

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PUBLIC MEETING

Via GoogleMeets

November 16, 2021

8:01 a.m.

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

Reported By:
Deborah L. Wilks, RPR
Certified Reporter (AZ 50849)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I N D E X

<u>PROCEEDING:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ITEM I	4
ITEM I (A)	4
ITEM I (B)	5
ITEM II	6
ITEM II (A)	6
ITEM III	7
ITEM IV	7
ITEM V	8
ITEM V (A)	9
ITEM V (B)	14
ITEM VI	56
ITEM VII	57
ITEM VIII	60
ITEM IX	60
ITEM X	61

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 8:01 a.m. on
3 November 16, 2021, via GoogleMeets, Arizona, in the
4 presence of the following Commissioners:

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

10 OTHERS PRESENT:

11 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director
12 Ms. Lori Van Haren Deputy Director
13 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant
14 Ms. Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer
15 Ms. Marie Chapple, Community Outreach Coordinator
16 Mr. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator
17
18 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group
19 Mr. Doug Johnson, NDC
20 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC
21
22 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
23 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr
24 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer
25 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Good morning, everybody,
4 and welcome to a beautiful day in Arizona. We'll get
5 to it.

6 Agenda Item Number I, call to order and roll
7 call.

8 Oh, and by the way, I just want to make an
9 announcement in case anybody didn't hear in the
10 beginning. Commissioner York will join us. He's going
11 to be about 30 minutes late so we will get started and
12 look forward to when he's able to dial in.

13 So call to order and roll call. I(A), call
14 for quorum. It is 8:02 a.m. on Tuesday, November 16th,
15 2021. I call this meeting of the IRC to order.

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

21 Val.

22 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

25 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

2 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

4 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

5 CHAIR NEUBERG: Present.

6 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record also in
7 attendance this morning is Executive Director Brian
8 Schmitt, Deputy Director Lori Van Haren, Public
9 Information Officer, Michelle Crank, Community Outreach
10 Coordinators, Mary Chapple and Alex Pena.

11 From our legal team we have Brett Johnson and
12 Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer, and from Ballard
13 Spahr we have Roy Herrera and Daniel Arellano.

14 And our mapping consultants we have Mark
15 Flahan from Timmons, Doug Johnson and Ivy Beller
16 Sakansky from IDC.

17 And our transcriptionist today is Debbie
18 Wilks.

19 That's everyone.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Val.

21 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is
22 present.

23 Agenda Item I(B), call for notice. Val, was
24 the Notice and Agenda for the Commission meeting
25 properly posted 48 hours in advance of today's meeting?

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

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you very much.

3 We'll move to Agenda Item II, approval of
4 minutes from November 9th, 2021. We have (A), our
5 general session. Is there any discussion on the
6 minutes from the general session from last week, the
7 business meeting of last Tuesday?

8 If there is no discussion I'll entertain a
9 motion to approve the general session minutes from
10 November 9th, 2021.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
12 moves to approve the minutes for the general session
13 for November 9th.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If no further
16 discussion, Vice Chair Watchman.

17 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please note for the
23 minutes that Commissioner York has joined at 8:04, much
24 earlier than expected.

25 Good morning, Commissioner York. We are

1 approving the general session minutes from
2 November 9th, if you would like to weigh in with a
3 vote.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: I approve.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And Commissioner Neuberg
8 is an aye, and I believe I got everybody, so with that
9 the minutes are approved 5-0.

10 We will move to Agenda Item Number III,
11 opportunity for public comments. Public comment will
12 now open for a minimum of 30 minutes and remain open
13 until the adjournment of the meeting. Comments will
14 only be accepted electronically in writing on the link
15 provided in the Notice and Agenda for this public
16 meeting. It will be limited to 3,000 characters.
17 Please note members of the Commission may not discuss
18 items that are not specifically identified on the
19 agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H)
20 action taken as a result of public comment will be
21 limited to directing staff to study the matter,
22 responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter
23 for further consideration and decision at a later date.

24 With that we'll move to Agenda Item Number IV,
25 discussion of public comments received prior to today's

1 meeting. I will open it up to my colleagues.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest that we're
3 getting very good feedback from the public. The
4 meetings have been very well-attended. The comments
5 have been constructive and productive. I think it has
6 been very helpful, and I thank the public for their
7 participation and ask for their continued
8 participation.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Ditto. I'm remarkably
10 proud of our state. You know, the constructiveness,
11 you know, the focus, the civility, the overwhelming
12 majority of the time. We have a passionate, engaged,
13 educated state, and it's truly -- you know, I said it
14 during our initial listening tour. It's truly an honor
15 to participate in the hearings and to, you know,
16 witness and be part of, you know, this democratic
17 process. So thank you to everybody who is tuning in,
18 and to those who don't know how to tune in or aren't
19 interested or can't for various reasons, we're going to
20 redistrict for you as well.

21 If there are no other comments on public
22 comment, we will move to Agenda Item Number V, update
23 from mapping team. We have two items. First an update
24 on polarization data, and then, (B), which the
25 Commissioners will be highly involved with, review of

1 the draft maps and opportunity for discussion regarding
2 the draft map adherence to the Constitutional criteria.

