

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona

October 21, 2021

8:19 a.m.

***Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 95340
(P) 623-975-7472 (F) 623-975-7462
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com***

Reported by:
Kimberly Portik, RMR, CRC
Certified Reporter No. 50149

Miller Certified Reporting

I N D E X

	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	ITEM NO. I	4
4	ITEM NO. I (A)	4
5	ITEM NO. I (B)	5
6	ITEM NO. II	6
7	ITEM NO. III	7
8	ITEM NO. IV	7
9	ITEM NO. V	16
10	ITEM NO. VI	174
11	ITEM NO. VII	174
12	ITEM NO. VIII	175
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, beginning at 8:19 a.m. on
3 October 21, 2021, at the Sheraton Crescent Hotel,
4 2620 West Dunlap Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, in the
5 presence of the following Commissioners:

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

11 OTHERS PRESENT:

12 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director
13 Ms. Loriandra Van Haren, Deputy Director
14 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant
15 Ms. Michele Crank, Public Information Officer
16 Ms. Marie Chapel, Community Outreach
17 Coordinator
18 Mr. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator
19 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
20 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr
21 Mr. Shawn Summers, Ballard Spahr
22 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer
23 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer
24 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group
25 Mr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographics Corp.
Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, National Demographics
Corp.
Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group
Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group
Mr. Brody Helton, Timmons Group
Mr. Colby Chafin, Timmons Group
Ms. Sarah Hajnos, Timmons Group
Ms. Anna Mika, Timmons Group
Mr. Ken Chawkins, National Demographics Corp.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If we can get everybody
4 situated, we do have a short day and with a potential
5 goal in mind if possible.

6 Okay. Why don't we all start by standing for
7 the pledge of allegiance.

8 (The pledge of allegiance was recited.)

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome,
10 everybody. It's been a long hard-working week, and I
11 appreciate everybody's diligence.

12 We'll dive right in. Agenda Item I, call to
13 order and roll call.

14 I(A), call for quorum. It is 8:11 a.m. on
15 Thursday, October 21st, 2021. I call this meeting of
16 the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

17 For the record, the Executive Assistant Valerie
18 Neumann will be taking roll. When your name is called,
19 please indicate you are present. If you are unable to
20 respond verbally, we ask that you please type your name.

21 Val.

22 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

25 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

2 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

4 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

6 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

8 MS. NEUMANN: And also in attendance we have
9 Executive Director Brian Schmitt, Deputy Director Lori
10 Van Haren, Public Information Officer Michele Crank,
11 Community Outreach Coordinator Marie Chapel and Alex
12 Pena. From our legal team, we have Roy Herrera, Daniel
13 Arellano, Shawn Summers from Ballard Spahr; Brett
14 Johnson and Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer. And our
15 mapping team, we have from Timmons Mark Flahan, Parker
16 Bradshaw, Brian Kingery; and from NDC Research, we have
17 Ken Chawkins, Ivy Beller Sakansky, and Doug Johnson.
18 And our transcriptionist today is Kim Portik.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please note for the
20 minutes that a quorum is present.

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

22 Val, was the notice and agenda for the
23 Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance
24 of today's meeting?

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

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

2 Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from
3 October 20th, 2021. That's yesterday. We had general
4 session, that's (A), and (B) we had two separate
5 executive sessions; the first one was to seek legal
6 advice regarding VRA compliance regarding the
7 legislative map, and the second session was seeking
8 legal guidance for VRA compliance and polarization
9 issues and that was for the legislative -- I'm sorry,
10 that was for the congressional map.

11 I open it up to any discussion. And if there
12 isn't any discussion, I will entertain a motion to
13 approve the minutes.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
15 I motion to approve the minutes for executive session
16 and open session.

17 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
18 seconds.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
20 Vice Chair Watchman.

21 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
4 an aye.

5 With that, the general session and two
6 executive session minutes are approved.

7 We'll move to Agenda Item No. III, opportunity
8 for public comments. Public comments will now open for
9 a minimum of 30 minutes and remain open until the
10 adjournment of the meeting. Comments will only be
11 accepted electronically in writing on the link provided
12 in the notice and agenda for this public meeting and
13 will be limited to 3,000 characters. Please note
14 members of the Commission may not discuss items that are
15 not specifically identified on the agenda; therefore,
16 pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action taken as a
17 result of public comment will be limited to directing
18 staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism,
19 or scheduling the matter for further consideration and
20 decision at a later date.

21 With that, we will move to Agenda Item No. IV,
22 discussion on the public comments received prior to
23 today's meeting.

24 Before I turn it over to my colleagues, I
25 wanted to acknowledge we have some guests that came a

1 very long way from Navajo Nation, wanting to share
2 public comments with us in person. We are so terribly
3 sorry, but it was not agendized. We do not have an
4 opportunity in the agenda for in-person comments. Open
5 meeting law in Arizona is very strict, and we cannot
6 make alterations in the agenda without at least
7 48 hours' notice.

8 With that, though, we greatly value your
9 feedback, and I believe that you have had the
10 opportunity to share your thoughts and your comments
11 with our Vice Chair. And so I'd like to first -- you
12 know, if the attorneys have anything to add on this
13 front just in terms of, you know, the situation we are
14 in with the inflexibility, and then I'd like to turn it
15 over to Vice Chair Watchman to summarize some comments.

16 MR. B. JOHNSON: Chairwoman, I don't have the
17 agenda in front of me, but there is -- you have to call
18 an item, and it is the public comment item to allow any
19 Commissioner to discuss about the public comment period
20 between the last meeting and this meeting, which would
21 be Item III on the -- on the item. So that would be
22 Vice Chair Watchman received public comment during that
23 period of time and now he is going to summarize his
24 perspective on that public comment from the Navajo
25 Nation. So Item III, if you would call that.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Then we'll move
2 back --

3 MR. B. JOHNSON: I'm sorry. It is Item IV. I
4 apologize.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's what we're on, on
6 IV now.

7 MR. B. JOHNSON: Okay. Just want to make sure.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So is there
9 anything else you'd like to add before I turn it over to
10 Vice Chair Watchman? Okay.

11 Vice Chair Watchman, please.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you, and thank you,
13 Madam Chair and my colleagues here. And (speaking
14 Navajo language).

15 And I want to see -- if I could have the guests
16 from Navajo introduce themselves for the record if you
17 don't --

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't know if --

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Is that okay or -- or
20 is --

21 MR. HERRERA: That's fine.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's fine. Okay.

23 So if we could, so that way I know that you
24 mentioned, Madam Chair, that they did travel quite a bit
25 and it is quite a ways, you know, to get from northern

1 Arizona to here, so I think I will have them introduce
2 themselves real quickly for the record.

3 So Mr. Mitchell.

4 MR. MITCHELL: Good morning. Arbin Mitchell.
5 Also present, Vice President, Navajo Nation.

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

7 MR. GORMAN: (Speaking Navajo language.)
8 Hello. Hello. Okay. (Speaking Navajo language.) For
9 all those in the audience and here that don't understand
10 the Native cultures, Navajos, we introduce ourselves by
11 our clans to recognize who we are in the society and in
12 the world.

13 My name is Leonard Gorman. I'm the executive
14 director for the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission.

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Anybody else from Navajo?

16 MS. BERNALLY: Good morning. My name is Lauren
17 Bernally. I am a policy analyst for the Navajo Nation
18 Human Rights Commission. (Speaking Navajo language.)

19 I look forward to working with you guys. Thank
20 you.

21 MS. CHARLEY: Good morning. My name is Tiffany
22 Charley. (Speaking Navajo language.) I am the public
23 information officer for the Navajo Nation Human Rights
24 Commission.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: And your legal advisor or

1 counsel.

2 MS. DWORKIN: Good morning. Judith Dworkin,
3 from the law firm of Sacks Tierney, and I represent the
4 Navajo Nation in this matter.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good morning. I'm Mike
6 Balucky (phonetic). I'm the political consultant, and I
7 assist the Navajo Nation.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

9 And so if I could, I'll try to summarize. But
10 first thank you for joining us. We appreciate you
11 traveling a distance to be before us. Unfortunately, as
12 you were informed, the agenda does not allow for public
13 comment physically. We do accept comments via
14 electronic mechanism. And so --

15 But I know that you have submitted on numerous
16 occasions your concerns and your position regarding the
17 congressional and legislative districts. And so a
18 couple things that I think I want to notice. One, thank
19 you for the map that was submitted the other day. We
20 did -- we did receive it and we did log it into our
21 system. We've had a couple discussions on it.

22 But maybe first and foremost what I should say
23 is that, you know, we're still in the process of trying
24 to determine the draft, the final draft maps. And so
25 today is our fifth day of discussion and deliberation on

1 both maps, and so the plan is to come up to it -- an
2 approved draft, draft district so that we can get out
3 for 30-day public hearing. And so there's plenty of
4 time to provide additional comments.

5 But I think for my colleagues here, a couple
6 things that I'm hearing is that the Navajo Nation has
7 requested the Commission to consider a 10 percent
8 deviation when it comes to the population count, and I
9 think the Commission has heard that. We did see your
10 map, and it did -- we did overlay that with what we
11 heard from other communities of interest in the area,
12 and so we acknowledge that. I think there's been a lot
13 of discussion also about the other tribes, in particular
14 legislative district proposed district No. 6, the other
15 tribes and their interests and their desires. And I
16 believe we heard from Hopi, we've heard from Hualapai,
17 and they are of the position of wanting to be in the
18 same district as the Navajo Nation. And I think there's
19 some concern about the White Mountain Apache tribe. I
20 don't recall hearing from them in particular, but
21 there's been discussion about their willingness to be
22 included in the district or not. And that goes also to
23 the San Carlos Apache tribe. And so I am -- I am hoping
24 that the other tribes in the state will submit their
25 comments and what they feel is in their best interests

1 for congressional and legislative districts. And so --

2 But I will conclude here that thank you. And
3 also, I should also acknowledge that there is also a
4 memorandum submitted from the Navajo Nation's legal
5 counsel regarding Navajo redistricting deviation, and so
6 I think this speaks to the deviation issue. And so I
7 think all the members here have received it.

8 And so I just want to acknowledge to the Navajo
9 Nation representatives that we do have all the
10 information. We're in the process of deliberating. And
11 so, you know, my apologies again for not giving you the
12 time to speak, but there will be opportunities coming
13 up. You know, we have 30 days of public hearing and
14 public comment, and so we hope that, you know, we'll
15 hear from you again. You're invited to join us here;
16 we're going to try to do everything possible to get out
17 to the state and get up to the Navajo area.

18 And so with that, Madam Chair, I will stop
19 there.

20 But thank you for joining us, and we will
21 continue with the agenda.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Vice
23 Chair Watchman.

24 And thank you again for, you know, coming and
25 attending, and we're deeply sorry that there just isn't

1 this agenda item.

2 I open it up for additional thoughts, comments
3 from my colleagues regarding the public comment we've
4 received since yesterday.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to say I --
6 thank you, first of all, again to the public. Thank you
7 for your attending today as well to the representatives
8 from the Navajo Nation.

9 We're getting a lot of public comments now
10 where we can -- at least from my perspective I can
11 recognize people are becoming very concerned about the
12 direction the maps are taking. So as Vice
13 Chair Watchman just indicated, we have long -- we still
14 do have quite a ways to go. We have a lot of public
15 comment periods to do.

16 We're working on draft maps, and so I want to
17 emphasize that piece. I have looked at a lot of the
18 very specific comments that you have from the public,
19 and we will certainly take those into consideration, as
20 we do with every comment that comes across. So thank
21 you.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The comments are certainly
23 robust. And now because of the process we're able to
24 see more specific comments. So I think especially once
25 we approve whatever draft maps we approve there will be

1 really significant public input and it will be able to
2 be way more specific because you'll be looking at maps
3 to work from. So I thank those who are following us
4 closely.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
6 I'd like to acknowledge the fact that our process has
7 been very transparent. And the public's ability to see
8 our daily activities and listen to us as well as comment
9 on the fly is a tad overwhelming, but I also think it's
10 been a real benefit for the citizens of Arizona, to the
11 fact to point to our guests this morning responded
12 basically to our behavior yesterday as we discussed a
13 map that was submitted and made a gallant effort to get
14 down here and present their opinions and ideas to help
15 us make better decisions for the future. And so I think
16 we have a lot of things to be proud of as we work on our
17 process.

18 One of the issues we have is the communities of
19 interest tend to create dense populations of like-minded
20 folks. And so sometimes that's not always in the best
21 interest of our constitutional efforts. So just please
22 bear with us. We're working our butts off to do a good
23 job, and we really appreciate the feedback.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Very well said by all.
25 We're working in good faith. Thank you, everybody, for

1 your public comments. These are draft maps. The
2 Commissioners are learning constantly. The public is
3 learning constantly. And we will have a robust review
4 period and, you know, further, you know, intense
5 deliberations. So let's be patient as a state and keep
6 up the collegial dialogue and real debate that's going
7 on. I think we are really a wonderful example in the
8 country.

9 If there are no other comments on public
10 comments, I'm going to turn it over to our mapping team,
11 Agenda Item No. V, draft map decision discussion. I
12 believe we are going to start with congressional map
13 drawing first. I suggest that we begin by reviewing the
14 options and then making a decision on a starting point.

15 MS. NEUMANN: Excuse me, Madam Chair. Our
16 Spanish interpreter is here.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I apologize. Thank you.

18 MS. LOPEZ: Good morning. My name is Brenda
19 Lopez. I'm a Spanish interpreter. If my services are
20 needed, I will be right here. (Speaking Spanish.)

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Madam Chair, we received
23 the legislative maps earlier than we did the
24 congressional. Is there -- last night. Is there any
25 way to review those first? Because the congressional,

1 we didn't get to look at all of them until pretty late.
2 Just asking if that's possible.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I had heard a request for
4 congressional first, but let's put it up for a vote, an
5 informal vote, on whatever the majority wants.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't have an opinion.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let's do legislative if
8 you don't mind, mapping. I know that we are making a
9 pivot a little bit here.

10 MR. FLAHAN: Good morning. Up on the screen
11 now, legislative maps, we have 6.0, 6.1, 6.2 which we
12 previewed at the end of yesterday and we will re-go back
13 over today. And then you can see LD 6.3 in the yellow
14 box. That was the citizen submission that we turned
15 into 6.3. So it's there as the yellow because there
16 will not be an audit log for that. We did generate,
17 though, demographics and competitive data for it. That
18 way the public knows why it is yellow.

19 Bring up 6.0. So the major goals of 6.0 was,
20 one, to develop a base that we could use to make two
21 different changes down in the Tucson area, but also to
22 incorporate the changes in the Maricopa County area.
23 This was built off of LD 5.1. The city of Tempe
24 boundary was used as a district boundary and the city of
25 Guadalupe was united into one district. The Phoenix

1 airport was moved into District 11. Yeah, there we go.
2 So the first change for the city of Tempe and the city
3 of Guadalupe, you can see that is now -- city of Tempe
4 is in the pink district, which is District 8, and city
5 of Guadalupe is now in District 11, including taking the
6 Sky Harbor Airport section.

7 The other thing that happened is we united the
8 communities along the eastern border of the Gila River
9 Indian reservation.

10 The popu- -- the map is balanced and it is
11 missing no population. And there was nothing that we
12 couldn't do with this map.

13 So we used that as a base to build LD 6.1.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: You also made some changes,
15 you pulled D-4 down to Thomas Road, if I remember
16 correctly. Because I think it was -- before it was --
17 maybe not. I mean, I just thought that we incorporated
18 the Arizona Country Club community also.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. You're right. We did bring
20 D-4 down to Thomas Road.

21 Why don't you go ahead and bring up 6.1.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I ask a question? To
23 refresh my memory, Doug, I know we looked at moving --
24 rotating 9 and 10 per Commissioner Lerner's request. Is
25 there -- I can't remember why we didn't do that.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. In the end, where we
2 left that was to not ripple through 15, and so the only
3 change we moved -- we made was within the population
4 deviation. So District 8 does move into Mesa a little
5 bit over to the freeway, but -- so the very western tip
6 of Mesa is that vertical piece in District 8. But
7 outside of that, we didn't rotate it additionally.
8 We're happy to if you wish.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, that was a request
10 from yesterday was to make that effort to rotate those
11 as part of it without taking all of the -- keeping the
12 light rail piece. I mean, we can take a look at it
13 today again, but we did request that.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. My apologies if we
15 misunderstood. I thought -- I thought the end of the
16 conversation we had gone back to just that deviation
17 mix. If there is an interest in rotating them -- well,
18 we can come back after we introduce the other maps.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. We can -- I think
20 once -- as we get to looking and once we select which
21 one, we can come back.

22 Thank you, Commissioner York, for reminding us.

23 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So 6.1 builds off of 6.0,
24 and the changes are down in the greater Tucson area.
25 And here in the map, Marana moves into the aqua-colored

1 District 16. And Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke
2 will move into the orange District 17 that neighbors 16.
3 The southern tip of D-17 is going to move into D-19.
4 D-18 pushes farther north into D-17 and the south into
5 D-19 for population balancing. And D-20 pushes east
6 into District 11 -- or, sorry, District 18 for
7 balancing.

8 And that was the major change to show what it
9 would look like to have Marana moved into District 16
10 and Oro Valley moved into -- and Saddlebrooke to move
11 into District 17.

12 The map's balanced. All the population is
13 assigned. There is nothing that we could not do with
14 those requests.

15 And this sort of -- this is one request down in
16 the Tucson area we got, and 6.2 is the other request
17 that we got in the same area.

18 So again this was built off the 6.0 map, and
19 the only changes were in the Tucson area. And the main
20 goal for here was to unite the communities of Red Rock,
21 Saddlebrooke, SaddleBrooke Ranch, Oro Valley, and Marana
22 into one singular legislative district.

23 Scroll up a little bit.

24 So you can see District 17 now has the cities
25 of Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, and it got the

1 SaddleBrooke Ranch portion into District 17.

2 District 16 moved west into Yuma to incorporate that
3 change.

4 And move over to Yuma. Zoom in to -- yeah.

5 You can see at the end of the meeting we
6 mentioned uniting the Fort Yuma Indian reservation, and
7 we have done that into District 23. So you can see
8 there's now a small north section over there. And then
9 District 18, in the Tucson area, moved more east into
10 Tucson more.

11 The one thing that we were not able to do was
12 to keep all of the communities of interest of Catalina
13 foothills into Oro Valley. We had to split it at Casas
14 Adobes for population balancing.

15 Scroll up a little bit.

16 So you can see District 20 does cut in a little
17 bit to District 17 at that area.

18 I mean, with that, those are the three
19 legislative district maps that we have for you. Then we
20 do have 6.3, if you want to bring up 6.3.

21 Legislative District 6.3 was a citizen
22 submission that you asked for us to present as 6.3. I
23 believe the comments yesterday was talking about looking
24 at the Tucson districts, but that's all the information
25 that I have for you on this.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Let's open it up
2 for conversation about a starting point. And I ask my
3 colleagues to -- you know, let's discuss all first
4 before making a motion, please. And I'd like you to
5 speak not just to the very specific changes but also
6 speak to why you think that starting point fits in with
7 a broader vision for the map. I mean, today, you know,
8 as we're putting all of these pieces together we want to
9 make sure that we're trying to deliver a whole product
10 that maximizes again as many of the six constitutional
11 criteria as possible and as many of the communities of
12 interest. So let's talk how your recommendation fits
13 with that broad state vision.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: As well as I know southern
15 Arizona, I've struggled with how these districts
16 properly should be drawn. And all three presentations,
17 and I -- the two official ones and the citizen one, all
18 create very similarly competitive districts, and indeed
19 they're -- District 17 in any configuration is a -- is a
20 dead-heat district or slightly in Dem.

21 The map I like the least is the 6.1 that
22 divides Marana and Oro Valley. And you've heard me for
23 many days speaking to the importance of combining Marana
24 and Oro Valley, so I'm at least consistent. And so I
25 really would prefer us not to be going with 6.1

1 whatsoever. And I have -- there's a lot of public
2 opinion in Marana that they want to be with Oro Valley
3 and vice versa. They're incredibly similar communities.

