Douglas border issues are separate from these  
4 issues, or should have a different voice represent been  
5 them, simply from our standpoint is not a viable thing  
6 to do.

7                   We continue to argue the case the entire  
8 border should continue to be included in District G.

9                   I think the statistical manipulations that  
10 have to be done would be minor enough to not cause --  
11 not be disastrous to the rest of the districts.

12                   On the Legislative side of it, looking at  
13 the Legislative side of it, what we call District 10, I  
14 couldn't make out what you call them over here, we have  
15 letters for them, I think District U, what we call  
16 District U, I think you know what it is over here, the  
17 south side of Tucson, south central part of Tucson.  
18 Historically it has been, historically it's been a very  
19 cohesive part of Tucson. That south central part of  
20 Tucson should remain in what was District 10, what we  
21 call District 10, you call whatever you call it.

22                   A d the west side of Tucson is also a  
23 traditional part, viable community part of interest that  
24 should also be kept together.

25                   The way it looks now, you've taken part

1 central part of Tucson and stuck it into the western  
2 part Tucson. While there are some commonalities between  
3 the two areas, historically, traditionally, it's a much  
4 stronger part of the sense of the south central part of  
5 Tucson and it makes much more sense to be in part,  
6 District 10, than District 11. The south central part  
7 of 10 has been small very cohesive community  
8 historically, has been in District 10, an agra District  
9 10, for that matter.

10 I see south Tucson, south central 10 in  
11 11, and I think you should reconsider that.

12 Look at the south side of Tucson, south  
13 central side of Tucson as a viable historically cohesive  
14 part of Tucson. Look at those sides.

15 That would make better sense for  
16 candidates running for office, people developing  
17 historical voting patterns, voting patterns, race  
18 issues.

19 If you do that kind of tweaking, again, it  
20 would not be disastrous, not entail monumental changes  
21 that have far-reaching ramifications. Tweaking can be  
22 done and should be done.

23 Speaking from a community of interchange  
24 point, I want to reiterate, the border should be one  
25 continuous border of interest. It is that in reality.

1 Chopping it off Sierra Vista, or whatever the line is,  
2 is an artificial boundary.

3 I think the border, which has been done  
4 way before we have, obviously, the reality is those  
5 issues are there. And to chop it off arbitrarily is  
6 artificial manipulation and doesn't make sense.

7 To reiterate, go back and maintain the  
8 south side of Tucson, south side the Tucson, what we  
9 call District 10. Maintain the south central side as a  
10 viable community of interest.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Baldenegro

12 Next speaker, Mr. Seanez, representing the  
13 Navajo Nation.

14 Mr. Seanez.

15 MR. SEANEZ: Good morning, Chairman Lynn,  
16 Members of the Commission.

17 The Navajo Nation is here again to speak  
18 to the Congressional District and Legislative District.  
19 The Navajo Nation is viewing the Congressional District  
20 as an improvement over the original, the original grid,  
21 as well as the first draft which was released on August  
22 the 9th. However, the gerrymander which is indicated on  
23 the draft map for the exclusion of Hopi from the same  
24 Congressional District from the Navajo Nation has merely  
25 changed shape. Now we have the flying giraffe there.

1 And the Navajo Nation is here to recommend the beheading  
2 of the flying giraffe.

3 We don't believe the Navajo Nation should  
4 be separated from Hopi Nation. It's diluted the Native  
5 Americans from the voting population. It's innumerical,  
6 and we're here to advocate with the Commission to make  
7 that additional change before adoption of the  
8 Congressional map.

9 The Navajo Nation as well is here to  
10 address concerns with the Congressional District even as  
11 it has been modified.

12 For discussion purposes, at the Phoenix  
13 meetings, the percentages of 64 percent and considerably  
14 less, and that assumes 12 percent Native American voting  
15 ages is still a percent less than the bench mark of  
16 Native Americans, less than the Native Americans in  
17 District Three voting age.

18 We believe the Commission can address the  
19 Americans voting age.

20 First, which Legislative District the Hopi  
21 nation, 7,000 individuals, or approximately three  
22 percent of voting district, we understand that there are  
23 intersections of other communities of interest,  
24 especially the southeastern part of the state; however,  
25 the adjustment of what we refer to as the EACO district

1 may be required in order to increase the native  
2 population, Native American voting Americans through the  
3 White Mountain Apache Tribe and San Carlos Apache Tribe,  
4 especially if the Commission is not to see clear to have  
5 the Hopi Tribe to see clear into the Navajo Tribe,  
6 especially for voting preclearance. Navajo sees other  
7 alternatives available to address the percentage number,  
8 one being possible exclusion of New Kingman Butler and  
9 Kingman from the proposed Legislative District, high,  
10 relatively high numbers of voters and very low numbers  
11 of Native Americans.

12 We don't believe exclusion of Kingman by  
13 itself will be sufficient. We believe it will also have  
14 to be addressed primarily through the addition of the  
15 Hopi tribe to the Legislative District. But also we  
16 encourage the Commission to look at other options  
17 involving San Carlos and White Mountain Apache Tribes,  
18 if that becomes necessary, and the Commission does not  
19 see it possible to redraft in the way we're suggesting.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

21 I ask, because the room is so small, if  
22 you have a cellphone, turn it off or put it on stun, one  
23 of the two.

24 The second thing, if anyone is standing in  
25 the seats to the far side of the room, that would be



1 your seat.

2 Next speaker, Dora Vasquez, representing  
3 the Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP.

4 MS. VASQUEZ: I'm here on behalf of the  
5 Pinal Hispanic Forum and Pinal NAACP. I'm here for the  
6 Pinal Coalition on Redistricting.

7 The Pinal Redistricting maps best  
8 represents, in addition, the Pinal Legislative District  
9 not only interests the Hispanic community, it also  
10 interests the native communities. The City of Casa  
11 Grande wishes to be kept in a district without being  
12 divided into two districts. The coalition map does just  
13 this. The Hispanic Coalition plan as submitted keeps  
14 the City of Casa Grande within one Legislative District.  
15 Even more important, it keeps the American Indian  
16 Hispanic population within city in the district. It  
17 reflects a community of interest, reflects the American  
18 and Hispanic in the district, and reflects other  
19 districts.

20 As you drive down Interstate 10, you'll  
21 see the Casa Grande area is rapidly changing  
22 traditionally. It's an agricultural community changing  
23 to a bedroom community, new homes being built daily.

24 The Pinal Hispanic Community Forum and  
25 Pinal NAACP want to assure this rapid development does

1 not infringe on the needs and developments of the  
2 long-term residents that need to assure transportation  
3 and social services are readily available to the elderly  
4 and need to assure education needs of the children are  
5 addressed at the Legislature.

6 We strongly support the Gila River Indian  
7 requests that the district be drawn as it joins the  
8 rural communities of Gila, the Fort McDowell  
9 communities, Ak-Chin Indians, and also request Ak-Chin  
10 not be divided at State Route 77, and the mining  
11 communities be included.

12 The Arizona Independent Redistricting  
13 Community plan increases retrogression for a planned  
14 Commission to represent the concerns and not compliance  
15 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The Voting Rights Act  
16 prohibits can't sell out and minimize the voting rights  
17 acts which are minimized, specifically, to dilute the  
18 voting rights of the American Indian Hispanic community  
19 which historically existed and provided sufficient  
20 registration to elect a party, the voting priority  
21 Legislative district as submitted by the Hispanic  
22 Coalition.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If you have those comments  
24 in writing, we'd be happy to take a copy, if you'd like  
25 to submit them.

1 Thank you very much.

2 Next speaker, Mark Clark, representing  
3 himself.

4 Representative Clark.

5 REPRESENTATIVE CLARK: Mark Clark,  
6 representing himself.

7 To let you know, and the audience as well,  
8 as well as you know, this is one of the first  
9 opportunities we've had to make and have an opportunity  
10 to make our districts competitive. I think that through  
11 that, it is a unique opportunity.

12 In the past, we basically have had to  
13 basically draw the lines, which I think has been okay.  
14 But for this committee, one of the best opportunities  
15 that we do have is to do just what I said, be able to  
16 let more people have an impact as to which district,  
17 instead of before, through what I've been able to see,  
18 in my own campaign, I've had to basically go and ask for  
19 votes. People generally tell me, you are Democrat, A  
20 Republican will win. You are in District Seven. I'm  
21 Republican. It's a Republican district. I'll win.  
22 Redistricting this way, it's a better opportunity to  
23 assure the best candidate will win. Through my eyes, as  
24 a freshman in the Legislature this session, with an  
25 opportunity to see a unique situation the Senate had, a

1 15-15 split, I think, you know, through that, we had  
2 some good legislation passed. It was where not only a  
3 certain group, the majority of the Senate was there, or  
4 whatever, it wasn't a specific group of people making  
5 legislation, all people. All senators were able to come  
6 to the table and had a voice. That produced a lot of  
7 good legislation.

8                   If you take, for example, the House of  
9 Representatives, we have a 37-23 split. In that, I  
10 think that there was only certain people making and  
11 passing legislation. I think it was one-sided at some  
12 times. If we, through redistricting this way, we'll be  
13 able to make our districts competitive, actually be able  
14 to bring more people of either an equal amount of  
15 Democrats or equal amount of Republicans on either side  
16 of the table, give us an even balance, a better balance.

17                   The main issue I have is basically  
18 reassuring. Hopefully you reassure districts are  
19 competitive, not lopsided. That's the major purpose,  
20 hopefully the issue of redistricting this way. When on  
21 the floor, it makes a huge difference, because we do  
22 have an opportunity to come to the table and give our  
23 input and feel like people are listening to you, how  
24 laws are made in the State of Arizona.

25                   Everybody, the team you have, everybody

1 has input. You have input on either side.

2                   Hopefully the redistricting, we can have  
3 that.

4                   I think another issue that I see, through  
5 my district, is we have a unique district, a lot of  
6 small towns. And small towns generally have been  
7 grouped together.

8                   I think than during the map I saw, it had  
9 my district as District Seven B, basically, in between  
10 Phoenix and Tucson. Now my district would go into  
11 Tucson taking Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke,  
12 going back toward Manuel, Oro Valley, and going back to  
13 Casa Grande, Apache Junction. If a person has part of  
14 the rural area, it would be hard for them to legislate  
15 because of factors. You would be passing legislation  
16 trying to add road improvements, pulling money from one  
17 side to the other. For people, and actually in the  
18 interests of the people, it would be better served if  
19 they had a representative basically representing a group  
20 of people that had a set of interests. Shifting from  
21 having two representing Tucson, representing a town like  
22 San Manuel would be extremely hard. Not only the  
23 people's interests, from the standpoint of interests,  
24 that would be a consideration I hope you take into  
25 consideration. I don't know what else I could tell you.

1 I don't know what else I could tell you, how policy is  
2 set and policy is made. It will be interesting.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative  
4 Clark.

5 Again, if you filled out a slip and want  
6 to speak at the morning session, there will be another  
7 session this afternoon. Please fill out a slip and hold  
8 it up. If at all possible, limit your comments to  
9 roughly a three-minute period.

10 Carol Shearer, League of Women Voters,  
11 representing the Greater Metropolitan Tucson.

12 Ms. Shearer.

13 MS. SHEARER: Good morning.

14 My name is Carol Shearer, S H A E R E R.  
15 I'm President of the League of Women Voters of Greater  
16 Tucson.

17 I'd like to thank all the Commissioners  
18 for doing a very difficult job. The League of Women  
19 Voters was very involved in collecting signatures for  
20 Prop 106. In collecting signatures, one of the most  
21 appealing points was the competitive part of the  
22 districts. I'd like to remind you, that was what the  
23 citizens felt. I think that's what many other leagers  
24 feel.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Shearer.

1                   Next speaker, Mr. Walker Smith, principal  
2 planner for the City of South Tucson.

3                   Mr. Smith.

4                   MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
5 Commissioners.

6                   At your hearing at Desert Vista Campus and  
7 the Pima Community Campus, we asked you to consider the  
8 community of interest for Tucson. I want to say a few  
9 more words about that, considering a few more remarks  
10 about Mr. Baldenegro.

11                   The community of interests of South Tucson  
12 go basically north and east. The current map for South  
13 Tucson goes east in Tucson on an east line to 12th  
14 Avenue and the Freeway. And historically south of  
15 downtown it's the west side of the river. The east side  
16 of the river tends to be a community of interest. It  
17 would be more natural to go east, perhaps toward the  
18 mainland of the railroad.

19                   The railroad is the east boundary of the  
20 Tucson, is a single track. Many years ago the railroad  
21 families settled on both sides of that single line  
22 railroad track and there continue to be families on both  
23 sides.

24                   South Tucson's relationship marks the  
25 family, the urban league. This is more than just a

1 single ethnic consideration. And we would ask you to  
2 consider those kind of factors in the community of  
3 interest for South Tucson on the south side of Tucson  
4 issue as you move forward in your deliberations.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker is  
6 Richard E. Green, representative of EAHEA.

7 Mr. Green.

8 MR. GREEN: Yes, I'm Richard Green. I  
9 live in Superior, Arizona. I'd like to speak on behalf  
10 of myself.

11 I'm a member of the KARA Board which  
12 represents low income people from Pinal County. I'd  
13 like to see the community of interest from Pinal County  
14 be kept as whole as possible. The way they have it on  
15 the latest map I see cuts Pinal County into four  
16 districts. We've been cut up into districts before. I  
17 don't think this serves the people of Pinal people very  
18 well.

19 Mr. Kingsbury will have a map to present  
20 to you. I support the map he presents.

21 Thank you very much.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Green.

23 The next speaker is Richard Salaz  
24 representing himself.

25 Mr. Salaz.



1 MR. SALAZ: Thank you. Good morning.

2 S A L A Z.

3 I've been a resident of the City of Tucson  
4 since my birth. I'd like to reiterate what  
5 Mr. Baldenegro, Walker, and Green said, Pueblo Hills,  
6 South Central, South Tucson, and the southern part of  
7 Tucson are more a community of interest with us than the  
8 west Tucson mountains. And I think, if I read your map  
9 correctly, there is a little dog leg that goes all the  
10 way up to Marana. I assure you there is not a whole lot  
11 of community of interest with the Town of Marana, even  
12 though we have a lot of good friends up there.

13 I would like to keep as much of District  
14 10 that we have now. It encompasses all of District 10,  
15 goes eastward and southbound. It has been there 30 some  
16 odd years, I believe. I've been involved a little bit  
17 in politics, am not a politician by nature. I follow  
18 whatever concerns I have directly.

19 Consider keeping District 10 as much  
20 intact as possible. Like in a walker, keeping it right  
21 now, it's not a single ethnic group we're talking about,  
22 it's a multi-ethnic community, South Tucson, the south  
23 Air Park Council, South Air Park Gardens. We'd like you  
24 to keep it as impact as possible.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next speaker, Mr. Ron

1 Kingsbury, Chairman of the Pinal County Democrats.

2 MR. KING: I guess I'm down low again.

3 I'm Ron Kingsbury, K I N G S B U R Y.

4 I'm representing the Pinal County  
5 Democrats, representing the Pinal County people, not  
6 just Democrats.

7 One of the things that very much concerns  
8 me, Pinal County has been a splinter of the State of  
9 Arizona. We're the one being squeezed between Maricopa  
10 and Pima County. What has happened through the history  
11 of Arizona, Pinal County has been, if we need votes,  
12 we'll grab part of Pinal County. We've really not had  
13 fair representation through Pinal County.

14 Redistricting, I thought had been a goal  
15 of bringing ahead, bringing the county together, so we'd  
16 have voice in the legislature and everything. As we  
17 had, we had six splits during the redistricting. When I  
18 look at maps, it's down to three.

19 My question to the Commission is why are  
20 we being split all together? We have 179,000 population  
21 in Pinal County. We are diversified, all walks of life,  
22 Native Americans, all walks of life, working together as  
23 whole. Our County Commissioners sent letters to the  
24 Commissioners explaining why the Apache Junction, Gold  
25 Canyon, should be part of our Legislature instead of

1 being City of Mesa, or that end. We have always been  
2 handed what is left or taken from us. And I think it's  
3 time that Pinal County be recognized as a legitimate  
4 entity to the State of Arizona instead of being a step  
5 child of everybody that grabs us.

6 I have a map here that I would like to  
7 present to you as to what I feel and we have been  
8 talking about for the -- during the last part of  
9 redistricting. I have a map I'll give you.

10 Nothing like getting them all mixed up.

11 On the map you will see, if I can point  
12 out some of the things on the map, that what we have  
13 done is included all minorities, the Indian nation.

14 I was talking to, just before I got a  
15 chance and the meeting started, looking at our map, the  
16 Hispanic and -- they are very agreeable with our map.  
17 The only question they asked, what they add to the map,  
18 if we could go above Apache Junction and take in the  
19 Gila River Reservation, Fort McDowell and that, as part  
20 of that. They would like to be part of that.

21 If you look at our map, we have the whole  
22 Pinal County as a district. We have dropped out Oracle  
23 on that map because of the figure of the -- the  
24 population figure. But if you look at it, the Oracle  
25 area is more or less part of the Tucson area and that

1 way.

2                   If you look, we are including San Manuel,  
3 everything. We are making our county a district or  
4 everything, whatever it is, whether Democrat,  
5 Republican, whatever Democrat, creed, whatever, so we  
6 have a speaking in the Legislature.

7                   My district, District Four, takes Gold  
8 Canyon, not Supreme Valley, as put in the -- during the  
9 report, all the way up to Utah, St. Johns, and  
10 everything.

11                   Our representation has always been from  
12 that area.

13                   District Seven comes into our area, but  
14 more or less the southeastern part of Pinal valley.

15                   What we'd like to do, our plans, and what  
16 we were asking the Commission, please consider, we would  
17 like to be whole instead of split so we have a voice in  
18 the Legislature and state government.

19                   Tucson, I came to Tucson in 1946. My dad  
20 was stationed at Mammoth Air Base. Tucson was a resort  
21 town, a mission, and growing in its right to ask for  
22 representation. Pinal has the right to ask for  
23 representation.

24                   Thank you for listening.

25                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.

1 We will take that map and make it part of the record.

2 The next speaker is Mr. Bob Mitchell, a  
3 speaker for the City of Casa Grande.

4 Mr. Mitchell.

5 MR. ECHEVESTE: Excuse me, sir. Can we  
6 have that?

7 A VOICE: Ron wants this one back.

8 COUNCILMEMBER MITCHELL: Excuse me,  
9 Mr. Chairman,

10 Commissioners, it's a pleasure to address  
11 you. I had an opportunity to address you when you were  
12 in Casa Grande earlier in the process. While I'd like  
13 to support the earlier map when you were in Casa Grande,  
14 and looking at this map when I just saw of Pinal map I  
15 don't know if it would be a bad map either. I don't  
16 know if it would be bad to have the worst of all world's  
17 in the map you now created, which includes the cities of  
18 Florence, Coolidge, Eloy, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Tohono  
19 O'odham, Eloy, Ak-Chin, those put together, many  
20 communities of interest we originally talked about, 80  
21 percent of dairies in state one area, most feed lots in  
22 one area. It does create an agricultural area of  
23 interest in one area, Gila Bend as well as Western Pinal  
24 County. It does in fact keep all school districts in  
25 Western Pinal County in one school area, and does keep

1 most Hispanics and Native Americans into a district,  
2 which is a part of our minority-majority district at  
3 that time. It also creates an industrial corridor for  
4 the western part of Pinal County going down to the  
5 south. So the areas of interest that have been put  
6 together by this map that have been submitted, while  
7 certainly not my first choice, is certainly a map of  
8 merit keeping the western Pinal areas, communities of  
9 interest, and as a cohesive map or Legislative District  
10 that would represent Casa Grande.

11 As I indicated before, we've before been  
12 split several different directions. I applaud the  
13 Commission keeping these areas of interest together.  
14 This is an improvement we never -- we haven't had and  
15 certainly appreciate.

16 Again, I want to thank you for the job you  
17 are doing and the opportunity to speak before you.

18 If there is some area of interest I've not  
19 mentioned, I apologize. I think overall, the concerns  
20 we have have been met by this map that was submitted.

21 Again, my first interest is to keep Pinal  
22 County whole. Second, look at the map we submitted  
23 originally in Casa Grande; and, thirdly, the map  
24 submitted.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you Councilmember

1 Mitchell. Appreciate you being here today.

2 The next speaker is Mr. Pederson. I take  
3 it from your slip you are representing yourself.

4 MR. PEDERSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You are representing  
6 yourself.

7 MR. PEDERSON: Yes. I represent myself  
8 also. I represent Mr. Pederson and am Chairman of the  
9 Fair Redistricting Campaign.

10 Those people came together for one  
11 purpose, that's to insure every vote counts in Arizona.  
12 We came out with a number of criteria for drawing a  
13 number of legislative redistricting lines.

14 I want to compliment the Commission. If  
15 this initiative would not have been passed, our  
16 legislature would be doing this in the basement of the  
17 Capitol, not in the open, in public, not subject to open  
18 scrutiny. Thank you.

19 Mr. Chairman, thank you members of  
20 Commission.

21 Involving the criteria as to how we  
22 arrived at Congressional and Legislative Districts,  
23 there were a total of five criteria. Certainly  
24 compliance with the Voting Rights Act, certainly that's  
25 number one. The Arizona history with regard to Voting

1 Rights Act, there have been many, many infringements of  
2 the Voting Rights Act. Arizona is on the Department of  
3 Justice Watch List, one of the few states on the watch  
4 list at the US Department of Justice. Other criteria  
5 are geographical compactness to respect communities of  
6 interest. We have to take all of those into account and  
7 come up with that definition, respect for natural  
8 boundaries. You've heard testimony as to how counties  
9 have been split up.

10 I went to my high school reunion. I was  
11 born and raised in the city of Casa Grande. That city  
12 was split three years ago into three Legislative  
13 Districts, Jim, I live on one side of the street. My  
14 neighbor on the other side of the street. And that  
15 legislative line goes right down the middle of our  
16 street. If you take into account respect for natural  
17 boundaries, communities of interest, we all know that's  
18 direct violation.