3 So at this point I will turn it over to Doug
4 to take it away.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Mark, do you have anything to
6 say first or --

7 MR. FLAHAN: Give me one second.

8 Good morning, everyone. I think tying onto
9 your guys's public comments section, I have some stats
10 for you. As of right now we have 867 accounts in the
11 redistricting system, so that's 867 people made
12 accounts. To date we have 191 submitted plans into the
13 system that have been published out to the hub. And in
14 the hub's public comment survey, we have received to
15 date 1,004 records, so we received 1,004 public
16 comments coming back through that vehicle. So I just
17 wanted to let you guys know what the current numbers
18 are. I think we're doing extremely well there.

19 So unless there is any questions on those, I
20 can turn it back over to Doug to talk about
21 polarization.

22 MR. JOHNSON: So I'll jump in. So we've had,
23 as we somewhat expected, a bit of an adventure figuring
24 out the primary election data, since that was a realm
25 we hadn't cleaned up before, but actually just got very

1 good news yesterday from the team working on it that
2 they think they have all the quirks worked out. And
3 Dr. Hanley, you know, back yesterday saying she doesn't
4 see any red flags in the data they sent her. So we
5 don't have her -- her table results for you today, but
6 hopefully it will be very shortly.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you. But,
8 you know, so, Doug, we will talk later this morning.
9 We're unlikely to have a business meeting next Tuesday
10 during the week of Thanksgiving given that we have
11 sufficient time to do business today and in two weeks.
12 It's great that the data is available. We may not be
13 able to publicly come together and get a briefing on
14 the data and, you know, review it, you know, together,
15 but if the Commissioners can get the data and, you
16 know, as you say, there weren't any red flags, that's
17 fabulous. We would like to dive into that a little bit
18 just as we're approaching deliberation for our own
19 comfort and as we're processing all the decisions we're
20 about to be making.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Actually, you raise a great
22 point. I should clarify: By red flags I mean data
23 that didn't -- that didn't look wrong, so it didn't --

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You're not interpreting
25 data, okay.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Correct. I wasn't
2 characterizing the findings because we don't have
3 those. But, yes, the idea is that we'll send it off to
4 you. Once legal has reviewed it we'll send it off to
5 all of you and actually post it for the public as soon
6 as we can. We certainly won't wait for the 30th. And
7 then we'll have a group discussion and answer any
8 questions you have on the 30th.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Doug, could I ask you to
11 remind us and the public which primary elections you're
12 using?

13 MR. JOHNSON: So this was part of our
14 challenge is going through and looking at which primary
15 elections will be useful to the analysis. Since we're
16 looking at proposed districts, not at existing
17 districts, that really rules out looking at past
18 legislative or congressional elections because
19 obviously the proposed districts only deal with parts
20 of the old districts and so you only have data from
21 part of your district. So we're really limited to
22 statewide elections. And in talking with Dr. Hanley,
23 the numbers of Latinos voting in Republican and other
24 primaries other than the Democratic primary are really
25 not sufficient to generate any useful data or readings,

1 so we're really focusing on Democratic primaries,
2 Democratic statewide primaries. And the only one
3 where -- in recent years where there was a Latino
4 candidate versus a White candidate was the 2018
5 primary. There was one other one for U.S. Senate that
6 came off the candidate list, but turned out the Latino
7 candidate there was a write-in who got less than 1,000
8 votes statewide, so that wasn't going to generate any
9 useful data for us.

10 There also was a statewide Corporation
11 Commission election. The challenge is that
12 multi-candidate elections like Corporation Commission
13 are tough. You get lots of noise in the data, and
14 they're tough to pull any useful findings out of.

15 So we're focused on getting that 2018
16 governor's race processed and to find what the results
17 of that are and hopefully that will give us clear
18 results and a clear guide to voting patterns, and we'll
19 figure out where to go from there.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I follow up with so
21 do you think that one election can really give us much
22 guidance versus having, you know, a few to do some
23 comparisons on? Because, you know, one election could
24 be an outlier. I mean, we don't know. But I guess I
25 know that the struggle is in finding elections. I

1 totally understand that. I'm just wondering if -- how
2 confident you are that a single election can really
3 give us some valid data versus having several. And I
4 know you're making every effort, but if you could give
5 me your thoughts on that.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Well, we can't change who has
7 run in the past elections, right, so we don't have any
8 control over what elections fall into the most useful
9 category certainly, you know, so thankfully there are
10 statistical measures of reliability and accuracy built
11 into these studies, and so we will get some sense of
12 that from this election, and we will get a sense of
13 what the results are, but hopefully it will be clear,
14 because otherwise we venture into the very gray areas
15 of trying to suss out data from either multiple
16 candidate elections or from White versus White or
17 trying to figure Latino polarization from -- or
18 polarization from Latino point of view and an election
19 that involves a White and Middle Eastern candidate.
20 These kinds of things are realms we're hoping we don't
21 need to go into.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But that also speaks to
23 the importance of the timeliness of the report, even if
24 we're not going to have a business meeting, so that if
25 there are those kinds of red flags that then we have to

1 mine deeper into data that there is sufficient time to
2 do so per Commissioner Lerner's, you know, concerns.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. And I think the
4 Commission's instruction is very clear. So we'll
5 analyze the data, work with legal on their
6 interpretation of it, and then if we need to, leap into
7 some other realm as soon as we get the analysis, and we
8 won't wait for the 30th to get additional direction
9 from you.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, of course, you're
11 still focusing on general elections as much as you can,
12 not just primary elections.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Right. We're still running the
14 same general elections, definitely. This is just
15 adding to that pool of data.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Anything else?
17 Thank you. We're anxiously waiting. We're
18 looking forward to it.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Mm-hmm. Anything else, or we
20 should we leap into the next segment?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please proceed.