4 So of the three, I would favor the citizen one
5 for southern Arizona. It was laid on top of an older
6 map for the north, so I am not suggesting any changes to
7 the north from that map. But for 16, District 16 on
8 down, I favor that map. And one of the key things that
9 it accomplishes is some -- is to greatly improve
10 District 20 and make it a more solidly majority-minority
11 because that was one of the marginal -- more marginal
12 districts that needs to be a majority-minority district.
13 And the Hispanic percentage from -- at 6.2 is only
14 around 34, 35 percent, and it goes up to 47, 48 percent
15 in -- in the citizen map. So that is actually a
16 significant benefit of that map. And I like how Marana
17 and Oro Valley are combined. It combines the out -- the
18 outskirts of the eastern -- unincorporated area of the
19 eastern Pima County that are really similar in character
20 and make-up and an attitude towards legislative issues
21 with Marana and Oro Valley.

22 So I would speak in favor of the southern
23 Arizona portion of that -- of that citizen map combined
24 with the other northern maps.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's almost become, which

1 is why I smile whenever -- with -- Commissioner Mehl
2 goes first or he smiles when I go first, because it's
3 almost ironic that I favor 6.1 as part of it. And I
4 know Commissioner Mehl has been very consistent on the
5 Marana, but we have seen comments both ways on where
6 Marana should go.

7 I'm all in favor of making sure that Oro
8 Valley, Casas Adobes, all of those communities are drawn
9 together. And I think there's certainly, you know,
10 movement there. But I see that, and I am certainly not
11 a Tucson person and would never speak to that. But I do
12 see those connections. And every time we've tried to
13 put Marana in, I feel like it could potentially alienate
14 others. I see Marana and Red Rock, that connection.
15 That whole I-10 corridor as part of that I see as a
16 tighter connection. I understand, and as
17 Commissioner Mehl has said, he's been very consistent.
18 I certainly acknowledge that.

19 My preference for 6.1 is I think it provides us
20 with some good balance overall in terms of what's there.
21 While it doesn't get us all the way there in terms of
22 where we want to go, I see that there's some really
23 potential for some of the communities. Looking both in
24 the south as well, I like -- in terms of the way the
25 layout is, I feel they're more compact, the districts

1 overall around the state with 6.1. I think there's room
2 for improvement. There certainly would be room to make
3 some modifications of the kind that Commissioner Mehl is
4 looking at.

5 In terms of some of the other reasons, LD-16 in
6 the other maps, 6.0 and 6.2, goes across three counties.
7 And so that combines a number of different communities.
8 Part of why I like 6.1 is because I'm hopeful that we
9 can start to condense some of these as well.

10 To some extent I find the configuration -- and
11 I'm just speaking to 6.1 here because that's the one I
12 tend to feel is a good starting point, knowing that
13 we're going to make changes. I feel that it actually
14 provides us with some opportunities to make some changes
15 and acknowledges some of the connections for folks,
16 placing the Gila River Indian Community connected with
17 Casa Grande, as they have requested. And some of the
18 communities in the south, they actually have requested
19 to be in District 16 as they are in this one. So I just
20 feel that --

21 And in Maricopa County, I feel that other than
22 that piece that we talked about earlier with -- which is
23 the same in all of the districts for D-8 -- for D-9 and
24 10, I feel it acknowledges a lot of where we're at
25 today.

1 So for me, 6.1 would be a good starting point
2 for our discussions today versus -- and I could go into
3 more detail on why the other ones are not, but I guess I
4 just wanted to start with why I felt that that one would
5 be more effective.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: As an added point on 6.3, I
7 do have great respect for Southern Arizona Leadership
8 Council and that business community, and they really
9 are -- they really prefer that configuration and feel
10 like it would give them better representation for
11 southern Arizona. I think we've all gotten a copy of
12 the letter from Ted Maxwell. So that to me is also very
13 influential. And, again, that's the map that I would
14 want to support.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if -- could I speak to
16 that submission? I was very -- I'm grateful for all
17 of -- we have 106 at least submissions right now,
18 probably is above that. I'm -- I may not have double
19 checked. And I think we need to be looking at all of
20 those submissions; they all have good ideas. Well, I
21 don't want to say all, but many of them will have good
22 ideas. That submission we gave -- because of
23 Commissioner Mehl's relationship with that, I was fully
24 supportive of having us take a closer look at it, but I
25 would be uncomfortable supporting it.

1 We received it at the end of the day yesterday.
2 It does create some partisan shift. So I'm more than
3 happy to consider it in our discussions today. I would
4 not support at all having us adopt that particular map
5 as part of it, especially since we are not doing that
6 with other publicly-submitted maps at this point.

7 I would encourage us and I had -- I will say
8 that I have not been as good as I should have been in
9 keeping up with the maps that have come in in the last
10 week and a half or so because we have been so focused on
11 what we've been doing here. I plan to use our next few
12 days, when we don't have meetings, to look at those maps
13 more closely. But that really concerns me to take one
14 publicly-submitted map, make those adjustments, and then
15 consider adopting it. I am open of course to looking at
16 their recommendations and considering what they've had
17 to say.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I gratefully respect
19 Commissioner Lerner, but I just think you're wrong on
20 this point. From day 1 we've said we're going to be
21 welcoming citizen-input maps, and any one of the five
22 Commissioners is welcome to review whatever maps and
23 suggest to the Commission anything they would like. And
24 I did this yesterday with plenty of notice so we could
25 all review it last night.

1 But I like this map and I think it has some
2 real positives, and I don't think it's out of place at
3 all for me to propose this as a -- as a direction to go.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other feedback from
5 Commissioners who have not yet shared their thoughts?

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: This is Vice
7 Chair Watchman. With regard to 6.3, you know, if I can
8 liken that to the Navajo Nation concept, I threw it out
9 as an idea, you know, with the thought that we can
10 discuss it. And so -- but, you know, if -- I guess my
11 thought is that if we're going to follow what
12 Commissioner Mehl is thinking with regard to 6.3, then,
13 you know, I'd like to have the Navajo Nation proposal
14 submitted as another option to consider so that we can
15 all, you know, discuss all submissions. And so -- but
16 that could lead to many, many, many maps with
17 everybody's submission. And so I guess we have to
18 figure out how to, you know, put forth a stopping point.

19 I don't support 6.3. I think Map No. 6.1
20 offers more competitiveness. It reflects I believe as
21 a -- as a whole in the state all the state's communities
22 of interest. And of course, you know, from the
23 perspective of the tribes, I think it puts the tribes in
24 areas where it improves their ability to select their
25 candidate of choice. And so we are grouping the

1 northern tribes in the District 6 area and the southern
2 tribes roughly in the District 23 area, and then you got
3 a couple of tribes in District 30. But I think this map
4 is again a good starting point, you know. And obviously
5 we're going to make changes to that. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York, do you
7 want to make a comment before I respond?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I did like in the 6.3
9 version how District 20 became a very strong
10 minority-majority district. I did not like in 6.2 how
11 we took -- I mean, I thought it was clever that we
12 went -- took the I-8 corridor, but I also feel that
13 western Arizona doesn't have a lot to do with northern
14 Tucson in that part of the state, And so I was not in
15 favor of 6.2. I would probably have to go with my
16 colleague and support 6.3 at this point.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'd like to just make a
18 clarification. What I'm suggesting on 6.3 is that you
19 would -- that you're only making the changes in 6.3
20 shown from District 16 south. We would go back to 6.1
21 for everything north of District 16. So there's no
22 changes to the Navajo Nation, no changes to anything in
23 Maricopa County. That was overlaid on an older map.
24 But the -- so the proposal that I would make would be to
25 adopt the southern Arizona changes from District 16

1 south and -- of 6.3 and then everything north of that
2 the 6.1 map.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's exactly actually
4 where I was headed, meaning that -- so I'd like to share
5 that overall, because I'm asking us to think
6 wholistically, I found 6.1 more comprehensive. It was
7 more competitive. I like the balance in the northern
8 half of the state better. I don't want us to get bogged
9 down arguing over a starting point when we can adjust
10 either map to our liking. So if there are things in the
11 Tucson area, the southern part of the state, that we
12 want to adjust off of 6.1, that certainly remains, you
13 know, an option.

14 Any other final thoughts on this before we take
15 a vote? Well, we have to entertain a motion on a map to
16 use as a starting point today.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Madam Chair, I will move
18 that we begin with Map 6.1 as a starting point,
19 Legislative Map 6.1 as a starting point.

20 MR. B. JOHNSON: Chair, before we do that, can
21 we go into executive session to discuss a legal issue,
22 please.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sure. Can you explain
24 what --

25 MR. B. JOHNSON: Can we go into executive

1 session to discuss a legal issue, please.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. Is there a
3 particular statute or rationale that I --

4 MR. B. JOHNSON: To discuss the legislative
5 district maps and the three that are under proposal. We
6 just want to make sure from a legal standpoint you all
7 are aware of the different versions.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

9 MR. B. JOHNSON: It's a -- it's a legal
10 procedural matter. It's not a substantive matter as to
11 the maps itself.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I'll entertain a
13 motion to go into executive session to seek legal advice
14 on these legislative maps.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do we need to rescind --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Mine wasn't seconded, so
17 it's probably okay. Right?

18 Do I need to rescind my motion?

19 MR. HERRERA: If it wasn't seconded, no.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: I move that the Commission
22 goes into executive session.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair seconds.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
8 an aye.

9 With that, we will move into executive session
10 to seek legal advice on the legislative districts.

11 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive
12 session from 8:53 a.m. until 9:25 a.m.)

13

14 * * * * *

15

16 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general
17 session.)

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All right. If I could
19 ask everybody to please reconvene.

20 Are we back connected to public session? Okay.

21 Welcome back, everybody. Thank you for your
22 patience. We went into executive session to discuss a
23 procedural issue related to the Legislative Map 6.3.

24 And because of a procedural challenge and the order in
25 which maps were approved, we are no longer considering

1 6.3.

2 And so with that, I turn it over back to
3 mapping. I believe you have some data to share with us
4 on the viable options.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair --

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What?

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: -- so are we going to, I
8 guess, delete that from the public record, too, that we
9 have on the system?

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. That is a
11 publicly-submitted map. It's for consideration. And
12 should the --

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I mean as the map
14 consideration for 6.3. I'm just -- procedurally, is
15 that -- yes, it's there for the record, but do we still
16 show it as 6.3 if we're not going to consider it?

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, no. We are no --
18 there -- are you asking if the mapping is going to
19 eliminate it from the website -- I mean from our link?

20 MR. KINGERY: So the citizen-submitted plan is
21 available on the website and in the system.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, but we don't --

23 MR. KINGERY: The IRC --

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: We don't -- we don't
25 assign a number to all the citizen-submitted maps, and

1 so we did for this one, 6.3.

2 MR. KINGERY: Right.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So what I'm saying is
4 that -- is that the right approach procedurally? Do we
5 put it and note it that it's in the record but it's
6 not -- it's no longer 6.3 on our system here?

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I think what we're
8 saying is it's no longer a viable option for us. I
9 think the question is do we need to physically eliminate
10 it from, you know, the draft map that we have online?

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Correct.

12 MR. HERRERA: So, Commissioner Watchman and
13 Madam Chair, is the question -- because obviously this
14 map can exist on the system as a -- as a
15 citizen-submitted map, which I think it already did.
16 And then it was converted to 6.3 per the request of
17 Commissioner Mehl. So is the question do we need to
18 delete the latter, which is the 6.3 piece,
19 Commissioner Watchman?

20 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's my question, yes.

21 MR. HERRERA: I don't believe it's necessary
22 given that's it's a Commissioner's request to see it.
23 So if any of the Commissioners I think made a request to
24 see a specific map --

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: But we didn't -- if I

1 could, we didn't approve it. You know, we all kind of
2 agreed, so --

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We didn't approve any of
4 these.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. These are all --

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: These are just --

8 MR. HERRERA: Right. So you didn't approve it
9 so it would basically end there in sort of that chart
10 that Timmons presents to you. But, similarly, if any of
11 the Commissioners requested to see something the next
12 go-around and Timmons created that map, that would be
13 the --

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I guess for the
15 public, though, if it's a map that we can't consider at
16 this point, so 6.3 we should change the label of it.
17 And it's available publicly, because, you know, the
18 public can take the assumption that, you know, if they
19 get enough support that every map that they submit can
20 be assigned a number, and I don't think we want to go in
21 that direction, so...

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If it would make Vice
23 Chair Watchman feel better, I'm happy to have it deleted
24 off of the 6.0 tree. And it's still up there as citizen
25 maps --

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- or map whatever. That's
3 fine with me.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I would like that. Thank
5 you, Commissioner Mehl.

6 MR. HERRERA: And just to confirm, that's --
7 that's allowable certainly. I think the question was
8 whether it was required. But if the Commissioners want
9 to do that, that's certainly something you can do.

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Got it. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It sounds like -- is that
12 something we would need to vote on? I don't -- you
13 know, there are other iterations of maps that are not
14 Commission approved, you know, that are on the sequence
15 of map developing. So just because there's a map there
16 with a number does not mean that that's an approved
17 Commission map. That's very important for the public to
18 understand.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But no vote? Okay.

21 So for the mapping team, let's, you know, get
22 rid of 6.3 given that it is not relevant. And we still
23 have the submission from the citizen for the public if
24 they'd like to look at that map and for our benefit as
25 well.

1 MR. KINGERY: So to be clear, I'll remove it
2 from the flow of how the grid map is now, version 6.
3 And then I will remove the section of text from the
4 draft map screen. But the plan, the source plan can
5 still be found as LD0033.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. Thank you.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

10 Just to briefly -- we won't take the time to go
11 through all the spreadsheets, but just to summarize the
12 key numbers that we are tracking on the Voting Rights
13 Act and competitiveness front, just for the Commission's
14 information and for the public that hasn't had a chance
15 to look at it yet, in 6.0 and 6.1 on the voting rights
16 side, they both have six districts that are effective
17 Latino seats by both measures, the attorney general's
18 race and the governor's race. And the seventh district
19 that's effective on the (indiscernible) are tracking by
20 just the attorney general's number. So six or seven
21 depending on which you're looking at for Latino seats.
22 And of course both have the 58 percent Native American
23 district that's common to all of these maps.

24 6.2, the only difference is that seventh
25 district which is actually the Pinal -- the Yuma seat

1 moves from being effective just on the attorney
2 general's race to the attorney general and the
3 governor's race. That's the only change amongst the
4 three maps you're considering today is whether that
5 seventh seat performs on both measures or just one.

6 And then on the competitiveness front, they're
7 all close. 6.0 and 6.2 have five that fall in our
8 7 percent range; 6.1 has six. And then there's a couple
9 seats just outside the range in all the maps. And
10 we're -- we -- as Brian showed, we have all the
11 spreadsheets if you want to look at the details, but I
12 wanted to, in the interest of time, just briefly
13 summarize that.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With that information,
15 does any of my colleagues want to offer up a motion for
16 a map to support as a starting point for deliberation
17 today?

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can we take just a moment?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'd like to propose 6.1
20 as a starting point, Legislative Map 6.1 as a starting
21 point for our deliberations today.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I will second that motion.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

24 Vice Chair Watchman.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
8 an aye.

9 And with that, we are starting with 6.1 for the
10 legislative map.

11 At this point, I'm going to suggest or
12 entertain a motion to go into executive session to seek
13 additional legal counsel as it relates to VRA compliance
14 and polarization.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I so move.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is
18 Commissioner Lerner. Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

20 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
3 an aye.

4 With that, we'll go into executive session for
5 the purpose of obtaining legal advice pursuant to
6 A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

7 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive
8 session from 9:16 a.m. until 9:49 a.m.)

9

10 * * * * *

11

12 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general
13 session.)

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Are we live with
15 the public back in session? Okay.

16 Welcome back, everybody. The Commission was
17 just in executive session. We're still on Agenda Item
18 No. V. We were obtaining legal advice as it relates to
19 our responsibility to honor the VRA. We discussed, you
20 know, data provided by Timmons as it relates to district
21 performance, polarization, the requirements that must be
22 considered when we're redistricting majority-minority
23 districts.

24 And so with that, we can dive back into our
25 deliberative process. We have voted to approve 6.1.

1 And we can open it up for directions from my
2 Commissioners to mapping, unless mapping has anything
3 they'd like to specifically ask first.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. I think we're open to
5 direction.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And if you could pull up
7 6.1.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to suggest
9 that we take the lines drawn in this citizen map 003,
10 whatever that name was, for Districts 16, 17, and south
11 and make those changes wholesale into the 6.1 map. And
12 actually, I'll make that as a motion because I think
13 we're going to need to either vote this up or down.

14 The mayor of Marana and a number of other
15 public officials have sent a letter this morning
16 strongly supporting that map, so we have the business
17 community and certainly the people in Marana and Oro
18 Valley -- and some people in Oro Valley strongly
19 supporting that map. I do think it improves, as we said
20 before, District 20 significantly as both a community of
21 interest for 20, it makes it a more compact, better
22 district, and it also makes it a stronger minority
23 district as we're looking at those. So I think for a
24 variety of reasons -- and it still keeps southern
25 Arizona very competitive, and it is -- it is just a good

1 change to make and therefore I propose it.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know that we need
3 a motion on that. I think we should take a look at how
4 that fits together in this new -- in a new iteration of
5 that. It's hard to -- there's a couple of districts
6 where I would like to see the impact once it's
7 implemented, but I have no problem at all with trying to
8 put those in there and then taking a look at some of the
9 data once it's -- once it's been incorporated.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think what
11 Commissioner Mehl is getting at is challenging us to
12 give specific direction to mapping so that we don't have
13 so many different options that we receive, you know,
14 competing maps again that, you know, don't help us get
15 to the end goal. So if there are fundamental conceptual
16 differences with this idea, now is the time to debate
17 it.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I --

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, Commissioner Lerner,
20 we do have the data. So you -- you know, we've all --
21 we've all seen the summary data. So I don't think
22 there's anything new we're going to learn, and that's
23 why I think we should either go yea or nay on this. And
24 I'm hoping it's a yea.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I have a couple --

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I am hoping you vote
2 for it.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. I have a -- and
4 I'll ask you those questions because as your
5 knowledge -- if we do that change for District 19, what
6 happens to District 19? This -- the District 19 -- and
7 I guess I'd have to pull up 6.3. The Summerhaven
8 communities, you know, those more rural Mount
9 Lemmon-Summerhaven, do those stay in the new District 19
10 you've proposed? I guess I should pull up --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. 19 doesn't change
12 much. I think the western edge of 19 into Tucson
13 changes slightly, but it's not a big change.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If you can just give me a
15 moment, I'm going to pull up 6.3 so I can see.

16 MR. KINGERY: 6.3 is currently showing on the
17 screen.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, yeah. Just...

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not sure. This is a
20 question for legal. Can we actually vote on a motion
21 that's not a map? I mean, just can we -- do we vote
22 conceptually on an idea to give direction?

23 MR. B. JOHNSON: It goes to locking. If you
24 want to lock that area, that's what the concept would
25 be.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that's why I'm not
2 sure that we need to vote on it, but I'm accepting and
3 supporting Commissioner Mehl's...

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But, Counsel, we'd be
5 locking in a conceptual idea; we wouldn't -- we wouldn't
6 be locking in a boundary because mapping needs to go and
7 make the change and present it to us.

8 Oh, you're saying just literally take that
9 exact thing. But we don't know the ripple effects, do
10 we?

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It fits up -- it doesn't
12 change any of the boundaries north of 16. It doesn't --
13 it doesn't change what are the -- it doesn't change 7,
14 it doesn't change anything that -- but that border. It
15 uses the border of the 6.1 map already approved for 16
16 and 7. So there's no other changes to the map.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. But you'd be
18 asking to lock something in where we're not locking in
19 anything else with the rest of the map, just taking
20 it --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, not lock -- I'm
22 actually not --

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Not locking it in forever,
25 no. But just doing -- I don't want them to go through

1 all the work --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- to then have us say we
4 don't want it. I think we know enough -- I'm really
5 looking do we have a consensus to direct them this way.
6 And if we do it's worth their time to do it; and if we
7 don't, it's not worth their time to do it.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Agree. I would like us
9 to be able to give clear direction to mapping. What I'm
10 getting at is I don't think we need an explicit motion
11 to lock something in now as a serious, you know,
12 decision, and we haven't done that yet. But, again, you
13 know, we are at, you know, a crossroads here and we
14 should make decisions. And so conceptually I would love
15 to have the Commission give clear guidance to the
16 mapping team about our approach to this.

