

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PUBLIC MEETING

Via GoogleMeets

January 4, 2022

8:02 a.m.

**Miller Certified Reporting, LLC**  
**PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 85340**  
**(P) 623-975-7472 (F) 623-975-7462**  
**[www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com](http://www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com)**

Reported By:  
Angela Furniss Miller, RPR  
Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

I N D E X

	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
4	ITEM NO. I	4
5	ITEM NO. I (A)	4
6	ITEM NO. I (B)	5
7	ITEM NO. II	5
8	ITEM NO. III	6
9	ITEM NO. IV	7
10	ITEM NO. V	9
11	ITEM NO. V(B)	9
12	ITEM NO. V(A)	12
13	ITEM NO. VI	21
14	ITEM NO. VI (A)	21
15	MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION	21
16	VOTE	22
17	EXECUTIVE SESSION	22
18	ITEM No. VII	23
19	ITEM NO. VIII	23
20	ITEM NO. IX	23
21	ITEM No. X	23
22	ITEM No. XI	24
23	MOTION TO ADJOURN	24
24	VOTE	24
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT  
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 8:02 a.m. on  
3 January 4, 2022, via GoogleMeets, Arizona, in the presence  
4 of the following Commissioners:

5 Ms. Erika Neuberg, Chairperson  
6 Mr. Derrick Watchman, Vice Chairman  
7 Mr. David Mehl  
8 Ms. Shereen Lerner  
9 Mr. Douglas York

10 OTHERS PRESENT:

11 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director  
12 Ms. Loriandra Van Haren, Deputy Director  
13 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant  
14 Ms. Michele Crank, Public Information Officer

15 Mr. Roy Herrera, Herrera & Arellano  
16 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Herrera & Arellano  
17 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer  
18 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer

19 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group  
20 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group  
21 Mr. Douglas Johnson, NDC  
22 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC  
23  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G

1  
2  
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome, everybody.  
4 Happy New Year and very happy birthday to Roy; we have a  
5 celebration today. So wishing you all good things in the  
6 year ahead.

7 And with that, we will dive right in.

8 Agenda Item I, call to order and roll call I(A),  
9 call for quorum.

10 It is 8:02 Tuesday, January 4th, 2022. I call this  
11 meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission to  
12 order. For the record the Executive Assistant Valerie  
13 Neumann will be taking roll.

14 When your name is called, please indicate you are  
15 present. If you are unable to respond verbally, we ask that  
16 you please type your name.

17 Val.

18 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 Vice Chair Watchman.

20 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

21 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

23 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

25 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

2 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

4 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record also in attendance  
5 is Executive Director Brian Schmitt, Deputy Director Lori  
6 Van Haren, Public Information Officer Michele Crank; from  
7 our legal team we've got Brett Johnson and Eric Spencer from  
8 Snell & Wilmer, Roy Herrera and Daniel Arellano from Herrera  
9 Arellano; and Mark Flahan and Brian Kingery from Timmons;  
10 Doug Johnson and Ivy Beller-Sakansky from NDC Research; and  
11 our transcriptionist today is Angela Miller.

12 That is everyone, Madam Chair.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All right. Thank you.

14 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is  
15 present.

16 Agenda Item I(B), call for notice.

17 Val, was the notice and agenda for the Commission  
18 meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance of today's  
19 meeting?

20 MS. NEUMANN: Yes, it was, Madam Chair.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

22 Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from  
23 December 22nd, 2021. We have II(A), our general session, we  
24 had one executive session, II(B), where we sought legal  
25 advice regarding constitutional criteria.

1           Is there any discussion on the minutes?

2           If there's no discussion, I'll entertain a motion  
3 to approve the general session and executive session minutes  
4 from December 22nd of 2021.

5           COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is Commissioner Mehl. I  
6 move we approve both of those sets of minutes.

7           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

8           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,  
9 Vice Chair Watchman.

10          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

12          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

13          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

14          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

15          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

16          COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

17          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
18 aye.

