

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Phoenix, Arizona

October 19, 2021

8:06 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 XAGENDA ITEM:PAGE

ITEM NO. I	4
ITEM NO. I (A)	4
ITEM NO. I (B)	5
ITEM NO. II	6
ITEM NO. IV	8
ITEM NO. V	9
ITEM NO. VI	11
ITEM NO. VII	12
ITEM NO. VIII	177
ITEM NO. VII (Continued)	196
ITEM NO. IX	206
ITEM NO. X	206
ITEM NO. XI	206

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, beginning at 8:06 a.m. on
3 October 19, 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 Office
16 Ms. Michele Chapel, Community Outreach
17 Coordinator
18 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
19 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr
20 Mr. Shawn Summers, Ballard Spahr
21 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer
22 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer
23 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group
24 Mr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographics Corp.
25 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: Good morning, everyone.
4 Welcome. It's great to see everybody again this
5 morning. We're going to start with the pledge of
6 allegiance. And do we have a Spanish interpreter? Hold
7 on one second. I believe we are not online yet.

8 Okay. Welcome, everybody. Good morning. We
9 are going to dive right in. We are going to start this
10 morning with the pledge of allegiance, if everybody
11 could please rise.

12 (The pledge of allegiance was recited.)

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you. Agenda
14 Item I, call to order and roll call.

15 I(A), it is call for quorum. It is 8:09 a.m.
16 on Tuesday, October 19th, 2021. I call this meeting of
17 the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

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

23 Val.

24 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

25 Vice Chair Watchman.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

2 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

4 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

6 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

8 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

10 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record, also in
11 attendance is Brian Schmitt, Executive Director; Lori
12 Van Haren, Deputy Director; Public Information Officer
13 Michele Crank; Community Outreach Coordinator Marie
14 Chapel. And from our legal team, we have Brett Johnson,
15 Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer; and Roy Herrera and
16 Daniel Arellano from Ballard Spahr. Our mapping
17 consultants, we have Mark Flahan, Parker Bradshaw, and
18 Brian Kingery from Timmons; Doug Johnson, Ivy Beller
19 Sakansky, and Ken Chawkins from NDC Research. And our
20 transcriptionists today are Kim Portik and Angela
21 Miller. Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Val.

23 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is
24 present.

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

1 Val, was the notice and agenda for the
2 Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance
3 of today's meeting?

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

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

6 Agenda Item No. II, approval of minutes from
7 October 17th, 2021. We have both A, the general
8 session, and we have B, e-session as it relates to
9 public records request as well as our discussion on
10 majority-minority Voting Rights Act commitments.

11 Is there any discussion on the minutes?

12 If there's no discussion, I will entertain a
13 motion to approve both the general session and the
14 executive session minutes from October 17th.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
16 I vote a motion to approve the minutes in October 17th,
17 executive and in general session.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is
19 Commissioner Lerner. I second the motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If no further discussion,
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 And with that, the general session and
7 executive session minutes from October 17th have passed.

8 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. III,
9 opportunity for public comments. Public comment will
10 now open for a minimum of 30 minutes and remain open
11 until the adjournment of the meeting. Comments will
12 only be accepted electronically in writing on the link
13 provided in the notice and agenda for this public
14 meeting and will be limited to 3,000 characters.

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

22 With that, we move to agenda item -- excuse me.
23 Before we move to Agenda Item No. IV, we do have a
24 Spanish interpreter with us today, if she could please
25 introduce herself.

1 MS. LOPEZ: Good morning. My name is Brenda
2 Lopez. I will be your Spanish interpreter today. You
3 can come to me if you need help for Spanish
4 interpreting.

5 (Speaking Spanish.)

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you.
7 Welcome.

8 We'll get back to Agenda Item No. IV,
9 discussion of public comments received prior to today's
10 meeting. I will turn it over to my colleagues.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would just like to
12 again thank -- I appreciate the fact that so many folks
13 are actually paying close attention to what we are doing
14 and providing feedback on some of the ideas that are
15 being proposed.

16 I want to remind everybody also we're still
17 early in the process because some folks I know seem a
18 little nervous about where we're going. But we've got a
19 lot of things to still do, but I just wanted to say we
20 appreciate that feedback.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Given our current schedule,
22 it certainly makes for late night reading, so but we --
23 I know all of us are actually going through these
24 comments. So we do try to absorb it with whatever
25 energy we have left, so thank you all.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have nothing to add
2 except thank yous to our whole team and my colleagues,
3 because we do know that it's a rigorous schedule. And,
4 you know, I think we have a great team. So thank you.

5 And thank you to the public for your
6 engagement. We're getting a huge number of maps now,
7 public comments. It keeps the debate, you know, active
8 and ongoing and highly organic. So we're very
9 appreciative.

10 With that, we will move Agenda Item No. V,
11 potential update discussion and potential action
12 concerning polarization data and report presentation
13 from mapping consultants regarding U.S. and Arizona
14 constitutional requirements. I do not know if there's
15 any further update from our mapping folks.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just on the polarized voting
17 report, we do have the draft report and legal, just sent
18 to legal just before this meeting, so they will be
19 reviewing it.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And is that by district, or
21 how is that being done now? No, it can't be.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. No. So the
23 district-by-district review, I think is a -- legal team
24 is doing that. This is just the written kind of more
25 detailed description of what Dr. Handley has already

1 presented to you. So there's no new information. It's
2 just a written text version with some background on how
3 it was done.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I imagine that that's
5 very helpful data for all of our VRA consultants who are
6 actively working behind the scenes. So thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chair?

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, please.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just to follow up with
10 that since -- is there -- do we know when we will get
11 the VRA report, polarization report from legal, then?
12 They are reviewing Dr. Handley's. But then as you
13 mentioned, they are going to be doing their own district
14 by district.

15 MR. HERRERA: To answer that question, I think
16 we're going to have an update and some advice that we
17 intend to give during executive session at the next
18 agenda item. But to answer the question generally,
19 we've received the polarization report, the draft of it,
20 from Doug about half an hour ago, so we're going to look
21 at that.

22 Our legal team and the consultants are going to
23 look at it during the meeting, and then I think we can
24 return back with our analysis hopefully later today. At
25 least some rough analysis later today and something

1 maybe more formal by tomorrow. But again, I'll provide
2 some additional update when we get to the next agenda
3 item.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. As foreshadowing,
5 when we get to Agenda Item No. VII prior to diving in to
6 mapping, we're going to suggest going into -- make a
7 recommendation to my colleagues to go into e-session for
8 further legal guidance on the VRA threshold issues.

9 Anything else on this?

10 Okay. Agenda Item No. VI, is there -- is this
11 where we're at? Potential support from staff and
12 mapping consultants regarding public outreach,
13 utilization of mapping software, and report on public
14 map submissions.

15 Any updates on that item?

16 MR. FLAHAN: As of yesterday, we had 86
17 submissions, and today we're up to 104. The AZ Latino
18 Coalition legislative districts has been published out
19 there. So anybody that's in the public that wants to
20 view them, they are available online.

21 With that, I think that's the only update that
22 we have today.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And if I remember
24 correctly, are we at some point going to work on some
25 kind of larger public opportunity for a tutorial or

1 live -- I know you've been gracious with your time and
2 opening yourselves up to coach the public with trying to
3 submit maps. Is that something we're going to continue
4 to work on, to provide opportunities for the public to
5 get some technological help?

6 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. So the plan is at least in
7 all the business meetings to continue to do some type of
8 training. And if there is an opportunity that we want
9 to schedule for a technical support session, we could.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Great.

11 MR. FLAHAN: And I've been working with staff
12 to figure that out.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. I mean, the
14 fact that we're just continuing to get more and more
15 data, more and more submissions in and of itself tells
16 me that the community is getting more and more
17 comfortable with the mapping tools and that whatever you
18 are doing to provide the tutorials and other options for
19 submitting data is really working. So thank you.

20 If there's no other comments on that, we'll
21 move to Agenda Item No. VII, draft map decision
22 discussion and possible action concerning revisions to
23 the grid map.

24 As we alluded to earlier, I'm going to make a
25 suggestion that the Commission go into executive

1 session, which will not be open to the public, for the
2 purpose of obtaining legal advice with respect to
3 acquiring the resources referenced in the consultant's
4 update A.R.S. 38-431.03(A) (3) to basically seek
5 additional VRA guidance to honor our constitutional
6 responsibilities.

7 With that, I'll entertain a motion to go into
8 executive session if there's no other further
9 discussion.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So moved.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
12 seconds.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
22 an aye.

23 With that, we will move into executive session.
24 So we will have our legal counsel, core staff,
25 Commissioners remain. And we will welcome the public

1 back. I don't expect it to be too long. Thank you.

2 Please turn your mics off.

3 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive
4 session from 8:20 a.m. until 8:59 a.m.)

5
6 * * * * *

7
8 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general
9 session.)

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
11 everybody. We are going to reconvene in public session.

12 I thank the public's patience for the
13 opportunity for the Commission to go into executive
14 session to get legal advice as we are drawing lines and
15 honoring the constitution and the Voting Rights Act.

16 With that, we will resume our public portion.
17 We are on Agenda Item No. VII, draft map decision
18 discussion and possible action concerning revisions to
19 our maps. So I will turn it over to our mapping
20 consultants.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Thank you very much.

22 Would you like to start with congressional or
23 legislative? Is there a preference?

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I believe we were
25 planning to alternate. And so if my colleagues are open

1 to it, I'm happy doing the legislative maps. We did
2 have more time to review the congressional map.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's the one caveat
5 that --

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Because of that, I'd prefer
7 to do the congressional first. And then while we're
8 sort of breaking, I can stare a little bit more at the
9 legislative.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Why don't -- why
11 don't we do the congressional since we did have more
12 time to review that.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So as a recap of yesterday,
14 the Commission approved Congressional Map 3.5, and you
15 can see how the state tree was built for the 4X series
16 that you received. There was two branches that came off
17 of 3.5. There was Congressional District Map 4.0 and
18 yeah, Congressional Map 4.2. And then we also drew a
19 4.1, and that is taking into account all the changes for
20 4.0.

21 So, Brian, why don't you bring up 4.0.

22 So the goal for 4.0 was to take the approved
23 3.5 version from yesterday and replicate District 7 from
24 the Latino Coalition's submitted plan. And then after
25 that, to balance the rest of the districts in this

1 change.

2 So the first thing that we did is we replicated
3 the Latino Coalition's District 7. And once we did
4 that, District 6 population became way over the limit
5 and District 9 lost a bunch of population. So we needed
6 to go in and balance that. We moved the Gila River and
7 Maricopa tribal nations from District 7 into District 2,
8 which is in the blue.

9 District 2 is now going to be pulling some of
10 the extra population out of District 6. That includes
11 the city of Maricopa, most of Casa Grande, the northeast
12 section of Eloy, Red Rock, and most of Marana.

13 District 5 is going to pull in extra population
14 from District 2 by taking parts of Florence, Queen
15 Valley, the Copper Corridor, and the non-reservation
16 part of Gila County.

17 District 4, we will pull extra population out
18 of District 5, moving further into the Gilbert and east
19 Mesa area there on the screen in the east valley of
20 Maricopa County.

21 District 1 will be taking the extra population
22 from District 4 by taking south Scottsdale, some of the
23 north Tempe, and all of the Salt River Indian
24 reservation.

25 District 8 is going to pull extra population

1 from District 1, which is the pink is District 8.

2 District 9 is going to take extra population
3 out of District 8 by taking Sun City West and Sun City
4 Grand. It does separate Sun City for them, so that is a
5 note there.

6 And District 9 then shifts some of its extra
7 population back into District 8 because it moves more
8 north Peoria into District 8.

9 The map is balanced. All population has been
10 assigned for the state. And there was nothing that we
11 were unable to fulfill out of your request.

12 And then the demographics we have added as
13 requested from the last meeting.

14 And that's all we have for 4.0.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you want to go through
16 the alternatives?

17 MR. FLAHAN: Sure.

18 You want pull up 4.1.

19 So 4.1 builds upon this 4.0 map. And the goal
20 of 4.1 is to show an alternate way of balancing the
21 districts after we replicate the Latino Coalition's
22 District 7 into the map, and it's mainly so that Gila
23 County does not have to move into District 5.

24 So the alternate steps that we took to
25 balancing 4.1, this map, is that Gila River and Maricopa

1 Indian reservations are moved back into District 7, and
2 then that would unbalance the district by about 15,000
3 people.

4 Glendale is moved from the northernmost tip of
5 District 7 into the southwest corner of District 8 for
6 balancing.

7 You can go ahead and show that.

8 There we go. So that very tip of D-7 does turn
9 into D-8 in the pink. District 1 pulls extra population
10 from District 8. District 4 pulls the extra population
11 from District 1, and that makes it move farther north
12 into Tempe. District 5 pulls the extra population from
13 District 4, and that moves further north into Chandler
14 and the Gilbert area. District 2 takes all of Gila
15 County from District 5. And then District 5 is going to
16 move further south into Gila County, taking the towns of
17 Kearny, the rest of the city of Florence, and the
18 northern part, portion of Coolidge for balancing.

19 Again, this map is also balanced. There's --
20 all the population has been assigned. The only thing
21 that we were really not able to 100 percent fulfill in
22 this request is we were not able to exactly replicate
23 the Latino Coalition's boundary in this request, in this
24 alternate.

25 Is there anything specific you would like to

1 see in this one, or should we move to 4.2?

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 4.2.

3 MR. FLAHAN: 4.2. Okay. 4.2.

4 Can you bring up the branching tree for a
5 second.

6 So keep in mind that 4.2 is a separate branch
7 off of 3.5 of what you approved yesterday. So it
8 doesn't take into account or build off of 4.0 or 4.1.

9 So using the guidance of the Latino Coalition's
10 District 7, the primary objective of this map is to
11 consolidate more of the heavy Latino neighborhoods
12 without going into Maricopa County.

13 So we matched the Latino Coalition's map with a
14 greater influence in the city of Yuma area specifically.
15 We split Santa Cruz County between District 6 and
16 District 7 out to the west, so the brown district with
17 the yellow district in the bottom southeast corner of
18 the state.

19 We grabbed population that was missed on the
20 outskirts of Marana and moved that from District 7 into
21 District 6. The neighborhood that is just south of
22 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson --

23 Scroll up. Scroll up. There you go. Right
24 there.

25 -- we moved that neighborhood into D-7.

1 This map is balanced. All the population is
2 assigned. And we feel we were able to fulfill all of
3 your requests.

4 And with that, that sort of is the three
5 different alternatives that we have for the
6 congressional districts for you.

7 Do you want to add anything, Doug?

8 No?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. It's good.

10 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, just -- just to let folks
12 know that in this map the yellow arm coming up from
13 Tucson towards Casa Grande, that's -- we needed
14 population in District 6, and that's that Red Rock area
15 that had been discussed before about trying -- there had
16 been earlier discussion about trying to include that
17 into 6. So when we needed more population, we just went
18 up that way.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like it -- to open it
20 up to questions, thoughts from my colleagues. And
21 please reference both which version you would recommend
22 starting from and why, but also speak to specifically
23 what you are liking about the maps because, you know,
24 whichever version we adopt obviously we can modify and
25 incorporate what we like about the different iterations.

1 And just, again, as a reminder, to try to
2 incorporate as many of the six constitutional criteria
3 as you can in elucidating why you are making these
4 suggestions.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I -- my preference
6 is either 4.0 or 4.1. It's back and forth. We know
7 that. And part of it is I think that they actually keep
8 our communities of interest the way they've been
9 designed. I'll speak a little bit to that and then I
10 know that Commissioner Mehl can speak to 4.2. That's
11 part of that.

12 I think that it -- 4 point -- 4.0 incorporates
13 the Coalition maps. It improves communities of interest
14 in District 2, keeping Ak-Chin and Maricopa whole with
15 the Gila River Indian community where they have good
16 relationships. It also helps with tribal representation
17 in the district as well. It also keeps District 7 --
18 actually, do we have 4.0 up?

19 MR. FLAHAN: We can get there.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I'm going to pull
21 it up here too. It keeps it extensively in Pima County
22 as they requested. It does go into -- we know it goes
23 into Maricopa County, but we also know that District 9
24 is going into Maricopa County. So basically we have two
25 districts that are going to have to reach in to that

1 area in 4.0. And again, 4.1 is similar. It is
2 something we could also go with.

3 4.0 seems to -- has quite a bit of
4 competitiveness as well, which is also what I like about
5 it. Four of the districts are pretty competitive as
6 part of it, which I think fits the way our state is as
7 part of it. So I think in terms of 4.0, that's kind of
8 part of -- part of my reasoning for that.

9 4.1, just to kind of finish the two of them,
10 because they are both similar since they have the Latino
11 Coalition map, so just to cover that, 4.0 and 4.1 both
12 keep Tucson pretty evenly split between District 6 and
13 7, which I like. And so I think that's part of why both
14 of them work.

15 District -- both of them do a good job in terms
16 of some of the inner city areas in Phoenix with
17 District 4 and District 3 and District 1 and District 8,
18 all of those do that. I recognize with 4.0 what it does
19 to District 5. And if we wanted to make that more
20 compact, that's part of why I was looking at 4.1 as part
21 of it, but those are just some of the ideas that we
22 have.

23 I think the argument that we don't want
24 District 7 to reach up into Maricopa County when we have
25 District 9 reaching into Maricopa County, to me that --

1 I don't think we can choose one or the other and say we
2 can allow -- we can have District 9 do that but not
3 District 7.

4 The other piece I will say why I prefer 4.0 and
5 4.1, just as a note, is that the mayor of Tolleson did
6 send in something saying they would like to be part of
7 that district. And so in recognition of that, that's
8 another reason that I like that. And the
9 competitiveness factor for all of those districts.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Good morning. And, yes,
11 shockingly, I do think that 4.2 is a significantly
12 better map. And it really is -- the Latino Coalition,
13 we are looking at their data because of communities of
14 interest, and that's really the key and that's the
15 reason we're looking at it. And I've been consistent
16 from day 1 saying Pima -- the urban area of Tucson and
17 the urban area of Maricopa shouldn't have the same
18 congressperson. And, yes, District 9 goes into Maricopa
19 County, but it only goes into one urban area.
20 District 7 right now is going into both of the big urban
21 areas, which just makes no sense whatsoever. So I
22 will -- I'll argue strongly against that.

23 In addition, District 6, we heard a lot-- we
24 heard from people in Santa Cruz, they actually would
25 prefer that county being split, and this does this well.

1 I think District 6, it takes in Marana properly and Oro
2 Valley and combines that whole -- that whole area and
3 going up to Red Rock. There's just a number of things.

4 And it's a-- yeah, geographically it's a little
5 less cumbersome map. The finger going up into Maricopa
6 County of District 7 I have objected to from day 1 and I
7 will object to again today, and I just don't think it's
8 the right thing to do.

9 The mayor of Yuma says he doesn't want to be
10 part of Maricopa -- the urban area of Maricopa. So
11 we've got one mayor arguing one way and another mayor
12 arguing the other way. So I think we've got equal
13 mayors upset no matter what we do.

14 And I do think that the District 7 actually
15 under this 4.2 comes up in a -- it's a strong district
16 that is the vast majority of what the Latino community
17 viewed as a community of interest. And the part of it
18 that isn't going up into the urban Maricopa, it's still
19 combining those Latinos with other Latinos and
20 communities of interest. So I would offer up 4.2.

21 In fact, I will make a motion that we approve
22 4.2 as the new base map.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would second that motion.

24 One of the things that I think is important
25 from a community of interest standpoint and from a

1 growth standpoint is that the west valley along the I-10
2 corridor stays together. And I feel Tolleson is part of
3 that community as well as Avondale. I know there are
4 older communities with heavy Hispanic and Latino
5 populations, but they all benefit from the growth and
6 job creation in the west valley. And I feel that they
7 should be involved in that voting process as it -- as it
8 goes forward.

9 The other thing I liked about 4.2 is that it
10 kept the mountain preserve area of Phoenix together in
11 District 1 and moved District 8 up along the I-10, I-17
12 corridor and encompassed Sun City. So I think those are
13 two good districts as we -- as we look at 4.2.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a couple of --
15 oh, I'm sorry, Chairwoman. Did you want to --

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Go ahead.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So a couple of points
18 about 4.2 on the concerns that I have about that in
19 terms of that. I think it adds too much of central
20 Tucson to District 7 which lowers the Latino Coalition
21 population numbers, the Latino population numbers. It
22 has actually a significantly lower HCV -- VAP than the
23 Coalition map which could be potentially problematic as
24 part of it.

25 The other thing that it does is it --

1 District 2, which is competitive in Maps 4.0 and 4.1, is
2 really on the outside piece of being competitive or not
3 competitive at all. In 4.0, it's a 4.5 spread. In
4 4.2 -- 4.1, it's a 6.8. And then it goes up to
5 8 percent. So it really impacts District 2 as part of
6 that.

7 It also splits Santa Cruz County, the
8 population between District 7 and District 6. Santa
9 Cruz County is heavily Latino, so it actually would
10 belong -- it should go into District 7. They have a lot
11 in common in Santa Cruz County. It's a community of
12 interest as a part of this district.

13 The other piece is that District 6 in 4.2 is in
14 actually six different counties in this map. So it
15 really splits up all of those counties. And it doesn't
16 seem like that would be in the best interest of many of
17 those folks. By keeping it in there in some form,
18 that's 4.0 or 4.1, I think it overall is a benefit to
19 those communities that have things in common.

20 And the majority of the west valley, as
21 Commissioner York said, will still stay together and be
22 able to be comprehensive as that voting bloc as well.
23 So I don't think when we look at all the constitutional
24 criteria 4.2 works as well as 4.0 and 4.1.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I too had a preference

1 for 4.2. As I looked across all nine districts, I
2 thought it was a little more balanced and provided a
3 template from which we could make additional movements.
4 I'm not satisfied with, you know, the spreads in all of
5 them. I'd like to try to make them more competitive,
6 but I thought that the map was more compact and
7 contiguous and I thought it aligned more evenly and
8 cleanly with communities of interest. And if we can now
9 tweak that and try to make it more competitive, I think
10 that the condensing of the spreads increases
11 accountability.

12 So to the extent that we can make it a little
13 more competitive, representatives, I think the data
14 show, are more accountable to their various communities
15 of interest. But again, I don't think we are going to
16 find an ideal great starting point, and there may be
17 positives with each map. And if we start with one, that
18 doesn't preclude making -- even I don't want to say
19 major -- I mean, I -- you know, there's ripple effects,
20 but we can try to incorporate principles that are of --
21 of significant importance.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair
23 Watchman here.

24 I support and I think 4.0 is a better map and
25 obviously for my reasons, and that is that it includes

1 in District 2 the city of Maricopa, the tribes of
2 Ak-Chin and Gila River. And so what that does is that
3 it increases the Native American voting age population,
4 which I think -- well, I not think. It would add a
5 little bit more ability for the tribes to choose their
6 candidate of choice. And that's -- that's really what I
7 think is important.

8 And I like the fact that now we have moved from
9 a western orientation to an eastern. So this District 2
10 I think covers and includes actually half of the Native
11 American tribes in this country. So I think it -- in my
12 opinion, it would speak well to the voter rights act,
13 which I know that that's important to the tribes.

14 But also I think 4.0 is a more competitive map,
15 especially in Districts 1, 2, 4, and possibly 6. And so
16 but my -- my biggest emphasis that I like with 4.0 is
17 just the fact that it adds two more tribes to the
18 earlier versions, which I think is very, very important.
19 And it gives the tribes, which, you know, obviously is a
20 tremendous community of interest in our state, it gives
21 them more voting power, which I think we need to respect
22 and we have. And I appreciate my colleagues here for
23 continually recognizing, you know, the Native American
24 tribes and their reservations. So thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I hear you, Vice

1 Chair Watchman. What about the southern tribes? What
2 about the southern Native American tribes? Does this
3 not empower more of the tribes in District 7? I mean,
4 you know, the Native American population is spread.
5 It's less than 4 percent of Arizona's population. And
6 so I'm just sensitive to the fact that we are not
7 drawing -- that we are not constraining ourselves on all
8 districts in order, you know, to accommodate, yes, an
9 extremely important community of interest, but we have a
10 lot of community of interests that we need to balance
11 there. And I wonder if the tribes will be well served
12 in District 7 as well?

