



# City of Flagstaff

Value Statement – for submission to the Independent Redistricting Commission  
adopted by the Flagstaff City Council, August 8/23/11


The City of Flagstaff values a redistricting outcome that is first and foremost compliant with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and does not regress in its representation of Native populations in Northern Arizona; maximizes competitive districts across the State and includes Flagstaff in such a district; we value placing Flagstaff in a district whose communities share our same transportation, economic, higher education, governance and natural resource interests, such as forest health and water issues; and we value placing the greater Flagstaff area in a single Legislative District.

Arizona Relay Service 7-1-1  
211 West Aspen Avenue, Flagstaff, Arizona 86001  
Main & TDD (928) 774-5281 \* Fax (928) 779-7696

# Scenario 3

Adopted by the Flagstaff City Council, August 23, 2011

## CONCEPTUAL MAP



<b>District 1</b>
Total Population = 213,388
<b>District 2</b>
Total Population = 200,326
<b>District 3</b>
Total Population = 208,536
<b>District 4</b>
Total Population = 220,751
<b>District 5</b>
Total Population = 215,962




The boundary of District 4 and District 1 are partially based on non Census Tract Data.

# Congressional District 1

Adopted by the Flagstaff City Council, August 23, 2011

## CONCEPTUAL MAP



Redistricting matrix 8-23-11				Scenario 3					
Criteria			Threshold	LD 1	LD 2	LD 3	LD 4	LD 5	CD 1
Mandates									
1a	US Constitution		yes	Dist 2 met					
1b	Voting Rights Act		63%	6.7%	66.6%	2.7%	1.2%	3.3%	22.2%
Requirements									
2	Equal population		213,000	213,388	204,204	208,536	216,200	215,962	
			<10% deviation	0.2%	-4.3%	-2.1%	1.5%	1.4%	0.2%
3	Communities of Interest								
	Transportation								
		FMPO	~1	0.64	0.40	0.40	0.46	0.25	
		NAIPTA	yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	
	Governance								
		# of GAMA communities	max 17	9	2	3	3	0	
		GAMA	50%	52.9%	11.8%	17.6%	17.6%	0.0%	
		NACOG	50%	70.0%	35.0%	15.0%	15.0%	0.0%	
	Economic								
		# of communities	1	10	1	2	2	0	
		employment index	-	0.51	0.50	0.65	0.65	0.00	
		Comm with econo gain	>0	6	1	-	2	-	
		Comm with net outflow	0	2	1	-	2	-	
	Resources								
		Federal lands	NF w/in 25 miles	54.6%	23.0%	98.0%	53.9%	45.1%	
		Water NAMWUA	member %	78.6%	14.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	
4	Competitive								
		Delta, Demo = +, Rep = <->	+/- 5%	-6.2%	33.8%	-15.1%	-27.0%	2.5%	4.1%
		Gov, delta	<7%	-11.1%	39.8%	-32.5%	-40.1%	-5.1%	-0.8%
		Democratic	-	44.5%	69.9%	33.7%	30.0%	47.4%	49.6%
		Republican	-	55.5%	30.1%	66.3%	70.0%	52.6%	50.4%
		AG, delta	<7%	-7.4%	42.0%	-28.7%	-36.3%	-2.6%	2.8%
		Democratic	-	46.3%	71.0%	35.6%	31.8%	48.7%	51.4%
		Republican	-	53.7%	29.0%	64.4%	68.2%	51.3%	48.6%
5a	Compact								
		Counties	4 (in 2000)	4	6	2	3	5	
		Schwartzberg test	1.5	2.42	2.32	1.74	2.05	2.18	
		Polsby test	1	0.17	0.19	0.33	0.24	0.21	
5b	Contiguous								
			yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
6	Geographic features								
		Mountain	yes	X	X		X	X	
		Rim	yes	X	X		X		
		River	no			X			
		International Borders	no	no	no	no	no	no	no