17 MR. KINGERY: So I did misspeak earlier. There
18 is no 6.3. This is citizen submission LD0033. And if a
19 motion is going to be made or if specific districts are
20 going to be called out for this specific submission, we
21 just ask that the exact districts, district or
22 districts, are clarified so that we know what districts
23 to merge into LD 6.1.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let me ask a timing
25 question as well. Will you -- you know, will you have

1 the time today to make these changes and come back to us
2 today in the latter part of the afternoon for us to look
3 at the map and vote? I mean, I -- because I think
4 Commissioner Lerner is wanting, you know, to visibly see
5 it. And if we give you clear direction and flesh out
6 the rest of the map, can we get that final product and
7 then do yea or nay?

8 MR. FLAHAN: I think we'd have a final product
9 on this before the end of the day.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I'm sorry. I'm
11 having a lot of trouble finding it in the lists. Can
12 you direct me where to look for it so I --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It's towards the end.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. It's up in the
15 congressional area.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which -- which group --
17 under Shared Plans where do I look?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: So Brian can get it. Are you
19 looking in the interactive viewer where you can overlay
20 the different maps?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. I just am looking
22 under shared -- it is in the draft map development,
23 draft map --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. Up --

25 MR. KINGERY: So I unshared 6.3 from the public

1 and from the Commissioners. But if you go into the
2 submitted plans, you can locate it --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: LD 303; right?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Who's its -- I keep
5 going -- I know...

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You told us it was going to
7 be called LD003.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: 303 is what --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, 303?

10 Do you have it open, Commissioner Mehl?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I still have the -- I never
13 shut it down from before so I still have it up.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

15 MR. KINGERY: So the one that's highlighted in
16 the submitted plans page in the redistricting system is
17 SaguaroMaps002 by note2anna as the owner. And if you
18 were to look at it in the published plan viewer outside
19 of the redistricting system, you can search LD0033 and
20 it would show up for you to be able to add it to the
21 map.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And to clarify my proposed
23 direction, I guess it's not a motion, but my proposed
24 direction, it would be to make changes to Districts 16,
25 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 23 -- so 16 to 23, except 22 --

1 pursuant to what's shown in these maps and to the extent
2 that there is any boundary issues for you to resolve
3 them. I mean, I don't know for sure that -- I don't
4 think there are. But -- beyond that. But if there are,
5 use your creativity one more time and resolve them.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I may, so this -- this map,
7 just to kind of orient folks, I talked previously about
8 the challenge of Marana and Oro Valley being where does
9 District 16 go. And so this one puts the together and
10 actually brings 16 below them into Tucson.

11 The one question I have for you is there is a
12 small change on the border of 17 and 7. So this does --
13 instead of stopping at Saddlebrooke and SaddleBrooke
14 Ranch, it actually goes up and picks up Mammoth and
15 San Manuel into District 17. So since that's the only
16 piece that's outside of little -- the circle we're
17 talk -- we're looking at, I just want to confirm whether
18 you want us to include that piece as well or leave that
19 where it is?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Whichever way population
21 balancing works better there. I don't have a strong
22 opinion as to which way those communities go.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm -- and I'm not as
24 familiar with this. Conceptually I have no problem. I
25 understand what you're trying to accomplish,

1 Commissioner Mehl, with this.

2 I have a question for you on -- I'm looking at
3 District 17, which I think is the main thing you're
4 recommending here -- is that correct? Because that
5 pulls in Marana with Oro Valley. I'm just looking at
6 the concern about it going around 18. And it basically
7 goes around the Catalina mountains, becomes quite a big
8 district as part of that. So I'm wondering if there's
9 something we could do --

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But population wise it's
11 not a big district, and it goes -- it just has a big
12 mountain as part of it. But it combines it with an
13 eastern suburban community that has very similar
14 interests and has asked to be combined with them. We
15 have significant testimony on that actually. And,
16 frankly, it's just hard to make any of this work, and it
17 was -- it's the best solution I have seen.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- well, all I was
19 wondering was if there's something we could do between
20 17 and 18 to -- that Tanque Verde part that's going in
21 there, on whether or not -- because right now somebody
22 in that district is going to be driving quite a distance
23 and all around 18. Is there anything -- and I'm just --
24 I'm asking you this, that question. It --

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Compared to some --

1 District 2 or 23 or a number of other --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh --

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- districts, I don't think
4 it's a big issue.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- there's some big ones
6 out there --

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- for sure. But I --

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I am just wondering
11 because we're making a really big one here where we --
12 it wasn't -- it isn't that big a one at this point. And
13 so I'm just -- that's why I'm asking about that
14 particular -- on what happens from our previous map to
15 what happens to District 17 here.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would encourage us to do
17 this and then we're going to -- and have it as a part of
18 our final draft map hopefully.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And then we're going to get
21 plenty of public testimony, and this will get flushed
22 out with a lot of people's opinions. And I suspect we
23 might even have people submit alternatives that you
24 might want to look at. But I think this is a good map
25 to work from for southern Arizona to go out to the

1 public with a draft map ultimately and get -- and get
2 real feedback.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I concur with
4 Commissioner Mehl. I think that it respects communities
5 of interest to the greatest extent possible in that area
6 and it's still reasonably compact. And I'm comfortable
7 giving mapping direction to start here and bring back
8 the map to us.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's fine. We can
10 start with that. And as Commissioner Mehl said, we
11 might make adjustments at a later time once we've heard
12 public comment.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it makes 20 much more
14 compliant for the -- for where we're headed with some of
15 the minority-majority ideas we're working on, and so
16 that's a benefit.

17 The way I see District 17, Shereen, is that
18 that outskirt backs out of Mount Lemmon and up into Oro
19 Valley and are very kind of like-mindedness and rural
20 communities to the greater Tucson urban community. I
21 mean, I don't know a lot about southern Arizona, but
22 that's how I see it. Because if you follow the
23 borderline of 18, in a sense of basically matches the --
24 runs along the top of the foothills.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You know what? At this

1 point I'm going to go ahead, for the sake of keeping us
2 moving forward, to accept that piece, knowing that there
3 will probably be some adjustments as we hear from
4 communities or this. Because I -- there are some other
5 things that strike me as a little bit concerning in
6 terms of communities of interest. But I'd say let's see
7 how this all fits together at this point, so we can move
8 forward with that.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: And, Madam Chair, before
10 we do that, could we overlay the tribe -- tribal
11 reservations for these districts? Because we did get a
12 letter from, like for example, the Gila River Indian
13 Community and their desires to remain in the same
14 district as, for example, Casa Grande and Coolidge. So
15 if we could, I'd like to see the reservation overlay.
16 And of course we've got the tribes in the Yuma area.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Watchman, did
18 you say the tribes want to be included with Coolidge?

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes. The Gila River
20 Indian Community. We -- I believe -- hopefully you got
21 a copy, but --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay. I don't have any
23 problem moving Coolidge into 16. I don't know what
24 other adjustments that would make if they -- and that
25 would put them in with the tribes.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I just -- I just want to
2 see the tribal overlay first to see.

3 MR. FLAHAN: And it's on the screen there. You
4 can see --

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay.

6 MR. FLAHAN: -- the green district is the --

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right. I --

8 MR. FLAHAN: -- up there is Gila River.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So in the -- in the map we're
10 looking at, Casa Grande is in D-16 with Gila River and
11 Ak-Chin. Coolidge is actually in District 7. So Casa
12 Grande and Coolidge are already in separate seats.

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay. And what about the
14 tribes in the Yuma area? I don't know. We had some
15 issues about including especially the north side of the
16 reservation of Quechan. Yeah, it is included.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that is something to
18 consider in terms of once this gets completed; I know we
19 have some of the data, but I'm not sure what happens --
20 well, no. I think District 23 stays pretty much the
21 same.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Looks like it.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm trying to see. Yeah.
24 I think the main thing to me that happens, and that's
25 part of the concern with District 17 ultimately, but I

1 know we can work through this to some extent, is that it
2 went from being a very competitive district to not
3 competitive at all. So we went from something that was
4 off by about 2 percent to now being off by over
5 10 percent. And so that is something -- and that is
6 something that I think we will want to look at because
7 we want to try to get to these within our range wherever
8 we can. And to move from something that was competitive
9 to not is something we can look at.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I do think here, though,
11 that, you know, the reason for it is keeping communities
12 of interest together.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, and, Chair Neuberg, just
14 to -- there's a lot of numbers on these spreadsheets.
15 What happens, actually, the competitive seat switches.
16 So in 6.1, 17 is competitive; in 6 -- well, in 003 --
17 33, it's 17. So -- Oh, I got it backwards. 16 and 17
18 switch, so one is competitive in one map and the other
19 one is competitive in the other one, so --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that is one of my
21 concerns is that in all of these districts we are
22 actually -- we have been moving to a less competitive
23 dis- -- maps as we've been going, and so this one
24 actually then again takes us -- drops us. And I'm
25 speaking as a Democrat here, which I've been trying to

1 not do as much as possible. But in this case -- and I
2 understand the purpose of the move, and I'm -- and
3 because it's been about including Marana and Oro Valley.
4 And there might be other ways ultimately that we can
5 do -- make some changes. But this really puts us --
6 loses us another competitive seat and it actually really
7 changes the dynamics of the overall number of Democrat
8 and Republican seats that exist out of the 30
9 legislative seats. And so that is my concern at this
10 point with this change.

11 And I know that we can make adjustments, but
12 when we lose what was a competitive seat to a
13 noncompetitive seat and we're not picking up one on the
14 other side, I have to express that concern, that making
15 this wholesale change does not necessarily do -- help us
16 in terms of our overall representation and efforts to
17 balance that, especially when we think about how
18 competitiveness is in the constitution and where it
19 fits.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Doug, I thought you had
21 mentioned that it just switched competitiveness, that it
22 actually didn't fundamentally change the overall number
23 of competitive districts?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct. And, again, as the
25 numbers change around, it does get confusing and

1 somewhat hard to follow. So both 6.1 and 6.3 -- well,
2 0033, I will get there, and 03 -- well, the map we're
3 talking about, 033 being integrated into our base map,
4 both have six competitive districts. It's just the --
5 which district is that sixth changes from 16 to 17.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And also I will say the
7 level of competitiveness, on whether they're in the
8 small range or the larger range. What we had was a
9 district with District 17 that was in the small range
10 and now it's going to be beyond that. And so --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But, Commissioner Lerner --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- that's just --

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But District 16 goes the
14 other way; it was in the wider range and now it goes to
15 the small range.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not based on what I see.
17 We basically just change two points, but we're still
18 above five point, just five point -- I see it as a --
19 almost a six-point range versus the four-point range
20 which is our small range for District 16. And again, we
21 may be able to make adjustments in that at some point,
22 but I want to bring that up that we are actually now
23 changing that. And in particular, I mean, with all of
24 these maps in the six range, we were not at -- we had at
25 one time -- and, again, I'm wearing my Democrat hat

1 here. We -- mostly I've been focusing on communities of
2 interest and have not been trying to do the
3 partisanship, but I'm going to do that in this one
4 moment. And again I'm saying to Commissioner Mehl I
5 will support you putting this in, because I know that
6 your effort has been to combine Marana and Oro Valley.
7 It's whether this particular configuration can work is
8 my concern.

9 As we've been moving with these districts, we
10 have been -- there was a point when we were looking at
11 all our maps that we were working on compactness,
12 communities of interest, contiguity, and we had really
13 reached a very closely competitive -- and I'm talking
14 about almost a 15-15 split, which to me is to some
15 extent optimum in terms of how we can work together as a
16 community. And now we have reached a point when we are
17 not close to that based on the numbers that we have been
18 seeing and if look at both the demographics as well as
19 the data sheets that you've been giving us but -- as
20 part of that. So it's something I just want for the
21 record to under -- to say as part of that, that that
22 loss of competitiveness seems to be moving in that
23 direction.

24 And, again, I know that this is just an effort
25 to combine Marana and Oro Valley; that's part of this

1 effort. I will support that, as I have been with this.
2 But I will say that I'm -- we're going to want to take a
3 closer look at how -- whether these communities in these
4 districts really worked as effectively.

5 Again, another one I'm looking at is
6 District 19 as one that I have a little bit of concern
7 in terms of how that's laid out at this point.

8 So there's some of the ones in the surrounding
9 areas that are of concern. And to move from a 50/50
10 seat to a noncompetitive concerns me when we've been
11 trying very hard to move the other direction with most
12 of our districts.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm sympathetic to the
14 goal of achieving as many competitive districts as
15 possible, but not at the expense of communities of
16 interest. And I think it's pretty clear what these
17 communities of interest have expressed to us.

18 I also want to make a point again that that --
19 I haven't even looked at, you know, the balance between
20 Rs and Ds; I'm looking at it through the lens of
21 maximizing all six constitutional criteria. I do want
22 to mention -- I mean, you know, goal of 15-15, I don't
23 think that that is an explicit goal. I don't -- it's
24 not in the constitution. And I also think we have a
25 responsibility to deliver an effective, functioning

1 government to the state. And, you know, given that so
2 many of the districts are, you know, more extreme, you
3 know, having, you know, 15-15 is not necessarily in my
4 mind the goal that is -- you know, should take
5 precedence.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I -- and I respect
7 that. I'm expressing my -- part of my goals in this
8 case. My goal is to try to get as many of those
9 districts closer together. And I -- my preference is in
10 the four-point range. Data shows that as we go outside
11 of that four-point range it's very difficult for someone
12 of another party to get elected either way, that if we
13 have a district that's got the six -- even the six-point
14 range that we have the chances of somebody on either
15 side getting elected in that district outside -- outside
16 of that one or two points is very difficult. So I too
17 am focused -- have been focused all the way through on
18 communities of interest and all the other criteria, but
19 now we're reaching a point when we are narrowing down
20 our maps and I am starting to take a look at that as
21 part of it.

22 This -- the other thing I will just mention is
23 part of my interest in the 15-15 is that we are a state
24 that is pretty balanced in terms of the people who live
25 here with a 30-30 -- you know, 33, 33, 33 split between

1 Democrats, Republicans, and independents. And so the
2 closer we can get to something that's balanced in our
3 legislature, the more it reflects our state, which is
4 what -- and that's just -- again I'm just expressing my
5 own opinion.

6 So I'm in favor of Commissioner Mehl's proposal
7 to connect Marana and Oro Valley, and I know he's been
8 working hard to try to figure out ways to do this. This
9 particular configuration I have concerns about some of
10 the areas, and I'm just expressing that up front to let
11 you know that at some point we'll -- I will want to
12 revisit how these lines are drawn.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Would you be comfortable,
14 Commissioner Lerner, if we gave direction to mapping
15 team to try to incorporate Commissioner Mehl's
16 suggestion; however, with their knowledge and expertise
17 to try to look for opportunities to increase
18 competitiveness? And if you see opportunities that you
19 can come back and report on that to us?

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I would be
21 comfortable with it. I'll -- if they can do that in
22 the -- in the southern district are you -- do you mean?

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. In the Marana/Oro
24 Valley area that we're talking about.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, in the Marana/Oro

1 Valley. And actually if you -- I'm -- I went back and
2 took a look. And I don't know, Commissioner Mehl, about
3 how you felt about Map 4.0, because that actually did
4 combine Marana and Oro Valley. And so I don't know if
5 that could be part of your discussion -- as you look at
6 that, I would be -- I would be comfortable with that,
7 Chairwoman. And perhaps you could take a look at that
8 piece as well of how 4.0 worked with that. But it's --
9 I want to -- I want to help Commissioner Mehl accomplish
10 what he would like to do. And he's been -- as he says,
11 he's been very consistent about the Oro Valley/Marana
12 connection, and I know that that occurred. And I don't
13 know the numbers for 4.0 off the top of my head, but I
14 do remember it was there at one point. But, yes, I
15 would be comfortable with also asking mapping to try to
16 take a look at that as we look at this community of
17 interest.

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, is
19 there a way to focus it just in that area?

20 I know that because of all the interplay that
21 what you're suggesting here, Commissioner Mehl, has
22 impacts to a multiple of districts. But can we focus it
23 down to just Marana and Oro Valley? Because what we're
24 doing now is, you know, at the expense of other
25 communities of interest -- I won't say expense, but, you

1 know, possibly diluting or changing the other
2 submissions that we received, you know, how do we
3 balance all of that. How do we balance, like, for
4 example, the Latino Coalition and their concern, their
5 interest with others. And so, you know, it's a tough
6 one to try to balance that. But can we focus it just in
7 this area?

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's a very good question,
9 Vice Chair Watchman, and I think the answer is no. But
10 I would then further say I think we've improved all the
11 communities of interest with this map. I think this map
12 accomplishes a number of things. The D-20 district is a
13 much stronger community of interest than it was. D-14
14 had that wing that went out and took in Douglas into
15 Santa Cruz, and that would be a bad change for
16 communities of interest.

17 So, actually, I -- the reason I was attracted
18 to this map is that I thought it accomplished a lot of
19 our goals all in one big fell swoop. And I'd -- I
20 would -- I would just hope we would move forward and
21 have it as our next version. And, again, we're nowhere
22 near the finish line, and there will be chances to
23 either tinker with it at the edges or to wholesale
24 change it if you have a better alternative later on down
25 the way.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm not saying that we
2 need to go back to everything in 4.0 at all. That's not
3 what I mean. So I know that there's some things in 4.0
4 that -- and we deliberately made changes to those.
5 That's not at all what I was meaning. So certainly not
6 going back. I know that the District 21 or that piece
7 that went across was -- even though there was a very
8 good reason for it, we -- and that was -- we decided not
9 to do that. But I'm just asking about that one piece
10 that's -- we're focusing on in District 17 that has been
11 what I thought was your main concern. Because you have
12 been mentioning that almost from the beginning, the
13 Marana/Oro Valley connection that you have been talking
14 about.

15 But this particular map changes a lot of other
16 things, as Commissioner Watchman said. So if there's a
17 way to focus on the piece that you've been most
18 emphasizing, I'm very supportive of doing that, of doing
19 whatever we can to get that to work without necessarily
20 making all these other changes that are now quite
21 extensive for that southern region as part of it.

22 There's putting a lot of different groups together that
23 weren't together before, and we'd have to really take a
24 close look at whether or not they even should be
25 together as part of it. So that's all I guess I'm

1 getting at is we've shifted things around and I don't
2 know if that best serves all the communities for the
3 sake of focusing on Marana, Oro Valley, and those
4 communities there that are linked. And that's what I
5 guess I would like to support, would be your effort to
6 combine those without necessarily making all the other
7 wholesale changes.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you want to respond to
9 that, Commissioner Mehl? Because my sense of hearing
10 you is that you feel that the wholesale changes actually
11 improve the overall map.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I do strongly think the
13 wholesale changes improve the overall maps, so I would
14 again encourage us to make those changes. And we're --
15 we won't be done when we make them.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And can you reiterate
17 again which other specific districts you feel that this
18 map improves?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It strongly improves 20. I
20 think it improves 21. 18 is --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you explain why when
22 you say improve? And on what dimension?

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Where 21 comes up into
24 Tucson is a better fit because 20 has moved it over. 18
25 is a really coherent community of interest in the

1 foothills, and it's a D-leaning district that's actually
2 solidified by these changes. 17 combines the -- is the
3 one we've talked about the most. 16 I think is coming
4 down that way for population balance, but it comes down
5 in a way that it really doesn't disturb any of the other
6 communities of interest. 19 backs out of Tucson
7 somewhat and now has less connection to Tucson, which I
8 think is actually appropriate. So I think there's a
9 ripple effect that are all positive.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that's a coherent
11 rationale. You know, and I like the larger vision. You
12 know, and I'd like to ask my colleagues can we give
13 direction to the mapping team to go with this plan? We
14 can come back and look at the ripple effect,
15 Commissioner Lerner and Watchman, in the areas that
16 you're uncomfortable with and fix, you know, to, you
17 know, mitigate whatever concerns you have. But in terms
18 of an overall, comprehensive vision, I'm sold by what my
19 colleague, Commissioner Mehl, is asking for.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm uncomfortable with a
21 number of the changes. I'll just say that. I know that
22 we want to move forward, but I see other areas that are
23 not -- I see places going in like District 19 which
24 comes sort of in the circle around and does capture a
25 small piece of Tucson.