19          With that, the minutes are approved from  
20 December 22nd. Thank you Val.

21          Sorry, I hear an echo. I don't know if everybody  
22 hears the echo.

23          But Agenda Item III, opportunity for public  
24 comments.

25          Public comment will now open for a minimum of

1 30 minutes and remain open until the adjournment of the  
2 meeting. Comments will only be accepted electronically in  
3 writing on the link provided in the notice and agenda for  
4 the public meeting and will be limited to 3,000 characters.

5 Please note, members of the Commission may not  
6 discuss items that are not specifically identified on the  
7 agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action  
8 taken as a result of public comment will be limited to  
9 directing staff to study the matter, responding to any  
10 criticism, or scheduling the matter for further  
11 consideration and decision at a later date.

12 With that, we will move to Agenda Item Number IV,  
13 discussion on public comments received prior to today's  
14 meeting.

15 I open it up as usual to my colleagues to see if  
16 everybody has any responses or -- or comments.

17 All right. I would like to just again thank  
18 everybody, the public, for their incredible involvement and  
19 discourse. I know we just completed, you know, a very  
20 intense, very serious deliberation process. I know some,  
21 you know, are not happy and -- and there's a variety of  
22 reactions.

23 I just want to comment that after, you know, having  
24 the time to absorb it all, I feel really good about the work  
25 that we've done. I feel really good about the maps we

1 delivered to the State. I believe these maps are going to  
2 bring even more talented and qualified candidates to be  
3 running in our districts.

4 I think regarding our congressional map, I think  
5 communities of interest were really well respected; all  
6 regions are represented well, the urban, the rural; a third  
7 of our districts are competitive, two so extremely  
8 competitive that these districts elected Biden, Kelly,  
9 Brnovitch, and Ducey, that's pretty independent; five of the  
10 nine voted for Biden and Kelly. The best candidates are  
11 going to win.

12 Regarding the legislative districts, I think we did  
13 our best to maximize as many communities of interest having  
14 representation as possible. There are five competitive  
15 districts, four of them extremely so. The party that will  
16 come out with leadership will be the party that puts forth  
17 the talented and best candidates.

18 Our minority communities were very well, I think,  
19 represented. The Latinos' legislative requests; the seven  
20 majority-minority districts were overwhelming accepted per  
21 their desires; the Native American community, I think, was  
22 able to secure, you know, their ability to elect a candidate  
23 of their choice; I think we did a really good job of trying  
24 to strengthen the unification of minority groups that have  
25 community of interest and political cohesion like our



1 African American and Asian communities.

2 No map is going to be perfect. We'll see how they  
3 hold up over, you know, the next ten years, but I have  
4 nothing but the greatest appreciation and respect for my  
5 colleagues and the public for everybody's participation in  
6 the process.

7 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item Number V,  
8 update from our mapping team.

9 And we have two items, an update on the  
10 constitutional criteria data review on the adopted maps; and  
11 II, the discussion of county election officials technical  
12 change requests to the congressional legislative maps.

13 We do have the ability to go into executive session  
14 which will not be open for the public for the purpose of  
15 obtaining legal advice to further implement and/or advance  
16 these issues if necessary.

17 I turn it over to Doug and Mark.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Good morning.

19 I think we'll take (B) first. The -- the final  
20 approved draft maps were sent over to the County, both for  
21 legislative and congressional.

22 Out of all of the counties, we received six  
23 responses back. We're currently processing their responses  
24 and working on seeing if the data will fit into the map.

25 So we're still processing their requests. Some

1 counties had just only a couple of requests, some counties  
2 had a couple dozens requests. So we're processing that,  
3 getting it completed as fast as we can.

4 For topic (A) I'll turn it over to Doug.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Mark, can I ask a question?  
6 What happens if counties don't submit any feedback? Is  
7 there any additional review on your part just to make sure  
8 that there aren't any, you know, unexpected divisions or  
9 things like that or do we just not worry about it?