22 MR. FLAHAN: All right, Doug. Let me share my
23 screen so we can start with congressional.

24 MR. JOHNSON: Turning to our review -- review
25 of data on the official draft congressional and

1 legislative maps, last time we did Congressional
2 Districts 1 through 3. We're going to leap in and try
3 to wrap up the rest of them, go through all 4 through 9
4 here today.

5 Let's go to the other screen. Thank you,
6 Mark.

7 So we've got District 4 is again all in
8 Maricopa County. It's really Ahwatukee, Tempe, Mesa,
9 South Scottsdale, and Salt River Reservation district.
10 By the numbers it's one person over the ideal, so it is
11 population balanced at 0.00 percent.

12 Citizen voting age percentage numbers, it's
13 69 percent Non-Hispanic White, so overwhelmingly White.
14 The largest of the other groups is Hispanics and
15 Latinos at 18 percent, African Americans at 6 percent,
16 Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders at 4 percent, and
17 Non-Hispanic Native Americans are 3 percent of citizen
18 voting age population and 2 percent of the single race
19 voting age population.

20 On the competitiveness scale this is a
21 competitive district. Its vote spread is 5.6 percent,
22 so it's within our 7 percent competitive range, but not
23 our 4 percent highly competitive range. And on swing
24 votes it also counts as competitive. The Democratic
25 candidate won eight of the elections and the Republican

1 candidate won one of the elections.

2 With the low Latino percentages in voting age
3 population, we're not tracking this district for Voting
4 Rights Act compliance.

5 But, actually, coincidentally, the one
6 Republican win is the 2018 governor's race where the
7 Democratic candidate got 46 percent of the vote.

8 On compactness score, because this is in urban
9 Maricopa County its perimeter and area scores are low.
10 It's Riock score is 0.29. The Convex Hull skull -- the
11 Convex Hull score is 0.72 percent. The Grofman score
12 is 6.24, Schwartzberg is 1.76, and Polsby Popper is
13 0.32.

14 Moving to District 5.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it might make
16 sense for us to just be able to talk about each of them
17 as we go along. Would that work for the Commissioners?

18 Okay. Comments on District 4, congressional.
19 I think it does a reasonable job on all criteria. I
20 think it's reasonably compact and contiguous. It's
21 competitive. Obviously, the population is spot on.

22 One -- one thing that I think, you know,
23 doesn't fit as well that we've been hearing from the
24 public is maybe trying to do a better job with honoring
25 city, town lines, boundaries. You know, it's part of

1 the Constitution, and so when we reconvene, but in
2 terms of the specific district I would say that's
3 probably, you know, the weakness when I look at it.

4 Any other comments or thoughts?

5 Okay. And the fact that it's competitive is a
6 great, you know, bonus.

7 MR. JOHNSON: So moving just next door to also
8 Mesa, District 5, again, we've got a Maricopa County
9 district. This includes the Maricopa County portion of
10 Apache Junction, parts of Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa,
11 Queen Creek, Sun Lakes. I'm sorry. It has a little
12 bit of Pinal County as well as. My notes are formatted
13 wrong. And so it's got Gold Canyon, Queen Creek,
14 and -- parts of Gold Canyon, Queen Creek, and San Tan
15 Valley in it as well.

16 In terms of population, again, we're right at
17 balance. It's one person over the ideal, 0.0
18 deviation.

19 Citizen voting age population, it's, again, 75
20 Non-Hispanic White. The largest of the Non-White
21 groups is Hispanic or Latino at 15 percent of citizen
22 voting age population, Black or African American is 4
23 percent, Asian American Pacific Islander is 5 percent,
24 and Non-Hispanic Native Americans are 1 percent of
25 citizen voting age population and also 1 percent of

1 single race voting age population.

2 On competitiveness front, this district is not
3 in our competitive range. It's at 14.7 percent vote
4 spread, and on the swing votes it's a 9-0 Republican
5 seat. Again, because of the citizen voting age
6 population numbers we're not tracking this group for
7 Voting Rights purposes.

8 In terms of compactness, again, in urban
9 Maricopa, a little bit of Pinal, very low on the area
10 and perimeter scores. The Reock test is 0.51. Convex
11 Hull is again 0.72, just like the last district. The
12 Grofman score is 5.55. Schwartzberg is 1.57, and
13 Polsby Popper is 0.41.