1 I see District 16 extending pretty far north up
2 to the edge of Maricopa County and then all the way down
3 and heading into an edge of Tucson, and we've talked
4 about not wanting to link these communities. We've
5 actually had other -- the Latino Coalition which went
6 from Yuma to Maricopa County and said that wasn't good,
7 and now we're sort of allowing that for District 16 to
8 basically capture a piece of Tucson and then go all the
9 way up into a part of this area of District 16 up into
10 Maricopa to parts of -- to the southern-most points of
11 Buckeye. It's a huge legislative district with lots of
12 different communities of interest within it. So those
13 are the kinds of things that are of concern to me, where
14 we're actually taking some of that.

15 Again, I'm very supportive of
16 Commissioner Mehl's effort on Oro Valley and Marana
17 connection. I know that that's something he's been
18 striving for, and I want to support that. But it's the
19 other changes that I feel -- and I'm trying to be
20 specific about those concerns -- that are now putting
21 disparate communities of interest together for the sake
22 of creating a community of interest or putting Marana
23 with Oro Valley as been recognized as two communities,
24 you know, that Commissioner Mehl has felt have good
25 linkages as part of it. But we're basically I think

1 affecting other communities in significant ways and
2 drawing in really different communities of interest for
3 the sake of that one.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you share,
5 Commissioner Lerner, which specific communities of
6 interest you feel will be marginalized under this plan?

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I just mentioned
8 District 16, where you're actually taking it --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, can I make a comment
10 regarding 16? This is Commissioner York.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I make a comment
13 regarding 16? If you --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- look at 16 on 6.1, it
16 actually does pretty much the same thing. It goes all
17 the way down into Tucson, all the way up into Casa
18 Grande, Maricopa, takes in the Gila Indian reservation.
19 It does not include Gila Bend, which is included in
20 Commissioner Mehl's suggestion. So it pretty much
21 mirrors what has already been approved. So I kind of --
22 I find fault in that argument as far as 16 already being
23 too expansive.

24 But what Commissioner Mehl's proposal takes --
25 pulls 16 out of Marana and loops it around the west side

1 of the Tucson urban area and picks up those communities.
2 So those communities might have more in common with Casa
3 Grande, actually, than maybe -- than Marana does.

4 Marana has more in common with Oro Valley, so that's why
5 I kind of like that suggestion. It doesn't really
6 change the northern boundaries much. So just a comment.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. I don't disagree. I
8 actually am not thrilled with District 16 in the other
9 map either, so I don't agree that that's a difficult
10 one. I concur, Commissioner York, that that's one that
11 we would need to take a closer look at, absolutely.

12 I mean, I think that just a number of the
13 district -- the same thing with District 19, taking a
14 look at how that wraps around District 17, taking a look
15 at how -- again, going from Yuma all the way -- I mean,
16 there's some things we have to do for population; I
17 recognize that. Some parts of District 18 I think could
18 be changed. But again --

19 So I guess what I'm doing is getting things on
20 the record of the concerns. I am recognizing that we
21 want to try to accomplish this piece that
22 Commissioner Mehl has requested from the beginning, and
23 I want to help him achieve that goal because he has said
24 that that's a distinct community of interest. But I
25 want for the record that I would like to be able to come

1 back to this with some significant changes potentially.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Absolutely. As always,
3 we are not locking anything in right now. What we are
4 asking for is to be able to give direction to our
5 mapping team to be able to come back with a
6 comprehensive legislative map from which we can of
7 course make additional changes. But we need to make a
8 decision about a general direction, and since there
9 isn't an alternative comprehensive plan in place, I
10 would like to suggest that we adopt this as a starting
11 point in terms of giving direction to the mapping team
12 to make changes and then come back to us this afternoon
13 with the maps, and we can further deliberate.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And can we add that
15 comment that you made as well that goes with that, that
16 if they see opportunities for -- to improve the
17 competitiveness in those areas which have now been
18 depleted -- and, again, you know, I look particularly at
19 what happens in District 17, where it went from
20 essentially a 50/50 district to now a ten-point -- well,
21 I'm sorry, not a ten-point -- six- to eight-point
22 difference, or closer to eight probably.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner, I
24 don't -- I think it would be better to not have them
25 make these judgment calls on their own. I don't know

1 how we can direct them to make those calls. I would
2 like them to just make these changes and then we will
3 look at it as Commissioners and see any adjustments we
4 want to make to make things more competitive or for any
5 other reason that you want to consider.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think we're
7 asking them to make changes. I think we're asking that
8 if they have ideas and want to propose an option, as
9 they have always done, they come back to us with
10 options. There's nothing wrong that if there's an
11 improvement or if they have ideas, you know, because
12 they're looking at the data pretty closely, I wouldn't
13 want to rule out an improvement.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I totally support that.
15 I'd like to see the base map. And then any other
16 thoughts that they have, I completely support that
17 thought.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I do believe -- and I
20 agree. I agree.

21 I think District 17 can work, but can also be
22 brought closer in terms of that -- in terms of
23 competitiveness.

24 And just as a last comment on District 16, I
25 know that we have it going around -- as

1 Commissioner York said, it does extend into -- in the
2 6.1 map, but I had to pull it up again because I've been
3 having the other map that we've been discussing up so I
4 hadn't had a chance to double-check where it was.

5 It does capture -- right now District 17 -- 16,
6 in the map that we adopted, only captures a very small
7 portion and it does have the Marana area. So I would
8 love to see a way to rethink District 16 in some ways,
9 but I don't know how that would go at this point. I
10 don't have any ideas right now because of the way it
11 currently is. So that will be something else for us to
12 look at when we get this map back.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And these again -- these
14 are draft maps. You know, we're going to have a lot
15 more deliberation. We have 30 districts. We're not
16 going to really achieve our ideal 30 districts.

17 Just I want to be able to give, you know, due
18 diligence to other areas of the state as well. Are we
19 ready to move from the south? Are there other
20 geographic areas that you'd like the mapping team to
21 pull up right now?

22 MR. FLAHAN: We have a couple questions from
23 the mapping side. We did hear a couple of different
24 options, and we did talk about some other rotations in
25 the morning, especially in the District 9 and

1 District 10 area in Maricopa. So let me read you back
2 to what we understand so we have clear guidance.

3 What Brian has on the screen now --

4 Can you zoom out a little bit?

5 You want us to integrate Districts 16, 17, 18,
6 19, 20, 21, and 23 into 6.1, with us being allowed to
7 slightly modify them for population balancing.

8 In the morning you talked about in the Maricopa
9 area to rotate District 9 and District 10, which is in
10 the Mesa area, to more of a vertical projection.

11 Can we include that in the same version as we
12 include the districts in the south?

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes, I would support that.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just to be clear, when you
15 make the motion -- when you see the map and make the
16 motion, you can make it for one part and not the other;
17 they could be voted on as separate pieces. But that
18 just simplifies us publishing it and getting it back to
19 you.

20 MR. FLAHAN: And then we also still want to
21 respect the Kyrene School District boundaries that we
22 have set; is that correct?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: To the extent that we
24 can --

25 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- without -- I mean --

2 MR. FLAHAN: It looks like they follow it from
3 the map, but I just want to confirm when we go into the
4 room to make sure that's --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that -- which area are
6 you thinking of in terms of the district?

7 MR. FLAHAN: It would be District 12. It would
8 be south of Ahwatukee, where it goes south into the Gila
9 Indian reservation but preserves the boundary of the
10 Kyrene School District in that northern part of the
11 reservation.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. And I think that
13 the tribe has said that they were fine being in two
14 legislative districts, and that would basically put that
15 northern piece --

16 I think that's what we've talked about;
17 correct?

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's correct, yes.
19 They're okay with the Lone Butte Industrial park area
20 being associated near Ahwatukee and Tempe or Chandler
21 and then the southern part which would be 16. Yeah.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So that would be one map.

23 And then the second request we will look for
24 ideas and options to increase competitiveness as a
25 second map.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And then I think where our
2 confusion is, do you want a second map or just for us to
3 come back with ideas where you might look at changes?

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Ideas, please.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I heard ideas, yes.

6 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Then we'll come back with
7 the ideas.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Just ideas.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Southern Ari- -- southern
11 Arizona; correct?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But if you have ideas for
13 the other state, absolutely. I mean, let --

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we'll -- the ideas we
15 had in kind of the Phoenix area are already in the 6.0
16 map.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: So, yeah, we can focus on
19 Tucson for this map.

20 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, I
21 guess we're looking at ideas because, you know, what
22 we're looking at in trying to respect
23 Commissioner Mehl's thought is how do we -- how do we
24 configure Marana and Oro Valley. Granted, you know,
25 everything is related and there's a ripple effect, but

1 now we're dealing with five or six different districts.

2 And so I think we need to -- well, what I'm
3 hearing is that the request and the interest and the
4 idea is how do we -- how do we address
5 Commissioner Mehl's interests in addressing the
6 communities of Marana and Oro Valley. And so what --
7 hopefully it's not a wholesale change, but I'm hoping
8 that we just, you know, focus the adjustments or ideas
9 to adjust the Marana and Oro Valley area, so...

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. The direction I think
11 was clear on incorporating those boundaries for the --

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- 16 through 23, missing
14 the one district.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Just looking at the map that's on
16 the screen there, there are a couple slivers here and
17 there. Do we have permission to clean up some of the
18 lines to make them more --

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Absolutely.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, while
23 we're doing that, also I just want to again raise the
24 issue of the Navajo Nation. And they're here, and so I
25 think the big issue that they want us to consider and at

1 least look at it as far as ideas is their deviation
2 proposal and concept. And I think there was some
3 discussion with our mapping team about the proper
4 numbers to be using for the CVAP relative to the Native
5 Americans in the state here. So we need to -- I'd like
6 to put that on the table as a discussion item. I don't
7 know if we -- if it's timely to include it in this
8 discussion, but we need to keep that in mind.

9 The other issue is just I know that my
10 understanding is that the Nation is going to be working
11 with perhaps other communities of interest, and I'm
12 hoping that the tribes all come together with, you know,
13 I guess ideally a collaborative map that reflects all
14 the different interests in northern Arizona. But I just
15 want to put that on the record that I think that's in
16 the works.

17 But the challenge that the Navajo Nation has
18 is, and this goes to the other six tribes in District 6,
19 and that is the proper number to use. Because I know
20 that I've been reading; there's a lot of concern about
21 whether or not there was undercount in Indian Country
22 because of the pandemic. It was hard to get out to
23 certain -- you know, as we found out, we're unable to
24 get to some parts of Indian Country, or I'll call it
25 Indian Country, but to some parts of the reservation

1 just because the reservations were closed. And so that
2 was a big challenge with the census takers; they just
3 could not get out there so they relied a lot on
4 Internet. But broadband and Internet connection is so
5 bad in Indian Country. So hopefully it wasn't a double
6 whammy, but there's that thought there of a potential
7 undercount on our reservations. And so, you know, we
8 just have to keep that in mind and -- as we look at the
9 data, particularly for Native Americans, and probably
10 some other folks in the rural part of the state too.
11 I'm sure that they weren't counted so just because of
12 being remote. So I just want to note that for the
13 record. And so I think that the mapping team is aware
14 of the deviation, the number challenge. So at some
15 point we'll raise it when the -- when the time is right.

16 So thank you, Madam Chair.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, if I could follow
18 up on Commissioner Watchman's comment. We did have a
19 technical discussion about which fields. Just so the
20 record's clear, we didn't talk about any lines on maps
21 or anything, just which fields are showing in the data
22 view and reported. And so I think we've got it figured
23 out in terms of what fields they'd like to add.

24 And so the question for the Commission is if
25 you'd approve of us adding another column into the data

1 sheet, it would be the Native -- what they're looking
2 for is -- we're using the federal government's guidance
3 on how to aggregate groups. And so if someone marks
4 white and Native American, under the government's
5 guidance that gets treated as Native American. And they
6 would like to see the single-race Native American
7 category without people that also mark white, which is
8 in our database. It's one of the hundreds of fields in
9 the supplemental section. So if we have that direction
10 from you, we can look at adding that in. I'm not sure
11 how quickly we can get it in, but we can certainly look
12 at addressing that technical question. So the end
13 result would be your spreadsheets would have one more
14 column to them.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We certainly welcome
16 additional feedback, additional maps. We can
17 reconsider, you know, many things. I do just want to
18 point out that, you know, there are a lot of challenges
19 to voting and elections, and we need to stay in our
20 lane. We're here to redistrict, and we must use the
21 data that we have and follow the constitutional
22 criteria. And if we were to take it upon ourselves to
23 try to adjust for other injustices, there's no
24 empirical, objective way to do our job. And so we --
25 you know, we all have empathy for, you know, a lot of

1 challenges that go on, but I think we have to be careful
2 and stick to what our legal obligations are as it
3 relates to the Arizona and U.S. constitutions.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I totally agree with
5 Chairwoman Neuberg, but I also would be very comfortable
6 doing another column of data to be looking at and would
7 support that.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, I
9 don't want to go into history, but our U.S. Constitution
10 speaks a lot to Indian tribes and commerce and tribes,
11 and so there is a historical, legal, and direct
12 relationship between and recognition of Indian tribes,
13 and so we have to keep that in mind. And so, you know,
14 it's a little bit different relationship. They call it
15 a -- there's a unique relationship between the U.S.
16 government and the tribes. And so, you know, I
17 understand what you're saying and appreciate that, but
18 there's a direct line between the tribes and the United
19 States government. And so that to me overlays and
20 spills into the state of Arizona and how the state of
21 Arizona works. And so we have to keep that in mind.
22 It's just how it -- how it is and it's unique, but, you
23 know, it's been challenged legally and legislatively.
24 And so I'm not saying, you know, special treatment, but
25 there is a unique relationship, so we have to keep that

1 in mind and notwithstanding the constitution of this
2 state. So we need to also consider that. So for the
3 record I want to -- everybody to be aware of that.
4 Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have just one
6 suggestion for -- I think we've done -- you're going to
7 adjust the D-9, D-10 as we've discussed. I just had one
8 other thought on -- in Maricopa County and otherwise no
9 other recommended changes, and that was to look at D-1
10 and D-2, at that boundary. And I'll appreciate
11 Commissioner York's help because his geographical
12 knowledge is always in these areas as part of it. But I
13 was looking at moving Sunnyslope from D-1 into D-2 with
14 the North Mountain Preserve because that's part of that
15 community of interest and then potentially shifting D-1
16 and D-4 a little bit east.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And again,
18 Commissioner Lerner, can you please give your rationale?
19 It sounds like you believe that it's a better fit for
20 one community of interest. Can you speak to the -- to
21 the other broader changes?

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They're just -- I mean, I
23 just -- I think Sunnyslope goes nicely with -- it is
24 part of the same community of interest. It's just
25 connecting them. Or D-1 -- I mean, D-1 could also

1 potentially go a little bit further south. I mean,
2 there's some options there.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, if you take
4 population from D-2, you can't really move D-4. So --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. It may be that
6 that's not the best.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: So population from D-2
8 would have to either go west into D-4 or north, I'm
9 guessing.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, D-1 could
11 potentially go south, and that might not affect D-4.
12 D-4 doesn't necessarily have to be impacted in that way
13 then.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you could either --
15 you could put the Sunnyslope area into D-2 and then you
16 could move D-1 south if you want to.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: But then that affects D-11.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, D-11 is
20 overpopulated, so that might actually work because it
21 would probably lose some population there.

22 That's the only other suggestion I was going to
23 make.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner, could you
25 help us out and define what are you -- what are you

1 defining as Sunnyslope?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, this is where I was
3 calling on Commissioner York to help me with that,
4 because he is so much --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there's --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I could say it and then
7 he'll change it and tell me what happened --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no, no, no.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- because he is so much
10 better than I am.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: The Sunnyslope area is
12 basically the area that runs along Cave Creek up into
13 the mountains and up the -- what would be called the
14 Dreamy Draw then along 7th Street up against the
15 mountains.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Hold on. Let us get it on the
17 screen so we can follow you.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's District 1 on the D --
19 District 1 and District 2 borders in north -- up in
20 Tu- -- up in Maricopa County. There you go.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. It's really
22 because you've got that mountain preserve area. I was
23 just trying to --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- connect those back

1 together.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Which I'm fine with, but
3 it's going to -- which, you know, I -- there is some
4 agreement in that is a community of interest. But if
5 you pull D-2 down into that area --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You could take D-2 down
7 maybe down towards Northern or something? I'm trying to
8 pull up -- I'm trying to pull up the street names.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, D-26 is -- the top
10 boundary is --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: D-26, the top boundary is
13 Dunlap.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: The area you're talking
16 about is going to move down 7th Street and east to the
17 51, which would be the sort Dunlap/Northern exit there.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. So if it went down
19 to Northern, D-2, I mean, it should population balance a
20 little bit as well is kind of what I was looking at and
21 then connecting --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. You're off by 5,000
23 people. There's a lot there.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: D-2 -- oh, wait. Which

1 one are you looking at? D-2 going into --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: You're talking about
3 putting Sunnyslope in D -- you want me to go north on
4 D-1, up --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- to Cactus?

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I was looking at
8 D-1, adding that piece that's not connected in the
9 mountain preserves basically.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you would say
11 Thunderbird to I-17 down to Peoria, that basically
12 includes that chunk around the mountain there.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: So just -- so you were talking
14 about bringing District 2 down or District 1 up?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you either go one way
16 or the other. How much mountain do you want to grab?
17 Do you want to go west up along --

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm just pulling it up.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- along Thunderbird to get
20 the rest of the mountains?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I had been --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, that's the smallest
23 population but also -- right now most of Sunnyslope is
24 in D-1.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Exactly.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: So if you went over to
2 I-17, Brian, where Peoria hits I-17 and you move it
3 north to Thunderbird, that gets the rest of that
4 mountain preserve into the D -- District 1.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I -- and I had been
6 thinking that you would take Sunnyslope from D-1 into
7 D-2 to just -- I thought that would be the least
8 disturbing maybe.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no. What I just
10 described was the least disturbing.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I was looking at
12 D-1 going -- I mean having Sunnyslope from -- and, I
13 mean, again, that's why I want to talk through this with
14 you because you also know this area very well. That you
15 are moving Sunnyslope from -- taking the North Mountain
16 Preserve as part of that D-1, that piece of D-1 to D-2.
17 D-1 right now is overpopulated a little bit. So is D-2.
18 So if we moved then D-1 a little bit south as you
19 suggested and 2 -- D-2 you -- I mean down to Northern
20 like that's what we were just talking about, right,
21 that's just that -- it is very populated in that area.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So we take D-2 south to
24 Northern, and D-1 could go up a little bit in that area
25 that we were just talking about, that corner.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And what --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that just puts --
3 fits the mountain preserve together.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I --

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: So if I -- maybe I can just
6 catch up with you guys.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. So there's a -- so
8 let me -- let me give you the boundaries real quick.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So District 2 is coming south
10 from the western edge of District 1 all the way down to
11 Northern. And all the way across, or just to --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't know. I think
13 that's too much. I think you would have to go down to
14 Dunlap --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We can try that.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- and then go up the
17 Carefree -- Cave Creek Road up into the mountains there.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, District -- oh,
19 just that corner -- you're talking about just that one
20 block, then --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- from District 2? That
23 could work.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We could try that and see

1 how that does with balancing population.

2 And the other thing I'd been looking at was
3 D-11 is overpopulated. So if D-1 went south --

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Are you also going into 27 and
5 16, or you're just talking about a switch between 1 and
6 2?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just between 1 and 2 right
8 now.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Pretty much just between
10 those two. I wasn't really going to kind of start
11 changing everything else.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Brian, you see North
13 Mountain Preserve? Up at the top corner, funky little
14 corner of District 1. If you come down that road, which
15 is North Cave Creek Road, and you stay along that,
16 there's a -- looks like a voting bloc district along the
17 east side of that. If you run that down to the next
18 mountain reserve, which I believe --

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Hold on.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You see why I called on
21 Commissioner York to give all the details. I can give
22 you the general, but I knew he would --

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: So yeah. So you're talking
24 about District 2 coming down to -- starting on the west
25 side of District 1 --

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right there.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- and then coming across to
3 where Cave Creek --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. And then cutting
5 over, over to -- yeah.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right that -- yeah. There
8 you go, right there.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: That would be a District 2
11 add.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- we're talking about --
13 about 20 -- 20 -- ballpark 22,000 people.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But when you make both --
15 all the changes, it hopefully -- well, that's why I
16 always thought --

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, that's why we're trying
18 to keep up. We only know the one change.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, right, right.
20 Okay.

21 And the other thing I -- well, go ahead.
22 Finish with Commissioner York that piece. Because you
23 understand what I was trying to do with --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- the preserve.