10 MR. FLAHAN: Doug might be able to elaborate a  
11 little bit more, but we plan on still looking for all the  
12 little slivers of data, whether the county actually turned  
13 anything in or not. So maybe a block here or there or weird  
14 looking shapes, we still plan on doing that review.

15 But if we don't receive anything from the county,  
16 there's no way to, you know, really get any of their  
17 feedback or solicit any of that and incorporate it into the  
18 administrative changes.

19 But we are -- we are doing our best to try to at  
20 least look at the splits and incorporate that into the final  
21 official map.

22 Doug, do you have the anything to elaborate on  
23 that?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, I think you said it perfectly,  
25 which is we'll do that review just to make sure we don't

1 have any little slivers of a city or anything like that.  
2 But we won't -- we won't be checking for like  
3 zero-population precincts and those kinds of things that  
4 only the registrars can check for.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

6 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: And Madam Chair, on that we are  
7 making every effort to reach out to counties to make sure  
8 they get back to us, we just haven't heard back from some.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

10 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: We'll continue to do that.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We'll there's valid reasons  
12 with the holidays and the virus and all of that, so.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I ask what our end date  
14 is to receive any word from counties? Like, what is the  
15 last possible date for them to -- to reply?

16 MR. FLAHAN: The original deadline was Thursday of  
17 last week. We did extend it for one county to Friday since  
18 they asked, but that was the deadline.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So what happens -- I guess my  
20 question is, what happens if -- if -- since Executive  
21 Director Schmitt said they're still reaching out to  
22 counties, what if they submit something this week?

23 MR. FLAHAN: We will do our best to get it  
24 incorporated into the map. If it's a couple of changes and  
25 we receive it this week, I don't necessarily see it being a

1           problem; but if it's dozen of changes and depending on what  
2           the changes are, that could lead to more of a lead time to  
3           get it processed.

4           MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, as you might imagine at this  
5           point we have to be extremely careful and meticulous in our  
6           work and make sure that nothing gets slipped -- messed up or  
7           slips by. So we do need to take our time and the clock is  
8           ticking on them for sure.

9           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

10          MR. D. JOHNSON: And on the -- on (A) on the  
11          polarized voting side of it, we don't have any new data to  
12          present today.

13          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

14          COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I thought we were  
15          going to hear the constitutional -- I have a few comments  
16          about that. Am I able to express those, Chairwoman?

17          Because I thought we were going to hear some review  
18          of the constitutional -- is that -- wasn't that IV(A)? I'm  
19          sorry if I'm misunderstanding.

20          V(A), sorry.

21          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I'm not sure, you know,  
22          what you had in mind with that but, you know, by all means  
23          if it's relevant to the topic, I don't see -- you know, I  
24          think counsel would agree that it -- there's no reason not  
25          to -- to give you the floor.

1                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

2                   So I -- I didn't know if you were going to be again  
3 reviewing the constitutional criteria. I know we did that  
4 at one point earlier in the process, but that's what I  
5 was -- so you're saying you have no updates on that at this  
6 point; is that correct?

7                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

8                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

9                   All right. So I do want to make a couple of  
10 comments about the constitutional criteria that I actually  
11 have some real concerns about. I already expressed my  
12 concerns on legislative; I'm not going to repeat anything  
13 that I've already expressed on the legislative on  
14 December 22nd, but I do have concerns about the  
15 congressional and whether or not they have -- meet all the  
16 constitutional criteria.

17                   So am I able to express that at this time,  
18 Chairwoman?

19                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm going to defer to counsel  
20 on this one. If -- if this is the appropriate time/place.

21                   I mean, it's fine for me but I don't know if this  
22 is directly relevant to, you know, what we have agendized.

23                   MR. B. JOHNSON: Chairwoman, can you hear me? It's  
24 Brett.

25                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

1           MR. B. JOHNSON: So the -- the purpose of this  
2 agenda item was for the mapping consultants to present their  
3 information that they've collected over the period of time  
4 and any other kind of constitutional criteria that  
5 they've -- they've established.

