

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

STATE OF ARIZONA
ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PUBLIC SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona
August 9, 2001
12:00 p.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 9, 2001,
3 at 12:00 o'clock p.m., at the Pointe South Mountain
4 Resort, Conference Rooms Estrella and Flagstaff, 7777
5 South Pointe Parkway, Phoenix, Arizona, 85044, in the
6 presence of:

7

8 APPEARANCES:

9 CHAIRMAN STEVEN W. LYNN

10 COMMISSIONER JAMES R. HUNTWORK

11 COMMISSIONER JOSHUA M. HALL

12 COMMISSIONER ANDI MINKOFF

13 COMMISSIONER DANIEL R. ELDER

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

ADDITIONAL APPEARANCES:

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

1

2 SPEAKERS FROM CALL TO THE PUBLIC:

3

4 PAUL ECKSTEIN

5 FRANK SEANEZ

6 AMBER WAKEMAN

7 TOM SIMPLOT

8 REPRESENTATIVE SYLVIA LAUGHTER

9 JIM HARTDEGEN

10 STEVE OWENS

11

12

13 AGENDA DESIGNATED SPEAKERS:

14

15 DR. ALAN HESLOP

16 DR. FLORENCE ADAMS

17 DOUG JOHNSON

18 CHRIS HUTCHISON

19 ADOLFO ECHEVESTE

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
Phoenix, Arizona
August 9, 2001
12:00 o'clock p.m.

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIRMAN LYNN: I would like to call the meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission to order. The record should show all five members are present.

Ladies and gentlemen, the next order of business on the agenda is call to the public for public comment.

Before we have public comment, I wanted to make some prefatory remarks.

What you see displayed on the easels to the left and right of the Commission are the initial drafts of maps that will be discussed over the next three days. And it's fair to say that those drafts will be modified to some extent, perhaps to a great extent, depending on the discussion over the next three days.

I'm reminded of family trips that we used to take to California when there was an awful lot of discussion in the car as to whether we're there yet. I want to assure everyone that we're not there yet. For

1 our benefit as well as the benefit of the public, it's
2 very important that we do this in a progress -- that we
3 progress through this process in a manner that gives
4 everybody an understanding of where we started and,
5 ultimately, where we will wind up and why we got there.

6 So, to that end, what I would suggest,
7 without objection from the Commission, is we will have
8 public comment at the beginning of the meeting. But I
9 would ask those that have specific comments on the
10 drafts that are being presented today, to perhaps hold
11 their comments until the maps have been presented.
12 There will be a full formal presentation of the two
13 draft maps. And as those maps are presented, we will
14 all learn information that may be useful in framing some
15 of the comments that you might make to us. What you
16 will then do is have public comment after presentation
17 of the draft. At that time, your comments would be put
18 in the proper context as you consider them, as we
19 consider the proper consideration or changes to the maps
20 as they exist.

21 Again, I'm not at all trying to dissuade
22 somebody from speaking early. I want to give you the
23 option of speaking later and give you that opportunity
24 without any sort of penalty, if you will.

25 There will be ample opportunities for

1 public comment throughout the course of the day.

2 Again, this is a work in progress. And
3 this work in progress will not be finalized until after
4 our second round of public hearings.

5 Our job this weekend is to move the
6 process forward so that the maps to be taken around the
7 state will be maps that we wish specific public comment
8 on.

9 Our last round of public comment was
10 designed to elicit comment from the public on
11 communities of interest. Those comments along with
12 other input that had been given to the Commission are
13 actually things that had been taken into account on the
14 maps that you see before you; however, it's clear to all
15 of us that many of the comments that were made by the
16 public, if taken side by side, are contradictory, or
17 competing. And, therefore, the information that we were
18 given, we had given to the consultants to prepare the
19 draft that you see, are the basis of some compilation of
20 that information and some definition of the Arizona
21 units of representation as was the subject of last
22 week's meeting.

23 We will have more comment from the
24 consultants about map development and specific
25 development of these maps as we move through the meeting

1 today.

2 So with that said, let us move to public
3 comment as is scheduled on the agenda, again with the
4 idea that those whose cards I already have, if you wish
5 to be heard on this subject and would like to defer that
6 to a later point in the meeting, we'd certainly
7 understand that.

8 As I go through these cards, and again
9 anyone who wishes to speak at this point or later in the
10 meeting, we ask you to fill out a speaker card with your
11 name and who you are representing.

12 As we go through these, I'd ask if you
13 wish to be heard now or might defer that to a later
14 point.

15 Item II, public comment: This is the time
16 for consideration and discussion of comments and
17 complaints from the public. Those wishing to address
18 the Commission shall request permission in advance by
19 filling out a speaker slip. Action taken as a result of
20 public comment will be limited to directing staff to
21 study the matter or rescheduling the matter for further
22 consideration and decision at a later date.

23 The first slip I have is from Paul
24 Eckstein.

25 Do you wish to be heard now?

1 MR. ECKSTEIN: At both times.

2 Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission,
3 I'm Paul Eckstein. I'm representing the Arizona
4 Democratic Party.

5 When I spoke last time, I believe it was,
6 I urged you strongly to take into account
7 competitiveness as you were drawing these lines. I
8 pointed out that one can look at Proposition 106 and see
9 that the competitiveness criteria is last listed. And
10 it clearly says that to the extent practicable, one
11 should take into account competitiveness to the extent
12 it does not significantly diminish the achievement of
13 the other goals.

14 And I think that maps we submitted last
15 week, both at the Congressional and the State
16 Legislative level, demonstrated it clearly, that one can
17 achieve all the other goals that are set out in
18 Proposition 106 and meet the requirements of the United
19 States Constitution and Voting Rights Act of 1965 and
20 have competitive districts and, indeed, increase the
21 number of competitive districts that exist.

22 At least at first glance, and perhaps
23 second and third glance, the maps that have been
24 submitted by your consultants do not do that.

25 And if they take competitiveness into

1 account, which it does not appear that they do, to us,
2 they clearly do not achieve the kind of competitiveness
3 that can be achieved as demonstrated by the maps that we
4 submitted last week.

5 And I'll speak at the 50,000-foot level
6 rather than dealing with individual districts.

7 To give you some sense of our concern, at
8 least in looking at the maps and the preliminary data
9 that we have seen, it appears to us that of the eight
10 Congressional districts that have been drawn by your
11 consultants, four are safe Republican Districts, as you
12 label them, A, B, E, and F. Two are safe Democratic
13 Districts, with all the provisos I gave last time. No
14 district is entirely safe all the time. If one has the
15 unusual circumstances and the right candidate, which was
16 demonstrated in Legislative District 30, miracles can
17 happen, but miracles don't usually happen.

18 And by that standard, there are two safe
19 Democratic Districts, D and G.

20 In our view, it's clear say there clearly
21 has been packing in Congressional District D. And there
22 are only two swing districts, C and H. And I think H is
23 somewhat problematic as a swing district.

24 If one takes the most extreme view of
25 that, one could say there are five safe Republican

1 Districts, two safe Democratic Districts, and one
2 safe -- two swing districts. That does not comply with
3 Proposition 106.

4 Under the map we submitted, there were
5 three safe Republican Districts, two safe Democratic
6 Districts, and three swing districts. We think that
7 demonstrates, clearly, the competitiveness and other
8 goals met at the same time.

9 There's a similar story with respect to
10 state Legislative Districts.

11 By our count, there are 10 safe Democratic
12 Districts, three swing districts, and 17 safe Republican
13 Districts.

14 According to the maps we submitted, there
15 were eight safe Democratic Districts. You may say we
16 are you nuts. Hear you are representing the Democratic
17 Party. You submitted a map with eight safe Democratic
18 Districts. We have 10 safe Democratic Districts. What
19 are you doing? Are you crazy. Because we were trying
20 to comply with Proposition 106. Under our map, we had
21 nine swing districts. We think there are three,
22 arguably, there are five swing districts. We think it
23 really is three. And if you assume that there are three
24 swing districts, then there are 13 out of 17 safe
25 Republican districts. Under our map, there were 13 safe

1 Republican Districts, eight safe Democratic Districts,
2 and eight safe swing districts.

3 At the very short level, I understand
4 you've had a very short time to look at the numbers.
5 But we believe that, given the time we have, those
6 points are valid.

7 We ask as you meet over the next several
8 days you make every effort possible to make these
9 districts as competitive as possible. You can do it
10 without diminishing the other criteria.

11 And as I am trying to talk to you
12 individually, and I've left voice mail messages for you,
13 you have to do it now. If you wait until end of the
14 process, get to the end of the process, you'll have a
15 third round of hearings. I don't think you have time
16 for that. I urge you to do it now and thank you for
17 your time.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Eckstein.

19 The next speaker is Frank Seanez who
20 represents the Navajo Nation.

21 MR. SEANEZ: Good afternoon, Chairman
22 Lynn.

23 As with Mr. Eckstein, the Navajo Nation,
24 we reserve the option to speak now and later.

25 I speak on behalf of the Navajo Nation.

1 There is so little similarity between the
2 proposal submitted, between the information the Navajo
3 Nation submitted on June 25th, between both the grids
4 and maps submitted by National Demographics and the
5 Navajo Nation.

6 The Navajo Nation is very concerned about
7 the lack of a Northern Arizona Congressional District,
8 even though we saw in downloading the Power Point
9 presentation from August 2nd that such a recommendation
10 was made by this Commission in a unanimous matter.

11 As well, the Navajo Nation, another one of
12 the recommendations which was apparently voted on by a
13 vote of three to two and later modified by four one
14 indicated one to two rural Congressional Districts would
15 not go into an urban area, and we do not believe that is
16 the case under the Congressional District draft map that
17 we're seeing today and which was published this morning
18 on page eight of the Arizona Republic.

19 The Navajo Nation is concerned about the
20 extent of the district, concerned about it's connection
21 into Maricopa County. We think there are problems with
22 that. Of course, as well, the Navajo Nation extremely
23 concerned about what appears to be a total abandonment
24 of compactness to gain contiguity in District A.

25 Inclusion of the Hopi Nation and Hopi

1 partition lands, the Moencopi, Moenavi, in District A is
2 only obtained through an extremely bizarre
3 gerrymandering, so extremely discernible on the maps
4 there.

5 The Navajo Nation is extremely concerned
6 about the wholesale incorporation about the EACO
7 proposal, Eastern Arizona Counties Organization proposal
8 for a Legislative District within the Legislative draft
9 map, inclusion of the southern portions of Southern
10 Arizona counties, Graham County, Greenlee Counties,
11 while I don't see any reflection of the Navajo Nation's
12 proposal for a Legislative District within the draft NDC
13 maps.

14 The Navajo Nation is concerned with
15 regards to the -- both the Legislative District and
16 Congressional District proposals in that the escape
17 valve is that corridor that you can see there for the
18 Hopi Nation into another Legislative District and
19 another Congressional District necessarily involves not
20 only the creation of a gerrymandering corridor, but
21 separation of the Navajo, of the Navajo Nation in both a
22 Congressional District and Legislative District as
23 questioned by the Navajo Nation in the report from
24 National Demographics Corporation on July 25th, it
25 indicated that the EDS information necessary to make

1 determinations with regards to political cohesiveness
2 and voting history was not available at that time.

3 We don't know at this point whether that
4 information has been made available and whether it is --
5 whether it has been incorporated within the draft maps.
6 That is something we would very much like to know.

7 The information relative to the racial and
8 ethnic breakdown, all the numbers we've seen, and, of
9 course, we understand it's just a printing within the
10 Arizona Republic, not the Commission's own documents,
11 contains only raw population data, does not address
12 voting age data.

13 One of the Navajo Nation's main concerns
14 in this area is information the Navajo Nation
15 population, as with most Native American populations,
16 are of a much higher percent not voting age population.

17 In order to really have a true opportunity
18 to participate within the electoral population, the
19 numbers of Native Americans need to be higher than the
20 general population in order to provide that opportunity.

21 The Navajo population is as well concerned
22 that there are not -- that there are not individual
23 packets available at this meeting, as there have been at
24 the other meetings of the Commission, to allow the
25 public to more readily access information. We do

1 understand draft maps are now up on the website.
2 Unfortunately, being up on the website, we don't have
3 the same access in the city as we do up at the nation.
4 If at all possible, we would like to see information in
5 hard copy, if not this afternoon, as soon as possible.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Seanez.

7 The next speaker is Amber Wakeman.

8 Is that correct?

9 MS. WAKEMAN: Yes.

10 On behalf of the City of Tempe, I would
11 like to take this opportunity to express the views of
12 the Tempe Community Congressional Legislative Districts
13 in Arizona.

14 This letter was sent earlier this week to
15 the Commission.

16 The City of Tempe boundaries represent a
17 distinct community of interest by recognizing common
18 interests unique to Tempe. The Commission expressed the
19 most accurate interpretation of law might by
20 representation of communities of interest. We'd ask the
21 guidelines in creating these maps conform to Tempe's
22 boundaries and provide, two, a geographic and compact
23 and contiguous district, and, three, incorporate visible
24 features provided by them and respect the boundaries as
25 conveyed through the overwhelming input as submitted in

1 the recently held hearings for dividing this community
2 into multiple districts so as not to dilute us.

3 The East Valley residents, in and around
4 Tempe, have made their position clear. Tempe should be
5 represented by one Congressional and Legislative
6 District.

7 Put simply, the community's best
8 represented by municipal boundaries.

9 Thank you for your time.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Ms. Wakeman.

11 If you wish to address the Commission at
12 this time, I need a speaker slip filled up out. Hold
13 your hand up, and they'll give them out.

14 The last speaker slip, Tom Simplot,
15 Chairman of the Historical Preservation District.

16 MR. SIMPLOT: Thank you.

17 As the current Chairman of the Historic
18 Preservation Commission, we're not pleased the Historic
19 Districts are now carved out into two innercity
20 Legislative Districts.

21 The Historic Districts have numerous
22 common interests, not the least of which are state laws,
23 federal laws, federal grant money, state grant money,
24 city grant money. They have common interweaving
25 throughout different entities. And we would simply ask

1 you restore all Historic Districts into one cohesive
2 district.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Simplot.

4 Are there other members of the public
5 wishing to be heard at this time?

6 If not, we will return to public comment
7 before we recess for the afternoon and at other times
8 throughout the meeting as appropriate.

9 Item III: Discussion and possible
10 approval of the minutes from the July 17 meeting.

11 Those minutes should have been provided.

12 Are there any additions or corrections to
13 the minutes?

14 If not, can I have a motion to approve the
15 minutes?

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: So moved.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All those in favor?

20 (Vote taken.)

21 (Motion carried.)

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Item IV: Executive
23 Director's report on current status and revisions,
24 discussion and possible decision regarding the
25 Commission's budget.

1 MR. ECHEVESTES: I was asked to have new
2 staff here to introduce to the Commissioners. I'd have
3 Susan Svitak stand up and be recognized.

4 That's Susan Svitak, the Administrative
5 Services Officer. She's here and will handle that duty
6 and a couple other housekeeping items.

7 I noted in e-mail some questions regarding
8 travel and transportation for the second round of
9 hearings. We completed all scheduling of all the
10 Commissioners. This coming week we'll touch base with
11 everyone, tie-down all the travel arrangements. So
12 you'll be hearing from staff.

13 The third item, I want to hand out to you
14 a copy of the revised budget. The actual expenditures
15 from last fiscal year through June 30th is on a single
16 sheet. And the budget and current expenditures and
17 projections through this fiscal year is in the second
18 handout, which is two pages. I merely will hand them
19 out to you and ask you to peruse them during these three
20 days.

21 If there's any questions, I'd be more than
22 happy to answer them at a later date.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

24 Any comments or questions on the Executive
25 Director's report?

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: If not, item V:
2 Presentation and report by NDC concerning modified
3 grids.

4 I've asked NDC if they'd mind doing this
5 in two stages so we might focus on doing this in two
6 stages.

7 At this time I'd like this to be on the
8 Congressional map. If we move forward on deliberations
9 on that map so we offer direction and possible
10 modifications to the consultants including comment,
11 additional public comment on Congressional comments as
12 they are discussed, then move into Legislative comments
13 as we do that one, give the consultants time, if not
14 today, overnight, on how some discussions might impact
15 the entire map.

16 Mr. Elder.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Do we still have the
18 opportunity, after seeing the ramifications of
19 directions give them, to enter into discussion,
20 ramifications of the map?

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Absolutely. It's an
22 ongoing process. We'll not conclude this meeting,
23 however long it takes, until we are satisfied that the
24 maps, as modified, are in a form we wish to take to the
25 public.

1 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
2 Commission, we are anxious that these maps be changed,
3 that the Commission can change them as their own.

4 They are currently NDC's maps. And we
5 hope at the end of the next couple days that the
6 Commission will proudly refer to them as the Independent
7 Redistricting Commission maps.

8 As the Chairman and Members of the
9 Commission and also NDC have been emphasizing
10 throughout, we are all involved in an unusual
11 experiment. This is redistricting in public. As a
12 result of a public process, that public process is far
13 from done. These are works in progress.

14 Let's go on.

15 As the Commission well knows, and as I
16 think perhaps the public understands, it was on August
17 the 2nd that the Commission framed 16 instructions to
18 NDC to develop both Congressional and Legislative
19 District maps.

20 NDC's effort has been to translate those
21 instructions into district lines. So we are very
22 conscious that we have done so imperfectly. We are
23 conscious that the Commission will wish to adjust these
24 maps.

25 Let's go on.

1 We believe that the Congressional plan
2 that we have brought before you has some very important
3 features. We believe that it does a good job in terms
4 of uniting Hispanic communities. We believe that it
5 does a pretty good job in terms of uniting tribal
6 reservations. It certainly reduces city and tribal
7 reservation splits from the grid plan.

8 As to the major communities that the
9 Commission identified, the Native American and the
10 Hispanic community, we think that the Congressional plan
11 does well.

12 We are much less satisfied with the
13 Congressional plan in terms of separation of rural from
14 urban areas. But this is an area, the issue of rural
15 and urban, on which we seek the Commission's help and
16 guidance.

17 Let's go on.

18 Our understanding of the process is that
19 these three days will be used by the Commission to
20 adjust the plans. The Commission will not only hear
21 from citizens now, but once the plans are framed, there
22 will be a second round of public hearings.

23 We have a great deal of experience over
24 the last 28 years in citizen redistrictings. And we
25 know that the second round of redistrict hearings will

1 be very different from the first.

2 The lines that you put on the map will
3 focus citizen interest. You will have many very
4 specific proposals for change. We believe that the
5 Commission should encourage these proposals for change.
6 But in order for them to be successful, in order for
7 them to fit with the principles and priorities of the
8 Commission that are well-established, we believe that
9 the criticisms must be focused on the map as good as you
10 can in this three-day period.

11 We believe that map should clarify to the
12 greatest extent possible Proposition 106 criteria and
13 the Commission's own principles and priorities. And
14 then, essentially, we think that you should challenge
15 the citizens of Arizona to see if they can adjust that
16 plan to record a great many other priorities.

17 We have not used registration data in the
18 development of these plans for reasons that the
19 Commission well understands. The registration data and
20 the racial block voting voting data have not been
21 available to us.

22 So this information, too, needs to be
23 taken into account in the second round prior to the
24 final adjustment fine-tuning release of plans, which I
25 might comment is followed by yet a further period of

1 public review.

2 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
3 we will be guided by your instruction. And here my
4 thought is I will ask Doug Johnson, who is our senior
5 mapping analyst, to go step by step through the
6 Congressional plan to describe the districts, their
7 origin, how they were developed, and as he does so, to
8 comment on our sense that perhaps a better district
9 could have been drawn here or there, that perhaps an
10 alternative should be explored here or there, and then
11 at the end of his description of these districts, and
12 after public comment, we would be happy either to either
13 still tell further of these alternatives we thought of
14 or tell further of alternatives the Commission wishes us
15 to explore.

16 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission,
17 we can explore these alternatives here.

18 Laptops here are slow. It would be
19 tedious to go through these. It might be best for the
20 Commission to recess when we -- it would be best to
21 recess for us before we go into major adjustments. I'll
22 ask Doug Johnson to go through the district by district
23 requirements.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
25 Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to walk you

1 through the plan and let you know what was our thinking
2 as we encountered the principles of Prop 106 and
3 instructions you've given us so far.

4 I will start with what we have labeled
5 District A, which is the Hopi and river areas.

6 This district starts, as both origins
7 started, by focusing on the three major principles the
8 Commission established, the Hispanic populations, Native
9 American populations, and rural-urban divisions of the
10 state. And then once we address those principles in a
11 given area, we would incorporate the AURs the Commission
12 developed and specific instructions you gave us the
13 other day. The instructions also incorporated three
14 major principles.

15 Starting with this district, the Native
16 American population, the Native American population in
17 District C to the east, and the Hopi, as instructed, was
18 removed from the denomination with the Indian Tribal
19 Reservations from the west.

20 Let me get my pointer. This will be a
21 help as go through the areas.

22 The Hopi here, we had a lot of testimony
23 and good direction about having different interests in
24 some respects from the Navajo. One difference you'll
25 notice from the current district is this arm was moved

1 from where it is in the current districts. Previously
2 it was down here. What we encountered was two pieces.

3 Number one, the current districts have two
4 fingers connecting the links, one main body, one here.
5 This is also part of the Hopi Reservation.

6 What we found, some people moved into this
7 area. The numbers of the Navajo Reservation affected
8 has gone up. If we go this way up, one finger instead
9 of two, and we minimize the number of Navajo
10 incorporated, according to the Census people, there are
11 less than 10 people living in this arm. It's not a
12 major difference. I wanted to point out the difference
13 because it's so visible on the map.

14 Thank you.

15 From that step we then worked our way
16 westward taking in the other reservations here, the
17 Grand Canyon and Colorado River here, and then worked
18 down to the river communities AUR, the Mohave, La Paz
19 counties region.

20 One of the directions had been to unify
21 Yuma County. There were too many people to incorporate
22 in an entire district. We were to go down to Yuma
23 County, keeping Yuma County unified. That still made
24 the population short for a district. We went inland,
25 have taken portions of Yavapai County to make district

1 C's population work.

2 The dividing line, we used input from the
3 community and input from the Commission, unified Sedona.
4 The city crossed the county line here. We put together
5 the area, the valley line here. And this region here is
6 the Prescott region. Those two areas are separate.

7 The Verde Valley community area are
8 unified with Flagstaff. That's a division that
9 primarily is to keep this AUR together and the needs of
10 the population, an equality to divide by county, then
11 move south into Maricopa.

12 One of the goals is to definitely separate
13 the rural and urban interests. The two have very
14 distinct interests in Arizona; however, they also need
15 to respect population equality. We were not able to
16 make a majority rural district and respect many of the
17 West Valley Districts here.

18 We have, the pink colored here is the
19 district we drew. The blue lines are the grid
20 districts.

21 So we, in an effort to both gain
22 population needed, unify cities, respecting city
23 communities, we unified Peoria here, moved over to the
24 city border through it, the district takes in Surprise,
25 El Mirage, the Sun Cities in that area.

1 Going down to, this is Luke Air Force
2 here, have Southern Glendale, and a little bit of
3 Phoenix.

4 So that is, of course, took this district,
5 see how we run into conflicting principles as the
6 Commission discussed and well-understood weeks ago when
7 we discussed principles and goals and focused on that
8 community. We tried to look at different ways on the
9 map. All things super relate. And it's tough
10 decisions.

11 We're presenting one set of decisions
12 we're open to review of.

13 I'll zoom back out and move down to --

14 Oh, I should mention in your packet is a
15 list of exactly what cities, counties, AURs are included
16 and split by each district.

17 One thing we were very glad we were able
18 to achieve in the grids is a great reduction in tribal
19 reservations. It was reduced because the Census, we
20 followed Census tracts, and we stayed about the same as
21 them on that.

22 We do have a much lower number of cities
23 and tribal reservations divided.

24 I should mention before we move on I've
25 included in your packet brief comments on possible

1 alternatives.

2 We could go more into Glendale, you know,
3 adjust areas of the West Valley included in this
4 district.

5 There is the opportunity to make a more
6 bizarrely-shaped district, which we're trying to avoid,
7 in trying to unify Yavapai County. It does have effects
8 on District C, as you'll see as well. That's District
9 A.

10 Let's move on to District B,
11 alphabetically. Central Phoenix, Northern Glendale
12 District.

13 This district, as you can see, we closely
14 follow city lines. This is the Peoria border. It
15 doesn't run across into Peoria. It follow the Glendale
16 city line around here. Once we get down into the lower
17 part of Glendale and the lower part of Phoenix, you run
18 into a lot of other AURs, Hispanic AUR, the Indian
19 Reservation. We weren't able to respect the city AURs
20 here. Given the size of Phoenix, some division is
21 required. We attempted to achieve communities of
22 interest.

23 We stayed out of Scottsdale over on the
24 east side and put that together with some of the equally
25 fast-growing suburbs to the north.

1 This is probably the simplest to describe
2 district, compact, very densely populated, a small area,
3 doesn't cross counties. It only splits Phoenix which
4 has to be split from Glendale.

5 One alternative has to be discussed which
6 we looked into. Some proposals were received from
7 communities groups and adjusted -- it took this arm here
8 we had in our proposed district, flattened that out,
9 made this the blue district here which stretched across
10 Phoenix. It does reduce the Hispanic percentage of the
11 district slightly; however, this district remains a
12 majority Hispanic district, remains a Hispanic district
13 which you saw in some plans. We did not want to do it.
14 We did want to achieve what the Hispanic goals asked to
15 achieve, one thing for the Commission to achieve.

16 Let's move on to District C, the Navajo
17 east counties.

18 It was an attempt, as I'll discuss, both
19 to put together the Native American communities of
20 interest and to make a rural dominated Congressional
21 District. And I'll describe what our thinking was in
22 the definition of rural.