14 Any comments or comments about District 51?

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think, again, it meets
16 the key, you know, Constitutional criteria, compact,
17 contiguous. I think the lack of competitiveness is in
18 deference to, you know, keeping communities of interest
19 together. I have the same comments about District 4.
20 I think maybe with adjustments there could -- we could
21 do a better job with, you know, city lines and with,
22 you know, keeping communities of interest together, but
23 you know, as is I think it meets criteria.

24 MR. JOHNSON: If there is no further comments
25 we'll jump into District 6.

1 So now we leave Maricopa and go down to the
2 southeastern corner of the state. As you can see,
3 District 6 is the yellow district on the screen,
4 getting all of Greenlee County; all of Graham County,
5 except for the reservation territory; all of Cochise
6 County; and then parts of Pinal and Pima County. So in
7 Pinal County we're getting everything from Casa Grande
8 to Coolidge, Florence, Oracle, Red Rock, and
9 Saddlebrooke. In Pinal County we're getting Avra
10 Valley, Casas Adobes, Catalina and Catalina Foothills,
11 Marana, Oro Valley, Rincon Valley, Tanque Verde,
12 Tucson, Vail, essentially the eastern and northeastern
13 portions of the county.

14 Statistically we're again one person over
15 ideal, so at 0.00 percent deviation.

16 In terms of citizen voting age population,
17 we're at 22 percent Hispanic or Latino, 69 percent
18 Non-Hispanic White, 3 percent Non-Hispanic Black and
19 Asian American -- I'm sorry, Asian American, Pacific
20 Islander. Those two categories are 3 percent each of
21 the citizen voting population. 2 percent of citizen
22 voting age population are Non-Hispanic Native
23 Americans, and 1 percent of the single race voting age
24 population is Native American.

25 This district is highly competitive. It's at

1 1.9 percent on our competitive scale, so it is within
2 our 4 percent highly competitive range, and it has a
3 strong tendency to swing -- of the nine elections we're
4 tracking, six of them were run by the Democratic and
5 three by the Republican. And, again, with 22 percent
6 of CVAP we're not looking at this as a Voting Rights
7 district, but on the swing scale the Republican did win
8 the 2018 election and the Democrat Latino candidate won
9 the attorney general's 2018 general election.

10 On compactness scores, as this is a more rural
11 district its area and perimeter scores are a lot higher
12 than the last two we looked at that were urban Maricopa
13 districts.

14 On the Reock score it's 0.37. Convex Hull
15 it's 0.67. The Grofman score is 7.46. Schwartzberg
16 2.11, and Polsby Popper is 0.23. Those scores are
17 somewhat lower than these districts we were looking at
18 before. Most of that is driven by the way that the
19 district picks up the freeway corridor coming out
20 Marana and going out along the freeway corridor into
21 Pinal County, which is an odd shape, but clearly
22 picking up communities associated with the freeway or
23 along the freeway.

24 Any questions about District 6?

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think, Doug, you did a

1 great job of, you know, really acknowledging kind of
2 the tradeoffs that, you know, although it may be less
3 compact and contiguous that there is, you know,
4 appropriate justification with, you know, communities
5 of interest along major, you know, highway corridors
6 and things like that, and maybe we can look at trying
7 to clean it up a little bit to improve it, but, you
8 know, there is a rationale for it.

9 And I would also like -- you know, we've
10 already, you know, discussed that particularly around
11 the Tucson area maybe there is some further adjusting
12 to better represent communities of interest between
13 Districts 6 and 7, but those are small, you know,
14 adjustments that don't affect the overall assessment of
15 meeting Constitutional criteria. And it's perfectly
16 competitive.

17 Anybody want to add anything?

18 Okay. 7.

19 MR. JOHNSON: District 7, as you can see on
20 the map, goes from Santa Cruz County into Tucson, up to
21 southwestern Pinal County, Southern Maricopa County,
22 and then over into Yuma County. In Maricopa -- well, I
23 should say in Pinal we're mainly getting the Tohono
24 O'odham community, the reservation land. In Maricopa
25 we're getting Gila Bend, small towns of -- I may

1 mispronounce this -- Kaka and Theba, and then the
2 southern end of Buckeye, really the state prison end.
3 It's the main population at that end of Buckeye.

4 Then in Pima County obviously we're getting a
5 large portion of Tucson, South Tucson, just some of the
6 larger numbers, Drexel Heights, Flowing Wells, Green
7 Valley, Sahuarita. I mentioned South Tucson. Tucson
8 Estates, Tucson Mountains, and, as I mentioned, the
9 Tohono O'odham and the Pascua Yaqui tribal reservation
10 that borders it over by Tucson.

11 In Pinal County I mentioned it's getting the
12 reservation. It's also getting Eloy and Arizona City.

13 And then over in Yuma County we're getting
14 Fortuna Foothills, Somerton, most of Wellton, and a
15 large portion of the city of Yuma in there, so we end
16 up with about 180,000 people coming from Yuma County
17 into this district.

