

1 So -- so fill me in, colleagues, on the strength to
2 which you're committed to 5.0 versus 5.1.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm committed to 5.1.

4 I really think it's the better map. I think we did
5 have amount -- small amount of testimony from Santa Cruz of
6 people that did want to split it, there's a real difference
7 in the communities of eastern and western Santa Cruz. So I
8 think that split is actually a very positive one; and
9 there'll be only minor things other than that.

10 So I will defer to Commissioner Lerner if you want
11 to make a motion first or if you want me to make a motion,
12 whatever -- however you would like to go about it.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to make sure that
14 there's no other further comment.

15 I'll entertain a motion.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I'm going to move --
17 I'm going to move to -- to begin with 5.0. I think -- I
18 think it gives us a little bit more room to work with than
19 5.1. I think it's a better map for us to make adjustments
20 off of.

21 I'm -- as I said, I've -- I think, you know, we
22 went -- we made some changes yesterday or earlier about the
23 legislative where we went back and took another look at
24 another map which was my reason for asking about 4.0. I
25 understand that's not where we're going to go today, that

1 we're going to go with any of the five-point maps; and of
2 all of those, in my opinion, we'll start -- I would
3 recommend 5.0 for the reasons that I've already mentioned.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh. If I could just add one
6 more thing?

7 I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Chair.

8 I feel that that's a compromise at least from my
9 perspective because of my -- my other preferences where I
10 would prefer 5.3, I would prefer going back, I feel 5.0 is a
11 good compromise as part of this to say -- you know, for the
12 sake of compromise we'll start with one of these maps, and
13 5.0 would be the one that I would suggest.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I second the
15 motion. Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
17 Vice Chair Watchman.

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.
20 We're voting on --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Hold on a minute.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hold on.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl is a yes on
24 5.0 as a compromise.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is a
5 yes.

6 With that, a 5-0. We will start with 5.0.

7 I'd like to just thank my colleagues for their
8 compromise and collegiality. It's a pleasure working with
9 you.

10 Something that I want to bring up as we're going to
11 dive into these maps, we're very far along in the process,
12 and it's at the point where I think we need to more
13 seriously be thinking about our requirements to honor the
14 VRA and -- and those requirements.

15 Just as an introduction, I want to ask the mapping
16 team to make sure that as we go back and we look at
17 Districts 3 and 7, to make sure that those are the right
18 configurations or to question are there different
19 configurations that would better meet our requirement to
20 honor the VRA as it relates to communities of interest as
21 well as polarization reports and the subsequent data that
22 support it.

23 So we're far enough along; I know our experts have
24 been catching up with that data. So, you know, before we
25 finalize maps, we'll want to be able to dive deeper into

1 that analysis.

2 I don't -- I don't believe that that needs to slow
3 us down right now from diving into, you know, the broader
4 map, but I did want to, you know, just put that on the
5 record.

6 I open it up to my colleagues.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I can make one
8 suggestion to get started.

9 Taking a look at -- if we just take a look at
10 District 5, do we want to complete -- add in -- and I'm not
11 looking at populations right now. I know we probably
12 should, but this is pretty balanced, and I know we're going
13 to be moving things around quite a bit, so -- but my thought
14 was that we should potentially move San Tan Valley, keep it
15 whole, in District 5 -- as part of District 5, because I
16 think at this point right now I think it's split.

17 If we look at the southernmost point of District 5
18 we could move that over -- I know. I know we're going to
19 have to adjust D-2, but that's one thing we could do.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I -- I'm sorry -- I'm
21 just starting now to look at the area, sorry. What's the
22 explanation for -- what's the goal you're trying to
23 accomplish right now?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Have San Tan Valley be whole.
25 Keep it together. In that one area.

1 You see how it's split down there, I was just
2 thinking we put it all in District 5 -- I think that's where
3 it probably belongs in District 5, but it could go all into
4 District 2. I was just trying to keep it all together
5 because I think that that's a community that would prefer to
6 stay together as one.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it's going to -- yes;
8 I think it's also going to affect the competitiveness. I
9 imagine it will decrease -- whatever competitiveness there
10 is in D-5, but...