19 I'd also like to spotlight another  
20 criteria we debated at some length when coming up with  
21 specific language in 106, and that's competitiveness.  
22 We've all heard the stories of people frustrated their  
23 vote doesn't count living in lopsided district. I live  
24 in a lopsided district. I'm sure most people in this  
25 room live in lopsided districts. Either Republicans or



1 Democrats dominate that room. Most districts  
2 congressional or legislative, are lopsided. Our basic  
3 conclusion was as long as the other criteria were  
4 satisfied, the main ones here, Voting Rights Act,  
5 compactness, competitiveness, to raise that to the same  
6 priority, as long as it has no detrimental effect to  
7 that of the other criteria -- now there are a number of  
8 ways, a number of opportunities throughout the state  
9 where competitive districts could be formulated.  
10 Naturally, we're not going to make North Scottsdale safe  
11 for Democrats and we'll not make South Tucson safe for  
12 Republicans. There are many parts of the state where  
13 drawing of lines -- through drawing of lines they can be  
14 made competitive.

15 What is competitive statewide?

16 Five percent differential through  
17 Democrats and Republicans giving Republicans, current  
18 Congressional, is favoring Republicans, Legislative  
19 Districts has 19 percent difference. Now, in our  
20 campaign, we emphasized everyone's right to vote. We  
21 said when you go into a voting booth, you should have  
22 more than one person to vote for.

23 We have a history of voting being decided  
24 in primaries, voting being the coronation of the  
25 election of the primary. We do not have to sacrifice

1 elections. Our party suggested how this can be done  
2 with respect to rural interests, with respect to urban  
3 interests, and at the same time have a minority map.  
4 They are not mutually exclusive. It can be done. You  
5 do not have to sacrifice the voting franchise of one  
6 part of the community to achieve the voting franchise of  
7 another person in another part of the community.

8                   Our efforts during the year passing  
9 Proposition 106 created promises. We feel the most  
10 basic part of the proposition is to achieve each  
11 proposition so we craft it such that it keeps the  
12 promise we craft that when we make a promise, the  
13 biggest promise is competitive campaigns, strong  
14 discussion of issues.

15                   Chairman Lynn mentioned, this is a draft.  
16 We consider it only halfway through process. When the  
17 Commission draft plan's complete, I expect we'll have  
18 districts fair with one another. One without the other  
19 is another broken promise without the other.

20                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Pederson.

21                   I have two more slips available. If  
22 others wish to speak, get those to staff. We'll  
23 accommodate you.

24                   Next is Steve Gallardo representing the  
25 Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

1 Mr. Gallardo.

2 MR. GALLARDO: Good morning, Chairman,  
3 Members of the Commission.

4 First of all, the Coalition would commend  
5 the Commission and the Commission's work they've done so  
6 far, during the weekend's marathon, and commend you for  
7 the work you've done so far.

8 The Coalition would like to request the  
9 Commission refer back to the Coalition's map submitted  
10 on July 16th. This map was based on 13 different  
11 illustrations of communities of interest. These  
12 illustrations were presented to you at the South Phoenix  
13 public hearing, and we'd request the Commission look at  
14 the Maricopa County districts, refer back to our map  
15 when creating the Maricopa County districts.

16 We'd request the Maricopa County area be  
17 created for a minority-majority district. This allows  
18 us to maximize minority voting strength. There are some  
19 concerns with Legislative District P, I believe, on the  
20 proposed map. There are a couple areas that when  
21 looking at the maps, or the illustrations of community  
22 of interest, they do not fall on our maps as communities  
23 of interest. And there are areas which are considered  
24 communities of interest that do not fall on any of the  
25 proposed communities of interest. We'd ask that

1 interest be looked at and be drawn up where it need full  
2 phases on communities of interest.

3 Also, with respect to come District D, I  
4 believe, the South Phoenix community of interest,  
5 looking at communities of interest presented, the area I  
6 believe of 24th Street and Camelback area, that does not  
7 meet any of the 13 communities of interest. And we  
8 would ask that changes be made to this congressional  
9 area. There's a southern part of Glendale that does  
10 meet communities of interest and ask you take a look at  
11 that, and again, maximizing the strength of the minority  
12 vote in the minority county.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Gallardo.

14 The last speaker slip I have, Carlos  
15 Salaz, vice president of an organization, SOAR.

16 Mr. Salaz.

17 MR. SALAZ: My name is Carlos Salaz.

18 I was born in South Tucson. As has been  
19 mentioned a lot here, and my opinion is try to leave  
20 District 10, District 11, as much as possible, the way  
21 it is now. I believe with the comments of my brother  
22 Baldenegro, and Walker, and Green, we're retired  
23 brothers, steel workers, Hispanic retirees.

24 We're barely getting in the picture here  
25 on redistricting. I have no idea what you are talking

1 about on redistricting. I'd like to get information,  
2 maps, so I can make a good decision if you guys are  
3 doing a good job or not. I believe you are doing a good  
4 job, but I hear there's areas where they could be left  
5 alone, maybe jump into another area. I don't know. But  
6 as a citizen I'm asking information so I can make a wise  
7 decision, so not just going on information, wise man,  
8 like to have a fax machine, fax whatever you can.  
9 This is my first meeting with the Commission. It's my  
10 fault. I didn't know where your meetings were being  
11 held and where. But I believe that the person that has  
12 spoken on the area of District 10 and District 11, I  
13 believe they should be -- if you could leave it as it  
14 is, I would appreciate it, if you could have that into  
15 consideration.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Salaz.

17 Are there any other members of the public  
18 wishing to be heard at this time?

19 If not, we'll close public comment for the  
20 early session. We'll again have public comment for  
21 later in the meeting or again if public comment will go  
22 to a later session.

23 Thank you again for the public comment at  
24 a later time.

25 Item three. Item three is presentation by

1 NDC, discussion and possible decision concerning  
2 development and adoption of draft Congressional and  
3 Legislative maps.

4 I believe this presentation refers to  
5 legislative mapping.

6 Is there any comment from the Commission  
7 with respect to the Congressional maps.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would  
9 like to make a motion we accept the maps on the  
10 Congressional maps as they presently exist.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, in  
15 passing this motion, are we saying this is only the  
16 draft maps we'll send out for public comment?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct. I understand the  
18 motion to mean every map we approve up to and during the  
19 approval is a draft. This is the draft we'll use for  
20 the purpose of securing the public comment period.

21 I might also point out under Proposition  
22 106, there is a 30-day fixed public comment period when  
23 the draft maps have been developed. Public comment  
24 period will begin as soon as draft maps have been  
25 developed and are made available to the public. The

1 public hearing schedule consists of 30 days. Public  
2 comment period will be 30 days.

3 This motion, as I understand it, refers  
4 only to the period the drafts will be made available to  
5 the public for 30 days.

6 Mr. Hall.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: No question,  
8 Mr. Chairman. There is no question we have work to do.  
9 We welcome the opportunity for the public to react to  
10 these drafts. I think we need to move to the phase of  
11 the Commission accepting these as drafts, the Commission  
12 accepting these as phase two.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion?

14 I don't know at what point he left the  
15 motion on the floor except to accept the Congressional  
16 maps as drafts for public comment.

17 Mr. Huntwork.

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One point I'd like  
19 to bring up is the -- I would like to address  
20 specifically the one line we have drawn connecting the  
21 Hopi Reservation to the rest of that district. I noted  
22 myself and heard numerous comments from myself and  
23 outside that creates a somewhat comical appearance to  
24 the district. And, in fact, we have done this for very  
25 important reasons which are entirely serious and

1 sober-minded. But I've asked the question a couple  
2 times and would like to ask it again whether it is  
3 necessary for us to have a physical connection. It  
4 seems to me to be an unnecessary embellishment if we are  
5 not legally required to have it.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll ask whether or not  
7 legal counsel wants to respond at that point.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd  
9 like to ask a question of Mr. Huntwork.

10 Is it because of visual appearance? I  
11 believe that linkage only has population of four people.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Four people. The  
13 comment from Mr. Seanez about the flying giraffe, the  
14 comment in the Arizona Republic, the Arizona dinosaur  
15 fossiles, all of those are unnecessary comments for  
16 something done for entirely appropriate reasons. I  
17 prefer not to if we have that option.

18 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman and Commissioner  
19 Huntwork, the criteria includes a goal of making  
20 districts that are compact and contiguous. There does  
21 not appear to be a -- an exclusion of the possibility of  
22 having a district that is noncontiguous; however, the  
23 draft includes a string of zero population string census  
24 blocks that although a little funny looking at least  
25 makes it contiguous, in fact, even though they are



1 separated by this zero population string.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman,  
4 aesthetics notwithstanding, I thought Mr. Seanez'  
5 characterization was rather creative. I prefer to have  
6 the Hopi Reservation physically connected with the  
7 remainder connected. I think it does look strange. I  
8 think it would also look strange as an unconnected  
9 island. No matter what we approve, having it connected  
10 or not will be a little aesthetically jarring. However  
11 we achieve having it connected will be a little jarring.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Reminds me of the  
13 discussion of the motion, again, this is for draft  
14 purposes, jarring, because the connection is relatively  
15 sparse population, could we at a later date decide to  
16 make a change on this issue.

17 Further discussion.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur. At a later  
19 date we could determine we could move it. Should it be  
20 determined it can stay, we can have the opportunity.

21 I emphasize with you this is a draft.

22 I'm not sure by removing the small neck,  
23 I'm not so sure the comical metaphors would stop.  
24 They'd simply change to an additional metaphor to  
25 represent a different type animal. I, therefore, call

1 the question.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been  
3 called.

4 Additional discussion?

5 Mr. Huntwork?

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree with my  
7 fellow Commissioners and encourage everyone to focus on  
8 the substance of this.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.  
10 Are you ready for the question?

11 On the motion to accept the draft  
12 Congressional map for the purposes of public comment,  
13 roll call.

14 Mr. Huntwork?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Chair votes "aye."  
23 It might be appropriate, because we do  
24 need public breaks so the public stenographer can stay  
25 with us for the long hours we'll be needing her with us,

1 to take a brief break, to go through some history. Our  
2 history has been for brief breaks to tend to take longer  
3 than they should. I'd like to, in the interest of the  
4 amount of work we have to do, the Legislative work we  
5 have to do, take as close to a 10-minute break as we  
6 can, reconvene as close to 11:00 o'clock as possible.

7 Thank you.

8 (Recess taken from 10:45 until  
9 approximately 11:00 a.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will be in  
11 session.

12 The next presentation will be a  
13 presentation by consultants.

14 I should point out between the last  
15 meeting in Phoenix and -- since the last meeting, the  
16 individual Commissioners have had a chance to provide  
17 individual input from the Commissioners. And hopefully  
18 the consultants have incorporated that individual input  
19 from the individual Commissioners and the public, and  
20 we'll see how rapidly we can make that progress.

21 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
22 Commission, we have a short Power Point presentation to  
23 explain the Power Point changes we've made and to bring  
24 before the Commission some decisions.

25 I'd like to bring before the Commission a

1 small housekeeping matter. There's a small sort of  
2 confusion, and I'd like to bring it up.

3           As you know, the current Congressional and  
4 Legislative maps before Arizona use a numbering system.  
5 Many citizens refer to those numbers. But the districts  
6 we are drawing are very different from the current  
7 Legislative Districts. So to signal that difference, we  
8 have used the alphabet. We have lettered the districts.  
9 So the original map we brought you on August 9th was  
10 appropriately lettered from the north to the south.  
11 However, as a result of the changes made, we are engaged  
12 in a kind of -- maybe alphabet soup because these  
13 districts are moving around and getting out of alphabet  
14 order. It would be my hope, Mr. Chairman, we continue  
15 to use letters we have on the maps even though we know  
16 their logic has become a little confused. And it would  
17 be our intention when you instruct us to reletter the  
18 map when changes have been made after this meeting of  
19 the Commission to bring new logic to them. I apologize,  
20 Mr. Chairman. That's where we are.

21           CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think anyone on  
22 the Commission will be inextricably tied to a letter  
23 versus some other designation as long as some confusion  
24 with the districts we're dealing with today and changes,  
25 that won't be substantive. I don't think anyone would

1 object to relettering once we have all 30 in position  
2 where we think it will be made available to the public  
3 later in a way for the public to comment and subsequent  
4 changes can be made in the most expeditious way  
5 possible.

6 Dr. Heslop.

7 DR. HESLOP: To assist in the Power Point  
8 presentation, I'm asking if Marguerite Leoni would  
9 comment on some screens involving voting rights and Doug  
10 Johnson to comment on detail of the maps for which he is  
11 predominantly responsible.

12 You will remember, Mr. Chairman, Members  
13 of the Commission, it was August 9 we brought the first  
14 draft Legislative map to you.

15 As a result of the hearings on August 9  
16 through 11, that draft map, which you see an outline of  
17 on the screen, was subjected to a number of instructions  
18 for change and instructions to test alternatives. So in  
19 the interest of reminding everyone and informing the  
20 public here about those instructions, I'm going to  
21 quickly rehearse them. You asked us to unite south  
22 Yavapai, west Yavapai with river communities; south  
23 Yavapai with topographical lines; linkage of Hopi with  
24 Flagstaff; you asked us to look at the historic district  
25 in Phoenix; moving District S southward; told us to

1 align Tucson districts closely with community borders;  
2 did not keep the tourist districts, despite they  
3 represented real community interests, asked us to  
4 eliminate it; to unify Tempe; asked us to experiment  
5 with EACO adjustments although seeking to preserve EACO  
6 to the extent possible; create a  
7 Glendale-Litchfield-Tolleson district; in Tucson told us  
8 to move the university from the Foothills District; and  
9 also in Tucson to put Flowing Wells in the Lower  
10 Foothills District; also in Tucson, separate East Tucson  
11 from mining communities; wanted improvement in the river  
12 AUR unity. The district under most fire was Tucson  
13 district L. Asked for elimination, perhaps  
14 extermination; asked to turn the Central Phoenix  
15 District from east-west to perhaps north-south and to  
16 unify Westbrook Village.

17 Well, now, what have we done. There is a  
18 lot of work, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,  
19 that has gone on on this plan since we left you on  
20 Sunday. And we believe that we have followed your  
21 instructions and that in doing so we have created a  
22 significantly better plan. You can see the items that  
23 we've done.

24 We united South Yavapai with Maricopa.  
25 United West Yavapai with the river

1 Yavapais, South Yavapai divisions.

2 Hopi with Flagstaff.

3 Casa Grande and Southeastern Pinal.

4 We have spent, we calculated rather about  
5 11 hours, dealing with the problem with the historic  
6 district. We have tested, retested, and tested again,  
7 and you'll hear more from us on that in a moment.

8 We have worked to align the Tucson  
9 districts with community borders, made major changes  
10 according to instruction. The Tucson border is gone.

11 We tested, retested unification with  
12 Tempe.

13 We've looked at EACO adjustments. We've  
14 worked very hard on that.

15 We have tested the creation of a  
16 Glendale-Litchfield Tolleson district.

17 We have moved the University.

18 We have put Flowing Wells in the Foothills  
19 District.

20 We have experimented with the East Pinal  
21 mining communities.

22 We have changed the river AUR community,  
23 the west unified district is gone.

24 And we unified the Westbrook Village, it  
25 is unified.

1                   The result is it respects Native American  
2 communities, respects communities of interest of  
3 Hispanic AURs, respects rural urban divisions, there are  
4 few city and county splits, improves compactness,  
5 respects AURs and other communities of interest.

6                   So those are our claims about the maps.

7                   Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to do is ask  
8 Doug to take you on a tour of the map quickly going  
9 through these districts referencing the changes. What  
10 we would then do is look at some of the remaining  
11 problems. And we believe there are some problems that  
12 the Commission would want to look at. And we'd bring  
13 forward these problems but also suggest some ways of  
14 improving them. If I may, Mr. Chairman, I'd ask Doug to  
15 come to the podium.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

17                   MR. JOHNSON: Good morning.

18                   We started looking in the north region.  
19 This region we looked at is the tourist district and  
20 other concerns in here. We have the spotter here so I  
21 can point to specific areas.

22                   You can see we've made the northern Native  
23 American majority district much more compact, a much  
24 more unified community, reaching from the reservations  
25 in the west, the Navajo reservation in the east. It



1 also includes the Grand Canyon area and Grand Canyon  
2 village in that district.

3 We are pleased with the compactness of  
4 this district. It is much more focused in one  
5 geographic area than the previous district was, and we  
6 believe it complies with instructions of the Commission  
7 as laid out.

8 We also should note as you clearly can see  
9 we have retained the separation of the Hopi and Navajo  
10 separation in this map as was the Commission's desire.

11 One other thing to point out, the very  
12 edge, you can't really see it on this screen, we did  
13 improve the unification of the river communities.  
14 There's not a lot of population in this area added on  
15 the north edge here, but it does, it does extent the  
16 river communities along the river while leaving the  
17 reservation areas in the east here with the Navajo  
18 reservation.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you answer a  
20 question regarding Kingman in this regard?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Sure. Kingman in this map  
22 remains in the Navajo to Havasupai tribal reservation  
23 district.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Flipping to the other side

1 of the state, the border area, in this map we have, as  
2 was discussed today in the public comment period, Casa  
3 Grande, southeast Pinal, and unifying it together with  
4 the tribal reservations, the urban tribal reservations  
5 up here. The only change from some of the comments made  
6 is in this area with the Tohono O'odham, we essentially  
7 looked back at the community information we received,  
8 and the Tohono O'odham received, the Ak-Chin requested  
9 they be placed with them, the Gila River requested  
10 Ak-Chin placed with them. Either can be done fairly  
11 easily.

12 Yuma County is intact, unified. It takes  
13 in a small, about half of La Paz County including about  
14 half the river county here. Unites the southern river  
15 into one district.

16 Over on the southeast county, it's again  
17 intact.

18 The Nogales portion, Nogales county along  
19 the west is divided along the areas here. It takes in  
20 Tanque Verde and Vail, goes over to, I believe, Green  
21 Valley and over to the edge of the Saddlebrooke areas,  
22 not including Saddlebrooke to the west. A more detailed  
23 map of Tucson will take that in.

24 A Tucson map will take in, more detailed  
25 communities will take in, detailed communities

1 stretching down I-10, separated that in, a grid line  
2 clearly between them, an airline base grid as we refer  
3 to it, stretching along the northeast and south of the  
4 base. Then the Saddlebrooke to Catalina Foothills base,  
5 newer suburb regions north of Tucson.

6 And H, the district labeled H here is  
7 south of the river district. It's very homogeneous with  
8 communities south of the river between them and the  
9 foothills areas.

10 One significant change to note is in the  
11 previous map where concern was we did not match up with  
12 communities of Tucson as well. An additional area of  
13 Tucson, that's around areas here and wraps around Casa  
14 Grande. It did result in removing a district from the  
15 Tucson area.

16 Moving to the other heavily urban part of  
17 the state, Maricopa County, when we met with you last  
18 and reviewed in progress work, we did the change in  
19 District CC, the dark orangeish valley district. We  
20 looked at attempting to unify it, showed you in the work  
21 in progress meeting, we were able to unify it, the split  
22 of Chandler, the significant split of Chandler in the  
23 area Chandler objected to, and the split of Gilbert as  
24 well.

25 And following the directions of the

1 Commission at that time, we put District CC back in its  
2 original configuration. It divides Tempe but divides it  
3 along the city. It numbered a number of CIFs, and that  
4 may be a logical place to divide it.

5 Other things, the District of Phoenix  
6 previously went E to the west, reoriented west to south,  
7 S, as you'll see in the historical district, did not  
8 reorient a AUR, historical district, and Hispanic  
9 contradict in that AUR. The other thing, the  
10 Willowbrook District is unified.

11 Further, northern areas AUR, mainly the  
12 Scottsdale district and mainly the north Scottsdale  
13 district, and part of it is taken over into the western  
14 district as well. One district isn't solely impacted by  
15 growth, as we discussed in last meetings.

16 Those are the primary changes in Maricopa  
17 County.

18 This is a better use of the river AUR. W1  
19 District, previously the north edge of the reservation  
20 of Kingman, the Kingman area, extended up the river to  
21 unify the river community. There's very little  
22 population in that area, not a significant population  
23 change in the river area. New Kingman is still in the  
24 reservation district.

25 Eastern Arizona Counties remains

1 essentially intact, did not make any significant -- I  
2 don't think we made any changes from the Eastern Arizona  
3 Counties' map.

4 Yavapai is an extensive change from the  
5 previous map. My apologies for not having the cities on  
6 here, but I can show you where each one is.

7 Essentially the key instruction that made  
8 all the instructions possible was the Commission's  
9 decision to decide what happens if we don't keep it  
10 intact, don't make it intact, let other communities  
11 around it affect Yavapai. The result around it is  
12 Sedona remains united across the county line, Verde  
13 Valley remains united around it, and Camp Verde remains  
14 united around it, remained intact around it, intact.  
15 Sedona remaintained intact with Flagstaff. The interest  
16 in that area, same with Prescott, more or less needs to  
17 be one or the other.

18 In this place, because of the interplays  
19 with other communities around it, we reunited the place  
20 with it.

21 Prescott is clearly impacted heavily by  
22 the change. The communities on this map in the yellow  
23 district coming over in the southeastern over is the  
24 City of Prescott. And remaining within the yellow area  
25 are other cities and towns north of Prescott.

1                   The small blue arm that comes west  
2 underneath the arm of the yellow district is the city of  
3 Prescott Valley. Because of population numbers in the  
4 same district as Verde Valley, the Sedona Valley area,  
5 the pink district, western Maricopa, Sun City district,  
6 where it comes along the city borders Prescott Valley,  
7 city and towns of Prescott Valley, all in pink. This  
8 was a source in a straight deal of efforts to unify the  
9 valley as much as possible. When we did have to divide  
10 it, the lines made some sense. The Commission had to  
11 discuss, if had to divide some portions of the state,  
12 some of the southern Prescott area does have a  
13 connection with interaction with Maricopa Valley, a  
14 logical place to group them, if we had to divide them.

15                   Prescott Valley was one we weren't able to  
16 keep with the rest of Verde Valley or with Maricopa.

17                   That, the result of it is, primarily, is  
18 an attempt to keep the Native American region AUR  
19 together.

20                   Also, the size of Flagstaff drives a lot  
21 of this, and the AURs of the river and eastern AURs  
22 impact this decision with this.

23                   We are fairly comfortable with this.  
24 Should the county have to be divided, we'd prefer to  
25 minimize the division of Prescott Valley, any divisions

1 of Prescott as much as possible. Every city is  
2 minimized. None of the cities within is minimized.  
3 Cities as a whole is divided, it's as logical and in  
4 compliance with Prop 106 as possible.

5 I'll step aside for this portion.

6 DR. HESLOP: On August 9th through 11th,  
7 we identified several problems. Maybe we've created  
8 some more as a result of solving them. It's been our  
9 experience the last problems are always the hardest  
10 problems. We bring you some problems we think require  
11 very careful attention. Many of these problems involve  
12 voting rights issues. I was very impressed very late  
13 during the night to see Margaret Leoni, an attorney,  
14 busy at work with the computer developing a historic  
15 district. And so since it is her work, I'll turn to her  
16 to explicate it.