6           In regard to deliberation on the existing maps and  
7 whether it's going to happen, that can either be that --  
8 will be obviously agendized for the final determination, but  
9 it is -- it's a pretty broad item; and if the other  
10 Commissioners wanted to discuss some of those issues now to  
11 possibly bring up in a different meeting that -- that's  
12 fine, too. But it was really meant for Mapping to give  
13 their report on the -- on the constitutional criteria.

14           I don't know if Roy agrees or disagrees.

15           MR. HERRERA: Yeah, I -- excuse me. I agree,  
16 Commissioner Lerner, I think the description is broad  
17 enough, so if you're discussing the constitutional criteria  
18 in how the maps comply with them or whether they comply with  
19 them, I think that would fit within this.

20           But given that Timmons is not going to be  
21 presenting any, you know, particular data on it now, it may  
22 be more appropriate to wait until we have it -- the full  
23 presentation at the last meeting, but it's really up to you.  
24 I do think it would fit within the agenda item if you want  
25 to, you know, do an exposition now.

1                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm fine doing it now, then  
2 they can present what they want to present or -- or the next  
3 time. But -- but I just have some things about the  
4 congressional that I wanted to -- that relate strictly just  
5 to the constitution, that's all I'm referring to nothing --  
6 nothing other than that.

7                   So if that's okay, I'll go ahead. If not, I can  
8 wait until the next meeting.

9                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Your choice. There's enough  
10 room to do as -- as you would like.

11                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I'll go ahead and do  
12 it now because I don't know what our next meeting will be  
13 and how long that will go, so maybe for the sake of time  
14 today is better potentially.

15                   So -- so I want to be real specific here as what I  
16 see as the constitutional flaws in our congressional maps.  
17 I spent the last couple of weeks just as you did,  
18 Chairwoman, looking at the maps in terms of the  
19 consideration how I felt at the conclusion of those.

20                   As you know, we had very little time in between the  
21 approval that we made -- or, the deliberations and then  
22 approval. So I have spent time looking at that. So I want  
23 to bring up my constitutional concerns about the  
24 congressional districts. As I said, I already think I've  
25 expressed my concerns about the legislative at the last

1 meeting.

2 So a lot of my concerns in terms of constitutional  
3 flaws relate to competitiveness, communities of interest and  
4 geographic boundaries, those three things; and I'm going to  
5 be very specific and give you the items that I am concerned  
6 about as part of the constitution.

7 CD-2 and CD-9, I -- I feel that we could have two  
8 very strong rural districts and I feel that we did not  
9 accomplish that. From the beginning there was a refusal to  
10 consider the constitutional requirements of geographic  
11 boundaries such as Mingus Mountain; to increase  
12 competitiveness in especially CD-2; to consider communities  
13 of interest and testimony, for example, the White Mountains  
14 communities saying they did not want to be with Prescott;  
15 Lake Havasu asking to be with Yavapai and Prescott; the West  
16 Valley of Maricopa County specifically saying they did not  
17 want to be in a rural district; and also the fact that the  
18 history of western Yavapai has been to be with the Colorado  
19 River communities.

20 We repeatedly, Commissioner Watchman and I, made  
21 the point about these kinds of issues and that western  
22 Yavapai County and the Mohave County used to be -- are used  
23 to being together.

24 We could have had, as I said, two rural districts,  
25 one of which would have been competitive. We could have



1 acknowledged that the Native Americans should have a voice  
2 in electing a representative that will be responsive to  
3 their needs, but we were denied those requests repeatedly.

4 Instead, CD-2 is not competitive and there's clear  
5 evidence in map 8.4 that it could have been, which in my  
6 mind says that we did not properly address the constitution  
7 with communities of interest, geography, and  
8 competitiveness; and CD-9 will be more ru- -- urban than  
9 rural, despite their requests.