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I guess a couple
14 points, Madam Chair, and thank you. First, the tribes,
15 even though they are only 4 percent of the state, they
16 have roughly a third of the state in terms of land mass.
17 And so, you know, by and large that's -- that's a huge,
18 you know, huge reservation setting. And I think it's
19 probably -- Arizona is probably one of the only states
20 that has a huge, huge reservation base.

21 And so the way I look at it is that you could
22 probably divide the tribes into two categories, the
23 upper -- the northern tribes and the southern tribes.
24 And so, granted, if you look at District 7, which I
25 think in version 4 has roughly a 4 percent voting age

1 population, they do have about -- if you look at it,
2 probably a third of that district. And so that has a
3 lot of meaning.

4 So the way I look at it is that from the 4.0
5 version, we would have two categories, two tribes
6 separated in two communities of interest. The northern
7 tribes and if you add Gila and Ak-Chin, that obviously
8 would give the tribes a little bit more voting power.
9 Not so much for District 7; however, you know, we've got
10 to recognize that they have land issues. And so I know
11 that the Tohono O'odam tribe and the Cocopah, and
12 probably Quechan have a lot of challenges, especially
13 with border issues. And so -- and so that obviously has
14 a different perspective than the northern tribes.

15 And so some of us don't know, but some of the
16 members of the Tohono O'odam Nation actually are -- they
17 live in Mexico. So they have the ability to go back and
18 forth. And so -- but of late it's been challenging for
19 them to come back to their homeland or come back to
20 their -- you know, to their capital, which is in Sells.
21 And so -- and so for them and the tribes, the two tribes
22 in the Yuma area, I think it's important that they -- I
23 think it would be fine for them to be in District 7.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Commissioner Watchman,
25 this is Commissioner York. From what I understand you

1 are trying to say is that the tribes would have more
2 cohesiveness as far as an interest group. But I would
3 argue that what you just said with the southern tribes,
4 including the Gila, would have more in common with the
5 border situation and what goes on in the southern part
6 of the state than what is going on in the northern part
7 of the state, which on version 4.2 concludes all the
8 northern tribes together in one bloc and all the
9 southern tribes together in another.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Along those lines, I'm
11 wondering, you know, if the Native American community
12 would be well served by having a stronger presence in
13 District 7 with a stronger representation on a federal
14 level. You know, the legislative district is another
15 story. The population is different such that it
16 warrants, you know, a different level of attention. But
17 just looking at -- you know, I understand the land mass
18 issue, but looking at it from a population perspective,
19 just looking at the population of the Native American
20 tribes in the north, I'm just struggling with carving
21 out the map to honor that community of interest when I
22 think that the alternative map honors a larger number of
23 communities across the state.

24 Having said that, I am committed and interested
25 in trying to take whatever starting point we have and

1 trying to, as the six criteria is, maximize
2 competitiveness to the extent that it does not cause
3 detriment to the other factors because narrowing that
4 range does help accountability. And at the end of the
5 day, I want to make sure that there's accountability to
6 these communities of interest in District 2. And so if
7 there are unique, you know, points, further debate, I
8 open it up. If not, we can take a vote.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, if I
10 could, I think in general most of the tribes in the
11 state are rural in nature. And so they're challenged
12 with basic services just because of their remoteness.
13 It's a little bit different with Gila River and Salt
14 River. They're for the most part close to populated
15 areas. And so -- but I do -- getting back to
16 Commissioner York's question about, you know, is there
17 a -- can you draw distinction between the northern and
18 the southern tribe, you probably can. And so, you know,
19 one could argue that while the southern tribes, if you
20 include Tohono O'odam and Cocopah and Quechan along with
21 Ak-Chin and Gila, that might be a better setting.

22 But I think I like version 4.0 because, you
23 know, you improve the numbers. And that's what it boils
24 down to. And so, you know, the more -- the more numbers
25 that favor tribes I think the better possibility that

1 they have of selecting their candidate of choice.

2 However, I think -- I think what the important
3 distinction that I like to draw attention to is that,
4 yes, we are talking about numbers. But getting back to
5 the sheer land size, you know, I know a lot of tribes
6 are pushing very, very hard to protect what they have
7 and to improve what they have. And so having about a
8 third of the state I think is very, very important. It
9 recognizes the long-standing history that tribes have
10 had with the state.

11 And so, you know, I think I've raised it
12 before, but the tribes actually were created in the
13 1800s, you know, well, well before the state of Arizona,
14 you know, this great state of Arizona of 1912. And so,
15 you know -- and so slowly by what we are talking about
16 here we are recognizing the long history, you know, of
17 the Native Americans.

18 I also heard, you know, some discussion about
19 the early Hohokam here in this valley here. You know,
20 the Hohokam and the Anasazis. And so, you know, I'm
21 grateful that a lot of us respect that, you know. And
22 so, you know, we live today what, you know, our
23 ancestors, you know, tried to put on the table for us.
24 And so many, many tribes are working hard to preserve
25 their land and their culture. And so this also lends

1 itself to the ability, you know, to elect their
2 candidate of choice. And so, you know, I just want to
3 bring some flavor to, you know, what I think is
4 important for the discussion here today.

5 But for me, I'm still sold on 4.0, but, you
6 know, we can further discuss it.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I suggest we -- I would ask
8 to call for the vote on the motion.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. And I just want to
10 make one other point that when we talk about, you know,
11 electing a candidate of a community's choice, there is
12 just a simple mathematical reality of percentages. And
13 what reaches a threshold on a legislative level may not
14 reach a threshold on a congressional level. And, you
15 know, we can have deep respect and recognition for the
16 history of our state. We are obligated to follow the
17 six constitutional criteria, and that is the only guide
18 that I can use as I am making my analyses of the maps,
19 those six specific criteria.

20 With that, if there's no further discussion?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess the last point
22 that I'll make, and then we can go for the vote, is I am
23 looking at all the criteria here. And part of my -- if
24 we take all that -- the rest of -- and talk about
25 representation, which we hear a lot when we heard from

1 people, I am trying to find a way for us to balance the
2 communities of interest, all of the different criteria
3 to be sure that people feel they have a voice. And part
4 of what I looked at with 4.2 is that I feel that there
5 is less balance in terms of the communities of interest
6 and the populations that are there when I look at the --
7 and competitiveness is just one criteria. I'm only
8 taking it as one criteria. But I look at it and say of
9 the three maps that we had, it is the least competitive
10 of all of them. So my hope is if we adopt 4.2 we take a
11 close look at how we can improve upon that.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Absolutely. But,
13 Commissioner Lerner, can I ask you a question. Aside
14 from the Native American community in 4.2, did you feel
15 there were other significant communities of interest
16 that were at risk of being marginalized?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think that to
18 some extent the Latino community. If we look at what
19 would happen to the community over in Tolleson and
20 Avondale, where they would be placed into District 9, I
21 think that they would also be impacted by that. So it's
22 not just one community. And there are other communities
23 too that may also feel that way. We can -- when we take
24 a closer look at where some of the other communities
25 are, whether we look at some of our rural communities

1 and the mining communities, are they going to get some
2 of the voice as well?

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So I hear concern
4 about Native American and Latino. Let -- with that,
5 absolutely, I think we can make a very serious
6 commitment, regardless of which iteration we start from,
7 to try to mitigate, you know, the challenges. I think
8 everybody has heard a deep commitment by this Commission
9 to honor the VRA and continue to solicit feedback from
10 the Latino Coalition and honor what the needs are of
11 that community of interest.

12 If there's no other further questions, we'll
13 take a vote. We are voting on the adoption of
14 Congressional Map 4.2 as a starting point.

15 Vice Chair Watchman.

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is a
24 yes.

25 And with that, with a 3-2 vote, we will start

1 from iteration 4.2 with the goal of working on
2 mitigating challenges to the Native American population,
3 an ongoing effort which has been part of our
4 conversation from day 1, to seek maximum representation
5 for our Latino community, and in general to try to
6 narrow the spreads to try to, while respecting
7 communities of interest, create as many competitive
8 districts as possible for the sake of accountability and
9 honoring.

10 I see it as -- I see competitiveness as
11 allowing for more error in the map, because the more the
12 spread is narrowed the more accountability there is for
13 elected leaders to be honoring all of their
14 constituents.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg, just --

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- if I may, going off the
18 conversation you just had, one of the things when we
19 were drawing 4.2, taking into account the previous
20 directions, we were looking at trying to keep the Gila
21 River and Ak-Chin in the southern district where they
22 were previously. Just as you were talking, those two
23 tribes are connected -- they are adjacent to District 2
24 in this -- in the map we just talked about and could be
25 connected into District 2.

1 There would be some rotation around there going
2 on, but you could probably put those two tribes into 2
3 and then more of Casa Grande and the area around Casa
4 Grande into 7, if that were -- just going off the
5 conversation you just had, if that is a preference of
6 the Commission, we'd just rotate right in that area
7 between 2 and 7.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If you looked at doing
9 that, and I would not have any opposition to the
10 reservations going into 2, but you could bring 6 up into
11 Casa Grande and pick up Maricopa and 7 could come more
12 into the city of Tucson would be an alternative way to
13 balance that out and I think a better way to balance
14 that out.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I'd like to take a
16 closer look at the interface of 7 and 6 in Tucson and
17 suggest that we take -- if we can get close in there --
18 we just received a letter from the former mayor and
19 we've received others from current mayor and others in
20 Tucson.

21 I think that what we have done in District 7
22 now is we're -- and District 6 is we are dividing Tucson
23 in kind of an interesting way. I would suggest taking
24 the university -- and I will preference this kind of in
25 an amusing way, I'm an ASU person, but I actually think

1 if we move -- my proposal here will actually be
2 beneficial to the University of Arizona and to Tucson as
3 a whole.

4 I would like to suggest that we take the
5 University of Arizona area -- and I don't know the
6 exact -- I know it's off of Speedway and -- I don't know
7 all of the streets. I just -- I'm zoomed in on it
8 here -- and move that over to District 6. That's a
9 community of interest right there. It's been attached
10 here I think in a way to increase some numbers, but it
11 doesn't actually increase the Hispanic voting age
12 population in that area. I think that was done as a way
13 to increase the competitiveness in District 7 to some
14 extent. But this is something that I think would be
15 beneficial to Tucson to actually have a more balanced
16 district, two strong Tucson districts which I think that
17 they need in that area. And if you take that piece out,
18 it gives a little bit more weight to Tucson.

19 Right now, the way this -- those two districts
20 are divided, it pretty much takes a lot of that
21 outskirts of Tucson, but not any of the interior, and
22 basically gives the bulk of the city of Tucson into
23 District 7. I think if we move that out into
24 District 6, it really gives Tucson a better voice and
25 having two congressional representatives that can

1 reflect Tucson's needs. So that's one area that I would
2 like to have us take a look at as part of that.

3 I'm not opposed to the other suggestion about
4 how to adjust some of these other things that were just
5 mentioned. But I would like to have us take a look at
6 what we could do to give Tucson a little bit more
7 representation by taking part of the core and adding it
8 in.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: As often is the case, our
10 suggestions are oppositional, but I think this is
11 another example of one where we should draw it both ways
12 and take a look at it.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm guess I'm not sure,
14 Commissioner Lerner, what problem are you trying to
15 solve with bringing U of A into D-6? It will shift
16 around the numbers such a tiny bit. I mean, what issue
17 is here?

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I -- what I see
19 right now is that Tucson basically has -- for the
20 majority of Tucson, the core of Tucson, and the
21 representative in the Tucson area is going to be very
22 divided. They will have somebody for District 7 for
23 right now for the predominance of the core part. That
24 person will be representing Yuma, they'll be
25 representing the tribes, they'll be going up to the Gila

1 River, down throughout that area, and then a piece of
2 Tucson.

3 What I'm looking at is that if we move that
4 piece of the university, they actually could get two
5 good representatives looking at the core of Tucson,
6 looking at Tucson city. I don't see that now. I see
7 what has happened with District 7 as taking a lot of the
8 main -- of that section, sort of separating it out. So
9 I see that as just being beneficial to Tucson, to giving
10 them what I see as two good core representatives within
11 part of the inner city area.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Ironically, I agree with
13 everything Shereen said, except I disagree with her
14 conclusions. I think having two strong representatives
15 in Tucson is a very good thing. I think having the
16 urban area of Tucson divided between two districts is a
17 very good thing. Right now, if anything, they have a
18 more even division of the urban area of Tucson. You'd
19 want to move 7 to the east, not 7 to the west. So I
20 agree with all the philosophy; I disagree with the
21 conclusion.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Did you just say move 7
23 to the east? That's -- you didn't --

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, I did. And that's
25 what the suggestion I gave, was if you move the tribes

1 into 2, move 6 north into Casa Grande and Maricopa so
2 that those don't go into 7, because those would not be
3 good communities of interest with 7. And then by doing
4 that, District 7 would need some more population and you
5 could get that by moving it slightly east in the city of
6 Tucson, which I think is a better division within the
7 city of Tucson.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I guess, as we said,
9 if we can see both options. I'd like to see what the --
10 what looks -- what it looks like in terms of
11 demographics.

12 I also am curious how this is going to work
13 from the Coalition's perspective in terms of our overall
14 numbers by adopting 4.2 and seeing what modifications
15 might be needed to get us to where the community of
16 interest works effectively.

17 I continue to have some concerns, and I'm not
18 sure at this point how to accommodate them, about
19 Avondale and Tolleson in District 9 and whether or not
20 there's some things that we can be doing there. I don't
21 have a suggestion at this point right now, but I feel
22 that they are heavily Latino communities who are going
23 to be -- and so I guess I would like to see if there's
24 something we can do. But they may lose some voice in
25 District 9. So I do have a little bit of a concern

1 about that. But, again, I don't have a great solution.
2 I don't see them adding to D-3. I'm not sure if adding
3 them to District 8 would work. I've got to mull that
4 over a little bit more.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'd like to remind all of
6 us that our goal is by ideally Thursday, but certainly
7 no later than next week, is to approve draft maps. And
8 they are only going to be draft maps. And we want to do
9 the best we can over this next couple of days, but we
10 are then going to have huge opportunity for public input
11 and then we will have a month of redoing the final maps
12 to really try to get into the detail and fine tune some
13 of these things.

14 So, you know, there is still ample opportunity
15 beyond whatever we approve for a draft map to make
16 changes. And with the -- with that, we will be able to
17 get a lot of input that will be really specific and
18 detailed input from the public because so much so far
19 has been more general and generic. But once they see
20 real draft maps, we'll be able to get real fine-grained
21 feedback from the public.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could you again repeat
23 the part about -- just pulling up the map closer --
24 moving -- what we were talking about, potentially
25 moving -- I just -- I want to be sure I understood what

1 was being said. Sacaton, Gila River, Ak-Chin into D-2
2 is what you were saying, Doug? Is that what you were
3 kind of --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, is that a benefit to
5 the tribes, or would they stay better served in the
6 southern district?

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not -- I'm not sure
8 if there was -- that's what I want to clarify. I think
9 I maybe misheard. I don't know.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I mean, Doug said he
11 could do it. But, I mean, the question is probably more
12 related to Commissioner Watchman's thoughts, I think.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I'm not sure if
14 it's needed. Yeah, I wasn't sure. I'm not saying that
15 that was the thing to do, but I don't...

16 The other -- the question I would have separate
17 from that, then, is trying to get Casa Grande whole
18 somehow no matter what rather than -- because right now
19 isn't it split? So whatever we do, it's not a large
20 community; it would be nice to put it into one district,
21 whether it's D-2 or D-7.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And my suggested changes
23 would get it into D-6 and also it would take Maricopa
24 out of being in D-7, which I don't think is a good fit
25 community of interest-wise and put it into D-6.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would say that it
2 actually -- Maricopa should be in D-7. It's closer
3 to -- it's very close to Maricopa County. And putting
4 it in D-6 really extends D-6 way north. And I just
5 don't see that as a connection. So I would not put
6 Maricopa in D-6 at all. Because then we are really
7 extending D-6 way north, which is the same issue that
8 you had with D-7. Right? Don't want to extend
9 something so far south all the way to the north. I
10 would say the same here with Maricopa.

11 We've talked about the fact that Maricopa is
12 connected to Maricopa County, that they have students
13 that go to the Tempe Union High School District.
14 Putting them in D-6 really would not fit with that. So
15 I think we want to keep Maricopa in either D-7 or D-2 if
16 it extends over there, whichever one, but I think
17 probably D-7. They have strong relationships with the
18 Phoenix area. They go to work in Phoenix. They --
19 their children go to school, many of them, to -- in that
20 area. So I don't think we want to be moving them into a
21 southern district.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: In respect for that, that
23 suggestion, I would then ask for you to draw two --
24 another map yet, where you do put Casa Grande in D-6 but
25 you don't put Maricopa so that we can at least just look

1 at these alternatives. Without looking at them, I can't
2 say positively what I really think is the best thing,
3 so...

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So one map with Casa
5 Grande in D-6.

6 Can you clarify what you would like,
7 Commissioner Mehl? I'm sorry.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So one map that would
9 include Maricopa and Casa Grande in D-6, move the tribes
10 wherever, maybe -- I really don't have a strong opinion
11 there. I've -- and then in the city of Tucson, making
12 up D-7's population by moving east into the city of
13 Tucson.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think for the tribes,
15 Madam Chair, with this version, considering again
16 putting Ak-Chin and Gila into D-2 I think would reflect
17 what I heard from at least their governor of Gila River
18 is that they want to remain a rural tribe. And so I
19 think the issues that these two tribes south of the
20 Valley face are a lot different than what the Tohono
21 O'odham faces, especially when it comes to border
22 issues.

23 I know that the Tohono O'odham tribe is always
24 dealing with -- not always, but they spend a lot of time
25 dealing with the border challenges. And so in -- and

1 they're very rural, but their challenges as a community
2 of interest are slightly different than what I see the
3 two tribes, Ak-Chin and Gila. So I think putting --
4 again, considering putting the two tribes in D-2 would
5 reflect what I believe those two tribes are suggesting.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So not to completely
7 disagree with my fellow Commissioner here, but I'm
8 looking at how we would then move Maricopa, the town of
9 Maricopa, and I think that needs to be kept in the
10 district closest to the Phoenix metropolitan area.
11 Whether it's that D-2 extends up into that area or
12 whether it's that D-7 stays there and the Ak-Chin and
13 Gila River Indian communities stay with the southern
14 Arizona tribes, other than the ones north of Tempe and
15 Mesa area.

16 So I'm not sure, Doug, in terms of giving you
17 direction, but my feeling is that we want to keep
18 Maricopa, the town of Maricopa, close to Phoenix because
19 they have close relationships there. Many people live
20 and work -- live in Maricopa and work, they travel every
21 day to the Phoenix area. So somehow we want to keep
22 those connected, and that would mean keeping them --
23 either putting them all in District 2 or all in
24 District 7. And maybe we can take a look at both.

25 Because we can't separate out Gila River Indian

1 community and Ak-Chin from the town of Maricopa. They
2 are all linked. And right now we have them in
3 District 7, which is a southern Arizona district, and it
4 might be that -- what I have been suggesting was putting
5 Casa Grande, the community of Casa Grande, either in D-2
6 or D-7 as a whole, but keeping them whole, and then
7 Maricopa, the town of Maricopa, keeping them whole, and
8 they can go into either D-7 or D-2. I was thinking D-7,
9 but to keep them connected.

10 So I know my -- my fellow Commissioner here
11 said to put them in D-2. I'm not -- it's a lot of work
12 to try it both ways, but I had been thinking they were
13 going to stay in D-7. Either way, my bottom line is
14 that I feel that the town of Maricopa needs to stay
15 connected somehow to the north, not to the south.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just --

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I concur with
18 Commissioner Lerner's reasoning on this.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So just to confirm, so is --
20 if it stayed with the tribes and went with the tribes in
21 D-2, that would meet it. Or if it stayed in D-7, that
22 would meet it? As long as it is staying with the
23 district that's right next to urban Maricopa? Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Correct. That's really
25 my main point here is just to keep it -- to not place it

1 into D-6, because I think that is just too far south and
2 there's really no connection in terms of community of
3 interest as part of that.

4 I think D-6 extends pretty far north and
5 probably doesn't need to, when we kind of take a look at
6 the overall picture of where D-6 is. I'm not sure
7 that -- that piece that goes along I-10 I don't think is
8 highly populated. And in terms of looking at it, it
9 picks up, it looks like, Picacho and Red Rock, which are
10 small communities and probably could go either way into
11 D-7 or D-6 as part of that. But in many ways we could
12 probably almost cut it -- if we wanted to make D-6 fewer
13 counties, because it has six right now, we could
14 potentially have -- make a change there as well in terms
15 of Pinal, where it goes into Pinal County.

16 I do see a relationship for Oracle, Catalina,
17 but I think we've kind of taken care of that piece in
18 this one, what we talked about yesterday.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Just finishing up
20 Commissioner Lerner's line of reasoning, for my sake I
21 think it makes sense to put Maricopa in D-7.

22 When we're done with this area, I'd like to
23 eventually -- I don't want to rush my colleagues -- I'd
24 like to move to 4 and 5, but not prematurely.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just one question. Given the

1 area we're looking at here, that has come up as we were
2 mapping is the bump of Saddlebrooke where the Pima
3 district comes up into Pinal, into Saddlebrooke, is kind
4 of historic and traditional, there has been mention of
5 SaddleBrooke Ranch, which is a newer area. It's the
6 top -- that top part. We haven't been moving that in
7 because it hasn't been the traditional part, but it --
8 just want to get Commission's impression on should
9 SaddleBrooke Ranch also --

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I just hadn't noticed that.
11 It should get moved in. It's definitely more -- it's a
12 strong community of interest with Oro Valley, yeah. So
13 that would be good to move in.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: It wasn't something we
15 consciously chose one way or the other. Just as we were
16 working, we noticed, oh, we haven't gotten that.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are we ready to move to
18 4, 5, or you want to keep working from this area?

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, no. I think we're ready
20 to move to another area of the -- of the state.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I'd like to take a
22 look at 4 and 5. I'm pleased with the general groupings
23 and general respect for communities of interest. I do
24 think, though, that there are ways that we can make both
25 districts a little bit more competitive by shifting up a

1 few lines. And this is where I'm going to ask your
2 help. You know, maybe it's moving a little east D-4.
3 But, you know, if you look at the spreads, you know, one
4 is, you know, very tilted in one direction, another is
5 very tilted in the other. And if there's a -- you know,
6 those communities, there's a lot of blending.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg, would you be
8 talking about going as far as really rotating them so
9 that instead of being a vertical split, it would be a
10 horizontal split between the two? Or does that get too
11 far -- does that take them too far east and west?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, not -- just slightly
13 east. You know, but, again, I don't know what you're
14 taking away from 5.

15 Oh. You know, I'm looking up more north,
16 uh-huh, but not quite so far east.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Where is Power Road? If
19 you could highlight Power Road for me, please.

20 MR. FLAHAN: It is basically the eastern edge
21 here of the town of Gilbert.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. I certainly would
23 not want it to go any further east than Power Road. But
24 that area that's just -- exactly, that populated area,
25 in that area, if there's a way to -- if it makes sense

1 for those communities, if, you know, they have enough in
2 common, I think that that would help moderate, you know,
3 the extremeness of those districts.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Falcon Field corridor
5 there?

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: To be honest, I don't --
7 I can't recommend the specific streets because I just
8 don't know the data well enough. But, you know, I'm
9 open to suggestions. And if it can't happen, it can't
10 happen. I just -- it's a priority of mine to try to,
11 you know, narrow these gaps here.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: We can certainly take a look
13 at the competitive data and move over -- essentially we
14 can move over as far as to --

15 Power Road, is that --

16 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- to Power Road in the north.
18 And then 5 would go into 4, kind of -- on the southern
19 side or somewhere. And we can see -- see what impact it
20 makes certainly.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I have another minor
22 adjustment on my requested map, and that's up in the
23 north part of Marana. There's almost no population, but
24 it's going to matter as a future growth corridor. So if
25 you look at Pinal Airpark and Red Rock, if you can get

1 all of that into District 6, like I say it's very few
2 people, but it is a future growth corridor and when it
3 grows it will make much more community of interest sense
4 with the Marana/Oro Valley area.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is it -- I think it's in
6 there already. Marana is already in District 6.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. It's north -- it's
8 north of Marana. It's actually part of Pinal County.
9 It's the southern edge of Pinal County on the west of
10 the I-10, and it's like a triangle or maybe a semicircle
11 to just capture that in there. And it's mostly vacant.
12 There's a little bit of housing in Red Rock and that's
13 about it. But that will be a future growth area that
14 will be a part of Marana and actually will end up being
15 incorporated in Marana.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: So where right now it's
17 following the freeway, essentially bringing it across
18 the freeway down to the county line.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I had been actually
20 thinking that we should -- in that particular area
21 that -- I mean, I do think we should look at how
22 District 6 is split into so many counties, because I
23 don't think that honors many of them. So, you know,
24 that's the piece of Pinal that goes into District 6
25 right there. So I just think it's something that we

1 should consider.