23 We're certainly open to input of the
24 Commission on the definition of rural or changes to the
25 district.

1 So you see the district starts in the
2 north with the Navajo Tribal Reservation, comes down,
3 takes in Flagstaff, takes in Verde Valley, all the
4 Navajo County, Apache Counties come down here, includes
5 Gila County, and the two tribal reservations over here,
6 and then uses the county lines down here.

7 There is one county split you see here,
8 the San Carlos Reservation where it stretches down into
9 Pinal County.

10 Most county splits are the result of
11 tribal reservations that stretch across county lines.

12 Then, that area, I think, is pretty
13 naturally considered naturally rural; however, it is not
14 in populationally in equality with Gila.

15 We looked into Cochise south. Once we
16 looked into the Native American tribal reservations and
17 the rest of this rural area, Cochise had too many people
18 to do that. We went west to northern Pinal County and
19 eastern Maricopa County. And here we wrestled with how
20 to do this.

21 You see we respected the Scottsdale City
22 line, went north from Scottsdale to the county line down
23 here to the tribal reservations. We wanted to include
24 it with the tribal reservations in this district.

25 This line we arrived at fairly quickly.

1 Down here is where we ran into population with the
2 border.

3 We described other borders. This is the
4 other border where we needed to get our population.

5 There was considerable testimony reviewed
6 about Apache Junction.

7 While this is obviously, as you know, a
8 fast-growing area, it does at this point have somewhat
9 of a rural character, had some rural characteristics.

10 Given a choice of where to go in this
11 area, we felt Apache Junction was a choice to make in
12 that area.

13 These areas of Mesa are also very fast
14 growing. And we're very reluctant to include them. We
15 do have a population equality requirement. These areas
16 are not densely populated. That may change, as you
17 know.

18 At this point, it does have a lot in
19 common with Apache Junction. So the approach we took
20 was to unify those, Queen Creek down bottom, the issue
21 of Queen Creek, that's one of the cities in Arizona that
22 crossed county lines. It made sense to unify it to the
23 east. So that was our thinking as we drew this
24 district.

25 We were able to put together and respect a

1 number of AURs with this, Apache Junction, the Hopi
2 Indian Reservation, unite Sedona, united Sedona with
3 Verde Valley. We did have to split Pinal County. We
4 were able to respect Scottsdale. We also had a number
5 of tribal reservations, a full list is included in your
6 packet.

7 It also, as I mentioned before, we worked
8 very hard to minimize city and town splits and to keep
9 counties together, to keep areas together and in keeping
10 communities, we went into only splits of Mesa and
11 Winkleman.

12 Winkleman, as you may know, is a small
13 town in the corner, crossed a county line, and that one
14 we did not split. Those are the only two splits out of
15 20 plus in that district.

16 If you go up to District D, the South
17 Phoenix Congressional District.

18 This district corresponds very closely to
19 the northern part of the Hispanic AUR established by the
20 Commission. It is a strong effort to meet the Hispanic
21 representation goals that both the Commission set and
22 the Voting Rights Act. We also looked very closely at
23 the various proposals from the South Mountain Community
24 College group and the Coalition for Fair Redistricting
25 group. So we -- established these lines.

1 Up in here, as I mentioned before, we got
2 into a lot of population trade-offs. We did look as
3 well at community input we received from the Historical
4 District and attempted to follow that. As you've seen
5 in past presentations we've made, that district
6 conflicts almost directly with Hispanic communities in
7 the area. It's very difficult to do.

8 As we drew district lines, we tried to
9 follow district lines one or another group proposed.

10 This is a good example Dr. Heslop was
11 referring to of the nature of public comment as it comes
12 in the second round. The first round of public comment
13 was the very big picture. Now we will have specific
14 comment. We expect to get a lot of comment on this line
15 here. Should it be a block up. We should be open to
16 that kind of comment and welcome it heartily.

17 One interesting piece of it is the
18 Avondale leg of it coming down here. We had a great
19 deal of public testimony from various groups advocating
20 Avondale in with this area, the economic political
21 interests with Avondale, and the smaller corner of the
22 jut, smaller City of Guadalupe, had an AUR shared that
23 interests with the South Mountain AUR.

24 This region is South Mountain. The region
25 south of it is the Ahwatukee portion. South Phoenix,

1 much input was received that clearly stated the
2 interests of Ahwatukee and South Mountain did not
3 include this in the district. The area you see is the
4 Gila River Reservation, attempting to respect that
5 border sets our border in this area.

6 Cities included in this is heavily inked
7 over on this side. It does pick up all of Tolleson. We
8 attempted to respect city borders the best we could
9 within the other principles you set; included all of
10 Tolleson, all of Avondale. We do have pieces of
11 Glendale in here.

12 Glendale is kind of a city on the edge as
13 one city always is on the edge of redistricting. We
14 attempted to respect Glendale as best we could,
15 especially out here where all the pieces are and
16 annexation lines.

17 I discussed earlier a potential line the
18 Commission may want to look at, a potential tradeoff.
19 This line was not the most compact. We've drawn this
20 configuration. Some of the proposals we have do have
21 more compact lines, small, but it does keep a Hispanic
22 voting district.

23 The next district is E, the east suburban
24 city. This is a very odd-shaped district driven by the
25 characteristics of this community.

1 We have, starting at the bottom, the
2 Ahwatukee area I discussed, which is growing rapidly,
3 has been growing rapidly. We have respected Tempe's
4 border and have incorporated it. We do leave out the
5 City of Guadalupe, then go up and follow the Scottsdale
6 line, attempt to keep Scottsdale together. We also
7 looked at where to go up here. And the thinking that we
8 employed on this, all areas are fast growing, shared
9 issues of growth, recent development, and incorporated
10 them on that.

11 We worked down into Phoenix, worked toward
12 population equality. This area shares population growth
13 with this area. This population was driven by equality.
14 Down in here, this jogging is both driven by population
15 numbers and by an attempt to respect the Historical
16 District and the South Mountain Coalition as much as we
17 could. Did not have a lot of input that directly
18 addressed it from this neighborhood, but that is the
19 direction we took.

20 One thing here down in Ahwatukee, we do
21 end up splitting the Ahwatukee area, which is enclosed
22 entirely with Phoenix.

23 This arm from the Southeast Valley
24 Congressional District comes over into Ahwatukee. The
25 tradeoff here is to unify this in a number of different

1 ways. But they, generally all lead to division of
2 Chandler. This way we're able to unify Chandler
3 entirely in one district. That's the tradeoff. That's
4 the east suburban Congressional District.

5 District F is the East Valley
6 Congressional District. This was another another much
7 discussed Congressional District. All the districts in
8 the East Valley really start with the Indian Reservation
9 line in the north.

10 You may notice, it's noted in the packets,
11 the Census information actually is incorrect in actually
12 where the reservation line is. We were able to confirm,
13 have a map from Maricopa County, the reservation does
14 not cross into the city line of Mesa. We were able to
15 respect the reservation border and city line border. We
16 took the majority of the city border, we lose these
17 parts I discussed earlier, go down through all of
18 Gilbert and all of Chandler.

19 This arm to the west, the weird looking,
20 this is Chandler, as long as the arm is out there, when
21 needed to pick up population. The tribal reservation is
22 here. City lines are over here. City lines are over
23 here. We went into the already split Phoenix to find
24 population.

25 As I described by the various borders of

1 that, this district is fairly limited.

2 One option we looked at is an option to
3 unify all of the Ahwatukee area with Chandler. That can
4 be done by a more severe split of Mesa where the
5 Scottsdale Tempe District and east into Mesa and pick up
6 population while the Chandler District is no longer
7 here. Things are possible that the Commission may want
8 to consider.

9 Next and second to last, we have district
10 G, the border rural Congressional District. This is
11 actually one of the first that we drew. It's a much
12 discussed and well-defined AUR. It includes all Yuma
13 County.

14 You see the blue line is the grid district
15 split right through the county and towns, cities and
16 area. We unified that area, came over here, unified the
17 Tohono O'odhom Reservation by the grid split into four
18 pieces, unified the arm, the noncontiguous arm here, the
19 only place not in the district, the tiny dots here,
20 small ranges, I believe, north of Gila Bend that -- in
21 the testimony were not the focus of the community by any
22 means. We'd love to unify it if possible.

23 We did reduce the splits from the majority
24 unified. We also unified it with the Ak-Chin
25 Reservation up here and Gila River Reservation.

1 We have significantly reduced the
2 influence on the Native American Reservation in this
3 district. We put it together with the Hispanic
4 community in the area. As you know, we have the Casa
5 Grande AUR. So we take in that community. As a whole,
6 that AUR is unified.

7 Go into Santa Cruz County, unified that as
8 well on that outline. We also had an AUR, the I-19
9 corridor. With respect to that, the only split of that
10 AUR is Green Valley. We did have testimony that Green
11 Valley encompasses the north and east. Then with
12 respect to west and south, when it came time to draw,
13 that was the logical place to draw that.

14 In Tucson, testimony was clear and fairly
15 unanimous the grid dividing line ran northeast to
16 southwest. It was not the logical division of the
17 Tucson area, nor did it respect communities of interest.
18 So our first step was to switch that to a more, I guess,
19 a dividing line more in line with the expressions of the
20 citizens of the area, move it more from a northwest to
21 southeast division. This also unified the Hispanic
22 communities in these areas in respect to the AUR,
23 Hispanic AUR, ordered by Commission. We did a lot of
24 work, not perfect work, intermixing areas here, worked
25 very hard in respect to intercity lines, the intercity

1 lines in Tucson.

2 One of the things I should point out on
3 the maps, in areas you are very familiar with, the
4 cities, towns, places, places are unincorporated areas
5 defined by the Census and local government areas as
6 communities. So areas like Summit is a designated
7 place. We, when we could, respected the Census data
8 designated 12, as those do not enjoy protection as
9 official designated towns. We did not protect those
10 places like cities in splitting those places.

11 District G, it's just over 51 percent
12 Hispanic population, a majority Hispanic District. It,
13 along with the majority Hispanic Phoenix District, South
14 Mountain area, more or less follows Hispanic AURs as
15 developed by the Commission.

16 Our options for division in this area, we
17 looked a lot at Pinal County, how this was done.
18 Obviously we'd love to unify Pinal County. Options are
19 fairly limited in this area by the Hispanic AUR. Any
20 attempts to move more into Pinal or more into eastern
21 Tucson rapidly dilute this percentage, in Tucson, saying
22 this line made no sense, that there could, we certainly
23 realize, in testimony, could be testimony of a better
24 spot to draw this line within that area, and we
25 certainly expect public testimony on exactly where that

1 line should go and obviously welcome testimony from the
2 public.

3 District H, the final district, eastern
4 Cochise District, 110,000, 120,000 people from Cochise,
5 and roughly the Tucson suburbs extend up into Pinal and
6 other parts of Pinal into here. The line drawn to
7 respect city borders whenever possible and within the
8 city of Tucson and the Hispanic community and need for
9 equality, despite all the jumble of towns and annexation
10 lines, as bad and difficult to incorporate as they are
11 in Maricopa, they are still the same issue we faced. We
12 do only split two cities.

13 I'm not sure Santa Rita in the south wraps
14 around Green Valley. Only two percent of the city's
15 population is down here. That was divided for
16 compactness to accommodate Green Valley and then split
17 Tucson. That district is 25 percent total minority and
18 only 17-and-a-half percent Hispanic. You see the
19 tradeoff, how rapidly this line is, as any adjustment is
20 made to that line, because of the already-defined
21 community of the Hispanic AUR.

22 So that concludes the introduction to how
23 we drew these lines.

24 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, you have in
25 your binders full detail on the adjustments to the grid

1 that were made as each of these districts was developed.
2 We made careful notations on the adjustments. You also
3 have on in your binders the notations on the changes to
4 AURs.

5 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,
6 thank you, Doug, for going through the maps for us.

7 We do have broad maps take a closer look
8 at alternatives that Mr. Johnson mentioned. And you may
9 wish to explore these concepts prior to engaging in your
10 general discussion. It is at your pleasure. We'd be
11 happy to share those with you prior to your general
12 discussion.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Alternative maps?

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Not alternative maps. I
15 understand there are alternatives within portions of the
16 maps in terms of where maps might be moved.

17 DR. ADAMS: Correct.

18 You'll notice at the end of each narrative
19 in the binder a section for alternative sections, broad,
20 at the Census tract level, just giving you a sense of
21 what the implications might be of such a move.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you show us, if
23 you demonstrate such a change, you also have the
24 information as to how it affects district by district?

25 DR. ADAMS: We can share some fairly broad

1 general statistics.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

3 MR. HUNTWORK: Alternatives mentioned in
4 the presentation, alternatives mentioned in the
5 presentation are not necessarily the ones I was
6 interested in exploring. So my reaction is it might be
7 a waste of time to do that en mass. There may be
8 individual ones we'll want to do. I think we ought to
9 see what direction we're heading before we take the time
10 to do that.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments?

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: I agree with
13 Mr. Huntwork.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It seems to be a consensus
15 to engage in discussion of alternatives you have. If
16 that fits in the discussion, you might want to show
17 alternatives we want to try ourselves.

18 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
19 Commission, that's fine as well.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Since this has never been
21 done before by an Independent Commission, and since the
22 methodology we're using is very public, the next phase
23 of this is going to be an interesting experiment for all
24 of us.

25 We're going to engage in discussion in

1 perhaps some broad general terms. At some point we
2 would want to invite, I think, additional public comment
3 specifically on the Congressional Districts as presented
4 and then engage in further discussion by the Commission
5 and specific direction to the consultants of what we'd
6 like to see redrawn or recalculated based on what we'd
7 like to make.

8 Does that methodology sit well with the
9 Commission or would you like to do it some other way?

10 All right, then, why don't we begin the
11 discussion.

12 If we may have -- to the extent we can
13 turn some of the lights up, without destroying all of
14 the ability to utilize the map, we may want to do that.

15 If we may, I wonder if we can at least
16 partially -- partially close that outside door so we
17 don't get the glare.

18 At this point the Commission would start
19 discussion of the map, Congressional mapping, as
20 presented by NDC with respect to how that map might be
21 altered. I ask we try as best we can to give that
22 direction with a goal in mind, or principle in mind,
23 that we be directed by that principle to make a change
24 to the extent that is applicable.

25 Who would like to start?

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, should
2 we start in linear fashion?

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'll take anybody that is
4 interested. It's tough to be first.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll be first, since
6 nobody else will.

7 As we discussed at the last meeting, with
8 respect to three area principles of communities of
9 interest, as I recall, they were the Hispanics, and
10 Native Americans, and the rural. And my recollection is
11 we instructed the consultants to provide us with one
12 rural district completely outside an urban area. With
13 all due respect, Apache Junction and Mesa might consider
14 themselves rural, but they're not. Therefore, I request
15 we reissue the directive that we -- our consultants come
16 back with a proposal of one Congressional District that
17 is entirely rural.

18 Is it necessary, Mr. Chairman, I make the
19 same motion, again?

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No.

21 I think in terms of offering specific
22 direction to the consultants, I think it is useful to do
23 it by motion.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I make the motion
25 again.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'll second it.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

4 Discussion.

5 Mr. Huntwork?

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I voted against
7 this motion. I may do so again. But I want to validate
8 Mr. Hall's comment. The direction was given. My
9 objection was given. We wanted one clearly rural
10 district. That may be difficult to achieve. And the
11 consultants may have had some good reason why they
12 didn't do it. But the attempt would have certainly been
13 instructive. And I think it should have been done. I
14 would like to see that district. We should make a
15 decision where we might want to go.

16 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, I don't know
17 whether it's appropriate. We do have a rough
18 alternative drawn up that may more nearly fit the
19 alternative we were instructed to follow.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In showing that, would you
21 show why this alternative was included in the plan and
22 other was rejected and is now an appendage?

23 DR. HESLOP: We will indeed.

24 Since Doug Johnson was the final author,
25 I'll ask him to speak to it.

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

2 The alternatives we have here, there is
3 one caveat I should add. These were concepts to see how
4 districts might be considered. They were done at the
5 Census tract level, not as fine-tuned populationwise,
6 and to illustrate one approach we could use, as
7 discussed before, focus in on, to put into more detail,
8 during a recess, if that was something the Commission
9 wishes to do. Chris is switching over the alternatives,
10 so just a second while we bring up the map.

11 When you see it, you'll see the difficult
12 choices faced by the issues we wrestled with as we tried
13 to draw the districts.

14 One thing I should note, too, when drawing
15 the districts, we did maintain the split of the Hopi and
16 Navajo Nation. And I'll point out how that change in
17 that direction developed the map.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: One second.

19 MR. JOHNSON: What we have is a rural
20 concept that will show a district that stays out of
21 Maricopa County in the north. Because of the use of
22 tracts, it is -- it's to the rural concept.

23 The Commission wants the rural concept in
24 Congressional.

25 One thing we should discuss, we have

1 faster computers faster than 10 years ago but not as
2 fast as we want.

3 DR. HESLOP: Discuss why.

4 MR. JOHNSON: It's not as fine-tuned. I
5 should point out, there is one big Census tract. This
6 is much more compact than it was in the Census tract on
7 the display. So --

8 Show Maricopa.

9 MR. HUTCHISON: Don't want me to show?

10 MR. JOHNSON: There we go.

11 The differences we see here, there's more
12 of a split of Yavapai County. Again, drawing the Census
13 tract, this tract does go into Phoenix and the
14 urban-rural area. This tract does as well. However, I
15 looked at how blocks were configured and could stay well
16 to the east of it.

17 One thing we wrestled with is the
18 definition of rural and definition of urban.

19 We avoided city lines, but clearly the
20 area is fast growing. And it's not, by any means, a
21 perfect definition.

22 What I looked at in doing these numbers
23 was a 45-mile circle from the center of Phoenix. We
24 drew a district that stays outside of that circle. By
25 use of tracts, it makes it look like it came in, and

1 potentially could do it.

2 If we zoom in.

3 What we end up with, if we retain the Hopi
4 division here, the division takes in counties, comes
5 into Cochise, splits more in this area, pulls back way
6 out of here. You can't follow exactly the division, but
7 one of the concerns was this district really ends up as
8 the odd man out and goes deeply into the East Valley,
9 deeply into Tucson, also.

10 This is an alternative the Commission
11 could consider as one of which to address. This
12 district is also one that follows to the block level.
13 It can be done. It does result in difficult decisions.

14 One other thing to point out. North of
15 Phoenix, what happens here is the north population needs
16 to shift west. So this district comes very heavily into
17 Maricopa, goes into a fifty-fifty rural district into a
18 good two-thirds, three-quarters of the Maricopa
19 District. But the advantage of that is this area stays
20 entirely out of this 45-mile circle of Phoenix and
21 30-mile area Tucson.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: The numbers of this
23 idea, the numbers are correct here?

24 MR. JOHNSON: Population numbers, they're
25 off a couple thousand. Taking off block numbers, we

1 could make it.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Zoom in on the knob
3 there, by Maricopa County. Where does that go in, this
4 notch?

5 MR. JOHNSON: This notch is Indian
6 Reservation, a tribal reservation. And again, when
7 going down to the block level, instead of here, you go
8 down to here.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Doug, when you say you
10 used a 45-mile radius, there's nothing magical about
11 that. How did you arrive at 45 miles?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Nothing magical, there's
13 nothing official defining that radius. That's the
14 radius you need to go to to get out of all city borders.
15 Before you watched city borders, it brings you in close
16 up here, keeps you out in the south. We just stay out
17 the same distance all around the city.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other comments or
19 questions?

20 Mr. Huntwork.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Another way of
22 creating a completely rural district would be to divide
23 the state north and south. Have you looked at that
24 possibility?

25 MR. JOHNSON: Not in the detail of this.

1 Not without a lot of population shifting. I mean in
2 Maricopa, obviously.

3 In the northern lines, if you ran north
4 and south, there's 4,000 to 7,000 people in this entire
5 section, just below 7,000 in the Hopi Reservation. I'm
6 sorry, 7,000 in the Hopi Reservation. So you could take
7 out population out, put it with the Navajo Nation, and
8 pick up additional population down here. As I said,
9 fifty-fifty urban-rural population, if you had the
10 original District A, this kind of configuration, A, down
11 below 30 percent rural. That would give you an
12 additional opportunity to enhance the rural nature of
13 this district at the cost of the Hopi Reservation.

14 This is a good example of the trade-offs
15 we face even when those Reservations are on.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I'd
17 like to talk very big picture urban as well.

18 It would be useful to have one of those
19 laser pointers. I don't need it at the moment. We
20 should have them as we discuss these things, questions
21 Josh was asking a moment ago, designating what he was
22 talking about.

23 All right. The question I want to ask, if
24 talking about rural versus urban, you would quickly
25 figure out where the rural areas lay if you start with

1 the urban areas.

2 Let me just give you an example by how
3 many numbers are right in these metropolitan areas. You
4 gain 62 percent of the state population. That is five
5 out of eight Congressional Districts, almost exactly.
6 This map has four, which means that a full district in
7 the Phoenix Metropolitan area has been allocated to
8 otherwise rural districts. So they are less rural than
9 they would be in the Phoenix Metropolitan area, it has
10 fewer urban districts.

11 If you look at the Tucson area, it has
12 something like one-and-a-half districts. With the split
13 that is being made, there's a minority population in
14 southwestern Tucson that goes off into the -- District
15 G, I guess it's called. If you -- that leaves
16 essentially one-and-a-half rural districts. One of
17 them, one of them is used to complete the Tucson
18 district, I suppose. But what is left over is a rural
19 district, purely rural district, which would consist of
20 much of the northern part of the state, both east and
21 west, comes down a good distance below the point of
22 Arizona. I don't need to have all the magic computers
23 to do that kind of population.

24 Have you created such a map in theory or
25 could you do so?

1 MR. JOHNSON: Down in Tucson, it is very
2 difficult to isolate it because of the nature of the
3 Hispanic community.

4 What you described in Phoenix is very true
5 and much more possible.

6 This is very similar to an attempt to do
7 that.

8 The Hopi is a compilation of the map.

9 This district, although takes in a large
10 population on the map, is population dominated by the
11 Phoenix area and will be, if you try to keep the
12 Hispanic community down on the southern border of the
13 state. We have done the -- that's where we always start
14 with the big picture behind in this area, as you say,
15 roughly five districts in Phoenix, one and a half in
16 Tucson, and try to allocate around that. What we're
17 into once we found other principles of keep Native
18 Americans together, Hispanic communities together, as
19 defined by Hispanic communities together and districts,
20 it won't be perfect on the map.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: How could you not
22 divide that? We have one Hispanic District in the
23 Phoenix Metropolitan area that wasn't affected by the
24 ideas of the outline, and reservations would all be
25 included in that district.

1 MR. JOHNSON: In Phoenix you are
2 definitely right. It can be done similar to this. We
3 could pull the northwest district in more and bring --
4 were we not to have the issue up here, could swing
5 around, have more to the north.

6 In Tucson is where we run into problems of
7 the Hispanic area definition, separate communities. In
8 Phoenix, we have the attempt, as this was attempted to
9 do.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: This has not
11 attempted to do that. There are four districts in the
12 Phoenix Metropolitan area.

13 MR. JOHNSON: This keeps mid-Phoenix as
14 one, South Mountain as one, the four, and increases --
15 instead of what was detailed in the maps you've seen,
16 touching the edges, green edges was --

17 Chris, zoom in on the area.

18 See, it comes all the way over to Cave
19 Creek. This dividing line could be drawn down here as
20 well, depending on the interests of the Commission or
21 direction of the Commission.

22 This takes in almost all of the West
23 Valley. It's almost all a West Valley district except
24 for the portion of Glendale included in there.
25 Population could be traded here and here. This is to

1 trade off population here and here. It doesn't
2 illustrate population here and here. It's to
3 illustrate.

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yeah.

6 MR. JOHNSON: My -- it would be more in
7 lines of direction of the district. We could do that.
8 Essentially you'd lose population here in the far north
9 and focus it entirely down there.

10 Does that answer your question?

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It does.

12 It just seems to me, in struggling to
13 divide rural and urban, that's one alternative that we
14 need to look at.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, could you zoom
17 back in on what I call the West Valley, a little further
18 back out?

19 Could NDC give me some idea what the
20 population of the West Valley, the district there, is it
21 something like 25, 30,000, or something like 250,000?

22 MR. JOHNSON: West Valley population?

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The part that's green
24 looks urbanized there.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Patching in there, Goodyear

1 is in there as well. It is -- I have the numbers.

2 Let's see if this will run it for you.

3 MR. HUTCHISON: It's doing it.

4 Selecting all areas in the district within
5 Maricopa County. There's almost 1,500 in the area of
6 the West Valley.

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Wickenburg, Gila
8 Bend, maybe 5,000.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Maricopa outside --

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Specifically the area
11 right there.

12 MR. JOHNSON: The far west Maricopa, not
13 in cities, about 12,000 people in the towns you
14 mentioned, Commissioner.

15 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you do the
16 entire west portion of the county, West Maricopa County
17 portion of the district, 8, 10 12 thousand people off?

18 MR. JOHNSON: Once you get the other
19 districts to the east, I would guess -- it's probably
20 four, 450,000 in those towns, off the top of my head.
21 We can certainly run the numbers and get back to you.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: It makes the whole
23 green block controlled by the West Valley, not
24 rural-urban, swing, nothing.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The world's largest

1 urban district.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I said it's a
3 rapidly growing area and will become more urban as time
4 goes by.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: A is not a rural
6 district. The only semi rural districts on the map are
7 C and G. Neither are semi rural, have portions of
8 Phoenix areas, and G is a portion Tucson.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: The rural -- the river
10 AUR is disenfranchised.

11 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The river AUR isn't
12 large enough.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: Therefore, by reason
14 of this, it's disenfranchised.