18 By the numbers we're again off by just one
19 person, so 0.0 percent deviation.

20 Citizen voting age population, this is -- by
21 citizen voting age population this is a plurality
22 Latino seat. It is -- 47 percent of citizen voting age
23 population is Latino, 43 percent is Non-Hispanic White,
24 4 percent is Black or African American, and 2 percent
25 is Asian Pacific Islander. And while this does have,

1 as I mentioned, a significant Native American
2 population in terms of number of reservations and their
3 populations in it, in terms of the numbers it's fairly
4 low at 4 percent of citizen voting age population, or
5 3 percent of the single race voting age population is
6 Non-Hispanic Native American.

7 On a competitive scale, it's at 20 percent for
8 its vote spread. It does not swing in the nine
9 elections we're looking at. They're all Democratic
10 wins. This is a Voting Rights Act sensitive seat at 47
11 percent Latino and plurality Latino. And it does
12 perform, so it is an effective district by both of our
13 measures being the Democratic governor selection in
14 2018. The Latino Democratic candidate won with
15 53.3 percent, and then the attorney general's race in
16 2018 the Latino Democratic candidate won with
17 60.4 percent, so it is an effective district by all
18 measures.

19 Oh, compactness. Sorry. Almost skipped over
20 that. In compactness, this is obviously a very large
21 geographic district, so it's perimeter and area scores
22 are quite high. On the Reock score it's 0.29. Convex
23 Hull it's 0.82. Grofman it's 6.51. Schwartzberg it's
24 1.84, and Polsby Popper is at 0.3.

25 Any questions about District 7?

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it's another
2 example of compromising compactness and contiguity for
3 keeping communities of interest in here. It's a
4 majority minority district, but, you know, based on at
5 least the data we're looking at now, you know, I think
6 it's also helpful for the southern three Native
7 American tribes to, you know, have a member, an elected
8 leader to represent their interests, so I think it
9 meets criteria, and we can improve with maybe adjusting
10 the Yuma area a little bit to honor communities of
11 interest. There is ideas about how to make it even
12 better, but I think it meets criteria.

13 MR. JOHNSON: Any questions or comments? If
14 not we'll take a leap back to Maricopa for District 8.

15 So District 8 is entirely Maricopa County. It
16 consists of portions of Glendale, Peoria, and Phoenix,
17 so geographically a much more easily described
18 district. Population-wise it is exactly at the desired
19 population, so zero deviation and 0.00 percent
20 deviation.

21 On citizen voting age population, it is
22 20 percent Hispanic or Latino, 68 percent Non-Hispanic
23 White, 6 percent Black or African American, 4 percent
24 Asian American or Pacific Islander, and 2 percent
25 Native American. And looking at single race voting age

1 population, it's 1 percent Native American.

2 It is a competitive district at 4.1 percent on
3 the vote spread. It's right on our border of highly
4 competitive versus competitive, but definitely
5 competitive. And also in the swing score it had three
6 wins by the Democratic party and six wins by the
7 Republican party, so it swung three different
8 elections.

9 With the citizen voting age Latino numbers
10 being only at 20 percent it's not a district we're
11 tracking for Voting Rights Act effectiveness.

12 And on compactness, again, we're back in urban
13 Maricopa so the area and perimeter scores are going to
14 be quite low. The Reock score is 0.38. Convex Hull is
15 0.73. Grofman is 6.77. Schwartzberg is 1.91, and
16 Polsby Popper is 0.27.

17 As you look at the district as you go back to
18 the map, it's worth noting there is a number of kind of
19 zigs and zags, especially on the western edge of it.
20 Those are all following city borders, so the U shape in
21 the top, that's the shape of the Peoria city border.
22 The little foot about halfway up the western side going
23 over off the edge is -- again, that's following the
24 city border of Peoria. So if you ever wonder why there
25 is zigs and zags and not a straight line, as we said,

1 it's following the city lines.

2 Any questions or comments about District 8?

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it does a great
4 job of meeting all criteria, equal population, compact,
5 contiguous, communities of interest, competitive. On
6 the communities of interest front, the only thing that
7 I would say if you're looking at Peoria, if you looked
8 at the city of Phoenix instead I think you'll see that
9 there may be adjustments to 8 and 1. Just Phoenix is
10 pretty split up, you know, in terms of having an
11 elected leader really represent the city, so that's
12 something to look at. But the district meets criteria,
13 but like many of the other districts I think, you know,
14 that doesn't mean the Commissioners can't try to
15 improve community of interest lines.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Are there any other comments or
17 questions?

18 District 9, this is another mix of rural and
19 urban population. You can see it's the river counties,
20 Mohave, La Paz, and the northern portion of Yuma, and
21 then coming over into Maricopa County. In Yuma it's
22 getting -- again, Fortuna Foothills are divided so it's
23 got a good portion of that. It's got a small piece of
24 the city of Yuma. And then a couple thousand of
25 rural -- rural Yuma County residents. It has all of La

1 Paz County. It has all of Mohave County except for the
2 Hualapai and Kaibab reservations. And there is a
3 little bit of tribal land next to the Hualapai
4 reservation that's not populated. It's not in this
5 district.