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree, D-5 right now is a
12 not competitive at all.

13 And I don't know how -- I mean, I would love to
14 hear from my colleagues on how to make that district more
15 competitive, if there are some ideas on that. I don't know
16 how to do that.

17 So I do agree that it's -- it would decrease it. I
18 think there are a few districts that we can work on in terms
19 of that, but some of these districts have a very large
20 spread.

21 I think we could work on District 2 to make it more
22 competitive and District 8. Those two are sort of at 7,
23 8 points, we could potentially make those a little bit more
24 competitive. But there's going to be some districts on both
25 sides that just -- I don't know how we get there with that.

1 District 5 is one of those, it currently has about
2 a 15 percent spread and, again, we have some on -- on both
3 sides of the aisle with that.

4 But if we focus on the ones that are within our
5 range and maybe try to narrow that range, I would be all for
6 that. And those -- the ones that I see that are on the edge
7 of our range are District 8 and District 2 where we could
8 potentially narrow that and make them within our lower range
9 of competitiveness. We have those two ranges that we've
10 talked about.

11 So that -- that one was just, from my perspective,
12 just taking a look at that community and not wanting to keep
13 it separate as part of it, so.

14 For District 2, I would love to see a way for us to
15 actually make it more competitive, if possible. One thing
16 would be to consider if we could make more of Pinal County
17 whole in that area. That arm that goes in -- I'm calling it
18 an arm, I don't know what else to call it. If Anybody else
19 has any other terminology...

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: The thumb.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Huh?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: The thumb.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay, we can do that.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Looks like a hitchhiker.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But that goes in, we could

1 potentially move some of that into District 2, if we wanted
2 to take a look at that.

3 I'm not -- and that would probably be taking
4 Coolidge and Florence and putting those together since they
5 are closely related. And potentially Casa Grande, but
6 certainly we could potentially move something like Coolidge
7 in there.

8 And we'll have to find ways to balance -- I know to
9 balance population, but --

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to say -- I'm not
11 a fan of making D-5, you know, much more extreme, and -- and
12 in fact I'm wondering, you know, shifting 3 over slightly
13 moderate, you know, and shifting 4 over into 5 I think may
14 moderate -- moderate all of them.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Madam Chair, I can make a
16 suggestion on District D-1 and D-8. It's easy to adjust
17 lines if you can do them from one district to the other.

18 So if you were to pull D-8 down to Glendale. And I
19 don't know how much population is in there, then you can
20 take D-1. If you go up to the Cave Creek Road is, we talked
21 about having D-1 follow the canal on up to the -- the canal
22 is there just south of Cave Creek Butte, the recreation
23 area, and follow that canal up to the I-17.

24 You trade that population on with D-1 and D-8 and
25 you could go south on D-8 along that I-17 corridor there.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner York, so I just don't
2 know where that -- which canal?

3 Are you talking about District 1 coming into
4 District 8 along --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. Down along the I-17
6 corridor.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: So down to Glendale, that seems
9 like a pretty big population; and then in tradeoff for that,
10 you would follow the Carefree Highway or Cave Creek Road, I
11 guess. As a boundary you could -- if you look there's a
12 mountain preserve and a canal there about the freeway, I
13 think it is, off the 101, it goes north of Deer Valley
14 Airport and diagonal up towards I-17. And that north --
15 that north corner could be moved into D-1 as a tradeoff for
16 the population going south down; and it would probably give
17 us a little more balance.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What would you think,
19 Commissioner York, of taking that piece there that -- that
20 corner, the northwest corner of D-1, and moving that into
21 D-8 as part of that?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's what I was talking
23 about.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that what you were talking
25 about?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry. See.