15 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, if I may, the
16 information in the corner, there's 418,000 people in
17 that district in Maricopa County. In this
18 configuration, what the concept I was looking at when I
19 did this was we were making a northeast district pure,
20 but definitely the northwest district loses it's urban
21 character completely. Completely.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do you wish to remind us
23 of the motion or redirect to create a purely rural
24 district for the sake of discussion?

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Look at District C,

1 see what portions of that district are in Phoenix
2 Metropolitan area?

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: It goes clear to
4 Greenfield, if I'm not mistaken. Superstition Mall is
5 in there.

6 MR. JOHNSON: East Mesa?

7 MR. HUNTWORK: Doesn't it go to --

8 MR. JOHNSON: It was done quickly on the
9 Census tract level.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District C --

11 MR. JOHNSON: The original plan?

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: She wants to know how
13 much it goes into the urban areas.

14 MR. HUTCHISON: Into Mesa.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: While waiting for the
16 map to go up, it appears there's enough population in
17 the West Valley to -- or West Maricopa County, if we go
18 all the way over to the county line, with that
19 population and the population outside the area in Mesa
20 and the East Valley, it would mean shifting all, you
21 can't connect all those together, it appears there's
22 enough for another Congressional District. And that
23 would resolve a lot of problems we have with the eastern
24 district being all the way into the entire Scottsdale
25 and western district, being urbanized. So it's

1 something that, just looking at it, trying to find
2 numbers, east and west, to see just where we could end
3 up in trying to attain the rural character of those two
4 areas.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me all
6 of this came about, if you look at population
7 distribution of the state, we can make in the state five
8 Congressional Districts entirely within Maricopa County,
9 excluding maybe Indian Reservations, may cross county
10 lines, and adjustments may need to be made for that,
11 could make a case for five Congressional Districts in
12 Maricopa County, don't take into account anything else
13 than three districts in the rest of the state.

14 We made a decision to separate the Hopi
15 and Navajo. We made it more difficult for that. There
16 are only three districts for the rest of the state and
17 Tucson. The Tucson area has too much population just
18 for one district. There is going to be at least two
19 districts that include a portion of the Tucson area.
20 Then we have to have outside Maricopa County two
21 districts with a southern component. Then we have
22 either one northern district, or if you split the Hopi
23 and Navajos, as we decided to do, with good reasons, you
24 create issues that it either has to link up with
25 Southern Arizona and Tucson or, as they've done, with

1 Maricopa County. I think that's where we're seeing the
2 issue arise.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: My sense is we
4 haven't really looked at alternative ways of maintaining
5 the Hopi-Navajo separation and developing districts,
6 that there is no reason that map has to go west. It
7 could go south.

8 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The Hopi, the
10 district to the west, to go south, could go into the
11 Navajo, separate -- there's testimony they did not want
12 to be separated, White Mountain Apache did not want to
13 be separated from the Navajo, did not to be separated,
14 be divided horizontally like the Navajo had in their
15 original proposal, coming down the two lands the Hopi
16 have acquired in the central part of the state now. In
17 my understanding, it is being asked to become a part of
18 the Hopi Reservation. If that is in effect reality,
19 maybe we should look at a horizontal as opposed to
20 vertical separation. I don't know if we've had
21 discourse as to whether that may or may not work.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I was going to
24 say, as Commissioner Elder did, the Navajo plan,
25 essentially, as representatives were planning to provide

1 a copy of, is essentially a vision of the state, a truly
2 rural district in Northern Arizona, North Maricopa
3 County, and shows very graphically how it is laid out.
4 It truly would require a significant extension north to
5 connect to the Hopi Reservation. I cannot recall which
6 we would be doing, in any of these plans, to have
7 significant extensions, obviously, for the sole purpose
8 of connecting the Hopi Reservation to something else. I
9 can't recall whether we are legally required to have
10 contiguous districts.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I know one of the
14 goals of 106 is contiguous, compact districts, to the
15 extent practicable. And the other is to reflect
16 communities of interest, to the extent practicable. If
17 they are truly of equal weight, then my question will be
18 do we not have the discretion to create a district which
19 is not compact and contiguous.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Well --

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In order to
22 reflect the community of interest we consider to be
23 significant.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I don't know whether
25 counsel wants to weigh in on that.

1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We need an answer
2 shortly if we head in this direction.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm struck by the logic of
4 the argument. But not being a lawyer, one of the few
5 who isn't, I'll defer.

6 Mr. Hall.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to clarify. I
8 don't think this Commission has made a decision with
9 respect to the Navajo-Hopi issue. I think we made a
10 direction and start there. That was the direction, to
11 start there. I don't know, in my mind, maybe I'm the
12 only one, I don't know if that's still a decision still
13 we need to discuss and analyze.

14 I'm concerned if we sacrifice, if you
15 will, for lack of a better word, all of rural Arizona in
16 an effort to accommodate in a way a situation
17 nonetheless difficult, no less it is a real issue, but I
18 wonder if the needs of the multitude may well take
19 precedence over the needs of a significant and less
20 number of people.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And I think your point is
22 well taken, insofar as what we've given so far as
23 preliminary instructions for mapping, and the results of
24 preliminary instructions are what we're reviewing today,
25 if indeed we believe instructions will be more

1 beneficial to the people of the state, to issue those
2 instructions and give instructions for the map,
3 notwithstanding the legal response coming, that's
4 coming.

5 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: With respect to
6 the motion, there are two approaches to a district, one
7 along the lines that is here now, and one along the
8 lines suggested by the Navajo plan.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In other words, another
10 way of putting that, one which maintains the separation,
11 maintains the Hopi-Navajo separation, and one that does
12 not.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One that divides
14 the state east-west. In order to do so, one divides the
15 state north-south. I don't believe the Hopi, Navajo are
16 involved in either of the issues. Personally, I think
17 we can deal with that either way, if we choose to do so.
18 That it's not a driving factor or nor will it preclude
19 us from taking it into consideration either way.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Looking at a north-south
21 versus east-south orientation.

22 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, maker of the
24 motion, want to deal with that?

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm willing to amend

1 that motion.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's assume that motion
3 is amended.

4 Is there further discussion on the motion?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman,
6 before we vote on that, could you just restate it so we
7 know exactly what the amended motion is?

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The amended motion, as I
9 understand it, is to direct the consultants to show us a
10 representation of the Congressional Districts which
11 includes a purely rural district that would be attempted
12 to be drawn in two ways for the purpose of review. One
13 would be with a division of the state horizontally,
14 north-south, and another with a division of the state
15 horizontally, east-west.

16 That's my understanding of the motion.

17 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: That's my
18 understanding as the seconder of the motion.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

20 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
21 Commission, we'd clarify, in both attempts, we're still
22 keeping the Hopi Nation divided from the Navajo Nation;
23 is that correct?

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The motion doesn't speak
25 to that at the moment, and, therefore, unless someone

1 wants to further amend the motion, the direction you are
2 getting is to attempt a rural district with those
3 divisions in mind.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is it possible to get
5 four alternatives then?

6 DR. ADAMS: Yes, sir, that's possible.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd like to look at
8 alternatives, dealing in all cases, sometimes, with
9 competing, sometimes with a great deal of differences,
10 and sometimes make decisions on which one is best or
11 better, or even marginal alternatives. Those decisions
12 have to be made.

13 Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: They'll ultimately
15 have to approve public comment drafts that include the
16 entire state.

17 My question to NDC is it be passed, a
18 motion giving instruction to prepare new totally rural
19 Congressional Districts, would that include the other
20 seven districts as well? Would you give us a complete
21 map of the State of Arizona incorporating these changes?

22 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Minkoff, Members
23 of the Commission, we could do that. We would need some
24 time to work those up, so -- at the Commission's
25 pleasure, we would be happy to do that.

1 I'm going to get an estimate from staff.

2 I am told we could can probably provide
3 that in a couple hours, provide at least a rough cut of
4 those concepts.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: From my point of
6 view, it doesn't do us any good just to look at just one
7 isolated district. We've looked at one isolated
8 district, and it made a lot of sense. It's when we
9 tried to combine them with other considerations we've
10 run into challenges such as we're discussing right now.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I obviously
13 propose, obviously, from what I said, what happens when
14 we try to put five districts into Maricopa County. I do
15 put that into the question.

16 I was saving that for a separate motion.
17 I respectfully will try to make it immediately after we
18 vote.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: What we need to do at some
20 point, we need to keep a running track of the amount of
21 work we're asking the consultants to do, a time estimate
22 to complete the work, and recess to see the full value
23 of the amount of work we're asking them to do, try to
24 do, the linear work in this session, coming in and out
25 of session so much. It may interrupt the flow of our

1 discussion in an in appropriate way.

2 Try another way.

3 Mr. Hall.

4 Dr. Adams.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Call question.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, a question?

7 DR. ADAMS: Chairman, Members of the
8 Commission. The point is well-taken. There could be
9 other things that come as a result of discussion that
10 affect other areas of the map. I think if we take all
11 of those into consideration, and in trying to address
12 them, each problem in the four maps, so when we come
13 back you'll have something fairly close to what you
14 have, that would be best.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: And if you would, try to
16 keep a running tab on what we've asked you to do.

17 Is there further discussion on the motion?

18 Mr. Elder.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Discussion only from
20 the point of view I believe it efficient for EDS --
21 excuse me, NDC and others, after the vote to give
22 additional considerations or criteria we're looking at,
23 some of the things I addressed, a personal thing I'd
24 like to see, what are the ramifications. It may come
25 out in this iteration. I'd like to have chance to say

1 would you consider these things also when looking at
2 this in a purely rural district.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Before we recess?

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll recess much later in
5 the afternoon.

6 Mr. Huntwork wants to make a motion on
7 five districts in Maricopa County. You may have others.
8 I may have others. We'll try to get them all on the
9 table for NDC to have a full evening of activity or full
10 night of activity, or whenever.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I just think it's
12 important to move a piece at a time. That's what I'm
13 intending to do.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I accept that as a
15 second.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: There's a motion on the
17 floor.

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Call the question.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All those in favor of the
20 question motion, say "aye."

21 (Vote taken.)

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye."

23 Motion carries unanimously.

24 Mr. Huntwork.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I'd move we ask

1 the consultants to present a conceptual Congressional
2 map for the Phoenix Metropolitan area, not necessarily
3 Maricopa area.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: This may be an
7 appropriate time to raise this issue.

8 Am I correct in understanding by creation,
9 do I understand correctly, what I heard is in creation
10 of Congressional Districts, competitiveness was not part
11 of the consideration; is that correct?

12 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Hall, that's
13 correct.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd ask as we go
15 through this process, folks. No question, as we've
16 heard, competitiveness is one of the requirements of
17 106. And versus have them compact, which is lines, I'm
18 suggesting that in creation of new Congressional
19 Districts we're proposing, that also be a proposal for
20 consideration.

21 I'm asking, this would be speaking
22 specifically to Mr. Huntwork's motion, if you start, for
23 example, at the bottom of the blue District C, and you
24 do a horseshoe all the way around to Parker -- that is
25 the community over here, right? Is that Parker?

1 MR. HUTCHISON: Right down here.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: I think that there is
3 more population than one district in that, correct? I
4 guess my question to you is that in proposing five
5 Congressional Districts within Maricopa County, what do
6 you do with whatever remainder there is? There's more
7 people. I don't mean Maricopa and Maricopa alone is
8 sufficient. What do you do with what Maricopa has left?

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Maricopa has pretty
10 close to it. The population of the state is a little
11 over 5 million people. Maricopa has a little in excess
12 three million people. Give or take very small numbers
13 of people, it has five-eighths -- three-fifths. It has
14 in excess of 60 percent of the population of the state.
15 Five districts, you need 62-and-a-half percent of the
16 population of the state, close to it. For five
17 districts in the county, some areas extend to other
18 areas of the county. There are portions of Phoenix
19 population areas that do extend across population lines,
20 Yavapai County, Yuma County, et cetera.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Clarify the motion.
22 Mr. Huntwork was very clear saying "Phoenix Metropolitan
23 area" as opposed to "Maricopa County area."

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Right.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Be clear. The motion as I

1 understand it, the Phoenix Metropolitan area, we should
2 attempt to draw five districts in that area.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Right.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Do I understand the motion
5 to say wholly contained in that area or dominant?

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The motion is to
7 the extent possible contained within that area.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I just want to understand.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If a percent is
10 outside, we have to go outside, but try to keep it where
11 it goes.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, where again,
13 what do you do with Parker?

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What do you do?

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: The question is what
16 don't you do with it?

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The problem, like I
18 say, La Paz County, relates not to this motion but a
19 previous motion. NDC will have to come up with an
20 answer. We told them we want one completely rural
21 district and also told them we want to separate the Hopi
22 and Navajo communities. And in order to do that,
23 they're going to have to do something other than what
24 just straight population would have them do, taking AURs
25 into consideration. They'll have to figure out what to

1 do with Parker regardless of the Phoenix Metropolitan
2 area. That was affected by the previous motion more
3 than this motion.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: The previous motion,
5 Parker, given the example, the current configuration, go
6 across west, that's why it's taken the communities, for
7 example, the four proposals we requested out of NDC,
8 that's Parker. That's my question, is given your
9 motion, given the Hispanic AUR of the southwestern part
10 of the state, what do you do with the community? I
11 don't think it's even possible for your motion to occur,
12 given the geography of the state.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems as I
14 recall public testimony that occurred, many people both
15 in their testimony and citizen input forms filled out
16 referred to the State of Maricopa and said basically,
17 not just people in Maricopa County, concerned about
18 their representation, people outside of Maricopa County,
19 were saying don't put us with Maricopa County. If you
20 do, we'll be dominated by Maricopa County. While we
21 have to deal with communities like Parker and find
22 district that work for them, I don't think it's going to
23 be in Maricopa County.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

25 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Commissioner Hall,

1 I think that the question really is can you do -- is
2 there enough to divide districts in the Phoenix
3 Metropolitan area.

4 Perhaps our consultants have those numbers
5 handy.

6 When we look at -- in our presentations we
7 did during the initial round of hearings, we had a chart
8 that showed the population of the state. I took my
9 calculation off those numbers, basically, as a way to
10 make a rough percentage of the total population of
11 Maricopa County. The number I came up with was close to
12 62 percent. Perhaps we can verify that right now. If
13 it doesn't work, we'll see what the result is. I think
14 that this has an appreciable chance of making Parker
15 something other than the rest of a Phoenix district,
16 which is what it appears to be in that map, along with
17 every other city along the river. They probably didn't
18 think of themselves as being part of Phoenix.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

20 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
21 Commission, we do have some numbers Chris would like to
22 share with you.

23 MR. HUTCHISON: Maricopa County, but the
24 county itself has about 3.07 million people, 3,072,140.
25 The ideal size is 640,321. Multiply that times five,

1 that's 3,206,645, which essentially means Maricopa
2 County itself is 134,496 over five Congressional
3 Districts. There is additional population, if you look
4 at areas of Apache Junction, Casa Grande. Those areas
5 are just about that size 135,000, people. That's where
6 you are looking in terms of the outer reaches of what
7 you might consider the Phoenix Metropolitan area, where
8 population could be. There is not just enough within
9 Maricopa County.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I want to say something
11 about the motion. I'll try to express why. The prior
12 motion which dealt with trying to correct what we felt
13 were specific instructions to consultants in terms of
14 mapping that were not achieved, that motion in its four
15 iterations gives us an opportunity to explore ways we
16 might be able to get to that specific instruction which
17 we had given them.

18 My concern about this motion is that it
19 gives a brand-new instruction without regard to any of
20 the impact to the rest of the state which had not
21 previously been given.

22 I'm not suggesting we shouldn't give new
23 instruction today, but I'm not sure on the pure basis of
24 population, with the numbers being what they are, that
25 this particular motion is going to be in any way useful.

1 That is my personal opinion, that what we will find is
2 those numbers are correct, that we could make four and a
3 fraction districts in the Phoenix area, if you did that
4 in the most compact way possible, you'd still, in order
5 to achieve the rest of the goals in rest of the state,
6 need to do something different from that to make all
7 eight fit together.

8 On that basis, it might be an interesting
9 exercise but not particularly useful.

10 At this point, I'm not sure I can vote for
11 the motion.

12 Mr. Huntwork.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The sole intent of
14 motion was to build on a previously approved principle,
15 separating urban and rural. We have basically something
16 like 4.8 districts, even with those numbers, 120,000
17 short, 641, so very close to five districts in Maricopa
18 County alone. And that's a good way of separating,
19 looking at a way of separating the urban from the rural.

20 It isn't a map we're asking them to draw
21 but consistent with the principles we're asking them to
22 recognize.

23 I want to see where it goes, at least. It
24 may turn out to be the cornerstone of how we do it or
25 may turn out to be just an idea to throw by the wayside.

1 It seems promising to me in the big picture perspective.
2 It's certainly a question of where we get the population
3 that is key, that you we get the question of perspective
4 as the dominating key. We're concerned now that one
5 seems like it probably does more damage to the
6 rural-urban split.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
8 motion?

9 If none, ready for the question?

10 All those in favor of the motion, signify
11 by saying "aye."

12 (Vote taken.)

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed, say "no."

14 (Vote taken.)

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll call for a roll call
16 with the division.

17 Mr. Huntwork?

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "Aye."

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Aye."

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: "No."

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "No."

25 CHAIRMAN ELDER: Chair votes "no."

1 Motion carries three to two.

2 Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Competitive
4 districts.

5 I understand competitiveness is not taken
6 into consideration, competitive districts. Looking at
7 them at the Congressional level, I think Proposition 106
8 requires us to create competitive districts, if we can
9 do so. I believe by shifting population, this is
10 doable.

11 I would like to propose we request the
12 consultants in redesigning the eight Congressional
13 Districts that at least three of those districts have a
14 division of population between the two major parties of
15 no more than about five percent.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is that in the form of a
17 motion?

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's a motion.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Second?

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I made the motion.

23 I think this is probably one of the most
24 important things we can do for the people of Arizona. I
25 may be concerned my rural interests be represented or my

1 urban interests be represented or my particular AUR has
2 representation, but the most important thing to me as a
3 resident of the State of Arizona that my vote matters.

4 I think that in order to empower people
5 when they go to the polls, the best thing we can do is
6 as much as possible to create districts where votes can
7 mean, when people go to the polls at the -- on the
8 general election day, that their vote matters, that the
9 issue has not already been decided in the primary. It
10 would be wonderful if we could do that in all districts.
11 We cannot comply with all the other requirements of
12 Proposition 106 and cannot comply with all the realities
13 and requirements of 106. To the extent possible Prop
14 106 requires we do this, we'd be in violation of the
15 requirements 106 if we do not do this as long as we can
16 achieve all the goals in 106. That's the purpose of the
17 motion in drawing these districts, that party
18 registration be a factor in three districts, that we
19 make an attempt to have them be competitive, arbitrarily
20 defining competitiveness as no more than five percent.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Competitiveness, what
22 the five percent is based on, is it registration, is it
23 where voters voted, 18 plus? What categories are you
24 using to define --

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: People below 18 are

1 not defined as Democrats or Republicans. There may be
2 more refined information later on in the process as data
3 comes in and NDC analyzes data. Right now all we have
4 is party registration, and we've got it in figures we
5 received today. We do have party registration figures.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree it's
7 important, but I almost believe we're premature in
8 trying to attain that goal, trying to attain major
9 concepts of how the state fits in. So my sense is that
10 we should give direction to NDC to, if, when possible,
11 when looking at this, report back to us the data in each
12 one of the four plans we approve or have authorized them
13 to do now so we see what the balances are based on 18
14 plus registration. But to go in there and try to assess
15 that now, and also take the time now, and the delay,
16 before we're able to debate, discuss other issues with
17 plans returned, I'm afraid it would take so much time
18 we'll not be able to achieve our goals by the end of
19 Sunday or Saturday.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'm trying to get
21 as much done before we go out for public comment as
22 possible.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser or Mr. Rivera.

24 MR. RIVERA: My turn.

25 I want to make the Commission aware, as

1 discussed before, we do not have the raw material
2 available to make a determination on what is
3 competitiveness. That's something the Commission will
4 be looking into from the state and also material from
5 some experts we've hired. They're making a
6 determination on competitiveness. Without the
7 determination, what it is --

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: I thought we received
9 raw data yesterday.

10 MR. RIVERA: In terms of raw data, it
11 determines party registration, but it does not tell what
12 is competitiveness or how to determine that in Arizona.
13 In some places, for example, running a Democrat and
14 Republican in Cochise County, there may be substantial
15 competitiveness, and that may be different than Tucson
16 or South Phoenix. The same thing for Tucson. Voting
17 patterns, how people voted, we have to have evidence.
18 We don't have evidence.

19 NDC is contacting somebody nationwide to
20 make a determination on that.

21 Also, as part of -- part of the process,
22 we're having to ask for input throughout the state as to
23 what is competitive throughout state for various
24 reasons.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, I
2 will speak against the motion. I want to say -- I agree
3 to a large extent. We are required to take
4 competitiveness into consideration before we're done.
5 I'm concerned if we don't find a way to try to do it in
6 this round, and in the maps we put out now, we may end
7 up being faced with another complete round as -- as
8 Ms. Minkoff suggested, Mr. Rivera, Mr. Eckstein said,
9 with a big adjustment, and we might need another round
10 of public comment. I'd be loath to complete this
11 process over the next few days without taking that into
12 consideration to some extent in some way.

13 Having said that, I disagree
14 philosophically with the approach being suggested. It
15 seems to me that our constitutional obligation is to
16 apply the other criteria and then apply competitiveness
17 criteria as an adjusted factor.

18 We make decisions with regard to Hispanic
19 AURs, rural issues, and so on. We have to carry those
20 before we can take competitiveness into consideration.

21 And the second thing that then concerns me
22 about the way the motion was stated, when the question
23 of competitiveness was debated in the context of
24 adopting Proposition 106, what I heard was we don't want
25 districts which are so weighted in one direction that

1 there is, in effect, no accountability. It's not a
2 question of 60/40, a question of 75/80 percent, so
3 people are there for, to take extreme positions, no
4 accountability. I believe that's exactly what took
5 place. Now the process that is being suggested, whether
6 intentionally or not, would be let's pack some districts
7 so that we can have others that are more competitive.
8 And that I think that's exactly the opposite of what the
9 proposition is telling us to do.

10 We need to take competitiveness into
11 account so we don't paint ourselves into a corner.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I suppose to put it
14 into the context of 106 and what we've had all the way
15 through the process is this is the last item considered,
16 and it says "where practicable." I think we should go
17 through and try to amalgamate or reaggregate, if you
18 will, other considerations, see where that leads us, and
19 ask NDC to give us the data by the district so that we
20 can look at it. And then if we can see opportunities to
21 make adjustments, to bring those closer together, that's
22 where the word "practical" comes in. We should do it.
23 To start off now and say let's "start moving lines
24 irrespective of the AURs" or "irrespective of the other
25 conditions of 106 and federal laws," I don't think is

1 appropriate at this time.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall then Ms. Minkoff.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: First of all,
4 Ms. Minkoff didn't propose we move lines and place
5 competitiveness over communities of interest or voting
6 rights. Second of all, she didn't say consider it last,
7 list it last; then said consider it not to the detriment
8 of other goals.

9 We have proposals. Whether we like it or
10 not, some are good. Some aren't. There are proposals
11 out there that have considered competitiveness and kept
12 intact all other goals: Voting Rights Act, communities
13 of interest. And while I'm not so sure, Andi, we should
14 place a specific parameter at this phase of game, I
15 concur with Mr. Huntwork's comment in that respect.

16 We, folks, do not have option as to
17 whether or not we consider competitiveness. We must
18 consider it. We have to consider at this phase or how
19 else are others going to be able to provide to us
20 intelligent, relevant feedback related to those issues?
21 Granted competitiveness is linear and relevant issue to
22 get our arms around. At least we should place party
23 registration and what data we have to place interest.
24 Consider communities of interest and what consultants
25 told us to do, then say when you draw that map or draw

1 that district, show us what it is. If it's way out of
2 whack, you have showed us what it is. If way out of
3 whack, make adjustments to show that. Otherwise, we
4 make ourselves open to a potential challenge stating
5 that we didn't consider it and, therefore, are in
6 violation of state law and, therefore, more subject to
7 increased criticism.

8 I feel like to the extent practicable we
9 need to make sure that threshold is unique.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The reason I made
11 the motion at this point, even though I recognize that
12 there are a lot of other things that need to be done, is
13 that we need to approve draft maps by the end of this
14 multi-day meeting. And in order to do that, I think, as
15 Mr. Huntwork said, that we must take competitiveness
16 into consideration.

17 We do not have all of the data. We don't
18 have all of the data, quite honestly, to deal with some
19 of the AURs we're dealing with, because we need some
20 voting analysis that isn't complete yet and there will
21 be changes that need to be made.

22 These are maps we're asking the public to
23 comment on. At the end of the second round of public
24 meetings, the changes we make should reflect that public
25 comment. But we also have an obligation to comply with

1 the Constitution, 106, part of the Constitution of
2 Arizona. It says we have to consider the Constitution
3 of Arizona. At the end of the second round of the
4 districts, now we have to consider competitive
5 districts, wholesale lines for districts we've asked the
6 public to comment on. I believe to an extent we can, at
7 this point of the process, but we must consider
8 competitiveness of districts before we take it out to
9 the people for public comment.

10 NDC told us already with the instructions
11 we've given them they're going to need several hours to
12 react to our instructions and come back with what we've
13 asked them to come back with. We can do it without
14 competitiveness and then give them, without
15 competitiveness, incorporate those instructions with
16 what we're doing.

17 I'm concerned we keep the deadline set and
18 make sure we're finished by the end of the multi-day
19 meeting.

20 The purpose of the meeting is not a set
21 hard-and-fast rule. Given the instructions before,
22 sometimes we can't achieve one because of conflicts with
23 one or two. I want them to understand as they redraw
24 these districts, if they take competitiveness into
25 consideration at this point, maybe we don't need to go

1 back and do it all over again after they've brought it
2 again.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder and then
4 Mr. Huntwork.