17 MS. LEONI: Thank you.

18 He thought I was a computer dummy.

19 One of the instructions we received at the  
20 last meeting was an attempt to respect, to a greater  
21 degree, the historic district.

22 And as you know, there is flexibility  
23 within Phoenix and in that portion of Maricopa County  
24 for handling these sorts of problems. One of the  
25 alternatives would have been to bring the historic

1 district south into the Hispanic AUR, South Mountain  
2 AUR. The second alternative would have been taking the  
3 historic district into the current district lettered S.

4 I think in looking at this current problem  
5 there's an additional issue that needs to be looked at  
6 in this area, and that is also the consideration for  
7 Hispanic representation presented for you. We've had a  
8 map out there for consideration of the Commission and  
9 the public assigning five districts to portions of that  
10 AUR. And I think it is very important that you be  
11 paying attention to the testimony you are getting to  
12 that AUR while you are considering realignment of the  
13 historic district. I will remind you we had specific  
14 input today, perhaps five districts, that realignment in  
15 that district is not an appropriate one. I think we  
16 should listen carefully to what we're going to hear from  
17 here on out to this issue.

18 I will mention this is a Maricopa South  
19 Phoenix Hispanic limited AUR problem and the flexibility  
20 we have there does not need to affect other parts of the  
21 state.

22 I think we have a map here, Doug.

23 This is an initial proposal focused on the  
24 historic District AUR. And, as you can see, the gray  
25 area up here -- let me get a pointer -- unites that AUR



1 by pulling it south into the area we have labeled as R.  
2 This area is a central part of the Hispanic AUR. This  
3 configuration of the representational interests of that  
4 AUR. But it is at least one option for addressing the  
5 historic district unification that you have instructed  
6 us to proceed with. But once again, I would ask that  
7 this be an area that is looked at as a whole and as a  
8 result of interest you've received today and in the  
9 future.

10 Do you have anything to add to that in  
11 light of the demographics?

12 DR. HESLOP: Tempe. We've gone back and  
13 forth on Tempe for good reason. The Commission was  
14 interested to explore what the results would be of  
15 Tempe's unification. We saw the effects on Gilbert and  
16 Chandler. The Commission requests us to explore further  
17 division.

18 This is not, in our view, a major problem.  
19 The alternatives listed here, we, on the whole, having  
20 read the testimony, think that the Highway 60 division  
21 makes rather more sense. And it certainly coincides  
22 with some recent community input. But the alternative  
23 split is available for the Commission's review.

24 Here's our Tempe map. We can explore it  
25 in more detail, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,

1 after the presentation.

2 Doug has done a pretty good job, I think,  
3 on the Prescott Valley splits as he went through the  
4 map. One of the facts to note here is that the  
5 Commission established no AUR in this area. We have  
6 very little testimony.

7 In the map as presented, each city is  
8 unified.

9 We do have Prescott Valley with the Verde  
10 Valley district, Prescott Valley with the Mohave  
11 District, and Sun City with the Verde Valley District.  
12 That's what one can say on its behalf.

13 We believe there's community justification  
14 for a split which is, of course, an awkward one. There  
15 are alternatives.

16 I think a line from Shakespeare: Nothing  
17 is good or bad save the alternatives. Make it so.

18 Here are some pretty bad alternatives,  
19 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. We could  
20 divide Flagstaff. We have worked on that. We have  
21 divided Flagstaff in different ways. That can be done.  
22 You can certainly split up EACO. It would not  
23 require -- it's not a small adjustment of EACO. It's  
24 multiple splits.

25 In Tucson, the map responds to community

1 testimony and the Commission's instruction, and we are  
2 convinced it does improve the Commission's instructions.  
3 It's a good community-based map, and the Commission will  
4 recognize it's handiwork here. But we have to underline  
5 that there are some issues with this configuration. It  
6 does reduce the number of Tucson districts. And it  
7 redistributes Hispanic voting strengths.

8                   There is Hispanic voting rights strength  
9 here and we have to address it.

10                   We have a proposal. It is a modification  
11 of the original plan which addresses those two  
12 difficulties and reserves, we believe, the best of the  
13 two community lines that the Commission instructed us to  
14 follow.

15                   And leaving, in a sense, the most  
16 difficult for last, we have the Northern Arizona  
17 District. On its behalf it needs to be emphasized truly  
18 it is a compact district. It united many tribal  
19 districts, does what the district instructed us to do  
20 with regard to the Hopi. Doug has brought you through  
21 the map. I won't bring you through it any further.

22                   Again, I'll ask Marguerite to take you  
23 through it further.

24                   MS. LEONI: Aesthetics is first. Though  
25 artificially contiguous, does comply with 106. The

1 issue needs to be considered seriously as to  
2 redistribution of Native American voting strength by  
3 this configuration. Numbers up there tell you that  
4 without much more.

5                   That area currently enjoys a 75 percent  
6 Native American total majority of citizens. Now that  
7 district is underpopulated by a significant amount.  
8 That number is subject to change. It is a flexible  
9 number. The proposed district brings it into closer  
10 compliance, not perfect compliance, the one person one  
11 vote issue, recognizes significant redistribution, the  
12 Native American voting strength. Highlighting that  
13 again to the Commission, it requires careful attention.  
14 One of the shall obligations of the district, the  
15 Commission, under Proposition 106, the Voting Rights  
16 Act, shall bring attention to this issue while  
17 considering obligations of the Commission to that.  
18 We'll have information of the voting rights pattern  
19 which will be very important to the Commission in making  
20 decisions to the Commission in considering these issues.

21                   We have a proposed alternative to Northern  
22 Arizona which addresses the numbers we need to be  
23 looking at with regard to the numbers we'll be taking  
24 in, if this is the alternative. I'll have Doug describe  
25 it to you, let you know what it does in regards to

1 voting strength.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Just look at the geography.  
3 Voting strength, unite the Hopi, Navajo, number two,  
4 take Winslow, not so small, out of EACO, and merge with  
5 the Navajo reservation area with the district. As a  
6 result of the to changes, over on the west side, put  
7 together more of our river AUR. Reunited Golden Valley,  
8 Dolan Springs, and part of Kingman and New Kingman.  
9 Those two are not enough to put together with New River,  
10 but a portion of it.

11 This is focused. See the small change  
12 here? This little arm reaching down does have  
13 significant population, however. And then the  
14 connecting arm, however you care to term it, is gone  
15 because the Hopi are now included within the district  
16 here.

17 MS. LEONI: I would mention we don't have  
18 a slide on this. This modification is one the  
19 Commission might consider changes to. The numbers are  
20 about a 67 percent total Native American district.

21 Now, as we have discussed here, voting  
22 rights is not a numbers game. It's a totality of  
23 circumstances investigation. But this is, and so you  
24 are going to need more input.

25 In so far as this is all we have before

1 us, it's a redistribution based on numbers.

2 The solution here, or alternative numbers  
3 here, it raises the northern district from 62 percent  
4 Native American to 67 percent.

5 DR. HESLOP: So, Mr. Chairman, we hope for  
6 some instructions on these issues. We would recommend,  
7 if we may, that they be discussed in terms of the  
8 Maricopa problems first, because that can be confined,  
9 the Tucson problems, and then the northern district.  
10 That would be advantageous to us.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, if we  
12 can use that order, unless the Commission like to start  
13 elsewhere.

14 DR. HESLOP: Finishing with Northern  
15 Arizona.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's then concentrate on  
17 Maricopa County Arizona issues, specifically with  
18 Maricopa county issues.

19 Mr. Huntwork.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I like the  
21 motivation issues. I'm very concerned with another  
22 piece of the puzzle. District P, I think it was, the  
23 western district, connected up with R. That was a  
24 district that seemed to me, on the face of it, to run  
25 the risk of being a short term, of being a short-term

1 Hispanic district. I thought short term, if we did a  
2 little rotation in that district, we could solidify the  
3 areas on the outskirts of that. It was the testimony of  
4 Richard Miranda last week there are three, four hundred  
5 thousand dollar homes going in on the outskirts of that  
6 district. So I'm wondering if -- how you have, whether  
7 you have considered that as part of the area and whether  
8 you would deal with that problem.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Commissioner, we have  
10 looked at that issue and looked at some concepts for how  
11 we can address that. Most of the efforts we have looked  
12 at, how we look at that, it's definitely something we  
13 will need to take into consideration, but --

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask it a  
15 different way. Is this compatible with that, does it  
16 move in that direction or move the other direction?

17 MS. LEONI: My preliminary -- first of  
18 all, I agree with you. District P is a sensitive  
19 district. We can work in a rotational way. This is a  
20 rotational configuration. And there is work improvement  
21 of this whole area here.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Seems to me my  
25 concern, I have the same concerns for it.

1                   It might be possible to look at that  
2 district along with district V and the district that  
3 includes the southern portion of Glendale, et cetera.  
4 That may be where the rotation and change take place  
5 with district rather than involving districts R and S.  
6 We may be able to isolate this particular issue, the  
7 Historic Districts, from our concerns with District P,  
8 and maybe deal with that later on. I do have a concern  
9 with the shift that you've made which I think looks  
10 good. It certainly does what we asked you to do in  
11 trying to unify the historic district. I'd like to know  
12 if there are any voting rights implications in terms of  
13 changes you made.

14                   MS. LEONI: Yes. I'll give you the facts.  
15 Voting rights implications. Redistributions, voting  
16 rights, between the area R and area S, the northern part  
17 of -- area R as it stood in the plan from this morning  
18 was quite a strong district. This reconfiguration  
19 redistributes some toward S. The counterbalance from  
20 area S is somewhat counterstrengthened. We need to look  
21 at that in terms of testimony in terms of ability to  
22 elect. We should have testimony on that. There are  
23 impacts on this move.

24                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do you believe  
25 those impacts are going to threaten the ability of



1 communities to elect abilities of their choice? Do we  
2 not have enough information? What we had, I thought,  
3 originally, was a very strong minority-majority district  
4 in R and sort of a marginal one in S. Do we now end up  
5 with two districts that are comfortably  
6 majority-minority districts or two marginal districts?  
7 What do we end up with?

8 MS. LEONI: At this point, S is improved.  
9 I don't believe it's improved to total voting age,  
10 Hispanic voting age improvement. I think voting age  
11 improvement. I think it's a movement. Initial reaction  
12 is movement in the right direction, but there's more to  
13 be done.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When I had the  
16 opportunity to meet with you one-on-one, the suggestion  
17 I made was to move back that district back south, to lop  
18 off I suppose the central corridor portion of S, bring S  
19 southward, accommodate that by bringing the other end of  
20 R southward. Can you do that and achieve four solidly  
21 minority-majority districts southward?

22 MR. JOHNSON: We did and looked at it. We  
23 did not do it in the context of looking at four  
24 districts. When we do E, we'll look at it looking at  
25 four, four districts. In the of context at context four

1 districts, essentially we could not go far enough south  
2 to make it worth it. We moved S south, and the  
3 repercussions changed the configuration and nature of  
4 all the districts.

5 Marguerite's brainstorm, the point, going  
6 west was the work you see here. Again, that's the piece  
7 of the puzzle we'll look at when we have more a in-depth  
8 analysis here.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Would you take it  
11 as a fairly high priority instruction to look at that as  
12 soon as possible? I would regard that as a couple  
13 reasons. Number one, you know, as we did with the rural  
14 district in Northern Arizona, the intent was to create  
15 districts that would be representative for over the next  
16 10 years, as least as far as we could predict, not that  
17 would pass today or change tomorrow, or not necessarily  
18 so.

19 The four districts is more consistent with  
20 the original minority plan, which I'm sure motivated  
21 that same consideration. I'm sure we're talking about,  
22 I'm sure parts of it are even reflected in that plan.  
23 In any event, would you take that as a high priority  
24 plan before we escape from today, if possible.

25 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we've

1 taken the historic district as a priority, as a  
2 considerable high priority. We've taken 11 hours in an  
3 effort to try that solution. This is a sensitive issue.  
4 The movement of territory among them is not something  
5 that can be done in a short recess. It's also our  
6 general opinion that we can expect valuable testimony on  
7 this arrangement and on alternatives from the members of  
8 the affected community. And I think it may be better,  
9 Commissioner Huntwork, if I may suggest it, to look at  
10 that testimony in the second round of hearings.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I guess I'll  
12 beat a dead horse here.

13 Can you show me where cities, towns, and  
14 street edges are, Tolleson, Sun City?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Tolleson is here. Good,  
16 here it is off.

17 This is almost entirely Phoenix, Guadalupe  
18 is unusually shaped. This, the city line of Phoenix,  
19 and Tempe is on the other side of it. Up here we get  
20 other cities. This is the Glendale, Peoria area up in  
21 this space here. These are all in Phoenix. We do have  
22 the freeways coming around and the freeway square,  
23 whatever you choose to call the square.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you have that  
25 alternative map?

1 MR. JOHNSON: We don't.

2 In order to get all the different things,  
3 we brought the desktop computer, an interactive map on  
4 the desk top. We tried to get it on this in time for  
5 the presentation, but we didn't have a chance.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I wanted to comment,  
7 we had a giraffe. Now we have a bear district or  
8 scottie district.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Looks like a place mat at  
10 McDonald's. How many animals can you find.

11 Let's not go through that.

12 Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, I wanted to  
14 address the point Dr. Heslop was making in context. I  
15 know it creates a lot of work to create one of these  
16 maps. I know how hard our consultants have been working  
17 to carry out our instructions one at a time. At the  
18 same time I have been trying to express this  
19 configuration does not reflect, and the revised  
20 configuration, does not reflect my understanding of the  
21 way those central neighborhoods logically lay out. I'd  
22 be reluctant to go out to the public, personally, with a  
23 map knowing that. And I would certainly, before we do,  
24 I would like to see -- personally I would like to see  
25 that alternative.

1                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Let me see the  
2 alternative.

3                   Are you saying, Mr. Huntwork, are you  
4 saying there were some concerns with respect to some of  
5 the designated AUR representations? Did I hear that  
6 or --

7                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No. I think my  
8 concern is this pattern does not reflect the AUR as well  
9 as an AUR would, several AURs would, a Hispanic AUR and  
10 Hispanic Historic District AUR.

11                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Historic District  
12 AUR, I'm looking at a map they have, looks like District  
13 15 on their map, it does include those new areas that  
14 have been moved from S into R. And while it's certainly  
15 not exactly the same, it does appear to cover a lot of  
16 the same area and not to be terribly different. As I  
17 recall the Hispanic AUR presented to us was a large AUR  
18 I'm not sure it would fit into one Legislative District.  
19 I think here there was some overlap between the Hispanic  
20 AUR and Hispanic District. I don't think this deviates  
21 too far from the proposal presented to us. And it seems  
22 to solve one problem without negatively impacting  
23 another AUR.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

25                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I would

1 recommend my colleagues make a motion to the effect of  
2 what they are referencing so we give clear instructions  
3 to our consultants with respect to the alternatives we  
4 are considering.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'll attempt to do  
7 that.

8 I'd like to make a motion we instruct the  
9 consultants to show us what we could achieve if we  
10 attempted to unite the historic district, or the essence  
11 of the historic district, with a nonminority-majority  
12 district, probably to the north, and consolidate the  
13 Hispanic AUR in the South Phoenix AUR into four  
14 majority-minority districts, period.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion,  
16 Mr. Huntwork?

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll second it.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Now let's clarify.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Exactly what we're talking  
24 about.

25 In this part of the process, we cannot

1 have anyone misconstrue or be less than completely  
2 understanding of a motion that is made since we expect  
3 this change or any other change to result in something  
4 we'll be able to vote on later today. Let's be clear.

5 Mr. Huntwork, explain that or ask the  
6 consultants if they fully understand what the motion  
7 goes to.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'm having to  
9 explain my thinking. My thinking is, number one, the  
10 historic district, in large part, is not  
11 minority-majority. It dilutes the minority strength in  
12 the surrounding districts no matter where you put it,  
13 unless you put it in a district that is not -- which  
14 we're not trying to create a minority-majority district.  
15 Secondly, I'm concerned as the Hispanic Coalition has  
16 expressed about the fact that we have attempted to  
17 create five minority-majority districts here; but at the  
18 expense of assuring that we successfully achieve four,  
19 so I would like to see how that option would lay out  
20 best in the opinion of our consultants.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: My question: In the  
23 opinion of our consultants, Doug, maybe you can respond  
24 to that. We did hear from representatives from the  
25 Coalition for Fair Redistricting. Mr. Huntwork is

1 correct, are they correct, does that strengthen four  
2 minority-majority districts and strengthen them?

3 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioner  
4 Hall, we've looked at this. One thing to keep in mind,  
5 always we've looked at this, the move, we welcome, very  
6 helpful, but such a move is not confined just to these  
7 districts. In every scenario we've looked at in an  
8 attempt to, up to this point, every district on the west  
9 side of the district all the way up to North Phoenix is  
10 affected by this change. It is an extensive analysis  
11 and very hard to give a gut reaction to this until we've  
12 done all the analysis.

13 While we certainly welcome the input, this  
14 morning we certainly expect additional input on exactly  
15 where the lines should be put.

16 The Coalition plan mentioned before is a  
17 useful guide and actually was used as a definition  
18 extensively in drawing lines. In one way, as it was  
19 considered extensively from their plan city splits to  
20 reduce the number of city splits is part of the reason  
21 it's difficult to analyze all the changes.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
23 motion?

24 Ms. Minkoff.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Commissioner



1 Huntwork, could you explain the areas of the map your  
2 motion deals with?

3 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This map clearly  
4 does not depict everything that would be depicted by  
5 this motion. I need a map of the Hispanic AUR.

6 Zoom out a little bit.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'm  
8 sorry. I really need to get some context, something,  
9 another computer, hookup, anything, roads, towns,  
10 something on there.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Until we make a map  
12 interactive, we don't have that capability on the nap  
13 that is up there.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And the question was  
15 can we get to that place in a fairly quick manner so we  
16 can deal with that.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we definitely  
18 share the interest in making these maps more  
19 descriptive. Given the time frame, the number of  
20 instructions, focusing on the maps, or the focus as  
21 complete, the priority of completes and getting  
22 interactive on the computer for the presentation, we  
23 have not been able to do so at this time.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm just concerned if we  
25 take these in isolation, we're not going to be able to

1 see it in a manner that would be useful. And I'm  
2 worried about not only from a time standpoint,  
3 understanding standpoint, the issue of going back and  
4 forth. I want to minimize the back and forth in terms  
5 of making adjustments, being able to see adjustments as  
6 we wish to make them, and the impacts of each.

7 Is there a configuration we can look for  
8 how long to get there? I sense on both Mr. Huntwork's  
9 part in understanding changes in the motion, do we have  
10 something that will affect it beyond the area itself,  
11 Mr. Elder's comments, his frustrations I share.

12 We need that position to understand the  
13 totality of the change before we can really decide  
14 whether it's a good thing or not.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, may  
16 we table the motion until we do that this afternoon?

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that acceptable?

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Do you have additional  
19 staff in the back rooms working?

20 DR. HESLOP: No.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: If was the consensus  
22 of the Commission, if people were working simultaneously  
23 while working on this mission, if that's not possible,  
24 I'd certainly table it.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, Dr. Heslop,

1 from that point of view, how did you expect this  
2 interaction to proceed with respect to making  
3 Legislative changes to this point? I want to understand  
4 what your expectations were to find out?

5 DR. HESLOP: I did not understand the  
6 desire for the Commission for further map detail. I  
7 thought we outlined the detail previously and the  
8 concepts alone would be a basis alone to proceed.

9 If further detail is needed, I'd request a  
10 recess in order to access the detail and bring it to  
11 you.

12 I wonder whether that necessity for detail  
13 is required for all the problems brought to you.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I assure you it will apply  
15 to many, if not all.

16 What we may do, if in it's in the opinion  
17 of the Commission some changes for the Commission don't  
18 require the detail, we might move to those. I think  
19 specifically with respect to both Maricopa and Pima  
20 Counties, the interactive nature of those districts,  
21 that it is going to make a big difference.

22 Ms. Minkoff and then Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, it  
24 seems that the reworking of Districts R and S, in terms  
25 of unifying the historic neighborhood worked when you

1 just took those two districts in isolation, you told me  
2 you thought I would like it, and I do. I think the  
3 issue has been brought to the table, which is an  
4 important one. It primarily involves five districts, R  
5 and S, as well as P, which is that western district  
6 referred to earlier, where Representative Miranda had  
7 some testimony at our last meeting. And of necessity  
8 doing anything with District P would have to do with  
9 District P and District T. We're really talking about  
10 five adjacent districts. And there may even be others  
11 that are brought into the mix. If we're looking at the  
12 Hispanic AUR, certainly District P is certainly very  
13 much involved, the eastern part is very much part of the  
14 Hispanic AUR and is not reflected in the current  
15 configuration of District P. I think that really that  
16 entire area needs to be dealt with, unifying the  
17 historic district, respecting the Hispanic AURs, looking  
18 at Goodyear, Litchfield Park, whether to keep them there  
19 or out or in another district.

20 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Minkoff, I  
21 understand everything you said. You are describing not  
22 work for a recess. You are describing days, days of  
23 redistricting work.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It may be something  
25 that will have to respond to public comment. If it's

1 possible to look at it in any way to look at it today.

2 DR. HESLOP: Take 90 minutes,  
3 Mr. Chairman, get detail on the map. It may be --

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For all options?

5 DR. HESLOP: Yes, all options, so you can  
6 interact with the map, yes.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is the map that you  
9 have up there a layer that we can give to Mr. Johnson  
10 and plot as an overlay or transparency we have? We've  
11 gone through this in two, three meetings, having a  
12 reference or something people can reference on the map.

13 I'm having a hard time in all the areas we  
14 discussed, from Kingman, the Prescott Valleys, Navajo,  
15 going on down into this area, the Tucson area.  
16 Understanding, I can't, I've been doing my homework, the  
17 isn't no way the public can have comment, or be able to  
18 evaluate and see what they are doing. I have to have  
19 this reference.

20 DR. HESLOP: As you know, Mr. Elder, we've  
21 developed an interactive map. I can add a zoom  
22 capability, do that, if you wish. I'm prepared to do  
23 that, if you wish. I'm also able to provide to Tim  
24 Johnson, materials to Tim Johnson, materials so we can  
25 provide plots. We'd be very happy to do it. It will

1 take 90 minutes. We may be looking at problems in  
2 detail. It isn't required if we're not prepared to move  
3 forward.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure the  
5 Commission has a position on all five of the areas you  
6 raised.