3 So that would take New River, Cave Creek, Carefree,
4 some of that, and shift from D-1 over to D-8.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think that would make it
6 more --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That might be too much. I
8 mean, I don't know what the population shift --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was just cutting off that
10 corner of D-8 and trading it for that south piece, because
11 the southern piece will be more competitive.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think these -- am I -- I think
13 these are two different ideas.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: They are two different ideas.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They are --

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I was clarifying
18 what Commissioner York was -- was saying.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So --

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you please summarize
21 this?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let me take a shot at it and see
23 if I understand correctly.

24 So District 1, starting at the New River/Anthem
25 area, would actually move south to the canal and to the

1 north edge of the city of Glendale; District 8 would then
2 move -- District 8 would then pick up District 1 territory
3 on the south side of District 8 with District 8 coming south
4 in the more Central Phoenix piece to balance out that
5 rotation.

6 Is that correct -- correct, Commissioner?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. I just had you along the
8 I-17 and going to Glendale, but...

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. You're talking about only
10 moving the piece on the east side of I-17?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. Okay. Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think that's what I was
14 thinking, and that's where I'm -- I wasn't sure if I was on
15 the same page or not, I was looking at that -- it's not
16 showing up there.

17 That northwest corner of District 1 where we heard
18 a lot about people being connected -- New River, Cave Creek,
19 Carefree, Anthem -- and then I was thinking if we move that
20 into D-8; and then, Commissioner York, I may be getting this
21 wrong here, but were you thinking then of the areas like the
22 Camelback Mountain Preserve? Those areas, Moon River areas,
23 moving those from D-8 to D-1?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I was just moving down the
25 -- the Squaw Peak.

1 So keeping the same border, same eastern border of
2 D-8, just moving it down the Squaw Peak and picking up
3 Glendale that's a mile -- right now it's at Northern -- over
4 to D-3.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

6 I think -- I think what I'm hearing is that
7 Commissioner York's request is that the southeastern part of
8 District 8 would move south into District 1.

9 Whereas Commissioner Lerner's request, if I'm
10 understanding correctly, District 8 would pick up New River,
11 Anthem, Cave Creek, Carefree -- all that territory from
12 District 8 up to the -- the county line, and the District 1
13 would balance that by coming into the southern part of
14 District 8.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. It would take --
16 there were some areas in there that would have the Camelback
17 neighborhoods, things like that.

18 So I guess what I'm trying -- what I was trying --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well there's some geographies
20 there that --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Go ahead.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- creates sort of communities
23 of interest. If you -- along Carefree Highway to the north
24 there, there's a little bit of a mountain range and above
25 that is New River and Anthem is tucked in there, and Cave --

1 Cave Creek is over on the other side. So I'd like to keep
2 those in the same area with D-1, I think those people more
3 resinate with North Scottsdale and the Desert Mountain areas
4 than they do with south -- south, down into North Phoenix.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So what I was looking at --
6 and maybe we can try both options to see how those work out.
7 I think was thinking some of those movement might help.

8 I mean, D-1 right now as it is if we didn't touch
9 it --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's pretty competitive.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- it's pretty competitive.
12 So if we left it completely as it is, it's a pretty
13 competitive district.

14 I -- I was really trying to focus more on those
15 districts that were -- where there was -- I mean, in some
16 ways I almost want to keep D-1 the way it is, because I
17 don't know if we'd ever get anything better than that with
18 a .1 percent spread. So that's why -- I mean, I was
19 interesting in looking at your idea for D-8 moving it south
20 potentially.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: That was to make it more
22 competitive was one of the --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, no. I'm agreeing with
24 that is a possibility.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to -- I'd like to

1 keep open the possibility that if we keep it within a
2 4-point spread, which is very competitive, and it
3 significantly helps another district, that we at least keep
4 open -- you know, an open mind to that.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: And with just looking at the light
6 impact, Commissioner Lerner, what we're talking about with
7 District 8 moving north. District 8 right now is -- it's a
8 8.2 percent, so it's not far outside of our range, but that
9 is currently 8.2 percent Republican advantage.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Mm-hm.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: So if we move that north into New
12 River and Anthem, it's going to make it even worse, I think.
13 Or --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Got it.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: I don't mean worse -- larger.