5 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Step back to
6 Mr. Hall's discussion. I agree with him up until last
7 the sentence or last two sentences. We need data that
8 shows what competitiveness is. NDC can redraw the lines
9 based on competitiveness rather than us making decisions
10 and seeing where numbers are and saying: Well, this
11 would work better than that. That's where I'm going.

12 I believe we should have data each time
13 one map's drawn. Just like I'm adamant it hasn't done
14 any good without streets, county lines, to have no
15 context for what we're looking at, we need registration
16 numbers so we know what we're hooking at there also.

17 So as long as data is back, so we can look
18 at it and evaluate it, that's one thing, not so we have
19 additional data, that we have to have it now, have to
20 have it during considerations.

21 We're going to have to have it.

22 Maybe I'm being very pessimistic, asking
23 for one set of plans. Now it may take two hours, and
24 they'll come back and say that's a plan. When we get
25 done with it, I think there's four or six more

1 iterations to go. That puts us into Saturday already.

2 I'd like to try to get as much of the
3 discussion based on what we do have an address it for,
4 understanding the underlying numbers as much as we can,
5 then for the next iteration have a little bit more
6 knowledge give the better direction, and each iteration,
7 more finite numbers.

8 I'd oppose the motion. I want to see the
9 data as best we can.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork then
11 Ms. Hauser.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Two big points.
13 Number one, I think that just as a purely logical point,
14 in order to know that the adjustments we're making for
15 competitiveness, to not substantially impair the
16 factors, we need to make best judgment to map out
17 factors, they need to be taken out of consideration in
18 as a purely logical function. I know some of the maps
19 presented purport to have done that, and I accept and
20 multiply some of the faith in those efforts. We need to
21 do some of that ourselves. I won't know the baseline
22 until we've done it.

23 The second thing, another lead approach, I
24 apologize, counsel is getting overworked by my question,
25 I need to say, I intend to personally, personally intend

1 to take competitiveness into consideration just as if it
2 were a mandatory requirement of Proposition 106. I do
3 think it's the intent of Arizona voters, and I point
4 out, if not mistaken, Proposition 106 shall take into
5 consideration, if I'm mistaken, by the way, I'd like to
6 have, go to church with my Bible here, when here we
7 probably should have Proposition 106 in front of us so
8 we can be sure we know exactly what we're talking about
9 at all times.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Hauser.

11 MS. HAUSER: Mr. Chairman, Jose and I
12 conferred on this over here a minute. We think we have
13 sort of a semantic bit of legal advice that we can offer
14 on this point, and that is that there is a difference
15 between registration figures and making adjustments
16 based on registration figures and testing for
17 competitiveness.

18 The discussion has been focused on
19 competitiveness and making adjustments on that basis.
20 But at this point, again, because we don't have the
21 data, it is possible for the Commission to see a
22 district that is very lopsided in one direction or
23 another. You can, of course, issue instructions to NDC
24 to make modifications, to make the registration less
25 lopsided, aimed at ultimately testing that for

1 competitiveness. But you are not actually making --
2 when you do that, you are not actually making
3 adjustments based on competitiveness, given in that
4 particular area, or in any area of the state, it is
5 undefined at the moment.

6 That may assist you in giving some
7 instruction that there's nothing wrong with making
8 adjustments based on party registration; but it really
9 shouldn't be put in terms of adjusting for
10 competitiveness.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It seems as though the
12 difficulty is that we cannot definitively make
13 adjustments for competitiveness until, for one, we have
14 more complete data available and, two, we have
15 established in more detailed terms just a five percent
16 spread, what we believe competitiveness to be as related
17 to all that data when it becomes available.

18 I understand the issue of timeliness. And
19 the issue here is whether or not that data will be
20 available and useful to us in a manner which precludes
21 us from having to make substantial changes to districts
22 that have been taken out to the public for review.

23 I think there's a clear difference of
24 opinion of how substantial changes will be based on the
25 fact none of us have been there before and made changes

1 to this process.

2 I don't know any more than anybody else
3 how much change will have to occur after the fact. I
4 believe, since we're talking about, in many cases, an
5 ability to take districts around the entire -- take
6 Census tracts around the entire circumference of the
7 district and either move them in or out to achieve that
8 purpose to do so, it may, I stress "may," might not be
9 as difficult as we imagine it to be. My concern is the
10 arbitrary definition of competitiveness.

11 I do think from this point forward now we
12 have a definition competitiveness, taking into account
13 gross registration numbers, now it's available.

14 I can't support the motion because it
15 contains a specific, albeit preliminary definition of
16 competitiveness which is incomplete. I don't want to
17 give it definition.

18 We can give direction when we see the maps
19 whether or not it's in line with what is reasonable,
20 whether they need more work or more analysis or what it
21 should look like.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I
23 hear the discussion. I would like to withdraw the
24 motion and substitute something else to perhaps achieve
25 it.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, will you
2 withdraw the second?

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Looking at the
5 eight Congressional Districts presented to us, four of
6 them have approximately a two to one dominance of one
7 party over another. It happens to be split two two, two
8 Republican Districts, two Democrat Districts. If I were
9 a member of the smaller party, I'd feel pretty
10 disenfranchised as a member of the smaller districts,
11 four districts drawn up. What I'd like suggest, I do
12 not presume to say party registration equates to
13 competitiveness, but just trying to get us closer, and I
14 understand there will be adjustments made after this
15 plan when we meet after the second round of public
16 hearings, but I would just like to move then that in any
17 readjustment and realignment of districts based on
18 instructions given to NDC by the Commission, that party
19 registration be addressed and considered to minimize
20 wide variations as much as practicable when complying
21 with all other instructions of the Commission.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Second.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion on that one?

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: In the interests of time,

1 not that this isn't a critical issue, it is, we do need
2 to take a break.

3 I do want to dispose of this issue before
4 we break.

5 I would ask, if we could, for those that
6 have spoken against the previous motion, if you would
7 weigh in in terms of your being more or less disposed to
8 support this one.

9 If I could ask, Mr. Huntwork?

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Again, I'd oppose
11 this motion for the other reasons that logically I would
12 not be able to determine whether competitiveness
13 adversely affects other factors until we've taken our
14 best shot at creating maps that affect the other
15 factors. It's a point of logic, and I'm afraid if we do
16 anything else, it flies in the face of 106.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I agree, this is more
19 problematic than the other motion. I disagree from the
20 standpoint of the other motion, I'd want to see that and
21 after that, the making of districts more competitive by
22 NDC. It's not something I want to leave to chance. And
23 the last part, the last part of the motion is something
24 I disagree with.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I, too, functionally am

1 finding difficulty with it, how to fully deal with it.
2 I do want to look at it, want to see the registration
3 data. How to fully get past the point, I don't believe
4 we at this point can go forward and fully define it.

5 Mr. Hall, want to be heard on motion?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: My question is when do
7 you three gentleman want to deal with it? When?

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question is not up to
9 us. We don't control the data. When we get all the
10 data we need. When we fully define the data.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: The question is to
12 whomever in this room can answer the question. When?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let's see if Ms. Leoni can
14 take a chance at it.

15 MS. LEONI: It's a tough question. I'll
16 have an answer, one part of it, for you probably after a
17 break. I have communication to one of the experts who
18 is assisting on the voting behavior analysis for the
19 systems on competitiveness as well.

20 But competitiveness, as Mr. Rivera has
21 pointed out, is idiosyncratic to districts. And some of
22 the evidence -- we can have an academic analysis of it
23 for you of it. But what really happens on the ground is
24 going to be something that you are going to learn
25 through public testimony.

1 What will be competitive in one part of
2 the state will not be competitive in another because of
3 behavior of third parties, crossover voting, incumbency,
4 quality of candidates.

5 The answer is we can get you one part of
6 that. Another part of that will come during commentary
7 on proposed draft maps.

8 Have I misstated that?

9 MR. RIVERA: If I can add, we'll not be
10 considering incumbency. That's one of the things 106
11 prohibits. On what NDC will provide you, what
12 competitiveness provides you, you can define, refine
13 that as you go out into general hearings, smaller,
14 sharper definition you have to make when you go out to
15 hearings. You'll have parameters from NDC and EDS when
16 you go out.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: On the motion.

18 Mr. Hall.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: So, Mr. Rivera, as our
20 counsel, what are advising us regarding this issue?

21 MR. RIVERA: From a legal component, when
22 Ms. Leoni gives you general background, you'll have a
23 general parameter as to what you want to do generally on
24 the competitiveness aspect of it, then refine it and
25 look at it further as you go off to hearings and hear

1 individuals coming in and hear changes from district to
2 district and standard to standard. Like any other
3 criteria, you'll be refining that as you go out to the
4 community. It's no different from the way you are
5 judging all the other criteria.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

7 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's all I'm
8 trying to achieve. I don't believe, and obviously
9 counsel has made it abundantly clear, that we are not
10 going to be establish competitive districts in the draft
11 that will go out to the public for comment.

12 We're also not going to be able to
13 establish districts that fully comply with all the
14 wishes that have been expressed until now. That's why
15 we're going off to public comment.

16 However, we're making an attempt to come
17 as close as we can in all other areas, rural divisions,
18 being sensitive to AURs as they've been adopted.

19 I understand we don't have racial block
20 analysis that allows us to do certain things. We also
21 don't have the partisan voting analysis that our counsel
22 had talked about. That will allow us to greater define
23 it.

24 I want to make sure we don't ignore it in
25 this stage of the mapping process, that we make

1 adjustments that we believe come closer to what the end
2 result is that we're trying to achieve, then go out,
3 listen to what people have to say, then go out and
4 readjust the districts. That's all the motion says,
5 consider it when NDC is coming back to us with changes,
6 to at least look at how it impacts on party
7 registration, which is all we have.

8 I know it does not define competitiveness.
9 It defines better than completely ignoring.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff, if your
11 motion, as you explained it, I want to double-check
12 Mr. Hall if that's the understanding, is come back with
13 maps that provide appropriate analysis of voter
14 registration data for voter districts, I agree with
15 that.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That doesn't mean
17 anything.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Correct.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I mean as making
20 changes to maps, if, without -- not to the detriment of
21 any of the other things we've asked them to do, which is
22 the language in Prop 106, also look at party
23 registrations and level it out some, some, I'm asking
24 them to do it, if it will work not to the detriment of
25 other things we're asking them to do, which obviously my

1 motion nor Prop 106 allows them to do.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Roll call is easier.

3 On the motion. Mr. Huntwork?

4 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes?

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "No."

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "no."

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Motion is defeated by

13 vote of three to one.

14 (Recess taken.)

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Commission will stand

16 in session.

17 Are there additional Members of the

18 Commission that wish to make additional motions relative

19 to Congressional Districts?

20 Mr. Elder first.

21 Ms. Minkoff?

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Things we're

25 looking at relating to trying to improve competitiveness

1 of the district, are those better held in --

2 MR. RIVERA: Could you speak into the
3 microphone?

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is this better?

5 I mentioned things I was looking at, I
6 think might work better in terms of improving
7 competitiveness of the districts in terms creating more
8 diverse districts, whether this is the time to present
9 them or whether I should present them when we have
10 further data.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall?

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Ms. Minkoff, I've been
13 educated over the break.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's about time.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: Evidently, there's
16 more than one.

17 I feel until we have all the appropriate
18 information that we need, we probably would need to
19 defer that. What I'm hearing, possibly we'd be able to
20 do that in the next day or two. My sense, from
21 Marguerite, today is probably premature. Maybe
22 tomorrow.

23 MS. LEONI: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: It will be Saturday
25 before we have all that data.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I'll hold off on
2 that. No sense.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: One issue that occurs to
4 me. I know we had a discussion about it at our last
5 meeting last week. And you can see the effect of that
6 discussion is we voted to attempt to draw districts with
7 a separation of Hopi and Navajo for good and proper
8 reasons. I'm wondering if there is not, if it would not
9 be useful to look at the configuration of the districts
10 if that separation were not maintained. By that I mean
11 there are, again, it's compensating factors. But if
12 that separation were not maintained, there would be
13 other benefits achieved in terms of the way that the
14 rest of the state's districts flow. And I'm wondering
15 if we should not explore that the same way we're
16 exploring five Maricopa County Districts, the same way
17 we're exploring horizontal versus vertical separation
18 for a rural district. I'd certainly, at least if
19 another member of the Commission feels the same way,
20 think that's something we ought to explore.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Is that in the form
22 of a motion?

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The Chair can't really
24 make a motion, but I'd be happy to entertain one.

25 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd make a motion we

1 should at least look at opportunities that may be
2 developed by not separating the Hopi from the Navajo.
3 And I -- I should make that as a motion.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can I ask question
6 before seconding?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I second.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Now ask a question.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Congressional or
10 Congressional and Legislative?

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Right now I'm
12 referring to Congressional.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Because of the
17 question I asked earlier, I'm not sure that there is any
18 substance to the motion. I look -- if, for example,
19 we're not required to have contiguous districts, then
20 the effect of separation is very small, because the
21 population in the Hopi, there is only 7,000 people.
22 Secondly, even if we are to have contiguous districts,
23 we don't know what measures might be available to
24 connect Hopi to other districts, including possibly
25 north Phoenix would be the closest if we divide north

1 and south. But we -- in that map that we have, there's
2 virtually no population in the area that connects, so
3 we're talking about 7,000 people. It doesn't seem as if
4 that is a major driving force in the design between east
5 and west, north and south, or anything else.

6 I am still thinking, in my own mind, that
7 unless there is a legal impediment that I'm not aware
8 of, the Hopi separation is not rightly anything.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Except if we leave it as
10 an instruction to the consultants.

11 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Correct. But the
12 sense of the motion was how the other motions we're
13 making are impacted by that. If it's truly just a
14 question of 7,000 people, I'm questioning whether there
15 is any impact.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It goes back to the issue
17 of compactness and contiguousness. In those two
18 instances, there's clearly a more compact contiguous
19 solution. If those are the only issues you are
20 considering, if you contain the Navajo and Hopi
21 Reservation together in the same district, if you a make
22 determination to separate them, clearly you have the
23 situation as we see it, and some resolution, shape the
24 Hopi Reservation where you connect the rest of state,
25 where you connect to the rest of the district, you draw

1 a threshold you draw for the district where you draw it.

2 My point in asking the question, because
3 it was such a definitive and critical decision in terms
4 of instructions, was to at least have the opportunity to
5 look at districts that did not have that constraint so
6 we could look at the impact on the rest of the state.

7 Mr. Elder.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes. I would like to
9 put this in the context of the framing of the motion. I
10 voted for the five districts out of Maricopa County
11 because I think it's something we should take a look at
12 to see what the effects of that decision would be, not
13 that I'm in favor of it. I'd like to see what the
14 ramifications are. I'd like to see what the
15 ramifications of compactness, contiguousness are of the
16 decision we gave NDC, the morphology of, see how
17 modified, if the constraint is not there. I'd like to
18 see what the effect of that would be.

19 The third thing I'd like to look at, I'd
20 like to take a look at a plan NDC has now to see if we
21 made these modifications, how will that plan look? I
22 want, in effect, to really take a look at three plans,
23 eventually, so that we can have the best information
24 we've got to be able to make a decision.

25 It may be it's a moot question with the

1 Hopi. If it is, great, then we respect things we've
2 heard in the various meetings.

3 If we end up with a problem being driven
4 by that population, then it may be something we've got
5 to look at and see if we bite the bullet on that issue.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
7 motion?

8 Mr. Huntwork.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I agree with the
10 motivation behind the motion. Personally, I'm convinced
11 that we can accommodate the Hopis, if we choose to do
12 so, regardless of the other decisions that we make.
13 Therefore, I don't believe it drives anything. That's
14 my personal conclusion. For that reason, I'm going to
15 vote against the motion. I want to explain that in
16 advance.

17 If I felt it was a driving factor, then I
18 would vote the other way, just to explore, make an
19 impact.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

21 Other discussion on the motion?

22 Roll call.

23 Mr. Huntwork?

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: "No."

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff?

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: "Yes."

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

3 Mr. Hall?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: "Aye."

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: "Aye."

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "aye".

8 Motion carries four to one.

9 Other discussion on Congressional

10 Districts?

11 Mr. Elder.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I would

13 like to propose we as a Commission go around, either in

14 roll call order or by volunteer, whoever wants to go

15 first, and address issues in the Congressional plan

16 submitted by NDC so that as they make revisions either

17 for the five District Maricopa concentration, or make

18 changes to districts based on the Hopi amalgamation with

19 the northern regions, or whatever it turns out to be,

20 they also can look at issues we as individual

21 Commissioners might have with the plans here. If they

22 can resolve some of them as they go, it benefits us all.

23 Is that an appropriate process or course

24 of action?

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Let me ask is there anyone

1 on the Commission that would object to doing that?

2 I would, however, Mr. Elder, just want to
3 make sure there are no specific substantive motions
4 we've overlooked, although if something out of the
5 discussion turns into a new motion, if appropriate,
6 without objection, if we may do that, without going into
7 forced order, if someone is ready to make comments, I'd
8 be happy to do that.

9 Mr. Elder.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, could we put
11 up the state map with Congressional Districts as NDC
12 proposed them? I'd like to point out areas I'd like to
13 have addressed, point them out on that.

14 I think, conceptually, I'd like to see, if
15 we can, to have Yavapai County, in effect, made whole.
16 That might mean we need to take Sedona, pull it out of
17 Yavapai County. We heard Sedona did not want to be
18 split down the center of the county or put into Prescott
19 as whole and put into Coconino, I think, is the county
20 to east. Take that portion of Verde Valley, Coconino,
21 which seems to make sense. That's the first one. Once
22 you adjust the map there, the corollary to that, balance
23 it out, it will help with the grid, in one sense.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd like to discuss
25 points with NDC and discuss them, or what is your

1 preference.

2 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd like to go down
3 through my list and discuss them or would other
4 Commissioners?

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Pile them on,
7 whatever the case might be.

8 Chris, zoom in on that area, including
9 that tab.

10 The area, for the public and rest of the
11 Commissioners, take the area right here, combine that
12 back into Yavapai County, in this area here. The
13 possible corollary modification of that, this area here,
14 bring that down here. Put this part over in, bring the
15 balance off that line into Yavapai.

16 MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, I hate to be
17 picky on this. Identify the changes you make. Make
18 them verbally for the record. "This and that," nobody
19 going back will know what changes you're making.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Counsel, tell me what
21 to call it.

22 MR. RIVERA: Draw the line. Identify the
23 cities.

24 COMMISSIONER ELDER: From Big Lark, which
25 I never heard of it, straight south to the Yavapai

1 County line, everything east of that going to the, I
2 miss it, the yellow zone, or district. If we can't get
3 population, keep Yavapai totally in the area. Keep this
4 area, do the entire portion of Yavapai. Put in balance
5 the Yavapai area, the blue and yellow communities, seems
6 to be the sense from my position.

7 Chris, if you'll go down to the West
8 Valley, Phoenix down a little further south from what we
9 have there.

10 I'm concerned that if we look at rural,
11 this area right in here has got, to my understanding,
12 somewhere in the range 400,000 people.

13 MR. RIVERA: Which area?

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The area including
15 Surprise, Litchfield, Avondale parts of Sun City,
16 Goodyear, in there somewhere, I don't know, El Mirage,
17 what others, Peoria, Sun City West. So that area there
18 is a fairly dense or urbanized area.

19 I would like, as you are looking at your
20 five districts, to try to get the West Valley where it
21 does not dominate. Maybe what our goal should be is to
22 try to bring enough in that, as a resultant of the urban
23 area, what I'm calling the west area, to bring about a
24 balanced or competitive district, so have a balance
25 between urban and balance with a rural. Maybe that's

1 another way look at it. Even though the West Valley
2 will continue to grow, and we know the balance of urban
3 and rural change, but there might be a way to accomplish
4 both goals of this Commission.

5 Further to the south, Gila Bend, those
6 areas, Chris, or south, further west, looking for an
7 area, I don't know what this will due to the racial
8 block vote, or standing demonstration, looking to areas
9 added, or considering adding areas to population to the
10 purple to -- I have numbers, to Congressional District
11 A, to compensate for that, I'm wondering whether it
12 would make sense to bring the southerly line below Gila
13 Bend and bring it to the north and possibly as far as
14 Avondale. Is there enough population in the area to
15 help offset gains included in Congressional District in
16 Yavapai? I know Gila Bend does not have have much
17 population. I do not know what this urban population
18 demographics might be. Can we look at that as a way of
19 getting population back in or added to an area or
20 subtracted from an area for balance?

21 Mammoth and Winkleman, the north of Tucson
22 or Pima County, this area here that goes from about
23 Saddlebrooke up to Florence east to Kearney,
24 Duddleyville and the county line, we heard testimony
25 that Thatcher, Globe, and one comment, I believe, in

1 Tucson that this area is primarily mining and
2 agriculture. It fit very well with the AURs,
3 agriculture areas of Gila River, Clifton, another mining
4 area northwest of Thatcher, older mines at Globe and
5 Miami. There is a Hispanic area here. If we tied
6 Hispanic areas there, it might have balance and the
7 numbers we're looking for for the work there. It would
8 seem like it fits better with that than it does with the
9 Casa Grande area. So I would like to see that area
10 possibly combined with the pink, which is Congressional
11 District C.

12 Then pull down south into the Tucson area.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: That would be G, not C.

14 MR. HUTCHISON: It's C.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: C. Is it C --

16 MR. HUTCHISON: G.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: C and combine with G,
18 so combined with the Gila River and agriculture, mining
19 here, Globe, Miami, mining down through this area. That
20 seemed to be a combination here.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Move the area into C or
22 move the area you described to pick it up?

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: It really wouldn't
24 make any difference.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Keep them together.

1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Keep them together,
2 Gila Valley mining communities are a very strong
3 linkage, moved into the valley, G within C, the balance
4 of the north or eastern county district. It doesn't
5 make a whole lot of difference. These two areas should
6 be together.

7 Then lastly, let's move down to the Tucson
8 area. Let's zoom in right around the center part of the
9 city here.

10 I would like you to take a look at, I know
11 by clicking on the tracks here, these were probably
12 needed for the Hispanic area, but it's also the
13 appendage that sticks out. We also have an area here
14 that has a fair amount of Hispanics. We had testimony
15 from both the Tohono O'odhom areas. I believe the
16 University is right in this area here, the area of the
17 University and surrounding area north was area they felt
18 an affinity for, shopped, socioeconomics, the people in
19 the Tanque Verde area do, I think from the standpoint of
20 the grid and the way the system works. If this area was
21 traded for people going to the river, it would be a good
22 break, balance here. Look at having this go to the east
23 and this area going to the west, I think this would make
24 sense from that standpoint.

25 Those are my comments and things I would

1 like NDC to look at as making adjustments to the grid.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I wonder if I might weigh
3 in, make my own suggestions, reinforce or challenge,
4 weigh in with my own suggestions. I've put my own list
5 together of my own recommendations.

6 Who would like to go next?

7 Mr. Hall.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: As I mentioned to
9 Mr. Elder, I think we need to be careful not to give
10 conflicting instructions.

11 So what I heard you say, Mr. Elder, is
12 combine Yavapai County. What you've instructed NDC
13 would be impossible to do without at least taking a
14 portion of Yavapai County.

15 I guess what I'm hearing, I'm hearing
16 we've already instructed them to do one, what I heard
17 with respect to Yavapai County, in my opinion, NDC is
18 welcome to weigh in on this subject, conflicts with what
19 we instructed them to do with a rural district.

20 Would you like to comment on that,
21 Dr. Heslop?

22 DR. HESLOP: I think either Commissioner
23 Elder is saying stay alert to these particular areas as
24 we develop the maps under your formal instruction and we
25 can report back with the implications concerning these

1 areas, and either the current draft map or current draft
2 map as amended, and we're happy to do that.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Joshua, to elaborate
4 on that, I wouldn't care if it shoots, works well, that
5 all Yavapai County is moved to the east district to get
6 to the numbers you need for an urban context. If that
7 works, that's fine, too. It seems that split, this
8 didn't make a lot of sense to me. And --

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: If I -- if I
10 understand that split, I think that split is Mingus
11 Mountain, is it not?

12 Is that correct? Close?

13 MR. HUTCHISON: Yeah, it's close.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: So, in essence, the
15 split would divide Verde Valley from Prescott and
16 Prescott Valley. There was testimony Verde Valley was
17 divergent and had separate interests. Whether we agree
18 with that, that's the rationale behind it as it
19 presently exists.

20 With respect to the West Valley issue, I'm
21 just coming at you with your issues, and this harkens
22 back to the previous motion we had with respect to five
23 Maricopa districts. That won't make, the way the state
24 is outlined, Parker, Parker and those same places, will
25 be sub-lined to that proposal. It's impossible for that

1 to work. I agree with Commissioner Elder with respect
2 to Mammoth, San Manuel, moving them to a rural district
3 closely aligned to the other mining communities.

4 I guess, without objection, I would like
5 to focus maybe more, spend more time on outlying areas.
6 I'd like to focus more, if we could, on more urban
7 districts as they presently exist, specifically B, D, E,
8 and F.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Better known as greater
10 Phoenix.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Maybe address these
12 alphabetical order, start with B. How is that?

13 Do I understand, correctly, essentially
14 this is a nonmajority-minority district; is that
15 correct?

16 MR. HUTCHISON: Which?

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: B.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: B is not.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Help me define, for my
20 benefit, the parameters of that district.

21 MR. HUTCHISON: Borders.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Parameters as far as
23 roads?

24 MR. HUTCHISON: Sure.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: The perimeter, I

1 guess, better than roads.

2 MR. HUTCHISON: Perimeter. The perimeter
3 on the authority, the border on the north is the
4 Maricopa County boundary up here. I'll zoom in on that.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: E?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: B as in Boy.
7 Alphabetical order. B before E.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Pinnacle Peak Road
9 on the north.