7 I think it's very important to Mr. Elder's  
8 comment to see the interactively, see however the work,  
9 whichever changes are working, the 90-minute opportunity  
10 to work at.

11 Are there areas this morning that  
12 capability is less important for that we can move  
13 forward with on any of those?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm thinking  
15 through the issues Dr. Heslop raised to see if we can  
16 deal with them. Some, I think we can deal with those  
17 now. After we've done that, take the break.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Sound reasonable?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: I concur.

20 I guess as we do that, I want to  
21 reemphasize the point, maybe I'm missing that, we're in  
22 the draft phase. Are these concerns or issues so  
23 significant, we're unwilling to stamp draft on it and  
24 say to the public now we have concerns; we want to hear  
25 your concerns, allowing all the feedback to be

1 incorporated in order to accommodate all the concerns?  
2 I think regardless of whatever we try to do in our  
3 efforts to perfect our draft, if you will, that we're  
4 still going to get into significant comment on every  
5 facet. I don't know where the line is on the continuum.  
6 I'm not sure whether I fully comprehend all the  
7 interaction on the concerns with respect to Central  
8 Phoenix. I'm wondering, would it be prudent to list  
9 what we have as concerns and add to whatever the public  
10 has and come back with a more cohesive solution.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Hopefully we get whatever  
12 the cohesive solution is before we go out. It's an  
13 interactive look within a 90-minute time frame.

14 If you would, look at the five issues you  
15 raised. Let's see if any of those, that interactive  
16 look is not necessarily needed for us to give you  
17 instruction. If there are some that we can deal with in  
18 the absence of that action, we should make progress at  
19 that point.

20 The first I take it you have up there is  
21 Tempe.

22 DR. HESLOP: Yes, sir. And alternatives  
23 we have considered, in light of your instructions, are  
24 listed on the screen.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To that point, do you have

1 the representative map of that change?

2 How many districts does Chandler find  
3 itself in as a result of that change and the same  
4 question as to the City of Gilbert?

5 MR. JOHNSON: Changes, to give you a  
6 sense, the city border between City of Mesa, Gilbert,  
7 this side of this district, go into the Mesa District.  
8 Look here, the Mesa District.

9 Tempe, District CC, come below the city  
10 line. We don't have the exact distance it would go to,  
11 nothing all the way to unify the city, a significant  
12 distance to the south.

13 The effect on Chandler, Chandler is split  
14 slightly to the arm that reaches westward to the city.  
15 There would remain some split. The split line would  
16 remain west of Dobson Road. The key dividing line, the  
17 representatives of that city indicated is their  
18 preference. So Gilbert would remain unified.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Without locating  
21 precisely where Tempe would be split, can you give us  
22 some idea where -- more of Tempe in the northern  
23 district than the southern district. Approximately what  
24 is the split?

25 MR. JOHNSON: A small sliver of Tempe is



1 left in the southern district, 10, 20 percent of Tempe.  
2 That's in the real ballpark.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I would like to see  
4 how that looks.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Interactively?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. I think  
7 something is to be gained from moving Mesa. There's one  
8 less community in that particular district, perhaps one  
9 less split of Mesa. It obviously has to be split many  
10 times.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's hold some comments  
12 until we look at it.

13 Look at the second area, see if we have  
14 some agreement.

15 DR. HESLOP: Here is the issue of Prescott  
16 Valley. Here is our Prescott Valley map, and here are  
17 the alternatives, the only ones we can see to the  
18 Prescott Valley split.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any reason to believe we  
20 don't need to see it interactively?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I do.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we need to see  
23 that one.

24 Go to number three. Keep going. That one  
25 we need to see.

1 DR. HESLOP: Northern Arizona District,  
2 Mr. Chairman. Here is our map, and here are the issues  
3 with it.

4 Ms. Minkoff.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seemed to me the  
6 solution Doug was proposing was not only incorporating  
7 the Hopi Reservation but incorporating Winslow and  
8 removing portions of Kingman that involved population  
9 with it. One has to come out somewhere else. It takes  
10 out population Y, AV1, a lot of changes. We need to see  
11 that interactively.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Fifth and last --

13 DR. HESLOP: That is the last,  
14 Mr. Chairman.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, the changes to  
16 the northern district may have some ripple effect. I  
17 think we will analyze the ripple effect. I think the  
18 specific issues in the northern district and those in  
19 and of themselves are pretty self-explanatory. In  
20 effect we take some issues, those are ones that can be  
21 addressed prior to a break.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think one issue  
24 we perhaps can address is the concern about whether we  
25 should revisit the issue about the Hopi Reservation

1 being inside or outside of that district. Obviously if  
2 we change our earlier position, that does have a ripple  
3 effect. If we keep the issues separated, there's not  
4 many changes.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd remind everyone of  
6 Ms. Leoni's comments on changes. It seems clear we need  
7 to make some changes about the district. The only  
8 questions are changes that are recommended are once  
9 without a further interactive look.

10 Mr. Elder.

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Excuse me. A couple  
12 questions. I know in my mind why I separated the Hopi  
13 from Navajo on a Congressional level. I don't know as  
14 well the issues on a Legislative level from the  
15 standpoint of how the Hopi and Navajo stand on  
16 Legislative state issues. The Hopi Legislative may not  
17 have a great effect on the Hopi. I'd like to take a  
18 look at the percentages. I think on percentages, with  
19 that inclusion, it brought percentages to where DOJ,  
20 we're at least in the ballpark; correct?

21 MS. LEONI: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And then that  
23 gerrymander, if you will, or tongue, coming down to  
24 Winslow, coming down to get Winslow?

25 MR. JOHNSON: That area is all of Winslow.

1                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: Are there tracts  
2 around that? I have problems in four of the five areas.  
3 We have an urbanized area that doesn't reflect that city  
4 boundary. This is taking in enough of the Winslow  
5 urbanized functional area, the city limits, the  
6 periphery around the city limits which is  
7 disenfranchised.

8                   MR. JOHNSON: I wouldn't say  
9 disenfranchised, the area around the freeway, some  
10 around Winslow, some around here.

11                   The reason we did not include it, make it  
12 probably better looking, a little more compact, is  
13 because of expressions from that area, that community,  
14 to not be included with the Navajo reservation.

15                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I don't know how big  
16 the tracts are. Something that only expands four, five  
17 miles outside Winslow, so long as the area remains  
18 contiguous, remains contiguous, whether they live in a  
19 truck stop along the freeway, whatever, along the  
20 outskirts, if you keep it whole, not necessarily go into  
21 the Navajo, Apache counties, take enough, four, five  
22 people, that group, the metropolitan area, if you will,  
23 of metropolitan Winslow.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other question, the  
25 metropolitan side of the map, splitting areas around

1 Kingman from Kingman itself, the area sees itself as a  
2 community. To the extent there's population along the  
3 southern boundary, any of this district might be picked  
4 up to unify Kingman. That's of interest to me as well.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure why  
6 Winslow was proposed to be brought into the Northern  
7 Arizona District. It seems to me if you put the Hopi  
8 Reservation into this district, you are adding about  
9 7,000 people. Without splitting Kingman, the New  
10 Kingman, Butler area, going into Dolan Valley, Dolan  
11 Springs, splitting those areas, putting them with the  
12 river district, you might accomplish what you need to do  
13 without going into the river district, leaving Navajo  
14 County, if Hopi is brought into Navajo.

15 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, the test  
16 is with regard to voting strength. Winslow has Native  
17 American population and we test for voting population.  
18 We test it for voting population.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm not sure  
20 Winslow does.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: 10,000.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I look at it,  
23 10,000 does. Winslow has 9,520, 25,004 white, 4,003  
24 black, 2,234 are Native American.

25 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, I'm

1 pleased to test it for you. Winslow is about a third  
2 Native American.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, less than a  
4 quarter.

5 MS. LEONI: When that area is traded to  
6 the area to the west, in the Kingman exchange, the net  
7 result is an increase in voting strength for the  
8 American Indian. But what we can do is give you the  
9 exact difference that it makes.

10 I do agree with you, it's not a majority  
11 American Indian area. But the trade is what boosts that  
12 district somewhat more. We can bring that back. It's  
13 not a difficult thing to bring back to you.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: While looking at  
16 that, I just have to mention you could take out, add  
17 essentially all Mohave County south of the Mohave --  
18 Colorado Mohave River in exchange for the reservation.  
19 I think obviously that would vastly enhance the Native  
20 American concentration in that district, not make it  
21 necessary to combine the Hopi Navajo. The testimony  
22 from the Hopi is clear and consistent, absolutely  
23 unequivocal, they do not wish to be combined at either a  
24 state or federal level. The reasons for that are less  
25 clear to me as well as other Commissioners. But the

1 expression of desire, interest, and concern was  
2 absolutely clear and unequivocal. I think that is an  
3 issue or alternative that we also need to take a look  
4 at.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: There's no question  
7 that their testimony is clear and unequivocal. And  
8 we've heard testimony as clear and unequivocal on a  
9 variety of other issues of separation. There's also  
10 testimony on the challenge to the federal issue. That's  
11 also clear my mind.

12 I make motion make for adjustment of the  
13 inclusion of Hopis within the northern district and  
14 excluding Golden Valley and Dolan Springs.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

18 Ms. Minkoff.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I strongly  
20 supported separating the Hopi from the Navajo.  
21 Conceptually I still do. I don't know how to make this  
22 district work otherwise. I'm not sure there's a way  
23 that we can come down, pick up the White Mountain San  
24 Carlos Reservations and make it work. I would like to  
25 make this change, send it out for public comment. I

1 have a lot of confidence in the people of Arizona and  
2 see if maybe they can find a solution we have not found.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: To understand the motion,  
4 just so I'm clear, Mr. Hall, the intent of your motion  
5 is to include the City of Winslow as well as include the  
6 Hopi or not?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Inclusion of Hopi,  
8 exclusion of Dolan Springs, exclusion of Golden Valley.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Inclusion of Hopi,  
10 exclusion those two communities.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In other ways,  
14 mean changing of the EACO District.

15 I personally feel before we send out a map  
16 we need to look at options.

17 I think we need to look at keeping  
18 together Yavapai County or most of the Yavapai County  
19 and solving some of the other difficult problems that we  
20 are facing. Obviously because of the highly interactive  
21 nature every change we make, it is impossible to say,  
22 without having it studied, but if that were the case, I  
23 certainly might be persuaded that the best solution is  
24 to solve problems in three or four other places in the  
25 state and find a solution in the EACO area that allows



1 it to remain rural, relatively compact, and with the  
2 communities of interest that are not defined by the  
3 county boundary but by other factors to remain intact.  
4 In fact, most of the other county boundaries could  
5 remain intact. I don't see any reason why Graham and  
6 Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact. I don't see why  
7 Graham and Greenlee Valley couldn't remain intact with  
8 the exception of rural valleys. Those could remain  
9 intact in parts of Cochise Valleys. Make a rural  
10 district. The essence is trade-offs in parts of the  
11 state. I.

12                   Want to make a point, was going to make a  
13 statement before we talked interactively.

14                   I didn't say we should solve problems by  
15 carving up by carving up Yavapai elsewhere. I said keep  
16 EACO together if you could. Consider it either way, if  
17 you had to. It is an AUR no more important than  
18 anything else. Don't consider ranking it above Yavapai  
19 County or keeping Yavapai County together. You said no  
20 there was Yavapai County AUR. I do recall -- I seem to  
21 recall we did have a Yavapai AUR. Even if we didn't, I  
22 remind you counties have express priority under Prop  
23 106. AURs, in our way of defining 106, we don't create  
24 license to break up one county to break up other  
25 counties.

1                   It's a long speech. I think we should  
2 consider what happens if you made adjustments to that  
3 Eastern Arizona District in order to solve some of these  
4 other problems.

5                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

6                   DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the  
7 Commission, we were picking up on a comment that you  
8 made about Yavapai County, that counties have no special  
9 status as AURs.

10                   We do have an AUR for Yavapai County. I  
11 agree it has no less a status than other AURs that the  
12 Commission has adopted.

13                   But if I may speak to the issue of  
14 dividing EACO, we have looked at that. We have looked  
15 at the idea of bringing the line south. We know  
16 perfectly well that you would produce not an adjustment  
17 to this map but a new map, an entirely new map of the  
18 State of Arizona. And I have to tell you that it was  
19 the impression I had, and I think the other members of  
20 the NDC team had, as a result of the hearings on August  
21 9 through 11, that it was the Commission's sense that  
22 the map with the changes you wished would bear good  
23 witness to the principles the Commission adopted that  
24 the map with the adjustment would be the map the  
25 Commission would consider for adoption. Now if we are

1 to look at the EACO splits, this will develop design of  
2 a new Legislative District map. As you well said, sir,  
3 there are 30 districts on this map. The change to some  
4 involves change too many, indeed to all. Just this  
5 morning, Doug and I looked at an EACO split alternative.  
6 I said how many work. He said several days, because  
7 we'd be designing 30 new districts. I did wish to say,  
8 we felt we're following transcript testimony from you  
9 with regard to Yavapai. Secondly, on the EACO split we  
10 felt it anathema to the district which involves such  
11 wholesale change.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'd like to remind  
14 my fellow Commissioners, public hearings begin in nine  
15 days. We have to have a map to the people of Arizona  
16 long before that time. We cannot expect the people to  
17 come to a public hearing tell us what they think unless  
18 we look at them, let them review it with them, consider  
19 it with them. If what Dr. Heslop is telling us is  
20 correct, I think the best we can do at this point is  
21 make modifications to the maps presented to us rather  
22 than wholesale changes that involve wholesale changes.  
23 There is time enough after the public comment for the  
24 wholesale changes that need to be made. At that point,  
25 there's time enough if they need to be made,

1 instructions need to be made, if wholesale changes need  
2 to be made.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: As additional changes,  
5 we'll be addressing Yavapai and EACO. The Motion is  
6 very specific, speaks to specific issues. In order to  
7 move forward, eat the sandwich a bite at a time, I call  
8 the question.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question is called  
10 for.

11 Further discussion?

12 If not, roll call.

13 Roll call.

14 Mr. Huntwork?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: No.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Elder?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye"

23 Motion carries.

24 At this point we'll take a break, a  
25 90-minute break, to allow the consultants to take

1 an interactive look the state.

2 The Commission will stand in recess until  
3 that time.

4 (Recess taken from 12:33 until  
5 approximately 2:10 p.m.)

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will go  
7 back into session.

8 Let the record show all five Commissioners  
9 are present as well as counsel and consultants.

10 We all have the capability to see  
11 interactively the maps interactively. However, to do  
12 that we'll have to see the screen behind us. We tried  
13 to turn it around, but it's not big enough, so we'll  
14 have to turn our attention around to the interactive  
15 map.

16 Based on the conversation this morning, we  
17 probably ought to turn our attention to the Phoenix area  
18 and look at the area we started talking about this  
19 morning.

20 MR. JOHNSON: We' want to focus on the  
21 larger area or four, five areas.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Have you done  
23 anything on the larger area?

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about the  
25 historic area.

1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Yes, Mr. Elder.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could we have NDC  
4 describe changes peripheral to this, looking at the two,  
5 three other districts peripheral? I wanted to know  
6 about the two, three areas peripheral.

7 MS. LEONI: Could I make two, three  
8 comments?

9 In this area, the only change made is the  
10 change we were instructed to make to the historic  
11 district.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In this instance, the  
13 unification of the last better term in the historic term  
14 only occurred between Districts S and R.

15 MS. LEONI: That is correct.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Could you describe  
18 for us the demographic impact had on those districts,  
19 where they were before where they are as drawn.

20 MR. JOHNSON: The map we're looking at  
21 here with the botched district lines are the previous  
22 district lines. Look at District S. It is -- before we  
23 made the change, it was 51 percent Hispanic origin and  
24 44 percent Hispanic voting age. When we make the  
25 change, the district is now 54 percent Hispanic

1 population and 47.2 percent voting age.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What was the other  
3 voting age, approximately?

4 Lisa, can you read it back to us?

5 (Read back.)

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: So both have gone  
7 up about three percent.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District R.

10 MR. JOHNSON: District R, we have done an  
11 equivalent amount. However, it started, 62 -- it  
12 started at 59 percent Hispanic,

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: 59? I have 62.

14 MR. JOHNSON: 62.

15 MS. LEONI: 62.

16 MR. JOHNSON: And 53 -- about 53 percent  
17 voting age. So it still remains.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From 62. And what  
19 voting age?

20 MR. JOHNSON: I think about 53 percent.  
21 It may have a couple blocks in it. That's why it  
22 altered a bit from earlier numbers. It was the most  
23 heavily -- the strongest Hispanic percentage.

24 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Minkoff, if I may  
25 intervene, it originally started from 62.63 percent

1 Hispanic. Hispanic, 63.1, 63.17 Hispanic, let me  
2 correct that. I need to correct that. Voting age was  
3 56.15, almost 57.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to make a  
6 motion we adopt changes reflected.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll second that  
9 motion.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In and of itself,  
13 as an isolated change, I think it's desirable. I'd  
14 support the motion.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other discussion?

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Question, call the  
17 question.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been  
19 called for.

20 Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."



1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?  
2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."  
3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."  
4 Let's move to the next problem area  
5 identified.  
6 MR. JOHNSON: Does the Chair have a  
7 preference?  
8 Tempe is probably the most convenient to  
9 go over to.  
10 In this case, let's see if we have this  
11 drawn.  
12 I believe in both cases it's showing the  
13 split of Tempe. I can zoom in and give more detail if  
14 you like.  
15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Please.  
16 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Currently, if you  
17 see, you have the north part of the district is  
18 Scottsdale.  
19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Uh-huh.  
20 MR. JOHNSON: Then we have Tempe following  
21 the city lines on the west edge down to the 60 Highway.  
22 The only place where it comes down a little bit from the  
23 60 Highway was -- there we go. This will help. This is  
24 to balance population equality right there. It  
25 essentially still the highway. Over in Mesa, this

1 district currently encompasses this district in Mesa.  
2 Currently zooming in, to give you a little detail on it,  
3 I drew the street, 18th and I think Second Avenue. Let  
4 me scroll over. Yes, it's Second Avenue in there.

5 The change that we were making, it has  
6 been suggested, would be to trade off the Mesa portion  
7 of this district. So that is the City of Mesa  
8 highlighted there. So take this portion that we saw  
9 before out of the district. It would join up with the  
10 blue district. The blue district border would now come  
11 up along the Mesa city line. What that would enable us  
12 to have the pink District CC and pick up additional  
13 population to the south.

14 When we looked at it, it is not sufficient  
15 population to reach all the way to the city line, but it  
16 would be all but the city line down there.

17 The swap that would then take place,  
18 because this district, the Ahwatukee district here would  
19 then be short on population, we'd pick up additional  
20 pieces of Chandler.

21 When we looked at it, we determined we  
22 could stay west of Dobson Road, which was Chandler's  
23 concern. Great.

24 The circle, here, going in four districts,  
25 chandler going north, and then pick up the Dobson Ranch

1 portion of Mesa right here.

2                   Somebody is trying to help me. Additional  
3 computer power.

4                   Four districts are affected.

5                   Primarily Mesa is the primary city  
6 affected. We'd unify the northern portion affected and  
7 divide the southern portion of Mesa affected.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

9                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a  
10 motion we adopt that change and include as much of Tempe  
11 in one district as possible.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

13                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

14                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to ask one  
15 question, if I may, Ms. Minkoff. I want to be clear.  
16 An area of one concern last week, which was answered  
17 this morning, though I want to be clear, ask a couple  
18 things:

19                   Number one, this is unifying more of Mesa  
20 by this move?

21                   MR. JOHNSON: Actually the population is  
22 divided, would stay the same. It's an even trade of two  
23 sections of Mesa.

24                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mesa stays the same in  
25 terms of division.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's more of Tempe in  
2 terms of the district?

3                   MR. JOHNSON: It's significantly closer.

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's reducing the number  
5 of districts in which Chandler is divided, two, except  
6 for a very small bit of population to the extreme south.

7                   MR. JOHNSON: Right. The split of  
8 Chandler would remain at the far western arm of  
9 Chandler. The portion of Chandler they testified is  
10 very important for them, the eastern portion of Chandler  
11 remains together.

12                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: The impact other than  
13 those three communities is zero?

14                  MR. JOHNSON: That is correct.

15                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

16                  COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I think this makes  
17 some sense. I think that the portion of Mesa that is  
18 put back into Mesa really fits much better there than  
19 with the district that has so much of Tempe in it. I  
20 think the Dobson Ranch area of Mesa is a very good fit  
21 with Chandler. It's not that much different, a newer  
22 portion of Mesa, seems to fit with a community like  
23 Chandler. I also think that the benefit of unifying  
24 most if not all of Tempe is very, very positive. I  
25 think that we're trying to split communities as little

1 as possible. And Tempe is unique among communities  
2 among our state. Demographically it's a very, very  
3 diverse community that has requested to be together.  
4 Some individuals obviously disagreed, and we've received  
5 a fair amount of input. The majority of input at public  
6 outreach meetings, Maricopa and City of Tempe, is to  
7 keep us together. Even though we haven't been able to  
8 accomplish all of it, I think this is a positive change.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
10 motion? If not, roll call.

11 Mr. Huntwork?

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Aye.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

20 Motion carries five-zero.

21 Next area of concern.

22 Doug?

23 MR. JOHNSON: The Commission voted on the  
24 Northern District. Is there interest in looking at it  
25 interactive?

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the sense is we  
2 looked at it earlier this morning, or this afternoon, by  
3 the time we voted on it.

4                   MR. JOHNSON: There was discussion earlier  
5 about the area of Winslow involved. I can pull that up  
6 here. I already changed it here.

7                   Census blocks here are what you see, and  
8 the reservation line here is in red. The numbers that  
9 are showing is population lines of each census block.  
10 To the level of information this provides we can roughly  
11 estimate the area of Winslow.

12                   Let me darken the city lines so you can  
13 see that a little better.

14                   This is the incorporated City of Winslow.  
15 As you can see when I zoom in, there are census blocks  
16 nearby that have census blocks in them.

17                   What we were attempting to do by making it  
18 contiguous along here, and the question we faced, are  
19 these areas people that live near Winslow, when we  
20 consider that portion, the 160 people in this block or  
21 that happen to be geographically close to that, really  
22 the only way is to get somebody close to the community  
23 to know where that line should be drawn.