16 So I don't --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, that's why I was trying
18 to move it south a little bit.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's why I was trying to move
21 it south a little bit.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

24 I'm just showing you, Commissioner Lerner, with
25 that -- given that that's the likely result, would you still

1 want us to draw that or not?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, no. That makes sense.

3 No, no. I -- I -- it's moving south a little bit,
4 it's just a matter of what happens with District 1 at that
5 point. So it's trying to keep the District 1 -- I would
6 still like to keep it really tight, if possible. So, it's
7 whatever those -- what those changes would do to District 1,
8 I guess.

9 But I think the idea of moving it south is a good
10 idea, but if we can limit the impact to some extent on
11 District 1 where it's reasonable in terms of communities of
12 interest, I think that would be great.

13 Let's see.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I think an 8-point spread
15 in D-8 is -- is, you know, really reasonable. I mean --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think -- I think your idea
17 of a 4-point would be great. If we can get to those.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, even 5 would be better.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Or 5. Even 5, you know,
20 would -- would be great.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm happy with 8. I mean,
22 I'm happy with -- you know.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, I mean that -- that is the
24 purpose of these tests, to see if it helps; and, if not, we
25 go back.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: So, no problem. Happy to check
3 that out.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I'm going to propose
5 it, even though I pretty much know what the answer is going
6 to be, but I'll throw it out there anyway: I would like to
7 know if there's any way we could go back to the
8 discussion -- so I'm looking at District 9, and District 9
9 extends a great deal into Maricopa County, it extends over
10 into Sun City West, Buckeye, areas that we have been talking
11 about and it -- it doesn't necessarily fit.

12 And it didn't matter whether this was 5.0 or 5.1,
13 it doesn't fit with that district very well.

14 So I would like to propose to see if we can look at
15 what happens if we take that Prescott piece, put into
16 District 9, and then we open up those areas in Maricopa
17 County to be back with other Maricopa County.

18 I mean, it would cause a bunch of shifts, I know,
19 but it could potentially be with Maricopa County --

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner, I don't
21 think we can do that -- we can ask the consultants --
22 without going all the way, you take so much out of 2, that's
23 going to push 2 down into 6, and that was the discussion we
24 just had and voted the other way, so.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I realize that.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Unless they have another way of
2 doing that.

3 You're going to make me try to get Santa Cruz split
4 again immediately instead of trying to hold on.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, no, I realize that.

6 You know, I personally still feel that that would
7 be a great option if we can do it. But I do understand what
8 you're saying.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, and, Commissioner Lerner, I
10 guess the challenge we ran into 5.3, we did -- obviously
11 when we presented we focused on 9 and Prescott Valley. The
12 other piece that we wrestled with is the challenge of 2 --
13 we didn't really highlight this, but in order to make up for
14 losing that population, 2 actually comes into Apache
15 Junction and Mesa. So that's -- that's the challenge of
16 where else would we go for that.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Right.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest a minor look at
19 where 9 comes into Yuma. 9 actually still a little short on
20 population and 7 is a little over on population, and to the
21 extent we can increase the cohesiveness of 7 Hispanicly,
22 that would be good.

23 So if there's areas of Yuma or that I-8 -- again,
24 we're talking small areas -- that would be non-Hispanic that
25 could come out of 7 and go into 9, then I think that would

1 be a good adjustment.

2 And I think we have looked at some other map
3 somewhere that we did that a little different.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I actually think that's a
5 good idea. I think you got Wellton right there that you
6 could pull in.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm kind of stuck on
8 Commissioner's Lerner's problem that she brought up,
9 although I didn't like the solution of Sun City West and
10 Surprise kind of being a little isolated there.