10 MR. HUTCHISON: Thunderbird Park then
11 becomes Pinnacle Peak. And it follows Pinnacle Peak
12 Road. I believe that's a canal.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No, it's not a
14 canal.

15 MR. HUTCHISON: That is the Granite Reef
16 Aquaduct. It follows that for a while, that becomes the
17 CAP Canal until Tatum Boulevard, south on Tatum, west on
18 Thunderbird, down to 40th Street, then follows
19 Sweetwater Avenue, then south on 34th Street, continues
20 on 34th Street, south on 32nd Street to the Squaw Peak
21 Highway. Follows the Squaw Peak Highway, goes all the
22 way on Northern to 16th Street. Follows 16th Street
23 south to Highland Avenue, west on Highland to Seventh
24 Street, north on Camelback, and follows Camelback west
25 to 43rd Avenue. Goes north on 43rd Road west, north on

1 51st Avenue, and then to Orangewood west, and then on
2 55th Avenue, and then to Olive Avenue, goes west to
3 59th, following north to Ortiz Street west, to 64th
4 north to Cactus west, and then north on 67th Avenue. I
5 believe that's a city boundary. Yeah, that's the Peoria
6 city boundary. Then goes around the Arizona Canal.
7 Then goes along the Peoria City boundary here to south
8 of Bell Road. And still traveling around the red
9 boundary. Which is --

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the red
11 boundary?

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's the city
13 boundary.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Peoria?

15 MR. HUTCHISON: It's roughly even with
16 75th.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: You are saying
18 portions of Glendale and Phoenix are in this boundary?

19 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: The rest of Glendale
21 is in E?

22 MR. HUTCHISON: Portions of Glendale are
23 in A, B, and E. I highlighted Glendale so you'd see the
24 division.

25 COMMISSIONER HALL: So my question is, not

1 being intimately familiar with this area, given the
2 principle of the desire not to split cities, what is the
3 rationale of Glendale, for example, of dividing Glendale
4 to that degree?

5 DR. ADAMS: Actually, in some of the
6 testimony, I think you will discover Glendale doesn't
7 have a serious problem with division.

8 When reach a serious problem in the map,
9 you make a serious decision with division. There are
10 very few divisions in the map. There are very few
11 cities out of -- Chris has very those very few numbers.
12 When you come up to a point like this and need to find a
13 point of division, you try to do it with a city that
14 expressed less concern about a division.

15 COMMISSIONER HALL: So from a --

16 DR. ADAMS: Let me mention one other
17 thing. There is an AUR that also comes up into a
18 portion of Glendale, and that AUR is a Hispanic AUR.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: And that reaches
20 where?

21 MR. HUTCHISON: The suburb right here.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: The AUR is here?

23 MR. HUTCHISON: Is in D as in dog.

24 I can give you the exact numbers of the
25 split in Glendale here. The portion of Glendale in

1 District A to the west, 38,812 persons, 12 percent of
2 the city's population, over 220,000 people, over 220,000
3 persons. 56 percent of the city, a portion D south, is
4 Hispanic. 56,300 persons, 56.3 persons.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is wrong with
6 shifting B east to align with the -- shifting B east to
7 align the western boundary of Glendale with the
8 exception of the Hispanic AUR.

9 MR. HUTCHISON: There is nothing wrong
10 with it. It's preferable. We then have 122,000 persons
11 then shifting into A.

12 If you do that, the obvious implications
13 are where to drop off 122,000 from District A. Most of
14 the population in District A we'd like to come from
15 there.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: It may be the desire
17 to accommodate the western valley to have the benefit of
18 that.

19 MR. HUTCHISON: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Eliminate the Eastern
21 Mesa place and shift to the east, from my standpoint,
22 taking this example, it's not a benefit, from that
23 standpoint. It's logical all the way across the board,
24 especially in connection with your desires,
25 Mr. Huntwork, to accommodate the metropolitan area and

1 simultaneously consider boundaries of municipalities.

2 MR. HUTCHISON: I think it's definitely
3 advantageous. We're probably going to look at if we
4 work on the five districts.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Great.

6 I highlighted one example. No one wants
7 to plow through each of these in this phase of the game.
8 This is one example, in my mind. I'm purely operating
9 from purely a theoretical example based on principles of
10 palate, accommodating communities of interest, and
11 that's a logical line I'm curious about. To that
12 extent, it's a numbers game.

13 I'm wondering about, given our previous
14 direction, a shift to the east to accommodate many of
15 the interests you've already heard in this meeting.

16 MR. HUTCHISON: I think it will. Just
17 speaking, trying to keep the urban areas together, even
18 more substantial than we already have, if you recall in
19 the West Valley, the Maricopa portion of District A,
20 talking about adding to, 418,000 persons, it could
21 accommodate 1,822. That is something that particular --

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: What?

23 MR. HUTCHISON: We looked at numbers
24 earlier today. The portion of District A, where
25 Commissioner Hall was proposing to include the rest

1 into, that portion of District A within Maricopa County,
2 had 418,000 persons in it. Essentially the other
3 roughly 200,000 persons were in La Paz County, up in
4 that area. If this is something we do, could possibly
5 take a look at, as instructed, the five districts of
6 this area, if you take, take out the rural portions, you
7 could be left with the possibility of adding that. You
8 have to look at everything -- it's something to look at.

9 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, may I get
10 clarification? Is this something we're being asked to
11 look at as we go through the map?

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: As we move to another
13 level of detail, my understanding is you've already been
14 asked to look at that pursuant to Mr. Huntwork's motion
15 and pursuant to the motion of -- with respect to a rural
16 district.

17 What I'm saying, I highlighted this
18 example of so doing, just purely from looking at a
19 purely objective, logical standpoint, it appeared to me
20 that's an area with respect to boundaries, look at the
21 City of Glendale even more. I'm simply making an
22 observation.

23 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Hall, we'll be
24 happy look at that as we look other issues. I'd also
25 like to revisit testimony from the Mayor of the City of

1 Glendale. I have the facility for that. We'd be happy
2 to do that.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I, too, and my
4 fellow urban Commissioners would like to weigh in on
5 that, what our preference is, Mr. Lynn, before we move
6 to another area.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I had thoughts on
9 the same area.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Give it at the same time
11 so the consultants understand. It's easier for Chris
12 not to go back to geographic areas.

13 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Most of what I had
14 to say involved these areas, B, D, and A, primarily, and
15 a little bit in G.

16 I was concerned about the northern part of
17 District D, which is the part that is in Glendale. I
18 guess it's the part north of Camelback Road that I
19 really feel that that belongs more in either District A
20 or B than it does with District D. I think that the
21 northern portion of District D I would like to see
22 shifted into A or B, I think probably B, because I would
23 also like to see just the northern portion of B.

24 MR. HUTCHISON: B as in boy?

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You've described

1 District B as Central Phoenix and Northern Glendale.
2 Yet when you look at District B, it goes so far north it
3 really loses -- it has a distinctive character, Central
4 Phoenix, the older portions of Phoenix and older
5 portions of Glendale. Especially if you put portions of
6 Camelback into portions of District B, the mature area
7 of the District may have common interests, common
8 issues, if you put it with the northern portion, north
9 of Bell Road, it's an entirely different area and it
10 might be better served by being with one of the northern
11 districts that it shares more of the issues with. It
12 takes Glendale out of one of the Congressional
13 Districts, takes out of a portion of D, unites it, goes
14 together with the city. It doesn't chop it up as
15 Commissioner Hall was trying to do.

16 We also heard the Gila River Indian
17 Reservation wanted to be in D, not to be in a rural
18 district. They do abut District D. You might move them
19 into District D where I think they feel more comfortable
20 than where they are now.

21 And if you pull enough out of District G
22 in that area, it might allow us to move La Paz County.
23 They very clearly wanted to be part of Yuma County
24 rather than Mohave County. You might put them in Yuma
25 County rather than Mohave, move them counterclockwise.

1 Obviously, not having the Census data in
2 front of me, I don't know what other data shifts there
3 would be, putting La Paz with Yuma, Gila River into one
4 of the metropolitan Phoenix Districts, perhaps D where
5 it seems to fit, pulling out the northern portion of
6 District D, and putting it in with B and the northern
7 portion of B and putting it with either A or E.

8 The only other thing I had --

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Commissioner Hall was not
10 quite finished.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: So with respect to
12 District G, we can go to that whenever convenient.

13 There was a proposal made by Mr. Elder to
14 move some of the eastern mining communities, if you now
15 have outlined District G, Chris, I guess I'm wondering
16 and somewhat concerned with how much of Tucson
17 influences District G.

18 What is the influence on that particular
19 district?

20 MR. HUTCHISON: I'd obviously like to
21 check the numbers to give an accurate number.

22 I believe, roughly, the Tucson Maricopa
23 area is 250,275.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: A third?

25 MR. HUTCHISON: A third, 40 percent.

1 DR. ADAMS: It's about, if you look at the
2 description in the binder, 55 percent rural, a 55
3 percent rural non-Tucson area.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: 65 percent?

5 DR. ADAMS: 55 percent.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: 55 percent.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess what I'm
8 saying, in light of the previous instructions you
9 received, in my mind I'm trying to watch the ripples of
10 the stone, if you will. I'm wondering, if you will, if
11 G can be shifted more up into the western portion of the
12 state, maybe even taking in Gila Bend to make that
13 figure. I'm not sure why Gila Bend was left out.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I believe that's what
15 I suggested.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Right. Gila Bend left
17 in G. Bringing G back up the western border a bit. If
18 in reality you shift your districts internally, or urban
19 districts east, then you have to put some of those folks
20 somewhere.

21 I'm simply trying to visualize in my mind
22 what the ripple effect is going to be. And I'd welcome
23 any input with respect to that.

24 Is my assumption correct the intrusion of
25 G into Maricopa County is simply the Native American

1 community?

2 MR. HUTCHISON: The Tohono O'odhom
3 community. The southern area here?

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Maricopa County.

5 MR. HUTCHISON: Gila River.

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Maricopa.

7 MR. HUTCHISON: Both Maricopa.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: The desire was to
9 combine the two reservations?

10 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Was there a desire --
12 this is the reservation.

13 MR. HUTCHISON: The desire was to combine
14 the tribal reservations to as few as possible so as to
15 not break them up.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm done,
17 Mr. Chairman.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The only other
20 thing I had to ask, other than the part I presented
21 about the urban area, to respond to Commissioner Elder's
22 suggestion, I recall there was a great deal of
23 testimony, primarily from the Sedona area and other
24 parts of the Verde Valley, they really saw themselves
25 linked to Flagstaff more than they did to Prescott.

1 Mingus Mountain is a pretty powerful barrier. So if it
2 makes some sense to split Yavapai County, that's a very
3 good place to split it. They already stated they really
4 would rather move north than west for their district.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

6 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: One of the
7 benefits of going last, I don't have to reiterate a lot
8 of things.

9 There's only one thing I want to focus on,
10 and that is the District E. In order to talk into the
11 microphone and look at District E, I'll put it here.

12 I don't know if anyone noticed it or not,
13 I think if you were to turn that around 180 degrees at a
14 vertical axis and put the cartoon of the gerrymander up
15 next to it, there's a striking resemblance. And, you
16 know, this district doesn't do the things it's supposed
17 to do. It's sort of -- it doesn't do what we're
18 supposed to do. You get the feeling it's what is left
19 over. There are certain things in achieving that that
20 is true.

21 I'm concerned, particularly, when you look
22 at B and E together, you could create equally, it would
23 be logical, if you look north, took E north, a little
24 bit of B north, a little bit of P north, a little less
25 of a gerrymander, a little bit of P that is growing very

1 rapidly. Other things are growing rapidly.

2 If I heard what you are saying, I think I
3 disagree with it philosophically: Rapidly growing areas
4 are growing rapidly; as a result, they are vastly
5 growing and people quickly will be under-represented.
6 At least if you put the same amount of people in B to E
7 and static people, you balance it. You try to balance
8 it. I thought we talked about it in principle. I
9 thought we talked about it.

10 After we adjust populations to be equal,
11 to the extent we allocate the growth areas among
12 districts, we ought to try to do that.

13 I certainly don't think we should consider
14 growth areas that will have this incredibly
15 disproportionate effect on population very quickly. And
16 it's unconstitutional. It's certainly something we
17 should not set out to do.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Huntwork.

19 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I have a question.
20 What is that 162,000 people?

21 MR. HUTCHISON: That was a label we put on
22 much earlier so we wouldn't forget. It's data.
23 Commissioner Minkoff asked a question to know how many
24 people were in the Maricopa County section of District C
25 area where it comes down. I think this was of

1 significant interest to the Commission in general.
2 There were 162,000 people in the yellow area of Maricopa
3 County.

4 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Then let me round out the
5 discussion. Mr. Huntwork wanted to ask, and I'll have
6 to jump in behind him and say most of the conversation
7 that just occurred, at least to me, has been very useful
8 in terms of trying to get a sense of where each of the
9 Commissioners finds, shall we say, spots of concern or
10 issue in the maps that have. Let me reinforce a couple.
11 Mr. Elder's point regarding the areas of Pinal County,
12 mining specific, and his discussion about reworking that
13 area, I think are very apropos. I'd support that. I
14 think his comments regarding Tucson are also apropos and
15 I agree with everything we heard from Southern Arizona
16 and all the input we received both in terms of
17 testimony, citizen information, and as well as
18 information from specific groups. I would concur with
19 those recommendation as well. I'd ask you look at them.

20 With respect to the Maricopa County
21 situation, I also agree that we have a situation where
22 District E, either along the lines of Mr. Huntwork's
23 suggestion and/or suggestions made by other
24 Commissioners, needs to be looked at in terms of a
25 couple that the first two at the southern end of

1 District E and the sort of interposing of District F,
2 where you have the split of Ahwatukee, I think that's
3 troublesome, even though Ahwatukee is not an
4 incorporated area. Certainly the area considers itself
5 a community. They have similar interests in terms of
6 things that go on in that area. That's an area that
7 ought to be looked at in addition to the general
8 configuration of E.

9 I think Mr. Huntwork's description of sort
10 of a well-fed or pregnant salamander makes sense. I
11 think there are other solutions in the central area
12 where when you look at those districts that need to be
13 drawn, you might take that into account.

14 I think the other issues I would have have
15 also been covered either by motion or by other
16 suggestions by Commissioners.

17 At this point, any other last-minute
18 additions to the list?

19 Mr. Elder?

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

21 Looking at this map way up here, a comment
22 earlier, I don't remember, Mr. Huntwork or Ms. Minkoff,
23 the Gila Tribe considered themselves more an urban
24 tribe, or linkage, if you look at that, with South
25 Mountain, a portion of E. It has to have very little

1 population. It would almost make sense to bring those
2 into Congressional District D, if we're looking at the
3 area north of Camelback and bringing that down, as
4 Ms. Minkoff made the comment. That might compensate for
5 population, although a hundred some thousand, if above
6 Camelback. I could see those, given it being more
7 compact, more contiguous, to help resolve some issues on
8 E.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It's certainly
11 worth considering. That area in E is actually south of
12 South Mountain.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Ahwatukee.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That's Ahwatukee.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: East.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Racial --

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: No. E doesn't have
18 the reservation. E is all Ahwatukee Foothills, Gold
19 Mountain Ranch, and is fairly well-populated and has
20 distinct population.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Didn't really get the
22 population. The heavy Hispanic population north of
23 Camelback, that would change that dynamic. How much it
24 would, that's something to consider when we get the
25 dynamic racial block voting, how that fits in with the

1 Hispanic population goals.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Just a request for the
4 consultants. The foot Mr. Lynn referenced, the foot on
5 District D.

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: District what?

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: D as in David. Is
8 that there because of the large Hispanic population?

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Avondale.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: City limits of Avondale?

11 DR. ADAMS: District D. A Hispanic AUR.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: My understanding, in
13 making that look cleaner, as has been requested by the
14 Commissioners, would that affect the majority-minority
15 aspect of this district?

16 DR. ADAMS: It would definitely have an
17 impact on it.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: My understanding with
19 respect to the gerrymandering, as it were, is for the
20 benefit of creation of a majority-minority district.

21 DR. ADAMS: To keep the minority AUR,
22 Hispanic AUR, intact.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Would any other
24 suggestions have been made with respect to the
25 metropolitan areas also inhibit or restrict, in your

1 opinion, some of the voting rights issues you've
2 attempted to address by reason of this map?

3 DR. ADAMS: Yes.

4 The other one, the Glendale Hispanic area
5 is part of the AUR.

6 Again, Commissioner Hall, I think what we
7 must do is be very careful at this point and wait until
8 we have further data, know how we can adjust these
9 things. We'll certainly assess the impact of these
10 possible changes.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any further comments at
13 this juncture? If not, I'd like to make a suggestion.
14 Before I make a suggestion, I'd make a suggestion to the
15 consultants. It might be an appropriate time to break,
16 notwithstanding the consultants also to need to eat.

17 Are there answers to some or any answers
18 to pose, if we gave you a period of time, let's say for
19 the sake of argument, two hours, or some period that
20 would still allow us time to meet into the evening, if
21 we took an extended dinner break, would you be able to
22 come back to us with some portion of what we asked you
23 to consider or ask you to look at or is that sufficient
24 for you to look at or would you need more time?

25 DR. ADAMS: Chairman Lynn, Members of the

1 Commission, rather than a need for more time, we're
2 talking about four maps. I'm presuming for each of the
3 maps, of course there are some common features, there
4 are some common concerns you want us to look up. I'd
5 recommend probably about four hours.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Clearly I don't think we
7 can break for four hours and come back this evening.

8 Ms. Minkoff.

9 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I wonder if we take
10 the break for an early dinner, do the Legislative
11 Districts, make suggestions, then they'd know what
12 changes to make, Legislative as well as Congressional,
13 find out how much time is necessary to do it, if
14 necessary, delay the start tomorrow to do the work and
15 come back to us.

16 DR. ADAMS: Chairman, Commissioner
17 Minkoff, I'd suggest it's best to concentrate on one
18 map, bring resolution, or try to bring it to resolution.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: Such a thing as too
20 much information?

21 DR. ADAMS: I think that's true.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Given what you've
23 said, what is your recommendation?

24 DR. ADAMS: Well, we could probably be
25 back at 8:00 o'clock with most of the answers. 8:30

1 would be better, if we come back. It would be wonderful
2 to have 9:30 to come back. Let's say we come back at
3 8:30 with most of the answers with what you want to
4 know.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Here's my question,
6 Mr. Chairman, and NDC, would it be possible to maybe
7 prioritize these issues into two or three categories,
8 have two hours, come back with phase one while you have
9 your minions working on categories phase two.

10 MR. RIVERA: Watch out with what you say.
11 I didn't do it.

12 DR. ADAMS: We don't have any minions in
13 this company.

14 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand. I'm
15 being facetious.

16 It's a simple discussion.

17 Early on, the rural issue, Hopi-Navajo, in
18 two hours reconvene on these four options we asked for
19 there. I'm sure we can chew on that for a while, given
20 history as a guide. By that time come back with some of
21 the other.

22 Whatever is the preference, Mr. Chairman.
23 The southern rural issues, the metropolitan proposal, if
24 you will, that Mr. Huntwork requested, the five
25 districts, it would be easy for you to come up

1 with, I'm just trying to find solutions here.

2 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Hall, if we said
3 the time to come back is 8:00 o'clock, two hours working
4 time, that would be a chance, at least, to get something
5 to eat. We probably can again come back with those
6 four, phase one, what you are talking about, phase one
7 information, probably some other information as well.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman, I'd
10 tend to like to see that happen.

11 One of my goals was to take a look to see
12 what the ramifications of that urban district, or
13 five-district concept did. If it doesn't do what I
14 think we as a Commission want it to do, I'd like to get
15 that decision done this evening, if possible, so we also
16 start town another track, if need be.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, I don't want to
18 rush you, but I want to make as much use of today as we
19 could. It is a quarter of 5:00 now. If we split the
20 difference and said 7:30.

21 DR. ADAMS: It's 5:00.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: 5:00 o'clock now.

23 MR. RIVERA: So 7:15.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Split the difference, said
25 7:30, look at the list just prioritized at 7:30, go

1 through as long as it takes tonight, reserve the balance
2 of the work we asked you to do for first thing in the
3 morning, then move into the Legislative presentation
4 after that.

5 DR. ADAMS: We can do that, see what we
6 can get through.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there an objection to
8 that schedule?

9 MR. RIVERA: One thing, we don't want them
10 rushed.

11 Ask Chris if he can do it at 7:30 or 8:00.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams, two hours work
13 time, Chris' work time. Dr. Adams' work time, we're
14 negotiating lunch or dinner.

15 MS. HAUSER: They need to move to another
16 location.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand. 7:45.

18 DR. ADAMS: We'll try to be back by 7:30.
19 We'll plan to be back by 7:30, Commissioner.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The thing that complicates
21 it, we indicated before we broke to do this work an
22 additional call to the public. We want to have that.
23 There's one slip.

24 Do others wish to speak at this time
25 before we break? Is there anyone else?

1 MS. REZZONICO: Is there anyone else that
2 wishes to speak before we close and recess?

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd suggest NDC might want
4 to start working and leave one person behind to carry a
5 message behind from the call to the public.

6 If we could take it in order, the first
7 person asked to speak was Representative Silvia Laughter
8 from District Three.

9 Is Representative Laughter here?

10 I'd just as soon ask them to go where they
11 need to go and then be happy to give you our full
12 attention.

13 I think we can get everyone's attention.

14 REPRESENTATIVE LAUGHTER: Thank you very
15 much.

16 Thank you, Commissioners, for allowing me
17 the opportunity to speak with you.

18 With regards to both the Congressional and
19 Legislative District discussed earlier, you suggested a
20 motion to include the Hopi Tribe with the Navajo Nation.
21 And I would highly recommend you reconsider that motion,
22 and for a number of reasons.

23 One, we know we have a federal statute
24 that will continue to remind us that we consider
25 communities of interest. And as I have read the Arizona

1 Republic, and it sounds like according to the article in
2 the paper that everyone is benefiting, and it is an
3 opinion I don't agree with. And perhaps minority
4 population in the state as a whole is getting
5 represented, but the Native American population is not
6 getting the representation they need according to the
7 proposed boundaries that have been set.

8 As you know, we have 23 tribes within the
9 State of Arizona. And of all of the 50 states, Arizona
10 has the largest number of Native American tribes. And
11 it would be very unfortunate if we don't have both
12 Congressional and Legislative representation.

13 And I understand the argument that the way
14 the Congressional grids have been proposed, we are going
15 to be underconsidered as a rural area. And I see that
16 the southern and the southwestern portion of the
17 Congressional proposal does not include a rural
18 district. You will note that Apache Junction, the
19 northern part of Mesa, Fountain Hills, within 10 years
20 is no longer, and even at this status right now, is not
21 even considered rural. Their issues are not rural
22 issues. They are urban issues. Within 10 years' times,
23 they will be so far from understanding what the rural
24 concerns will be, to me that argument doesn't stand.

25 And the article also says that Native

1 Americans will have a fighting chance at both
2 Congressional and Legislative issues. I'm wondering if
3 they are referring to a literal fighting chance; because
4 that's basically what will happen, and we won't have a
5 chance at all, whether we fight or not.

6 I think we need to remind the Commission
7 of the importance of considering the communities of
8 interest. We see minorities, the Hispanic population
9 has been very assertive, aggressive in their commitment
10 to get representation. I would strongly recommend that
11 you consider the Native American population as well as
12 rural areas.

13 What I'm recommending, I know 7,000 people
14 really doesn't do a whole lot. But with the pros and
15 cons, I know you understand the reasons behind why the
16 Hopis might not want to be included in being represented
17 with the Navajo population. Having talked with my
18 constituents in the last three years, I think there's
19 more of a benefit to including them than there is to
20 not.

21 I think it's critical we include them and
22 we try to exclude some of the urban areas on the
23 southern, southwestern portion, and so that we can
24 create more of a rural and possibly Native American
25 District.

1 I know that some of the --

2 You mention also the Gila River, Salt
3 River want to be included in the urban districts. I
4 recommend we include them as a rural -- in our district
5 as well. If that is -- if there's any consideration at
6 all, mainly because I think we do need to have some
7 representation Congressionally and Legislatively. I
8 don't see that is happening right now. Congressionally
9 representation has been more beneficial to us.

10 I recommend you strongly look at this grid
11 and consider the proposal that the Navajo Nation has
12 made.

13 Thank you very much.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Representative
15 Laughter, very much.

16 Jim Hartdegen representing the City of
17 Casa Grande and Chamber of Commerce.

18 MR. HARTDEGEN: Thank you.

19 It's a great day. I'll go home and won't
20 be confused and will know what you are up to.

21 Just a couple comments.

22 It's -- AURs. I learned not all AURs have
23 the same strengths, not all AURs have the same strengths
24 as others.

25 The Congressional map, grid you're talking

1 about now, if you're having a community of interest, to
2 me, common sense would say Gila Bend would be included
3 in the Pinal community area. At one time the largest
4 contiguous farm was in Gila Bend. That has a lot in
5 common with the Pinal County area. Large grants
6 probably don't know it. It's hard to pick and choose
7 from a map and a computer. It's very hard to pick and
8 choose on a computer.

9 Even though you need numbers, we have very
10 little in common with Tucson.

11 Believe it or not, Western Pinal County
12 associates more with Eastern Pinal County, not the last
13 couple months, but years.

14 I know you have a rough job. People in
15 California, they have to do with what they do with
16 numbers and stuff. I know you've made great choices,
17 have sent folks back to the table to look at things.

18 I think we do need to have some
19 representation in Congress.

20 We like you sending the folks back to the
21 table to look at alternatives. We appreciate that.

22 We'll see what happens tomorrow, and we
23 appreciate the effort and time.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen.

25 Are there other members of the public that

1 wish to be heard?