10 For CD-6 and CD-7, I feel that there was a complete  
11 manipulation of the borders; and while it does fall into our  
12 competitive range, we showed in map 7.1, 9.1, 10.1, 11,  
13 11.2, and 12 that it could have been even more competitive,  
14 and the decision on the last day was to make it less so.  
15 And in terms of vote spread it went from 4-5 to 3-6  
16 Democrats to Republican.

17 In CD-3 we gave Councilwoman Pastor wide range of  
18 using requests for her boundaries that impacted the rest of  
19 the districts around those. The councilwoman requested  
20 boundaries that aligned with her Phoenix council districts  
21 and, thereby, if we look at the numbers, packed Democrats  
22 into a district and that affected the competitiveness of  
23 CD-1.

24 We talked about historic districts a lot in that  
25 area, but not all historic districts are the same and

1           there's no reason that they all needed to be in a VRA  
2           district at that point; and every attempt that we made to  
3           modify that district was refused despite community of  
4           interest concern.

5                   Overall my feeling is from a constitutional  
6           perspective that competitiveness was not adequately  
7           considered, despite the fact that we brought this up over  
8           and over again.

9                   The foul- -- and I'll give you some very specific  
10          examples. And Chairwoman, you just went through some  
11          examples that I also looked at about the election of our  
12          president in 2020 and senator in 2020. But when I look back  
13          at the -- the data that we compiled, that we were using as  
14          competitiveness factors, from the congressional district,  
15          only two of nine actually went to the Democrats, the  
16          governor 2018 and treasurer, Secretary of State, Attorney  
17          General, Mining, 2016 president all were three of nine.

18                   So those -- that is really not a -- a balanced when  
19          it's that -- that -- those numbers, when I went back and  
20          looked at that.

21                   But let me give you a few just examples and then  
22          I'll be done on where I think that things did not follow the  
23          constitution, despite our attempts to do so -- or I should  
24          say my attempt and my colleague Commissioner Watchman, his  
25          attempt as well since draft map 7.1 congressional map and

1 some earlier maps.

2 CD-1 went from a 1.6 percent with a 5-4 Democrat  
3 advantage; in map series 11, CD-1 was .2 percent with a 5-4  
4 Dem/Republican; and it ended with a 2.6, 4-5 Republican  
5 advantage.

6 CD-2 in map 8.4 was a 1.1 percent with a 4-5  
7 Republican advantage, and then went to 7.1 with a 0-9  
8 Republican advantage.

9 CD-3 went from 40 percent in map 7.1 with a 9-0  
10 Democrat advantage to 53 percent.

11 CD-4 went from 5.6 percent to 7.0 with a 8-1  
12 Democrat.

13 CD-5 went from 14.7 to 18.1 percent with a 0-9  
14 Republican advantage.

15 CD-6 went from .1 percent in map 9.1, as  
16 competitive as it could be, with a 5-4 Democrat advantage,  
17 to 2.4 with a 3-6 Republican advantage.

18 CD-7 went from a 20 percent in map 7.1 to  
19 35.4 percent with a Democrat advantage.

20 CD-8 went from 4.1 percent to 15.3 with a 0-9  
21 Republican advantage from a 3-6. There was no significant  
22 change in CD-9. In fact, congressional map CD draft map 7.1  
23 had five congressional districts with a single-digit vote  
24 spread.

25 Time and again our colleagues across the aisle

1 rejected -- the three colleagues across the aisle rejected  
2 our attempt to use competitiveness as a factor. It is part  
3 of the constitution. The areas that we wanted to use it  
4 were not going to significantly change communities of  
5 interest, and it allowed the maps to be systematically  
6 modified, the borders, to increase the vote spread in many  
7 of these districts.

8 The Democratic proposal 7.2, 8.4, 9.1, 10.12, 11.2,  
9 and 12 showed that we could have had competitive districts  
10 that honor all the constitutional criteria, but the maps  
11 that were approved do not do so and these concerns will  
12 affect my final vote.

13 Thank you, Chairwoman.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you for your comments.

15 I think everyone has their subjective opinion about  
16 what facts lead to a constitution CD map, but we're a  
17 democratic commission and every voice is equal.