1 Because the other piece I was -- if it adds too
2 much in there, D-1 could pick up a little bit from D-11
3 and -- because D-11 is overpopulated. So if we needed
4 to -- by adding people in those areas, if we needed to
5 lose some population in D-1, just we could shift it
6 south a little bit and it won't -- the neighborhoods are
7 still between the border of D-1 and D-11. You're not
8 going to affect any communities of interest there;
9 they're all connected as well. There's some good
10 historic neighborhoods in that area, so if needed for
11 population balance.

12 That's the only major -- that's the only real
13 change I had. It was just seeing that those -- that
14 preserve, was trying to connect them. And we heard from
15 a lot of folks saying please put us together.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I have one change to
17 suggest that I know we're going to agree to, but I don't
18 know if this is the right time, so you have to tell me.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, are we good with
20 this, what we've been talking about? And we can always
21 look at it when you come back, and if need be we can
22 make a few more changes there. But the concept you
23 understand?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think so. You know, so
25 we're -- about 20,000 people would come out of

1 District 1 and go into District 2. And then -- so
2 District 1 is currently over by about 4,000, so that
3 would leave it 16,000 short. But down in District 11,
4 it's over by 9,000, so we could split the difference
5 there.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Exactly.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: And both of them would end up
8 about -- trying to do math in my head, so don't hold me
9 to this -- about 3500 or so short, but they'd both be in
10 that range.

11 The catch is the other piece of this change,
12 though, is District 2 has now added 20,000 people. It's
13 almost perfectly balanced right now. So where would
14 District 2 go to give up those people?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What if we -- let me pull
16 it up real close.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: I mean, we could -- I think
18 Commissioner York may have mentioned this earlier.
19 District 2 could lose on its eastern edge to District 4
20 and 4 could pick up from 1 rather than going into 11,
21 and we could do kind of a three-district rotation there.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, District 2 -- in
23 terms of losing population?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. So 2 has got --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I mean, District 2

1 potentially could lose a little bit from the north. And
2 could it go into --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Let's look at District 3.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: And actually, Mark just --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That would work actually
7 because you could add -- District 3 is a little short.
8 So you potentially could put a little bit of District 2
9 into District 3 to balance that a little bit, unless you
10 had another idea.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: And actually Mark was just
12 mentioning that District 27 has the same thing, where
13 it's short as well, so -- oh, and 28 is short as well?

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it could go into
15 District 27; that would work.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, okay. Yeah. So between
17 3, 27, 28 that are all short, we could balance -- we
18 could pick up from District 2 to balance the -- all four
19 of them out, and then we wouldn't have to go into 4 and
20 1 could still go into 11.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That sounds good. And we
22 know they'll be a little bit off here and there, but
23 we're not -- we're not at the final yet, so...

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

25 Commissioner Mehl --

1 Are you now finished with your thought,
2 Commissioner Lerner?

3 Okay. We're going to deliberate for about
4 another seven minutes or so. At 11:00 we'll take a
5 ten-minute break.

6 Commissioner Mehl, did you want to bring
7 attention to a different part of the map?

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're getting to memorize
9 all these numbers and think with these numbers. And at
10 some point Prescott needs to be District No. 1.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So if it seems like it
14 would be just simple to make Prescott No. 1 now and just
15 make whatever was No. 1 whatever the number -- I think
16 it was 5. So make 1 5 and 5 1 and then we can keep
17 memorizing and learning and having district numbers that
18 can stand up.

19 MR. KINGERY: We will make that change.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it's -- I'm in
21 agreement. I'm not disagreeing one bit. I know every
22 time we look at each other it's like what's she saying
23 now? But I just wanted to double-check. Does that mean
24 all of them are now going to be changed? I didn't catch
25 that. I apologize. I was --

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. I was just suggesting
2 flipping 1 and 5 so that Prescott gets the official 1
3 label that they have always held.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just to note in the oddity
5 that the numbers are now evolved as the grid evolves,
6 this would now put 4 -- 5 next to 4.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And there are no legal
8 implications of this, right, because District 1 has
9 always been in that area; correct?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's actually state statute,
11 yeah.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So I have a minor point.
13 I was -- but eventually are we going to have some kind
14 of sequence? I mean, just as a -- you know, the public,
15 when they are wanting to go in and analyze districts, to
16 have a sense of sequential order just helps people.

17 MR. FLAHAN: And you can see on the map it is
18 now District 1, and District 1 is now District 5.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I -- some of
20 our submissions has questioned the numbering, and so at
21 some point we have to look into that. So -- I know it's
22 all -- well, it's random right now, and so we'll
23 probably have to get to that point or how do we
24 rerandomize it or -- if you will. And so -- but --

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I --

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I did see some
2 submissions along those lines that, yes, we're trying to
3 change things, but, you know, everybody has, you know,
4 memories and so how do we follow that, keep it balanced
5 between the two.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. If you get questions
7 about -- the numbering is the residue of starting in the
8 middle, so 1 started in the middle and then went to the
9 northeast. And then we ran out of -- you know, we hit
10 the corner. And then the next number went from the
11 northeast down back to the middle and then to the
12 southeast. So, yes, it is kind of pie-charted numbers
13 around the map. So, yes, if at some point we do want to
14 look at, you know, from north to south or something like
15 that, we can. I hadn't seen how easy it was. But as
16 the team just showed, it's fairly easy for us to
17 renumber, yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would make the simple
19 suggestion that if we're ever going to do that we should
20 do it prior to approving draft maps so that when we get
21 all this public comment for all this time we're then
22 dealing with permanent numbers. So I have no opinion as
23 to the numbering system, but I think it really would be
24 wise to do it now.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: I would suggest that we --

1 other than No. 1, which is easy, 1 and 5, that we -- the
2 Commission come to a point where it votes on a draft map
3 and then have a quick -- so that as we're debating
4 District 7 is always 7 through your whole --
5 consistently through your debate, if nothing else then
6 just for the sanctity of the transcript. And then once
7 you adopt a map, you just have a quick second motion to
8 renumber them. So that when they -- when we do release
9 them to the public they will be renumbered.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, do we just want to
11 wait on No. 1, then, that shift, or does it -- is it so
12 small that we've already made it?

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I tend to agree.
14 Whatever we do, let's do it before we vote on our final
15 draft, whenever that happens.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, it sounds like what
17 Doug said is that we vote on a final draft and then we
18 renumber it, two different motions.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: That would be my suggestion,
20 just so that the people who sent in letters, you know --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- yesterday and today, they
23 are writing about District --

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. Keep it all --

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- X.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- consistent.

2 Absolutely.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I just -- I just
4 noticed one other thing that I thought we talked about
5 yesterday, and that was we had talked about trying to
6 make sure San Tan Valley wasn't divided in D-15, and
7 it's still divided here. I know that there's going to
8 be a lot of changes that are coming with the southern
9 part and this might fit in, but we had talked about the
10 fact that we thought it should be whole and right now it
11 is kind of divided right in the middle. And so I think
12 we had talked about putting it back into 15 with the
13 rest of it, but that didn't happen. And as you're
14 making all those other southern Arizona changes, maybe
15 that will work its way through. But we were trying to
16 connect those two, or connect the community together,
17 which I know that they would prefer rather than be -- so
18 that's at that little corner of D-15 and D-7.

19 MR. FLAHAN: I think -- yes, I recall that, and
20 I think there was also a concern, though, because if we
21 take San Tan Valley and put it into D-15, D-7 would have
22 to probably push into Gold Canyon and the Apache
23 Junction area to pick up the population loss.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, as part of all of
25 these wholesale changes that we're talking about in the

1 south, there might be a way to -- I don't know what
2 happens, whether D-7 gets affected with that or not, but
3 it might. But I guess I'm just concerned about --
4 again, it's the communities of interest, which ones are
5 being addressed. And to have San Tan Valley, which --
6 be separated like that, I would like to see us, if
7 there's a way, to connect that in there.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Would it make any sense for
9 all of San Tan to go into D-7 and D-7 to give up
10 Coolidge? I'm not sure what other adjustments then
11 would have to be made.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Unfortunately, then we'd have
13 to get population from 15. It gets complicated. So
14 then the extra population would be in 15, and 16 would
15 be the one that's short. So 16 would have to --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Not if 16 picks up
17 Coolidge, it won't be short.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we can wait and see
19 what happens after we see those southern changes, but
20 I'm bringing that up because it was -- it was something
21 we talked about yesterday. Apache Junction I know wants
22 to be with folks to the west, but they -- well, I don't
23 even want to go there at this point. Let's -- maybe
24 let's take a look at how that all fits together and see
25 what we can do. And if not, we can always come back

1 later on, but it was something that we talked about
2 yesterday.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: And Commissioner Mehl is
4 right. It would be 7 that is short, not 15. So it
5 would be -- and just so you're all thinking about this,
6 that corner of San Tan Valley is 30,000 people, so it's
7 a lot of people.

8 MR. FLAHAN: And Coolidge is 13,000. So we
9 have to pick up a little bit more. Maybe Florence.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If you can take a look at
11 that, there's obviously multiple interests in trying to
12 clean up that corner. So if you have any suggestion
13 there...

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: I mean, as Mark said, if you
15 are comfortable we can rotate those in, but 7 would need
16 to go into Gold Canyon, Apache Junction area. We can do
17 that instead of San Tan.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Wait. What would go in?
19 7 -- oh, 7 would pick up Apache Junction you're saying.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And take it out of D-15.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And would that include
23 Coolidge going into 16, then, or --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Coolidge and Florence
25 potentially could go into 16.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Or just Coolidge and leave
2 Florence -- Coolidge is -- we've had people request
3 Coolidge to be with Casa Grande. I haven't heard --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, and -- but I think
5 Florence and Coolidge are connected, and population wise
6 it might be good to combine them. You know, I'm
7 thinking more population size at that point. If he says
8 30,000, then you put both of those. And Coolidge and
9 Florence have very close connections. I wouldn't want
10 to separate them into two districts.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Commissioners, I
12 want to be mindful of the time. We do need to take a
13 break. Can we finish up? Are there last-minute
14 directions? And are there other aspects of the
15 legislative map that you'd like to dive into so we can
16 give direction to mapping about whether when we return
17 from break if we're going to continue on the LD map or
18 not?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm done.

20 MR. FLAHAN: Madam Chair, mapping needs one
21 clarification.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, please.

23 MR. FLAHAN: On the numbering, we did switch
24 Prescott to be No. 1 and District 5. Do you want to
25 wait until the very end to do that?

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think we should. Since
2 we're going to re -- I didn't know we were going to
3 renumber everything. We should wait, because we're
4 already getting -- like you pointed out, we're getting
5 comments now. So let's not make any change yet and
6 wait.

7 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. We will switch it back
8 then. Thank you.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All right. So at this
10 point I'm going to suggest we take a 10-minute break,
11 and we will come back and begin congressional maps.
12 Thank you.

13 (Whereupon a recess was taken from 11:01 a.m.
14 to 11:21 a.m.)

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If we can get
16 everybody back so we can reconvene in public session.
17 Okay. I believe that we are ready.

18 We are resuming with Agenda Item V, draft map
19 decision discussion. We are going to turn to
20 congressional map drawing. I will turn it over to our
21 mapping team to walk us through the options.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So on the -- on the tree
23 here, we have the last approved was Congressional 5.0,
24 and off of Congressional 5.0 we built Congressional 6.0
25 and 6.1.

1 So 6.0, the main point was to build off of 5.0,
2 with the goal of moving a section of District 8 that is
3 northeast of I-17 and the canal into D-1. So as you can
4 see there, between the pink District D-8 and D-1, the
5 top northern eastern portion of that triangle that's in
6 D-1 right now used to be part of D-8, and that now
7 shifted into D-1. And then D-8 moves south into
8 District 1 to balance from the population loss of the
9 previous move.

10 Part of that move, it also changed the
11 competitive numbers a little bit. And for District 1,
12 the spread from the old District 1 was only .08 of
13 1 percent, and now that moved to 1.64 percent of a
14 spread. But in District 8, it used to have an
15 8.22 percent spread, but that decreased and shrunk to a
16 6.34 spread, so that actually got more competitive for
17 District 8. So we did sort of a little swap on the
18 competitiveness; District 1 went up a little bit, became
19 less competitive, but District 8 came down and became
20 more competitive.

21 It is balanced. The population is all. All of
22 the requests were fulfilled.

23 And you can see there, there's the demographics
24 and the competitive data on the screen.

25 With that, those are the only changes for 6.0.

1 We're going to -- we're going to jump into 6.1. I'm
2 going to pass it to Doug.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: So thank you. So one of the
4 things as we're working and discussed is that as
5 District 7 is now shifted out of the kind of urban
6 Phoenix area, we've looked at Avondale and Tolleson and
7 those areas that used to be in earlier versions of
8 District 7. With those out now, there -- one of the
9 things we wanted to look at is is there the chance for
10 an opportunity district, perhaps not a -- almost
11 certainly not a majority Latino district but an
12 opportunity district where they could have a shot at
13 electing.

14 So what we're showing you in District 1 -- I'm
15 sorry, in Map 6.1 only rotates in the Phoenix area. So
16 we're only -- well, Phoenix and the west valley. So
17 we're only changing Districts 1, 3, 8, and 9, so the
18 Phoenix and the west valley seats. Here we go.

19 So essentially we take District 8 and move it
20 from being north Phoenix, roughly, over to be a west
21 valley seat. And we also shifted District 3. So
22 obviously the core of District 3 is in the same place,
23 the Guadalupe over to Laveen up to the I-10 is all the
24 same, but the north piece of it has moved west as part
25 of the shift. And the eastern part has actually gone

1 into District 8. And so as you -- as you go through
2 here, so now Avondale and Tolleson and west Glendale and
3 actually up into the southern portion of Peoria and
4 Surprise, south of Ball Road -- that horizontal line at
5 the top of District 8 is Ball Road at the higher part.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Bell Road.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, I'm sorry. The little
8 font on this gets me every time.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I'm just saying
10 there's no ball out that way.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. So -- and I'm actually
12 working for Surprise, Glendale, and Buckeye all right
13 now and I should really know that. So Bell Road. Yes.
14 Thank you.

15 So -- and then where it comes -- so it's
16 Bell Road west of Sun City and it is Thunderbird east of
17 Sun City is the northern edge of that. So -- and
18 we're -- and then we go out and get -- it's Avondale,
19 Goodyear, Buckeye as it goes out.

20 So the results of this is that in 6.0, the map
21 that Mark was showing before, before we make this
22 change, CD-3 is 54 percent Latino CVAP. In this -- in
23 this version, CD-3 comes down to 51 percent. So it's
24 still majority Latino by citizen voting age population;
25 it's just a little bit less, and that's because it's

1 giving up that Latino population to District 8. CD-7 is
2 unchanged; we didn't touch anything in CD-7, so it stays
3 at 47 percent. And CD-8 goes from being 18 percent as a
4 north Phoenix seat, 18 percent Latino, to 28 percent.
5 Obviously still not near 50 percent, but a 10 percent
6 bump. And on the performance scale, the attorney
7 general's race you can see gets up to 47 percent. So
8 we're getting close to something that registers
9 effective.

10 And one of the things as we thought about this
11 is the Commission has talked about in the past with the
12 Native American community, you know, it's only going to
13 be 20 percent of a congressional district no matter how
14 you draw it, but if that congressional district is
15 competitive then that 20 percent can be a key player.

16 The same thing here. District 8 is a highly
17 competitive seat, 2.9 percent spread and on the swing
18 it's 3 and 6. So we are -- we're getting a 28 percent
19 Latino CVAP seat out of this in a highly competitive
20 district. I think the competition actually improved a
21 little bit. I forget -- District 8 is also competitive
22 in 6.0; we're just having a competitive District 8
23 somewhere else. But, yes, it goes --

24 That's right. Thank you, Brian.

25 So in 6.0, District 8 is 6.3 percent. And in

1 6.1, it's 2.9 percent.

2 And the other piece of this is of course as we
3 look at the map, this is a very compact map. You know,
4 you can walk through it city by city and you can see why
5 it makes sense. So while I'm talking about the Latino
6 numbers and its performance, it's obviously very
7 community oriented.

8 The one piece given the Commission's previous
9 direction that we try -- couldn't quite fit in is that
10 Sun City is divided from Sun City Grand and Sun City
11 West. As you can see on the map, it's just -- Sun City
12 is the little bump at the top of District 8, and it's
13 just really hard to get around that and still create
14 this opportunity district.

15 So it's a -- it's a thought again. It's a
16 rotation of Districts 1, 3, 4, 8, and 9 through the --
17 I'm sorry, not 4 -- 1, 3, 8, and 9 through Phoenix and
18 the west valley, and it does give us that Bell Road and
19 Thunderbird division in the west valley. Those are both
20 very major roads out there obviously.

21 And so we're happy to answer any questions or
22 show you any additional detail on this.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm going to suggest,
24 given the sensitivities with honoring the VRA and, you
25 know, some of the data points that we move to go into

1 executive session to get legal advice to understand our
2 compliance responsibilities more. If there's agreement
3 on that, I'll entertain a motion to go into executive
4 session pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I move to go into
6 executive session.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I second.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 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
17 an aye.

18 And with that, we will move into executive
19 session to seek legal advice in our efforts to comply
20 with the VRA.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg, is the plan to
22 come back from executive session before lunch, or should
23 we -- or are you -- should we break for lunch on our
24 side?

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. Lunch will not be

1 for probably -- oh, I think lunch will be in about an
2 hour to an hour and 15. We're hoping that we'll have
3 you come back and join us as soon as executive session
4 is over so that we can dive into the maps.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Perfect. Thank you.

6 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive
7 session from 11:31 a.m. until 12:28 p.m.)

8
9 * * * * *

10
11 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general
12 session.)

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.
14 We'll reconvene.

15 Okay. Thank you for everybody's patience. We
16 were on Agenda V. We just came out of executive session
17 where we obtained legal advice with honoring compliance
18 to the VRA and understanding polarization data in terms
19 of our responsibility for redistricting for all minority
20 communities and all citizens.

21 So with that, we're going to bring up
22 discussion on congressional map drawing.

23 MR. FLAHAN: Lori, can we get Brian to share.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is there a -- is there --
25 just one thing. You walked us through, Doug, the

1 change -- the differences between 6.0 and 6.1. Could
2 you just do -- you know, could you all do that overlay
3 that just shows us what those changes were prior to us
4 making a -- while we're -- while we're just talking
5 about the maps. It would be interesting for us to kind
6 of see the changes.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: We're bringing that up now.
8 So you can see how bright all the colors turn when he
9 overlaid the two maps. That's because everything on the
10 outside didn't change; they are the same in both maps.
11 We're only looking at a rotation between 1, 3, 8, and 9.
12 So if you -- you can see where the red District 1 is
13 coming into the green. Let me make sure I describe this
14 correctly. So --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: That's why I'm trying to make
17 sure I describe to you correctly.

18 MR. KINGERY: 6.0 is showing right now.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah. There you go. So
20 6.0 is there. And then for 6.1, District 3 moves
21 slightly to the west. What we were looking at there, I
22 believe this is where we had the Alhambra area united in
23 District 3, as 3 moves north.

24 Yeah, let's overlay the two. There we go.

25 Yeah. So District 3 is moving -- the top part

1 of District 3 is moving slightly west and then coming up
2 north to Northern, and that's picking up population as
3 it gives off from the western side. You can see the
4 lighter green on the west, that's where District 3 is
5 giving up the population to the moved District 8. If we
6 zoom in there, that is -- what street is that? Yeah.
7 Yeah. So it's 91st is the --

8 Oh, sorry. Go down. District 3.

9 The new -- the new western border of District 3
10 is 91st.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: 91st Avenue.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Kind of splits Tolleson in
14 half sort of, and Avondale moves into the west.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. If it's -- it could
16 be -- if it did, that was unintentional.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I understand, but just
18 trying to give Commissioner Lerner some bearings.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So one thing would be
20 that if we did modify that, we'd want to make Tolleson
21 whole. If we decided to go -- that's in 6.1; correct?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

24 MR. KINGERY: You're side by side.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah. Oh, there we go.

1 Side by side. Thank you.

2 MR. KINGERY: So left is 6.0, right is 6.1.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Very nice, Brian.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. So now you can see
5 where in 6.0 District 3 came up to Northern for just a
6 relatively smaller section. Now Northern is almost the
7 northern border for about two-thirds of the district.
8 So it's coming up and getting significantly more
9 population north of where it used to be. And that's
10 because it is giving up kind of -- that's where we go
11 from the 54 percent Latino CVAP in 6.0 to 51 percent
12 CVAP in 6.1, because we're giving up some of that more
13 heavily Latino communities in the west in order to
14 create the new opportunity seat and we're picking up to
15 the north. So by giving up the -- the net result of
16 moving the different communities around is that we give
17 up 3 percent CVAP in 3 and the Latino CVAP in 8 goes up
18 by 10 percent. So that's where we are picking up all
19 those District 9 communities that are -- have a lot of
20 Latinos as well.