11 And I don't know if there's any way to get them
12 into -- into D-8, shifting some population up to D-1, which
13 I know -- and then shifting some population of D-1 into D-2
14 without totally ruining everything.

15 But yeah, I -- I imagine that those residents are
16 not -- not going to feel that this is a great solution for
17 them.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I would argue that that
19 303 Loop that comes to the west of Sun City, it's a
20 brand-new corridor that I think those people resonate quite
21 a bit with I-10 as it heads west out to California. And so,
22 you know, the La Paz County is -- is primarily rural, the
23 west side of Maricopa County is primarily, I mean
24 agricultural and so is La Paz County; and so from that
25 standpoint, there's quite a bit of cohesion as far as

1 connecting the warehouse district along I-10 and the 303 and
2 the 202 Loop, as well as connecting the -- the sort of I-10
3 traffic that moves the freight across from California to
4 Phoenix.

5 So, yeah, geography-wise it looks a little funky,
6 but I think those people identify more with the people that
7 we have in District 9 than currently along the I-10
8 corridor, especially than they would anywhere else in the
9 state.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, it's not -- it can --
11 it can work. I mean, that's -- that's not a deal breaker
12 for me at all.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: And the other -- I was just doing
14 some quick numbers just so you have them.

15 It's a little different where over on the West
16 Valley, those areas are touching onto San Tan, District 2 is
17 really staying a rural district.

18 District 9, despite the area that you see on the
19 map, I was just looking at it, just bar- -- just under
20 30 percent of the population is in Mohave and La Paz
21 Counties, about 70 percent of the population of that
22 district is in the West Valley. So Even though it looks
23 like a rural district that is just touching the West Valley,
24 it's actually a West Valley seat that just happens to
25 include the rural areas in it.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: District 9?

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah.

3 Yeah, just roughly 71 percent of the population in
4 that district is in Mohave -- in Maricopa County, so.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm not sure if we've made
6 any adjustments to District -- I'm sorry, District 2 and 8,
7 which were the ones that if we could narrow down that
8 competitiveness piece and keep communities of interest
9 together.

10 I guess we did that one change Commissioner York
11 mentioned, I guess we could take a look at that once it's --
12 once it's mapped and see if those helps us.

13 'Cause I think we get the smaller the spread, I
14 think the better it will be for all the communities as part
15 of it; and it keeps 1 and 6 pretty competitive.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and we also we have
17 Commissioner Neuberg's request for further analysis around
18 the other constitutional requirements --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- that needs to happen with
21 this map.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would like to table this
24 map and maybe move on in the agenda and let the mapping team
25 get to work.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Does that sound like a good
2 -- good plan?

3 I mean, it sounds like you got some additional
4 feedback as well as some additional work on the VRA piece.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think that works.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

7 In terms of moving forward, would you like to come
8 back and present us anything on the legislative front? If
9 not -- I mean, let us know if you're ready for anything.

10 MR. FLAHAN: We will have some legislative maps.
11 If you want to take a ten-minute break, we can go look at
12 them and bring them back in here.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. How about a ten-minute
14 break, and we'll go through the latest iterations of the
15 legislative map before we wind down.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Sounds good.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you. Ten-minute break.

18 (Recess taken from 3:44 p.m. to 4:06 p.m.)

19

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If we can get our team
21 together, we can resume the public meeting.

22 It is 4:06, and we will dive right back into Agenda
23 Item No. V, and I believe our mapping team has some updates
24 for us on the legislative maps.

25 MR. FLAHAN: We have three new versions of the

1 legislative map in 6.0.

2 MR. KINGERY: Oh. Hold on.

3 That is the breakdown.

4 MR. FLAHAN: And that is -- that is the breakdown:
5 6.0, 6.1 and 6.2. We have 6.0 because both changes one and
6 two incorporated both the same Maricopa County changes, but
7 then make changes to the southern district. So for a
8 mapping perspective, it was easier for us to develop
9 Maricopa County and then build two versions off of that with
10 the changes in the south.