2 And because, to be quite honest, I hadn't taken
3 as close a look to 4.2 as I probably should have because
4 I was so focused on 4.0 and 4.1, I'm going to have to
5 take a closer look to see how we might make some
6 adjustments. And I'm thinking in terms of
7 representation in that case, when you have such diverse
8 groups and all of that and the split, especially when we
9 heard from folks who have requested that.

10 So that piece I understand, Commissioner Mehl,
11 what you are -- how you are wanting to condense or
12 consolidate in that area, but I'd like us to at some
13 point take a look at that. I don't have a specific
14 suggestion right now. I have to think it through.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just think we have to
16 be careful. County lines in a more condensed, populated
17 area isn't as logical as it is in more of the rural
18 areas when we have so many clear communities of interest
19 that transcend the county lines.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: To follow in your
21 discussion, Chairwoman, about making things a little bit
22 more competitive, we do have -- in this particular
23 iteration, 4.2, we have a few districts that are really
24 not at all competitive. And I don't know if there's a
25 way to even bring that swing into our range, our widest

1 range, which I would love to do for all of them if
2 possible. But I look at District 9, and that's where my
3 concern comes in for some of the west valley communities
4 who are not going to feel connected to that district
5 when you look at that district and how they are not
6 going to be connected in that way, and it's also very
7 noncompetitive as is District 5. Those are probably our
8 two least competitive districts. I know you're working
9 on District 5 right now.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. My concern about
11 District 9 is the geography is the geography and the
12 people live in our state based on separate interests.
13 And to make too much of an effort to moderate that
14 district may never be enough. And what you'd be doing
15 is lumping people that would then be permanently
16 unhappy. You know, so to make it more moderate, you're
17 going to just add more people, but it's never -- I don't
18 want to say never. To get that district competitive,
19 you would have to blow up the state, the whole map. So
20 I think we have to be really cautious about how many
21 different communities we want in there. It's something
22 to really think about. Sometimes moderating doesn't
23 lead to a more moderate map with the other eight
24 districts, I guess is my point.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I concur. I understand

1 what you're saying.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But I do think 4 and 5
3 can be worked around. I think there's enough -- and I
4 haven't given it -- you know, I can look more on the
5 street level. I am familiar with these areas. But I
6 think we can do more there.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I may, Chair Neuberg and
8 Commissioner Lerner, on looking at that 9/8 area, one
9 thought that may be related on this front that we may be
10 able to do a little work if there's Commission interest
11 in this is, you know, we talked about District 3 was
12 drawn by the Commission and that Avondale and kind of
13 the history -- the older parts of Avondale and Tolleson
14 are not in there. Of course, hopefully the Coalition
15 will add to this, but my presumption is that the
16 Coalition did not put those areas in there because they
17 assumed they would be in the other Latino seat.

18 If the Commission wishes, we could look at
19 putting those areas into District 3 and the -- not the
20 high growth areas, but the kind of traditional parts of
21 Avondale and Tolleson, and then that would take out of
22 District 3 something else, either on the north side --
23 it could be done on the north side, which would put
24 those areas into 8, and 8 is not that far from
25 competitive. So that may be a rotation that might

1 assist with -- with competitiveness in that part of
2 the -- of the region.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: You have that finger of
4 El Mirage up in District 9. You could drop that into 8;
5 it would probably help.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think your ideas of --
7 you could actually take some of -- some of that and put
8 it into 3, as you're suggesting. I think that's an
9 option. And you could actually take some of 3 and put
10 it into 1 as well. We've heard from folks, some of that
11 area over in the Northern Avenue, north Glendale area.
12 There's the freeway that's right there, I-17. You could
13 take that slice that's right there on the north part --

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, that's been the
15 Alhambra historic area for --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. But I'm just
17 thinking it could go into D-1 potentially if we're doing
18 that exchange that you're talking about. I was just
19 thinking we could move that over to D-1, that slice, as
20 you're adding in those older communities that we've
21 talked about into D-3 and see what might happen. And,
22 actually, you could take it all the way down. You know
23 how it goes that -- I don't know how to describe it --
24 where it goes down and then to the right, that little
25 box that's right there.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Which district are you talking
2 about?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm on District 1. That
4 red district. Yeah, right in that area. You could take
5 pretty much that L shape. If you move those others in
6 to District 3 as a way to remove population, you
7 potentially could move that population into District 1
8 is what I guess I'm getting at, that little piece, and
9 see what would happen.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But that might help those
12 folks that were in District 7 that are now not going to
13 be there or potentially not going to be there by moving
14 them into District 3 as you suggest.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Then you give up the folks
16 that have been in District, what we are calling D-3
17 forever. That's been their congressional representative
18 along the freeway there forever. That seat's been
19 with --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I understand. I
21 just -- I'm trying to think of that community that has
22 also been represented. So, I mean, it's worth taking a
23 look at. I'm not saying it -- that's all we're doing
24 right now is making some suggestions. It may be that
25 that doesn't work, but I think that's a good idea to see

1 if we can do a little bit of moving around there to
2 accommodate those folks.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: If you just push District 8
4 south to Glendale from Northern and then picked up
5 Avondale and Tolleson, what would that do with the
6 population?

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: That was -- actually, I was --
8 just as I was looking at Commissioner Lerner's request
9 on the map, that occurred to me that, yes, there's the
10 kind of Ocotillo part of Glendale, which is historically
11 very Latino, but D-3 actually, it picks that area up,
12 but it also moves farther west into kind of the
13 high-growth parts of Glendale, which I -- again, I'm
14 kind of guessing at what they were thinking as they drew
15 it and certainly welcome clarification from the
16 Coalition, but I'm think -- my assumption is they were
17 just bringing D-3 over to match the border of the D-7.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Of the 101, yeah.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So now that their D-7 is not
20 there, it may make sense to pull it back to just get the
21 historically downtown Latino Glendale, and then some of
22 those areas could come out.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. And basically I
24 think what would happen is you'd be moving it, D-3 --
25 you'd be taking a little bit, moving it west really to

1 I-17, with what you're talking about, by adding those
2 areas in. Right? Then you'd be taking that eastern
3 portion, putting it into D-1 as you shifted D-3 over.
4 Is that what you were thinking as well?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I was talking about
6 moving D-8 down.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, and I'm thinking of
8 D-1 because I think that when you look at I-17 it's
9 actually a nice piece right there. But we can have it
10 look both ways if you want.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: That Alhambra neighborhood
12 is, what, 19th Avenue to 32nd Avenue, Northern to
13 basically downtown, I think. Am I right, Doug?

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: That Alhambra neighborhood
16 is 19th Avenue to Northern to 32nd, roughly down to
17 about -- I think it's down to McDowell; isn't that
18 correct?

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: I actually am not familiar
20 with precisely where it is. Ivy knows the area better
21 than me and is nodding yes. So, yes, I believe so. We
22 can certainly look.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: To me, just looking at
24 the neighborhoods, I think it's a very logical place
25 rather than splitting it at -- let me just check --

1 15th Avenue.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's on -- yeah. The
3 line's on 19th Avenue. Yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 19th. Thanks. My eyes.
5 Moving it over to the freeway. But, you know,
6 why don't you take a look at these options, you know,
7 and see what it would look like to add those communities
8 into D-3 and then we could look at what it would look
9 like to put them -- to shift it over to the west and
10 incorporate those into D-1. And then Commissioner York
11 has the other idea of moving them north, but I actually
12 think their communities may fit nicer to the -- to the
13 east.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I'm wondering if this
15 may be a decent breaking point. If there's a few, you
16 know, summation questions that mapping team has in order
17 for you to get, you know, a clearer sense of all these
18 things we're throwing at you, please.

19 Okay. I do think some need a break. Are
20 you --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: (Inaudible.) That's fine.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you want to bring it
23 up now?

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, that's fine.

25 (Inaudible.)

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Go for it.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It might be the last thing
3 on congressional (inaudible).

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: I've got one -- just one
5 more comment, and that is in respect to
6 Commissioner Neuberg's question about D-5, D-4, that the
7 logical moving north on D-5, if you're going to take out
8 of some of D-4 from the north, I think up to Ray Road
9 and over, that matches along the 202 corridor as it
10 loops down in Chandler there.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry. Was -- can you say
12 that one more time?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: So the --
14 Commissioner Neuberg asked if you could make D-5, D-4 --
15 we could figure out how to make it more competitive.
16 And so she recommended north of 60 along the Power Road
17 corridor, to take a look at that. So you've got to get
18 population out of D-4 someplace. So I'm suggesting if
19 you take the 101 south at Ray Road and move that -- move
20 the lower border, which is along the 202, up to the
21 Ray Road corridor, which kind of matches the 202 to the
22 east, that might be some population trade-off. If you
23 look at the tech sector, it basically runs along
24 Price Road down from Ray south down into south Chandler.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: I do not know those streets.

1 Sorry.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I understand. But I'm
3 giving you specific instructions, so hopefully Brian or
4 one of these people from Virginia that we like so much
5 are taking notes.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Mark is actually local to the
7 area --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I understand.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- so I'm looking at Mark to
10 see if he --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: But I'm just saying
12 that's -- I want the public to know why I'm having that
13 rush of -- all right.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. No. Mark will be
15 able to find it if there's a whole Intel section,
16 there's a whole, you know, high tech area, that actually
17 logically really makes a lot of sense.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So we could look at both
20 options. I think it's interesting just to do it both
21 ways.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think they've got
23 to come out of 8. You've got to kind of jiggle-jug, I
24 think.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I mean, actually I

1 think both options sound interesting. I just -- I'm not
2 opposed to any of it. I just, I like -- I like the idea
3 of looking at that north/south and also the east/west
4 option.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Perfect.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So --

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- I believe there's one
10 other issue that a Commissioner would like to bring up,
11 and then we'll take a break.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So I'm going to go
13 back in time a little bit to what we started with
14 originally, one of the maps that had been proposed. But
15 I want to take this option. And now that we've seen
16 sort of where we are right now with where things have
17 been going, in looking at D-2, District 2 and
18 District 9, I would like to -- and looking at where
19 things have been over the last 10 to 20 years in
20 Arizona, in the past a lot of Yavapai County, but in
21 particular Prescott, has been aligned with District 9.
22 They've been with the Colorado River Indian community.

23 Commissioner Mehl's original map had sort of
24 just taken that whole part. I'm not actually interested
25 in looking at the whole thing, but I would like to see

1 what would happen -- and I guess I'm thinking in terms
2 of communities of interest and where people are aligned
3 in terms of their views, where they settle, that's part
4 of what we talk about.

5 This would not -- it would change District 2 to
6 potentially being more competitive, but it would still
7 keep it as a Republican-leaning district, I think. I'm
8 almost positive as part of it. That's not really my
9 intent to kind of -- I know it won't flip, but it would
10 probably become a little more competitive. But more so
11 it would actually align Prescott with communities that
12 they have been with and have created strong communities
13 of interest for the past many years.

14 So what I would like to ask is for you to run a
15 test map that would take Prescott and if needed all of
16 Yavapai County, but at least Prescott, the four -- and
17 the quad cities and put them with Mohave and La Paz
18 counties and see what would happen.

19 I think it might help that we won't have as
20 much of District 9 going into west Phoenix, which is
21 something we've heard from west Phoenix, that they would
22 like to be associated with Phoenix more so. So it might
23 actually help that.

24 Prescott itself is aligned a little bit more
25 philosophically with those communities as they have been

1 aligned for many years. We've heard about Mingus
2 Mountain, so it could be a break at Mingus Mountain.

3 If that doesn't work population-wise, you know,
4 and you need to do all of Yavapai, we could, but I know
5 Mingus Mountain has been raised -- talked about quite a
6 bit. And I think they are more aligned on the west than
7 they are with those in the east as part of that. So I
8 think that putting them in that area would -- would be
9 interesting. So it's a variation on Commissioner Mehl's
10 original proposal.

11 And so I would be appreciative if we could just
12 see what would happen population-wise and in terms of
13 the alignment if we tried to do that.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And where are you
15 suggesting to pick up the population for D-2?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I actually would --
17 I would add Graham and Greenlee, which is what I've
18 always thought should be in that area because I feel
19 that they have communities of interest that are
20 connected. I realize this would be a big impact on the
21 map as we have it. It -- my feeling is it doesn't have
22 to be precise at this point to see if it would even work
23 in any way. But I do feel that the Prescott community
24 is more aligned to the west. I didn't feel that the
25 entire north was aligned together, but I do feel that a

1 portion of it is aligned.

2 So I actually think if we added Graham and
3 Greenlee into that, they are also mining interests, they
4 have forest interests, they are connected to the other
5 communities to the north. They do a lot travel up and
6 down in that area. They are more aligned together than
7 they are to the border communities, Graham and Greenlee.

8 So if we picked up those communities and
9 attached them to the other communities that go into that
10 area, to Eagar, Pinetop, they fit with, you know,
11 putting Safford up there, all of those into the mining
12 communities. So that would be my suggestion. So it
13 would be a variation on what Commissioner Mehl, but not
14 completely.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. The only challenge is
16 that Graham and Greenlee have less than half of the
17 population that we're talking about moving. So we could
18 move those, and then D-6 would have to get the 50-some
19 thousand that that would involve. It would probably
20 push D-6 up. It may push D-6 really into Maricopa or
21 into San Tan.

22 The bigger issue is that D-2 would then still
23 be short about 50 or 100,000 people that would --
24 looking at the map, would really have to come from
25 Apache Junction, the San Tan Valley. So we could -- we

1 could rotate that, but just want to be clear you'd be
2 taking out Yavapai and putting -- putting Graham and
3 Greenlee, but then probably putting in either San Tan
4 Valley or a good chunk of Apache Junction and Gold
5 Canyon.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- so part of it
7 is -- and I know that there will be challenges. I'm
8 not -- I'm very aware. But what we are doing now is we
9 are taking rural areas either on the east or west and
10 attaching them to urban areas. We know that we have to
11 do that because of population needs. Right now we're
12 doing that with District 9. We're taking District 9 and
13 adding it in to the urban area on the west.

14 So just to look at this and see how this would
15 do in terms of alignment, we would be doing that on the
16 east, which has happened before. Right? They've been
17 aligned with that community, Apache Junction currently
18 is with that same district and has -- has that same
19 area. So they've already had that as part of their
20 alignment for the past ten years.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm open to looking into
22 this. What I want to be careful is that we're not
23 circling back to the very beginning of our deliberation
24 process where we are then delib- -- because eventually
25 if -- to get the population is encroaching more into the

1 Maricopa area for D-2, then we're are right back at the
2 same deliberative, you know, conversation we had a
3 couple days ago. So I'm open to looking at it, but I
4 think that there are going to be some challenges.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I can't help but saying
7 that -- oh, No. 1, a clarification, you referred to maps
8 as my map, and believe me, believe me, I've never done a
9 map and have no clue how to go about it.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I didn't mean it that --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So it was a map --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I meant you suggested
13 that.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It was a map I supported.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's all I -- that's
16 all --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I had nothing to do
18 with generating.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. No. That's all I
20 meant. I did not mean it --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm not capable.

22 But, ironically, if you wanted to go this
23 direction it would have been way better to start with
24 that original map.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And so I'm willing to -- I
2 have no objection to you asking for this. I feel sorry
3 for you over there having to draw it, but I don't think
4 it's going to be productive. But you're -- yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I understand that.
6 You know, it's one of those things where you keep
7 staring at maps long enough, and part of -- part of the
8 process that we're going through with having to make
9 changes by doing this on a daily basis is sometimes you
10 don't have enough time to process all of that. So I do
11 understand what you're saying. And probably if I'd have
12 had enough time to process that I might have been able
13 to say why don't we just try this one piece from that.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I may, Commissioner Lerner,
15 if you are comfortable with it, we are happy to draw it.
16 We can do the D-9, 2, 6 rotation. 90 percent of the
17 work is then going to be try balancing it through Mesa,
18 Tempe, Scottsdale, all that. So perhaps we know where
19 we would balance it, but maybe we'll draw the test and
20 not doing that balancing, if that's okay with you.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That would be fine.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to kind of
24 see. It may be completely off. It may be that it --

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- something works.

2 That's fine. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Or -- and this is, like,
4 totally blowing it all up -- what if, and
5 Commissioner Lerner, this is, you know, your desire, so
6 it has to be what you're comfortable with, starting with
7 the map that Commissioner Mehl had proposed, which was
8 that -- because that's in essence what you're getting at
9 it. Instead of thinking about it from east/west, think
10 about it from the north and then make an adjustment. If
11 you started from that iteration where the top half was
12 in essence one district and then adjusted for that,
13 could you approach at all what Commissioner Lerner is
14 wanting? I don't know.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Part -- part of my thinking is
16 that the Graham/Greenlee piece, actually I think -- I
17 think this will fit in with the earlier request that
18 Commissioner Mehl made of changes to Red Rock and all
19 that, so it may work to not be all that much work to do
20 this test off of what we're already doing earlier
21 versus -- if we go back and move Mohave again, we're in
22 a whole new map.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Honestly, however you
24 think you can do this. If it's going back to that, if
25 it's -- whatever -- whatever works. My thing is, and

1 again this is part of the processing that I go through,
2 is thinking about that alignment of communities of
3 interest, and that's why I was -- I was not thinking
4 across the board because I look and I don't believe, for
5 example, what's in -- which was part of the issue I had
6 in the first place, that north/west corner having the
7 same connection to the northeast, but I do see the
8 Prescott area as having those connections.

9 So whatever you think, Doug, can work.
10 Whatever is the easiest way for you to kind of just see
11 how that might fit I would appreciate.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And as a reminder, just
13 the reason why I ended up not voting for this iteration
14 of the map just had to do with the extremeness of
15 District 2 as it is in this particular map and the
16 Native American population. Our District 2 now, it has
17 a much narrower spread than this District 2 had.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I agree with that.
19 That's why I was only thinking of Prescott going into
20 that one area in the Yavapai County, not the rest of it.
21 So that was really what -- and I didn't visualize it
22 before until...

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Is CD-3.1 balanced?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I'm not saying I'm
25 tied to it. I'm just curious on how that might fit.

1 MR. KINGERY: 3.1 is not balanced. There's --
2 entire Pinal County is unassigned.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. This would just
5 pull out that one piece. Okay. Thank you. That's all
6 I had. Thank you.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would suggest a break.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. We are going to
10 take a break, but I would like some guidance from -- I
11 would like some guidance from mapping about -- so how
12 would you like to proceed now? Do you want to go back
13 and work on this as a team and have us have a
14 substantial break? Do you want to have just a little
15 break and us come and begin the deliberation process on
16 legislative maps? What would be efficient for you?

17 MR. FLAHAN: I think the preferred method for
18 us is that we have a lot of feedback from you guys and a
19 lot of different versions of maps that you would like to
20 see. It would be better for us to take a medium-sized
21 break; that way we can give the direction to the team
22 and get them off and running and working. And then once
23 they are working, then we come back. So we're thinking
24 maybe like a 45-minute break, if that's possible.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Wonderful, 45-minute

1 break. We'll reconvene at 11:15. Thank you, everybody.

2 (Whereupon a recess was taken from 10:24 a.m.
3 to 11:32 a.m.)

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we have all our core
5 teams in place? I see nods from legal. Mapping, you
6 guys all ready to reconvene?

7 MR. FLAHAN: Mapping is good. Can somebody
8 make Brian the presenter for WebEx?

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We can resume back to
10 public session as soon as we are live.

11 Oh, we are live on WebEx? We're good to go.
12 Okay.

13 While mapping team pulls up the map, we are in
14 the midst of deliberation on Agenda Item No. VII,
15 deliberations on our legislative and congressional map
16 drawing. We just took a break in which our mapping team
17 went back and integrated our substantial feedback on the
18 congressional maps.

19 And at this point, I am going to suggest that
20 the mapping team turn it over to the legislative map
21 that you have. I believe we have a couple of options.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Correct. We have two options for
23 the legislative map. Yesterday you approved
24 Legislative 3.2, and so we used that as the base to
25 build off 4.0, and then 4.1 will build off of 4.0. So

1 it's a continuation of making a couple of changes.

2 Brian, you want to pull up 4.0.

3 So the major purpose of 4.0 is to include the
4 eight majority-minority districts that sent to us from
5 the Arizona Latino Coalition. And then the other two
6 major points that were made is to unite the Kyrene
7 School District in the Maricopa County area and then
8 also unite the cities of Marana and Oro Valley in the
9 greater Tucson area.

10 Bring that up.

11 So here at the statewide level you can see we
12 incorporated all of the eight Latino Coalition's
13 districts that they sent over to us. If you zoom in to
14 the Kyrene School District area, D-12, the green
15 district there, D-12, that's -- in the Ahwatukee
16 Foothills that bleeds over into Tempe and possibly some
17 of Chandler and then down into the Gila River Indian
18 reservation, that is the border of the Kyrene School
19 District, so that is united in whole under one district.

20 If you go down to Marana and Oro Valley, down
21 the 10 --

22 No. Down the 10 freeway.

23 MR. KINGERY: Oh, sorry.

24 MR. FLAHAN: Scroll down. Yep. Follow 10.
25 Keep going. You're fine. That's the purple D-17.

1 So you can see now in D-17, it unites the Oro
2 Valley and the city of Marana with also Casas Adobes.
3 And you can see that it also comes out crossing the Pima
4 line, incorporating Saddlebrooke. But as you pointed
5 out in the congressional map, SaddleBrooke Ranch is not
6 included in that.

7 The map is balanced. The map has all the
8 population assigned. There is nothing in that request
9 that we could not fulfill. And that was the main goal
10 of 4.0.

11 4.1 builds upon 4.0. So now taking all the
12 changes that you saw in 4.0, 4.1 basically takes
13 Tombstone and a portion of Cochise County and unite them
14 into District 19.

15 Zoom out a little bit more.

16 So you can see now here in the southeast corner
17 of the state, District 19 now incorporates Tombstone.
18 It looks like it incorporates all of Cochise County into
19 that district.

20 That is balanced. That is all the population
21 is assigned. There is nothing that we could not do with
22 that request, so everything was fulfilled in there.

23 Those are the two major changes in this map.

24 Doug, do you have any more dialogue? No?

25 MR. KINGERY: Do you want to go over

1 competitiveness?

2 MR. FLAHAN: We can pull up the demographics
3 and competitive data if you'd like. But with that, I
4 will turn it back to you.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I open it up to
6 reflections from my colleagues about if they have a
7 preference of a starting point, maybe make mention to
8 what you like about the different versions. And again,
9 as a reminder as always, please, you know, reference
10 your comments as it relates to the six constitutional
11 criteria.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I will say that I
13 think both maps are very similar in many ways. And --
14 but I prefer 4.0. And I like -- and the reason I like
15 4.0, a couple of different reasons. And I know 4.0 has
16 that piece that goes across, so I know that that's an
17 oddly shaped part, but that is there just really to grab
18 the Latino border town of Douglas and not go into
19 district with Nogales because they share so much in
20 common, that's a good community of interest.

21 I like this Map 4.0 also because of the fact
22 that it does unite the Kyrene School District, which we
23 have heard about. I also like the fact that it unites
24 Marana and Oro Valley, which I know was something that
25 Commissioner Mehl was interested in seeing that occur.

1 And so it kind of works through some of the things that
2 we had talked about.

3 The District 21 is an odd shape, but it sort of
4 brings some border towns together, which I think is
5 important because of their common interests and issues
6 that they have. I think in general, in general I'm
7 saying, the districts are compact and tend to respect
8 communities of interest, recognizing this district has
9 an odd shape to it, but it has an odd shape to it for a
10 very specific reason.