18 The map was a creation of democratic consensus and  
19 I'm proud of the 5-0 vote. Some may have some buyer's  
20 remorse and wish for changes here and there; I do for sure.  
21 But the fact is that it was a unanimous decision and that  
22 speaks for itself.

23 Monday morning quarterbacking does not do justice  
24 to our sincere and equitable process.

25 I'd like to be able to move forward with the work

1 that we've done, and if there's no further comments, I'll  
2 open it up to my colleagues, we can move on with the agenda.

3 Okay. We'll move on to Agenda Item Number VI,  
4 Executive Director's report. We have two items, (A) public  
5 records update; and (B), final map approval and  
6 certification logistics.

7 Brian.

8 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Thank you, Madam Chair. First  
9 up for the public records update I'm going to turn it over  
10 to Lori.

11 MS. CRANK: Madam Chair.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes?

13 MS. CRANK: Lori -- Lori Van Haren is on a delayed  
14 flight right now and can't join us. She sent out the most  
15 recent public records request list to you-all.

16 We now ask to go into executive session to receive  
17 legal advice to the current public records request.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I will open it up to a  
19 motion to move into executive session, which will not be  
20 open to the public for the purpose of obtaining legal advice  
21 to further implement and/or advance these legal issues  
22 pursuant to public records A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair,  
24 Vice Chair Watchman motions to go into executive session  
25 regarding the public records update -- I'm sorry, regarding

1 the --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner York seconds.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second? Was that  
4 Commissioner York?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We'll do a quick vote.  
7 Vice Chair Watchman.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
16 aye.

17 With that, we will move into executive session for  
18 the purpose of obtaining legal advice. We will resume in  
19 public session, give an update.

20 Please X out of this link and go into the executive  
21 session link.

22 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive session  
23 from 8:27 a.m. until 8:47 a.m.)

24

25

\* \* \* \* \*

1                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,  
2                   everybody. We just finished up executive session on Agenda  
3                   Item VI, where we were seeking legal advice with the filling  
4                   responsibility for public records requests.

5                   And with that, we'll move to Agenda Item  
6                   Number VII, discussion of future agenda items requests.

7                   Anything would like to put on the agenda?

8                   Just, you know, foreshadowing with Item VIII  
9                   announcements and Item IX next meeting date, we are aiming  
10                  to reconvene two weeks from today, January 18th, 8:00 a.m.,  
11                  to do the final map certification and address any other  
12                  outstanding business items.

13                  But is there anything else that anybody would like  
14                  to add to the agenda?

15                  Okay. Again, a reminder, the next meeting date  
16                  January 18th.

17                  We'll move to Agenda Item Number X, closing of the  
18                  public comments.

19                  Please note members of the Commission may not  
20                  discuss items that are not specifically identified on the  
21                  agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action  
22                  taken as a result of public comment will be limited to  
23                  directing staff to study the matter, responding to any  
24                  criticism, or scheduling the matter for further  
25                  consideration or decision at a later date.

1           With that, we move to Agenda Item Number XI, I will  
2 open it up -- I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

3           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl motions.

4           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair -- I'll second.

5           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We have Commissioner  
6 Mehl moving to adjourn; we have Vice Chair Watchman  
7 seconding that motion.

8           We'll do a vote. Vice Chair Watchman.

9           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

10          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

11          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

12          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

13          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

14          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

15          COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

16          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
17 aye.

18          With that, we will adjourn, and we look forward to  
19 seeing everybody two weeks from today.

20          Take care. Bye-bye.

21          (Whereupon the proceeding concludes at 8:50 a.m.).

22

23          "This transcript represents an unofficial record. Please  
24 consult the accompanying video for the official record of  
25 IRC proceedings."



C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ARIZONA )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were taken before me, Angela Furniss Miller, Certified Reporter No. 50127, all done to the best of my skill and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my direction.

I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in the outcome thereof.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 6th of January, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR  
CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)

\* \* \*

I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 6th of January, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC  
Arizona RRF No. R1058