6 In Maricopa County we're looking at Avondale,
7 a small piece of Avondale, almost all of Buckeye, El
8 Mirage, a piece -- really, the western end out by the
9 Air Force Base of Glendale, Goodyear, Litchfield Park,
10 Sun City, Sun City West, all of Surprise, including Sun
11 City Grand, Wickenburg, the Maricopa portion of
12 Wickenburg, Wittman, and Youngtown.

13 In population numbers it's perfectly balanced
14 right at the ideal, so zero deviation and 0.00 percent.

15 In citizen voting age population, it's at
16 17 percent Latino or Hispanic, 75 percent Non-Hispanic
17 White, 4 percent Black or African American, 2 percent
18 Asian American or Pacific Islander, and 2 percent
19 Native American. In single race voting age population,
20 it's 1 percent Native American.

21 On a competitiveness score, this is not a
22 competitive district. Its vote spread is 27 percent,
23 and there is no swing elections. The Republican
24 candidate won all nine of the elections we're following
25 for that. And with the citizen voting age population

1 score we're not tracking this district for
2 effectiveness on a -- from a Voting Rights perspective.

3 On compactness scores, this is, again, a mix
4 of urban West Valley and large rural areas, so it's
5 area in perimeter are quite high. The Reock score is
6 0.29 percent. Convex Hull is 0.61. Grofman is 8.82.
7 Schwartzberg is 2.49, and Polsby Popper is at 0.16.

8 Any questions or comments about Congressional
9 District 9?

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think District 9 is a
11 great example of the challenges we have in Arizona,
12 that the shapes of the nonurban districts often aren't
13 as clean in order to capture, you know, communities of
14 interest in non-populated areas, and I think it's just
15 consistent with that, and so I think we've done a good
16 job of maximizing, you know, the six criteria to the
17 extent possible. Again, you know, trying to achieve
18 competitiveness would cause detriment to the ability of
19 communities of interest in these rural areas to be
20 represented, so I think we've balanced the needs well.

21 MR. JOHNSON: We did have a couple of comments
22 from the public at different hearings about West Valley
23 not wanting to be in a rural district. It's worth
24 noting, as the Chair just mentioned, this is an ongoing
25 challenge in the decades of redistricting. 68 percent

1 of District 9's population is in Maricopa County, so it
2 is -- from a population voters perspective it's
3 definitely a Maricopa County district that has the
4 rural areas making up the other 32 or so percent, so
5 they're a significant vote, but they're not a majority
6 by any means.

7 If there are no other comments we can jump to
8 the legislative maps.

9 MR. FLAHAN: All right. Let me get those.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Doug, would you be able
11 to -- or Mark send us those data sheets that you've
12 been showing now that we've reviewed all of those for
13 the CDs, or did you already post them somewhere?

14 MR. FLAHAN: I can -- I can send them over to
15 you.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

17 MR. FLAHAN: I can also post them.

18 MR. JOHNSON: We covered District 1 through 7
19 last time. We're going to see if we can get through 8
20 through 20 this time.

21 So we'll start with District 8, where, again,
22 entirely in Maricopa County with this one. We're
23 looking at Tempe, Scottsdale, and the Salt River
24 Reservation.

25 On the numbers, this direct as currently drawn

1 is a little short of the target population. It's about
2 just under 9,000 people short, or 3.77 percent.

3 On citizen voting age population, it's
4 16 percent Hispanic or Latino, 70 percent Non-Hispanic
5 White, 6 percent Non-Hispanic Black or African
6 American, 4 percent Asian American or Pacific Islander,
7 and 4 percent Native American. By single race voting
8 age population it's at 3 percent Non-Hispanic Native
9 American.

10 Competitiveness scale, it's not a competitive
11 district. The vote spread is at 19.8 percent, and on
12 the nine elections we're analyzing for swing, the
13 Democratic candidate won all 9. Given the low citizen
14 voting age population it's not a district we are
15 tracking for Voting Rights Act effectiveness.

16 On the compactness scores, again, it's an
17 urban district. The area and perimeter scores are very
18 low. Reock score is 0.3. The Convex Hull score is
19 0.6. The Grofman is 6.81. Schwartzberg is 1.92, and
20 Polsby Popper is 0.27.

21 Comments or questions about this district?

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Similar to the
23 congressional map, you know, I'll start with LD8, but
24 it will, you know, have ripple effects through, you
25 know, the rest of Mesa and Gilbert. I think we've done

1 a great job on the six criteria. The one area that I
2 think that we can improve on has to do again with
3 respecting city lines. So if you, you know, put up
4 Scottsdale on the legislative map, you know, it's
5 divided quite a bit, so I think we could potentially
6 unify certain areas of Scottsdale a little more without
7 compromising the other criteria, but small adjustments.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Let's jump into District 9 then.

9 Now moving down to the East Valley, District
10 9, you can see it's -- there you go. So although in
11 Mesa, it does have a slice of Tempe. I believe that's
12 a freeway. And then it has a small piece of Chandler
13 and a big piece of Gilbert.

14 On the population numbers, we are just short
15 of ideal. It's about 1,800 people short of the ideal
16 population, or 0.79 percent short.