21 And then you can see if we look at the north a
22 little more -- there you go -- you can see where
23 District 8 on the left in 6.0 is a Peoria, Glendale,
24 northwest Phoenix district, and then it -- all of that
25 becomes District 9 as District 9 and 8 essentially shift

1 to be a horizontal split along Bell Road and Thunderbird
2 there.

3 The southern border of District 8 follows the
4 current -- in 6.1 is the same southern border as 9 has
5 in 6.0. So we're not touching anything out of those
6 four districts.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So just for clarity for
8 me, and Commissioner York can help me with this, on the
9 retirement communities over in that area, if we can --
10 because we've been -- we've talked a lot about trying to
11 connect them.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: The Sun Cities?

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, the Sun City,
14 Surprise, that whole area. So in these two iterations,
15 I guess maybe we can focus in on that. Or,
16 Commissioner York, you know that area. You want to --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, in 6.0, most of the
18 retirement communities are in District 8. And then in
19 the far east side of District 9 there's Sun City West.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And interestingly,
21 actually, Sun City -- Sun City itself, as Commissioner
22 just mentioned, not Sun City West or Grand, Sun City
23 itself is in District 8 in 6.0 and stays -- and stays in
24 District 8 as the district moves. It's one of the few
25 pieces -- places that --

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's a funky little
2 jog there on Thunderbird.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Yeah. And that's --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: In --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 6.1.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: 6.1.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. So the bump off of --
10 of the northern border of District 8 is the northern
11 border of Sun City in 6.1, and then it comes back down
12 to Thunderbird and picks -- so then it's picking up
13 Peoria territory as it goes east.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: On the 6.0, that funky
15 area that drops in, the -- next to Glendale (inaudible),
16 58th, 59th --

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, below Northern there?
18 Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right there --

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- where you are. Which
22 (inaudible.)

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: That neck is actually west
24 Glendale. So you can see the Luke Air Force Base out to
25 the left and then Glendale is that corridor. And

1 north -- Northern is the border between Glendale and
2 Peoria. So it's -- it's just coming in along -- taking
3 up the city of Glendale territory.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I recall, you said the
5 majority of the population in District 9 would end up
6 being that west valley, right, when we -- when we look
7 at the numbers? Because I'm looking at something like
8 west Glendale and going do they really want to be with
9 Colorado River? But I think you mentioned that most of
10 the population was actually closer in to Maricopa
11 County?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct. The number of west
13 valley people in District 9 is the same in both because
14 we don't touch anything outside. It's just which west
15 valley communities are in District 9. And if I recall
16 correctly, it's right about 70, 71 percent of the total
17 population in District 9 is west valley.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: In 6.0.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: In both. So it just --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Wouldn't the 303 corridor
21 be considered part of the west valley?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, I'm broadly saying.
23 Yes, I'm saying all of -- all of western Maricopa County
24 and --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- Phoenix.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Got it.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: It might be 69 and a half, and
4 then Wickenburg is the other 1 percent.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you for reviewing
6 those changes. It was getting -- I mean, you were
7 talking through it and I was just getting a little
8 confused because I'm not as familiar with the west
9 valley in terms of -- I can see it, though. It's pretty
10 clear what -- as you kind of take a look.

11 And the concern I would have is that, you know,
12 breakup of the -- of some of those communities. I'm not
13 sure how we get around that with -- we've looked at --
14 we know that some of the retirement communities want to
15 be together, but I'm not sure how we pull them all into
16 one without really making a mess of changes to
17 everything for that. So if we can at least not divide
18 them, then that would work.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is that possible? Is
20 that possible to get Sun City West into 8?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, our move -- well...

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, because Sun City West,
23 Sun City Grand as well, my concern is that 8 is a highly
24 competitive seat. And if we're adding those areas in
25 and giving up area -- essentially what we would have to

1 do is give up some of the eastern neck of 8, where it's
2 picking up Peoria, and I don't know what the overall
3 impact of that would be, but --

4 Oh, stay with the maps.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Do you mean 8 being
6 competitive? It's actually got a seven-point spread.
7 Or do you mean 1?

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. Oh, sorry. Okay. Sorry.
9 Bring the spreadsheet back.

10 MR. KINGERY: For 6.1?

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah.

12 So it's a -- in 6.1, 8 is a 2.9 spread and a
13 3-6 swing. This is part of the reason we're presenting
14 it is that obviously 28 percent Latino is not anywhere
15 near a majority Latino seat, but they would be a much
16 larger chunk of an extremely competitive district.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: My only concern is
18 compromising the community of interest of the Sun City,
19 the retirement communities, who, you know, really are a
20 unique voting bloc. They are so different from the rest
21 of the state. You know? The way they live their lives,
22 the way they budget. You know? And we'd be
23 compromising an important community of interest, a
24 unified community of interest for competitiveness.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, I would just note they

1 are divided in both maps. So Sun City is out of there
2 because this is the -- we have wrestled -- we have had
3 this instruction to try to put them together, and we've
4 been trying to do it in every map and it just hasn't
5 worked out with any of the instructions.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, one of the things I
7 like about 6.0 is that we don't split up Glendale in a
8 way that -- and then we give also the suggestion from
9 the Latino Coalition around District 3 that they gave
10 us. 1 is competitive, 8 is more competitive the way we
11 have it drawn. 9 is 9. The west valley is part of 9,
12 kind of keeps it all together more so than it does in
13 6.1. So, I mean, I feel really comfortable with 6.0.
14 And I appreciate the efforts.

15 So I'd like to make a motion to approve CD
16 Map 6.0 as our new map.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I will second the motion.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Discussion?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think we can support
20 6.0. I want to acknowledge that there's some changes
21 from -- in District 3 from what the Coalition had
22 proposed, but it is still performing the way it needs to
23 perform. And I might -- after we've voted to accept
24 this map, I might propose one small change to see if
25 that would work with bringing some communities of

1 interest a little better together. But, otherwise, I
2 think I could support also going with that.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman, do
4 you have an opinion?

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, both maps for the
6 most part meet what I believe some of the tribes are
7 looking at; that's obviously my big focus. But looking
8 at and opining on the discussion here, I certainly had a
9 preference for 6.1. But, you know, in the interest of
10 reaching some conclusion today so that we can get
11 feedback from the community, I think I would be
12 supportive of 6.0, notwithstanding, you know, needed --
13 probably some needed changes as we go out and do our
14 30-day public hearings. So I'm okay with 6.0. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I was intrigued by 6.1
17 for the opportunities it created and a little bit more
18 of the competitiveness. But it seems like there's
19 greater consensus around 6.0 so -- and there is a motion
20 on the table, so I will put it up for a vote.

21 Vice Chair Watchman.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
5 an aye.

6 With that, a 5-0 vote, we have approved 6.0 as
7 a starting point for congressional deliberation.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So there's just one
9 change that I'd act to do -- I'd like to suggest that
10 kind of follows what we were talking about with the
11 legislative area, and that's taking -- if we take a
12 close look at the intersection between D-8, D-1, and
13 D-3, there's an area there that's east -- in D-8 that's
14 east of I-17 and south of Thunderbird. And again,
15 Commissioner York, please correct me if I get some of
16 these things off a little bit.

17 But I'm again looking at portions of that
18 mountain preserve area, trying to connect them all. So
19 that's a community of interest. So similar to what's
20 done in the legislative map, taking Moon Valley,
21 Sunnyslope, and some of the other communities adjacent
22 to the Phoenix Mountain Preserves and trying to unite
23 them closer with that. So that would take -- yeah, I
24 think it -- and then I know that population is balanced
25 on these. District 8 would then need to pick up some

1 population, and it could potentially take some from
2 District 1 north of Bell Road.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you have a lot of --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not sure if that
5 balances.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- that Sunnyslope mountain
7 preserve area currently in D-8. And it would be easier
8 to pick up the rest of that area if you move south in
9 D-1 down to Bethany, I think. Bethany Home over to the
10 canal, Lincoln area.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, are you talking
12 about moving from 1 to 8 or 8 to 1? I'm thinking of
13 moving from 8 to 1 to just capture some of that and
14 finish --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no. That's -- you're
16 looking at almost 30,000 people if you went all the way
17 up toward the end of that mountain. Like I said, there
18 would be less people to move -- to pick up the
19 neighborhood would be to move south to Bethany from its
20 current -- currently on Glendale. Bethany over to the
21 60 -- the Squaw Peak 51 highway up to Lincoln.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It seems like that
23 might --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, then you would
25 make --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm just trying to
2 combine those communities. It seems like that might --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I understand. But you
4 would make 8 more competitive in doing so.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't think it'll get
6 to that competitive point where -- are you talking
7 about -- it would make 1 less competitive then, I think.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: A little bit, yes.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And right now it's pretty
10 close.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I agree. But, I mean,
12 that -- so the trade-off --

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it's really just
14 trying to put those communities together around Piestewa
15 Peak and North Mountain.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: But I believe, you know,
17 when we did it on the legislative map I might have made
18 a mistake, because in my head that neighborhood moved
19 south down into the central Phoenix area, Brophy High
20 School, Central High School, Xavier, as opposed to north
21 like we have it now on the legislative map. So the
22 border of the north side does most of its business and
23 school district and church and all that is to the north,
24 up towards Bell Road, whereas the south works its way
25 down the Central corridor downtown.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not sure -- can you
2 tell me exactly which road you're talking about when
3 you're saying that, please?

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I'm just talking
5 about the way that those neighborhoods work between the
6 17 and the 51, up against the mountain, Sunnyslope,
7 currently D-8 has most of that in its -- in its
8 boundary. And so if you were interested in moving more
9 of those neighborhoods in together, you would -- ideally
10 you would move the boundary of D-8 down from currently
11 Glendale, which I think is a natural boundary for it,
12 down to Bethany. But I wouldn't go any further south as
13 far as that neighborhood.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're talking about
15 moving south. I was -- I was thinking -- into D-1? So
16 the Phoenix Mountain Preserves are all in D-1 now.
17 We're just trying to --

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. The only mountain in
19 the Phoenix mountain reserve now is Squaw Peak. The
20 rest of the mountain reserve to the west is in --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- is in D-8.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. And that -- I --
24 yeah, I misspoke. I was just looking at the map where
25 it shows Phoenix Mountain Park. That's what I meant to

1 say.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So that's what I
4 was -- and that's -- I basically was just trying to
5 connect that community in some way.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there's a natural
7 boundary there of this -- of the -- of the highway, the
8 Squaw Peak expressway. And currently to the west --
9 east is in the Paradise Valley D-1 district, which I
10 think fits well. And that North Central school --
11 North and -- north central neighborhood, which is
12 basically the corridor along Central Avenue, runs up
13 into the mountain reserve which right now half of it's
14 in D-8, the other half is in D-1. So if I was to add
15 any area to D-8 that was of communities of interest, I
16 would add that north central neighborhood to D-8 along
17 the freeway, along the 51 freeway there.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you would take some of
19 D-1 into D-8?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct. I mean --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- if you want to make it
23 more -- if you were interested in enhancing the
24 community of interest and the neighborhood and the
25 geography, yes.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I was going -- I was
2 going the flip side of that.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I understand, but that
4 doesn't --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: That is kind of against
7 that neighborhood, I believe.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So, yeah. So I'm looking
9 at that area right next to -- I've got to pull this up
10 on my map where the D-1 shows up. Dreamy Draw, sort of
11 over at Northern. If we take Northern all the way
12 across and that Dreamy Draw area and then take up --
13 what's the street? Skyline Heights.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I understand what
15 you're trying to do. You're trying to make District 1
16 more competitive. But I'm still arguing the fact that
17 anything across the Squaw Peak Parkway is in a different
18 community than anything to the east side of the Squaw
19 Peak. The east side is Arcadia, south side of Camelback
20 Mountain. You've got the Scottsdale School District.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Yeah. No. I see
22 what you're saying with that.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Where you've got Central
24 High, Camelback High, Xavier, Brophy all in that other
25 corridor.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, where would --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think it's in a pretty
3 good spot right now, Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, if I could,
6 could I clear the record? I think Squaw Peak has been
7 changed, was changed in 2003. So could we, for the
8 record call, it Piestewa Peak?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: I apologize,
10 Commissioner Watchman. I have a hard time pronouncing
11 her name.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Piestewa.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: By no pes -- whatever.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you. Just so
15 that's -- I think the legal name is now Piestewa Peak.
16 So thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. Xavier and Brophy
18 are a distance from this area, so they are much further
19 south.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and that's what I'm
21 saying. The neighborhoods that attend those schools are
22 north. And so you could either come down Central some
23 more to Bethany --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: All right. You know
25 what? I think I'll -- I need to take a closer look at

1 it. I had this vision, and now you've kind of had me
2 rethink the whole. So I probably need to look and see
3 about the alternative that you've proposed, and I'm
4 going to take a little time to do that. Because it
5 might be good to do it the other shift that you're
6 suggesting, but I probably need to take a closer look at
7 it.

8 And just as a question for D-8, that little one
9 square mile maybe, the 27th Avenue one, is that there
10 just for population? Is that why that goes down on the
11 west side of I-17?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: The finger.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, that's just population
15 balancing.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Population. Okay. All
17 right. I'll probably come back to this because I want
18 to take a look and maybe look closer at your thoughts on
19 it as well.

20 So the only other things I guess I'll say is
21 that at some point, as Commissioner Watchman mentioned,
22 we'll -- we're going to want to take a closer look again
23 at these with regard to some of the locations for the
24 Native American communities, not right at this time.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't have any further

1 changes to this map.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It sound -- I do not
3 either. It sounds like Commissioner Lerner might and
4 would like just a little extra time to look at it. So
5 maybe after lunch would be a time that you'd be able to
6 make decisions? Okay.

7 Are there any other thoughts or feedback from
8 mapping on the congressional map? This might be a good
9 time. I don't know where we are with lunch. Oh, okay.
10 So maybe we take a lunch break and the Commissioners can
11 maybe put thought into some of these, you know, little
12 finer details.

13 And, mapping, how much time would you like?

14 MR. FLAHAN: We think an hour at the most for
15 our side.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Why don't we take
17 an hour break. We'll resume at 1:56 so that at 2:00
18 we're going to start.

19 (Whereupon a recess was taken from 12:56 p.m.
20 to 2:17 p.m.)

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are we ready to convene?
22 Everybody ready to go? All right.

23 We're returning back to public session,
24 returning to Agenda Item V, discussing congressional
25 maps. I will turn it over to mapping for them to share

1 their latest iteration.

2 MR. FLAHAN: Give us one second. We're pulling
3 up the WebEx right now.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do you have new
5 spreadsheets for us?

6 MR. FLAHAN: We do.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Not printed out. We're
8 literally finishing it as we sit here.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Legislative or --

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Legislative.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

12 MR. FLAHAN: These are the legislative changes
13 from this morning.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, we're -- oh, we're
15 working on the legislative map right now? That's the
16 changes you have? I'm sorry. I said congressional,
17 didn't I? I'm sorry.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Do we have congressional?

19 MR. FLAHAN: No.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think there were --

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah, I guess -- you were
22 going to -- when we broke, you were discussing
23 congressional. If you want to start with resuming that
24 discussion, that's fine. Or we can report back on
25 legislative.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't have a
2 preference.

3 Colleagues?

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: What did we change in
5 congressional? We accepted 6.0.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We never made a change.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think we made a
8 change.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. You were discussing
10 the preserve but didn't give us any direction on that,
11 and I -- and --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no, I didn't -- yeah.
13 I thought I was -- correct.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, we're going to have
16 to see it.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We didn't make changes.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, you -- oh, you didn't
19 make any changes whatsoever?

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Right.

22 MR. KINGERY: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The whole time we did
24 back and forth, but we didn't make any changes.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. All right.

1 So let's do the legislative map, please.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So Legislative 7.0 has
3 just about everything, and there's one change we left
4 for 7.1. So both of these come off of the Commission's
5 approved 6.1.

6 So in 7.0, this starts with making the changes
7 in the Tucson area. So we're incorporating all of the
8 revisions drawing from the 033 map and making those
9 changes in Tucson area. The -- you're familiar with all
10 those changes.

11 The one challenge we ran into and the reason
12 it's asterisked on the star is that you may recall
13 District 17 comes -- in the 033 map comes up into
14 District 7 and takes some areas --

15 There we go. Can you pull -- go up by
16 Saddlebrooke.

17 So District 17 comes up and takes Saddlebrooke
18 and SaddleBrooke Ranch. And in the citizen map it also
19 continues in and takes Mammoth and that area.
20 District 7 wasn't part of the instruction. We're hoping
21 not to touch that. And it turns out that the map as
22 imported, District 17 is short, just a little bit short;
23 it's a 6 percent deviation there. And so we have three
24 options there:

25 District 17 can come north into District 7,

1 just as was shown in the submitted map, and that would
2 balance it out and District 7 would still be okay. It's
3 not going to throw District 7 off.

4 Alternatively, District 7 -- I'm sorry,
5 District 17 --

6 Can you zoom in on Tucson there?

7 -- can take the southeast edge of District 18
8 and the last block on the -- on the southeastern side of
9 18 to balance.

10 Or 17 could take the Davis-Monthan Air Force
11 Base at the -- at -- that's at the top of 19 and then
12 some population right below it, and that would balance.

13 We did check all three of those options. All
14 three would balance 17 and not throw the other district
15 off balance. But those are the three questions we would
16 need to bring 17 into balance.

17 Otherwise, everything down here worked,
18 imported successfully. And we now have essentially the
19 map as described before with the full audit log of the
20 changes that we made to get there.

21 We also have a couple changes up in the Mesa
22 area included in this map.

23 Can you go up to Mesa?

24 So we did take District 9 and 10 and rotate
25 them in this map.

1 Go ahead and just clear that out. There we go.

2 So in the last map, 9 and 10 were horizontal
3 and now we have returned them back to the vertical in
4 this area.

5 And then -- oh, and then the last piece was San
6 Tan Valley.

7 So go down to the bottom part of 15.

8 So you can see in this map San Tan Valley is
9 now united in 15. There's that little blue spot you can
10 see in there. It is just barely connected. It actually
11 is connected by more than a point to 7. It turns out
12 that there's a piece of Florence that zooms in and
13 takes -- there's about 20 Florence residents in there,
14 and then the piece of San Tan that's outlined in red
15 there that comes around it and almost cuts it off has
16 zero population in it. So we left that one piece out so
17 that we would keep that contiguous and not move any
18 people. So as we talked about this morning, that was
19 about 30,000 people roughly.

20 If you go up to the top of 15, this was a
21 straight trade between 7 and 15. So District 7 is
22 picking up Gold Canyon and then coming in to Apache
23 Junction to balance that out. So it's a straight 30,000
24 population trade between the two.

25 So that's the changes. We should bring up the

1 spreadsheet for 7.0. So you've already seen the numbers
2 for the changes down in Tucson. They're essentially as
3 you looked at before when we were looking at the 033
4 map. In 9 and 10, you see the competitive scores now
5 are 21.3 spread in 9 and 6.8 spread in 10. 10 does have
6 one swing, so it's an 8 to 1. So it's just within
7 7 percent and does have one swing election. I'm trying
8 to think. 15 and 7, I don't think we were -- those --
9 the changes in San Tan and Apache Junction weren't going
10 to really impact competitiveness. These are -- these --
11 neither 15 nor 7 is anywhere close to our competitive
12 ranges. So those are the changes in 7.0.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I ask a question?

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Are you sure the numbers
16 for 9 are correct?

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: We were -- we were working
18 very fast, but I think so.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 9 -- I just looked at
20 6.1. That's what we went off of; right?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we want --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was -- it was a bigger
23 spread before, so it's a little bit less now. It was at
24 28 percent in -- wait a minute. Am I right?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I read that correctly --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. You're right.