11 So I guess that's -- those are the main points
12 for my comments on 4.0, just in terms of what I like
13 about it.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Is it correct that this is
15 the only difference 4.0, 4.1 is this southern -- I mean,
16 and then you had to balance it, but basically that's the
17 only difference?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly. There's some
19 balancing kind of along the corridor between Tucson and
20 Santa Cruz and then a little bit of balancing in Tucson,
21 but that is the only difference between the two.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You know, frankly, I'd be
23 much happier going back to 3.5 or wherever, 3.2,
24 whatever that was before. I think there's some problems
25 with all of this, but I think we have problems no matter

1 where we are starting from right now. I think we are
2 farther advanced in the congressional maps than we are
3 the legislative, and -- but if we are going to go with
4 either 4.0 or 4.1, I'm going to argue not to include
5 that southern Cochise County in this district, so
6 therefore it would make more sense to start with 4.1.

7 We've heard loudly from people down there that
8 they want to be part of Cochise County. We haven't
9 heard anybody suggest that -- to break up Cochise County
10 like this. So I think it's not the -- the right thing
11 to do and everything else is the same and I've got a lot
12 of other problems, but I have problems no matter what we
13 do.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I think -- I mean,
15 we can live with 4.1 as well. I mean, because they are
16 so similar.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we recognize that
19 that looks real odd. I wanted to be sure to explain
20 what my understanding was about why it's there. But I
21 think -- I think we should move forward with these new
22 maps and then work from there.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I motion that -- this is
24 Commissioner York. I'd like to propose a motion we
25 approve Legislative Map 4.1.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
2 seconds.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

4 With that, we're going to put a vote forth to
5 move forward with iteration 4.1 on the legislative map
6 from which we will do further deliberations.

7 Vice Chair Watchman.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
16 an aye.

17 With that, we adopt 4.1 as a starting point to
18 begin deliberations.

19 And as we begin deliberations, I know that we
20 have many specific issues in each and every district to
21 cover. I'd like to make a broader comment that looking
22 at particularly the swinginess of the districts, very
23 few districts ever swing. So the legislative map as it
24 is right now is a very locked-in group. That's
25 something I'd like to collectively tackle to try to

1 maximize all the communities of interest, but try to
2 inject a little bit of a closer spread in these
3 districts. And so as we are navigating all six
4 criteria, I do think we need to consider
5 competitiveness.

6 And again, in all my conversations across the
7 state, and it cuts across I'd say all communities of
8 interest, all parties, there isn't a -- well, there's
9 preferences. It's not an issue of right, left,
10 whatever. There is a sense of having enough, you know,
11 competitiveness that it rewards dialogue and debate such
12 that communities of interest have a chance to bring
13 their thoughts to a deliberative process.

14 So that's where my mind is headed with again
15 maximizing the voices of communities of interest, even
16 if they are not in the majority, to be given
17 consideration to advance their interests. And so
18 because of that, I think we need to do a little better
19 on this spread as we're focused on communities of
20 interest.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: So to add to
22 Commissioner Neuberger's comments, I would sure like to
23 see where the current seven Latino majority communities
24 are, LDs, currently, because this says eight and I don't
25 understand the change.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the challenge is that given
2 this process we don't have the current districts built
3 up as demographic spreadsheets and plans and all that.
4 So we can -- we can check on that and probably easier to
5 come back after lunch and show that to you, if that
6 makes sense. I'd hate to speculate and get it wrong.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think the big
8 difference in why they did -- and it would be
9 interesting to see what you do. We know the population
10 has grown. We know that they couldn't come up with a
11 third CD, but they could -- because of the population of
12 the size of the legislative districts, they could come
13 up with the eighth, and I think that's part of the
14 discussion that they have given is we know that the
15 population, the Latino population, has grown as a piece
16 of that. But I might -- I'm not completely sure. We
17 probably should go back and look at the Latino
18 Coalition's letter and see what they wrote with regard
19 to that.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I'm not sure we're
21 ready to go into specific numbers. I'm just not -- I'm
22 not sure we have all the full data about specific
23 numbers of districts. But if we just continue to focus
24 on the communities of interest and the demographics, I
25 think we're all going to get in the right direction.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Check -- looking at my
2 notes from the past meeting, there are -- currently
3 there is -- are two essentially effective Latino seats
4 in Tucson, then we have the kind of Yuma/Tohono O'odham
5 seat, and then four seats in Phoenix. I think this map
6 now has five in Phoenix, Phoenix and the west valley and
7 that whole area. So I think that's where we're picking
8 up. But like I said, we could confirm exactly where
9 those current ones are and get back to you after lunch.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would like to -- I like
11 the concept of trying to create some more competitive,
12 so I would -- I would love to hear from my fellow
13 Commissioners on how we might -- we have the two areas
14 for approaching that, right, on what is competitive. We
15 know we have a number of districts that will never reach
16 that point, but we have some that are within range.

17 And I guess, Chair Neuberg, can you maybe speak
18 to that a little bit more about how do you think -- I'm
19 all for approaching that as a concept. How do you think
20 we might go about thinking about that?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I actually defer to
22 mapping on this, but I want to be clear. I'm not in
23 favor of maximizing the number of competitive districts
24 at the expense of other communities of interest. I'm
25 actually interested in an overall sum of

1 competitiveness, minimizing the ranges all across the
2 board, whether or not it arbitrarily meets our 4 to
3 7 percent spread.

4 My concern is if we limit ourselves to say we
5 need to come up with X number of competitive districts
6 as defined by us, which is arbitrary, that we're causing
7 ripple effects that screws up the other, you know,
8 constitutional criteria. And I'm not sure we know
9 better than that. But I do know that to the extent that
10 we could narrow the ranges all across the board with all
11 30, I think that's a good goal.

12 So I don't want the goal of specific
13 competitive districts to come, you know, at the expense
14 of moderating or bringing together the rest of the
15 state.

16 Am I -- am I making myself clear here? Okay.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: So for just an example,
19 looking at the numbers from the spreadsheet and the
20 current map, so if we look -- make sure I get this
21 right.

22 So currently you can see on the spreadsheet,
23 it's a little hard, on 16 and 17, 17 is almost perfectly
24 competitive. You know, its vote spread is 0.9 percent.
25 Its swing is six Dem wins and three Republicans wins.

1 And 16 is that southern Pinal County district. So it's
2 Gila River, Casa Grande, over to Superior and Mammoth.
3 I think I'm getting that right. Over to Mammoth and San
4 Manuel. Sorry. Not Superior.

5 So it's that southern -- roughly the southern
6 two-thirds. There we go. Thank you. District 16. So
7 that is a highly competitive seat.

8 Seven -- six -- oh, no. I'm sorry. I'm
9 looking at 17. That 16 is just -- is very close. It's
10 a 7.7 percent spread even though it doesn't swing. And
11 the numbers I gave you are for 17 below it, but the
12 Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes district.

13 So those two are -- to Chair Neuberg, to your
14 point, 16 isn't in our defined range, but it's really
15 close to it. And then 17 is almost perfectly
16 competitive by our numbers.

17 So if we want to look at competitive -- places
18 where competitiveness might be changed, well we don't
19 want to blow up those. So if we're looking down in
20 Tucson, we are really looking at 18 and 19. 20 and 21
21 are both effective voting rights seats, so we don't want
22 to mess up that voting rights compliance. So 18 and 19
23 would be a place we could look, but we are really only
24 looking between the two of them because otherwise we
25 mess up. You don't want to create one competitive

1 district by blowing up another competitive district.

2 So that's the kind of places where you could
3 look. And, you know, the Commission can tell us is
4 there changes there that would improve competitiveness
5 and not blow up the communities of interest or not. And
6 then you can similarly look in Phoenix and other areas
7 where are there -- somewhat as you -- as you did with
8 the congressional map, where is there a 9-0 Dem seat
9 versus a nine -- next to a 9-0 Republican seat that we
10 might rotate in some way.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Since you have sort of
12 walked us through a little bit 16, 17, and 18, I may as
13 well jump in. And I think the goal is both to improve
14 communities of interest and to improve competitiveness.
15 And so let me give a try on something I'd like you to at
16 least give a pass at drawing and see -- see what it
17 does. And I'm not positive what it does.

18 But on 17, it needs to go up a little bit into
19 Pinal County to keep communities of interest and capture
20 the Saddlebrooke, SaddleBrooke Ranch, and Red Rock. And
21 it's already a little overpopulated, so that will add a
22 little population, but not much. And actually, if a
23 chunk of 17 could come down into 18 -- and I'll describe
24 it in more detail.

25 Some of 18 and 17 swing around more, and then

1 loot and take up some of 19, I think we can reduce the
2 spread in 18, reduce the spread in 19, keep 17 almost
3 identically competitive is sort of the -- sort of the
4 goal, but to make communities of interest match up
5 better.

6 So that the Casas Adobes area -- so Ina Road,
7 it would take the -- split the foothills instead of
8 splitting at the river. So you take sun -- Ina Road and
9 Sunrise Drive as the split all the way out to maybe Kolb
10 Road. So Ina, Sunrise, Kolb, and everything south of
11 that get into 18. 18 will still be a strong D, but it
12 should be -- right now it's a 20-point spread. That
13 should, I think, reduce the spread, but I'm not sure.

14 I think 17 -- 17 then can swing east and take
15 up some of that Houghton Road corridor, which is what
16 the southern Arizona leadership was arguing for more.
17 So that -- that eastern side, the Tanque Verde Valley,
18 could swing up and be part of 17, which will take a
19 swath out of 19.

20 And I'm just curious to see what -- how that
21 would all work out. That would be a work in progress,
22 I'm sure, but...

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I'm interested to see
24 what happens as well. I can say 17 is probably as
25 competitive as it gets without making any changes to it

1 at all, so --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I don't think you can
3 impact the others without changing it and I --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I do understand
5 that.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. And I think it will
7 still be really --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just wanted to mention
9 that.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I think it'll still
11 be really competitive, but I'm -- but we can look at
12 see.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I mean, between --
14 it would be interesting if we could do some things that
15 would connect communities between 18 and 19. And I'm
16 curious, because those two, whether -- if we took Tanque
17 Verde -- did I say it correctly?

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

20 You know, if we kind of looked at 18, between
21 18 and 19, and kind of moved some things around, I think
22 that those are connected communities as part of that.

23 Tanque Verde goes through both 18 and 19, Tanque Verde
24 Road, as a main thoroughfare that connects those. And I
25 sort of think that if we move some things around there,

1 that might actually accomplish some of what you're
2 talking about. I'm not sure if we needed to adjust 17
3 with the way it is right now, but we can certainly look
4 at that.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, 17 needs to go up
6 north a little bit. Although it's just not a lot of
7 population.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: If 17 goes north and picks up
11 SaddleBrooke Ranch and the little piece of Oracle we're
12 missing and Red Rock, as you said, I doubt that
13 would impact the competitiveness of 17. It may move it
14 slightly, and actually it may -- taking those areas out
15 of 16 may help 16. So -- and I think we are talking
16 about like within -- we'd stay within population
17 deviation. I don't think we would need to balance that
18 out even.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So essentially are you
20 talking about moving, just if we were to visualize, kind
21 of drawing a horizontal line in -- just to get that in
22 my head where you're talking about for in 16, sort of --
23 are you talking about adding Oracle in there?

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. Oracle, Red Rock,
25 and the Saddlebrooke, SaddleBrooke Ranch area.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And San Manuel and
2 Mammoth?

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: See, that would be -- I
5 think that gets really complicated when you --

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I'm not --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- only take one and not
8 the other, because they're very close to each other.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We have done that on every
10 map, actually.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: San Manuel and Mammoth are
13 much more aligned with the -- with the mining and
14 copper --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- to the -- yeah. Not
17 so -- whereas SaddleBrooke Ranch and Oracle -- I don't
18 care about which way Oracle goes. SaddleBrooke Ranch
19 and Red Rock are suburban communities of the Oro Valley.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So more SaddleBrooke -- I
21 could see SaddleBrooke Ranch and --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I don't -- I don't
23 care one way or another on Oracle.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think it --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Don't say that out loud.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think it fits
3 appropriate -- the reason I don't care, I think it fits
4 appropriately either way.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Sure.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Flexibility.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. Well, that --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Exactly.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: We welcome that definitely.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I think getting that
11 southern foothills area into 18 and swinging 17 around
12 more I think would be a better community of interest.
13 And I'm curious to see how it will then impact 19 and 18
14 and, you know, and make them at least -- they're not
15 going to change their nature, but going from 20 to 15 or
16 12 spreads would be interesting, so...

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: So I might suggest, unless you
18 have other comments in the Tucson area, the greater
19 Phoenix area probably is for after lunch, but if there
20 were other feedback you had on the more rural areas, I
21 would be happy to take that now. If you think you can
22 do that before we should break for lunch.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is there a particular
24 region, Doug, that you are wanting to look at?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. I -- I don't have

1 anything that we come back and say this didn't work, we
2 need to get direction on how to fix it. I think this is
3 more your impressions and what direction you want to
4 give us, if any, at this -- at this point.

5 The one -- I guess one piece I would highlight
6 just to get a little more description of what change is
7 made, if you notice over on the river, on the Colorado
8 River side, previously we had District 30 coming
9 essentially the whole river and then down to 23, and 30
10 and 23 met there in Yuma.

11 With the changes in the coalition map's
12 configuration of 23 down in Yuma, there were now too
13 many people in Yuma for 30 to pick it up and still be
14 population balanced. So that's why now District 2 comes
15 down and gets the north part of Yuma.

16 I haven't compared them, but I think that's
17 much like the current district and we did get a lot of
18 comments about Yuma being happy with that. So it's a
19 little weird to have three Colorado River districts, but
20 it's purely because with 23 being the way that the --
21 drawn the way the Coalition had proposed it, there are
22 now too many other people in Yuma to pick up for 30 to
23 get them all. So instead 2 -- and 2 comes down and
24 picks them up. So I just wanted to add that as
25 explanation, not as anything you need direction -- to

1 give us direction on.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's also a little odd to
3 have that little piece of D-2 coming into west Phoenix
4 at White Mountain, White Tank Mountain Regional Park
5 over on Olive. It's kind of what we were trying to
6 avoid before.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. I would agree with
8 Commissioner Lerner. I would drop 27 and 29 down in to
9 take in that.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, just for your --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: For compactness. And I --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- understand population in
14 there and also --

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just so you're aware,
16 overwhelmingly the majority of District 2 population is
17 in the west valley.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's just a -- if we
21 just -- we just worked to avoid that on the
22 congressional, right, having a slice. And I feel like
23 the slice here --

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, you mean just how the neck
25 of D-2 goes into the west?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah, yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think what
4 Commissioner York is talking about is trying to condense
5 those, but I'm not sure how we make those adjustments,
6 but --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think 25 was the
8 boundary that was suggested by the Latino community.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would drop 27 and 29
11 down to match that.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. What you see a lot of
13 in the Phoenix west valley area is just the unaligned
14 maps of the Coalition map versus our old map and things
15 like that. So, yes, none of those odd extensions are by
16 design. Certainly we can certainly clean all those up.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think -- I think,
18 yeah, you could take -- you're talking about maybe
19 moving some parts of 27 and 29 down?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I think something
22 like that. I don't know what would happen, but I think
23 it's worth taking a look at and --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it would make 29 more
25 competitive, that's for sure, because that gets

1 El Mirage into 29.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just certainly happy to. The
4 thing I want to flag, though, is that 29 -- I guess it
5 does go west. Oh, okay. I was thinking -- 29 is the
6 Sun Cities?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: But you're right. We can drop
9 a little bit. It extends west past the Sun Cities so we
10 can trade that out there.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, and I don't know
12 what would happen -- so if we dropped 29 down, my only
13 concern is are we dividing up -- I know we are dividing
14 up to some extent the retirement communities; right?
15 But they do want to be together. So I wouldn't want to
16 drop it down and then now have Sun City -- which they
17 said very clearly they don't want to be divided.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, he was saying that
19 you could take some population off the west side of the
20 303 loop, which is that road there. See, that little --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- finger is El Mirage.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I think our test would
24 be take that -- take what's west of the freeway in 29
25 out and drop it south. Hopefully that would be enough

1 to pick up that whole neck. If not, we'll find an
2 alternative way to --

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- clean up the neck.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That works.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: But, yes. No, I don't take
7 the instructions to be to split the Sun Cities in
8 any way.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And population-wise you
10 think you could do that?

11 Okay. Yeah, I think that works.

12 What else?

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have a conceptual
14 question that's very different than what we are focused
15 on, but something I am struggling with and I don't know
16 when to bring it up.

17 I am looking at Goodyear and Avondale and the
18 west valley where there's this robust growth, it's
19 urban, it's alive. And my understanding in both the
20 legislative map and the congressional map is the
21 representation is going to be connected to communities
22 that seem to me to be very different than them, a little
23 more rural. And I wonder from their lens, from their
24 perspective, are we honoring their growth, their
25 entrepreneurial, you know, spirit of this community?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is D-22, you're
2 thinking?

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: So are we going to dive
6 into Maricopa now, or are we going to wait?

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know what? I know
8 that I'm throwing this out there illogically. It's not
9 connected to anything, but I'm connecting -- I mean, I
10 can't help but think about the legislative map also
11 through the lens of congressional, because, you know,
12 there's give-and-take and some communities may have
13 better representation federally. And if they're not,
14 you know, maybe at least making sure -- you know, I know
15 that they're different, but I'm just thinking through
16 the lens of everybody feeling that they have somebody
17 watching out for their interests. And that community
18 seems to me to just be a little bit at an island. And
19 so I'm throwing it out there conceptually as -- I know
20 I'm not being helpful as we move forward.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think actually
22 you raise a good point about Buckeye in general. Right?
23 Because you look at D-2 and D-22 and it kind of divides
24 Buckeye and we've talked about how Buckeye is growing
25 and yet they are connected. So I think you raise a good

1 point about that particular area.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think the dividing
3 line is the Agua Fria River Basin which basically splits
4 Avondale, Tolleson off into D-22 and would take Buckeye,
5 Goodyear, and the remainder of the west valley into D-2,
6 I guess. I don't know how you would do it, but -- and
7 so that's the -- that river drainage is where all the
8 concrete mason materials dug out for the Phoenix area
9 and everything else. And so to me that's the natural
10 divide. It's a little bit west there. Just north of
11 the D-22 sign there as it snakes up towards Avondale.

12 Brian, that river runs north/south into the
13 Gila. The Gila's the river that's running there along
14 the -- where all the greenbelt is. It's a -- it's a dry
15 wash, but it's --

16 You know what I'm talking about, Mark?

17 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, it goes north.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it goes north from
19 there. Right in along there, yeah. That's kind of the
20 natural -- plus it goes north up into District 25.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The current D-22 as drawn
22 here I think is one of the Coalition map districts.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And just in -- in
25 Buckeye, the District 22/District 2 border really is

1 kind of the -- nothing is fully built out in Buckeye.
2 But as far as anything in Buckeye is close to built out,
3 that's the District 22 piece, and almost all the growth
4 happening in Buckeye is in the District 2 piece. So I
5 think there's some -- I suspect that's the -- what they
6 were thinking as they went through there and why that
7 line is drawn the way it is. But, yeah. I mean, both
8 of those -- the legislators from both of those is just
9 going to be very focused on growth issues without a
10 doubt. And it is more and more, you know, urban, I
11 guess is the way.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And the majority of
13 population in D-2 is going to be in the urban area in
14 Maricopa County; right? It's going to be mostly that
15 Buckeye and all those areas. There's not a whole lot
16 that goes all the way west even though the district
17 does; is that correct?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct. You have the town of
19 Gila Bend in District 22 and --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I meant 2 is what I
21 meant. Sorry.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, in 2?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 2, is most of the
24 population in -- for that district?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. We haven't split the

1 exact numbers. There is a significant population in
2 Yuma, but, yes, I would assume a significant majority of
3 it will be in the west valley. And including Buckeye as
4 part of the west valley. Yeah. Buckeye itself is
5 90,000 plus. And I -- I would guess probably certainly
6 70,000 of that is in D-2, probably more. And by the
7 city's own estimates, they're actually almost 110,000.
8 So that's essentially half the district is going to be
9 almost Buckeye.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And Buckeye is a -- it's
11 this growth area, but it also has an old area. Right?
12 So if we were to look at this, if you -- I mean, there's
13 an old Latino area within Buckeye and then there's a big
14 growth area as well that's going on. Are they -- when
15 we look at how Buckeye is split, is that kind of how the
16 split works is the older neighborhoods in D-22, whereas
17 the newer ones are in D-2 somewhat?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. Primarily the -- the
19 kind of old town is in District 22. There's -- I'm
20 trying to remember where city hall is. It's right on
21 the border there. Yeah. Let me check one thing real
22 quick on that.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you point out
24 Surprise on there? Because I always forget exactly
25 where it's located.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And while he's doing
2 that, actually looked up -- yeah. So old town
3 Surprise -- I'm sorry. Old town Buckeye or old Buckeye
4 is entirely in 22.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, I just -- it's
7 important for us to realize the constituency of D-2,
8 it's this high growth, you know, touching upon urban
9 area along with, you know, approaching the border and
10 the Yuma area. It -- I'm not saying it's -- it's
11 doable, but it's different interests.

12 What's the -- what's the spread there in D-2 in
13 terms of Rs, Ds, and...

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: It has a 25.3 percent spread.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 62 percent Republican.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's west valley.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But it doesn't seem to
18 encroach in the areas in Yuma in which I think
19 significant communities would I think be marginalized.
20 I mean, that's my sense of the map. So I'm just trying
21 to think through all of the different communities in the
22 area.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: You know, this is the
24 challenge where -- so D-2 and District 29 are, you know,
25 overwhelmingly Republican; 25 and 22 are overwhelmingly

1 Democrat. But 22 and 25 are part of the effective
2 voting rights seats.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And if I recall, too, and
4 I know this is Buckeye, you know, is that growth area
5 that we need to be very conscious of, that split between
6 D-2 and D-23 kind of addresses some of the things we
7 heard in Yuma about having a separate -- two separate
8 districts with different interests, different
9 communities of interest, I should say.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: After lunch, you can kind
11 of show us where the previous minority-majority
12 districts were.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: There's a lot to look at, so
14 this may be a good point to break for lunch.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I will just a -- I'll
16 just make a quick comment. I went back and looked at --
17 if you recall when we were in Show Low, we received
18 sample maps from the folks in Show Low. And I think if
19 they take a look at the D-7, they should be pretty
20 pleased overall with how similar. It's not identical,
21 but there's a lot of overlap there. And from my
22 perspective, it speaks to when we hear from the public
23 and they give us some ideas, sometimes those align, to
24 some extent anyway they -- but we are listening to that.
25 But when I look at that old map that we received a

1 couple months ago, it's -- it's quite interesting how
2 much similarity there is.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that does bring up one
4 thing I'm not sure we have on the record right, so let
5 me just be sure. That D-7, I'm glad you mentioned that,
6 Commissioner Learner. Over in the east side, it does
7 not follow Highway 191 all the way up. It does follow
8 Highway 191. It gets all of St. Johns, but then it
9 comes in and picks up territory. The reason we cut in
10 there is as the team was drawing the maps, they actually
11 noticed the Zuni reservation. So D-7 is coming off the
12 highway and farther in than we expect in order to pick
13 up that Zuni reservation to make sure it's in D-7. So
14 just so folks, if they spot why is it not following the
15 highway all the way up to the Navajo Nation, it's
16 because to make sure we get the Zuni in there, too.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Good. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So it sounds like from a
19 mapping perspective this is a good juncture to take a
20 break maybe for lunch. And what amount of time makes
21 sense for us to reconvene and come back to the
22 legislative map?

23 MR. FLAHAN: Would an hour be amenable?

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sure.

25 And let me just check in, actually, with

1 counsel and staff in terms of just overall scheduling.
2 Is there any preference with our break schedule?

3 Okay. So why don't we take an hour break. It
4 is 12:15, and we will reconvene at 1:15. Thank you.

5 (Whereupon a recess was taken from 12:15 p.m.
6 to 1:26 p.m.)

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I believe -- do we
8 have our entire team here?