24                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: As I recall, the  
25 instruction I gave before the break did not involve

1 Winslow, the Hopi Reservation into the northern, and  
2 taking out --

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Dolan Springs and  
4 Golden Valley.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Something like  
6 that. If Winslow were to stay or go, that might have to  
7 wait until public comment during the hearings.

8 Can we see the changes that putting Hopi  
9 Reservation in and taking out those two Mohave County  
10 communities have may?

11 MR. JOHNSON: My apologies for any  
12 confusion, the questions about that at the time.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Did that keep the  
16 district in balance or come up more less somewhere to  
17 keep it conceptually somewhere to keep it in the right  
18 number?

19 MS. LEONI: Commissioner Elder, the  
20 numbers we're looking at this morning included the  
21 Winslow switch. We now eliminated that which was done  
22 on the lunch break. We're about to see the numbers now.

23 MR. JOHNSON: The details, when I zoom in,  
24 are on the other side. The details, as Marguerite said,  
25 are just about there. The details, we're about 1,300

1 people short. A little of the blue area here will need  
2 to return, also. But you can see the area of Dolan  
3 Springs, Golden Valley, and then down here, this is  
4 actually, we're still working on getting that part out,  
5 is unified in the river district.

6 You can see how this follows the city  
7 border around, around the edge of Kingman, and around  
8 the edge of New Kingman here. When we complete the move  
9 we'll follow the edge of New Kingman.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If I understand, all  
11 incorporated Kingman and all New Kingman will be in a  
12 new district. The two communities are in the western  
13 district.

14 MR. JOHNSON: That's correct. The 1,300  
15 people we need to still move for population equality we  
16 have actually looked for in the blue unincorporated  
17 area.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You think that can  
19 be easily done without impacting on the two communities  
20 we just moved out?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fine.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Let's look at the  
24 numbers.

25 MR. JOHNSON: These are the numbers for



1 the northern district. Let's go down to the percentages  
2 here.

3 The Native American percentage is now  
4 66.03, and the Native American voting age percentage is  
5 now 61.027.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Say that again?  
7 Voting age percentage.

8 MS. LEONI: Voting age percentage is  
9 61.027. So this is now an improvement over the district  
10 which you saw this morning.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Believe you started 62  
12 percent.

13 MS. LEONI: This is an improvement of four  
14 points. The Winslow margin left 62.087. We rounded it  
15 up to 267. This is 66.03 total without the Winslow  
16 switch.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Ms. Leoni and counsel,  
18 do you have recommendations or would you like to  
19 maybe --

20 MS. LEONI: Can you give me a moment to  
21 talk with your counsel?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Please. While doing  
23 that, would you mind going over by Flag?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Census tract,

1 there seems to be a Census tract to the east of Flag not  
2 part of Flag. My understanding is there's a thousand  
3 Native Americans that live there.

4 MR. JOHNSON: This one? That's correct,  
5 1,052.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is that my  
7 understanding, that would affect the City of Flagstaff?

8 MR. JOHNSON: It just barely touches the  
9 northern pieces here, working on the block level, and  
10 would affect all --

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I make a  
12 motion we add that northern portion to the block line.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I second that but  
14 ask it be identified.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's moved and seconded we  
16 add that Census tract.

17 Is there any other way to identify the  
18 area?

19 MR. JOHNSON: I can give you the tract  
20 number.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I make the motion  
22 simply for the point of discussion, Mr. Chairman. I  
23 realize the ramifications. I feel it's the most  
24 expeditious manner to move through this. I would like  
25 to, quite frankly, adopt the motion of the Northern

1 Arizona District and receive feedback from all  
2 neighboring communities relative for that.

3 Here is another example of a potential  
4 adjustment area.

5 I think, you know, if you do this  
6 adjustment, for example, somehow find another  
7 alternative way to reduce population another way, I  
8 think there are other opportunities for the potential  
9 Native American voice to be properly heard. I simply  
10 site one example. There are probably others, several  
11 others.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well, I would suggest,  
13 again, this level of change at this point may not be the  
14 appropriate time to make it. But the motion has been  
15 made and seconded, so we are in discussion on the  
16 motion. Frankly, I would prefer to just note that this  
17 is not a unique situation but rather a situation that we  
18 will find ourselves in throughout the map where minor  
19 adjustments of this kind can create effects that we are  
20 trying to achieve whether it's in voting strength,  
21 competitiveness, or whatever the issues are, the kind of  
22 changes that can allow us to give impact on the map as  
23 it can.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: With that, with  
25 Ms. Minkoff's permission, I'll withdraw the motion.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll withdraw the  
2 second.

3                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni, now you've had  
4 a chance to consult with counsel.

5                   MS. LEONI: We agree this is a  
6 configuration that can go out for public comment  
7 recognizing public input will be crucial to finetuning  
8 final changes made. We are also anticipating in the  
9 near future additional voting pattern information to  
10 help make that information.

11                   Have I misstated that, Ms. Hauser?

12                   MS. HAUSER: Pardon me?

13                   MS. LEONI: Have I misstated that?

14                   MS. HAUSER: No.

15                   COMMISSIONER HALL: To that, from  
16 Flagstaff, Tuba City, we'll hear ample information  
17 regarding that subject wherein we'll have ample  
18 opportunity to make an intelligent decision.

19                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right. We've already  
20 voted on the northern district as modified.

21                   MR. JOHNSON: The next area to look at  
22 would be Yavapai, a similar area, actually. There is  
23 some interconnection between these issues.

24                   The particular area we're focusing on here  
25 is the Prescott Valley portion.

1                   COMMISSIONER HALL: Doug, zoom out so I  
2 get a little perspective and zoom back in one or two  
3 more clicks.

4                   MR. JOHNSON: If I highlight the county  
5 line, it might help here, too.

6                   There's a lot of information on this map,  
7 obviously. The Yavapai, Maricopa line is right along  
8 the south here, and Yavapai County comes up. Sedona is  
9 right here, southwest of Flagstaff. The county line  
10 comes up. The county line continues up into the  
11 reservation, slow growth of the county map.

12                   The districts we're looking at are here.  
13 The blue is the river district coming over a little bit.

14                   One thing I should note, this blue piece  
15 coming in shrinks as we pick more of Kingman up into the  
16 new district. There's a tradeoff as it comes around.

17                   What we're looking at here is actually a  
18 more recent version as we work on the map.

19                   Let me go back. It's a little clearer.

20                   Nope. That's too old.

21                   The slide I showed you this morning,  
22 Paulden, Chino Valley, these all trigger around. That  
23 was under the scenario where Winslow was included in the  
24 northern district, blue district. Winslow would have to  
25 come around and take part of one of these.

1                   We are, as we mentioned this morning,  
2 working hard to not split any one of any individual  
3 cities.

4                   Taking Hopi into one, and Kingman, get out  
5 one of these two, one remains. I'll read the names.  
6 Williamson is in blue. Prescott in the blue. Prescott  
7 Valley in the green and Dewey Humboldt in the pink.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I ask again, ladies and  
9 gentlemen, turn your cellphones off.

10                  MR. JOHNSON: This is a key area of influx  
11 for a lot of reasons. Actually changes to be discussed  
12 in Tucson may impact the Maricopa district to some  
13 degree as well. So I think, in fact, correct me if I'm  
14 wrong on this, I think we wanted to be sure to inform  
15 you on this, there's a lot of impact on this area, and  
16 get direction from you if this was acceptable or one of  
17 the alternatives proposed more acceptable such as  
18 dividing Flagstaff.

19                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

20                  COMMISSIONER HALL: I like all of this,  
21 whenever central areas seem to be divided, and referring  
22 to some of the comments that have been made previously,  
23 I think, however, there are a couple perspectives one  
24 must take on the subject. One must be, certainly I  
25 would be interested to hear, effectively this area would

1 have tripled it's representation. In light of the  
2 massive amount of representation, per se, relative to a  
3 rural area, that certainly may be a situation that would  
4 give increased clout to this particular area.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: For clarity, would you  
6 again go over the alternatives you are again asking us  
7 to consider, one of which you alluded to in terms of  
8 dividing Flagstaff?

9 MR. JOHNSON: The Flagstaff question:  
10 What are the driving complications, other population we  
11 have to work with outside Yavapai, to make that a  
12 complete district, which is overwhelmingly centered in  
13 the City of Flagstaff?

14 As you know, the city is very large and  
15 areas around it are almost uninhabited except for  
16 smaller towns along the road. There is not a lot of  
17 room to work to try keep different communities separate  
18 and unified, unified within themselves, separate from  
19 each other, which means to try to get to the right  
20 population number.

21 Looking at this, one option would be to  
22 divide Flagstaff, get flexibility on population, move  
23 around these districts, perhaps the river district, come  
24 up to the north. We haven't developed exactly how that  
25 would work. Perhaps the Native American majority

1 district up north would come up allowing us to pick up  
2 Flagstaff, allowing us to pick up Kingman. I guess that  
3 was one alternative.

4 Oh, that's right.

5 The other alternative, and one the  
6 Commission had asked us to look at when we ran into this  
7 Yavapai problem back with the tourist problem back with  
8 EACO, we did look at problems there. Because EACO  
9 counties are smaller, did divide multiple counties of  
10 EACO. Obviously there are options there.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Just for perspective's  
12 sake, what is the current situation with respect to  
13 Legislative Districts in Yavapai County?

14 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, I can pull this  
15 up.

16 I think I have the maps and data here.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Currently districts  
18 one, two, and five.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In this district,  
20 would it do things terrible? If we do things we should  
21 do, it's all been a good education, we can't achieve  
22 perfection everywhere. This area has been sliced and  
23 diced into three pieces to solve problems that arise in  
24 other areas. This is intimately connected to the  
25 situation in Kingman. As we've talked about, that's an



1 area added that's onto the extreme western end of that  
2 northern district. Demographics are different.  
3 Demographically it's far removed from the political  
4 center of that district where it's going to be, and I  
5 think that's part and parcel of this same problem. I  
6 don't think either of those are acceptable situations.

7 Now, as a quote from Shakespeare was  
8 indicated, it does depend on what the alternative was,  
9 as indicated.

10 Before I could vote conscientiously in  
11 favor of this, which, by the way, so we understand each  
12 other, I don't criticize the consultants for putting  
13 this on the screen. This is a logical outcome of some  
14 of the other decisions we have made. And we have  
15 painted ourselves into a corner. This graphically  
16 illustrates how this appears on the map. I would like  
17 to see the alternative.

18 You say it would involve some splitting of  
19 EACO. But I would like to know exactly -- I would like  
20 to know what that entails.

21 We've discussed several alternatives that  
22 would involve, have some effect on EACO. But I think we  
23 have the obligation to look at that. I want to clarify  
24 just one point. I think there was a misunderstanding.  
25 And I want to say again to the consultants again what my

1 understanding is regarding counties and AURs.

2 I think I said this correctly before. I  
3 may have misspoken so I'll say it again. Counties are  
4 already given priority by proposition by 106. It is  
5 therefore a redundancy to call them a community of  
6 interest. Community of interest is a redundancy of  
7 106.

8 There's a political entity calling  
9 themself a community of interest under 106. No way did  
10 I mean a system, nor did I think political entities  
11 unimportant or shouldn't keep them in mind, as well. I  
12 think this configuration appears to me to reflect a  
13 misunderstanding on that point.

14 We have divided this political subdivision  
15 into three pieces in order to keep a political  
16 subdivision, AUR, intact. That priority does not arise  
17 from Proposition 106, certainly does not arise from any  
18 decision I intended to take. I personally feel before I  
19 could vote for this, if we compromised a bit over on the  
20 other end to solve some problems on the other end over  
21 here.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Almost surprise  
24 surprise.

25 Could you zoom out and pick up the

1 southern part, also. Now maybe zoom in. What is it  
2 further south.

3 I'm sorry, actually picking up like the  
4 Maricopa County edge. I want to see what is at the  
5 bottom of this.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Coming up here, this is  
7 Peoria, New River, the Sun City area.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Could you drag into  
9 that Sun City area. I want to zoom in to that area.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Sun City, Sun City West,  
11 Peoria, Surprise, Buckeye, following around. This point  
12 up here is the Phoenix line, coming over to the edge of  
13 Cave Creek.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess my comments,  
15 some in held pieces, some pieces, some pieces we could  
16 manage or micromanage, don't affect micromanagement. If  
17 you took Sun City and dropped it down into the T2, take  
18 it out there, add Prescott Valley, and make more it  
19 contiguous with Yavapai, the T2 compensate, or reverse  
20 that, in any case, I think quite a few edges needs to be  
21 taken a look at.

22 I'm in agreement with Mr. Hall, we  
23 probably ought to go ahead in this instance and go out  
24 and find out. We did hear correctly, Mingus Mountain,  
25 the original, unifying the community, hearing other

1 things, look at the public, get more information, go  
2 ahead with it as it is there.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Do we need a motion  
5 to leave it as it is?

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We're dealing with each  
7 with motions as it is. As the consultants raised, they  
8 need direction as to each of the areas. Maybe if not  
9 making changes, we can move on, deal with it all at  
10 once. That would probably work just as well.

11 If there isn't a motion for any change at  
12 this time, let's move on to the next district.

13 Mr. Hall.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: We need to summarize a  
15 point. The consultants said two options. One is a  
16 division in Flagstaff. The other is annihilation of  
17 EACO. The consultants have looked at that. I can say  
18 personally, I've had personal sessions and on my own  
19 looked at it, what is driving the cart, looking at it,  
20 what is driving the cart is strict compliance with the  
21 Voting Rights Act. That's what is driving Northeast  
22 Arizona. We are able to accommodate communities of  
23 interest to the best extent possible.

24 There are a variety of options, if we look  
25 at them. The ramifications, if you look at the other

1 options, most especially the division, the ripple  
2 effect, as stated earlier by the consultants, is a  
3 completely new map which I think does not represent any  
4 communities of interest. So in light of that, I would,  
5 I feel like we do need to have a motion.

6 I want to make a motion, present this  
7 portion of the plan as it is shown as part of our draft  
8 map.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

12 Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It's very  
14 important to me, if there is something that shows what  
15 the ripple effects are, that I have the opportunity to  
16 see it. What I am hearing is a contradiction. I'm  
17 hearing we don't have anything and it would take a long  
18 time to create it. But what I thought Mr. Hall said is  
19 we do have something and we've seen it.

20 Could someone tell me if we do have  
21 something? If so, I'd like to look at it.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

23 DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, we  
24 have at a conceptual level, not once, but at a  
25 conceptual level looked at ways to adjust EACO, replace

1 EACO. We've never drawn a complete map to reflect  
2 either the adjustment or dismemberment of EACO.

3 We could share with you, with a little  
4 preparation, at a conceptual level, what we see as the  
5 major change.

6 We could perhaps in a little longer show  
7 you some of the results of detailed adjustments to EACO.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, if this --  
10 Number one, I think it's important to say  
11 that the obligation is on us as Commissioners to see  
12 this information and understand it. It's not the  
13 consultants as the gatekeeper and we are to take their  
14 word for this. I need to see that information at least  
15 before I can vote on this motion.

16 Secondly, the implication is at the  
17 conceptual level you must have seen something so  
18 devastating I will be able to see it, too, and,  
19 therefore, we will not need to go to the more detailed  
20 level. I will be interested in seeing the presentation  
21 up to that point and then presumably we would all  
22 reasonably agree that is as bad as you seem to be  
23 implying and adopt this with a clear conscience. I  
24 can't delegate the responsibility for making that with a  
25 clear conscience. I need to see it for myself.

1                   MS. LEONI: Commissioner Huntwork, I need  
2 to make it clear, we've never been instructed to break  
3 up EACO. And we have not done so for that reason. This  
4 testing that occurs is in response to other changes that  
5 are made. We look at a variety of options to accomplish  
6 the directives of the Commission. Many have led to  
7 EACO. We've not brought them back here because we've  
8 not been instructed in that direction.

9                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Heslop.

10                  DR. HESLOP: Commissioner Huntwork, I  
11 should also say that really, to understand, at the level  
12 that I think you are asking for understanding, the  
13 consequences of a major change to EACO, we would have to  
14 draw a completely new map. It would be a very different  
15 map from the one that you now have.

16                  CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

17                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I  
18 understand that. I believe that is the correct answer.  
19 I also believe it is inaccurate to say, and we should  
20 correct the record to make it clear, no one has checked  
21 what would happen if we did go into EACO. And no one  
22 has verified that would indeed not result in an overall  
23 satisfactory map for the State of Arizona. We haven't  
24 done it. The consultant has not done it because they've  
25 felt they've not been instructed not to do it. We

1 haven't done it.

2 Is that not correct?

3 DR. HESLOP: That is correct.

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on the motion.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I think

7 we have the capability to play whatever "what if"

8 questions with our computer.

9 I call the question.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been

11 called for.

12 Mr. Huntwork?

13 MR. HUNTWORK: I want to respect it's

14 called.

15 I think there's a broader question here.

16 In my mind, has to do with the schedule, the immediate

17 schedule and long-term schedule. If there is a

18 significant possibility that we're going to change our

19 own minds and make substantial changes to the maps, big,

20 substantial changes, not fine-tuning, changes that

21 affect the overall scope of the map in broad detail,

22 then we might have to schedule another whole round of

23 hearings in order to obtain public input on changes in

24 addition to the round we have coming up at this time.

25 As long as there is such a possibility, I



1 would personally prefer to delay the upcoming hearings  
2 by a week, if that's what it takes, in order to flush  
3 out the alternatives so that we can really choose  
4 between them and make our own best decision as to what  
5 we think we're going to do.

6 I don't want to send out a map for that  
7 much public comment at this point that has a substantial  
8 likelihood of being radically changed.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Whatever map we  
11 send out has the likelihood of being dramatically  
12 changed. Whatever likelihood it has has the likelihood  
13 of being changed. With the amount of publicity the next  
14 round of hearings has received, it's a serious mistake  
15 to the public if we change them. We have to be  
16 committed to going ahead with them. We have to  
17 understand, bite bullet, and understand at the end of  
18 the public hearings we'll be making significant changes.  
19 If we go out to a third or fourth round of public  
20 hearings, unless we're unwilling to listen to people, it  
21 always changes at public hearings. It's a more open  
22 process than ever before. Ultimately the decision is  
23 ours.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion, the  
25 question has been called.

1 Roll call. Mr. Huntwork?  
2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."  
3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?  
4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."  
5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?  
6 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Yes."  
7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?  
8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Yes."  
9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "yes."  
10 Motion carries four-one.  
11 Next area, please.  
12 MR. JOHNSON: The next and final area does  
13 end up affecting Pinal County.  
14 Let me focus first on Pinal County.  
15 We described issues and concerns this  
16 morning. Really there are two approaches to take to  
17 addressing these concerns. I'll open it up to the  
18 Chair, if the Commission prefers, or whatever the  
19 Commission prefers.  
20 There are two sets of concerns in this  
21 map, the previous districts and the ones we came back  
22 with from the latest set of instructions with. And we  
23 could attempt to alter this area. And working from  
24 either one as a starting point, I think what we're  
25 specifically looking at, from the Commission on, and

1 looking for any direction they have, is on this  
2 direction of moving the district back into Tucson.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Which district?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Leoni.

5 MS. LEONI: I want to remind the  
6 Commission on two points made on this morning's Power  
7 Point. This modification did result in loss of the  
8 Tucson district, number one. Number two, we highlighted  
9 for your attention a rearrangement of the minority  
10 voting strength and asked you to consider that in future  
11 decisions you made in regard to decisions here. This  
12 arrangement includes two districts.

13 Can I see numbers? Is it I and H, Doug?  
14 Yeah, right, they are approximately 50 Hispanic  
15 minority.

16 The other alternative we brought back to  
17 you this morning rearranged that voting strength so one  
18 voting district is at around 50 percent and one is  
19 around 30. In a moment I can give you precise numbers.

20 Can you give me the numbers on the voting  
21 district? Is it H and I?

22 The rearrangement of voting strength is in  
23 TT and in J. And TT is now significantly higher. And  
24 obviously this is not the only issue in Tucson. We want  
25 to continue to note for your consideration the loss of a

1 Tucson district.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

4 MR. JOHNSON: When talking about a  
5 district moving from Tucson, it's obviously a place  
6 where a district went to, or the flip side of that, to  
7 illustrate from two sides of the maps, one for the  
8 Tucson area maps, or three in and one up to  
9 Saddlebrooke. Where the other went is Casa Grande,  
10 Pinal County, up to the -- up into the Fort McDowell and  
11 Salt River Reservations.

12 In the other approach, this is a little  
13 older than the most recent version other I showed you at  
14 the last presentation, the green comes over and takes in  
15 Gila Bend and Ajo as well.

16 This is an area we received considerable  
17 public comment on, including some very helpful comment  
18 today to help guide us in this.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: This, we have a macro  
20 issue, a configuration in the southern part of state.  
21 Tucson has predominantly three, four core issues, core  
22 issues of interest. The other is where lines are drawn,  
23 communities of interest, as defined in earlier testimony  
24 today, or previous testimony before the Commission in  
25 one form or another.

1                   The difficulty I'm having, and I live  
2 here, so I can imagine how others are feeling, is that  
3 for the first time I feel we have far too many maps and  
4 far too many changes to contemplate without being able  
5 to see in detail what we're talking about in order to  
6 give you appropriate instruction. It's very clear to me  
7 that District L in the previous map are unacceptable  
8 districts for a number of reasons. Changes made in  
9 support of the motion resulted, in part, in the map  
10 shown earlier today. You refer to it as a map that had  
11 the District E, or whatever it would be, in that map,  
12 the green district to the west, configured slightly  
13 different from this one, insofar as it would take --  
14 that's a more correct representation.

15                   MR. JOHNSON: Kind of puts it in here.

16                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Can we get to something in  
17 between? I'll tell if I like it or not. Show me  
18 something in between. I can't tell if I like it or not.

19                   MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, we're  
20 currently developing a plan that put out addressing a  
21 fifth district into Tucson and accommodating the  
22 concerns in the macro area, as you put it.

23                   I think what we're looking for is  
24 confirmation of the Commission's desire to return that  
25 district to Tucson, not forgetting the concerns with the

1 earlier version, and trying to find a way to bridge the  
2 two, a direction to bridge that approach and develop the  
3 map in detail.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

5 Mr. Hall.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: So for my edification,  
7 I'm wondering if we can kind of summarize, if you will,  
8 in just a tad bit more detail, when you say the previous  
9 concerns, middle concerns, the last concerns, what we're  
10 saying.