11 So we'll start with 6.0.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: These are not yet posted?

13 MR. FLAHAN: These are not yet posted, and if we
14 want to look at demographics or competitiveness data, we can
15 look at the table on the screen; I don't have the PDF
16 generated just yet.

17 So 5.0 [verbatim] it was built off of 5.1 and the
18 Tempe City boundary was used as a district boundary, the
19 city of Guadalupe was united into one district -- okay.

20 Zoom into the west side of Tempe. There you go.

21 So you can see there in District 8 and District 11,
22 we used the Tempe border, and then we also included the city
23 of Guadalupe into District 11.

24 The Phoenix airport district was moved into
25 District 11; and then we also united the communities along

1 the eastern border of the Gila Indian Reservation.

2 So it's balanced, everything is assigned, and we
3 used this as the precursor for building the southern
4 districts in 6.1 and 6.2.

5 Over on 6.1.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You didn't adjust 9 and --

7 MR. FLAHAN: What was that?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You didn't really make the
9 adjustments to 9 and 10 that we talked about at this point?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we -- so District 8 pushed a
11 little bit east over to the freeway, so the area between the
12 freeway; that was really all we could do within the
13 population balancing. We had talked about just using the
14 population balancing in there, so that -- that shows you how
15 small those population balancing changes are.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Go down to 16.

17 In 6.1, this is where we moved Marana into
18 District 16 which is the aqua color there on the screen; and
19 Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke moved into the orange
20 District 17.

21 Want to move in there?

22 Yeah, there. Zoom out now.

23 So that's what that area would look like if D-17
24 came up and D-16 went down to grab Marana.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: We have two districts that are the

1 same color?

2 MR. FLAHAN: They're very similar -- you talking
3 about 20 and 17?

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

5 MR. FLAHAN: Can you make 20 a different color?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, there you go.

7 MR. FLAHAN: So let's see.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: There you go. Thank you.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Also the southern tip of District 17
10 moved into the north -- I'm sorry, hold on. I lost my
11 place.

12 The southern tip of D-17 moved into District 19,
13 D-18 pushes farther north into District 17 and south into
14 District 19 for balancing, and District 20 pushes east into
15 District 18 for balancing.

16 The map is balanced, and that is Option 1 in the
17 southern half of the state in the Tucson area.

18 If we open up 6.2, this is a different alternate
19 way of doing the Tucson area.

20 Zoom down.

21 So the main purpose in this map is to combine
22 Red Rock, Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, Oro Valley,
23 Marana into a single legislative district which you can see
24 on the map there is District 17 in the orange color.

25 It is balanced.

1 District 16 had to move west into Yuma to do
2 population balancing; and District 18 moved east into Tucson
3 more for balancing.

4 The one thing that we couldn't do -- can you zoom
5 into the border of District 20 and District 17?

6 Keep zooming in.

7 The one thing we couldn't do -- you can see
8 District 20 encroaches into District 17 at the Casas Adobes
9 area. We had to split that for population balancing.

10 And --

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just -- just on that, just it
12 could be going into a Casas Adobes, it could be 19 coming
13 into Catalina Foothills, or 19 coming into -- or, 18 coming
14 into Catalina Foothills, just somewhere in there we had to
15 pick a population in order to get Marana and Oro Valley
16 united in 17.

17 MR. FLAHAN: And we had to cut a little bit of the
18 Catalina Foothills on the bottom of District 17.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: This is, as you've probably
20 spotted, this is Commissioner Mehl asked us to get creative,
21 so that's where the District 16 -- so the challenge in
22 putting Marana and Oro Valley together is that District 16
23 currently relies on that population. So the -- the way we
24 kept -- we achieved this was to essentially take 16 out of
25 the Tucson area. It comes to the border, but it doesn't

1 really have any population in Tucson; and now, instead, it
2 is a rural district that goes across and gets the north part
3 of Yuma County; then that then frees up 23 to go into Tucson
4 and complete the population circle there.