2 If not, the Commission will stand in
3 recess until 7:30 this evening.

4 Thank you.

5 (Recess taken from 5:09 p.m. until
6 approximately 7:30 p.m.)

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd call the Redistricting
8 Commission back in session.

9 I'd turn the floor over to NDC for their
10 presentation on the work product over the last couple of
11 hours.

12 DR. HESLOP: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
13 Commission, we have worked at the questions that you
14 gave us, and we have a report for you.

15 Just so you know who was responsible for
16 what, Chris Hutchison worked on the Northern Arizona
17 District development. Doug Johnson worked on the
18 East-West District development. Florence worked on the
19 Phoenix issues. And Marguerite Leoni worked on the
20 voting rights issues. Ian Rudge and Christiana
21 Dominguez worked to develop the power points, and I
22 ordered dinner.

23 We have a Power Point which I think will
24 answer your questions and also speed us as we move
25 through here.

1 By the way, I should say I'm delighted by
2 the result of the Northern Arizona District. This is a
3 wonderful solution for a very bad problem. It comes to
4 you with the unanimous and enthusiastic endorsement of
5 NDC staff. We are truly grateful for this instruction
6 that you gave us.

7 Some of the other items you suggested you
8 gave us aren't so quite as positive and give us a
9 significant number of items of concerns.

10 Chris, why don't I give the podium to you
11 and have you lead the Commission through the Northern
12 Arizona items and then the East-West.

13 MR. HUTCHISON: Okay.

14 We proceeded to draw Northern Arizona and
15 the East-West District along the lines that the
16 Commission had laid out for us early on. As you see
17 above, it includes the pulling the areas, all of Mohave
18 County, Coconino County, Apache County, Navajo, Graham,
19 and Greenlee Counties, includes northern -- with Yavapai
20 County taken in pretty much all of except to the
21 southern Census tracts, one Census of the tracts, not
22 wholly excluded, I forget the name of it. We can look
23 at it. We did that to reach equal population. It takes
24 all of the White Mountain Apache Tribal Reservation, and
25 the White Mountain Tribal Reservation is included in the

1 District.

2 Let me give the run-down of deviation.
3 It's 32 persons above. That was with just unification
4 of the city, didn't put in any other modifications, and
5 subtract, have total minority of 36.47 percent. The
6 vast majority, you can see. There's 30.63 percent.
7 Beyond that, you can see the data.

8 Consequences: You have items, I guess is
9 the best way to put it. One of the instructions we had,
10 one of the other instructions I didn't personally put
11 on, five districts in Maricopa County centered in
12 Phoenix, Maricopa County. Let me draw in Arizona,
13 rural, all rural, not all rural counties, leave out La
14 Paz County in the west, leave out non-Reservation
15 portions of Gila County, mining areas in northeastern
16 Pinal County, the district -- the red mining areas.

17 Rural areas on the east side of Maricopa
18 and west side of Maricopa are not connected, and there
19 is really no way to connect them, thus there's no way
20 they'll be united with a district centered in Maricopa
21 County. There's no way around that.

22 You have Pinal, Tucson, and Maricopa, with
23 no population around.

24 Possible alternatives. We looked at
25 several, mining areas in Eastern Pinal County.

1 Commissioner Elder addressed it pretty specifically,
2 mining maybe would belong together to the east, to the
3 rural district.

4 If you include those, you run into the
5 problem of where do you drop off population.

6 As I explained before, we split Yavapai
7 County south. You have to go farther into Yavapai,
8 10,000 people further.

9 Prescott, we split at least one city, not
10 specifically Prescott. It has to be something.

11 We take the remaining portions of Gila
12 County, non-Reservation portions, and run into the same
13 portions of Prescott, take the nonmining remaining --
14 the Prescott area there is fairly large. I believe it's
15 roughly 90,000 people, something like that, maybe a
16 little less, but not 90,000 people in mining areas, plus
17 the remaining portions of Gila County.

18 The other possible alternatives, La Paz
19 County, go ahead and include that into the northern
20 district, take out it somewhere else, either Yavapai or
21 a possibility of Graham, Greenlee, which aren't
22 reservation areas. You end up with what is called an
23 umbrella district. If you do that, you take that out
24 take of Yavapai. You have a McDonald sign, two arches
25 that come around Maricopa, extend around the far south

1 into the state, hollowed out in the middle. Doesn't go
2 straight out of the south. If you keep taking more out
3 of Yavapai, each of these involve decisions on how to
4 split the Prescott area and include -- keep the mining
5 area of Yavapai out of La Paz.

6 I also, at this point, in this Power
7 Point, my portion of the Power Point is done, so I'll
8 Bring open the map if you want to see the map, see how
9 it looks.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Please.

11 MR. HUTCHISON: As you see, the light blue
12 northern district as I just described it, zoom in on the
13 Yavapai area in terms of what I was talking about in
14 terms of the split.

15 I should explain the green. I didn't get
16 the plan completely finished in the time allotted. Sort
17 of where we were going with it, we were taking La Paz,
18 moving the East-West valley, taking the remaining
19 portions of Yavapai, the portion above the county line,
20 dropping it off right here, uniting Glendale, and could
21 still pick up 150,000 people for that district. That's
22 as far as we got. Area where the split mainly is is
23 right here. Let me put the label on the city, it's just
24 south of Dewey-Humboldt. That's what we united. The
25 Census tract split it.

1 Otherwise, along Mohave Valley, it goes
2 south to Prescott, Verde Valley, Flagstaff, and so on.
3 Gila County, it includes the two reservations.

4 The reason, just to address why we decided
5 to drop off the southern end of Yavapai, it's 13,000
6 people. Rather than dropping off Graham or Greenlee,
7 Graham and Greenlee are more rural.

8 There has been discussion by the
9 Commission about the Black Canyon area, I believe I can
10 zoom in on it, how Southern Yavapai is expanding out
11 from Phoenix, Black Canyon City. It's just a choice of
12 do we keep Graham and Greenlee together and whole, as it
13 does in a lot of polls we've seen, and also the
14 Commission, with regard to the Eastern Arizona Counties
15 for the legislative land. We decided it would be better
16 to drop off the southern part of Yavapai and Maricopa.

17 If the Commission has any questions or
18 concerns?

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: Tell me the population
21 of the rest of the -- in the portion of Pinal that
22 includes the mining communities. Can you tell me that?

23 MR. HUTCHISON: Asking how much it is? I
24 believe -- offhand, I don't know. Let me -- I can start
25 aggregating it.

1 I believe 75, 65 thousand people,
2 something like that.

3 The Pinal area, probably around 15,000.
4 The Pinal area, probably 15,000.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: Total of what, 80?

6 MR. HUTCHISON: What?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: Total of 80?

8 MR. HUTCHISON: Pinal, 15,000,

9 MR. JOHNSON: 51.

10 MR. HUTCHISON: I can get the exact
11 number.

12 MR. HUTCHISON: Only two tracts in the
13 county are included in this plan. And it would -- they
14 total out to about 60,000. In the county, 51: 45,000
15 plus 15. 65,000 between the mining areas and the
16 remaining portion.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: 60,000?

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Roughly.

19 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population
20 of Mohave?

21 MR. HUTCHISON: Mohave, 155,032.

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: Pardon?

23 MR. HUTCHISON: 155,000 people.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population
25 of the remaining portion of Southern Yavapai?

1 MR. HUTCHISON: 12,500.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Including Cave Creek,
3 New River, only 12?

4 MR. HUTCHISON: Two tracts, 12,000. We
5 took another 12,000 out of that when reuniting
6 Dewey-Humboldt.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is the population
8 of Lake Havasu?

9 MR. HUTCHISON: 41,138.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions?

11 So what we have is a rural district. And
12 it -- in order to create this rural district, it does
13 not separate the Hopi and the Navajo.

14 MR. HUTCHISON: Actually, I can address
15 that, if the Commission would wish.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Go ahead.

17 MR. HUTCHISON: It's NDC's position that
18 this map represents what the district can look like
19 regardless of the Hopi decision. You can take the Hopi
20 out of there. It just involves what the Commission is
21 willing to take out from that distance. We can make it
22 contiguous this way. We can find a contiguous way to
23 take the Hopi out regardless of how far you need to take
24 them out, run a neck, a line around the river, along the
25 highway. It's a decision the Commission has to make.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With minimal, with
2 relatively minimal impact on population other than the
3 area that would be removed?

4 MR. HUTCHISON: Exactly. There are
5 around -- very few people by the Hopi attachment
6 affected. 7,000 people. Population would be minimal.

7 DR. ADAMS: Excuse me, Commissioner Lynn.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Put it on the board.

9 DR. ADAMS: Oh, it's on. I just want to
10 make one comment, Chairman Lynn, Members of the
11 Commission. This scenario would divide the Hopi from
12 the Walapai and Havasupai, so you are aware of that.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you take the
15 Hopi out of that area with some kind of narrow
16 connector.

17 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Can't hear you.

18 MS. HAUSER: You have to use the mike.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: If you take the
20 Hopi out of that area, taking seven or eight thousand
21 people out of that area, you then have to replace them
22 from someplace else.

23 MR. HUTCHISON: Exactly.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Any suggestions?
25 Would it be the southern part of the county?

1 MR. HUTCHISON: Southern Yavapai. They're
2 already split for equal population purposes.

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Kind of equate that
4 for population purposes?

5 MR. HUTCHISON: It equates to one tract,
6 the southern part of Yavapai is 13,000 people. I highly
7 doubt we'd equal them perfectly. Two parts to unify
8 Yavapai, take out the Hopi and be exactly the same.
9 6,000 extra people.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other questions?

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my question is
12 if we include Payson, Globe, Superior, Kearney, all of
13 that, all those rural areas there, and exclude some
14 portions of Mohave, do we have the numbers?

15 MR. HUTCHISON: Do I have the numbers?
16 What is the number I said a second ago, 54,000?

17 MR. JOHNSON: 51.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Saying roughly 55 -- the
19 Gila portion was just 46,000, about.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm saying include all
21 of that.

22 MR. HUTCHISON: If we include all of that,
23 take out --

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: Everything from
25 Superior to --

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Apache Junction and
2 Gold Canyon in that as well? That's -- that's a large
3 portion, probably that, 50 some population.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: In there you are
5 saying?

6 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Gold Canyon
7 certainly is.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Not including Gold
9 Canyon, Apache Junction, are you?

10 MR. HUTCHISON: No. I specifically
11 excluded them.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Trade this portion
13 here, those rural areas for a portion of Mohave, do the
14 numbers crunch?

15 MR. HUTCHISON: I don't think you could
16 even get through Lake Havasu. If you stayed interior,
17 you'd probably get into Kingman. If you wanted to go up
18 the river, you wouldn't get up to Lake Havasu. It has
19 46,000 or 47,000. We just looked it up before.

20 COMMISSIONER ELDER: 47 plus 15 or 16
21 thousand.

22 MR. HUTCHISON: I'll put a label on the
23 tract with population.

24 MS. HAUSER: Right.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: This tract has 8,152, not

1 all the way out to the tract line. I can see the
2 totals. Can you read those?

3 I'll make them bigger.

4 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Can that total for
5 you?

6 MR. HUTCHISON: I can total it.

7 That will work.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: What is Desert Hills?

9 MR. HUTCHISON: At that point, just with
10 those tracts, 42,307.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I guess my question
12 is, Chris, go north or east, whatever is most
13 appropriate. What does it look like if we trade? I
14 want to know approximately what it will look like.

15 MR. HUTCHISON: If we wanted to take
16 Mohave County, take it out of the mining communities,
17 take it out of Mohave, it is 155,000.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: Where is the line in
19 Mohave if you do that, approximately?

20 MR. HUTCHISON: I can go ahead and draw it
21 for you, if you want to see.

22 This may take a minute or two.

23 MR. HUTCHISON: This won't be exact.

24 We're taking it at the tract level.

25 Those tracts there, mining tracts there --

1 those are mining tracts.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: Is Florence in the
3 room?

4 MR. HUTCHISON: Florence is out.

5 Highway 79 out, most of the population,
6 13,664 west of it, that's why I hesitate to take out
7 population, say 63,000 people, 63,745. The district is
8 overpopulated 63,777. That's essentially what you can
9 take out of Mohave.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Which would send us
11 how far north?

12 MR. HUTCHISON: That's what I'm about to
13 see. I wouldn't really know offhand. This is also
14 assuming no reunification of Yavapai.

15 MR. HUTCHISON: This district is 3,200
16 short at the tract level. That's as close as you can
17 get it.

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: You can pull that CD
19 and Kingman into a rural district.

20 MR. HUTCHISON: Uh-huh. It just drops out
21 Lake Havasu, Mohave, and the Colorado Indian
22 Reservation.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: That segment, the
24 green district, rippled the metropolitan district east
25 replacing a portion of Gila and Pinal previously in the

1 Congressional District, right?

2 MR. HUTCHISON: I guess I'm not following.

3 You would ripple -- lose population from
4 Gila and from Pinal. Those districts wouldn't have to
5 be --

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Eastern districts.

7 MR. HUTCHISON: More urban.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Western districts are
9 too much. Western districts followed --

10 MR. HUTCHISON: Are not filled in yet.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: In theory, correct?

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Does everybody understand
13 the last statement? I want to be clear everybody
14 understands where we're going.

15 I understand what Mr. Hall just said.
16 Take the area along the western border now shown in
17 white, the area removed from the original district as
18 we added the population on the eastern end, and if you
19 started adding that to what is depicted up there as the
20 green District A, correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Hall, if
21 you add that to A district, that district becomes
22 overpopulated by the amount of white --

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: 60,000.

24 MR. HUTCHISON: It's still underpopulated.
25 As it stands, it's still underpopulated. District A is

1 still underpopulated. The remainder of draft District
2 A, if you recall, included all of Mohave County,
3 originally, and Yavapai County, the Hopi population, and
4 Williams. Most of that dropped off. After you unite
5 Glendale, it was 150 short. Now it's 90,000 short.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The rest of the state is
7 not yet balanced from having created the Northern
8 District.

9 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes, exactly. The map is
10 not complete.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'm interested in my
12 fellow Commissioners' reaction to that particular
13 adjustment.

14 I guess if I can, and Dr. Heslop can
15 correct me if I miscue you here, but regardless, some
16 communities of interest, or AURs, will be divided. The
17 question is east, west, or south. So divide Prescott,
18 divide the urban community, or divide mining
19 communities, correct? There are about only three
20 options, if I'm accurately summarizing the choices.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Is Bullhead City in
23 the white area or the rural district?

24 MR. HUTCHISON: Rural district.

25 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Rural district.

1 If we pulled Lake Havasu out, put it with
2 Parker, La Paz County, et cetera, if we add Bullhead
3 City in that mix, it might be a more workable district
4 for them. We still have the rest of Yavapai County in
5 the white area there. It's possible, I don't know how
6 much population is there, if we're going to split Mohave
7 County, I'm not sure if the best place to split it is
8 between Lake Havasu City and Bullhead City. I'm
9 wondering if Bullhead City was pulled out of that and
10 the more eastern white unallocated area was pulled in
11 and put in the white allocation.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: The portion of
13 Eastern Yavapai, 15,000.

14 DR. ADAMS: Could you excuse us just a
15 moment, Mr. Hall.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I have a question
17 that doesn't relate to that comment.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

19 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: In adjusting the
20 details for this district, I would like to see how it
21 relates to everything else. To me, that's where the
22 question is. As Mr. Hall correctly pointed out, if we
23 create this district, we do split some communities and
24 counties from the other criteria that are important to
25 us. And how does that affect the rest of the state so

1 we can minimize those effects throughout the state as a
2 whole?

3 COMMISSIONER HALL: Well, if I -- I think
4 that is going to become clear as we see the analysis of
5 your proposal with respect to the five. And clearly,
6 assuming there are two southern districts that are
7 approximately close, I don't know -- utilizing that
8 assumption, and assuming we do something in the north,
9 the five are simply going to change. And that was
10 speaking to my previous point. No matter what you do,
11 Parker is with the valley, it doesn't matter how you
12 slice it, because the horseshoe is there. We can
13 readily see. The adjustment within Metropolitan
14 Phoenix, depending on what you throw from west and east,
15 throw Pinal and Gila east, throw more from the west,
16 trickle more from the east.

17 I could be wrong, you folks correct me,
18 that's just a general point.

19 I guess with respect to if it's the will
20 of the Commission that we have, I understand that's
21 certainly our wish, to have a Northern Rural District
22 irrespective of the Navajo-Hopi issue, that essentially
23 that is how that is how it's going to look. We'll have
24 to tweak borders, tweak lines, make internal districts
25 longer, shorter, wider. Essentially that's the basis.

1 Parker, no matter what, given this
2 scenario, will have to go to the valley, unless a
3 decision is made that the southwestern district, with
4 our Hispanic AUR, we amend that and then bring that up.
5 That would affect the majority-minority Congressional
6 District, which we feel like is certainly important.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

8 DR. ADAMS: Commissioner Lynn, Members of
9 the Commission, the only thing I want to comment upon is
10 in what we presented to you, no counties were split
11 except a tiny portion, two tiny portions of Yavapai.
12 Now there are three county splits in this scenario.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: In your scenario, two?

14 DR. ADAMS: Only one.

15 MR. HUTCHISON: Gila, Yavapai portions
16 were taken. Only Indian reservations.

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: Nevertheless, three
18 were split previously.

19 DR. ADAMS: We typically don't consider,
20 if unifying Indian Reservation that crossed a county
21 boundary, we don't consider that a major county split.
22 It's a technical split.

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: Three before, three
24 now, correct?

25 DR. ADAMS: Technically.

1 COMMISSIONER HALL: Technically or not,
2 I'm okay.

3 With respect to Ms. Minkoff's question on
4 Southern Yavapai, is it correct the population is only
5 15,000?

6 MR. HUTCHISON: 12,500 at this point.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: New River, Cave Creek?

8

9 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Black Canyon City,
11 Maricopa.

12 What is the white area of Maricopa, all
13 urban?

14 MR. HUTCHISON: No. The white area to the
15 east, if I zoom in on that, I'll explain as well. Those
16 areas were previously in District C that we dropped off
17 to have an entirely rural district. They are currently
18 unassigned. They will go in with -- as it stands now,
19 they'll go in with the eastern side of Phoenix.

20 COMMISSIONER HALL: How much population do
21 we pick up with that north Fort McDowell Reservation?

22 MR. HUTCHISON: Fort McDowell and Salt
23 River?

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: Both.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: To get there, the

1 difference, how to do it, full Census tracts, 4,120.
2 Get through the Census tract there and then pick up
3 Indian Reservations that are contiguous to that.

4 COMMISSIONER HALL: Total of that is?

5 MR. HUTCHISON: 824 persons in the Fort
6 McDowell Reservation. Salt River, there are 6,400. So
7 together, 7,200, roughly 11,500 max.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: 11,500?

9 MR. HUTCHISON: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: What, up to now,
11 Chris, if we included reservations, given the current
12 configuration, amendments we played with, what is the
13 total tally?

14 MR. HUTCHISON: If we included those, also
15 including Southern Yavapai?

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: Excluding Southern
17 Yavapai.

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Excluding, 11,500.
19 Include those, you can drop off 11,500 more people in
20 Mohave. That's really --

21 Want to know percentages?

22 COMMISSIONER HALL: I want to know the
23 total tally now, with two additional reservations
24 included, excluding Lake Havasu, and including the Gila
25 portions. What is the total tally? I lost track.

1 MR. HUTCHISON: Oh, sure.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: It's like three
3 children got off the bus and four got on.

4 MR. HUTCHISON: 649,337. 3,000 below.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: 8,000 over; is that
6 correct?

7 MR. HUTCHISON: 8,000 over.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Okay. So what is the
9 population of Bullhead City?

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I've eagerly
11 awaited to know the principle and incident so I can see
12 what happens, what the other five may create. There are
13 some important interconnections with this. So I think
14 we should -- I suggest we should move to that and then
15 come back to this point; because I'm not really getting
16 any criteria for making a decision.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The other point,
18 Mr. Huntwork, the purpose of the demonstration this
19 evening and reporting back was to show us what the
20 Northern Arizona District would look like. Having not
21 balanced the remainder of the state, it's not up to us
22 to do it this evening. This is sort of on the road we
23 embarked upon.

24 I think from the standpoint we see what
25 the Northern Arizona District would look like, the

1 Northern District without ties to Maricopa County, we
2 get that. That's clear.

3 Without objection, I'd like to move to
4 Mr. Huntwork's suggestion, take a look, rather than
5 complete this, it's not for us to complete tonight. We
6 have a pattern, if we chose to suggest to the
7 consultants this is something we'd like to see flushed
8 out, that could happen, go through with it tonight, I
9 don't think it's inappropriate.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Chairman, I do
11 object. I'm almost done. Mr. Huntwork will get it when
12 I prove to him what we do is completely relevant to what
13 occurs to the two major relevant areas.

14 Is it a major issue?

15 MR. HUTCHISON: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: At this point, given
17 these proposed adjustments, we're left with some
18 decisions. Just making assumptions, as I understand it
19 then, we're 8,000 over.

20 You approximately have dealt with the Hopi
21 situation, or, if there's a determination to leave them
22 together, we simply tweak the borders. I would suggest
23 that this, in principle, or I make a motion in principle
24 that this would be what the Northern Arizona, completely
25 rural district, would look like as we then iron out the

1 details with respect to numbers.

2 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I understand you put that
3 in the form of a motion. I ask you hold the motion.
4 There are several interdependent things. The rest of
5 the state is not balanced. I feel it is not appropriate
6 yet to vote on it.

7 Notwithstanding your conviction it will
8 not have any impact, I'd like to see it. I'd Like to
9 look at it. Everything is interdependent. I'd not want
10 to vote on it, because I've not had a chance to take a
11 look at it. If it seems to me they seem to fit
12 together, then we should determine it. I'd like to look
13 at it in totality.

14 Again, if you'd like to make the motion,
15 I'll certainly try to get a second and work it.

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: The motion has been
17 made.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

19 Then we'll revisit that later this
20 evening.

21 (Motion dies for lack of a second.)

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Might we then move to
23 Mr. Huntwork's --

24 Is that where go next, gentlemen? I don't
25 want to foul up your order.

1 The five greater districts next?

2 DR. HESLOP: Yes.

3 MR. HUTCHISON: Mr. Chairman,
4 Commissioners, I'm speaking about the Maricopa, the
5 Maricopa Districts.

6 DR. ADAMS: We did work on east-west,
7 north-south, a number of the issues. We were in the
8 midst of working on this at 20 minutes after 7:00. We
9 had just begun really getting into that. It was a more
10 difficult issue to deal with, making adjustments. We do
11 have some issues within Maricopa County.

12 Chris can work on some things we'll advise
13 you of, and then we'll examine them in more detail.

14 MR. HUTCHISON: I'm putting up place
15 labels.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: With the caveat I'm not
17 sure without place labels, unless we see it.

18 DR. ADAMS: Possibly true. We were just
19 getting into it.

20 Chris, describe what we had done in that
21 shift, how much we had done --

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Dr. Adams, how long
23 would it have taken you to prepare those maps?

24 DR. ADAMS: Probably another 45 minutes or
25 so, maybe to an hour.

1 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Let's embark, see
2 if it's --

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris, proceed.

4 MR. HUTCHISON: Thank you.

5 We talked earlier about how Maricopa
6 County had somewhere close to 3.07 million persons
7 within it, according to the 2000 Census, .02 million
8 short of a fifth Congressional District. Where you get
9 the population for the fifth Congressional District is
10 where we'd like to possibly get instruction from the
11 Commission on.

12 If you look around Maricopa County,
13 there's not a lot of populated areas, except for Pinal
14 County. There's Pinal County, and we're trying to stay
15 out of rural areas, areas immediately surrounding it,
16 Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, a little further away,
17 Casa Grande. Those areas do total up to 125,000
18 persons. Apache Junction, I'm Gold Canyon, I'm not
19 trying to dispronounce it, together in one district,
20 there would be trade-offs, splits, most likely in one of
21 those cities, because there are areas in between that do
22 have populations as well.

23 The other option would be to move west.
24 La Paz has 20,000 persons. The remaining portion -- we
25 already included all of Maricopa. La Paz only has

1 20,000 persons. There isn't a lot for you to grab. You
2 could go up to Yavapai. Yavapai has 168,000 persons.
3 You may come close to Verde Valley. I don't know yet.
4 That would be something we could look into.

5 Moving east, Gila County has 51,000
6 persons. That's pretty the much surrounding area you
7 could look to for the extra 125,000 persons.

8 The other issue, once you get the 125,000
9 persons, what happens to the rural areas to the east and
10 west, actually I addressed that in the other, when
11 addressing the Northern Arizona Rural District. Those
12 areas left, islands attached to the Northern District,
13 or Southern District, aren't currently attached to it
14 now, speaking specifically La Paz County areas, Gila
15 County, possibly Graham, Greenlee, if there is a
16 Northern District.

17 Any questions?

18 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Chris, could you show
19 the boundary areas you are referring to in Gila?

20 MR. HUTCHISON: Gila County, if I zoom
21 over, Gila, 51,000 persons, which includes Native
22 American persons. If I exclude those 85,000 persons,
23 leaving it 85,000 persons short of a fifth Congressional
24 District.

25 I'll also go through all, for the Maricopa

1 County point of view, the relatively unpopulated areas
2 on the eastern edge of Maricopa County.

3 COMMISSIONER ELDER: What is the
4 population in that Maricopa, Black Canyon area south
5 combined?

6 MR. HUTCHISON: This area?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: 15,000.

8 MR. HUTCHISON: 8,000, 4,000, I forget
9 which.

10 I believe it's roughly 6,000, 7,000, all
11 together, up in the Yavapai white area. Down south in
12 the area, white within Pinal County, roughly 50,000,
13 maybe a little more.