11 MR. JOHNSON: Let me start with the first  
12 map. This is the dreaded L.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

14 MR. JOHNSON: I don't think anyone  
15 foresees returning. The Casa Grande community also  
16 expressed concerns about this map, not only the Maricopa  
17 portion, how their concern was divided, how their  
18 community was divided.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

20 MR. JOHNSON: The second map was similar  
21 to this except E, the green district, had less of a  
22 piece of Tucson. It was still taking in the Tohono  
23 O'odham, and a little bit of southern Tucson, but it  
24 dropped some of that reservation and picked up the Ajo  
25 southern Maricopa sections, which is what we had as an

1 in-progress map last time we presented this to you.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

3 MR. JOHNSON: On the L side, we've taken  
4 this out of Maricopa. Part of the reason for this being  
5 in progress, we had not determined where it would go in  
6 there. The latest version --

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Hold it. I'm  
8 interested in the reaction regarding E, where we  
9 configured at as regards this one. Is there some  
10 feedback or --

11 Mr. Chairman, did you have feedback on  
12 that, not this version of E, later feedback of E?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not specifically until I  
14 determine how it interacts with everything else.  
15 Interaction of everything, one part of E, absent one  
16 portion of E with everything else. I can't do that.  
17 Again, to put a point on it, if you are developing,  
18 along the lines of everything you've already been given,  
19 the direction you've already been given the Commission  
20 and from testimony, when might we see that alternative?  
21 And let me help your discussions.

22 My intent, because of some specific needs  
23 of members of the Commission, is to call a dinner recess  
24 at about 5:00 p.m. and to reconvene at about 7:00 p.m.  
25 Or let me it this way, if I were to do that, how would

1 that help?

2 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I believe we  
3 could get it done following a dinner break, along those  
4 lines.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If we extended that dinner  
6 break sooner, would that accommodate it sooner? I'm  
7 trying for a lot of reasons to get as much done today as  
8 soon as possible, not the least of which are the public  
9 hearings we've committed to. The sooner we have the map  
10 drawn, the sooner people can analyze it and give us the  
11 benefit of information on it.

12 I think it's difficult, speaking only of  
13 myself, it's difficult to give more direction than you  
14 have, without seeing a map in progress that might  
15 resolve more of the issues important in this part of the  
16 state.

17 MR. JOHNSON: I think we could get you  
18 something with four, five issues.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You need four, five hours  
20 to create that alternative for us, to create that  
21 alternative?

22 MR. JOHNSON: We should be able to do it  
23 in four.

24 This will actually, the northern issues of  
25 this, impacts into the northern Yavapai area. We



1 anticipate minimal impact. Yes, we should be able to do  
2 it in four hours.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not sure we have four  
4 hours at this stage of the process. That's your good  
5 faith estimate of what it would take, so that's fine. I  
6 don't know what discussion we can give you on Tucson  
7 without looking at that alternative.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: One thing I've been  
10 relatively silent on, deferring to people from Tucson,  
11 the University of Tucson issue.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think the revised map,  
13 some of those changes are in progress.

14 Mr. Elder.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I've  
16 been told we need to make those requests in the public  
17 form. I'd like to at least take a look at, and I pose  
18 this question primarily to Marguerite and our attorneys.  
19 It almost makes a lot of sense whatever it turns out to  
20 be, trade with the Casa Grande area, where you end up  
21 with the area horizontally, end up going around before,  
22 green, going around. The problem is not going to end up  
23 matching with the Hispanic numbers and the Native  
24 American numbers.

25 I'd like at least to take a look at it.

1 It does have Hispanic in it, whether close to  
2 balancing -- not Yavapai, yeah. Pinal County, including  
3 Casa Grande County, plus areas up in here. I think that  
4 is one area that we should look at. I don't know  
5 whether we can make the Voter's Rights Act and all that  
6 work, look at it and say here's why it won't or will  
7 work.

8                   And I think after that, Doug, if we zoom  
9 in, give more, or my perceptions and more of the Tucson  
10 area, zoom in from about there to about there. We  
11 had -- Tucson is considerably different than the Phoenix  
12 area in that I want to say we have more geographical  
13 boundaries that somewhat match district populations than  
14 Phoenix does, it seems like. We heard testimony this  
15 morning that the area from, you know, I-10 and the  
16 railroad, in there, that this part is a fairly strong  
17 community of interest. So that's from I-10 north and  
18 the railroad south. I'd like to take a look at, I don't  
19 know which way it makes sense with the voting numbers,  
20 or whatever, see what happens with that central  
21 district.

22                   Right now we have an area, just like  
23 Phoenix, the historic area from the Presidio, almost  
24 I-10, Baronito, fairly old communities, to the  
25 University, a designated historic community, south,

1 Broadway, my mother-in-law was born in, from 1912, 1913,  
2 I'm not quite sure what her birthday was. That area  
3 runs south, that area, keep the historic area, various  
4 boroughs and that together would be helpful. Outside of  
5 that, the other thing I have, areas of the river that we  
6 have two miles, a mile and a half, two miles, no  
7 crossing, as the corridors would have it, one to one  
8 can't climb up it or down it, no social communication  
9 from one side of the river to another.

10 If we look at areas south of the river and  
11 bring them into the mid part of town and areas north of  
12 the river that, you know, stay north of the river, it  
13 seems like that would probably be good from the numbers  
14 situation.

15 Outside of that, the only other thing in  
16 the newer plan is a very long, cigar-shaped area. The  
17 freeway does link, but the freeways do function.

18 If the rivers give us edges that would be  
19 helpful, also. Those are comments on Tucson.

20 Last one, the mountain range, Catalina,  
21 the area in held here, forest land, Saguaro National  
22 Monument, Tanque Verde Monument, Sabano Canyon, that  
23 Tanque Verde area is almost a contiguous piece of  
24 Tucson.

25 We heard many times from Cochise, the

1 outlying areas did not want to be with Tucson. We  
2 figured we were rural. They were rural, not urban, that  
3 we would remove them from rural-urban issues of Cochise,  
4 take them out of social economic issues of Cochise.  
5 Those are areas I'd like to take a look at with NDC with  
6 NDC on revisions with NDC and why on that issue.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does that square in the  
8 main on areas you were intending to look at anyway in  
9 terms of alternative anyway for Tucson?

10 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. Appreciate the  
11 information.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there further input on  
13 this particular issue, Tucson issue? Are there other  
14 areas of the state that we have not yet addressed, or is  
15 this the last one?

16 MR. JOHNSON: This is the last of the five  
17 we presented this morning. Then let me make a  
18 suggestion. It's 3:30 this morning. If we were to give  
19 you until 7:30 to finish the Tucson portion, and please  
20 correct me, members of the Commission, if I'm wrong, but  
21 I believe once having dealt with this part of the state;  
22 we'll have dealt with five problem areas that were dealt  
23 with by the five consultants that might be prepared to  
24 prepared to talk about adoption of draft legislative  
25 districts. There might be other things to talk about,

1 given that's generally the case.

2                   Would it be appropriate to ask the  
3 consultants to discuss their work, for us to take care  
4 of any other business that does not involve the  
5 consultants, to complete our work for the afternoon,  
6 break, and reconvene at 7:30?

7                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Excellent idea.

8                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: All right.

9                   MS. LEONI: Commissioner, it will take a  
10 few moments to mobilize upstairs.

11                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's time to take a  
12 10-minute break anyway. We can do that while you do  
13 that and then proceed.

14                   Let's stand in recess.

15                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Did you not say we  
16 were going to stand in recess?

17                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's take a 10-minute  
18 break and we'll be back.

19                   (Whereupon, a recess was taken from  
20 3:30 p.m. until approximately 3:45 p.m.)

21                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come  
22 to order.

23                   Let the record show all five members of  
24 the Commission are present along with legal staff along  
25 with Commission staff.

1 I'd like to take other items.

2 I'd like to take other items, and the  
3 public comment period, a third public comment period.

4 If there are no other items, we'll break  
5 until 7:30, reconvening, and then take up the five other  
6 areas we're dealing with.

7 Let's take item V.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: The Commission is  
9 aware there's been an issue with Mr. Echeveste.  
10 Therefore, we had some additional personnel issues to  
11 work out with respect to his personnel matters in that  
12 regard. Therefore, to date he had not received a pay  
13 adjustment under his new responsibilities as the  
14 Executive Director of our Commission.

15 Therefore, I would like to make a motion  
16 that as those other issues have now been addressed and  
17 taken care of, we would adjust Mr. Echeveste's salary to  
18 \$95,000 a year annualized.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Would you clarify the  
21 effective date of that motion?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Effective date of that  
23 motion would be, I think that's today, is it not,  
24 Adolfo?

25 MR. ECHEVESTE: Whatever the whole pay

1 period is.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Retroactive to the  
3 current pay period.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Retroactive to August  
5 1st.

6 MR. ECHEVESTE: Next pay period.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: This is the first of  
8 the pay period.

9 MS. HAUSER: The next first pay period.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Annualized first full pay  
11 period. It's moved and seconded.

12 Any discussion?

13 It's moved seconded. Any discussion?

14 All in favor, say "aye."

15 (Vote taken.)

16 (Motion carried.)

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd move that legal  
18 counsel is instructed there be additional compensation  
19 for additional expenses he's incurred by reason of the  
20 rapid pace and extreme distances that his job requires.

21 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, before there's  
22 a second on that motion, I think there needs to be some  
23 clarification that we're talking about a manner of  
24 reimbursement rather than compensation.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: That's correct. I

1 apologize, Ms. Hauser.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: An expense reimbursement  
3 mechanism.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Second.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All commensurate with the  
8 appropriate governing laws and regulations.

9 Discussion on the motion?

10 If not, all those in favor say "aye."

11 (Vote taken.)

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion carries  
13 unanimously.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Still under item  
16 III, I guess, of the agenda, I'm wondering what we  
17 expect to come out of tonight. Are we going to have a  
18 presentation by the consultants, I guess, a conceptual  
19 plan by the five districts centering on Tucson, but will  
20 they have an opportunity, tonight, to actually draw  
21 those districts, or are we merely going to see this  
22 concept in more detail and have a map developed to the  
23 same degree as the rest of our map, adoption at a later  
24 time.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My understanding, with the



1 break, we're going to take the map we will see tonight  
2 which will have sufficient detail to compare with the  
3 rest of the map we've looked at. That's my  
4 understanding of what we're going to see tonight.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let me ask. I  
6 tabled the issue for minority-majority districts in  
7 Phoenix. In my mind, that was as important, it is a  
8 comparable issue and comparable decision to the one we  
9 are thinking about making with respect to Tucson. And I  
10 would like to see that issue explored before we put out  
11 a map for public discussion. I'm not quite sure why,  
12 but the consultant indicated it would take days to  
13 produce that map yet only hours to produce a new map  
14 with comparable detail focusing on Tucson. I'm not  
15 quite sure why that was, in any event. The issues in my  
16 mind are very comparable. I don't want to -- I really  
17 don't want to put out a map that fails to give our best  
18 analysis to central regions of Phoenix.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And, therefore?

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think I'm just  
21 discussing what we're about here right now. What is the  
22 timing?

23 Are we really -- are we really looking at  
24 putting -- at adopting a map tonight for presentation to  
25 the citizens of the State of Arizona?

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think we're looking at  
2     adopting a map either tonight or tomorrow, either of  
3     which, if the information from consultants, as you  
4     describe it, would allow for a complete remapping of the  
5     districts in Phoenix for discussion purposes prior to  
6     that time.

7                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: There really,  
8     there's another area of the state, as indicated earlier,  
9     where I also have grave doubts about whether we have  
10    fully considered all of the options. And that also  
11    would take some time to really evaluate. I have looked  
12    at options to that on my computer as best I can. But as  
13    the consultants have pointed out very emphatically, it  
14    takes even them days to flesh out that plan, and it's  
15    not something that it's feasible for us to do.

16                   My feeling is it's very important for us  
17    to do it. So I would like to, personally, delay things,  
18    be given the opportunity to really prepare the plan for  
19    Tucson in detail, be given the opportunity to develop  
20    the alternative plan for Central Phoenix in detail, and  
21    be given the opportunity to explore alternatives that  
22    might solve the problems in Kingman and in Prescott  
23    Valley, at least to the point of seeing what other  
24    problems that might lead to before we put a plan out for  
25    consideration by the citizens of Arizona.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that a motion?

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes. I'll make it  
3 a motion.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

5 Hearing no second.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I was going to  
7 respond to it. If there's no motion on the floor, I  
8 don't need to.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there any other matter  
10 we need to discuss before call to the public?

11 This is the time for consideration and  
12 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.  
13 Those wishing to address the commission shall request  
14 permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.  
15 Action taken as a result of public comment will be  
16 limited to directing staff to study the matter or  
17 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and  
18 decision at a later date unless it is the subject of an  
19 item already on the agenda.

20 First is Mr. Hartdegen.

21 MR. HARTDEGEN: I know you are probably  
22 getting tired of me for public speaking.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: You should get college  
24 credit.

25 MR. HARTDEGEN: It would look good on my

1 high school diploma.

2 I feel like an inch worm across the road.  
3 In Pinal, the Pinal County plan, Mr. Kingsbury, I'm glad  
4 you asked for public comment, I'm afraid if later it  
5 would be too late. The little piece between south,  
6 western Pinal County south in Gila Indian River  
7 Communities north of Tohono O'odham, the little piece of  
8 the pie that touches the western south of the pie that  
9 touches south.

10 In some way, I know you have to deal, if  
11 you haven't already, with the Ak-Chin community. If you  
12 put that slice back in Pinal County to the Maricopa  
13 County line to the west. I think most of us would be  
14 very happy. Not unless the consultants come back with  
15 another rendering of what they are doing. We'd be very  
16 happy. That little slice taken out on the map earlier  
17 today, you cut the Casa Grande elementary school  
18 district, and cut the Santa Cruz, and Casa Grande union  
19 high school district, and people in Maricopa, Stan  
20 Fielding High School, those people in the part of the  
21 county do have a lot common with Casa Grande, go to  
22 hospitals there. If unlucky enough to die, they go to  
23 the mortuary, if unlucky enough to get pregnant, they  
24 are lucky enough to go to the hospital, not in the city  
25 limits. Have tremendous Tucson ties, have more ties

1 than the citizens on the east side of Scottsdale than  
2 consultants asked to be put in the districts, cousins,  
3 and whatnot. If you think about that when the  
4 information comes back, I'd appreciate it.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hartdegen put it,  
6 define the slice.

7 MR. HARTDEGEN: If I looked at the map,  
8 right south of the Gila River Indian Community north of  
9 Tohono O'odham, north of Borrow Road, Casa Grande city  
10 limits, the Ak-Chin Reservation, an odd pie-shaped.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The next speaker, Anne  
12 Murray, vice president of the Broadmoor Broadway  
13 Village.

14 A VOICE: She thought you would not have  
15 testimony until tonight.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I did tell her that.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll save her and she'll  
18 have an opportunity later.

19 Any other business until what will turn  
20 out to be a lengthy dinner break?

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Kingsbury, if that's  
22 your wish.

23 MR. KINGSBURY: I'd like to thank the  
24 board for the consideration -- excuse me. My voice, for  
25 the consideration, you've done an excellent job, and

1 it's a fair job. One of the things you and I just  
2 mentioned, bringing the communities together.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Kingsbury.

4 MR. KINGSBURY: We'll always have time for  
5 comments like that.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand  
7 in recess until 7:30 this evening.

8 (Recess taken at 4:14 p.m. until  
9 approximately 7:57 p.m.)

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will come  
11 to order. Let the record show we finally have five  
12 Commissioners present.

13 May we have a report from the consultants,  
14 please.

15 Dr. Heslop, please.

16 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
17 Commission, as we promised, we have worked on the Tucson  
18 problem since you recessed. We have failed to produce a  
19 complete map. We're sorry for this. But the problem is  
20 complex. And as we have all been learning, the  
21 problems, the big problems, affect all parts of the map.  
22 So we come before you with the Tucson districts in  
23 outline form. We cannot produce a complete map this  
24 evening. We are confident if we work through the night,  
25 we will have a map for you tomorrow morning at 8:00 a.m.

1 I realize that this imposes a great strain on the  
2 Commission, and it is a matter of our sincere regret.  
3 There is nothing that we can do about it.

4 Our suggestion, Mr. Chairman, is that you  
5 let us show to you the outlines of the Tucson districts  
6 so that we can be sure that we are on the right track,  
7 and if we are, we then go away and work that plan up and  
8 go into final form.

9 We are confident we can not only do that  
10 but that at around 7:30 we can have a diskette for our  
11 associate, Tim Johnson, who can run the data for you so  
12 that you will have a map and the data almost  
13 simultaneously.

14 So, Mr. Chairman, what we'd like to do  
15 with your permission is show you the outline of our  
16 Tucson configuration, get that from you. If you may,  
17 we'll get your reactions to that, and then also present  
18 to you findings that we have in response to other  
19 questions that were posted to us with regard to district  
20 P and Districts E and L.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection?

22 Proceed, Dr. Heslop.

23 DR. HESLOP: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Johnson.

25 MR. JOHNSON: As we discussed earlier

1 today, micro macro issues on Tucson, micro macro  
2 dependent, haven't spent on macro in Tucson. Roughly,  
3 very roughly, working on rough issues of Tucson, clearly  
4 staying out of urban areas and working to keep the Casa  
5 Grande at least with Gila Bend, we were unable to keep  
6 it with eastern Pinal. Let me keep it with where the  
7 main focus of work where was this evening. You can see  
8 similar to the original map. Zoom in on the downtown  
9 map, where we discussed a number of features.

10                   You can see a number of streets and things  
11 here. This is the University area, we've been unified  
12 with the district coming in from the west, have the  
13 freeway coming in here. We discussed with the  
14 University District and railroad tracks and University  
15 area.

16                   This is the ugly inlet still being worked  
17 on. The main goal was to get the railroad track  
18 identified. Up to the north, this the area that has  
19 been significantly revised. Let me zoom a little bit so  
20 you have a bit of a sense where we are here. You have  
21 the foothills district, foothills area which is back  
22 essentially to Casas Adobas and Catalina Foothills,  
23 coming to where Catalina Foothills comes together.

24                   And District H, the green district, comes  
25 together only where the City of Tucson comes across the



1 river. It comes together where the river comes across  
2 the river.

3           One thing we're trying, we're not sure how  
4 it will balance, where numbers balance, we talked about  
5 Tanque Verde, how it balances, those things, Cochise.  
6 Those things, Tanque Verde belongs more with Cochise.  
7 It's difficult to balance. While we can't put in  
8 Catalina Foothills without splitting, we're trying to  
9 put it in with Saddlebrooke Foothills. It fails the can  
10 you drive from here to there. We can't promise it will  
11 remain once we're equalizing population on the map.

12           To give you a sense of the current  
13 challenges we've been wrestling with, a majority of the  
14 population, voting strength we discussed earlier, we're  
15 well on the way to being addressed with.

16           This district has been strengthened,  
17 currently 20, 25 thousand people overpopulated. Those  
18 will come off the western parts. And those will be more  
19 populated into the Tucson city area which will improve  
20 cohesiveness and community flavor well, communicating  
21 well in almost suburbs up here, and the agricultural  
22 town, from the town here.

23           Otherwise in the town, population needs to  
24 move, space is the east end of what is District H.

25           This is -- we worked so hard to focus on

1 getting H to have cohesiveness around communities around  
2 the river, this part we need to address because now it's  
3 significantly overpopulated as well. Trade-offs around  
4 this, the district is coming around Saddlebrooke, or the  
5 Air Force District still needs to be done. This gives a  
6 sense of where the areas need to end up.

7                   This area will be south of the river. The  
8 Air Force Base will be south of here. The Air Force  
9 Base as we discussed as well has moved over to 12, in  
10 this area. This actually worked out fairly well. The  
11 tradeoff portion below the freeway here, in exchange for  
12 the University and Historic Districts over here, moving  
13 in with the district from the west. So that is working  
14 towards the goals that have been described, gives you a  
15 sense of the progress we've been able to make so far.  
16 We're fairly pleased with it. This path will get us  
17 toward communities in Tucson and voting rights  
18 questions. Obviously those two are clearly related.

19                   The larger question of Casa Grande, again,  
20 we're attempting to go to the proposal that was fairly  
21 warmly received by just about all parties, keeping Casa  
22 Grande with Ajo, Tohono O'odham, if not possible to keep  
23 with Pinal; also the question before the urban  
24 reservations, and whether they and the group were  
25 separated. That will be very difficult to tell before

1 we get more population balancing in districts.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This looks like the  
4 return of District L now labeled E and the problem  
5 before if coming back is still the problem.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Definitely a concern. No  
7 plan can take any metropolitan problem before we keep  
8 out of Maricopa keep out of Apache Junction and --

9 DR. HESLOP: Gold Canyon.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Then you have an  
11 issue if trying to unite for urban reservations.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The way you have to  
14 do it is through Apache Junction.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

16 If we -- this is all very theoretical at  
17 this point.

18 If we do unite them, my suspicion is it  
19 will be through the Tohono O'odham District coming  
20 around, and somehow the Pinal District will spin down  
21 and pick them up. It's all very theoretical.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: How do you connect  
23 them to reservations east of Scottsdale, which is what  
24 they were asking for.

25 The Gila River Indian Community is asking

1 to be with the Salt River Pima River Reservation, not  
2 down towards the Tohono O'odham, but east of Scottsdale.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Again, it's very theoretical  
4 at this point, if that were the scenario to happen.

5 This district is more or less, have the Tohono O'odham  
6 piece in Tucson. Virtually nothing else in Tucson, that  
7 conceptually allows us to swing around Apache Junction.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Apache Junction can  
9 entirely be within Maricopa County.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Within Maricopa  
12 County District.

13 MR. JOHNSON: That's the goal. It has its  
14 own complications.

15 MR. JOHNSON: That's where we're aiming to  
16 be with this area. It's completely dependent, the end  
17 result of balancing out populations. It can't go south.

18 Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

21 Let's take a look back at Tucson a little  
22 bit, from about that size and perspective.

23 I think we're probably moving the right  
24 direction from this morning's map. I think there's a  
25 couple things we look at like the Casas Adobas. With

1 the exception of people that passed petitions for  
2 incorporation, I wager not five percent of the  
3 population can describe where Casas Adobas, where that  
4 is. It's not incorporated and is almost homogeneous. I  
5 guess I'd like to take a look at it. I don't know the  
6 population of Tanque Verde is, the whole area slid east,  
7 Tanque Verde slid up, put Tanque Verde, slide it up,  
8 have it more contiguous, more uniform. That would be  
9 one thing to look at. I asked before the break to look  
10 at the area coming around, pick up the eastern area.  
11 And I believe Marguerite Leoni did that. Or do we have  
12 any numbers or does it work is the question.