5 So that was how we had -- that's our way of getting
6 16 out of there so we could then put Marana and Oro Valley
7 together.

8 And this tradeoff actually -- now we have a lot of
9 flexibility to move around in Tucson now. We have all of
10 Tucson and it's extended area in a set of Tucson districts
11 so we can shift those around as you wish.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You have gotten creative and I
13 appreciate it. And it will take some -- it will take new
14 energy in the morning to -- to fully absorb it.

15 And then I did, I got an e-mail just a little bit
16 ago from Southern Arizona Leadership Council, which I've
17 alerted the Chairwoman to, from Ted Maxwell who is the head
18 of that council, and they have submitted a map for Southern
19 Arizona that -- that I would see if you could also bring
20 that up; and it's under Saguaro maps 002. Just submitted an
21 hour ago or so.

22 'Cause it has some interesting thing -- it's a
23 third creative alternative to the Southern Arizona; and --
24 and it has some things that appeal to me, but I haven't had
25 a chance to digest either of these two versions or that one.

1 But for the sake of closing out the day, I would
2 suggest if the Commissioners take a quick look at it and
3 don't object, to make it -- what is the -- the -- LD-6.3 so
4 that there's three alternative Tucson maps that are
5 officially entered; and then we can all sleep on this
6 tonight, and I'm sure we'll have some lively conversation
7 tomorrow. But --

8 MR. FLAHAN: Saguaro?

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

10 MR. FLAHAN: Before we jump there, go back to the
11 one other map, I did notice something.

12 District 16 did take the Fort -- or, the Fort Yuma
13 Indian Reservation and we can clean that up, but I did
14 notice it did get put into District 16 and separated.

15 So if the Commission allows, we will put that back
16 into District 23 to keep that whole.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Did they do a whole map or
18 just Tucson?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: They just did Tucson; but I
20 think they used our map from this morning to do it, so.

21 So I think it fits in, but just changes Tucson.

22 MR. FLAHAN: The border of Tucson somewhere.

23 MR. KINGERY: Yeah, it's yellow somewhere.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, take that off if you can.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Take the yellow border off.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Zoom out a little more so we can
2 see 17.

3 Interesting. So, as I mentioned, the challenge
4 when we're trying to get creative is District 16 when it
5 loses Marana and/or Oro Valley, where does it then go? And
6 in our creative approach we it took over to Yuma; and in
7 their creative approach, they actually take it down -- can
8 you zoom in on Tucson then?

9 They bring -- 16 comes out and goes around Marana
10 and comes into, I guess, Northwest Tucson.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Does anyone object to just
12 making this a third alternative that we can then all look at
13 tonight?

14 Okay. Then if that's all right with you, we'll
15 just label this the third LD-6.3, and we'll have those three
16 Tucson alternatives that we can talk about as we talk
17 through the rest of the LDs tomorrow.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are we by public notice have to
20 start at 8:00? Could we start at 9:00 and have a little bit
21 of time to look at these in the morning before we come in
22 or...

23 MR. B. JOHNSON: I guess what I'd recommend because
24 we do have an agendized time is, is that basically we open
25 up and immediately go into recess. I hate to do it to you,

1 but we got to make sure for the open meeting stuff that
2 we're following the agenda. It sounds weird.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We could go to our rooms and
4 study it.

5 MR. B. JOHNSON: Oh, you know what? We could call
6 in, that's exactly right.

7 So everybody could call in at 8:00 a.m. and then do
8 a roll call and then immediately recess.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Perfect.

10 MR. B. JOHNSON: It's frustrating, but that's
11 unfortunately --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Is that okay?

13 I don't want to be presumptive on that.

14 MR. B. JOHNSON: Except for Commissioner York who
15 has to be here.

16 Just kidding.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm willing to go along.

18 So what's the plan? What -- what is the
19 suggestion? To...

20 MR. B. JOHNSON: I think the suggestion was is that
21 everybody could call in at 8 o'clock and start the meeting
22 and then, if the Commissioners so chose, immediately go into
23 a recess to further consider the maps.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. The issue that many of
25 us are going be commuting at the time, I'm just a little

1 confused how this is going to logistically work for all of
2 us. Is this really something that's going to expedite
3 people?