17 In terms of citizen voting age population,
18 Hispanics and Latinos are right at 25 percent.
19 Non-Hispanic White is at 61 percent. Black or African
20 American is 6 percent. Asian American, 3 percent. And
21 Non-Hispanic Native Americans are 4 percent of citizen
22 voting age population, and Non-Hispanic Native
23 Americans are 3 percent of single race voting age
24 population.

25 On a competitiveness spread, this is a

1 competitive district at 6.8 percent. It's in the
2 Commission's defined 7 percent range, so it's
3 competitive, but not in the 4 percent highly
4 competitive range. And by swing elections, it also has
5 like one swing election. So the Democratic candidates
6 won eight of the elections we're looking at, and the
7 Republicans won one. It's not a race we're tracking
8 for Voting Rights Act effectiveness, but the 2018
9 governor's election is one of those nine elections that
10 the Republican candidate won. The Democratic candidate
11 got 47 percent, and the Democratic Latino candidate did
12 win the attorney general's election that year.

13 Moving to compactness data, again, a highly
14 urbanized, very densely populated district. The
15 polygon score is one of the lowest in the state in
16 terms of area and in terms of perimeter. The Reock
17 score is 0.57. The Convex Hull score is 0.89. Grofman
18 score is 4.43. Schwartzberg is 1.25, and Polsby Popper
19 is 0.64. No surprises. When we look at this district
20 it comes out quite well on the compactness scores.

21 Any questions or comments about District 9?

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it, again, meets
23 all criteria. I think, you know, looking at the areas
24 that we can improve, you know, looking at, again,
25 mapping Gilbert, we'll see that Gilbert -- just all of

1 the East Valley trying to be more sensitive to the city
2 lines. And the other thing that I would like to just
3 ensure is that the district is maximizing the Latino
4 community and the Asian community to do a deeper dive
5 in where those pockets are. That's just part of the
6 public comment that we've been hearing. But, you know,
7 the district does a great job with the criteria.

8 MR. JOHNSON: If there is no other comments
9 we'll move just a few steps east to District 10.

10 And as you can see on the map, District 10 is
11 a heavily Mesa district. It does have a piece of the
12 north end of Gilbert in there, and the rest of it is
13 all mixed up.

14 Looking at the numbers, it's a little short.
15 It's about just over 5,900 people short of ideal, or
16 2.49 percent under the ideal.

17 In terms of citizen voting age population,
18 we're at 13 percent Latino or Hispanic, 79 percent
19 Non-Hispanic White, 4 percent Non-Hispanic Black,
20 2 percent Non-Hispanic Asian American or Pacific
21 Islander, and 2 percent Non-Hispanic Native American.
22 By single race voting age population we're at 1 percent
23 Non-Hispanic Native American.

24 This district does not count as competitive.
25 Its vote spread is 21.3 percent, and the Republican

1 candidate won all nine of the elections we're looking
2 at for swing election, and it's not a district we're
3 tracking for Voting Rights Act effectiveness.

4 On the compactness scores, again, it's an
5 urban score. It scores well on the area and perimeter
6 scores. On Reock it's at 0.49. Convex Hull it's 0.84.
7 Grofman it's 4.92. Schwartzberg, 1.39, and Polsby
8 Popper is 0.52. And, again, as you look at it you can
9 see it's a -- it's scoring well on the competitiveness
10 scores.

11 Comments or questions?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: My comment about keeping
13 the eastern valley cities a little bit more whole goes
14 for all of these legislative districts, although Mesa
15 is -- the size of Mesa will make it difficult, but, you
16 know, we could clean up some of this to respect the
17 city lines a little more with all of east -- the
18 southeast valley.

19 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Let's jump to District
20 11.

21 So with this we move out of the East Valley
22 and in South Phoenix. You can see we're getting a
23 Phoenix and Guadalupe district here, which also brings
24 in South Mountain. So it's got the little city of
25 Guadalupe, and then all of the rest of the population

1 is Phoenix.

2 On the deviation scores, this one is actually
3 a little overpopulated by about 9,700 people, or
4 4.08 percent.

5 Citizen voting age population, it's actually
6 just under majority Latino. It's at 49 percent, but a
7 big plurality at 49 percent. The next largest group is
8 White at 20 points back at 27 percent, and then this by
9 far is our largest African-American or Black district
10 with Non-Hispanic or African-American population being
11 19 percent of the citizen voting age population. Asian
12 Americans and Pacific Islanders are another 3 percent
13 of the citizen voting age population, and the Native
14 American population is also 3 percent. By single race
15 voting age population, Native Americans are 2 percent
16 in this district.

17 It is not competitive with a 54 percent vote
18 spread, and it does not have any swing election. It's
19 a 9-0 Democratic wins on our nine swing elections.

20 This is a district, obviously, that we're
21 tracking for Voting Rights Act effectiveness, and, yes,
22 it certainly performs. The Democratic Latino candidate
23 for governor got 70.7 percent of the vote in 2018, and
24 the Democratic Latino candidate for attorney general
25 got 76 percent of the vote in the 2018 election, so it

1 definitely performs.