13 MS. LEONI: Commission Elder, we have that  
14 on a separate one.

15 Commissioner Elder, we've taken a look at  
16 it.

17 Chris, can you put it up on here?

18 If you can wait until we finish, we've  
19 tested it, have comments. We have a picture of it.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: And I think probably,  
21 zoom in a little further in through here. Do we know  
22 what the cross streets are. 22nd Street, Broadway --  
23 now we know about where we are.

24 I think you are on the right track there.  
25 I think the only piece, like you mentioned, and it's a

1 work in progress, is that area. If you look at the  
2 areas immediately south of that area, immediately south  
3 of Broadway, not as heavy a line, I don't know which  
4 district, the purple district here, 25,000 over on, so  
5 adding in population there, where would we take it out.

6 I don't know. Maybe this northern area,  
7 Flowing Wells, matches the demographics pretty well,  
8 strong in H, green, also for population?

9 Good luck.

10 A couple comments, couple edges. The  
11 numbers, getting better, Presidio, Baronito, Boroughs,  
12 the area on west of town, Main and Broadway, down over  
13 to, oh, Pueblo, the neighborhood center, some  
14 neighborhood centers west of town into those areas, this  
15 does, west of the freeway, talking about edges and  
16 railroads, I think there's enough crossings in this area  
17 of the freeway, very similar freeways of Phoenix,  
18 crossculture. The eastern portion in through here, a  
19 lot of forties, fifties, maybe even thirties  
20 neighborhoods that if they're not Historic Districts,  
21 they have very strong homeowner's associations, very  
22 strong cohesiveness, seem to stick together, community,  
23 glue, libraries, that sort of thing.

24 In general, in some way take a portion  
25 here, take that off, move it down, put the Tanque Verde

1 population over, get the numbers on this purple. I  
2 think that works fairly well.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Thank you for the  
5 analysis.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can you move back  
7 up to the Pinal County portion of the map?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Assuming you tried  
9 to unite the four communities you tried to unite, how  
10 many districts would we have in Pinal County?

11 MR. JOHNSON: It's very difficult to say.  
12 Probably, the assumption is in that case Saddlebrooke  
13 would come up into east Pinal. We wouldn't have that  
14 come up into Pinal. The question is is Apache Junction  
15 split off. Probably Apache Junction would go one way.  
16 Apache Junction, eastern mining, number three, is very  
17 hard to predict.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand E is a  
19 work in progress. Show me the demographics as it  
20 currently exists. I can't see the population.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Population as drawn is  
22 185,000, 14,000 over.

23 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

24 MR. JOHNSON: 28,260 of Hispanic origin  
25 and 5,500 of Native American origin, so maybe one-sixth,

1 math in my head is done poorly, 33, 34,000 combined  
2 Hispanic population out of 180. That district would  
3 need to change.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand from  
5 people who know Tucson more than I do this is an  
6 improvement in Tucson, which is a good thing.

7 We need to be very, very careful we don't  
8 create problems in other areas by solving problems in  
9 Tucson, Phoenix, or anyplace else. We need to be very,  
10 very careful about making sure that it's not at the  
11 expense of Pinal County, that we create a better  
12 situation in Tucson.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: As I understand  
15 it, you have -- you have District I almost out of the  
16 Tucson, almost out of the Tucson metropolitan area.

17 MR. JOHNSON: As it's currently  
18 configured, it still has some numbers down here in  
19 the -- this would be to the east of the edge of the  
20 reservation. Let me zoom in a little with it.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Sahuarita.

22 MR. JOHNSON: This edge is to the edge of  
23 the Tohono O'odham Reservation.

24 I don't have it highlighted. This is the  
25 edge of the reservation. We have some highlighted,



1 Sahuarita and East Sahuarita.

2 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is that the airport  
3 at the top, the white?

4 MR. JOHNSON: The reference coming  
5 completely out, the reference, if we try to unite the  
6 four Maricopa reservations, this would be an area we'd  
7 drop off, the non-Reservation portions.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I'm  
9 wondering, I can't see how many Tucson districts there  
10 are, with the colors being so similar. It's hard to  
11 tell. Are there five Tucson districts there or only  
12 four?

13 MR. JOHNSON: There are four centered  
14 entirely in Tucson from the foothills, below the  
15 foothills. The Air Force base, and west side, then the  
16 Saddlebrooke, Oro Valley District, and then the District  
17 I. Five definitely dominated by Tucson, possibly six  
18 with influence, depending on influence.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Saddlebrooke is  
20 one that goes all the way up.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If you consolidate  
23 more in Tucson, you wouldn't have to go all the way up.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Right. Definitely looking  
25 at how to do that. It's preferable to stay in the area.

1                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  Where is South  
2 Tucson, in the light blue area now?

3                   MR. JOHNSON:  Yes.

4                   CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Yes.

5                   MR. JOHNSON:  It is just -- let me  
6 highlight the line so you can see a little better.  It  
7 is just in the purple here.

8                   COMMISSIONER MINKOFF:  It is not what we  
9 heard in public comment earlier today where they said  
10 there interests lie to the southeast rather than to the  
11 west.

12                  MR. JOHNSON:  Right, focused down by 12th  
13 and to the 12th.  There was testimony related to the  
14 historic areas, and rather to the railroad, the trying  
15 to get to where they were speaking to this morning.

16                  CHAIRMAN LYNN:  Mr. Huntwork.

17                  COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK:  What would happen  
18 if you just set out to create the five districts in  
19 Tucson without regard to what was around, made that as  
20 logical as possible, then you would have -- simply have  
21 to look around for additional population to complete one  
22 district, something like you did with the Congressional  
23 Districts in Phoenix?  That would seem to be the way  
24 that would make the most sense out of the Tucson  
25 metropolitan area?

1                   MR. JOHNSON: In general, that is somewhat  
2 the approach we're taking on internal Tucson districts.  
3 The two factors that kind of affect our ability to do  
4 that, one, the Tohono O'odham Reservation to the west is  
5 a very large geographic feature affects Tucson  
6 regardless of how we draw the districts there and, two,  
7 the Hispanic community AUR that includes Tohono O'odham  
8 and actually goes up along Casa Grande. So we're  
9 somewhat coming out of Tucson two ways, one, through  
10 Saddlebrooke --

11                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

12                   MR. JOHNSON: One through Tohono O'odham.  
13 The two sides directly affect how we draw these.

14                   COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I see that. One  
15 is if you combine some reservations really up in  
16 Maricopa County, you could get the area south of Tucson  
17 out of that district all together, leave you back in the  
18 position that was no longer a factor in the Tucson  
19 metropolitan area, and then you could set about to do  
20 five Tucson districts without that influence.

21                   MR. JOHNSON: Right. The complication we  
22 wrestle with in that case is population numbers kind of  
23 in that circle. Once you've enclosed it from the north  
24 and the west and somewhat to the east, Cochise is very  
25 solid population. That is a significant factor in its

1 district, and we're trying to avoid affecting it's  
2 percentage as well. So that's -- we really can't  
3 encircle ourselves completely, as you know, or we'd  
4 start combining Saddlebrooke with Eastern Arizona County  
5 areas which is tough to justify as well. So there's no  
6 easy out.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can we zoom out a  
8 bit? Both blue and purple are overpopulated now?

9 MR. JOHNSON: The green and purple are.  
10 The blue Air Force district is  
11 underpopulated by about 4,000.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's difficult to know how  
13 much progress we're making, in my mind. If you go out  
14 at least one more generation, and maybe -- let's start  
15 with that, and then I'll go further.

16 There's no question that this area,  
17 Mr. Elder is quite correct that this area, as well as  
18 into Oro Valley, and in fact, even up as far as  
19 Saddlebrooke, it could be dealt with in almost any  
20 manner, because it would be hard to make many  
21 separations in that whole area in terms of community of  
22 interest. The only difference would be that the further  
23 north you get in Pima county, and then the southern end  
24 of Pinal County, the only real difference is one of age,  
25 because there are significant retirement communities,

1 such as Sun City, Sun City West.

2 In the north end of Oro Valley, Sun City  
3 Vistoso, and Saddlebrooke.

4 Now, as you move further north into Pinal  
5 County, the differences become distinctly clearer. If  
6 you curve around the Catalina Mountains, we've already  
7 heard the cities of Oracle and San Manuel tend to think  
8 of themselves as associated more with Tucson than with  
9 the northern end of -- either the northern end of  
10 eastern Pinal County or certainly Maricopa.

11 As you move north through Pinal, that  
12 changes dramatically.

13 The further up you go, the worse it gets,  
14 from my perspective, in terms of affinities.

15 I think in terms of the interior  
16 districts, in Tucson, I've already talked about this  
17 one. This district, which comprises much of central  
18 Tucson and eastern Tucson down curving around to the  
19 bottom of -- or side of the Air Force Base. Again,  
20 there, it's relatively the same. And I think -- I think  
21 that works.

22 We have had, continued to have testimony  
23 about the dividing line. And there's an argument to be  
24 made either way between the interstate creating a  
25 dividing line between neighbors or, as Mr. Elder said,

1 there are some historical ties that obviously predate  
2 the freeway that connect neighborhoods on the east and  
3 the west side of the freeway.

4 I think -- I think I'm comfortable enough  
5 with this general direction to allow it to go out for  
6 public comment, because what I think we'll hear much  
7 more refining comment about how these lines individually  
8 should be drawn.

9 As you come across the southern part of  
10 Tucson, say even with the air base, and come across what  
11 at that point is, I-19, again, you have some natural  
12 barriers that you are dealing with. But I understand  
13 that some of the distinction there is going to be on the  
14 basis of not only even population but percentages of  
15 subpopulations within the district that we need to keep  
16 balanced as well. I understand that distinction.

17 I think the biggest difficulty you've got  
18 at this point is solving the north end of this problem.  
19 The south end of the problem, I think through public  
20 testimony and revisions that we will subsequently make  
21 will resolve itself. And I'm relatively comfortable to  
22 let that go. But I certainly am not comfortable unless  
23 there's a better solution of what is now called District  
24 E, which is L revisited, until we get that resolved. It  
25 really does not -- it does not solve the problem that

1 we've been talking about. So clearly concentrate on  
2 that area. And to the extent that either some  
3 arrangement, such as suggested by Commissioner Minkoff  
4 earlier, or there's some other logical solution, we've  
5 certainly had enough testimony from enough people in  
6 Pinal County how that area of the state relates to one  
7 another. We ought to be able to figure out how to make  
8 that thing work.

9                   The thing I don't like about this  
10 configuration, we have this meandering wraparound  
11 district that goes around the edge of Tucson.

12                   One of the districts that the current  
13 districts in Tucson is reminiscent of, this is the big  
14 semicircle around the city. It's something that we had  
15 hoped to correct through this process. And I certainly  
16 don't want this result to revisit that, if we can avoid  
17 that.

18                   I do think there's some natural divisions  
19 that we've already addressed that are layered as you  
20 come down from the foothills area to the center part of  
21 Tucson and into the west and south portions of Tucson  
22 that do make natural divisions that make sense. I would  
23 certainly respect those, if you could.

24                   Mr. Elder.

25                   COMMISSIONER ELDER: I make one comment.

1 We heard testimony at the Amphitheatre that the  
2 superintendent indicated he would like to have that  
3 district whole. That might give us a line. I cannot  
4 tell you, I think probably the Amphitheatre goes through  
5 B on Adobas, Casas Adobas north to south. I can't tell  
6 you. If something comes up, we need a line, that may  
7 work for you. Other than that, I don't know of any  
8 lines of demarcation for you.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's talk about that a  
10 moment. The southern boundary is the principle road in  
11 Tucson. The northern boundary is, I believe, north of  
12 Marana. So it is a significant district in terms of  
13 geography. And -- I heard the same point. But it is  
14 enormous.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Looking east-west,  
16 vertical, that's the only line that makes any sense  
17 there.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Matter of fact, the  
19 northern boundary is all the way up in the City of  
20 Catalina. There is a middle school in Golder Ranch,  
21 G O L D E R.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Unless there is  
25 something else on this map, some questions may be



1 answered in the answer done on the request I made of  
2 let's look at trying to rotate Pinal County  
3 horizontally. The northern part represented what one of  
4 the plans was, and the southern part then wrapped  
5 around, made an ugly looking district but it seemed as  
6 though we might look at some of the issues.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There may be one more  
8 comment before we move on.

9 Mr. Huntwork?

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I certainly  
11 wouldn't, don't mean to presume to know as much about  
12 Tucson as you gentlemen do. I do want to say the  
13 problem we're grappling with is there are too many  
14 pieces of Tucson broken off, the south is probably going  
15 into somewhere else. That's why the northern district  
16 has to break off so far.

17 In a nutshell, the only way to solve that  
18 is to bring all the pieces of Tucson into the  
19 metropolitan area back in and try to keep them as close  
20 to the center as possible. That would bring the Pinal  
21 County back down into, probably, to work the numbers,  
22 probably back into the Saddlebrooke area. But you have  
23 to keep Tucson together, start keeping the pieces  
24 together. That goes off to the north because there's  
25 nowhere else to go.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm curious, what is  
3 the total population? Short? Long?

4 MR. JOHNSON: Total population, Pima,  
5 Cochise, Pinal, 30,000. Full set of districts, set  
6 districts.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: 50,000 short?

8 MR. JOHNSON: 30 to 50,000 short.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Plus or minus 20.

10 That's why you figure in an effort to kill  
11 two birds with one stone, as it were, the desire is to  
12 combine the reservations, pursuant to their wishes, in  
13 an effort to garner more population.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Not necessarily our desire.  
15 There's so many factors in here, we're running through a  
16 whole bunch of scenarios that could work. That's one  
17 we've had, community testimony, interest in that, and  
18 we're considering that.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: The other alternative  
20 is Western Maricopa, or is that not going there. I  
21 can't tell if that's a line there or not.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Right now we're looking at,  
23 seem to have had fairly favorable testimony from the  
24 community on including Southwestern Maricopa, an  
25 extremely rural portion of the county. That is a fairly

1 homogeneous community with the Pinal, Pima area, makes  
2 us get some of the 30,000 there, or however many we  
3 need, regretfully not enough to get all of them there.  
4 So that is a start.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: And in your opinion a  
6 combination of two of those areas, is that sufficient  
7 population?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The scenario we drew  
9 yesterday, or when I wrote the proposal we had this  
10 morning, we did take exactly that approach, taking in  
11 roughly the line you see here in Maricopa, the west, and  
12 then it took a different approach than what I described,  
13 came up through the Indian Reservations, and the  
14 extremely far Eastern Maricopa as well. Got us to the  
15 set of population we needed to complete districts.

16 We know it can be done in essentially the  
17 approach. Now we're wrestling with the configuration of  
18 the districts in that area.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the  
20 Tucson map, per se, before we look at the alternative  
21 analysis?

22 All right.

23 If you proceed with the analysis of the  
24 alternative in the Pinal area.

25 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the

1 Commission, we'll move machines. Margaret Leoni has  
2 worked with the analysis and Chris Hutchison will assist  
3 her in explaining what our findings are.

4 MS. LEONI: At this afternoon's session,  
5 Commissioner Huntwork asked us to look at District E.  
6 This is rough. Work with District E, and then draw  
7 District L, over into the Gila River Reservation, taking  
8 in the Ak-Chin and leaving Casa Grande in the Pinal  
9 District but uniting the Tohono O'odham with the  
10 Saddlebrooke area.

11 I want to advise you, we did this on the  
12 map, not the current map Doug is working on. To  
13 transfer from one to another takes 90 minutes or more.  
14 That was not time we had. We have numbers on it and can  
15 tell you in a nutshell with this configuration we lost a  
16 minority district in E with the loss of population in  
17 the Casa Grande area and Gila River.

18 Chris, can we put some numbers up there?  
19 District E is lacking slightly, 18,000  
20 people.

21 Hispanic origin population dropped to 33  
22 percent and slightly more. So we've gone, total  
23 minority population is now about 44.23.

24 When we looked at this on August 4th, and  
25 we did this on the August 4th draft, the ugly L

1 District, we were approaching 64 percent minority. So  
2 this is something that needs development. It needs  
3 population. And I'm going to ask Chris to speak to  
4 this. We would naturally on this one move further east  
5 into the San Manuel area. That would take in a Census  
6 tract, rush up into eastern Pinal County, only gather  
7 about 8,000 people, bringing in population we have  
8 available to us, or so, into the district, is not such  
9 that it would recover the minority percentage.

10 As you can see, we have the San Manuel  
11 area, the one highlighted, 8,000 people, which brings us  
12 far north. With San Manuel, about four, bringing in  
13 change, about 13,000, but not enough to put our numbers  
14 up, changes to 34.3. Makes movement. Then have to move  
15 over to west to the Census tract. Has about 13,000  
16 people there. We're going to have to split that.

17 Can we get the number on that, Chris, for  
18 the Hispanic percentage.

19 We're just not going to be able to get  
20 enough minority to establish an AUR that the original  
21 District E was built on.

22 Commissioner Elder, did you have any  
23 further question on this experiment?

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Ms. Leoni and  
25 Mr. Chairman. I wanted to take a look at that as a

1 concept or idea to see what we'd pick up, the southern  
2 half of what was the old L district. It's becoming  
3 quickly obvious to me we can't get back enough of the  
4 population distribution we're looking for to maintain a  
5 majority-minority district on the west side there of E.  
6 I guess -- my frustration is I like the east-west  
7 orientation. We can't achieve our goals doing that. I  
8 appreciate the efforts for getting me the numbers so we  
9 can make the evaluation, and that, but I think it's not  
10 working.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't think there's any  
12 reason to pursue that.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: No.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Next point.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree. Yes, there  
16 is no reason.

17 MS. LEONI: We have a number of tests on  
18 the machine, not that particular test.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go ahead.

20 MS. LEONI: Once again, the test does not  
21 include the plan. We worked on side-by-side plans.

22 This experiment, test we're about to  
23 describe to you now, does not include the  
24 reconfiguration of S and R to include the historic  
25 district, the historic -- Phoenix historic AUR, pulling

1 it south and west into R. But the test we did does not  
2 affect that. I ask you to ignore that. That has been  
3 approved by the Commission on motion. It will appear on  
4 the map that goes out for public comment.

5 We were asked to experiment with  
6 reconfigurations of P and T.

7 As you can see, P has become quite  
8 compact. T remains an elongated district that includes  
9 Goodyear and Litchfield.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Before you go on,  
11 is the district next to it the same color?

12 MS. LEONI: I'm looking at it on the  
13 screen. It's more distinct, Commissioner Minkoff.  
14 Excuse me.

15 Has that helped at all?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes. Thank you.

17 MS. LEONI: Is that helpful? On the  
18 screen I'm looking at it is yellow.

19 T, it's light green on that. Yellow is  
20 what I'm looking at. P is light blue. I apologize.  
21 The colors don't appear true.

22 Does that -- I apologize.

23 There it is. That's T.

24 We don't consider this a finished product.

25 We're able to report to you, we believe

1 this rebalancing of the population has distinct  
2 possibilities in observing more closely the  
3 five-district configuration of the AUR that had been  
4 adopted by the Commission. If we get some numbers up  
5 there for T.

6 T has now become a district with a total  
7 Hispanic origin population of close to 39 percent. This  
8 is a change from the 44 percent that was literally  
9 neither here nor there under the five-district option.  
10 By making these changes, as I said, they are not  
11 completed, but populations are close.

12 District P -- Chris -- has been  
13 significantly strengthened. When we started this test,  
14 P was 50 and a half percent, 50 and a half total  
15 Hispanic population. We now have P at 55 and a half  
16 percent total Hispanic population, that's Hispanic total  
17 population, Hispanic voting population of 50.5 percent.  
18 We achieved Hispanic majority voting age population with  
19 this. We're not satisfied with all the lines. We think  
20 the extension of what is now T over the top of that  
21 bears a closer look. We were forced to take Avondale  
22 into the west side for population purposes. By the time  
23 when we left Avondale on the side with P, the west side,  
24 we were overpopulated 50,000.

25 We want to look more closely at



1 arrangement of districts move in this direction. We  
2 believe working between P, V, and T, we can achieve a  
3 better configuration.

4 So our report to you is we think this is a  
5 positive move, but our report is not finished. Our  
6 report is this test is not completed. We'd like to  
7 bring this back first thing in the morning with a  
8 completed proposal.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a step in the  
11 right direction. The thing I suggest you look at  
12 between now and tomorrow morning, P and V, divide them  
13 horizontally, not vertically. That would address some  
14 issues, school district boundaries and communities of  
15 interest that seem east-west rather than north-south.

16 MS. LEONI: We think that's very  
17 perceptive and a good approach to this.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

19 MR. HUNTWORK: I agree. And this was one  
20 of my major concerns I expressing earlier today. I  
21 think if there's a good test of this by tomorrow  
22 morning, it would help make me a lot more comfortable,  
23 probably help make me more comfortable with the map.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, then,  
25 if you finish that overnight and give us the benefit of

1 that analysis in the morning.

2 MS. LEONI: We'd be pleased to do so.

3 Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm beginning to  
6 feel much more comfortable with the way the northern  
7 part of the state and Phoenix are developing. I still  
8 have real, real concerns with the southern part of the  
9 state. I don't suppose to know what works best with  
10 Tucson. I suppose I know less about it than other parts  
11 of the state. I ask other Commissioners, you expressed  
12 comments to my mind, comments which created real  
13 problems Pinal County and Metropolitan Phoenix. Are the  
14 improvements in Tucson sufficient enough and important  
15 enough to do that? And I'm not proposing to say they  
16 are or aren't, whether they are worth, in a sense, the  
17 collateral damage that has occurred to some of the other  
18 districts. If they are I'm prepared to support them. I  
19 don't know.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm not prepared to  
21 answer. We don't know the collateral damage on the  
22 damage to Pinal County. It's our hope and direction to  
23 the consultants to minimize that damage, to the extent  
24 either through Mr. Huntwork's observation to draw  
25 districts back into Tucson and begin anew, put all the

1 pieces together so you have a full complement to draw  
2 from, or whether you continue on the basis that the  
3 layout in Tucson, in general terms, is reasonable to  
4 begin with. But to the extent you still have to make  
5 adjustments in Pinal County, to pick up that last 30 to  
6 50,000 population to make a district, that you do that  
7 in the most benign way possible, consistent with either  
8 AUR, testimony, or something else that we can hang our  
9 hat on, it's something that makes sense. I'm not sure  
10 we can give a definitive answer on that until we see it.