9 Okay. We are now back in public session, and
10 we are going to dive right back into Agenda Item
11 No. VII, our map deliberations. I will turn it over to
12 our mapping team.

13 MR. FLAHAN: During the break we prepared the
14 current VRA districts, and we can show you what they
15 look like overlaid on a map on top of the current map.
16 Brian just put on the screen here are the current
17 districts. And if we want to overlay them, so you can
18 see the slight differences there are in that muted green
19 color.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

21 MR. KINGERY: These are the current.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Those are the current ones right
23 there.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: When you put that on
25 the --

1 MR. FLAHAN: Yes, the one that we're overlaying
2 is the new that we were working off of. So you can see
3 there's the current -- well, there's the new ones that
4 we're working at here.

5 MR. KINGERY: The draft map.

6 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. The 23 and 2 and then turn
7 them on and you can see where there are some
8 differences.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Were the -- were the
10 differences there that there was less of Yuma in that --
11 in the southern boundary there or more of Yuma? I got
12 confused on the colors. Sorry.

13 MR. FLAHAN: So on the screen right now is the
14 current legislative districts. So you can see that the
15 white piece in Yuma, in the middle of Yuma, is not
16 there.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

18 MR. FLAHAN: And if we turn on the current
19 draft maps -- turn off theirs -- you can see that there
20 is a little bit of D-23 --

21 Actually, turn off ours again and turn on
22 theirs.

23 So you can see that where it says Somerton,
24 there's a part of the district that's not part of our
25 bottom district there.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So we should at least look
2 at that and see if we think -- we should look at those
3 areas and see do we -- which way do we think they should
4 be based on their demographics.

5 MR. FLAHAN: Right. So they cut out a hole in
6 the middle of your draft map District 23. So that's --
7 that's currently the draft maps that you're working on.

8 Turn that off.

9 And you can see that the current district that
10 is in place today, not your draft maps, dip down a
11 little bit.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I assume that's just
13 population shifting and where people are living. That's
14 what's going on there; right? They're just moving
15 things around based on the population? Is that what you
16 would assume?

17 MR. FLAHAN: I don't have those numbers. I
18 wouldn't want to make an assumption on that.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. It's the geography
20 around the Marine Air Force -- the Air Force base there
21 in Yuma.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah. You can see there, there is
23 the --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's just -- I mean,
25 I think that if you think of D-2, our current D-2 and

1 their current -- and our current D-23, I'm guessing that
2 was a population grab to make -- to make D-2 more
3 balanced with D-23. I don't know what's south of the
4 airport there, but...

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But we're not grabbing it.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no. This is what --
7 the suggestion -- what we current -- or D-23 is a
8 suggestion, the primary suggestion of the Hispanic
9 coalition that we placed. So they didn't grab it for
10 some reason.

11 So in a -- in a constitutional thought process
12 of compactness, is that -- are we -- it is uncompact, I
13 guess?

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If it's enough to matter.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think it's enough
16 to matter either, but it just seems odd.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the current -- so the
18 Commission's map right now is more compact than the --
19 than the current -- than the existing legislative
20 district.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct. But I was curious
22 if we should grab that geography there over the airport
23 and just to the east of the airport up along the
24 highway.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Into D-2?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Into -- well, it's already
2 in D-2. Into D-23.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. It's in D-23 now.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. It's in D-2 now.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. The air base hasn't
6 moved in either map. It's in the same place in either
7 map. It's the neighborhood to the west of the air base
8 and the neighborhood south of the air base that differ.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know that I want
10 to start making these minor changes at this point. I'd
11 like --

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- to see the whole thing
14 because --

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- we -- I'm sure that
17 they drew those out pretty carefully to kind of -- to
18 get to the percentages that they were looking for.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And I think the main
20 request, as I understood it in looking at the existing
21 legislative districts, is where -- where is there a new
22 Latino empowerment district. And it's certainly not in
23 Yuma.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, we have been
25 starting from more the border moving up in the

1 west/east. You know, we can also move from the east
2 west because I do know there needs to be some shuffling
3 in the Mesa, Tempe, moving Phoenix area. I don't know
4 if my colleagues want to dive into that area of the map
5 for --

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think he's trying
7 to show us first where the new --

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, okay.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- district is.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sorry.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: And I think it's
12 District 22, if I did my math right, is the add on our
13 current map. Because the District 4 in the previous map
14 moves all the way up into Maricopa. District 22 is the
15 one -- is the new minority-majority district.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I mean, it -- the
17 districts have all shifted around so much there's no
18 one-to-one correlation of four old seats and then a new
19 one. The new one is pieces of each of these. So you
20 can see right now we've got 25, 24, I think 26 too.
21 Yeah. So 26, the one showing in white, it's kind of up
22 on top. And then 25 to the left. 24, 22, and 11, as
23 you walk down.

24 And can you switch to the current -- to the
25 existing legislative districts.

1 Yeah. So you've got the two kind of side by
2 side without the one up north. And then two side by
3 side and...

4 Yeah. So essentially District 4, which in this
5 map blends --

6 Can you zoom out? I think --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Blends 23 and 22.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And now the new one --

9 Can you go back to the Commission's map.

10 So the Commission's map is split. Well, it's
11 the Coalition map has split so that the
12 Avondale/Tolleson seat no longer goes down to Tohono and
13 Yuma. And so we could look at that as a new map, new
14 one, or the other one. It's hard to identify which one
15 is the new one, but that's the big split is that we no
16 longer are blending those.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. That's the big
18 change.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And it's showing the
20 growth in the -- in the Phoenix area of the Latino
21 population.

22 Yeah. And part of reflecting that, the
23 current -- or the existing legislative map has three
24 districts that are majority Latino by citizen voting
25 age, so 56, 54, and 52. And the Coalition's proposed

1 maps have two that are over 50 percent and one that's
2 right at 50 percent. So to some degree they are taking
3 a little bit off of all those Phoenix seats to make the
4 new seat.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. Do you understand?
6 I mean, are you following? I am. Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I am. Yeah. No. I'm --
8 I don't think we are going to try to change the
9 boundaries of those maps just --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- to change them.
12 Right?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're going to be looking
15 overall at all the different districts.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And the challenge, of
17 course, the existing legislative districts are not at
18 all population balanced since they were drawn to be
19 balanced ten years ago.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So from a strategic
22 perspective, colleagues, is there a preference for
23 diving into maybe where certain communities of interest
24 are, for example Latinos, or would you like to go
25 geographic, maybe east/west? Or I'm open to

1 suggestions.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I just have a --
3 I'd like to just make a general comment and then I'm
4 open to wherever my colleagues want to make -- start
5 looking at things. But part of why I liked both 4.0 and
6 4.1, understanding the issues with, you know, why we
7 picked one with the other, I understand some of the
8 concerns about competitiveness and all, but I actually
9 think this is a pretty balanced -- in terms of looking
10 at our competitiveness in broad terms, right, that we
11 are now a competitive state.

12 The fact is that we actually have pretty
13 balanced districts overall. Not within the districts,
14 where we might have a spread of 20 percent here and a
15 spread of 20 percent there. We actually probably have
16 the same issues whether it's a Republican-leaning
17 district or a Democrat, but we -- I think this 4.1 comes
18 up with about a 50/50 split Republican to Democrat; that
19 most of the districts, not all, are fairly compact and
20 contiguous, but most of them are. They recognize
21 communities of interest in terms of how they've been
22 drawn.

23 So we might be tinkering here and there, but
24 I'm not sure what -- I'm not sure of the parameters of
25 where we want to make changes, because I don't see --

1 you know, I saw what Commissioner Mehl did before. You
2 know, he felt there was a community that needed to be
3 added. But when I look at especially the urban area,
4 I'm not sure how we are changing this, what we're
5 changing it for if they are recognizing communities of
6 interest.

7 So, you know, if I look at a mountain park
8 area, you know, where the mountain preserves are, are we
9 keeping those relatively intact as people had requested?
10 Are we placing groups who have requested to be together,
11 school districts? But it's -- to me, it's a pretty
12 remarkable map in the sense that we are in our state
13 right now fairly competitive overall, and this map
14 reflects that.

15 So I just wanted to make that -- that comment
16 of what are we actually going to accomplish in terms of
17 changes as part of that.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I'm not sure that
19 this map would produce a functioning body of elected
20 leaders. That remains to be seen.

21 From my perspective, I'm a little less
22 concerned with coming at it from it has to be a certain
23 balance in partisanship. That's not of the six
24 criteria. I'm focused on maximizing the representation
25 of as many communities of interest, which to me requires

1 a balancing of respecting the geographic areas which,
2 yes, we've done a good job of identifying the general
3 areas, but we haven't done a good enough job yet of
4 moderating those areas.

5 And that's where, to be honest -- and we can --
6 you know, the five of us will go into, you know, the
7 specifics of the districts and give as much feedback as
8 possible. But I just want to be very honest. You know
9 the census blocks far better than I do, far better than
10 I'll ever be able to. And so if we ask you to lean in
11 with trying to seek competitiveness, we may need ideas.
12 I may need ideas because I don't have as much of a
13 command of that data. Maybe it's not possible.

14 But I think you're understanding our general
15 focus of which communities are of importance. And if
16 there's a way for us to juggle these lines, it may even
17 be a half mile here and there that may really shift
18 things. So we're going to need collaboration because
19 we've got ideas, my colleagues know much more about the
20 geography than I do, but I know you all know even more.

21 So with that, I'm open to suggestions about
22 where to start.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I know we
24 are talking about competitiveness, communities of
25 interest, and of course earlier the Voter Rights Act.

1 Do we have an idea from legal counsel where our
2 polarization report is? Because I think that would be
3 helpful at least for me in understanding, you know, how
4 these districts potentially lay out and how it meets
5 the --

6 MR. HERRERA: So as we have talked about
7 before, Voting Rights Act compliance is a question of
8 performance and of course with that analysis of
9 polarized voting.

10 Our consulting experts on the legal team, as I
11 alluded to, have been doing a district-by-district
12 analysis. What we were just informed of a little bit
13 earlier would be that the analysis for the congressional
14 districts will be done at around 3:30 this afternoon, so
15 actually fairly soon, but that they were then turning to
16 the legislative analysis of this 4.1 map, but we don't
17 have an ETA on that. Although my colleague literally
18 just stepped out to take a call from our experts so we
19 may have an update in the next -- you know, whenever he
20 walks back in. But the latest update is the
21 congressional map analysis by this afternoon certainly.
22 And then the legislative map analysis hopefully today,
23 but it could be into tomorrow morning of this 4.1 map.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Which seems to me the
25 timing works well because we can conceptually give

1 feedback integrating the Latino ideas, our ideas, give
2 feedback to the mapping team, and then subsequently we
3 will have the actual polarization data for the
4 consultants to be able to do those fine analyses to make
5 sure we honor the VRA. So it seems to me that the
6 timing is converging appropriately. I don't think that
7 precludes us from moving forward with conceptually, you
8 know, making progress on the maps.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: So this is
10 Commissioner York. There are a couple of cities that I
11 got -- I felt got divided up by this current map
12 rendering that we've accepted that I think I'd like to
13 talk about.

14 First is the City of Tempe. It appears to be
15 in three different districts, 12, 9, and 8. Originally,
16 we had talked about south Scottsdale across the river
17 and Tempe, the hospitality areas of those markets being
18 kind of combined into one legislative district with
19 taking on part of western Mesa. So my suggestion would
20 be move that up to McDowell Road, D-9 up to
21 McDowell Road.

22 I'm not sure the Kyrene School District lines
23 fall out -- fall in south Tempe, and so I probably would
24 follow that, but I would think that would be one
25 community of interest we need to sort of pull together

1 there.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a note, because I
3 happen to know, Tempe actually currently does have three
4 districts now. It actually already has three
5 congressional -- three legislative districts just as a
6 point. So it's not new for them to have three. It
7 seems odd being a smaller community, but it does have
8 three currently and I think they have been comfortable
9 with that.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we had suggested that
11 we would move it -- move the -- combine the south
12 Scottsdale-Tempe district with the Tempe ASU corridor.
13 I still think that's over long -- an arching community.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think this
15 District 8 does that right now. It actually extends --
16 a previous map had it cut off at either Apache or
17 Broadway or something, and now it goes down to Southern.
18 So it actually is a little different from current
19 configuration, but not that much.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: And from a population
21 balancing perspective, if you wanted to unite it, 12
22 could move north and take up the Tempe part of 9, and
23 then 9 would come south and take up the eastern end of
24 12.

25 If we start trying to bring 8 south, then

1 there's -- there's nowhere for 9 to go to get that
2 population.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was trying to move 8
4 north to take on Fountain Hills in that northern part of
5 the Salt River community and Fort McDowell.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that's too far
8 north. I think lumping north Tempe in with Fountain
9 Hills -- is that what you're getting at?

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I'm taking --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- just the boundary of
13 District 8, making Tempe and east Mesa and that 60
14 corridor there part of that District 9. And then trying
15 to move the boundary, lower southern boundary of
16 District 8 north to take in Fountain Hills along that
17 boundary there and actually going out to get
18 Fort McDowell to be put in with the Salt River.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: See, I don't -- the
20 Fort McDowell wants to be with Fountain Hills, but I
21 think you are really putting different communities
22 together there. This current configuration has Tempe
23 with Salt River and a little bit more of Scottsdale
24 maybe than what was originally planned, but I'm not sure
25 that that does a whole lot in those areas.

1 I'm looking at the numbers, too.

2 But Tempe is -- is kind of different, kind
3 of -- it has the university area. Then it has -- you
4 know, the southern part of Tempe is pretty different
5 from north Tempe and that middle area as well. I'm not
6 sure putting it with Fountain Hills --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I wasn't putting it
8 with Fountain Hills.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was putting it with
11 District 9, which runs along the river.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: District 9, which it --
13 well, it already is part of District 9. You are talking
14 about the northern part?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm talking about the
16 university and --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- the southern part. You
19 know, I mean, if you cross the river there, that's south
20 Scottsdale, Tempe -- that's in that area and there's
21 tons of housing for the students and they are commuting
22 down to the university. I thought that that should all
23 be together.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I think that makes
25 it difficult in terms of how the Salt River kind of

1 connects with all of that, the Indian community there as
2 part of it. So I guess my -- my main thing is --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doesn't the Salt River
4 connect more with Scottsdale?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. They want to be with
6 Tempe.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just to put this all in
8 context of how it ripples through the whole map, if the
9 border between 8 and 9, if that moves, then everything
10 through the east valley through 15 has to move, and it
11 shifts out into the rural areas.

12 So we can -- we can move things around within
13 the east valley, between 9, 10, 12. And actually what
14 you're -- Commissioner York, to your goal of trying to
15 get Fountain Hills and that area in, the western border
16 of District 8 could move in. I think that's the Arcadia
17 area where it sticks out.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. Well, the -- what I
19 was trying to get is Paradise Valley into one district.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah. Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: There's a district of --
22 there's an area north of the mountains, the Phoenix
23 Mountain Reserve, that could include Paradise Valley
24 that is a geography and a community of interest going
25 north. That is a differing area than south of those

1 mountains which includes Arcadia, Biltmore, Camelback
2 corridor. You know, conceivably, you could move 8 or --
3 I mean, I don't know where you slide it around, but, I
4 mean, you could have a district that sits on top of --

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: So we can certainly move
6 things around within like 3 -- 1 and 3 and 4 and 8. We
7 can move those around however you wish and however to
8 meet the communities of interest in that area. And
9 those can all rotate around, no problem. Where we
10 impact the out -- the whole map is if that border
11 between 8 and 9 move. So if we can do it by rotating --
12 by changing 8 and only impacting, you know, 4 and 1 and
13 3, that we can do.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So basically just take
15 the northernmost part of 4 out and put it in with 1 or
16 3, is that what you're thinking? Because I'm not really
17 sure of -- I understand trying to get Paradise Valley
18 together if you want to try to pull that into one, but I
19 don't know how -- that could have other implications for
20 the others.

21 So, Commissioner York, are you mostly focused
22 on just what can you do to pull Paradise Valley into
23 one?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I was just -- I
25 was -- I thought -- I thought when we originally looked

1 at these maps before we took on the assignment to
2 institute the Latino suggestions we had decided that
3 Tempe and south Scottsdale were going to stay together.
4 Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, Salt River were going to
5 stay together and that Paradise Valley somehow was going
6 to get encompassed in with the northern areas of the
7 mountain preserve that definitely wanted to be separate
8 from the western side of that corridor, that I-51
9 corridor. We heard it pretty loud and clear that that
10 was definitely a different type of demographic than --
11 than the north part of those mountains.

12 So, you know -- and so I'm trying to slide
13 around that whole area to make it fit what I thought we
14 had originally talked about. So I don't know. There's
15 not anything specific. I know this is balanced, but at
16 the same time this is based on a suggestion from a
17 minority-majority influence that we said we would look
18 at.

19 If you remember correctly, the grid maps really
20 hadn't been messed with much in Maricopa County up until
21 that point. And so now we're trying to re-sort out in
22 our heads where -- where these districts need to be and,
23 you know, where it makes sense from a community of
24 interest or geography.

25 There's boundaries in Maricopa County that we

1 have to consider like the Salt River and the Indian
2 reservations on the east. And then to the south, we
3 have the Gila. And, you know, the west valley with
4 District 22 takes up probably more of the growth area
5 than it -- maybe it should. I don't know. But, I mean,
6 those are things that I'm thinking about as I look at
7 this map. You know, and I appreciate your comments
8 around it being a very competitive statewide map, but we
9 also have a duty to our citizens and where the bulk of
10 our people live here in Maricopa County to try to make
11 it fit their neighborhoods.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree -- go ahead.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: When we started on this,
14 that's why I wanted to really prefer to go back to 3.5
15 and not go to either of these 4.0 or 4.1 maps. And we
16 agreed to do it partly for harmony, partly to make
17 progress.

18 But when we said that, we said that there's
19 significant changes in Maricopa County we want to look
20 at. So I don't want to just get rejected whole cloth on
21 looking at those changes when I think it's important
22 that we look at them.

23 And, as always, we may draw something and
24 decide that it's not better and we would reject it, but
25 I think we want to make a good effort at looking at an

1 alternative for that Maricopa County area.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not -- we're not
3 objecting to it at all whole cloth. I'm just asking
4 questions because -- and especially when you pick an
5 area I happen to know real well, I can speak to that.
6 And I'm just asking about what the purpose of the change
7 is. That's all. I just don't want to make -- as we all
8 do. Right? We don't want to make changes just for the
9 sake of making changes. We want to make things better.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. And I think --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And so that's -- that's
12 all I was asking. I'm not --

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I appreciate that.
14 But I also think if you look at District 11 -- I think
15 24 serves the Latino community well. District 11 serves
16 south Phoenix well. District 26 overlays with the
17 Congressional District 3. District 25 takes into the
18 west side of Glendale. And if we move 27 and 29 and
19 figure out where the population changes come in
20 District 2, maybe they come from the west valley in
21 District 22. I don't know. But those -- those four --
22 11, 24, 26, 27, 25, those make a lot of sense to us, I
23 think.

24 And maybe I'm speaking out of turn, but the way
25 that that caused the shuffle on the east valley --

1 because I'm not sure if we don't want to go more rural
2 in some of these, in D-7 or D-5 or D-14. I don't know.
3 I don't know the east valley well enough to make those
4 calls.

5 Did we take into all the consideration for the
6 Copper Corridor? And, you know, does Apache Junction
7 want more in it than just Gold Canyon? I don't know.
8 Do we want to go down 60 farther? Those are things
9 we've got to consider.

10 But if you look at the guts of this map of
11 Maricopa County, even including D-12, I think those
12 are -- that corridor is in pretty good shape from my
13 standpoint, taking into consideration geography of South
14 Mountain, geography of Queen Creek School District, that
15 big minority populations in 11, 24, 26, and 27, and that
16 serves those -- it's just the other side that I think
17 needs to be jostled around a little bit. And so
18 that's -- that's my objective is to make sure we don't
19 forget about the rest of the valley.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I actually think we
21 should definitely -- we should take a look at D-3 and
22 D-7 to see -- especially D-7 to see if that can become
23 more compact as part of it. It's a -- and because it
24 does take an area -- and that's one of the ones I think
25 you mentioned. Right?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's just the rural
2 districts, yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, it comes into --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Queen Creek.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- Queen creek. Right.

6 And so -- and we heard from Apache Junction, you know,
7 and Gold Canyon. They want to be linked together. I
8 don't know if they are right now. I'm not sure how --
9 no. They are. Okay. So that -- that particular
10 district, D-15, seems to work.

11 But then that portion of Queen Creek, I can see
12 where we can try to make some changes there to get more
13 of Queen Creek in there. I know that's a population
14 issue, but dividing Queen Creek like that -- and it's a
15 big growth area with San Tan Valley is also growing and
16 I would say is more metropolitan as it's growing. So
17 I'm not sure if there's something we could do in that
18 area.

19 I'm very open to it. I just wanted to know,
20 you know, what we're looking for to doing. That's all.
21 But maybe we can take a look at District 7 and the --
22 and District 15 and see, and District 3.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I guess to
24 Commissioner Lerner's point there, if you -- if you
25 wanted to revisit District 7, that -- I mean, to

1 describe what would be happening is if 7 were to pull
2 out of San Tan Valley, then 7 would have to go into
3 Verde Valley. And 5 would then come down into Maricopa
4 County, into D-3 and get the -- some portion or all of
5 the New River/Anthem area.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is there any part of -- I
7 guess I'm just trying to see if it can become more
8 compact in some way. It skirts around D-3. But there's
9 probably not much population where it skirts around.
10 Right?

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Where it skirts around D --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, yeah. There's no
13 population there.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Are we looking out in Maricopa
15 County piece? Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. Just trying to see
17 if it could be more compact and connected.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: And to Commissioner York, to
19 your earlier question too, Paradise Valley can be put
20 whole, you're right. It's divided currently. It could
21 be done in D-4 or D-8. We'd just be rotating amongst
22 those two, and District 3 in all likelihood. So that
23 can be -- that works without going out into D-7. It's
24 only if we try to offset it with change between D-8 and
25 D-9, then you -- then you end up going out to D-7 and

1 rotating all the way through, through Gila County.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And one thing I would
3 take a look at is Wickenburg seemed to want to be with
4 Congress. It's right now in D-2. I don't know if it
5 can be put into D-5. Remember we heard from folks on
6 that saying that they -- am I wrong? We heard from
7 Wickenburg Ranch and Wickenburg. Right? They wanted to
8 be with Congress, I think. So if we can move them.
9 And, again, I know it's population balancing. I'm
10 not -- I don't have all the answers by any means, but
11 they seemed to feel that they had those connections.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that would be crossing the
13 county line. I guess we've done that down in the
14 Pinal/Pima County line certainly, but --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I actually think
16 Wickenburg could go either way. It could go either into
17 D-5 or D-28 because they are also connected to
18 Morrystown; they are not far from there. And I know
19 that we heard -- we heard from them -- I mean, I think
20 that that's a better connection for them than
21 District 2. I guess that's what I would say is that I
22 don't think they have any connection --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would probably put them
24 in D-5 if I was --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's fine.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: I kind of agree with you.
2 We have consensus.

3 I would like some agreement on 11, 24, 26, 27,
4 25.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you just say those
6 again so I can -- I'm just writing them down because I
7 can't keep track.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: 11, 24, 26, 27, 25.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Just take a look
10 at all of those?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, those are the
12 minority-majority communities of interest suggestions
13 from the Latino community that make sense.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you said you want to
15 take a look at those?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't mean take a look at
17 them. I'm just telling you that I feel those are -- I
18 do think the little sliver of District 2, where it
19 reaches across 25, needs to be consolidated either into
20 27 and 29 somehow, and that'll -- leave that up to Doug
21 and Mark to figure that out.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree with you, though,
23 to take that District 2 sliver and get rid of it out of
24 that place and somehow reconnect it. And I think with
25 three districts surrounding it that should work okay,

1 29, 27 and 25.