2 It's --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- it's backwards.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is backwards.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: It should be 70 --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Because the 2008 governor
8 race to 9 probably went to the Democrat as well as the
9 AG race.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let me see.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's a reverse
12 (inaudible)?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, yeah. No. I don't
14 know about that. I thought the 9 was -- shouldn't 9 be
15 blue, Shereen?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. And according to
17 this --

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: According to this, it says
19 it's red.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible)
21 automatically?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can you -- can you bring
23 that --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was before; right?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can we bring up the

1 redistricting tool?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's just --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. There you go. Oh, so
4 what happened is when we turned them vertical we turned
5 them around. Sorry. So 10 is on the left and 9 is on
6 the right.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Oh, okay.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: So sharp eye.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: There you go.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: All right.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm sorry.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry about that.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. That makes sense.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: That makes sense.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Ooh. Okay. My heart can
18 restart.

19 MR. KINGERY: Want me to switch them?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: He probably should switch
21 them back to how they -- the numbers at least to how it
22 was.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, go ahead and switch them

1 back.

2 And then we'll redo the spreadsheet before it
3 gets --

4 You haven't published the spreadsheet to the
5 website?

6 MR. KINGERY: No, I haven't. I haven't --

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

8 MR. KINGERY: -- published anything yet.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: All right. Okay. Okay. Be
10 still, my heart. So --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm so impressed how
12 awake everybody is.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I was going to say good
14 eye. So --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm impressed
16 Commissioner York has (inaudible).

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

19 MR. KINGERY: All right.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: So okay. Then --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, so just -- go ahead.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So we did lose the
23 competitive seat there. We're outside the range there.
24 But it is -- it is -- well, I guess it's in the farther
25 range and has one swing in there.

1 The last change in 7.1, if we can switch over
2 to 7.1. So 7.1 incorporates everything we just looked
3 at. And then we were trying to get creative in terms of
4 looking at Florence and Coolidge. Fix the numbers here
5 first. There we go.

6 So if you zoom out to Florence or Coolidge.
7 There you go. And then zoom out a little more.

8 So this was the request to put Florence and
9 Coolidge into 16, which would put them with the Gila
10 River reservation as well and put the two of them
11 together. The challenge then was that 7 had lost a
12 bunch of population, and so where to go to get that.
13 Obviously we could have continued into 15 and picked up
14 more of that Apache Junction area, but the -- but the
15 trick is then where would 15 go because it can't rotate
16 through very effectively because the reservation is on
17 the southern border there.

18 So trying to be creative, what we did is we
19 took -- in the submitted 033 map that we've now
20 incorporated as 7.0, 16 comes down into Tucson, and
21 instead 7 comes down in Tucson. It follows the exact
22 same footprint that 16 did so we're not changing
23 anything in Tucson; it's simply 7 coming in instead of
24 16. So lacking a better solution to the Florence,
25 Coolidge question, this is one that works. I don't know

1 if it is one that passes muster with the Commission. So
2 this is -- this is actually why we separated it, because
3 I didn't know if that would be something the Commission
4 would go for.

5 So we have 7.0 that we'd simply need the
6 direction on where to balance 17 if the Commission
7 wishes to adopt it. And then 7.1 if you like this, like
8 this approach.

9 Oh, we should bring up the spreadsheet for
10 this.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I think the
12 community of interest going from the White Mountains
13 down into Tucson isn't going to make either end of that
14 district happy. So appreciate the creativity, but I'm
15 not too wild about it.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, that's good. That's --
17 there we go.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I agree. I
19 appreciate that -- you trying it. I still think it's
20 something that we may want to take a look at in the
21 future because I think that's ill -- it's logical for
22 them to be together. I just don't know that this
23 particular -- but -- you know, thing works. And I think
24 as we look at doing some -- making some changes in the
25 map, we'll probably be -- we hopefully will be able to

1 find something that works. But I appreciate you making
2 the effort. Because I think there's a logic to that
3 group of communities being together that -- but this
4 particular way maybe not.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sounds good.

6 MR. KINGERY: And remember 9 and 10 are
7 switched in this table, and we'll fix that before we
8 publish it to the site.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It sounds like there's
11 consensus on version 7.0.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we need to adopt one, I
13 guess.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, we do.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So I make a motion that we
16 approve 7.0 as the new base to work from.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: A comment. There was three
18 questions, correct, by the mapping team for us to think
19 about in 7.0?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, after we adopt it.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. That's fine.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'll second.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

25 Vice Chair Watchman.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner work.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
9 an aye.

10 We have adopted Legislative District Map 7.0 as
11 a new starting point.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So now I have questions on
13 the alternatives you mentioned for 17. If you went
14 north, what would you take in? Because you said one of
15 the alternatives -- and if that takes in Mammoth and
16 Oracle, then I think that's a good alternative. But
17 then what happens to District 7?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: It actually works out. So
19 we've tested all three so we could --

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- answer questions. So, yes,
22 it would take in --

23 Go down to the southern tip of D-7.

24 It would take in Mammoth and Oracle. And D-7
25 would -- can give up that population and still be

1 balanced. So D-7 doesn't have to pick up anything in
2 trade-off.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then I would strongly
4 support that because that's a -- that was a community of
5 interest I mentioned this morning as an alternative,
6 so -- to include those. So I think that would be a
7 good -- a good way to go.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just to, you know, look
9 into the map there, remind, so it's Mammoth, Oracle, and
10 San Manuel.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Now that we have this map
13 adopted, are we working on changes now?

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, before you go elsewhere --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- is that consensus on that
19 change or --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: From my perspective, yes.
22 Is there anybody that disagrees with
23 Commissioner Mehl's suggestion?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: So do we need to propose a
25 motion to adopt the additional change before we move

1 forward?

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't -- I think let's
3 hear all -- let's hear all the changes.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And just so you can
7 visually see it, it's -- it literally would be the same
8 line that was in 033 which would be right below where
9 the -- right about where the D-7 label is on the screen
10 as you look at it.

11 Okay. Sorry. Sorry, Commissioner Lerner.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. That's okay.

13 I remain concerned about District 17. It's
14 kind of the same thing I was saying earlier about Tanque
15 Verde and where it's been placed. I think we need to
16 make changes into that, into that district.

17 The goal of this change was to combine Marana
18 with Oro Valley. We have changed a lot of other things
19 that didn't necessarily need to be that dramatically
20 changed. Oro Valley really in some ways should have
21 been with -- we have now taken it away from Casas Adobes
22 where we have heard a lot of folks say we are actually
23 connected to that. They head south quite a bit. I
24 think Marana wanted to be with -- thank you -- Oro
25 Valley, but we also heard from a lot of people in Oro

1 Valley saying that their connection is to the south.

2 But my other -- my real concern that I wanted
3 to bring up, at least initially, first of all -- or, you
4 know, I don't know that -- I will freely admit I don't
5 know Tucson as my colleague does. But Tanque Verde
6 itself should be part of the Tucson district. Instead,
7 it is being put into a much more rural district, and it
8 is -- we're taking parts of Tucson that we don't need to
9 do. It should be put back into, well, I guess the
10 old -- it's basically being put into this -- well, part
11 of it is being put into the District 17, and maybe -- so
12 I think it needs to go back into District 18 as part of
13 that.

14 The map itself is really splitting Tucson in
15 kind of interesting ways. I'm also concerned about how
16 District 19 wraps around District 17 in the manner that
17 it does. We've just made so many whole-scale changes to
18 accomplish one basic goal. And as I said earlier, if we
19 had looked back at Map 4.0 for the method to combine
20 Marana and Oro Valley and worked from that point, we
21 wouldn't have had to make so many changes that
22 dramatically impacted these smaller communities of
23 interest and where they are located. So part of it is I
24 don't even know exactly where to begin with some of the
25 changes. But I know with Tanque Verde we basically have

1 a mountain range in that area, we have that basically
2 will have to be wrapped around for -- to travel for this
3 person to -- whoever their legislator is to travel as
4 part of that.

5 There are a number of different areas I think
6 that could be tightened up to make this look a little
7 cleaner and not have Tucson split in one, two, three --
8 I mean, it's got six different splits. This to me is
9 not a compact strategy. And, again, it goes to we
10 wanted to try to connect those two communities, but
11 Tanque Verde is across a mountain range and the city
12 from Oro Valley but now is put in with Oro Valley or in
13 that area.

14 D-17 also could be much more competitive
15 ultimately if we make a few adjustments. It went from
16 being something that -- well, I don't even -- honestly
17 I'm not sure where it began anymore because so many
18 changes were made here I don't know what it used to be
19 as part of it.

20 So I have some real concerns. I'm going to
21 have trouble with this map all the way through and
22 especially as we move forward with it. And I want -- I
23 want my colleague to have what he recognizes as the
24 connection, but as I mentioned earlier I'm having a lot
25 of trouble with the discontinuous nature of this. I

1 don't know why D-19 has to wrap around. I don't know
2 were Tanque Verde is not in with D-18. We see D-23
3 coming into a split in this area, coming from Yuma and
4 then sort of filtering up in sort of an odd way. And we
5 have this one Mission Road; I'm not sure if that's
6 because there's maybe the tribal -- there was that one
7 piece, I'm not sure if there was that one piece in that
8 area, but --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, that's the Indian
10 reservation.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that the -- that's
12 what that is? I kind of figured it must be something
13 like that as part of it.

14 So there's a part of me that just says I don't
15 even know how to begin to take this because this is such
16 a dramatic departure from what we had before.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can maybe,
18 Commissioner Lerner, we ask or if I were to ask what is
19 your top priority? So when you look at this area and
20 you're most concerned about something -- I know that
21 you're just not liking it. But in terms of
22 priorities -- you know, for example, I look at Tanque
23 Verde. I mean, I -- if we put them in 18, aren't they
24 going to be a marginalized community of interest? So
25 just help me understand what your top priority here is

1 with this area.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: For the -- well,
3 honestly -- I'm sorry, Chairwoman -- it's so
4 dramatically different that it's hard to get a whole
5 picture of it. But Tanque Verde and where the mountain
6 range is located and making it -- I don't think it will
7 be a marginalized if it goes into that area.

8 But I'm also looking at it from a district
9 perspective for 17 on the area that it covers. They're
10 not all connected. Especially now we're adding in --
11 which I tend to agree with, those communities up in --
12 that we just talked about of Oracle. Because I've
13 always -- I felt that Oracle and Oro Valley, Catalina
14 should be connected. So I'm glad to have those
15 connected.

16 But then we head all the way south. I think
17 that what we are doing is creating a very disparate
18 district in this area. Tanque Verde would I don't think
19 be marginalized; they would actually be connected to
20 Tucson which is what they should be. They should have
21 that connection. Tanque Verde is -- by putting it in a
22 rural community I would say would be more marginalized
23 by having it in that area.

24 I'm not sure why Davis-Monthan is -- and as a
25 second point, District 19 as we look at that, we have

1 Davis-Monthan in a Cochise County, Graham, Greenlee. I
2 mean, we have talked a lot about the communities there.
3 That is all of a sudden going into a rural community in
4 Cochise County, Davis-Monthan base. So that's another
5 concern I have.

6 Flowing Wells is now connected -- that's one --
7 wait. Did we just move Flowing Wells? No. Is in --
8 has also been moved in this.

9 There's just -- it's got a -- Flowing Wells has
10 a Latino community that's a pretty decent one. It's now
11 outside of a Tucson district and placed into Pinal
12 County.

13 It's -- we made whole-scale changes in an area
14 that needed to have one change, and I don't think
15 that -- I mean, I've said this before. Let's focus on
16 the change that we wanted and not focus on making a
17 massive change. This was -- we had previous to this a
18 couple of good, solid Tucson, central Tucson districts,
19 and that's been completely split apart.

20 If you look at west of the I-10 now, we have a
21 couple of districts to the west and then they extend
22 over to the east. And we've got one, two, three, four
23 to five districts to the east that are all connected to
24 Tucson all split apart. We have 16 and 20 and 21 on the
25 west side. This really splits apart Tucson in just

1 different ways.

2 And I haven't looked at competitiveness at all
3 at this point to see what happened with that from our
4 previous. But as I said earlier, I think we built a
5 mountain out of a molehill. We needed to make a change
6 to connect Marana with its community of interest, and we
7 could've easily worked through that as we have been
8 doing with other communities. And as we just did with
9 adding Oracle, San Manuel, and Mammoth, that was a
10 change that we made and our mapping folks were able to
11 find the population to balance that. That's what we
12 needed to do with Marana without doing all of these
13 other changes.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The reality is that we
15 have voted on this map and this is the map that we're
16 working from. So rather than going back in time to, you
17 know, work from there, I think we need to work from here
18 and fix or mitigate, you know, what you're not liking in
19 the map. And I understand you're looking at it and
20 it -- and it sounds like it's a lot. But, you know,
21 we've got to start somewhere.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
23 I want to make a couple of observations. And I'm not
24 totally fluent in southern Arizona geography, but a
25 couple of things. This city of Tucson is our second

1 largest population in the state. The average
2 legislative district has 230,000 plus or minus people,
3 and Tucson is roughly almost 1.2 million in sort of the
4 MSA as you surround the outstanding area. And so
5 realistically Tucson deserves to have six congressional
6 or legislative seats.

7 And so if you look at the corridor from D-21,
8 moves up from the border, and that's the major corridor
9 up into Tucson from Highway 19. And highway --
10 District 19 comes from the eastern portion of the state
11 into the city. And in my opinion, D-17 serves the
12 mountain range that guards Tucson to the north as the
13 outer boundary around the outside of that mountain
14 range.

15 And so as I look at these maps, D-20 performs
16 exceptionally well with the minority-majority guidelines
17 that we're working around. And so I'm pretty happy and
18 excited about what this looks like.

19 I understand, Commissioner Lerner, that these
20 were wholesale changes, but at the same time I also
21 think it served the community of Tucson rather well.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'd like to add to that,
23 Commissioner Lerner, and I have said this before, it was
24 way more than just the Marana/Oro Valley connection.
25 This I think serves all -- a great number of different

1 communities better, and that's why we pushed for and
2 adopted this map. The outskirts of Tucson, the
3 unincorporated area of Tanque Verde and the separately
4 incorporated cities of Marana and Oro Valley are -- do
5 all sorts of things together legislatively and are
6 very -- a very good community of interest.

7 The edge of -- and Flowing Wells, where
8 Districts 16, 18, and 20 meet, I agree that we could
9 take a -- that warrants a closer look to see where those
10 lines should be, and I -- and I have no problem with us
11 doing that. I think we could wait and do that in a
12 final mapping period as opposed to dealing with it now,
13 but we could dig into there now.

14 The Davis-Monthan Air Force base is an
15 interesting one because I -- I'm not that passionate
16 about keeping it this way, but there is a reason for it.
17 And the reason was that we had a lot of testimony that
18 the Davis-Monthan people want to work with the Sierra
19 Vista and the -- and the major base there, so we were
20 connecting those two bases. And there's -- and that was
21 the reason for that connection. We could -- again, to
22 me that's the less important of a number of things, but
23 I think it was a good -- it wasn't there by accident.
24 But we could certainly relook at that.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, and I think a lot

1 of what they were talking about there was at the
2 congressional level, wanting to bring -- we were talking
3 about sort of the military groups together, not at the
4 legislative level for that.

5 But we also seem to be dividing -- I appreciate
6 what you're saying. I think we've also been dividing
7 some communities of interest. District 17, if we take a
8 look -- so I appreciate you being willing to take a look
9 at some of this.

10 I don't want to wait till the end till this
11 goes because I'm -- I -- as I mentioned before we
12 adopted this, I felt that we should go back to 4.0. We
13 did that previously. We went back to a map when we
14 found that it didn't work for us. So I personally think
15 we could go back because we have done it -- we have
16 shown precedent with our group to say this one isn't
17 working, let's go back.

18 District 17 connects communities that are
19 really on opposite sides -- I'm just going back to 17
20 for right now because that's what I've been talking
21 about -- on pretty disparate parts of Tucson when you
22 look at that. It would basically be like cutting from
23 one end of Phoenix to the other, taking a district.
24 Because when you think about Tucson and you're looking
25 at it, we're going north of Tucson extensively up to

1 Marana and then we head way south down to Vail and we're
2 doing all around it. It would be like going from Apache
3 Junction to Glendale in Maricopa to do -- or something
4 similar to that effect. And we're not -- we don't have
5 all of -- we should be putting the communities that
6 have -- the communities of interest as you were trying
7 to do, putting those together. And this -- this
8 circular one is -- I have -- I have some issues with.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I see the circular, you
10 know, that arc similar to I see that -- the Native
11 American district, that there are times that communities
12 of interest just align a little better in a -- in a
13 different shape. And, you know, it's reasonably
14 compact. There -- you know, there aren't, like, crazy
15 tentacles, you know, going too deep into any district.
16 So, I mean, to me logically when you keep communities of
17 interest together we're going to see funny shapes all
18 over.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I agree, and we have
20 that certainly throughout our maps. We have some odd
21 shapes. But this wasn't a request. Tanque Verde, for
22 example, didn't say we would like to be up with Marana
23 and Oro Valley. They did not request that.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Actually, we had a lot of
25 testimony that said exactly that. That was --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would like to see that.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That was a common -- that
3 was brought up numerous times at our -- at our meeting
4 in Tucson. So I do think we have reason for that.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But they also were saying
6 that they wanted to be within -- in Tucson itself. So,
7 again, when we talk about having duplicate -- different
8 perspectives -- there were a lot of people in that area
9 that said we are completely connected to Tucson and
10 that's where we want to be. So do they live a little
11 bit outside? Yes. But they do all of their work and
12 their travel and they do all of that in Tucson. And
13 they are more east/west than they are north/south in
14 terms of their connection. So they -- the difference is
15 in terms of what we see with the tribes is that they
16 have asked to be together in that way. We did not hear
17 from Tanque Verde to say let's be with Marana. That's
18 not what they were saying.

19 And we have to look a little bit at the
20 geography as well in that area, as we've been doing with
21 others where we've been using rivers or mountains or any
22 of that as somewhat of our boundaries as is part of the
23 constitutional requirements. So that's just one area in
24 particular that I've been pointing at that I don't feel
25 is a connection.

1 And in that metropolitan area, again just
2 looking at the extent that District 17 -- and that's why
3 I'm kind of giving you the analogy. Would we really
4 want something that goes from Apache Junction to
5 Glendale and say that they're communities of interest
6 aligned in that area, and I don't see it in this area.

7 I think this district was drawn to try to just
8 create something that gave us enough population by
9 pulling all of that together, because I don't see a
10 community of interest alignment with that. And
11 that's -- ultimately, Commissioner Mehl, that's the
12 biggest problem I have with a lot of these is that I
13 feel that we -- these things were placed for other
14 purposes that did not necessarily align with communities
15 of interest and with things that we have heard where it
16 would fit together.

17 I agree, Commissioner York, just as a note, my
18 last point and then I'll -- sorry, Commissioner Mehl,
19 I'll let you go -- is that there are -- now I lost my
20 train of thought. There are some alignments, you know,
21 along freeways and all that might be -- might work, but
22 there are also some things when we look at things -- if
23 we take a look at D-21 and D-19 on how that border was
24 made that don't seem to fit.

25 And I know, Commissioner Mehl, you were going

1 to say something, and I'm sorry if I cut you off.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I also have a question.
3 So, you know, some of these questions are really --
4 they're empirical. I mean when we say what does Tanque
5 Verde want. We have heard conflicting reports. And I
6 do have concerns that with, you know, the needs of that
7 community that I heard that I'm not sure that they'd
8 feel well represented in 18.

9 Given that a lot of these are empirical
10 questions and we're not going to be able to come up with
11 a perfect map, and the point isn't even to come up with
12 a perfect map because we can't -- we need more feedback.
13 The point is to come up with a wholistic, logical first
14 glance of what the Commission is thinking, a work in
15 progress so that the community can come back and share
16 feedback about the general direction and the general
17 outline of what we're doing.

18 And so the real question is is this a good
19 enough starting point for you, where we can go out in
20 the community and get more feedback, or is it really a
21 stumbling block where we can't get community feedback
22 until we get better consensus as a Commission?

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, this
24 is Vice Chair Watchman. When we talked about this
25 earlier, I was okay with Commissioner Mehl's and looking

1 forward to having Marana and Oro Valley connected. And
2 now we have basically a whole new map and it has changed
3 the complexion, divided some of the communities of
4 interest, like Tanque Verde. You know, District 7 now,
5 you know, runs -- it's a bigger district for anyone to
6 represent that.