11 Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I think you  
13 minimalize collateral damage in other areas but also  
14 Tucson, start with Tucson, putting those districts in  
15 order.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Fanning out.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Fanning out with a  
18 small piece has to be put somewhere else rather than a  
19 big piece.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, the issue this  
21 evening is is there sufficient direction to make  
22 substantial progress overnight. That is the key. If  
23 you feel you are lacking in any way in that direction,  
24 now is the time to get it. There will only be one  
25 overnight.

1 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, we feel we have  
2 indeed the direction and will work the next 10 hours to  
3 produce a better map.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other areas  
5 you'll report on tonight we need to address?

6 DR. HESLOP: No, sir.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there further  
8 directions to consultants?

9 Mr. Hall?

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Dr. Heslop, we are  
11 grateful to you and your staff for their efforts,  
12 grateful you hired staff that have no need for sleep  
13 whatsoever, and we want to express our confidence and  
14 appreciation for efforts you guys are doing, your  
15 diligence and hard work.

16 DR. HESLOP: We reciprocate our gratitude  
17 to the Commission for their understanding.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd only say, Dr. Heslop,  
19 when you next report to us, if you say "we have failed,"  
20 I think you should change it to "we have not yet  
21 succeeded." We will succeed.

22 DR. HESLOP: In our lexicon, "fail" is a  
23 temporary word.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Very well.

25 Any further direction to the consultants?

1                   If not, I think, if you'd like to get a  
2 head start, I don't know if it will help you, we'll will  
3 entertain one more round of call to the public.

4                   You may want to continue to have a  
5 consultant, some member of the team to be here to hear  
6 the call to the public as well.

7                   Those who wish to be heard would need to,  
8 as usual, fill out a yellow speaker form and we'll be  
9 happy to entertain call to the public as our last item  
10 this evening.

11                   (Discussion off the record.)

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, this  
13 is the last item this evening.

14                   This is the time for consideration and  
15 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.  
16 Those wishing to address the Commission shall request  
17 permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.  
18 Action taken as a result of public comment will be  
19 limited to directing staff to study the matter or  
20 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and  
21 decision at a later date.

22                   Being as we've been at it about 12 hours,  
23 let's try to keep it to a three-minute time period, if  
24 we can. We don't have a watch on it. If you'd do your  
25 best.

1                   The first speaker is Anne Murray, vice  
2 president of the Broadmoor Broadway Village Neighborhood  
3 Association, I assume.

4                   Ms. Murray.

5                   MS. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
6 Commissioners. I appreciate the chance to speak.

7                   The issue I wanted to speak to is a macro  
8 type issue, that is the use of Broadway Boulevard as a  
9 boundary dividing north-south districts. And as I  
10 understood the most recent map, District H, and the  
11 southern boundary, it would be the boundary for what  
12 they are calling the Air Force District. Northern  
13 boundary would be the boundary, do I have that  
14 correctly, with the use of Broadway as an east-west  
15 boundary between the districts. Broadway functioning as  
16 a corridor is a significant corridor impacting  
17 neighborhoods adjacent both north and southwest of  
18 University. Broadway goes into downtown with a  
19 different kind of population business mix. East of  
20 University, going east, probably as far as Wilmot,  
21 certainly as far as Swan, we have a network of very  
22 cohesive, strong neighborhood associations with a long  
23 history of working together on issues which we share on  
24 both sides of Broadway. Broadway functions to us as an  
25 organizing factor. For example, currently

1 transportation on Broadway is being considered.  
2 Broadway carries a great deal of transportation.  
3 Consider the amount of transportation on Broadway. My  
4 transportation is on Broadway. My neighborhood is  
5 anchored by the Broadway Village Shopping Center, the  
6 first shopping center designed by Jose O. Johnson.  
7 That's also an identity point for all four neighborhoods  
8 north, south, east, and west of Country Club.

9 Another feature of this is that Broadway  
10 runs kind of in between Speedway and 22nd Street. When  
11 you go from the University east to Wilmot, the schools  
12 all inter-relate. So the middle schools and the high  
13 schools in that swath of neighborhoods all receive  
14 feeders from the elementary schools all between 22nd and  
15 Speedway.

16 So to divide this very cohesive community  
17 that has worked together over a long period of time and  
18 put some of it south of Broadway in one district and  
19 another part of it north of Broadway in another district  
20 really divides what is a very close community of  
21 interest.

22 So that basically is the point I wanted to  
23 make. Please do not see Broadway as a boundary. But  
24 actually 22nd Street would be a better boundary.

25 Thank you very much.

1                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Murray.

2                   Next speaker is Mr. Bohnee, public  
3 relations speaker for the Gila River Community.

4                   MR. BOHNEE: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
5 Commission, thank you for the opportunity to say a few  
6 brief words.

7                   I wanted to reiterate a few words made by  
8 the Lieutenant Governor of the community and echoed by  
9 Ms. Minkoff, and really that is, if at all possible, to  
10 look and consider combining the four metro area tribes,  
11 which would be Fort McDowell, the Navajo Nation, Salt  
12 River Indian Community, Pima River Indian Community, and  
13 Ak-Chin Indian Community into what would be the same  
14 district. One of the iterations I guess I see to my  
15 left over here I guess accomplishes that goal.

16                   The iteration that was addressed last week  
17 by the Lieutenant Governor had the Tohono O'odham  
18 Nation, Ak-Chin Nation, the Tohono O'odham Nation in one  
19 district. Cultural relations, there are many  
20 distinctions the bind the metro area tribes together,  
21 both culturally, but also a number of issues that the  
22 communities address as -- both as Indian communities,  
23 the four metro tribes, and economic development issues.

24                   In that context I just wanted to reiterate  
25 that that would be a strong recommendation from the



1 community.

2                   With respect to the compactness issue,  
3 this may have already been provided to the Commission.  
4 The reiteration we have over here, pretty much most of  
5 Pinal County in one district, which also includes the  
6 four metro tribes, I think gets to that particular issue  
7 in terms of having compact districts, also looking at  
8 the communities of interest.

9                   I hope as the map drawers and Commission  
10 consider viewpoints, that would be one strong  
11 consideration you take into consideration.

12                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Bohnee.

13                   The next speaker, Ms. Cecilia Cruz, Latino  
14 Self-Help Network.

15                   MS. CRUZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and  
16 Commissioners.

17                   I know it's a difficult task tonight. I  
18 did appreciate that.

19                   There are two points I'd like to have you  
20 consider, to be very brief. I know you received a map  
21 considered by the Chicano Consortium Border Map, I  
22 believe, that takes into consideration strong  
23 considerations and all considerations shared by the  
24 issues in that map.

25                   Second, issues looking at Legislative

1 issues what is identified by TT and J in Tucson,  
2 primarily, areas in West Tucson and South Tucson, I  
3 would like you to consider natural boundaries that  
4 occurred along the interstate and including South Tucson  
5 into what is identified on the map as J, that has been  
6 historically South Tucson, which has been, the dividing  
7 area has been the interstate, where it does merge into  
8 I-19 and I-10 going south. It does address the issue  
9 25,000 in population, gives District J added population,  
10 and keeps historically what has been represented before.

11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Cruz.

13 Salomon Baldenegro, Chicano Consortium for  
14 Public Issues.

15 MR. BALDENEGRO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
16 Members of Commission.

17 This morning I talked, fixated on some  
18 issues on South Tucson, the same issues she talked about  
19 and border issues I talked about, and forgot some things  
20 I think are important to mention. One is what the  
21 previous speaker referred to: I want to thank you for  
22 your work. You are doing a lot of work, hard work, and  
23 a great service for our state. I know how hard work is.  
24 I want to make sure you are aware we appreciate the  
25 work. Some may not agree with it. We appreciate the

1 effort. You are doing good work.

2                   The second thing it's important for you to  
3 know, from the standpoint of citizen involvement, it's  
4 political important from a democracy point to know the  
5 border map I submitted for Chicanos Consortium for  
6 Public Issues was looked at, reviewed by about 400  
7 people. I distributed it to 258 people in Tucson and 68  
8 people in Phoenix. I got feedback from people I did not  
9 distribute it to, people got it passed to. It was  
10 passed on to other folks. From that I calculate about  
11 400 people looked at the map we submitted and many  
12 commented, either called me or sought me out personally  
13 and talked to me. I mention that to impress upon you  
14 that the map we submitted and the border district we  
15 argue was not created in a vacuum.

16                   The third thing I forgot to talk about  
17 this morning was to make sure you understand that those  
18 of us in Tucson working here on issues, Chicano  
19 Consortium for Public Issues that supports issues for  
20 fair redistricting are very active, appeared before you  
21 many times, and will again want to reiterate their plans  
22 and their comments. Be aware we do support and  
23 conceptually endorse their comments and their plans.

24                   And fourthly, I forgot this morning to  
25 talk about, after I spoke, a lot of speakers talked

1 about the competitive aspect of redistricting. I know  
2 that Prop 106 was devised and passed and has as -- at  
3 its heart the notion of competitive districts. And  
4 that's important. When you juxtapose the competitive  
5 aspect with Section Five Voting Rights, and things,  
6 sometimes those things have a way of getting in the way  
7 of each other when you wind up with the final product.  
8 I know you will, and you'll make sure it's in the  
9 record, juxtapose it, based on the fact with voting  
10 rights and other things driving this.

11 Thank you for your time, patience, and  
12 work.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

14 Frank Seanez, attorney with the Navajo  
15 Nation.

16 Mr. Seanez.

17 MR. SEANEZ: Thank you, Chairman Lynn,  
18 Members of the Commission.

19 I wanted to, on behalf of the Navajo  
20 Nation, thank the Commission for its diligent work,  
21 especially today in considering some of the very  
22 difficult issues involved in redistricting.

23 All the Commissioners at one point or  
24 another have led to discussions within the public  
25 hearing of some of the very real concerns which affect

1 not only other communities of interest but the Navajo  
2 Nation as well.

3 In particular, the Navajo Nation is  
4 appreciative of the fact the Commission is willing to  
5 revisit again its support in separation of -- separation  
6 of the Navajo Nation and Hopi Tribe. We believe it's  
7 much more defensible, much more reasonable, and much  
8 better Legislative, better than one, than the prior  
9 iteration, NE1.

10 There are changes in support for various  
11 ideas, as the discussion winds up. The Nation as well  
12 wants to express its appreciation for some of the  
13 discussions and initiatives which did not go forward,  
14 particularly Commissioner Huntwork's keeping in play the  
15 idea of the combination of the White Mountain Apache  
16 Tribe and the San Carlos Tribe in the same Legislative  
17 District as the Navajo Nation.

18 One thing the Navajo Nation reminds very  
19 concerned about is the drop of Native American  
20 population between the bench mark plan and even that  
21 which is now before the Commission in M1.

22 We're still talking about a Native  
23 American population which is topping out at somewhere  
24 near 66 percent. And we can't let the Commission forget  
25 what we're looking at from the bench mark plan is 77

1 percent.

2                   The Navajo Nation still very much  
3 concerned about that drop.

4                   Some of the discussions did not come all  
5 the way through fruition or passage of fruition of the  
6 motion.

7                   There are Census tracts out there which  
8 would not involve splitting census places or  
9 municipalities which would increase Native American  
10 population. They surround municipalities, like  
11 Flagstaff, and are contiguous with other portions of the  
12 Legislative District which is now under consideration in  
13 the Legislative District map.

14                   As well, the Navajo Nation would encourage  
15 the Commission to still keep under consideration other  
16 Census places and municipalities that have large Native  
17 American populations, specifically Winslow and Holbrook.

18                   The Navajo Nation does not give up its  
19 position that a Legislative District with a Native  
20 American population of 77 percent can be obtained by the  
21 unification of Apache County and the unification of the  
22 White Mountain Tribe and San Carlos Tribe in accord with  
23 the Navajo Nation's Plan first set before this  
24 Commission on June 25th of this year.

25                   Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

2 Next speaker, Mr. DuPont.

3 Mr. DuPont.

4 MR. DUPONT: I'm here as regards the  
5 dividing line on Broadway. As Anne Murray stated,  
6 Broadway and its cohesiveness is a community of  
7 interest. We've studied using the Broadway corridor.  
8 Most of us share the Broadway line. There's a balance  
9 in the neighborhood plan. I sit in a building on  
10 Alvernon, a plan that is inclusive on this side of  
11 Broadway and the other side of Broadway which is  
12 inclusive of businesses on Broadway, which I've done for  
13 four years.

14 I'm one of the organizers of the Central  
15 League of Businesses which is inclusive of both sides of  
16 Broadway.

17 We'd ask you to reconsider moving that to  
18 the 22nd corridor so it keeps us together. It is a  
19 major part of Tucson, that being considered, Broadway.  
20 There are several historic buildings on Broadway that  
21 need to be together on Broadway.

22 Thank you for your time.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. DuPont.

24 Next is Mr. Smith.

25 Mr. Smith.

1 MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2 This day has given me my first real window  
3 to what you all have been going through. I want to say  
4 I appreciate it. I'm reminded of an analogy to making  
5 sausage. I won't go any further than that.

6 I hadn't intended to speak tonight.

7 I particularly appreciated the comments  
8 and questions by Mr. Elder, Ms. Minkoff, and the  
9 Chairman.

10 I associate myself with your comment of  
11 the progress made, probably talking about some small  
12 lines in Tucson, South Tucson, which I was talking to.  
13 However, as I looked at the map, it appeared to me the  
14 consultants were perhaps trying to be responsive to the  
15 testimony of several of us from South Tucson,  
16 Mr. Elder's comments, but maybe they didn't quite  
17 understand what we were saying.

18 I'd like to take a quick crack at it. We  
19 said we have communities of interest, in particular  
20 south and east. I think I may have confused them when I  
21 said east to the railroad, because there was an area  
22 associated with South Tucson with this new map north  
23 between the freeway and the railroad which is a  
24 different area. I'm trying to be helpful to the  
25 consultants, and they are looking at this.



1                   I would mention a comment Mrs. Cruz made,  
2 I also noticed that.

3                   Without the maps, I'm not sure. There was  
4 a purple district in which South Tucson appeared on  
5 tonight's map. And that district wound up west. And  
6 what we had been asking is that portion of the district  
7 on the southeast part of that district that was on the  
8 east side of the freeway be associated with the pale  
9 blue. We also noticed that you commented that the  
10 purple was overpopulated and -- in a very heavy  
11 majority-minority district. It sounds like, as you  
12 indicated, Mr. Chairman, there may be kinds of things  
13 can be worked out, perhaps in public comment after you  
14 do the map.

15                   I thank you for the opportunity to restate  
16 what I was saying, and thank you again for all your  
17 work.

18                   CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

19                   The next speaker is Paul Mackey.

20                   Mr. Mackey.

21                   MR. MACKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,  
22 members of the Commission. I intended to talk on  
23 another comment. As I sat during the day, certain  
24 things developed, particularly the last item dealing  
25 with the Tucson area.

1                   I was concerned initially when I came in  
2 this morning hearing talk of only four districts in  
3 Tucson. The phraseology of the consultants, I was  
4 concerned Tucson was totally screwed in terms of  
5 districts. Seems now there's consideration of five  
6 districts.

7                   Talking of population of 583,000 in  
8 Tucson, Tucson and Eastern Pima County, 171,000 in each  
9 district, it would work out, roughly, using one man one  
10 vote thinking, to roughly five districts for Eastern  
11 Pima County, or Pima County as a whole, with the  
12 intended focus on that.

13                   After watching the map and the work done  
14 during the recess, I guess, let me speak to one of the  
15 concerns, and that had to do with the green area in  
16 Tucson, or what I'm referring to as District H. I wish  
17 we still had the maps. I could suggest adjustments.

18                   Some of the previous speakers, Bill and  
19 Anne Murray, some involved the central part of Tucson,  
20 central Tucson leadership. It's 30 associations, covers  
21 an area roughly on the East of Wilmot Road and extending  
22 roughly to Stone Avenue, east of I-10, and extends north  
23 to Grant roughly to 22nd.

24                   Now this is a relatively cohesive area of  
25 the Tucson central area. I say that, having been in

1 this community a long time working a lot of data in the  
2 area. I also chair a group that is neighbors the  
3 University of Arizona and 10 neighborhoods there. We  
4 don't think in terms of us being in the purple area. If  
5 anything, I would suggest this area, area H, or the  
6 green area, that be shifted eastward.

7 I know a couple members of the Commission  
8 from the Tucson area said it seemed to make some sense  
9 to you. I differ in the sense the central part of the  
10 city doesn't begin to associate itself, think of itself  
11 with the Wilmot area, part of the southern part of  
12 Sahuarita. We're talking a totally different part,  
13 orientation, voting patterns. And you begin to see real  
14 cohesiveness in that part of the city.

15 I suggest the area perhaps be dropped to  
16 the south, south of Broadway, perhaps down around 22nd.  
17 You'd have to play with it somewhat. I think the  
18 consultants said the blue area, airport district, excess  
19 population, something be done with it there.

20 The main concern is it be shifted somewhat  
21 eastward, part is the airport district, and that it be  
22 shifted.

23 What is the organization for the  
24 districts? There is different criteria. The Foothills  
25 District extend in Oro Valley, a relatively homogeneous

1 area. This not a competitive area. It's a safe  
2 district. It's like what are we using here as an  
3 organizing base in the Tucson area, criteria? We're  
4 beginning to get very questionable about it.

5 So, in the absence then of defining better  
6 the criteria, I'm going to suggest then if nothing else  
7 we have a strong central district, a cohesive district.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Mackey.

9 If others wish to speak, I'd ask you get  
10 speaker slips filled out. Raise your hand.

11 The last slip I have of those wishing to  
12 speak this evening is from Steve Gallardo for the  
13 Coalition for Fair Redistricting.

14 Mr. Gallardo.

15 MR. GALLARDO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16 I'm with the Coalition for Fair  
17 Redistricting. I'm Steve Gallardo.

18 I know it's been a long day.

19 I want to reiterate the points by  
20 Mrs. Cruz and Mr. Baldenegro, support the changes in I  
21 and U. We feel it would maximize the minority voting  
22 strength in those two districts, and we support that  
23 wholeheartedly.

24 We have made a change and plan on  
25 submitting a proposal to the Commission in regard to our

1 suggestion regarding Tucson as well.

2 Also, in regards to Pinal County, we also  
3 support Mr. Bohnee with the Gila River Indian Community  
4 with regard to the Pinal County Legislative lines. We  
5 feel this is minority-majority district and feel the  
6 Indian Reservations should be put together.

7 Also, the Coalition also would ask the  
8 Commission please look at the Yuma County District. I'm  
9 not too sure what number or letter that is. That's  
10 currently a minority-majority district. Although we're  
11 a little hesitant to call it a strong majority-minority  
12 district, we'd ask the Commission, as far as minority  
13 voting right interests, look at it to make it a stronger  
14 minority-majority district.

15 Finally, as regards Maricopa County and  
16 district P, the West Phoenix District, I did see the  
17 draft the consultants have created with some  
18 corrections. We again have submitted a map I'd like to  
19 submit to the Commission for their consideration.

20 One thing I want to point out for your  
21 consideration. I understand the population problem. I  
22 feel if we could add Avondale, maybe have the district  
23 go as far west as Litchfield Road and I-10, I-10 being  
24 the northern boundary, going eastward to 83rd Avenue,  
25 83rd Avenue north to Glendale, Glendale east to 51st

1 Avenue, 51st Avenue down south to Buckeye Road. And if  
2 you look at that particular district, again, if it's  
3 overpopulated, have the northern boundary currently cut  
4 off at Glendale Road, have it keep continuing down until  
5 the population is where it needs to be at, I believe 171  
6 plus, I feel that would be a strong minority-majority  
7 district.

8 We've also outlined three other districts.  
9 I know there were concerns early on in the hearings in  
10 regard for minority-majority districts. We outlined  
11 them. And we hope the Commission takes them into  
12 consideration.

13 With that, good night.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Are there other members of  
15 the public that wish to be heard this evening?

16 Any final comments from the Commission?

17 I'd simply ask the consultants as they are  
18 doing their work this evening, the public comments this  
19 evening are very apropos, and they continue to define  
20 things, particularly in the Tucson area.

21 It seems to be problematic as we move  
22 forward. There are natural divisions that have been  
23 suggested. I'd suggest you take those strongly into  
24 account as you move forward as you are trying to solve  
25 the greater macro issue of Southern Arizona.

1                   As we move through the southern area, the  
2                   comments made this evening and earlier in the day have  
3                   been very instructive and I think can be very helpful in  
4                   making some choices easier for the consultants to select  
5                   where lines go, so I'd actually take those into account.

6                   Further comments from anybody on the  
7                   Commission?

8                   If not, we'll stand in recess until 8:00  
9                   o'clock in the morning.

10                   (The following is a letter for submission  
11                   to be included the record:

12                                   Arizona State Senate

13                                   August 15, 2001

14  
15  
16                   Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission  
17                   1400 West Washington, Suite B-10  
18                   Phoenix, Arizona 85007.

19  
20                   Dear Commission Members:

21  
22                   I'm writing to encourage the Commission to preserve  
23                   Yavapai County intact as a Legislative District.

24  
25                   Our population is within 3% of the required number.

                                  ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
                                  Phoenix, Arizona

1 Including all of Sedona brings us precisely to the ideal  
2 population and meets the City boundary goal. The County  
3 is clearly a community of interest and is geographically  
4 compact. We obviously fulfill the Proposition's stated  
5 intent to use county boundaries to the extent  
6 practicable.

7

8 These are the very criteria identified in Proposition  
9 106. We are the perfect example of what the law asks you  
10 to carry out. Thank you for preserving Yavapai County  
11 intact.

12

13 Sincerely,

14

15 (Signature in original on file with the Commission)

16

17 KEN BENNETT

18 State Senator

19 KB/jy.

20 (Whereupon, the Commission adjourned for  
21 the evening at approximately 9:29 p.m.)

22

\* \* \* \*

23

24

25



1

2 STATE OF ARIZONA        )  
                                  )  ss.  
3 COUNTY OF MARICOPA    )

4

5

6                   BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was  
7 taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified  
8 Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona,  
9 Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were  
10 taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to  
11 typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 192  
12 pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all  
13 proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all  
14 done to the best of my ability.

15                   I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way  
16 related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any  
17 way interested in the outcome hereof.

18                   DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 5th day of  
19 October, 2001.

20

21

22

23

24

25

\_\_\_\_\_  
LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR  
Certified Court Reporter  
Certificate Number 50349

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE  
Phoenix, Arizona