2 As a question, and I don't have an answer for
3 this, but I'm going to ask the question about Black
4 Canyon City and whether it should go with District 5 or
5 District 3? And I don't know if you all have any
6 thoughts on that.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would argue it should go
8 with District 3, just from a growth standpoint. People
9 with the new semiconductor infrastruc- -- businesses
10 going up there on the 303, I'm thinking that the New
11 River/Black Canyon City is going to be a desirable
12 market for new homes and for those employees.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So put Black Canyon City
14 in New River?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree with you.
17 Another point we agree on. I just -- I'm trying to
18 remember corridors where people talked about certain
19 things, and that was one that I --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: If you look at the line
21 between District 28 and District 3, that cuts across on
22 Carefree Highway there, there's a big open area to the
23 west of Carefree Highway. That area has very little
24 population and is probably -- so if you are looking to
25 balance, you could run District 1 up along Highway 17,

1 Mark, and you could take a part of that little, whatever
2 you want to call it, polygon shape and move it into
3 District 3. There's mountains there and some mines, and
4 there's a big dump.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: So is part of the request to
6 try to move -- just trying to wrap up the earlier
7 conversation, trying to move Paradise Valley into D-8,
8 it's -- or into D-4?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would probably move it
10 into D-4.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: You're you fine moving --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: And I would probably shift
13 D-8 up a little bit into D-3.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's definitely easier to put
15 it in D-4 than into D-8.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So take a little bit
17 of -- I'm just trying to figure out where you would do
18 that. You would take a little bit of -- take a little
19 bit of Scottsdale from --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- D-3; right?

22 Just if you can walk me through it, I'd be --
23 that'd be great. That's all I need, because I know the
24 area so --

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, and related to that, I

1 guess, you know, the arm of District 8 coming west below
2 Paradise Valley, that's just the residue from drawing
3 District 24 that came in from the Coalition. I don't
4 know if that's something you want to preserve or if that
5 should go into D-4 as well?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That could -- I think
7 that could go into D-4. Right?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's Arcadia -- that's
9 Arcadia.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Do you think that
11 could go into D-4? And then what --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: The way -- the way it was
13 drawn previously is that Arcadia followed the canal
14 there, that squiggly line kind of runs diagonally. That
15 was -- that was part of a district in itself and it
16 swung back around to Tempe.

17 Can you -- Brian, can you drop in PV, in red?
18 I can't remember.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the part that currently is
20 shown east of that district boundary would move in --
21 would move into District 4. And then we could shift the
22 line above or below or move up into D-3 and move
23 District 4 down and District 3 into District 4. It's a
24 fairly easy two- or three-district rotation there. The
25 question is whether we also want to rotate the part

1 below that, as you were saying, the Arcadia piece where
2 8 is coming over.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if D-4 moves a little
4 bit west --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: East.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: East.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: East. Sorry. You would
8 think I would know that.

9 -- moves east, are you just trying to take
10 Paradise Valley; right? And then D-1 would move a
11 little bit south?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Probably D-3.

13 Can you zoom out, zoom out a little bit?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: D-3 would move north.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: D-3 moves north. D-4
16 moves west. And D-1 moves south --

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: So --

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- to balance.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: D-1 would move north, I
20 think. Well, it could be, yeah, a little south.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: So -- yeah. So District 4
22 would pick up that Paradise Valley piece, and then it
23 would need to give something up. So the -- I'm just
24 trying the easiest way. I'm open to your direction if
25 you think an alternative would be -- would be better.

1 But the easiest way would then be for the north end of
2 District 4 to move south and District 3 to pick that up,
3 and then District 8 to move a little bit north to pick
4 up from District 3. Yeah, it could --

5 But you could move District 1 south a little
6 bit. And District 4 could keep its north -- far
7 northern border, and instead District 1 could come south
8 into District 4 farther to the west if you think
9 that's --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's what I would do
11 because I think the people to the north of District 4
12 have more in common with those people in the northern
13 part of that D-4 area.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So move D-1 a little
15 south? Yeah, I can see doing that.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And would you have D-3
18 move a little bit west as well to pick up some of that
19 area north of 101, then, based on that?

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: That was going to be our next
21 question. So either D-4 can move west into D-1 or --
22 wait. Let me make sure I'm doing this right. Oh, no.
23 D-4 would be balanced at that point. So District 3
24 would move west into District 1 and then District 5
25 would pick up from -- from District 3.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: All right.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That was one of the
4 things you wanted to try to do; right?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. Move a little bit
6 west of Carefree Highway.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Nice work.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Then we already talked about
10 over on the west side, the District 2, District 29, and
11 District 27 rotation. I think we're good on -- with
12 instructions on that section at least from compactness
13 and communities of interest.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't know. It would be
15 nice to put all of Buckeye in the same district. So I
16 would put that in District 2, but that's my opinion.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: We can do that. We would
18 be -- that would be impacting District 22, which is one
19 of the Coalition drawn districts.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I understand. But
21 right now, I mean, I'm more interested in that top
22 piece. That lower piece was just incorporated; there's
23 not much population down there. Just the stuff maybe,
24 what six, -- four, five miles south of I-10 as it runs
25 east/west.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Let me see here.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which part?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: That -- where he's running
4 the mouse around.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The -- just south of I-10
6 or just north, are you talking about?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just that little corner
8 there.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I'm sorry. I keep
10 looking at my own --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Because below the river
12 there isn't any population even though Buckeye's annexed
13 it all.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: To try to combine it into
16 one?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, just that town -- you
18 see that leaves Avondale and Tolleson in D-22.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: That is -- that is the
20 Sundance development out there. It's pretty big, in
21 that purple area, so --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you have all of the,
23 what's it called, Estrella in D-22 currently.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. I'm just saying that
25 would be -- that would be taking a pretty big chunk of

1 population out of 22 that we need to get back from
2 somewhere.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that a new
4 development?

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: No. That's actually one of
6 the older.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think that's what
8 you said then. You have said that Buckeye seemed to be
9 divided old town versus new development, you know,
10 expansion. Isn't that kind of how this was broken down?

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: That's what it looks like.
12 There -- the Valencia area is the exception to that,
13 but -- which is right on the line between the two. But,
14 yes, the Sundance is a golf development, but it's been
15 around for a while.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we could probably
17 come back to that to see if there's a way to -- I like
18 the idea in terms of Buckeye, of trying to acknowledge
19 and recognize that growth piece with the -- also the
20 older, more diverse areas and try to balance those two.
21 And if there's a split between -- in Buckeye for that, I
22 think that works okay. And maybe what we do is need to
23 come back and take a closer look at that and make sure
24 that we're addressing that.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: I mean -- no. I'm smiling.

1 One thing I'm realizing is the prison, the Buckeye
2 prison, is actually in 2. So there may actually be the
3 possibility to trade. We can check the numbers, but we
4 may be able to trade Sundance for the prison.

5 Oh, yeah. Sundance is about 4,000, which I --
6 which actually is about the size of the prison. So
7 those aren't -- so down in that far southern piece of
8 Buckeye, where Commissioner York's correct, there's
9 nothing down there right now. The only thing down there
10 is the prison.

11 So District 22 portion is -- that Brian is
12 showing on the screen is largely wide open and then the
13 District 2 side of it is the prison. So we could -- we
14 could switch those two areas, and that would put the
15 Sundance area into District 2. (Indiscernible.)

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And you think that's
17 helping Buckeye? I mean, I'm looking at this going --

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: I guess the question for the
19 Commission would be is Sundance being in 2 -- with the
20 growth areas of Buckeye, does that make sense to the
21 city. Obviously it's not going to be an impact on the
22 Buckeye voters to move the prison one way or the other.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: My opinion is yes, it
24 would. If I was a city citizen, I'd want my -- I
25 wouldn't want two districts, but that's me. I mean,

1 back to the community-of-interest conversation. It's
2 not all Sundance. I mean...

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, right. There -- yeah,
4 there's much more of Buckeye that's in 22, but...

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If we're looking to try
7 to balance some things too, based on the Chairwoman's
8 thoughts as part of it, we could take a look at a couple
9 of adjacent districts where if we shift lines -- I don't
10 think we affect the communities of interest that much,
11 but if we shift lines we might find a little more
12 balance. But I'd want to be sure that we were not
13 affecting specific communities of interest in that way.
14 And we could look at potentially 27 and 26.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: 26 is one of the
16 Coalition-suggested districts.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, okay.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: So is 27, I think.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, 27 wouldn't be.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: I mean, the areas similar to
21 where we looked at in the congressional map is 9 and 10
22 over in Mesa, where currently 9 is -- both of them are
23 about 20 percent spreads and one is Democrat and the
24 other is Republican. So we could, instead of a vertical
25 border between them, you know, look at a horizontal

1 border between them. But the slightly challenging piece
2 is that 13 below -- District 13 below them is
3 actually -- doesn't have any swings, but it is a
4 6 percent spread. So it's in our -- it's in our spread
5 competitive range, but we could -- we could switch
6 between 9 and 10 and see how that worked out.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We potentially could look
8 at 12 and 13 as well.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: The 12 includes the school
10 district, which I thought was the goal.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is. I'm just trying
12 to -- I'm trying to help out here.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: We could --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm making an effort.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: We could take -- the eastern
16 part of 12 is not in Kyrene, so we could look at if
17 altering between that and 13 would change the dynamics
18 of those two.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean, I think there's
20 potential that --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: That population -- but
22 where is the population going to come from? I mean,
23 that's part of the problem.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 13 is short and 12 is
25 over. So there might be a little bit of flux in there.

1 And the eastern part of 12 potentially could go into 13.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: We would probably be looking
3 at really blending the two, so there would be -- let's
4 see. Instead of -- essentially instead of there being
5 the vertical line on the east side there, 12 would
6 probably come over the top of 13 and 13 would -- and 13
7 would pick up the southern part of the non-Kyrene
8 District 12.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, that's the key,
10 would be to try to not break up the school district,
11 both Kyrene, there's Tempe Union --

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. Well, no. I'm
14 sorry. Tempe Union won't be affected, but Kyrene in
15 there. That's why I thought if you could take the -- if
16 you took the -- if you took some of the eastern piece
17 from 12 and then maybe moved 13 up or something.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly. Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I was
20 thinking of is you've got that little piece that's
21 sticking into 13. I keep looking at my map and forget
22 to look up there.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Right.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That piece. And that
25 would balance those two districts out a little bit more.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, but we need to be
2 compact, guys.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. Well, I don't
4 think it changes the compactness at all by doing that.
5 I think you can take that piece, potentially
6 Chandler Boulevard, over to the 101. I'm sorry. Yeah,
7 that could move up in D-13. And then you could take
8 Arizona Avenue over to the western border of D-13, kind
9 of as an exchange. And it might provide a little bit
10 more balance in terms of the numbers. And I don't think
11 you are going to be affecting communities of interest in
12 those cases because you've got two big streets. You are
13 not separating communities in terms of that.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: And we can certainly take a
15 look at that.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you're talking about
17 moving 12 around next to the -- taking Sun City -- or
18 Sun Lakes?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. 12 is over by east
20 valley, over by Gilbert. It's between Gilbert and
21 Chandler.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I see.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, sorry. Sun Lakes.
24 Yeah. I was thinking Sun City. Yeah. Well, it would
25 actually just move -- it actually would take what's

1 above the 202 and move that up to Chandler Boulevard.
2 And then exchange that with 87, Arizona Avenue, and give
3 that to 13. I don't think there's a lot of change that
4 needs to happen, but I'm looking at balancing the
5 districts a little bit.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: It does -- just as a caution,
7 it take -- to move competitive percentages, it takes a
8 lot of people.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: So...

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I know that there's
12 a lot of neighborhoods in those areas, so --

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- I don't know.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's good and bad.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I don't know how much
17 they need to be moved. They both just don't need to be
18 moved dramatically maybe. And so what we're trying to
19 do is get the spread.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right? So if -- if we
22 adjust it a little bit to get into the spread, that's
23 all I was looking for.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And we can do -- we can
25 certainly just see what we can do where the numbers

1 come. Essentially the southwestern part of D-13 would
2 keep the same far western border but come farther north.
3 And instead of it being kind of a square in the
4 northeast for District 12, it would become more of a
5 rectangle going -- going farther east into the top part
6 of D-13. And then we'd have to balance out 9 and 10 and
7 14 around it, but we could do that.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm still arguing for Tempe
9 to be part of D-9, so -- in that north side of the river
10 there where all those students live.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Yeah. And we're happy
12 to draw it. It just would mean redrawing all of
13 District 7 and District 15.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, but didn't we have a
15 map that had that?

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I do want to say that
18 there has been sentiment of keeping that Tempe/west Mesa
19 area together. I mean, there's just a lot of synergy
20 going on on a very local level. And it's mutual. And
21 so I don't know if there's a way to make that work.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, right now -- that's kind
23 of the third piece. So Tempe -- you know, this is kind
24 of classic Tempe. North Tempe is with south Scottsdale,
25 central Tempe is with Mesa, and south Tempe is with

1 Ahwatukee and -- is that Chandler? Yeah. So it's --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which is pretty much what
3 it's been in that same way, and they do have -- I mean,
4 the north Tempe part with south Scottsdale also is tied
5 to the Salt River Indian Community and --

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- there's a lot that
8 goes on between the communities, a lot of the -- the
9 folks from Salt River serve on commissions and boards
10 with Tempe. They do a lot of work together. So those
11 three actually, as odd as it is, it does align in terms
12 of their interests. South Tempe is very much more like
13 Ahwatukee than it is north Tempe, for example.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And just along D-8 --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and I would say north
16 Tempe is a lot like south Scottsdale. I'm sorry. I
17 mean --

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, it is.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- that's part of my
20 argument.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But it's in there, right,
22 right now.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Not really.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: North Tempe is with
25 Scottsdale, south Scottsdale.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: But I would say north of
2 the mall there in Scottsdale is a lot different than
3 south -- than down into the campus area of Tempe.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I guess I just
5 can't figure out where we would put the north part of
6 Scottsdale that you're -- you know, I thought we just
7 moved the Paradise Valley. I thought we kind of redid
8 D-4/D-8 a little bit.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: We did. Since you're --
10 but you're --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So we'd want to see how
12 that--

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- but you were monkeying
14 around with 13, so I thought I would monkey around with
15 8.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, can I just make
17 an observation? As we are talking about this geographic
18 area, I'm hearing that there's quite a few subsets of
19 people that can work together. That's a wonderful
20 thing. Given that and given that we are wanting to
21 maximize or actually minimize the spread, knowing that
22 we have some flexibility, I think we can give you the
23 charge to see what's possible here.

24 I think another natural -- you know, as I said
25 earlier, moving D-8 into D-9, just remember there's

1 light rail now going along from west all the way to east
2 which is connecting Tempe all the way into Mesa, and
3 it's becoming a really nice hub. So there's just a lot
4 of areas that -- you know, for me, maximizing all six
5 criteria, if we could achieve more competitiveness and I
6 can, you know, ensure that these different communities
7 are going to be, you know, represented, that makes
8 sense.

9 I'm not sure we need to wed ourselves to these
10 very, very specific boundaries right now given that it's
11 going to have ripple effects. Unless I'm off base and
12 my colleagues want to lock some of this in. I mean, if
13 you've got, you know, some district that you think, wow,
14 this is it, you know, feel free.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do you -- does mapping have
16 a lot of direction?

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I think we have -- good
18 to go. I was actually just thinking back to see, as you
19 were talking about, Commissioner York, the map that had
20 south Scottsdale, Tempe, and west Mesa in one seat with
21 Salt River. And just so you have it as reference if you
22 want to look, it's Map 3.1. And as you are getting a
23 good sense I think at this point of how things are
24 locked together, the key to making that happen is that
25 the Verde Valley and Prescott -- you know, ironically

1 enough, the key to making that happen is that Verde
2 Valley and Prescott have to be separate.

3 So that's -- that's the kind of wide spread,
4 kind of roll-through that happens in these maps. I
5 mean, once we start doing -- focusing on things like
6 where do the tribal reservations go and the voting right
7 seats.

8 So I just want to comment that it is -- we're
9 happy to draw it. I'm not saying we can't draw it. I'm
10 just saying that's the kind of ripple that comes out
11 of -- when you move that line in Mesa -- I mean in
12 Tempe, ironically enough, you then move things in the
13 Verde Valley.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's the kind of
15 feedback we need to hear.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Since you mentioned the
18 north, can I make one comment on when I look at
19 District 6 and District 7. That could also have ripple
20 effects, but Winslow is not completely in District 6. I
21 know there are Navajos who live in Winslow, and I'm not
22 sure why we have that -- why we don't just have I-40 be
23 the boundary there.

24 Could we -- could we make I-40 that boundary up
25 there? I don't know how it would impact the two

1 districts. There's probably not a huge amount of
2 population, but I notice that District 6 is a little
3 short, District 7 has a little bit more. So maybe if we
4 put -- I'm sure there was a reason for that boundary,
5 but could we consider -- consider doing that?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: I believe that is the city
7 border.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is it? Because it --

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, we missed it by a block, I
10 think, but the idea was to follow the city border there.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, was it to put
12 District -- was it to put Winslow in District 7? Was
13 that the idea --

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- rather than in
16 District 6?

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. As we were looking at
18 all the non-reservation lands going to 7 up there.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I guess the question I
20 would have is since District 7 is a little
21 overpopulated -- which may not be the case when you are
22 done with other things, I know. And I don't know how
23 that affects anything. I don't think it's going to
24 dramatically affect, but it might, because I have no
25 idea what the makeup of Winslow -- other than it's as a

1 community of interest. But it seems to me that maybe we
2 could make I-40 that -- or just put all of Winslow
3 potentially into District 6.

4 Commissioner Watchman, do a lot of tribal
5 folks, do people live in Winslow?

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I'm not sure about the
7 exact demographics, but the north side of Winslow I
8 think is some tribe land, the Nation. I know the
9 southern part of Winslow is the prison there, the
10 southern part of Winslow. So I'm not exactly sure,
11 so...

12 But I also want to also add to this mixture
13 here. The Nation just sent and I think our director
14 just received their maps, and they're shooting actually
15 for a 63 percent population ratio. And so that's their
16 desire. And that would obviously stretch the deviation
17 to about 5 percent. And so I think Mark just got the
18 map, and so we need to throw that into the mix.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: We certainly can. The email
20 came in over lunch, so we didn't see --

21 MR. WATCHMAN: Did it?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- it come in.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay. So...

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think this, when you say the
25 63 percent seat, is actually a 15 percent deviation.

1 Just reading from -- we haven't -- yeah. So to reach
2 63, they take a 14 percent deviation in that district.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: But they -- I think they had
5 an alternative that they mentioned in the email that
6 is --

7 Yeah. With a 7 percent deviation in that seat,
8 they get to 60 percent CVAP. So 7 percent, it -- we can
9 do that and stay in the 10 percent overall range. Just
10 if that's 7 percent short, nothing else can be more than
11 3 percent over. So we can -- we can stay in the
12 10 percent with that.

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, yeah. Look at it,
14 because they're making that argument because the
15 Nation's also working with the state of New Mexico on
16 similar issues and so they are pushing that argument.

17 But in terms of population for Flagstaff,
18 Winslow, and Holbrook for the most part, I think there's
19 a fair amount of Navajos that live in those three towns.
20 I would say probably a quarter, 25 percent or more. So
21 I'm not sure about the breakdown in -- in Winslow and
22 so...

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, and actually to your
24 point, that may -- that may answer the question of
25 Winslow. We can take a look and see what they are doing

1 with Winslow.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right. Right. Because
3 there is a -- I know there's an Indian hospital in
4 Winslow and a lot of the employees are Navajo members.
5 So I have to assume that they reside in Winslow.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just something to look
7 at. I mean, it's not critical --

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right. Right. Exactly.
9 Well, that's -- that's the point here for this
10 discussion.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. I mean, this is -- do
12 you have that that we can show it? Or not --

13 It just came in over lunch, but that's what we
14 were just talking about.

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Actually, they've got it.
17 They do have it. They can show -- they can show it on
18 screen, the one with the 7 percent deviation.

19 Timmons moves fast. And just for residents
20 watching, they've got it in their internal systems.
21 It's not shared with the public or anything like that
22 yet, but it will be as soon as we can process it.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: This may be a good time for
24 a ten-minute break.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. Ten-minute break

1 and we'll come back and we'll look at the -- is this the
2 Navajo map?

3 MR. FLAHAN: Yes, on the screen.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Ten-minute break.

5 (Whereupon a recess was taken from 2:31 p.m. to
6 2:48 p.m.)

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.
8 Let's dive right back into our main event today, which
9 is Agenda Item No. VII, map drawing.

10 I turn it back over to our mapping team.

11 MR. FLAHAN: Thank you.

12 What Brian is putting on the screen right now
13 is the Navajo Nation's suggestion for District 7 that we
14 were talking about right before the break. He is just
15 setting up the demographics.

16 So you will see here is their proposed
17 District 7 that they sent in is in purple. It has a
18 total population of 221,588, with a deviation of
19 negative 7.05 percent. And it is under by 16,795.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: And the key thing, you know,
21 at a glance it looks very similar to the Commission's
22 District 7, but --

23 Can you zoom in on Flagstaff?

24 -- but it actually takes Flagstaff completely
25 out; the whole city is out of District 7 and into

1 District 6. And then they balance that both by under
2 populating the district and then by lots of changes all
3 along the border of the district.

4 Can you go over to Winslow?

5 MR. FLAHAN: Just down I-40.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: So to -- we haven't looked at
7 this so I don't know. So, yes, Winslow and --

8 Zoom out some there. Yeah.

9 Winslow and the whole area around it is all
10 taken into 7.

11 And then zoom out a little bit more. Yeah.

12 And so where the Commission's map goes over to
13 Highway 191, this has all of Navajo County in District 7
14 and only goes over to the border.

15 Oh, you can turn -- turn on your mic.

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: St. Johns.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. So St. Johns.

18 St. Johns, Eagar --

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: It does have it. Okay.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- all those towns are in
21 District 7.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Including the town of Show Low.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: It looks like -- can you zoom
24 in down there where it says Pinetop-Lakeside.

25 Yeah. So Show Low, Pinetop, Lakeside, all of

1 those towns are in District 7. Yeah. Show Low is
2 actually divided slightly.

3 So the general makeup of it is the same when
4 you look at it from the statewide view, but obviously
5 moving Flagstaff is a big change. And then all the --
6 all of these communities are moved in order to offset
7 it.

8 And as I mentioned earlier, the 7 percent, 7.03
9 or whatever, 7.05 percent deviation, we can still keep
10 within the overall 10 percent plan deviation that's
11 considered presumptively constitutional. We just have
12 to be very careful on the districts that are over to
13 make sure that none of them is over by more than
14 2.95 percent.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any reactions or thoughts
16 from my colleagues?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With all due respect to
18 their request, I think it just goes counter to
19 everything -- we've talked about these things actually
20 in detail and voted on them. And at one point -- it's
21 really trading the White Mountains for Flagstaff. And
22 we heard vociferously from the White Mountains that they
23 did not want to be part of this district. And we heard
24 a pretty even-keeled response from Flagstaff. At one
25 point I asked my colleague, Vice Chair Watchman, whether

1 the Navajos would prefer Flagstaff to the White
2 Mountains, and he said yes, he thought they would prefer
3 Flagstaff. So this just goes counter to all of the
4 discussions we've had, and I would not support it.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to add that
6 it -- you know, to alter equal population to me would
7 require a very serious explanation for how we're
8 honoring other responsibilities, and I just don't see
9 that here. And so I think in addition to that... okay.

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair and
11 Commissioner Mehl, I think we all are trying to honor
12 what we think are communities of interest and what has
13 been conveyed, you know, from the -- from our forums and
14 our tours and information. And so this is, you know,
15 one data point to consider. And so I haven't seen this
16 until now.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So, you know, I'm, you
19 know, trying to understand it.

20 And I did hear -- like, for example, we did
21 hear the city of Snowflake and Show Low and that area,
22 you know, basically state that they liked -- that their
23 community of interest is somewhat different than the
24 interest of the tribes.