4 I mean, just personally I'm -- yeah. What are we
5 going to call in a cars and start a meeting and then go on
6 recess?

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This wouldn't be the first bad
8 idea that I've had if people want to reject it, so.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, how long are we
10 anticipating on -- on going tomorrow? Because I would like
11 to leave about 3:00 tomorrow. If -- if we get there.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, we had scheduled
13 8:00 a.m. through the entire day --

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- to deliberate as long as
16 it is necessary.

17 We don't -- it's an organic process. I mean, none
18 of us know. You know, when we'll receive these new maps,
19 and nobody knows how much work we're going to want to, you
20 know, ask for additionally.

21 I don't want to -- we can certainly start at 9:00,
22 call in at 8:00. I mean -- I'll personally come here, and
23 we'll start the meeting and we can recess. So if -- if the
24 Commissioners would like an additional hour to study, we --
25 we can certainly do that. That limits time on the tail end.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Vice Chair Watchman, do you
2 have an issue on the tail end? Because if you do, I'll just
3 get up earlier and we'll start at 8:00.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I do.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I have to start a Navajo
7 ceremony up in Tuba City.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then in respect to
9 Vice Chair Watchman, let's just start at 8:00. And we'll
10 make that work.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you. Appreciate that.
12 I can fudge a little after 3:00, but, you know, that's my --
13 that's not my drop-dead time, but at least in that
14 timeframe.

15 But if we could start at 8:00, I would really
16 appreciate it. So, thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just request in the future
18 to our entire staff, our Commissioners, when we schedule
19 these long days and blocks, if there are conflicts that do
20 come up, let us know as soon as possible because it has an
21 implication for a ripple effect with the number of people.

22 So it sounds like we're going to aim again for
23 tomorrow from 8:00 to 3:00.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well 3:00, 4:00-ish.

25 4:00-ish is the latest, but yes.

1 And this just came up today so I need to address
2 it. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Before you -- you wrap. For the new
5 6.3, of the citizen submission, for the development history,
6 we are just going to add it as sort of a leg over here since
7 we don't know exactly where it came from being a citizen
8 submission.

9 And just so the Commission knows, we'll pull the
10 competitive and demographic data, but there will be no audit
11 log available for it at this time because there is no way
12 that we -- that we would have an audit log.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Or ever, actually.

14 MR. FLAHAN: Yes, you're right.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And so if we like it, you will
16 then go back and readjust something and create an audit log
17 and do it?

18 MR. FLAHAN: When we start touching it we can
19 create the audit log, but as of right now, but there is no
20 audit log that will be generated.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: At least that way we'll get to
22 see it and we'll --

23 MR. FLAHAN: Yep.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Thank you.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Just wanted to make sure we set that

1 up.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So if there's no other
3 further discussion on Agenda Item No. V, we will move to
4 Agenda Item No. VI.

5 Next meeting date will be tomorrow 21st from
6 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., depending on the flow of our mapping
7 work.

8 Next Agenda Item, No. VII, closing of public
9 comments.

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

17 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VIII,
18 adjournment. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With joy, I make a motion to
20 adjourn.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I second with joy.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,
23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes -- or, aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
7 aye.

8 With that, we will adjourn.

9 And I want to thank our Commissioners, our broader
10 team, the public for your relentless energy and commitment,
11 and we look forward to seeing you at 8:00 a.m.; and for
12 Mapping, I hope you get a few hours.

13 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 4:25 p.m.).

14

15

16

17

18 ***"This transcript represents an unofficial record.***

19 ***Please consult the accompanying video for the official***

20 ***record of IRC proceedings."***

21

22

23

24

25

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 10th of November, 2021.



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 10th of November, 2021.



Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058