14 I can tell you exactly.

15 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Then, Chris, on the
16 other side of the Metropolitan area, Buckeye, Goodyear,
17 Sun City, how many people in that --

18 MR. HUTCHISON: Those are already included
19 in the Maricopa County total, so they don't really add
20 anything to your numbers.

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Chris, you have Rio
23 Verde hung out by itself. You have Rio Verde hung out.
24 It's not a large area, but it has to be something.

25 MR. HUTCHISON: Where?

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The Rio Verde Hills
2 out by the reservation.

3 MR. HUTCHISON: Again, it's within
4 Maricopa County and doesn't affect -- it's the
5 unassigned here, but it doesn't affect what we're
6 talking about. The area of Pinal is 41,460 persons.
7 This area here is now highlighted. Combined with the
8 7,000 here, it's roughly 50,000.

9 Those areas combined with the entire Gila
10 counties, non-Indian reservations, still less than a
11 hundred thousand people, looking for 30.

12 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

14 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I just guess I'm
15 coming to the realization there isn't a good way of
16 getting five districts in the Maricopa County area, that
17 it looks like with four, and then a transitional, four
18 may be the best for both the rural and the urban issue
19 that we have as well as the communities of interest. It
20 seems like we're really going against a lot of things we
21 were trying to do by trying to get five districts within
22 that Metropolitan area.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chris?

24 MR. HUTCHISON: Mr. Chairman,
25 Commissioners, it was just pointed out to me it's

1 important to remember a fifth Congressional District,
2 regardless of where you put it, would still be dominated
3 exclusively by Maricopa County. We're talking 85
4 percent of the Congressional District, depending on
5 where you draw it, one coming out from the west, still
6 from the east, would still dominate the district when
7 drawing the lines.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Wouldn't that be
9 commensurate with what we discussed earlier, take the
10 population of the county, it's enough for approximately
11 4.75 districts, which would be four inclusive, if that
12 were your choice, one and three-quarters dominated by.

13 MR. HUTCHISON: Sure.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The problem, this
16 is a very difficult problem. There is no good way to do
17 it that solves everything. We've not nearly seen enough
18 here to begin to come to the conclusion that this isn't
19 the best solution.

20 I think that that in itself convinces me
21 that we need to see some maps. I don't think we should
22 talk about this without maps. Because we can't possibly
23 begin to make that statement.

24 What we saw first thing this morning were
25 five districts dominated by Maricopa County, but the

1 domination wasn't even close. One went all the way over
2 to the Colorado River, all the way over to the west
3 corner of the state. That was a fifth district already
4 dominated by Maricopa County.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We should be careful not
6 to confuse geography with population in view of
7 dominance. There is a significant amount of land where
8 fewer and fewer people live as you move out of the core,
9 but I understand your point.

10 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: It wasn't compact,
11 and the further away you live, the less people believe
12 they have the Town of Maricopa County. We're not going
13 to end up having Maricopa County dominating at least
14 five districts. There is, however, potentially a
15 solution with Maricopa County dominating at least six
16 districts. What we saw on the board first thing this
17 morning ran the risk of that. Maricopa County, I should
18 have is said the Phoenix Metropolitan area. That's what
19 I really meant to say, had five already, and we have,
20 you know, an exploding area on the very east which is
21 not entirely Maricopa County which part is quickly
22 growing, connected by the freeway to Maricopa County,
23 will quickly grow. So that had six areas that would be
24 dominated by the Phoenix Metropolitan area, if I don't
25 miss my guess.

1 I think this is the way, and I'm moving to
2 come to the conclusion we're not onto something here. I
3 think we need to see some lines before we really get
4 into it.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

6 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I would like to see
7 the maps, also. That's the reason I voted for and
8 supported the review of the five districts wholly
9 centered with the Metropolitan area of Phoenix.
10 Mathematically, those, as connected to Jim's last
11 comment, you could indeed have the option, alternative,
12 with four solid districts and that 4.7, and dividing
13 that .7 into the surrounding four districts and come out
14 with four four as opposed to five three or six two.
15 Mathematically it can be done.

16 I guess what I'd like to do is see the
17 maps, move onto our north-south options to see what we
18 have there, and see if we can get those maps together
19 where we can make a decision.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Without objection, take
21 those comments. Without objection let's have the
22 consultants complete the mapping process four five
23 districts and look at that in the morning.

24 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, that was our
25 intention.

1 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I want make sure it
2 was understood, in agreement with Commissioner Huntwork,
3 what we're trying to do by this: Make sure Maricopa
4 County, Arizona, the 500-pound gorilla, does not
5 dominate all Congressional Districts in the state. It
6 could be drawn that way, having all eight districts
7 dominated by Maricopa County. We, the Maricopa County
8 residents, are trying to make sure that does not happen.
9 We want to make sure Maricopa County's dominance does
10 not extend to state-wide dominance. I believe there is
11 a large growth rate in Maricopa County. Look at the
12 numbers beginning with. Even Maricopa County does not
13 yet dominate six eight districts. In six years it soon
14 will. And the population does not yet exist to justify
15 that.

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No one will be more
17 grateful than those of us that don't live there.

18 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Grateful you don't
19 live in Maricopa County?

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Grateful you are taking an
21 interest in the decision.

22 Mr. Hall?

23 COMMISSIONER HALL: At the risk of being
24 redundant, for me it's very simple. I'd welcome some
25 comment. If logic fails me, the alignment, with respect

1 to the numbers in the Phoenix Metropolitan area, there
2 is a remainder. Therefore, the remainder must be
3 gathered from either one of four directions, or we could
4 have a combination of any of the four directions. For
5 the sake of simplicity in discussion, we must gather the
6 remainder from the north, west, south or east.
7 Therefore, in order to identify the remainder, we must
8 make considerations of what is most important. The most
9 important items we have determined as this Commission
10 are communities of interest. Communities of interest
11 constitute Hispanics, Native Americans, and rural versus
12 urban. Therefore, I reiterate if this Commission is in
13 agreement, the Southwest District essentially is fair as
14 it stands as a draft, and I capitalize Draft Map. Then
15 we lock, we have that to move forward, to move forward
16 for public comment. Then if the Commission is of the
17 opinion the Southeast District is essentially okay as it
18 stands as a draft map, we make a decision regarding the
19 rural Northern Arizona District. We just played several
20 games to determine leaving the remainder of Gila County
21 or the leave the remainder in Mohave County, increase
22 the remainder in Mohave County. Those seem to be three
23 logical choices, combining as many Native American
24 voices as possible remaining with as much rural texture
25 as possible, not now or for the future.

1 Once there are those decisions now, we
2 have a remainder. Once there's a remainder, then it's
3 subject to discussion. The remainder, wherever it is,
4 or whatever it is, it becomes a component. The lines go
5 diagonal, horizontal, or vertical.

6 Back to my point, I think given the
7 principles already established, no matter how you slice
8 it, Parker will be in some Congressional District with
9 Metropolitan Phoenix because it's almost impossible to
10 get to that point, no matter how you slice it. So,
11 therefore, I reiterate the fact that we all would like
12 to look at the Metropolitan maps but it, in my humble
13 opinion, is not going to affect what we do with respect
14 to the three outside districts. Those decisions need to
15 be made first. In the nature of geography of the state,
16 we have to draw outside in.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman, the
19 distinction here is what you are saying, Commissioner
20 Hall, is certainly correct. And it almost goes without
21 saying that the issue I'm -- I want to look at is how
22 then do we create the connections with Maricopa County.
23 Which of these other areas fits best with Maricopa
24 County. We, Maricopa County, counts as well. So you
25 have shown that that Northern District and put it

1 relatively evenly across the north half of the state, or
2 it can be tilted to the left, or it can be tilted to the
3 right. Now that we have, what we have to do now is look
4 at how Maricopa County fits into this and with the
5 remaining issues, which ones fit best with Maricopa
6 County, which are more compact, refine the interests,
7 and so on. How can we do it, divide counties as little
8 as possible, and so forth. Those are questions we need
9 to ask. We need to start with maps in order to do it.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on this
11 issue before we move on to some of the vertical versus
12 horizontal split issues?

13 I think -- I mean if I can convey the
14 sense of the Commission without a vote being taken, I'd
15 like to see the maps on the Maricopa County Districts.
16 If time permits between now and tomorrow, again, in
17 terms of some of you can sleep, others can work, a shift
18 kind of thing, or however you might want to configure
19 it, it's also nice to know, the essence of what Mr. Hall
20 is saying, with Mr. Hall's concurrence, we may be
21 interested in the total configuration, very interested
22 to know how all the pieces fit together before we decide
23 on any one of the pieces. Because we had this morning
24 maps, complete maps, not necessarily perfect, complete
25 in terms using all areas of the state to look at each of

1 the districts and determine what was the composite
2 configuration in each of the districts.

3 I think we need it, speaking for myself, I
4 need that to be able to tell you that we like that
5 direction in its totality more than we like other
6 directions. So we'd like to see that tomorrow morning.

7 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
8 Commission, may I request that the meeting start just
9 slightly later tomorrow? We have been working many,
10 many hours, rather intensely. I want to make certain my
11 staff does indeed get some sleep tonight.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: My only concern, we
13 noticed the meeting for 8:30 tomorrow morning. Perhaps
14 a member of your staff can get the early bed shift, have
15 one person be with us for public comment, other issues
16 we might take at the beginning of the meeting, the
17 schedule of the presentation, then we'll have the next
18 presentation from NDC as close to 9:00 o'clock as we can
19 make it.

20 DR. ADAMS: That would be helpful. We'll
21 have staff members here by 8:30.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

23 Are you prepared to talk about the
24 horizontal-vertical split?

25 I've just been informed as well, the

1 Commission and consultants should be aware, the Gila
2 Indian River Communities are coming in tomorrow morning
3 to make public comment and will be making a bit of an
4 extended comment that will dovetail nicely with the need
5 to delay NDC's presentation.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
7 Commission, we don't have as highly developed a map for
8 this one as we did the last one.

9 You are now familiar a lot with the
10 population numbers. I did show you the effects of this
11 northwest dividing line between the East-West District
12 will affect what you are discussing today. And I'll
13 bring up a pen here.

14 What we're talking about as we -- with
15 what Chris was describing, if the Hopi come in or go out
16 of this district, it's without a major impact to the
17 look, feel, the same issue Chris was describing.

18 The base map is the one prepared from this
19 morning. We were focusing on changes that we need to
20 create a district.

21 This area, we need to move to the east.
22 And we also want to take this portion out. It's a
23 letter priority because this would be the primary rural
24 district, as we discussed this morning.

25 The impact of these changes, as you

1 probably caught on through discussion of the ripple
2 effects of such moves, the district effect in the west,
3 the need to move south, as you know, that runs into
4 problems. The likelihood is this district will become
5 more more urban as we make this district a purely urban
6 district, as the goal has been expressed. So similar
7 features come into play, although this one keeps, as
8 Chris was describing, this keeps somewhat of a flavor of
9 a north-south orientation, the heavy orientation is
10 here.

11 This district will need to come south in
12 order to get it out without going all the way into the
13 configuration just described. The effect is this
14 district down in the corner will be disrupted. Instead
15 of the population shifts Chris described here, we have
16 population shifts here. To make up for shifts in this
17 side here, this side -- this region, the not heavily
18 Hispanic portion relative to other portions. It's also
19 not very densely populated. You could move it this way.
20 You do end up with two districts passing on the side.
21 It's part of the reason we focused on the district Chris
22 focused on.

23 This could be done. You'd end up with a
24 purely rural eastern district, a kind of, almost a
25 district freeway, you might say, riding just east of the

1 freeway, you might say, to keep population equality
2 around.

3 This one we obviously didn't spend as much
4 time on, go into as many details on. I think you are
5 familiar with as many of the details or the nature of
6 it.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any questions?

8 Ms. Leoni.

9 MS. LEONI: I want to point out the
10 necessity of moving La Paz into the Southern Hispanic
11 AUR affects one of the most sensitive areas of the
12 state. The La Paz County portion of it is about 20,000
13 people, and it's only about 22 percent Hispanic, and I
14 think not much more than that total minority. The
15 southern state AUR is borderline, right now at about 50
16 percent Hispanic, and somewhat higher than that
17 minority, and will be easily diluted by this sort of
18 arrangement.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Comments or questions?

20 Mr. Huntwork.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Conceptually it
22 seems to merge with the plan we talked about before in
23 red, an extreme clockwise shift of the Northern District
24 which becomes an Eastern District in part, as was that
25 plan, the result left over becomes a Northern District.

1 I think this illustrates if you took the Northern
2 District to the extreme, have it become an Eastern
3 District, and push it all the way down to the southeast
4 of the state, obviously what that does. Anything that
5 creates a purely rural district phases the rest of
6 the -- goes more and more into urban domination.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I have a question
9 on this district, whether you have any decision about
10 the Hopi Reservation. Is it in the Eastern District or
11 Western District as it currently is?

12 MR. JOHNSON: Similar to Chris'
13 presentation, it could go either way without significant
14 impact. The finger would be shorter than the case Chris
15 was describing. We do think the other had advantages.

16 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Mr. Johnson, I might
17 not understand your hieroglyphics. Does this area get
18 attached to the urban core? Is this area attached to
19 the urban core, and north-south?

20 MR. RIVERA: For the record, would you
21 identify the areas you've talked about, give a
22 designation or something?

23 MR. JOHNSON: Eastern Maricopa as included
24 in District C would now be merged with the urban
25 districts in Maricopa County, and district C's border

1 would move to the east and be left out of Maricopa
2 County. The west side, the option there is to keep
3 somewhat of a rural flavor.

4 This would never achieve a purely rural
5 flavor. The western Maricopa County portion joins up
6 with the urban portion to the west and joins up with La
7 Paz.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further comments?

9 Ms. Minkoff.

10 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I understand the
11 point you make about the eastern portion staying with
12 the Maricopa County Metropolitan area. That western
13 portion you outlined is a pretty urban area and includes
14 parts of Peoria, the Sun Cities, Litchfield Park, a lot
15 of western communities.

16 Are you saying that is now moving to a
17 rural district? It can't. Wherever it moves, it is no
18 longer a rural district.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Right. The directions we're
20 trying to implement here, the difficulties we moved into
21 are not as developed as the previous one, trying to get
22 one pure rural district, one somewhat rural district.
23 It doesn't work very well, as you illustrate.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: It seems to me, if
25 changing the western district, dropping down into Yuma

1 County, you've now taken the Southern District, I think
2 originally District G, taken population away from it
3 that you have to pick up someplace else.

4 MR. JOHNSON: The Maricopa County area.

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Why, what are you
6 trying to achieve by doing this?

7 MR. JOHNSON: The Commission had given us
8 the instruction to try to look at two configurations to
9 see which ones would work. We wanted to fully report
10 back to you that we had looked at both approaches, and
11 the results are fairly clear.

12 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: This is what you
13 call the north-south dividing lines.

14 MR. JOHNSON: North-south dividing lines
15 of the East-West Districts.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: The point you are
17 making is the other one --

18 MR. JOHNSON: We think the other one has
19 fewer problems.

20 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Okay. Point made.

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

22 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I guess I have to
23 agree. There are just a tremendous number of things
24 from either AURs, from counties to other things on this
25 plan, that just go against most of the things we've

1 given direction we agreed upon, to course of development
2 of draft plans. In the Yuma area, there having been
3 dilution issues that come into there. Cochise in the
4 southeast corner, and moving further on up, and that
5 doesn't seem to make sense. Bringing the Eastern
6 Counties into Cochise and breaking Cochise doesn't seem
7 to make sense.

8 I would have to say right now, and without
9 looking, unless we're going to get a map there, I don't
10 think there's a lot more reason to go forward with the
11 exercise of the vertical east-west, whatever we want to
12 call those districts.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I want to make a
15 point, again, I'm not sure I said it right the first
16 time. Phoenix, G and H, for the sake of argument, we're
17 not going to change G and H. Then all we're doing, say
18 one purely rural district, then all you are doing is
19 moving it around from the east side to north to the
20 west, and whatever is left over gets put into Phoenix.
21 To do this you don't have to go into G and don't have to
22 go into H unless you decide to do it. Automatically say
23 don't touch G and H. Automatically say whatever is not
24 a purely rural district gets united with Phoenix and,
25 therefore, be open to that extent. Everything except

1 Cochise County here -- I don't know why you're saying in
2 order to create essentially an east-west tilt instead of
3 a north-south tilt, one floating district, you have to
4 invade the Hispanic AUR, because obviously don't.
5 Simply drive the western district further into the urban
6 areas of Maricopa County.

7 MR. HUTCHISON: I'd actually agree with
8 that. The only reason to describe this option was the
9 goal to find any way to do this with a north-south
10 dividing line. I think we found there really was not,
11 as long as we were going to respect the areas of
12 District G.

13 District G is going to be discussed in
14 considerable detail by counsel.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I do concur with the
16 premise, making the assumptions Mr. Huntwork outlined
17 that the rural district could rotate on its axis down
18 the west side and east side of the state to the extent
19 necessary again, given the parameters you wouldn't
20 invade G and H given the scenario whatever you needed to
21 make up the difference would force you to the center of
22 the state to align with something in Maricopa County.

23 MR. JOHNSON: We could do that in the
24 center of this. District, we could arrive at that
25 point.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further comments or
2 questions on this analysis?

3 Now, is this the bulk of the work?

4 You have more to tell us?

5 DR. ADAMS: Mr. Chairman, Members of the
6 Commission, we do have other analysis to show you in a
7 Power Point.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'd ask at this point,
9 Mr. Hall needed to be absent for a few minutes. I
10 wonder if we to take a short break.

11 We need a short break.

12 Let's all keep it to a 10-minute break, if
13 we could.

14 (Recess taken from 9:02 p.m. until
15 approximately 9:24 p.m.)

16 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ladies and gentlemen, I'd
17 ask everyone to take their seats, please, and we'll
18 reconvene the Commission, and we'll hear the balance of
19 the report from NDC.

20 Ms. Leoni, are you making your report?

21 MS. LEONI: Yes. I'll be making this
22 aspect of my report with my trustee superior here. We
23 have no minions in the firm.

24 MR. RUDGE: We have the Power Points here.

25 MS. LEONI: We wanted to address this

1 segment here.

2 We had a number of issues raised in regard
3 to some of the Maricopa County neighborhoods, because
4 they will impact, I think, what we do in tonight's work.
5 I want to address them quite quickly.

6 The first one was a suggestion that we
7 look --

8 Is Doug there?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah.

10 MS. LEONI: Doug, were you going to draw
11 some circles for me?

12 We were going to look at drawing Ahwatukee
13 into Congressional District D. Two main comments up
14 there on the Power Point. I wanted to talk about that.

15 First, let's highlight the Ahwatukee area,
16 get our little pen out here. And this is an area with
17 54,749 people. And the proposal was to move that into
18 the Hispanic AUR. And the compensating move would be to
19 take the portion of the Hispanic AUR that is in Glendale
20 and unite it in one of the more Northern Districts with
21 the rest of the City of Glendale. Now, that more
22 northerly portion of an AUR has 57,297 people, and it's
23 about half Hispanic. It's that area right there. The
24 resulting impact on the AUR would be, number one, a
25 social AUR, a community of interest impact in that you

1 would be bringing in a dissimilar neighborhood in
2 Ahwatukee and losing a portion of an AUR specifically
3 included. It would have a diluted effect on numbers,
4 but whether it was an effect of significance, we're not
5 prepared to tell you yet.

6 It would reduce the Hispanic nature of
7 this district from about 59.6 or 7 percent to 56.1.

8 The impact on the voting age population
9 would be a drop from about 54 percent to about 50.

10 Now, this is a total overall
11 majority-minority district. And while these are
12 possible moves, I think they remain to be refined based
13 on the voting analysis that we are in the process of
14 developing.

15 I am not prepared at this point to tell
16 you that this is absolutely not possible. I think it's
17 on the list of possibilities. We need to bring you more
18 information.

19 A third addition to this move was the
20 movement of the Gila. I think we're going to hear more
21 about this tomorrow, a movement of Gila River
22 Reservation into District G.

23 Let me address the La Paz area since
24 that's up here on the Power Point. And I've already
25 mentioned that when we were discussing the east-west

1 orientation for the rural districts, the movement of La
2 Paz into Congressional District G, which is most
3 representative of Hispanic AURs, would result in
4 dilution, I believe, which is much more problematic than
5 working with the Hispanic AUR in Maricopa County.

6 Moving on.

7 We've already discussed the Glendale
8 issues.

9 Let's move on, too.

10 We don't have Gila. I'll address that in
11 a moment.

12 There's also a suggestion of moving the
13 Gila Reservation into an AUR. There would be a slightly
14 more dilutive effect in terms of the Hispanic
15 population.

16 That portion, that reservation, has about
17 12,000 people in it. It is very slightly Hispanic,
18 although it is 96 percent total minority. But bringing
19 that group into the Maricopa County AUR, Hispanic AUR,
20 would require a loss of an equal number of people
21 elsewhere. So we have some additional dilution issues
22 there that impact not only the Maricopa County AUR but
23 also the southern AUR.

24 Once again, we're taking a highly minority
25 area, removing it from that southern state AUR.

1 My concern, once again, is the possibility
2 of a legally significant dilution in that area of the
3 state.

4 The last issue that we were looking at
5 that impacted our Hispanic AURs were Tucson issues.

6 There was a suggestion to move a
7 neighborhood surrounding the University into District G,
8 not because of the racial make up but because of an
9 identity of political and social issues. We've looked
10 at those neighborhoods, neighborhoods under the thematic
11 map, the areas in there north and east of the boundary
12 lines of the draft plan we showed you this morning, not
13 highly minority, however information we're receiving
14 which is also part of the public record is they do have
15 a social and community orientation to the south.
16 Obviously, bringing a high population density population
17 area around the University into the minority AUR will
18 have an impact in terms of numbers. Whether it has an
19 impact in terms of voting strength, we can't tell you
20 that. There may be a strong crossover of voters on
21 issues of importance to the southern state AUR.

22 And we also have flexibility in La Paz
23 County. Right now it is not divided. However, there is
24 an option to divide that, to try to rebalance numbers
25 once the neighborhood is moved. This is something we

1 did not look at in detail and would like to bring you
2 more information on.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I think you mean Santa
4 Cruz County, not La Paz.

5 MS. LEONI: I'm so sorry, I do mean Santa
6 Cruz, not La Paz.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Any comments or questions?

8 Ms. Leoni, thank you very much.

9 Are there other issues or direction that
10 we need to give the consultants this evening before we
11 adjourn and before we are prepared then to see the full
12 mapping of the Maricopa County Districts and also the
13 impact of the other work that we did this evening on the
14 full statewide map Congressional Districts?

15 Ms. Minkoff?

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I've had a chance
17 to think about some of the things that were said and
18 also the original draft map, and I find myself in an
19 unusual position. I'm agreeing with Commissioner Hall.

20 Looking at the map, the two southern
21 districts really do seem to make a lot of sense. Maybe
22 they need a little bit of tweaking here and there, but I
23 think that those districts do work. I didn't raise the
24 issue of possibly moving the Gila River Indian
25 Reservation out. It's not a large number of people.

1 And if that is what they want and tell us tomorrow and
2 we choose to do it, there may be some minor adjustments.

3 Commissioner Hall said awhile ago probably
4 what we need to do get the rural districts in place and
5 then divide up the rest of it. That may be a good
6 approach for you to use. You have districts G, H, south
7 of the eastern corner. Even though H is not really a
8 rural district, they seem to work.

9 We looked at a Northern Arizona District
10 tonight that seems to have the potential for further
11 development. And I would just suggest that maybe the
12 way to go is to nail down those three districts and then
13 the rest of it gets divided in five pieces. And those
14 are just my thoughts.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: But it's not an five easy
16 pieces.

17 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I never said it was
18 easy.

19 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I just wanted to be sure.
20 Mr. Hall.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: Thank you,
22 Mr. Chairman.

23 Dovetailing on that, I agree totally, as
24 was totally made clear, and I appreciate Commissioner
25 Minkoff's comments.

1 Therefore, I make a motion that we would
2 essentially instruct NDC to continue the drafting
3 process, leaving District G essentially as it stands
4 with the adjustments that were just noted by Ms. Leoni,
5 and District H essentially as it stands with the
6 adjustments as noted by Ms. Leoni.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second to the
8 motion?

9 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

11 COMMISSIONER ELDER: For clarification.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

13 COMMISSIONER ELDER: For clarification,
14 Mr. Hall, does that preclude the shift of the map, and
15 that, into C --

16 COMMISSIONER HALL: The question, I
17 discussed that briefly with NDC. I think we have a
18 population problem. Furthermore, we may have a voting
19 rights issue there. I don't know. They can look at
20 that. I guess, as I understand the concern, Ms. Leoni,
21 I welcome input on that issue.

22 If you took a sample, Mammoth,
23 Duddleyville, et cetera, moved it east, picked up Gila
24 Bend, not trading people for people there, both in
25 respects to numbers and in respects to necessarily the

1 make-up there, Ms. Leoni, please, if you would enlighten
2 us, Chris, or whatever.

3 MS. LEONI: Chris pointed out the numbers
4 for me in the minority communities there.

5 The impact on the Southern Arizona
6 Hispanic AUR, there are 8,000 people there, about half
7 Hispanic.

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: Certainly, Mr. Elder,
9 it would not preclude us, again. I'm just trying to get
10 somewhere. We can tweak it again as we look at it. I'm
11 just trying to give our consultants a little clear
12 vision as they move into the wee hours of the morning.

13 So that's my opinion, just start here and
14 try to work to that goal.

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

16 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: A question first.

17 Is the reference to the changes Ms. Leoni
18 discussed, maintain flexibility to do those after we
19 looked at the results of her -- we're not making those
20 changes now.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understood -- my
22 motion, the intent of my motion was for them to
23 incorporate the changes with respect to Santa Cruz
24 County and the University as she specifically just
25 discussed and reflect those in Districts G and H so we

1 then could analyze those, whether or not --

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: What I understood
3 her comment to be was she thought they might be possible
4 to make, but she needed to look at it further. She
5 intended to say this has promise, I need to look at it
6 further and get back to you.