25 Holbrook and Winslow are in the Navajo map, and

1 I don't recall hearing from -- and they may have
2 provided some information. Flagstaff being outside of
3 what Navajo is considering is something that I guess I
4 have to further study because I think Navajo does
5 have -- or there's quite a few Navajos that do live in
6 Flagstaff and so -- but I think this is something to
7 take under advisement. And like we said earlier, we
8 will be coming to some conclusion and going back out to
9 the public. And so --

10 But, you know, I do also understand that we've
11 gone through several series of maps and we did approve
12 them, and so in this case we are now at 4.1. And so I
13 think we need -- you know, in respect for that work that
14 we've been doing, you know, we continue to -- to move
15 forward and improve every subsequent map that we -- that
16 we do agree on by vote and then we move forward. So
17 thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we appreciate the
19 feedback from the Native American community, from the
20 public. You know, it provides points for deliberation,
21 but there is consensus that we'll continue from 4.1 with
22 the added benefit of learning from this proposed map.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And then in total
24 contradiction to all of that, I'm really struggling with
25 this -- with this current 4.1 map. And similar to my

1 colleague this morning on the congressional map, we want
2 to create more work for you. So I would like to see an
3 alternate version going back to using base Map 3.5 --
4 3.2.

5 And starting with 3.2, take a look at the
6 Latino-recommended districts but not trying to get to an
7 eighth district and take a look at those and see if
8 there's adjustments that should be made from 3.2 that
9 would better incorporate those Latino community of
10 interests and -- and have an alternate map that works --
11 works from this. I think the Maricopa County and the
12 number of competitive districts are far better working
13 from this 3.2 map than they are from the 4.1 map.

14 All the changes we were trying to do in
15 Maricopa County or suggested, we keep hearing that you
16 can't do it without changing everything. So we either
17 need to change everything in 4 -- in the 4 series or we
18 need to go back to the 3.2 and see if we can work from a
19 better start that direction.

20 I do think in the 3.2 maps you don't want
21 District 16 coming all the way up as far north as it
22 does, and District 16 should incorporate the Marana area
23 down south.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I appreciate the fact
25 that you acknowledged that on the one hand we are saying

1 let's not go back and on the other hand you're saying
2 let's go back. I do very much appreciate that.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. This morning I said it
4 was okay to go back. And, now, I was just thinking in
5 the Flagstaff area on the -- on the District 7, we spent
6 a lot of time specifically talking about that district.
7 And I think -- I think we took into the community of
8 interest of the Navajo Nation really strongly in that,
9 but also the community of interest expressed by the
10 White Mountains.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I think we can -- I
12 think we can -- we want to take them -- the -- what the
13 Navajo have proposed into account and take a look at
14 that as we move forward.

15 I look at -- and I'm all for giving it a shot,
16 certainly, as Commissioner Mehl has requested, just as
17 he agreed with me this morning. And so certainly we can
18 take a look at that.

19 I am looking at the -- I will say from the --
20 looking at 3.2, I think we would have a lot of work to
21 do. There's a lot of the same partisanship that we are
22 seeing in the current map that we're looking at, 4.1, we
23 are -- it is evident in 3.2 as well. So I think we're
24 going to have struggles on both sides, whichever map we
25 pick. There's going to be work that needs to be done to

1 look at communities of interest and how they're aligned
2 and trying to find that balance.

3 But I'm all for the effort that
4 Commissioner Mehl has proposed, but I will say I have
5 some real concerns when I take a look at the map, the
6 3.2 map, and how that is laid out. And I will be
7 curious to hear once we get the information from our
8 attorneys about the VRA analysis as part of this. So we
9 can actually hear a little bit more once that comes in
10 on the racial polarization.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Would it be possible to
12 pull up the demographics from 3.2?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: We certainly can, and this may
14 be where you are going, Chair, but I would flag it's not
15 so much the Coalition districts that are locking us in
16 for the Tempe moves; it's the balancing of District 15
17 and District 7. So 3.2, remember, is not a balanced
18 map. So District 15 is left way short.

19 You can see here. Thank you.

20 As noted at the bottom, I think most of those
21 changes are pretty easy.

22 There we go.

23 Yes. So we can balance it and list there kind
24 of how we would go about that, but just to know that
25 what locks us in is that District 7 and balancing

1 District 15.

2 So we can do it, but it's not so much the
3 Coalition and the map as that District 7.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just for curiosity, if
5 you can take a look at a comparison between the vote
6 spreads between the two maps, I'd be curious. I mean, I
7 can try to do the count. You're probably much faster at
8 it. But if we could compare the 3 point -- 3.2 --
9 correct? -- and 4.1, I would appreciate it.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: In terms of how many
11 competitive districts there are?

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think the vote spread.
13 I think that's part of what we are looking at and then
14 we're also looking at -- we -- in 3.2, we did not yet
15 put the Latino Coalition maps; correct?

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Correct.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I know there would be
19 adjustments, which is what I thought we did with 4.0 and
20 4.1, but...

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. So --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: And the only real change in
23 the Latino Coalition map that I could see in 3.2 is that
24 24 moves across the bottom of 20 -- District 1 and
25 District 1 moves north. The rest, D-11, D-26, D-27, and

1 D-22 are all pretty similar. And so...

2 But I like the way it treated District 12 and
3 District 13 in effort, and I think that was kind of what
4 you were trying to refer to, Shereen, to make it more
5 competitive.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: So in terms of comparing
7 numbers -- I mean, do this as a caveat -- as the map is
8 posted with an asterisk, this is not a balanced map. So
9 when we are looking at competitive numbers, these may
10 not hold up under balancing although we try to keep them
11 in mind.

12 So we have two districts that are highly -- in
13 the vote spread that are less than 4 percent in 3.2.
14 They are Districts 2 and 4, you can see there. It's
15 hard to read on the screen, but if you look at the --
16 for the Commissioners, if you -- the residents can see
17 them because they are seeing on the screen what you are
18 seeing on the screens on the floor before you, which is
19 much better quality than the projector screen.

20 So 2 and 4 are less than 4 percent. 12 is an
21 8.9 percent spread, but it does have one swing election.
22 13 is a 5 percent spread and has one swing election. 23
23 is at 4.6, so it's in our seven percent range and has
24 one swing. And 27 is 6 percent but does not have a
25 swing.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Would you mind comparing
2 that to 4.1, please.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. The one -- the one thing
4 I should flag is that District 4, that's the 1 percent
5 spread, is also 36 percent underpopulated, so that may
6 very well not survive.

7 So compare that to which one?

8 MR. KINGERY: 4.1.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: 4.1. Okay. Got that up
10 there. Yeah. So in 4.1, we have District 1 is less
11 than 4 percent spread and a 6-3 swing. We have
12 District 13 is within the 7 percent spread at 5.9. And
13 then District 17 is at 0.9 percent, almost perfectly
14 balanced, and a 6-3 swing. Then there's a couple others
15 that are close. So you've got District 16 is at
16 7.7 percent and then -- yes. And then District 27 is at
17 8.1 percent.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So based on this, if we
19 take out No. 4, since you said it is underpopulated so
20 that would shift, we have basically the same number. We
21 have five in each of these two maps that are within our
22 range. Is that -- is that what you are seeing?

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, no. 4.1 only has three
24 that are within our range and then the two that are
25 close.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, okay. Because 12
2 is --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. 3.2 also has one, two,
4 three seats that are close that I -- that I had not
5 listed earlier.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So there's a
7 little bit of a difference, but not a huge difference.
8 But that's -- we also don't have the Coalition maps in
9 there yet.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. We don't have the
11 Coalition maps and it's not balanced so we don't know
12 how the balance would swing it.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, the Coalition maps
14 give us an extra district. And so, you know, I think
15 it's our job to make sure we kind of keep within our
16 current guidelines. And, you know, one of the things
17 that -- if you look at these maps, it looks like to me
18 3.2, east valley, works for the Commission somewhat,
19 it's a good starting point, whereas the Coalition map
20 changes the center of Maricopa County. I don't know if
21 there's a way to blend those. I mean, obviously
22 District 8 is the big caveat, but...

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Really hard to say, I guess.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I thought that's
25 part of what we did with 4.0 and 4.1 was -- and so I

1 would just love to know, you know, actually exactly what
2 you would like as your proposal, if you can clarify. Is
3 it that you only want seven coalition maps? Just to be
4 clear, so that would help the guidance --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, currently right now
6 we have 7 coalition -- Latino Coalition maps and one
7 Native American.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I think it's our job to
10 at least get to that.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So I guess the
12 question would be, then, which of the Coalition maps to
13 drop of the eight. Because they submitted eight.
14 Right?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could we hear from the
17 attorneys just on that?

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Keep in mind that we're not
19 trying to exactly -- you know, we're trying to learn
20 from what they have submitted what their communities of
21 interest are. And it's up to us to draw lines and
22 determine how many districts that turns into and to
23 interpret what they've said.

24 So it's -- so we shouldn't take them by rote,
25 which is what we've done on 4.1, and we should -- we

1 should be more thoughtful on how we are looking at that
2 input and staring at it on a community of interest
3 basis. Because right now it's just -- by taking it
4 rote, we've disturbed communities of interest in the
5 rest of Maricopa County, and so I don't think it's
6 working.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I see our attorney
8 actually about to speak, so I'm going to let him go.

9 MR. HERRERA: Well, I was going to make a
10 suggestion -- and obviously I want to get your thoughts
11 on this, Brett -- but obviously we are waiting on this
12 VRA analysis. But if it is Commissioner Mehl's desire
13 to see a version of 3.2 with population balancing,
14 because it's unbalanced, and then do an analysis for
15 that map as well as 4.1 from the VRA perspective, we can
16 do that, if that is the Commission's desire.

17 Do you agree, Brett?

18 MR. B. JOHNSON: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think that would be good
20 and worthwhile doing. And whether we want to then hold
21 off in trying to make any changes to 3.2, there are
22 changes I think all of us would want to make if we
23 decide that it is worth working from that. But if we
24 want to just wait and take the changes we've suggested
25 for 4.1 that we've already talked through and then do

1 the VRA analysis on 3.1 and -- on 3.2 and our new 4
2 whatever it is and then work from there, that -- I would
3 be okay with that.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm confused, then, with
5 what direction we are giving our mapping team.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think what I'm hearing is
7 just population balance 3.2 and then send it over to
8 legal for review.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I guess since we have
10 to population balance it anyway, then I would at least
11 take a look at any obvious changes anybody would like to
12 suggest. My obvious one is to try to get Marana in with
13 Oro Valley and to try to have that district, whatever
14 the number is, 16, not go as far north as it does.
15 District 16. So 16 would drop south.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: I'm just worrying about time.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: (Indiscernible) on the
18 wrong maps.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I'm -- if I may ask the
20 legal team, if we finish this tonight and get this to
21 you, you know, we're talking midnight, would legal be
22 able to -- how fast could the legal analysis be done?

23 MR. HERRERA: Doug, are you talking about a 3.2
24 map that's balanced?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

1 MR. HERRERA: It's a little hard to say, but I
2 think we can push to have that done by tomorrow as well.
3 Because I assume that now that we're going to have the
4 4.1 done at some point this afternoon it will be easier
5 to turn around a second map. So I think we -- if you
6 get it to us by midnight, hopefully we get it to our
7 east coast friends, and by the time we're here it'll be
8 ready. That's my optimistic prediction.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just my fear is we're
10 getting close to Thursday.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And frank --

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would suggest that we
14 don't -- that we just take 3.2 as we left it rather than
15 start to make one or two changes here and there at this
16 point. And then if we decide to go back to 3.2 tomorrow
17 and work from there once we've got some of the analysis
18 done, then we can start. Because I'm a little
19 concerned; I'm not working off of 3.2. I haven't been
20 thinking of it. To start to make one or two changes
21 here and then say -- I'd rather just kind of do it all
22 at one time at that point because, as we know, one
23 change impacts another.

24 So if we could have it population balanced,
25 have the VRA analysis, come back tomorrow with those for

1 both 4.1 and 3.2 as you suggested, Commissioner Mehl,
2 I'm okay with that. And then we can just work on
3 whatever changes at that point, if that's the map that
4 we choose to adopt. Since we've already adopted 4.1, we
5 would have to go back to rethink that.

6 So that would be my -- my suggestion rather
7 than to do -- because I'd have to otherwise start really
8 going back and saying, now I want to change this one or
9 that one. Since it's not population balanced,
10 everything we do is going to have this domino effect.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And my slight disagreement
12 with you, or modification to that, is because they have
13 to population balance it anyway, they've got to make a
14 bunch of changes and they're going to be trying to
15 decide those changes.

16 So since that Marana/Oro Valley one jumps out
17 to me so big and it's so easy, I should at least mention
18 it. If they can incorporate that as they balance
19 population, great; if you can't, great. But the fact
20 that you need to population balance it anyway means
21 they're going to be making changes to make it work. And
22 I'm happy to make no further comments and no further
23 changes than that to keep it simple.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And if there are broader
25 issues that we've already debated and -- you know, feel

1 free to throw them out if they're relatively, I don't
2 want to say, simple, but, you know, clear direction to
3 incorporate in 3.2, it just is more efficient that way.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I will say that we
5 made a bunch of requests which is how we got to 4.1 in
6 many ways. And so now to start over and start with the
7 requests again, we'd almost have to say can you go back
8 and look at all the requests that we made last time and
9 then put those in, rather than just one or two. And I
10 think that's where -- that's where it gets complicated
11 for me is that when we were looking at 3.2 we -- we all
12 had a few things here and there that we wanted to make
13 changes.

14 So I guess what I -- my preference is to go
15 back to 3.2 and do the population balance that you were
16 talking about, take a look at the VRA requirements,
17 looking at the seven districts, just like what you
18 requested, and then depending on what we decide tomorrow
19 we can start to make some of those changes.

20 Because, honestly, I don't remember all the
21 requests that we made last time for 3.2, which took
22 us -- I mean, because -- yes, 4.1 ended up with
23 Coalition maps, but there were other changes that we
24 incorporated at that time as well. And that's where I'm
25 concerned about do we need to kind of rehash all of that

1 right now or should we wait and see what happens
2 tomorrow once we get that new analysis done.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I remember correctly, we
4 made changes -- we accepted 3.2 predicated on what we
5 wanted to see the overlay of the Latino Coalition's
6 suggestions. Correct?

7 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah. From 3.2 to 4.0, there's
8 really three main things that happened. One was the
9 addition of the Arizona Latino Coalition eight districts
10 into the map, and then the other two were uniting the
11 Kyrene School District and uniting Marana and Oro
12 Valley.

13 And then from there we went to 4.1, which also
14 looked at the Tombstone and a portion of Cochise County
15 being united into the southern District 19. Those were
16 the major differences between 3.2.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: We were waiting to balance
18 population once we received the Latino suggestions.
19 Correct?

20 MR. FLAHAN: Correct. 3.2 was unbalanced.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

22 MR. FLAHAN: 4.0 and 4.1 were balanced.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. But once we got
24 those suggestions implemented. So we just go balance
25 3.2 and take a look at it with those other two changes,

1 I think that would be a good start.

2 MR. FLAHAN: The other two changes being the
3 Kyrene School District and Marana and Oro Valley, is
4 that the two?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: And --

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes. And -- and you have
7 heard other changes that collectively we mentioned from
8 4.2 to -- to whatever the new number would be that you
9 are working on now anyway. If any of those are obvious
10 things you should incorporate as you are trying to
11 balance, use your discretion to use that input; if they
12 are not, then don't.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: As well as with the
15 underlying goal of shrinking the extremism between those
16 spreads.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I would ask that that
18 occur with both maps, 4.1 that we have been working off
19 of as well as the 3.2. Because as you just read to us,
20 those partisan extremes are not very different between
21 those two maps. They are very similar. And so that's
22 why I'm not -- I mean, I'll support my Commissioner's
23 request, but I'm not so sure why we have to go back when
24 we have almost -- very similar -- very similar patterns.
25 So it will be interesting to look at those tomorrow

1 because...

2 MR. HERRERA: Madam Chair, we are trying to
3 figure a different question now. I'm not sure if
4 there's a question to legal. If there is, we can -- if
5 you could repeat it, we can answer it.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think there's
7 a --

8 MR. HERRERA: Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- question, is there,
10 right now?

11 No. I thought you were going to look at us
12 with --

13 MR. HERRERA: Well, actually, we were
14 discussing something, and it could be that because we've
15 got very little sleep that we forgot, but we were
16 wondering if there was a vote to adopt any map on the
17 legislative side yet today. We don't -- we didn't
18 believe there was one. So that's what we were
19 discussing.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Didn't we vote one in the
21 morning?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We did vote for 4.1 this
23 morning and --

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- moved forward from that.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. We've been
2 operating from 4.1.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. And just circling back.
4 So as you're thinking about what you want to see in the
5 map and where you're hoping the map will go, I would
6 note to the point earlier when I was talking about the
7 Salt River reservation, south Scottsdale, Tempe, and
8 west Mesa together and how Verde Valley drives that,
9 Map 3.1 actually shows that and it is population
10 balanced too. So if you're wanting to see how that
11 rotates through, you do have that on in front of you, or
12 on the table.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think Verde
14 Valley should control Maricopa County. I mean, I -- you
15 know, struggling to map for the whole rest of Maricopa
16 County based on that area just doesn't make sense,
17 especially when there's not even a unified vision from
18 the people who live there about where their natural
19 community is. I mean, that -- you know, there's
20 division, there's divided opinions.

21 So it sounds like we're going to need to take a
22 vote to go back -- if this is the consensus of the
23 Commission, and my general consensus is based on our
24 conversation we can start again from 3.2 with the
25 additional feedback that we have just provided, we will

1 need a vote to put forth giving direction to our mapping
2 team to make changes from 3.2.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So --

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't think -- I don't
5 think we need a vote. It's similar to the request this
6 morning on the congressional where they are doing an
7 alternative to map to look at that Commissioner Lerner
8 asked for, and it's really the same thing here with what
9 I'm asking for. So we're not yet going back. I'm
10 not -- I'm not asking for us to go back yet. I'm
11 thinking that once we see this revision I may then ask
12 for us to go back, but at this point I am not.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I stand corrected.
14 So we are asking our mapping folks to merely draw out
15 some ideas, bring it forth to us, after which we will
16 vote on a starting position. And I want to clear that
17 with our attorneys.

18 MR. HERRERA: That's correct.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That is correct.

20 Anything else with Agenda Item No. VII?

21 Okay. Agenda No. VIII, we may want to defer
22 that item just given where we are in the day and timing.

23 Staff, would you like to give your report
24 today, or would you like to defer this to tomorrow?

25 MS. VAN HAREN: Chairwoman, we will leave that

1 up to you. We are ready to give it today or we can
2 defer to tomorrow, whatever the Commission wants.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's get her done,
4 Madam Chair.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are they ready with -- are
6 you ready with anything on the congressional map?

7 MR. FLAHAN: We have 5.0 ready and we --

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, you do want -- okay.

9 MR. FLAHAN: -- and we have two more that we
10 need to go take a quick look at and might have ready by
11 the end of the day.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I apologize. Do
13 you want to go back into those reviews?

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. If you're on --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Sorry about that.
16 We're going to --

17 MS. VAN HAREN: That's okay, Madam Chair. I
18 don't think that we have agendized the executive
19 director's report for tomorrow, so if we could leave
20 time at the end for --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

22 MS. VAN HAREN: -- the executive director's
23 report, that would be great.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We will do that.

25 MS. VAN HAREN: Thank you.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Or you could do that now while
2 we go check.

3 MR. FLAHAN: Let us go that way.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You want to do that? Why
5 don't you go get some time, then you'll come back and
6 sum up.

7 And we'll now turn it over to the executive
8 directors.

9 MS. VAN HAREN: And, Madam Chair, if you'll
10 just give me one moment, I'm trying to share my
11 presentation.

12 MR. B. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, you may want to
13 identify what item we are on, the actual item number.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We are on Agenda
15 No. VIII, executive director's report and discussion
16 thereof. We'll turn it over to Lori to address A --
17 you'll announce which subcategory; correct, Lori?

18 MS. VAN HAREN: Yes.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

20 MS. VAN HAREN: Okay. Madam Chair, we are now
21 probably going on to something that is -- feels a little
22 premature for the Commission, but we want to discuss our
23 plan for the listening tour that is coming up for the
24 30-day public comment period.

25 As the Commission is aware, once the draft maps

1 are adopted, then that triggers a statutory requirement
2 for a 30-day public comment period. And that can come
3 in a number of ways.

4 And staff's plan, if the Commission adopts the
5 maps this Thursday, is to use the October 28th and 29th
6 date as the start of the public meetings. If we need to
7 use the 28th and 29th days to continue deliberations,
8 then staff will use the next week to start the public
9 meetings.

10 But we, over the last several months, have
11 gathered a lot of information from the public about what
12 they would like to see in these public meetings and
13 how -- the formats that they would like us to hold them
14 in and the locations of where they would like them to
15 be.

16 We heard from many members of the public, from
17 commissioners, from local elected officials, from
18 nonprofit groups, from our outreach groups,
19 organizations that are interested, from public comments,
20 from emails about locations that people would like to
21 hold the next public comment -- public hearings. So
22 we're putting together an extensive list. And it's
23 really not something that I think the Commission can
24 physically go to in that 30-day period, but we'd like to
25 be able to physically go to as many places as possible.

1 But what we'd also like to suggest, and with the
2 Commission's direction, is to have different types of
3 meetings.

4 In the last two rounds of listening tour
5 meetings, we have held public hearings and public
6 meetings in places with satellite locations. We have
7 streamed them to the Internet, and we've been able to,
8 at our satellite locations, have members of the public
9 speak directly to the Commission. We have recorded them
10 and put them online.

11 We are also proposing for this next round to
12 have open houses. The open-house concept would be where
13 we have staff in a particular location. For example, if
14 next week deliberations have concluded, the adopted
15 draft maps are finalized, and we are going to the
16 open-house concept, we would have an open house from
17 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. where staff is here,
18 Commissioners can attend at their convenience, public
19 can attend at their convenience, and they can come in,
20 they can provide public feedback either in a recorded
21 session, they could -- we will have written
22 opportunities for them to provide feedback, and we'd
23 like to utilize those open houses for anybody who is
24 wishing to submit their version of the map, to have that
25 troubleshooting session that Mark talked about with

1 Timmons where if they are having any kind of technical
2 issues they can call in or come in and we can be there
3 all day for them.

4 The telephone town halls, we were able to work
5 with Cisco and WebEx in order to be able to allow the
6 public to call in through WebEx. They -- all they need
7 is a phone number or a phone to be able to call in. And
8 we'll have -- we are proposing two meetings where they
9 would be telephone town halls where essentially the
10 Commissioners could log in via WebEx, like they would do
11 if they were on the Google Meets meeting, they could --
12 members of the public could call in and provide their
13 testimony and their feedback on the draft maps.

14 We -- timeline is -- again, it's like
15 everything in this process, it's fluid. And it's -- so
16 it really depends on whether or not the draft maps are
17 adopted on Thursday, but we have contingency plans for
18 both. Again, we've already booked a space for
19 October 28th and 29th either for deliberations or for
20 our first public meeting. So we would propose that
21 October 28th and 29th would be open houses with the
22 mapping troubleshooting meetings.

23 From November 4th to the 22nd, and again it can
24 be extended, but there's a Thanksgiving holiday in that
25 period, we would propose traditional meetings with

1 satellite locations. And, again, those meetings are
2 going to be streamed to WebEx and YouTube, similar to
3 the listening tour and the grid map sessions.

4 And then we would also want -- propose at least
5 two telephone town halls via WebEx.

6 I've shared, and I will share online, our
7 proposed meeting dates. These are all subject to venue
8 availability. And so we'd like to, if at the direction
9 of the Commission, go forward and be able to select
10 venues and locations and be able to move forward on
11 selecting these dates. And if we have to be able to be
12 a little bit flexible in this time period, we'd like to
13 do so, but these are our ideal dates. And times would
14 be at convenient times for the public. We've heard
15 several members of the public say that during the week,
16 you know, meetings that are at the end of the week are
17 much better for them, whereas, you know, on the weekend
18 Saturdays are the most ideal date for everyone.

19 We want to also make sure that we are taking
20 into account accessibility. One of the things that
21 we've heard over and over again is the more accessible
22 that the Commission can be, the better. So our public
23 meetings will continue to have interpreters in different
24 languages, including American Sign Language and Spanish.
25 They are all streamed to WebEx and YouTube as this

1 meeting is being streamed right now. They are all
2 recorded and posted online. And then we also have a
3 transcriptionist who is attending every meeting and the
4 transcriptions are posted online as soon as they are
5 available.