7 And so I guess for me, my thought was to focus
8 just on the area that we talked about. Now we have, I
9 guess to me, a wholesale change to the whole area. And
10 so does that mean we have to go step back and look at
11 all of our notes to see if we adjusted the VRA, if we --
12 if we had community of interest changing. And so I was
13 comfortable with the prior map. This one, it makes too
14 many changes. That's my --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Colleagues --
16 colleagues, I'm just a little confused because if -- I
17 thought we already voted on approving this map as a
18 starting point, and now I'm hearing that you don't want
19 to use this map as a starting point. So I'm confused
20 why you supported it --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We had --

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- as a starting point.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We had a lot of
24 objections to it. We spoke quite at length that --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, I --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- and then we said that
2 we would be willing to take a look at it, but we didn't
3 say that we approved -- we weren't approving it. We
4 were saying we were willing to certainly take a look at
5 Commissioner Mehl's proposal as we have been doing when
6 somebody proposes something.

7 And so now that we are looking at it in its
8 entirety and how it impacts it, we have significant
9 issues where -- just as we did in the past when we had a
10 map that we had had a number of changes and then we said
11 it didn't work and we ended up voting to go back. We
12 did not -- I mean, I didn't vote to go back, but the
13 Commission ultimately did, and we -- because we made
14 changes, they didn't seem to be going in the direction
15 that some of the Commission preferred, so we actually
16 said let's go back and restart and relook at things and
17 try to get to what we were hoping to accomplish without
18 whole-scale changes. And that's part of what I am
19 saying.

20 We were very willing to take a look, but we
21 expressed our concerns right up front and said here is
22 why I -- I mean, I went through a whole list at that
23 time as well. It's pretty much the same things I'm
24 saying now, some of the same concerns, saying why don't
25 we take a look at 4 -- we brought up 4.0 and said could

1 we go back and look at how Marana is connected in 4.0.
2 Commissioner Mehl commented that he had tried that, it
3 hadn't worked, and he felt this was a better solution.
4 So for the sake of working together -- and I'm always
5 happy to look at options, and that's what we agreed to.
6 But that doesn't mean that -- at this point now we've
7 seen how this works, and I don't think it's -- it's not
8 working for us, or for me.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I'm a little confused.
10 So when I look at 4.0 and 4.1, those are incorporating
11 the Latino community suggestions for 8,
12 minority-majority legislative districts, and we never
13 adopted those. We looked at them heavily. We tried to
14 make some decisions. So that was why we decided to go
15 to -- back to I think it was 3.5 and take those
16 suggestions as opposed to with the 4.0 channel.

17 And so in the Tucson area, they currently
18 have -- in the 4.0 or 4.1 renderings, we have six
19 legislative districts on those maps. Yeah, they do not
20 match currently what we have accepted in 7 -- what is
21 this? What are we on, 6.0 or 7.0, Mark?

22 MR. KINGERY: 7.0.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: 7.0.

24 MR. FLAHAN: 7.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: You know, and so in some

1 ways this serves I think the city -- 7.0 serves Tucson
2 better than the 4.0 map. There are some things in the
3 4.0 map we can talk about.

4 But I don't see us going back,
5 Commissioner Lerner, unfortunately, because we -- of the
6 voting procedures we have taken, and I just don't think
7 that's a precedent we have set.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, again, I think this
9 does a really good job of representing the communities
10 of interest, which is why I supported this map, and many
11 communities, including the improvements to the -- to the
12 Latino areas.

13 And the suggestion that 17 is too big of a
14 district, I mean, if you gave me a -- if I was a state
15 legislator with a gas budget, there's at least eight or
16 ten districts I would rather not be in than this one.
17 So, I mean, this is not an overly large district for --
18 within the state. And it -- and those communities do
19 work together and do like one another. And we will hear
20 disagreements on that, no question, because that's the
21 nature of what we're going to be hearing. But I think
22 you'll hear a lot of support for this configuration, and
23 I stand by it as doing an excellent job of representing
24 southern Arizona.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is there any way to

1 integrate some core aspects of that 4.0 map in that
2 Tucson area to what we have here so we don't have to go
3 back? I mean, the point is mitigating what you don't
4 like.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I'm more than
6 happy if we can kind of -- and, again, the 4 -- the
7 main -- the main advantage of the 4.0 map -- I'm not
8 saying all of it was perfect or anything. I know that
9 Commissioner Mehl felt that there were some things that
10 didn't work and I always -- with his knowledge of
11 Tucson, I completely recognize that.

12 The main advantage of the 4.0 was that it did
13 take that effort that we had been trying to do and
14 attach Marana over to Oro Valley. And so if we take a
15 look at just that piece, that was what -- I honestly
16 thought that was -- that was a consistent -- as
17 Commissioner Mehl has said, he has been very consistent,
18 and that was something that he had been requesting as a
19 recognition of the interests, the mutual interests of
20 those communities. That was something I thought we were
21 working toward. But then we changed all these other
22 districts as well. I don't think we needed to change
23 all of those districts to accommodate that particular
24 community of interest. So, yeah, I would have to
25 probably -- we'd have to start looking at individual

1 ones, individual areas.

2 And the other piece is there's just a comment
3 about the Latino Coalition map, the VRA district. I'd
4 like to take a look at a comparison of what the -- what
5 we had in Tucson for the Coalition map and what is now
6 here so we can actually take a look. Does it improve
7 it? Does -- how does it look by comparison?

8 Because I don't know -- you know, in drawing
9 this map, we've been talking a lot about the different
10 communities and communities of interest and testimony
11 that we have had and people submitting letters about
12 what their preferences are prior to this submission. I
13 would love to know from the group that submitted this if
14 they spoke to a lot of these communities. I would love
15 to get testimony from those communities saying we
16 support this map. And maybe we can get that over the
17 next few days to say, yes, this is the map -- from these
18 different communities, they were consulted and they
19 appreciated being drawn in as these maps were being
20 changed.

21 But as a starting point, if we could look at
22 that -- the 4.0 difference in that area and then the VRA
23 difference, I would appreciate that.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think the better starting
25 point is 4.1.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, Commissioner --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: You asked 4.0 or 4.1?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just don't recall which
5 one was --

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: 4.1 consolidates the
7 county. We don't have the little jigger along the
8 border.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that the one that
10 brings Marana with --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. They both do. They
12 both do.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the one I was
14 looking for, was the one that brought Marana with --
15 which is what we were talking about.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think they both do.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, Commissioner Lerner, I
18 would suggest that this map is a good map. And, B, I
19 agree with you that we're going to get a lot of
20 feedback. But we don't need to try to get the feedback
21 in the next couple of days. That's the purpose of the
22 listening tour and the major public outreach we're going
23 to have. So I would suggest that we approve this as a
24 draft map and consider that over the next week. And
25 then let's do our listening tour, let's get additional

1 feedback. We know we're going to get mixed feedback,
2 but let's do that and then we can assess that and debate
3 that as a Commission.

4 MR. KINGERY: So what's currently being shown
5 on the screen is on the left side 4.0 and on the right
6 side 4.1.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: But you're not showing the
8 border.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, I think
10 Commissioner Mehl brings up an interesting point, and
11 that is what's the most efficient, effective way for us
12 to draw maps that best represent Arizona. And the
13 question I think is is it better for the five of us to
14 continue to debate and, you know, yes, read public
15 comments that come in on a daily basis, or is it best to
16 say, well, this is collectively the best idea that we
17 have broadly, we don't love every region, but let's take
18 it out into the public and test it and let's get
19 thousands of eyes on it. And something may change in a
20 very significant way that all this debate and dialogue
21 is moot because something else came.

22 So, you know, I'm open to further debate, but I
23 want to be careful, Colleagues, that we don't move back
24 in time, recreate. And then, you know, where are we
25 going to be, I mean, the -- you know, a week from now?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I greatly appreciate what
2 you're saying, and I'm always in favor of moving
3 forward. But in this case, we received this map
4 yesterday afternoon, we incorporated it without really
5 taking a close look at what the impacts would be to
6 communities of interest that we had been working through
7 six iterations of legislative maps. And then we
8 received something at the end of the day which we agreed
9 to test, which is what we did. I am not in favor of --
10 without --

11 I mean, everything we have been doing I think
12 has been very carefully discussed. Somebody makes a
13 proposal, we all take a look, we go that sounds good,
14 and we move forward. But in this case, we took a
15 wholesale area and said let's make these changes from
16 one late afternoon to today. And that's where my
17 concern is.

18 I think when I look at these maps up here and I
19 look at District 17, I see a really nice, compact
20 district that takes -- and could be expanded as was just
21 done earlier. But it takes that compact area with Casas
22 Adobes and Marana and then you could add in, you know,
23 as we did if needed for population Oracle, San Manuel,
24 and Mammoth, but it includes Catalina. It has the
25 things that seemed to work.

1 And then when you look at what District 18 is,
2 again, fairly compact. It gives us, either one of
3 those -- and I don't know -- I don't remember, I'm
4 sorry, after all these iterations all the different
5 pieces of it. I'm sure there are things that could be
6 corrected with those maps as well. But when you look at
7 that, that gives a very nice, more compact view of
8 District 17 than what we have now with communities that
9 have a lot in common.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to then -- given
11 the way that this conversation is going, you know, I am
12 really reluctant to force a vote when there's such
13 strong disagreements about this. And we have built
14 remarkable collegiality and a process that I think is
15 remarkably transparent, ethical; we're working in good
16 faith.

17 It sounds like Commissioner Lerner -- and it
18 sounds like, Vice Chair Watchman, you agree -- you want
19 considerable additional work done on this section of the
20 map, and you're not comfortable moving forward with --
21 is it 7.1? Or 7.0.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 7.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We voted 5-0 (inaudible).

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. We -- the -- we
25 did vote 5-0 on 7.0. And I guess that brings back my

1 earlier point that I'm confused after the affirmative
2 vote to approve a new iteration, now we're stuck with
3 saying, well, you don't want to start from there.

4 But I -- you know, look, we have 50 minutes
5 before we must adjourn. We need a game plan. Okay? It
6 sounds like there's not agreement on the legislative
7 map. It does not sound like we're going to be able to
8 get to a vote today in my opinion.

9 I think that -- I can be, you know, convinced
10 otherwise, but the way in which the dialogue is going,
11 you know, it may well serve us well to pursue both
12 7.0 -- and if Commissioner Lerner and Watchman can maybe
13 give a little bit more feedback about an iteration they
14 would like, we can come back next week and vote on which
15 option we want, provided that we're, you know,
16 minimizing the ripple effect to the southern areas as
17 much as possible. We don't want to undermine all the
18 really great work that we have already done.

19 Now, if we do this, there's also additional
20 time to maybe get feedback from the Latino Coalition if
21 they want to add anything else, you know, before we vote
22 on, you know, a final iteration and ultimately a final
23 draft map.

24 But what are your thoughts on this? We also
25 have the congressional district to return to. But the

1 clock is ticking, and we do need to have a game plan
2 about what's going to work for us to instill the
3 greatest level of confidence in the work that we're
4 doing and understanding --

5 Again, I just want to make a very clear point.
6 There's a diminishing return when the five of us
7 ongoingly debate, where we're not out there in the
8 public soliciting the kind of deep feedback that may
9 dramatically change this anyway. So I want to be
10 cognizant that -- you know, here I am maybe indulging us
11 to go into next week. I want to be cognizant of the
12 fact that we've got to end at some point and say it's
13 not going to be a perfect map. So I'd like assurances
14 that, you know, we're going to vote on ultimately an
15 option and then move forward from that.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chair Neuberg, I
17 appreciate that suggestion and I am very happy to work
18 together on that to come to something. I think there's
19 a compromise that can be had here. I don't think this
20 map has to be kept in its entirety -- entirety, but I
21 don't think also it needs complete wholesale changes
22 either. So I think if we can take the week to take a
23 closer look, we can see how -- I mean, there's some
24 things I just don't know what the impact is. I don't
25 know how this has affected -- you mentioned the

1 Coalition. You know, I don't know how it affected their
2 districts that they had put in either. And maybe it has
3 improved them and maybe not. So I would appreciate, but
4 knowing that next week we're ready to move on and we
5 will come to agreement and take a vote.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any disagreements from my
7 colleagues or different thoughts or different -- I
8 should say different solutions?

9 Let's talk practicalities, and this is going to
10 be a collaborative effort with mapping. So we have the
11 option to meet on Tuesday, which is -- you know, can be
12 a regular business meeting. I don't know if it's
13 possible for mapping to maybe join us virtually and
14 provide, you know, additional iterations based on
15 feedback. And then potentially we can meet a full day
16 next week to finalize, you know, both the CD and LD.
17 That's an option. We could just try to put it all in
18 one day, let's say on Thursday if that's preferable. We
19 do have some business that needs to be discussed. So,
20 you know, it's up to the Commissioners if we want to
21 separate out business on Tuesday morning and then just
22 do mapping all day Thursday.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest that if
24 Commissioner Lerner or Commissioner Watchman have any
25 changes Tuesday that they know they would like to see

1 that give them an opportunity to ask for those so that
2 we could actually have something drawn by Thursday so
3 that when we're here Thursday -- and we will look --
4 likewise, we'll look and see on the entire map if
5 there's anything that we'd like to see as an
6 alternative. So let's ask for whatever alternatives and
7 not debate them a lot on Tuesday, and then we'll have
8 things to look at on Thursday so that we can really
9 reach a consensus.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Would that work for
11 mapping, for us to come prepared on Tuesday, we -- not
12 ask you to do anything with anything, but to share with
13 you visions, ideas of what to do so then on Thursday you
14 can come back to us with plans, and we will vote on
15 Thursday for final plans?

16 MR. FLAHAN: That would be great with us.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Wow. That was
18 fast.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I concur as well. I
20 think that's a great plan.

21 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I agree. Vice
22 Chair Watchman agrees.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Given where we are at
24 this juncture, we still have time for additional debate
25 and dialogue if you'd like to debate. I don't -- if

1 it's -- if it's useless time, I'm not for that. But if
2 there's -- you know, we are convened and Watchman has
3 until 4:00. Oh, we also, though -- you have the
4 congressional you want to get back to us. Okay.

5 How about at this point I think we are done
6 with the legislative. Commissioners, public, feedback
7 to us by -- I don't even say Tuesday morning because we
8 need the feedback early enough in order to study maps so
9 that the Commissioners are prepared to give final
10 direction to mapping at our Tuesday business meeting.

11 Is there a preference for a time? We typically
12 convene at 8:00 a.m. Does that work for the
13 Commissioners? Something along the lines of 8:00 to
14 10:00?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm just going to be in
16 their time zone.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Does that work for
18 you, though?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Me? Yeah.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And we have --
21 it'll be addressing the business items, the -- our tour
22 and now the mapping issues, so I don't expect a long
23 business meeting.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: One procedural question, and I
2 think we should probably weigh in on this too. Might I
3 suggest the Commission vote on the population balancing
4 change to 7.0 just so we have formal direction? Then we
5 can publish that so that the public -- as it's looking
6 at maps between now and Tuesday the public's looking at
7 a balanced map? And literally it's just moving the
8 border of 19 up to where it was shown in 033. We can --
9 I think we can actually put it on screen if you want to
10 see it, but that's the only change.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I have a comment and I'll
12 just make that motion. It would help Commissioner York
13 if on the agenda at 8:00 we did the mapping suggestions
14 first and then did the business stuff, because he may
15 then end up dropping off and not being there for the
16 business stuff. So if that's all right with everybody.

17 And then so I make a motion that we approve one
18 change to 7.0 of including Mammoth -- what was it? It
19 was three -- Mammoth, Oracle, and --

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: And San Manuel.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- San Manuel.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: For purposes of
23 population balancing.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner York will
25 second for purpose of population balance.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, actually, these guys are
2 so fast, they are putting it on the screen now.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you want me to hold
4 off on the vote?

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, there you go. Over on
6 the top of 17. Zoom in on the top of D-17. There you
7 go.

8 So it would be -- as shown on the screen, would
9 be Oracle, Mammoth, and San Manuel would be going into
10 17. And 7 -- so 17 is then balanced at 2.87 below.

11 Can you show 7?

12 And 7 is in our balanced range at 3.11. We'll
13 obviously -- as we continue, we'll be working to shrink
14 all these deviations, but...

15 Oh, and our suggestion is just in the process
16 of each vote getting a new number, this would be 8.0.
17 It will remove some of the confusion because now the
18 confessional and legislative will be on different
19 numbers, so that may help with the conversation,
20 actually.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's good.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I like it when it's the
23 same. Oh, well.

24 MR. KINGERY: So just so --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm fine.

1 MR. KINGERY: -- everyone stays the same, we
2 just voted on 7.0, which has an asterisk, it was
3 unbalanced, the reason for the asterisk. So whatever
4 changes we do will be in the 8 series now branching off
5 of 7.0.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Perfect.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Now we need a
8 vote.

9 Vice Chair Watchman.

10 We have a motion on the table.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Correct. Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
19 an aye.

20 With that, we have adopted this new iteration
21 with the minor adjustments for population balancing,
22 which will now be called 8.0.

23 MR. KINGERY: And give us a few to get the hub
24 site updated with all the competitiveness and all the
25 associated files.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Do you want to
2 lead us through anything with the congressional?

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. I think we don't have any
4 updated maps to show you. So if --

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- if you have any direction
7 you want to give us; otherwise, we can wait until
8 Tuesday.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're good.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we want to talk about
11 congressional? We want to defer this to next week?

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I think we're good.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Defer.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I think we can
16 move to the next agenda item. And I want to thank
17 everybody for their very robust debate. I am really
18 deeply impressed with the knowledge of my fellow
19 Commissioners and, you know, the depth of all of what
20 you've learned bringing to the table is -- you know, I
21 feel really terrific about both the process and the
22 product. I know it's not where we need it to go, but I
23 think it's gotten us off to a great start. And I just
24 really, really appreciate the good-faith attitudes of
25 working together. And I'm really proud of our entire

1 broader team. It does take a village.

2 So with that, we will move to --

3 MS. VAN HAREN: Chair Neuberg --

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- Agenda Item No. VI,
5 next meeting date. We are going to meet for our
6 business meeting on Tuesday, October 26th, from
7 8:00 a.m. I believe it'll probably go about two hours,
8 although I'm not suggesting an end time. And then we
9 will also convene on Thursday, the 28th.

10 We're going to recommend, if it's okay with the
11 team, to start at 9:30 that morning. We have some
12 people traveling in from further parts of the state, and
13 so that would help people just get in town.

14 And are there any constraints on the tail end
15 on Thursday, the 28th? How late can we go?

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm good.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's great to know.
18 There will not be an end time, so that way we have
19 however long it takes to approve draft maps.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No dinner until we have
21 draft maps.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Excellent.

23 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VII.
24 We are now going to close public comments. Please note
25 members of the Commission may not discuss items that are

1 not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore,
2 pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action taken as a
3 result of public comment will be limited to directing
4 staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism,
5 or scheduling the matter for further consideration and
6 decision at a later date.

7 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VIII,
8 adjournment. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman moves
10 to adjourn.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
21 an aye.

22 With that, we will adjourn. Everybody get some
23 rest. Have wonderful weekends, and I look forward to
24 connecting with all of you next week if not before.

25 Just not in a quorum.

1 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 3:19 p.m.)

2
3
4 ***"This transcript represents an unofficial record.***
5 ***Please consult the accompanying video for the official***
6 ***record of IRC proceedings."***

7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2
3 STATE OF ARIZONA)
4) ss.
5 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)
6

7 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings
8 were taken before me, Kimberly Portik, Certified
9 Reporter No. 50149, all done to the best of my skill and
10 ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me in
11 shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my
12 direction.

13 I CERTIFY that I am in no way related to any
14 of the parties hereto nor am I in any way interested in
15 the outcome hereof.

16 I CERTIFY that I have complied with the
17 requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at
18 Glendale, Arizona, this 12th day of November, 2021.

19
20 *Kimberly Portik*
21 Kimberly Portik, RMR, CRC
22 CERTIFIED REPORTER NO. 50149

23 * * *

24 I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting,
25 LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in
ACJA 7-201 and ACJA 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK,
Arizona, this 21st day of November, 2021.

26
27 *MCR*
28 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
29 Arizona RRF No. R1058