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: So we instruct them to
8 do it and let us look at it further tomorrow.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Complete the
10 investigation to consider it further.

11 COMMISSIONER HALL: Make the changes.
12 Bring back the lines. Let us look at it, and we'll
13 evaluate it tomorrow.

14 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Then let me treat
15 the motion, for descriptive purposes here I've drawn a
16 map of Arizona which has labeled these districts a
17 little differently. I've called the southeastern
18 district one, the Hispanic south district two, drawn a
19 square intended to represent Maricopa County and called
20 it 4.8, and I have drawn the entire rest of the state
21 and called it 1.2. What that is intended to show is
22 there is 1.2 districts floating around in the rest of
23 the state. I feel very strongly that where that one
24 whole district ends up depends in large part on which .2
25 makes the most sense to unite with Maricopa County.

1 This is the point I've been trying to make. And to me,
2 to simply say we're going to do it this way without
3 looking at those connections violates the spirit of 106.

4 I think there are communities of interest
5 we need to know.

6 If there is a way to do it that makes the
7 districts that relate to Maricopa County more compact,
8 more contiguous, or divides fewer counties, et cetera,
9 we need to know.

10 I would say before we fix the location of
11 that district, we need to look at the Maricopa County
12 situation first.

13 COMMISSIONER HALL: When you say that
14 district, you say referring to which district?

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: The one purely
16 rural district --

17 COMMISSIONER HALL: The motion,
18 Mr. Huntwork, doesn't have anything to do with that
19 district.

20 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Please clarify.

21 COMMISSIONER HALL: I just wanted to bite
22 the sandwich one bite at a time. My motion is we accept
23 G and H with the adjustments noted, start them utilizing
24 those two before they move into the other areas of the
25 state.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall, for my
2 clarification, when you say "accept," are you saying
3 that in terms of accept them for inclusion in our map
4 for public comment or are you saying accept them in
5 terms of progressing to a point where we will vote for a
6 map to be included for public comment?

7 COMMISSIONER HALL: The latter. Tomorrow
8 we have to look at something. In order for us to look
9 at something, we have to tell them something. If we
10 don't tell them something, nobody is going to sleep
11 tonight. For tomorrow, for additional and multiple
12 consideration, I recommend they utilize leaving G and H
13 essentially as they are with inclusion of the changes as
14 noted. Then we'll address, of course, Northern Arizona
15 next. Then based upon those three decisions, they then
16 will go and map the Phoenix Metropolitan area, in my
17 opinion. But the Northern Arizona is a separate issue.
18 At this time I'm only speaking to G and H. Which are
19 the two southern districts.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

21 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I did indeed
22 misunderstand the original motion. I think that's a
23 good idea.

24 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Further discussion on the
25 motion?

1 COMMISSIONER ELDER: I'd call the
2 question.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: All in favor, signify by
4 saying "aye."

5 (Vote taken.)

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Chair votes "Aye."
7 Motion carries unanimously.

8 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Took 10 minutes to
9 get the motion out.

10 COMMISSIONER HALL: I understand.

11 I'd like to make another motion we
12 instruct NDC, for further consideration and analysis,
13 that they would, for mapping purposes, tomorrow draft
14 the Northern Arizona District similar to what we saw in
15 the initial presentation, including the adjustments I
16 recommended wherein they remove portions of Mohave
17 County and include the portions of Gila and Pinal in the
18 rural and including the portions of the two northern
19 reservations.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

21 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

23 Mr. Huntwork.

24 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I don't know. I
25 made the argument previously, I believe. I would like

1 to add to it that we are -- where exactly we draw the
2 lines for this other district, even if we take
3 essentially the approach that was being developed, it
4 still doesn't work. I was not commenting, I was
5 responding at that time to the particular point of
6 Mohave County to separating now two places in Yavapai
7 County, and so on, letting it go, because it illustrated
8 one possible way of adjusting that 1.0 district in the
9 northern part of the state. In fact, there is .2 of a
10 district that is also located somewhere in that area and
11 an infinite number of possible variations of how to draw
12 that district, an infinite number. The connections of
13 that .2 and the 4.8 districts in the Phoenix
14 Metropolitan area are as important as any other decision
15 we're going to make. I don't believe we can make a
16 decision on that Northern District without considering
17 the relationships with what is left over, and that is
18 the remainder.

19 I oppose the motion. I believe we need to
20 look at the Phoenix Metropolitan area and what
21 connections there are in the Northern District.

22 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder.

23 COMMISSIONER ELDER: It goes back to
24 comments about the ripple effect and the direction we
25 need to give NDC about where to start and adjust that

1 ripple.

2 We seem to have two options. One we had
3 at the very beginning of discussions, the change in the
4 Mesa split, in the Mesa shift in the East Valley, that
5 starts ripple back, or start in West Valley and start
6 adjustments and go east. Seemed like those two areas
7 are areas where we it's problematic and are the eventual
8 solution. So I think that probably working with the
9 East Valley, trying to make Mesa, Chandler, and the
10 communities there whole and working back would be my
11 approach, or my feeling of the approach we should take,
12 and whatever happens on the west happens.

13 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Ms. Minkoff.

14 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: That doesn't solve
15 the problem. All those areas are already in Maricopa
16 County. That's another issue.

17 The issue is within Maricopa County, where
18 do we draw the lines? That's obviously something we're
19 going to have to deal with.

20 What we're talking about is what areas
21 outside of Maricopa County are going to be incorporated
22 into Maricopa County districts?

23 One thing, one question I'd like to ask,
24 Ms. Leoni, at what point are you going to have voting
25 data which would factor into drawing of these districts?

1 MS. LEONI: Are you talking about racial
2 voting data?

3 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: I can't hear you.

4 MS. LEONI: Racial voting data?

5 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Not racial voting
6 data, I'm talking, you know --

7 MS. LEONI: Competitiveness?

8 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Some voting data,
9 not perfect, it will need to be adjusted, we'll need to
10 begin to approach districts that begin to make sense
11 that can be fine-tuned at a later date. I'm also
12 talking about competitiveness.

13 MS. LEONI: If I understand our
14 capabilities now, we will be able to give you voter
15 registration on districts as they are developed. So we
16 will have the registration data. We're on a conference
17 call tomorrow morning at 7:00 a.m. to confirm when we
18 can get a more whole analysis of that.

19 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: You would not be
20 able to use that to help us make decisions in this
21 particular area for us to see tomorrow?

22 MS. LEONI: We will not have that data at
23 the meeting tomorrow morning.

24 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Then we're still
25 left with the issue of what there is outside of the

1 Maricopa County that should be incorporated, what is the
2 .2 that comes out of the rest of the state. That's the
3 issue that needs to be dealt with. One area that seems
4 logical to me, although it's not enough, is the area of
5 northern Pinal County, Apache Junction, Gold Canyon
6 Ranch. Even though Pinal County seems to connect to
7 East Mesa, it's an easy place to get population to
8 Maricopa County, maybe cut down to 1.15, 1.5 -- I
9 recommend adding that to Maricopa County. As to where
10 the rest of it is going to come from, I'm not sure.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

12 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would be
13 interested in seeing the map that results from moving
14 the 1.0 whatever district as far as east and as far to
15 the south as possible while not -- while remaining
16 entirely rural. I'm not sure that that is exactly what
17 the exercise that we went through proves. But certainly
18 one way to do this is to take this and just turn it that
19 way as far as possible and then we would see what --
20 we'd see how the rest of the state, including Maricopa
21 County, is laid out. That would define where the other
22 .2 came from and properly wind up in West Phoenix that
23 way. There's no question about it.

24 One of the points is that's not the only
25 way to do it. I'd like to see it that way. I'd also

1 like to see it as simply an entirely separate analysis,
2 Maricopa County and the surrounding areas, to determine
3 whether there is a more logical way of completing the
4 five districts in Maricopa County than simply going to
5 Pinal.

6 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Elder and Mr. Hall.

7 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Talking the same
8 terminology, there was earlier discussion talking about
9 the Phoenix Metropolitan area, not specifically Maricopa
10 County. The first submittal was a presentation of areas
11 to the east. Maybe these areas, and we went through an
12 exercise of subtracting out areas, adding areas, plus
13 and minuses. And I believe the intent of the motion was
14 to look at those plus and minuses with the Metropolitan
15 Phoenix approach as opposed to a Maricopa County
16 approach. I want to find out and make sure we're still
17 talking the same language here.

18 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: If the motion had
19 been what I outlined, to move that way as far as
20 possible, not using any urban areas, exclude the Pinal
21 urban county areas, if they meet that definition, define
22 the urban areas, I support that. I agree. I want to
23 see what that looks like.

24 I haven't had an opportunity to really
25 understand or agree that what we were doing there is the

1 specific lines we were drawing in Mohave County, some
2 areas were down in the southeast quadrant, some weren't,
3 and so I -- it wasn't -- it was sort of an arbitrary
4 shift. We got part way there but not all the way to
5 that configuration. I don't know if the pieces left
6 over in the southeast made any sense and could wind up
7 with Maricopa County. It may have been logical, may
8 have made no sense whatsoever.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I'm wondering if we could
10 get get clarification, to bring closure to the argument,
11 if there are two points of view. I think I understand
12 both. If the consultants remember specifically, maybe,
13 Mr. Hall, you recollect, what is the southeastern most
14 corner of the district that we discussed earlier as
15 being the rural district? We now know it doesn't go as
16 far south, doesn't go into Cochise County. Does it go
17 all the way to Cochise County?

18 COMMISSIONER HALL: To Greenlee and
19 Graham.

20 CHAIRMAN LYNN: No shifting can be done.
21 If I understand, essentially it has been shifted. We
22 adopted G and H as a starting point. The top part of H
23 is the county line of Cochise County. Immediately above
24 it is the rural district we've been talking about. It
25 has been shifted as far to the east and south as you are

1 suggesting as it can go.

2 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Well, but then
3 there are also rural areas in -- I think in Pinal
4 County.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: They are already
6 included.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: They were included in some
8 adjustments made as we discussed earlier this evening.

9 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Can we see it back
10 up on the board?

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: I suspect we could.

12 COMMISSIONER HALL: Mr. Hall, folks, we
13 have to start somewhere. Okay? I'm suggesting we start
14 here.

15 And, Jim, the whole reason we have these
16 high-dollar laptops and high, big consultants is so we
17 can do individual meetings, play what-if games to our
18 individual heart's desires.

19 I'm just not sure that all that needs to
20 occur here.

21 I would, therefore, encourage if you play
22 every what-if game, and I have done that, therefore, I'm
23 saying there are not an infinite number of
24 possibilities. There are only a relatively limited
25 number of possibilities for the .2, and they are very

1 easy to identify. I'm not sure to identify those is the
2 purpose here.

3 Therefore, Mr. Chairman I think we need to
4 give direction, a starting point, and from that see what
5 happens inside the Phoenix Metropolitan area and then go
6 ahead and then analyze from there.

7 Therefore, I call the question.

8 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question has been
9 called for on the motion.

10 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.)

21 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Other direction?

22 Mr. Huntwork.

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: I would like to
24 make a motion we ask the consultants to make a
25 recommendation to us as to where the additional .2 would

1 most ideally come from in order to complete the
2 districts in the Phoenix Metropolitan area.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Is there a second?

4 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Second.

5 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Discussion?

6 COMMISSIONER HALL: Call the question.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The question is called
8 for.

9 All in favor, signify by saying "aye."

10 (Vote taken.)

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Opposed, signify "no."

12 (Motion carries.)

13 DR. ADAMS: Could you restate that motion
14 and also the previous motion?

15 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Dr. Adams.

16 DR. ADAMS: I want a bit of brief
17 clarification. I want a bit of clarification on the
18 recommendations.

19 We've had two recommendations. The Tucson
20 motion could be dilutive, as we explained. Also, the
21 motion to alter the Northern District by taking out some
22 areas of Pinal County out of G is also dilutive, also.
23 I want to be certain I have clarification.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'll attempt to do
25 that. I'll also attempt and hope I won't misspeak.

1 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

2 COMMISSIONER HALL: With respect to G and
3 H, it is my understanding that there was a desire to
4 move the dividing line, move some areas within, along
5 the dividing line. Ms. Leoni proposed some ideas, did
6 she not.

7 DR. ADAMS: Ms. Leoni spoke to the
8 implications of such a move and said they would be
9 dilutive.

10 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Might be dilutive and need
11 to be tested.

12 DR. ADAMS: Would be dilutive. What the
13 impact would be, we'd need to wait until we see the
14 racial block voting analysis. Once we see the racial
15 block analysis, in terms of racial block analysis and
16 total analysis, then analyze in terms of the district
17 located in the Phoenix area.

18 The second point.

19 And we're happy to make the change. We
20 just want you to understand the implications of it. I
21 wasn't sure you totally understood that.

22 The second situation you just voted on, it
23 also moves territory out of G into the rural district,
24 and that is a second impact on District G and would be a
25 further dilution of the Hispanic population of G.

1 I just want to make certain that you
2 understood the report we gave you. It's getting late
3 and we're all a bit tired. I wasn't certain you
4 understood.

5 COMMISSIONER HALL: I don't think we
6 understood taking anything out of G to D.

7 DR. ADAMS: Mining areas?

8 COMMISSIONER HALL: I wasn't referring --
9 maybe we were. If so, then fine. I think the intent
10 was to include the remainder of Gila with Superior and
11 the top of the mountain, and that area. If -- then the
12 mining to the south. If we made that, that was simply
13 the numbers game. Fine. The remaining portion of Gila,
14 the rural area of Pinal, in that district. I was just
15 wanting to see and look at it. Guessing at some
16 numbers, fine, leave G intact. Make adjustments to the
17 south.

18 What I was trying to say, then make
19 adjustments with respect to dilute -- increasing the
20 impact on Mohave, increasing Mohave County to include
21 the northern reservations in the Northern District. My
22 understanding is it would be approximate numerically,
23 not be super close in all draft maps, but as close as we
24 can.

25 My understanding was, Dr. Adams, if you

1 split Santa Cruz County, it's fine with respect to the
2 dilution issue.

3 CHAIRMAN LYNN: It's to be determined.

4 MS. LEONI: That had to be tested to see
5 if that was available to address the dilution issue.

6 We're pleased to test it. We wanted to
7 know, you may make a decision in 10 hours you want to
8 move it back.

9 COMMISSIONER HALL: Great.

10 COMMISSIONER ELDER: Fine.

11 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We'll be happy to do so.

12 DR. ADAMS: Thank you for the
13 clarification.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: We won't be able
16 to do the testing for quite some time, correct?

17 When will we be able to test the
18 effectiveness.

19 MS. LEONI: We'll be able to see numbers
20 right away, racial block.

21 DR. ADAMS: We will know about the
22 dilution. Racial block voting?

23 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When will we know
24 about racial block voting?

25 MS. LEONI: It's going to be a bit. We're

1 still waiting for at least half of the data base.

2 MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, what Ms. Leoni
3 says is true. The Southwestern District is really close
4 to 50 percent. If it goes below 50 percent, you don't
5 need to get any more information to find out that's a
6 Voting Rights violation.

7 CHAIRMAN LYNN: The point is we don't need
8 any more additional data to find out. If it goes below
9 50 percent, we'll know that tomorrow, so we'll be able
10 to determine that tomorrow, right?

11 MS. LEONI: Right.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you.

13 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: Mr. Chairman.

14 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Huntwork.

15 COMMISSIONER HUNTWORK: When we voted on
16 the previous motion, I did not understand with regard to
17 that.

18 I want to say drawing a line that would
19 have a dilutive effect without putting it through
20 testing, that's something we can do later. I didn't
21 understand -- I did not understand the substantive
22 reason for doing it. It just -- it sounded like it was
23 just out of curiosity. At this point I would prefer not
24 to do it.

25 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We've given direction to

1 the consultants to take a look at adjustments in H. If
2 they do not meet the prima facie test for dilution,
3 don't do them. But they are to look at it. If they can
4 figure out a solution to make those changes without
5 affecting dilution, then we'd like to see that, how they
6 would do it.

7 MR. RIVERA: Mr. Chairman, I want clarify
8 it. I forgot Tohono O'odhom, the other non-Hispanic
9 minority. It doesn't have to be a total 50 percent
10 Hispanic. There are serious possible consequences with
11 other minorities. You can see possibly, how they vote
12 together. If you go below below 50 percent, it's not a
13 definite absolute.

14 MS. HAUSER: 50 percent total, voting age.

15 MR. RIVERA: Voting age.

16 COMMISSIONER MINKOFF: Total number.

17 Okay. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Again, we're not directing
19 you to dilute. Take a look at dilution. Give us the
20 benefit of your wisdom as to whether or not it can be
21 accomplished without diluting.

22 DR. ADAMS: Thank you. That answers that.

23 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Mr. Hall.

24 COMMISSIONER HALL: I'd like everyone to
25 raise their hand if I'm beginning to sound like a broken

1 record. We have got to look at something tomorrow. We
2 want to look at it.

3 I think there's clear direction for these
4 three districts, just to look at them, discuss, and I'm
5 fully confident additional analysis will occur. Then in
6 that respect, then go ahead and do something internally,
7 kind of to get our arms around this, that's our intent,
8 in the event it's the wish of this Commission not to
9 mess with District G, our rock of Gibraltar, if you
10 will, our majority-minority district.

11 So I also recommend we adjourn.

12 CHAIRMAN LYNN: We indicated we'd end with
13 a call to public. One member of the public indicated a
14 wish to be heard.

15 We'll end with a call to the public.

16 This is the time for consideration and
17 discussion of comments and complaints from the public.
18 Those wishing to address the Commission shall request
19 permission in advance by filling out a speaker slip.
20 Action taken as a result of public comment will be
21 limited to directing staff to study the matter or
22 rescheduling the matter for further consideration and
23 decision at a later date.

24 MR. HARTDEGEN: I'm confused. I got up
25 early to fill in potholes. I love that light sound,

1 keeps out the riffraff. I'm confused. I feel like the
2 car has got to the destination. If I understand the
3 motion, I'm not too sure everybody does understand the
4 motion Mr. Hall made on G, it sounds like G is a done
5 deal, especially if it comes back saying it meets the
6 AUG (sic) definition for Hispanics, or whatever else.

7 I'll say this one more time, and I'll
8 probably say it again tomorrow and until Christmastime,
9 or the cows come home, or Casa Grande runs out of money.
10 But the scenario is probably the worst case scenario
11 that Pinal County, Western Pinal County, can be put in.

12 Let me tell you again, Yuma County, Pinal
13 County, the area you are going to put in D, Red Rock,
14 Marana, Avre Valley, are all agricultural areas. They
15 have a common interest. Everybody pretty well knows on
16 the Democrat side, Independent side, Republican side,
17 everybody else, there's 99 percent chance it will be
18 controlled out of Tucson, which has had a negative
19 attitude toward agriculture. Money, economics out of
20 those districts is heavily dependent on agriculture, no
21 two ways about it.

22 I don't care who you are, don't care if
23 Hispanic, Swedish, male, female, whatever. If you do
24 away with or hurt the economic base of that district,
25 you are out of a job. And no lawyer in Washington that

1 works in the Justice Department will come to the rescue,
2 because they already have a paycheck.

3 I'd like you guys to really think about
4 it. It's suicide, flat suicide, to do this.

5 We're talking about economics, talking
6 about politics, talking about feeding your families.

7 If you put that agricultural district into
8 an area in Tucson, you are creating problems.

9 Thanks.

10 Oh, by the way, if the Casa Grande, Eloy,
11 Coolidge area, if you were looking for an area to
12 sacrifice to Maricopa County, we'd rather go into
13 Maricopa County rather than than Pima County. It's kind
14 of like do you want half a dose of castor oil rather
15 than a full dose of castor oil. We'd rather have half a
16 dose.

17 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Hartdegen.

18 The other is Steve Owens.

19 Mr. Owens.

20 MR. OWENS: Thank you.

21 I've attended quite a number of meetings
22 and never felt a need to comment.

23 Having sat through the discussions today,
24 I did feel a need make a couple comments.

25 Having been through some long meeting

1 sessions with Former Representative Hartdegen and Former
2 Representative Valdez, I believe I'm the only one
3 running for Congress. I ran for Congress in
4 Congressional District VI, one of the closest
5 Congressional races. No one is more acutely aware of
6 the rural portions of the district and rural-urban
7 portions. In '96, I carried the rural portions of the
8 eastern counties. The man that currently holds the
9 office carried the Maricopa County District by 23,000
10 votes. He won the race by 2,000 votes out of 253,000
11 votes.

12 I understand the rural voters in Maricopa
13 County, voters in a district like that.

14 I emphasize to you all in deference to
15 Commissioner Hall, you've got to know they cast many
16 votes. And I respect this a great deal. The issue
17 ought not be whether Maricopa County be totally excluded
18 from Eastern Arizona, Northern Arizona, whatever you
19 call it right now, Northern, Eastern, Southern Arizona,
20 the district the way proposed, but whether it ought not
21 be -- whether Maricopa County should be excluded from a
22 district like that, whether Maricopa County should
23 dominate a district like that or dominate any other
24 district.

25 As someone that has resided in a district

1 like that, I don't see an inherent evil. I do see a
2 concern in having so much of Maricopa County in a
3 district like that that not only overwhelms but controls
4 the outcome of the election. That's the real problem
5 this Commission needs to address.

6 I'd also urge all of you when looking in
7 particular at that rural district to discuss the
8 opportunities, not only the interests contained in that
9 district, the very divergent interests ranging from
10 Bullhead City, to Duncan in Greenlee County, Window
11 Rock, Prescott Valley, other places I'm talking about,
12 not only interests contained in the district, drawing
13 upon them the burden and ability of candidates to
14 campaign in a district like that.

15 One fortunate or unfortunate to be elected
16 in a district like that, to effectively represent a
17 district that large geographically, that diverse in
18 terms of community of interest, in conjunction with that
19 amount of resources, one must compile extensive
20 resources.

21 Having raised several million dollars, my
22 opponent having raised several million dollars times
23 what I raised, it was not a million dollar race but a
24 multimillion dollar race. With the media, things you
25 have to do to get elected to Congress these days, I ask

1 you to consider that when crafting Congressional
2 Districts.

3 I ask you consider now the state
4 constitutional mandate to create districts that not only
5 respect community of interests but are compact as well
6 as districts that are competitive. You heard about that
7 from Mr. Eckstein this morning.

8 I have a great concern, listening to
9 discussions over the course of the day and to some votes
10 that have just been taken. You have taken huge, giant
11 steps opposite from competitiveness in some decisions.
12 You may be able to come back in before the day is out
13 Saturday and move back toward competitiveness. But
14 forgetting to lock in, by locking in districts, locking
15 in noncompetitiveness, especially inside Maricopa
16 County, you make decisions where you may in no way in
17 the world be able to create competitive districts in
18 Maricopa County. You just can't do it, given the base
19 of people that live in Maricopa County, the voting
20 history there, party registration history. I'd ask you
21 to consider that.

22 The only other point I'd ask you to
23 consider in your deliberations is that virtually every
24 issue you discussed today, and certainly this evening
25 when you came back after the recess, has been addressed

1 in a map presented to you by the Arizona Democratic
2 Party. I had some small help creating the map. I don't
3 agree with everything in the map. It's not the way I'd
4 draw the map for the State of Arizona. The reason is we
5 addressed virtually every issue you wrestled with here
6 tonight in trying to create districts in Eastern Arizona
7 that were overwhelmingly rural, addressing
8 majority-minority issues.

9 The Maricopa County Southern Hispanic
10 District was created in that map. You can make
11 adjustments for some things contained in the map to
12 accommodate some concerns expressed during the course of
13 the day's proceedings. If you look for answers for some
14 questions raised, if you haven't looked at that map, I
15 urge you very strongly to do so.

16 As Mr. Eckstein said this morning, it
17 creates competitive districts, three Republican, two
18 Democrat, three swing districts. You might adjust it to
19 make it better or worse. Look at that.

20 Look at what areas are included in the
21 various districts. Party registration breakdowns are
22 included consistent with competitiveness.

23 Once you get whatever data you get from
24 the consultants about competitiveness and past voting
25 histories, put it in there. See what comes out. I

1 think you'll find it meets a lot of concerns.

2 Other than that, I wish you luck in your
3 deliberations.

4 As I said, I hope you think about all the
5 issues, especially when you're beginning to create the
6 large districts out there, what the actual practical
7 result is going to be of that process.

8 Thank you very much for your time.

9 CHAIRMAN LYNN: Thank you, Mr. Owens, very
10 much.

11 Are there other members of the public
12 wishing to be heard at this time?

13 If not, the Commission will stand in
14 recess until 8:30 tomorrow morning.

15 I'd like to emphasize today we felt with
16 not being finished with eight Congressional Districts,
17 we have 30 Legislative Districts to deal with, we need
18 to start not at 8:45, 10 minutes of 9:00, we need to
19 start at 8:30 tomorrow. We need to take as much time
20 tomorrow as we need to fit into the schedule.

21 With that, we'll recess until tomorrow
22 morning.

23 (Whereupon, the Commission recessed at
24 approximately 10:18 p.m.)

25 * * * *

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

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing hearing was
taken before me, LISA A. NANCE, RPR, CCR, Certified
Court Reporter in and for the State of Arizona,
Certificate Number 50349; that the proceedings were
taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to
typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing 219
pages constitute a true and accurate transcript of all
proceedings had upon the taking of said hearing, all
done to the best of my ability.

 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am in no way
related to any of the parties hereto, nor am I in any
way interested in the outcome hereof.

 DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 24th day
of August, 2001.

LISA A. NANCE, RPR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate Number 50349

ATWOOD REPORTING SERVICE
Phoenix, Arizona