6 The open houses and telephone town halls would
7 be something where it's a little bit more flexible, that
8 the public can by -- come by anytime during a period of
9 time, provide public comment in a variety of different
10 ways. And then also with the calling in in the
11 telephone town hall, they can use WebEx, call in, speak
12 to the Commission, and not have to drive anywhere or
13 travel to any place. And then again, they would still
14 have all of the things that a traditional public hearing
15 would have.

16 So at this point, what staff would like is just
17 to monitor the meetings this week to ensure that if the
18 Commission adopts the plans on Thursday we can be ready
19 to start promoting meetings for next week; if not, then
20 we will start promoting the meetings beginning
21 November 4th and then actually book the venues in
22 different various locations. And we'll need direction
23 from the Commission on what you would like to do and how
24 you would like to do that.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't really understand

1 the content of the meetings. You've shared like a lot
2 of different formats of meetings, and I don't understand
3 what each one would look like in terms of how the public
4 feedback would be shared with us and recorded,
5 memorialized by our staff. So I don't -- I'd like --
6 can you play it out a little bit?

7 MS. VAN HAREN: Absolutely. So I think in the
8 traditional meetings we are envisioning those to be
9 similar to the -- the listening tour where there'd be a
10 set start time and it would run as long as there's
11 public feedback. The intent would be to get the public
12 feedback on the adopted draft maps. So we'd give a set
13 time for the public to give their feedback and -- and it
14 would just be the Commissioners listening.

15 As far as the open houses go, we would just be
16 there to collect data. So in the form -- in whatever
17 form the public wanted to do, we would be set up to
18 record public testimony. We would have that posted
19 online as soon as possible. We would be able to collect
20 data in a written form if that was more convenient
21 and/or amenable to the person wishing to provide the
22 public feedback. And then again the Commissioners can
23 be there at the time that works for them, but the staff
24 would be there all day.

25 And then the telephone town hall I think would

1 be set up similar to some of the -- to the listening
2 tour, where there'd be a set time for public to call in.
3 Commissioners could log in at their leisure on WebEx and
4 then listen to the feedback. Again, everything would be
5 recorded online. We would have staff and members of the
6 mapping team to be actually able to input that data into
7 a report at the end.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And how many of each? I
9 mean, I see the days. I'm not sure which ones are
10 which.

11 MS. VAN HAREN: Well, that is all dependent on
12 the availability of the venues. There are some venues
13 that are just -- we're not sure if they are available
14 yet and we wanted to make sure that we move forward with
15 your direction on that. But there are -- we're
16 anticipating two telephone town halls, two open houses,
17 and the rest would be in-person public meetings with
18 satellite locations.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So, Madam Chair, one of
20 the challenges, and maybe it's just my note-taking --
21 or, you know, here are all my notes right here. So, you
22 know, how do I -- well, the trouble I'm having is that
23 we've gone through a lot of information gathering. But
24 as we sit here deliberating, there's no resource, a
25 readily resource to reference, like letters or whatnot.

1 You know, because I do recall seeing it, but, you know,
2 how do I go back and retrieve it?

3 And so now we're contemplating another 30 days
4 of more public input. And so are we going to have, for
5 example, you know, the verbal transcription available so
6 that we can go back and kind of verify, you know.

7 Sometimes my memory is foggy, so how to go back and
8 retrieve information that I thought I heard, but just to
9 verify that? Because I'm having the trouble right now.
10 So that's the first thing.

11 So then the second thing is you have 12 events
12 here. It would be nice to kind of jot down is it going
13 to be an open house, is it going to be telecom, or is it
14 going to be in person and, you know, and so forth so
15 that at least I can plan. Because I'm trying to plan
16 for the month as well. Because this is -- this is half
17 my life; the other half I have to figure that out, too.

18 So -- but, for me, the biggest thing is how do
19 we -- how are we able to retrieve the information that
20 we are hearing so that we can use it? You know, right
21 now it's just kind of foggy recollection and, you know,
22 bits and pieces. So that's the part that I think we
23 need to work on so that we don't get bombarded, you
24 know, saying you forgot this or we sent this to you and
25 you didn't recall it.

1 Going to get -- like for me, for example, I'm
2 waiting and hoping that at some point for the Native
3 American communities we'll have kind of here, here is a
4 report of what all the tribal leaders sent to us as a
5 Commission. Likewise, you know, we are kind of getting
6 piecemeal from the Latino Coalition; it's not all
7 together.

8 And to me, it would be very helpful because we
9 are actually looking at blocs and we are looking at
10 communities of interest, and so how do we try to put it
11 together, you know. And so I appreciate what we did on
12 our grid. We have a thousand -- or 200 different
13 communities of interest, but it's just one big blob
14 right now.

15 And so how do I discern it and, you know, try
16 to make it useful? Because people are traveling many,
17 many miles and spending hours to come to us and, you
18 know, present their views, and we want to make sure we
19 do our part to try to acknowledge each and every one of
20 those very important pieces of information that these
21 folks are spending time to generate for us.

22 So I will stop there, but I'm just curious as
23 to how we're going to try to figure that out.

24 Thank you.

25 MS. VAN HAREN: And, Madam Chair, Vice

1 Chair Watchman, I think those are all really great
2 points. You have really, I mean, been I think one of
3 the model organizations in being able to receive
4 feedback. And wanting to have an organized way of
5 sorting through that feedback is important, especially
6 as we are looking to gather more feedback. And so we
7 want to take this opportunity to make sure that we are
8 planning out in a way that you can discern through all
9 of the feedback, especially through the models that
10 we've proposed.

11 One, all of transcriptions are available online
12 up through, I think the last one we received was
13 September 28. So as soon as we get them, we are posting
14 them online. And I can re-share that to the
15 Commissioners.

16 We can absolutely look at giving you reports on
17 various organizations that -- what their feedback has
18 been thus far and kind of organizing that and looking to
19 move forward, making sure that we are gathering that
20 when members of the public are coming in to testify or
21 to provide feedback.

22 And then also I think that Timmons will be
23 looking at providing a report, much like the
24 community-of-interest report and much like what will be
25 the grid map report or what has been the grid map

1 report, gathering all of the, you know, objective bits
2 of data so that you guys can look through that.

3 And then I believe you have received all of
4 the -- so far all of the paper maps and emails that we
5 have received. And we are going through and putting as
6 much of that as we can online so members of the public
7 can review all of that data as well.

8 As then far as scheduling, absolutely, we
9 will -- we will, as soon as we can, start booking these
10 venues. If the open-house concept and the telephone
11 town hall and the -- and the public meeting concept is
12 amenable to the Commission, then what we will do is we
13 will start booking those venues and then we'll share
14 those locations and those dates as soon as possible.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think the general
16 concept is excellent. I think it's trying to maximize
17 public opinion in efficient ways. I love the open
18 houses, provided that the Commissioners make efforts in
19 rotating. Even just a five-minute appearance, I think,
20 can make all the difference in helping people feel
21 heard.

22 Love the town halls because, again, there's
23 just an efficiency there. I love the idea of a Spanish
24 language town hall for people who, you know, maybe just
25 are a little uncomfortable speaking a different language

1 and want to speak in their own.

2 I want to make sure there's enough face time.
3 So one of my experiences is that I think people
4 appreciated the fact that there was a human body and
5 eyes across, you know, the room from them, that it's not
6 all virtual. So let's -- I don't know how many you are
7 thinking about live.

8 MS. VAN HAREN: Sorry. Madam Chair, as it's
9 proposed right now, it's eight live meetings.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, tons live. Okay.
11 That's -- that's plenty.

12 The last thing I want to say -- and I'm not
13 opposed to it; I just feel the moral responsibility to
14 acknowledge it -- Jewish and Muslims, they observe the
15 Sabbath Friday to Saturday, and let's make sure we have
16 evening hours during the week because for that group
17 it's just a nonstarter for them to come on Friday night
18 to Saturday evening. And that's fine. I'm not asking
19 to open up hours for this incredibly small population,
20 but let's at least make sure that there's opportunities
21 for them to come.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I could just ask a
23 question. I like the diversity of opportunities. I
24 think that's great, because, you know, not everybody
25 likes to stand up and testify. Some people want to have

1 more individual conversations.

2 Just for clarity, this would be more of the
3 town halls, but then we would be adding to that as well
4 with other opportunities, or are these all of the events
5 that you're talking about?

6 MS. VAN HAREN: Currently that is all of the
7 events that we are talking about during that 30-day
8 period; however, we can add at the Commission's
9 direction.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'm only wondering
11 whether or not -- I guess I have to think more about
12 whether or not we'd want to add something, but add
13 things that are more -- that are not in person as much
14 as maybe some of those telephonic things or something
15 other -- other ways that people can provide input on
16 other days. And then how we mix those up between town
17 halls and open houses would be important as well to make
18 sure that we're in contact with as many people as
19 possible. But I think having a diversity of options is
20 great.

21 MS. VAN HAREN: Absolutely. Thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest not trying
23 to start next week and to be looking at that early
24 November date as the start date. Because whether we
25 finish by this Thursday or not -- I think it is 50/50 we

1 will finish. If we don't, then we are into next week
2 with our meetings; but even if we do, it wouldn't hurt
3 to have started them on that November 3rd date and then
4 use that last week of November also. Because we are not
5 scheduled to meet for the decision meetings for the
6 final maps until December 14th.

7 So even finishing up by December 1 gives two
8 weeks for our team to try to help consolidate and give
9 us information in ways that we can digest it. I think
10 Vice Chair Watchman's comments there were very
11 appropriate and I appreciate them. So if we can, you
12 know, use that time, then -- but I think we can go not
13 next week and flip to the end of November and be in
14 great shape.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: And what's the timing on
16 the legislation review? I mean for the -- yeah, go
17 ahead.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You mean the 30 days or
19 when the legislators have the opportunity to come and
20 address us? It's within that 30-day period.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct, yeah. Is that
22 after we do our public meetings or during?

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I believe it's
24 triggered -- that's --

25 Counsel, when is the 30 days triggered? As

1 soon as we vote on the draft map?

2 MR. HERRERA: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And it doesn't matter
4 what day of the week, just 30 days from that point?

5 MR. HERRERA: That's correct. And as far as
6 the order you want to go in, that's ultimately a policy
7 decision of the Commission. In other words, when you
8 get that feedback that the legislature's entitled to
9 give you via the constitution, if you do that and
10 receive it and consider it before, after, during your
11 public tour, that's ultimately the decision of the
12 Commission.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could we -- as part of
14 that, we have our Tuesday meetings, and we could
15 potentially be doing some of that on our Tuesday
16 meetings as well, right, as an add-on in terms of taking
17 comments or having legislators or something. Because
18 that's not listed on here, but those -- I would assume
19 once we have the maps and are going out there, those
20 could be additional meetings for feedback with our
21 regular planned meetings. Would that -- is that
22 correct?

23 MS. VAN HAREN: Absolutely. We've -- we've
24 kept Tuesdays for business meetings because it's been
25 very difficult on staff to conduct both the business

1 meeting and an in-person public meeting. But if you --
2 if we wanted to tack on some of the telephone town halls
3 or have some of the feedback from legislators or however
4 you want to do that, we can absolutely make that happen.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think the idea is
6 combining them. I think if we're just going to invite a
7 few isolated guests, you know, elected leaders, that
8 that may be on a Tuesday if it's virtual, but that's not
9 going to throw our business meeting off and it just may
10 be an efficient, you know, use of time.

11 MS. VAN HAREN: Perfect. Okay.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, I like this
13 schedule. I think three a week is -- is -- two, three a
14 week is what we can handle. I think it's a good pace
15 for mapping. And this doesn't preclude individual
16 Commissioners, up to two of us, from going into other
17 communities that have difficulties reaching us as well.

18 I mean, I -- you know, so this is just the
19 minimum of what we're going to do collectively as a
20 body. And I know that there are a lot of communities
21 that want, you know, even, you know, more access and all
22 of that, and that's also a possibility for us to -- to
23 be out there more.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I just want to
25 mention I concur with Commissioner Mehl on the concept

1 of leaving next week off just -- on the just in case and
2 going in through the last week of November. I think
3 Thanksgiving week is difficult for everybody because
4 certainly it would be nice almost to leave that open for
5 staff as well so that if staff wants to have some time
6 with family that week. So, you know, we could
7 potentially consider seeing if we can maybe do three
8 that week, the week after Thanksgiving, to allow staff
9 that week of Thanksgiving some time, as well as the
10 Commission.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: How much time, mapping,
12 by the end of this public tour before we begin to
13 deliberate in an ideal world? I know you're going to be
14 updating information constantly, but is there a certain
15 number of days that you feel need to be in between?

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: You know, it's hard to
17 predict. You know, we don't really know where things
18 will come out from what you hear and -- and your
19 thoughts on what you hear. So it's a lot of time to
20 process and make sure that you have time to review the
21 materials that are coming in before the meetings, but,
22 you know, I think we've got -- I think we planned on at
23 least a week where we may not need two weeks.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we -- if we move
25 in the public hearings until the first week of December,

1 that still positions us well to give mapping a week and
2 for us to have considerable time to deliberate maybe
3 even before the 14th. Of course, only after we have the
4 legal 30-day review period.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And the only thing I'll
6 add is that we know that over the course of these
7 last -- when we were holding hearings previously we
8 heard from some communities, and I -- and you've
9 mentioned this, so I appreciate that -- that you'd heard
10 from some communities who had been asking to have
11 hearings, and I know that you are considering that as
12 part of it. So I appreciate the fact that you're
13 listening to communities on those that want to host and
14 have us visit them.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: In terms of the physical
16 locations of the eight, are you talking about eight
17 primary locations and then satellites in addition as --
18 as we've traditionally done?

19 MS. VAN HAREN: Yes, Madam Chair, that --
20 that's correct.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If you could just
22 get a list of those locations as a draft to us, that'd
23 be great. I know that there's a lot of clamoring in the
24 community for who is going to get them.

25 MS. VAN HAREN: Absolutely.

1 And with that, I think that was the end of my
2 report, if there are no more questions.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Anything on the
4 other items, Lori?

5 MS. VAN HAREN: I think we reviewed public
6 records yesterday. I don't know if there are any more
7 questions on that by anybody. I think that was it for
8 staff's report right now.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. With that, we can
10 go back to Agenda Item No. VII and turn it back over to
11 mapping for whatever summations and questions you have
12 from us.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Well, thank you. Lori, could you
14 give us sharing permissions for Brian.

15 So what we have for you right now is Map
16 Series 5.0, 5.1 and 5.2 and 5.3. So we do have four new
17 maps for you guys ready to go within the same day. Just
18 throwing that out there.

19 So you can see here on the tree it all builds
20 off of 4.2 that you approved earlier today. So we have
21 5.0 and then 5.1 and 5.3 both come off of that 5.0
22 version. And then 5.2 comes off of the 5.1 version. So
23 we'll start by putting on the screen 5.0.

24 MR. KINGERY: And everything that we're about
25 to show is not publicly shared yet, but it will be.

1 MR. FLAHAN: So on 5.0, this map basically
2 builds off of the 4.2 version. And the main goal here
3 is to unite the Ak-Chin Indian reservation and the Gila
4 River Indian reservation and Maricopa -- the city of
5 Maricopa into District 2; increase competitiveness in
6 Districts 4 and 5, moving parts of Avondale and Tolleson
7 into District 3; moving all of Casa Grande and the
8 University of Arizona into District 6.

9 And in order to accomplish these major goals,
10 Gila River Indian reservation, Ak-Chin Indian
11 reservation, and the city of Maricopa were moved from
12 District 7 to District 2, which is north of there.
13 There you go. Were moved into District 2. All of Casa
14 Grande, Coolidge, Red Rock, SaddleBrooke Ranch, Oracle,
15 and part of Coolidge were moved into the yellow
16 District 6 on the screen. All of Santa Cruz, Green
17 Valley, and Picacho were moved from District -- moved
18 into District 7 for balancing purposes. The area around
19 the University of Arizona, including the university, was
20 moved from District 7 into District 6. And we used the
21 east of 6th Avenue road as the dividing line.
22 Districts 6 and 7 were then balanced along the Tucson
23 border south of the university.

24 Go on down. Go down the 10 freeway. Yeah.
25 Zoom in there. There you go.

1 Most of Gold Canyon was moved from District 5
2 to District 2 in the Maricopa County area.

3 There you go. Right where the 60 is.

4 District 4 moved further east into District 5,
5 reaching Power Road, while District 5 was moved further
6 north into District 4, east of the 101 corridor, in
7 order to increase competitiveness in the area.

8 District 4 was then moved slightly north into south
9 Scottsdale into District 1 to offset for some population
10 balancing.

11 Tolleson and part of north Avondale were moved
12 into the District 3.

13 For balancing purposes, the southern border of
14 District 1 moved into District 3 down to the 101 loop
15 and slightly west of I-17.

16 Glendale was then moved from District 3 into
17 District 9 west of 75th Avenue. The eastern border
18 pushing into District 1 we used for population
19 balancing. And El Mirage was added from District 9 into
20 District 8. And then District 9 incorporated Sun City
21 West, Sun City Grand, and some of north Peoria from
22 District 8 for the final population balancing.

23 The map is balanced. All population is
24 assigned. There was no request that we could not
25 fulfill in 5.0.

1 I know that was a lot of changes there for you.
2 If there are no questions, we can continue to move on to
3 5.1.

4 Okay. Can you bring up 5.1.

5 So 5.1 built upon that 5.0 map that we just
6 talked about, but just with some slight changes to
7 balancing between Districts 6 and 7. The University of
8 Arizona area in Tucson moved from the yellow District 6
9 back into District 7.

10 If you go south, Brian.

11 Santa Cruz County was then split again between
12 Districts 6 and 7, as you can see there on the screen.
13 The two districts were then balanced along the Tucson
14 border, south of the river. The Rillito River, I think.
15 I'll get that right. And then this map also has all of
16 Casa Grande inside of District 6.

17 Go up.

18 And this was the request then that took the
19 city of Maricopa not into District 6; it's still in
20 District 2.

21 Map is balanced. All population is assigned.
22 We were able to fulfill every request for this.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just as a quick note, that
24 odd shape where 6 comes around into Casa Grande, we are
25 coming around Eloy. So the reason for that jagged edge

1 is keeping Eloy together in 7, and Casa Grande is
2 together in 6.

3 MR. FLAHAN: And Arizona City.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, and Arizona City is in 7
5 as well.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can you just pull the stats
7 up a little bit so we can see them.

8 MR. FLAHAN: Sure.

9 Any other questions on 5.1? 5.2.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the 5.2 report is actually
11 fairly simple, as Brian pulls it up. So the difference
12 is 5.1 was taking D-6 up to Casa Grande, and then the
13 next step was to see if 5 dot -- in 5.2, we were testing
14 can we actually get D-6 up to Casa Grande and Marana.
15 And it --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You mean Maricopa.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, I'm sorry. I have Marana
18 and Oro Valley on my mind.

19 So Casa Grande and Maricopa would be together
20 in District 6. So -- and obviously we can draw that and
21 you can see the result. The challenge is that the 5.0
22 impact on District 2 was trading the reservation for
23 other territories. So it was a straight District 2 was
24 giving up and adding.

25 In this case, we are then trying to also take

1 Maricopa from District 2, and it ends up that it is too
2 much population coming out of 2 and nowhere to pick it
3 up.

4 So in these tests we can get District 6 up to
5 Casa Grande, but we can't balance District 2 if we take
6 it all the way to Maricopa. So we wanted to show it to
7 you, show you the results. But if you look at the
8 bottom, we end up with District 2 being short by 34,000
9 people because Maricopa is so big. So we wanted to show
10 it to you, but we weren't able to -- to draw a map that
11 would meet that request.

12 So in conclusion, the Casa Grande works; Casa
13 Grande and Maricopa doesn't.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do we see a Lerner map?

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Are we going to see the
17 Lerner map?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. So the 5.3. Team's been
19 busy. So 5.3 starts with 5.0, so it has all those
20 changes you saw in 5.0 built into it. And then the main
21 focus here was the discussion of trading the kind of
22 I-17/Prescott portion of Yavapai County for Graham and
23 Greenlee County.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: That was for the La Paz.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: So -- and then down in Tucson,

1 it then -- I believe this is the university. Sorry.
2 This was finished seconds before we walked in. So, yes.
3 So -- and this has the university I believe in --

4 Can you zoom way in on that border?

5 I think the university is back in 7. Or I'm
6 sorry. The university is --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Which the trade --

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: I'm sorry. The university is
9 moved to 6 in this one.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: But I thought we asked --
11 the Commission asked to see the river communities in the
12 northern district together.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think that's it.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Northern Tucson, not --

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: So there was a discussion at
16 the end about should we also move Mohave County in or
17 not, but at least our understanding was that wasn't part
18 of this test.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Oh. That's part of our
20 test.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: All right. So this was -- so
22 this is putting all the -- as we understood the request,
23 it was to have 9 not be so much in the west valley by
24 pulling the Prescott/I-17 corridor into 9, so to reduce
25 how far it had to come in. Obviously, going in --

1 taking Mohave out would then push it farther back into
2 the west valley.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Tucson you are
4 showing us.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: You are talking about
7 Prescott.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, so now you jumped to
9 Prescott. Yeah, but --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Sorry.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: So it did work. It is
12 population balanced. And you can see the change.

13 The edge, along the Mingus Mountain edge, it --
14 all the Verde Valley population's in 2. All the
15 Prescott population's in 9. We didn't have time to
16 make -- to do the little zero population blocks that
17 make it look a little smoother. But you can see there's
18 all -- so we are working with everything that was in 5.0
19 and then just making those trades as discussed this
20 morning.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: (Inaudible.)

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

23 MR. FLAHAN: Also Graham and Greenlee go into
24 District 2 in this map also.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, as noted this morning, we
2 didn't population balance everything in all the
3 districts in Maricopa, but we certainly could to make
4 them work within this.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So at this point it
6 sounds like we have the ability to go home and kind of
7 study these options.

8 Is there any other direction or feedback from
9 us that would be helpful?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think we probably have
11 plenty to do this evening.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Unless --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And when will these be
15 posted where we can see them?

16 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. When we go back to the room,
17 we will make sure they are posted where you guys can see
18 them and then we will work on getting them posted to the
19 public to the hub site. We will also work on getting
20 the demographics and the competitive PDF out. So
21 that'll be the immediate homework we have and then we'll
22 work on the other legislative district homework that you
23 have for us.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And it seems like, and I
25 will ask for my fellow Commissioners, that when we've

1 added that list of things on the -- on the default
2 demographics, it seems like there's been a lot of
3 interest in looking at the vote spread. So could we
4 also add the vote spread as one more column? I don't
5 know if there's any column that can get knocked out of
6 here or if we just add one. But I would appreciate
7 adding the vote spread just on an ongoing basis, if
8 others agree with me, as one more thing for us to be
9 looking at across.

10 MR. FLAHAN: We can add the -- the CompRepVotes
11 as well as the Dem votes that we have on there. We
12 don't have the ability to create a new column to add
13 those together because the system is building that
14 information on the fly as we put blocs and blocs
15 together.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay. That's not one of
17 the listed things that can be done?

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: You can see it there. So the
19 Comp -- CompDemVotes to CompRepVotes, the difference
20 between those two numbers is the vote spread.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Right.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: So in District 1, the vote
23 spread is --

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- eight-tenths of a percent.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We can do the math.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: All right.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's not quite as nice having
4 it done --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I was trying to make it
6 even simpler. Okay. Thank you. Request withdrawn.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If there's nothing
8 else, I think we can move to Agenda Item No. IX.

9 Okay. Item No. IX, next meeting date,
10 tomorrow, October 20th, 2021, at 8:00 a.m.

11 Agenda Item No. X, closing of public comments.
12 We are now closing public comments.

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

20 We'll move to Agenda No. -- Item XI,
21 adjournment.

22 I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So moved. Vice Chair
24 Watchman.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Second, Commissioner Mehl.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
10 an aye.

11 With that, we will adjourn. And thank you,
12 everybody, for your very hard work. And I look forward
13 to seeing you bright and early tomorrow. Have a great
14 evening.

15 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 4:05 p.m.)

16

17

18

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

20 ***Please consult the accompanying video for the official***
21 ***record of IRC proceedings."***

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 8th day of November, 2021.

26
27 *MCR*
28 Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
29 Arizona RRF No. R1058