2 On compactness scores, again, it's another
3 urban densely populated district so it's area and
4 perimeter scores are both low. On Reock it's 0.54. On
5 Convex Hull it's 0.85. Grofman it's 4.85.
6 Schwartzberg at 1.37, and Polsby Popper is 0.53. So as
7 you look at it, you know, it's a highly compact
8 district, right up there in the scores with the two
9 Mesa districts we were just looking at.

10 Any comments or questions about District 11?

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: District 11 makes sense
12 for all the reasons you clarified. It gives the Latino
13 community representation and, you know, the African
14 American community seems to be a little bit more, you
15 know, spread out, but this is an area where, you know,
16 it's more of a center, and I think it captures that
17 community well. The South Mountain border, you know,
18 it's a very different community of interest in District
19 12. So in addition to the physical barrier, more
20 importantly it's separating communities of interest. I
21 think it does a good job.

22 MR. JOHNSON: That puts us into District 12.

23 So briefly just look at the map. This is the
24 Ahwatukee region of Phoenix. We do get -- the Kyrene
25 School District is united in this district, so it does

1 go down into the Gila River Reservation to pick up the
2 portion that is in Kyrene and then gets some of Tempe
3 and extends into the East Valley. So by the numbers,
4 city by city it's Chandler -- actually, I believe
5 Chandler is the biggest. Yes, Chandler is the biggest
6 population count by city. It also has a large portion
7 of Gilbert and obviously a lot of population from
8 Phoenix. And then you can see past the break in the
9 screen about 36,000 people from Tempe as well.

10 So moving over to the demographics, District
11 12, we're overpopulated by 8,450, or 3.55 percent. The
12 citizen voting population we're at 15 percent Latino or
13 Hispanic, 71 percent Non-Hispanic White, 6 percent
14 Black or African American, 6 percent Asian American or
15 Pacific Islander, 2 percent Native American. By single
16 race voting age population we're also at 2 percent
17 Native American.

18 This district on the vote spread does not fall
19 in our defined competitive ranges, but it is close.
20 It's at 9.7 percent on the vote spread, and it does
21 have a swing election, so by the swing election scores
22 this is a competitive district, with the Democrats
23 winning eight of the elections and the Republicans
24 winning one.

25 With the citizen voting age scores we're not

1 tracking this for effectiveness, and it turns out the
2 one Republican win is the 2018 governor's race.

3 On compactness scores we're at -- again, it's
4 an urban district, so low area in perimeter scores.
5 Reock is 0.32. Convex Hull, 0.72. Grofman, 5.9.
6 Schwartzberg, 1.66, and Polsby Popper is at 0.36.

7 Any comments or questions about District 12?

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we've heard
9 quite a bit of feedback about whether you want to call
10 it a thumb or a panhandle. I think the district does
11 an excellent job on the criteria, and the fact that it
12 approaches competitiveness is a bonus. There are
13 communities of interest within that strip that I think,
14 you know, need to be fixed up a little bit. That's the
15 weakness. But, again, these are minor adjustments and
16 doesn't really compromise its adherence to the six
17 Constitutional criteria.

18 MR. JOHNSON: And it's a good lead into a
19 perfectly square district as we've got in the entire
20 map, so part of the reason for the panhandle is the
21 compactness of District 12 with District 13, so let's
22 jump into that.

23 So as you can see from the report, this is an
24 entirely Maricopa County district. This consists of
25 Chandler, Gilbert, and then the Sun Lakes community.

1 And as you can see, almost perfectly square.

2 In terms of the population numbers, it's a
3 little bit overpopulated at 4,800 over the ideal, which
4 is 2.02 percent over.

5 The citizen voting age population numbers,
6 this is a 70 percent White, Non-Hispanic White
7 district. The remainder, 15 percent is Hispanic or
8 Latino, 5 percent is Black or African American,
9 8 percent Asian American, and 1 percent Native American
10 by citizen voting age population and the single race
11 VAP.

12 This is a competitive district. Its vote
13 spread is 4.4 percent, so just by decimal points out of
14 our highly competitive range, but well within our
15 7 percent competitive range. And it does have a swing
16 election, so the Republicans won eight elections, the
17 Democratic candidate won one of the elections in this
18 district, so it does have a swing score that triggers
19 it competitive by that measure as well.

20 Compactness-wise, it's urban East Valley so
21 area and perimeter scores are very low. The Reock
22 score is 0.62. Convex Hull is 0.99, almost a full 1.
23 The Grofman score is 4.01, and Schwartzberg is 1.13,
24 and Polsby Popper is 0.78. So going through, this is
25 by most measures our most compact district in the map.

1 Comments or questions?

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we approve of
3 this district. I think it meets all six criteria quite
4 well.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Then we'll move east to District
6 14, which is also very close to a square. Not quite as
7 close as 13, but very close itself. This does -- I
8 used the county line as the southern and eastern
9 border, so it's all Maricopa County. It is population
10 from Gilbert, from Mesa, and from Queen Creek, the
11 Maricopa County portion of Queen Creek.

12 So jumping into the numbers here, 14, we're
13 about 1,500 overpopulated, or 0.66 percent, so we're
14 pretty close on the population count, at less than
15 1 percent deviation.

16 Citizen voting age population, again, we're
17 75 percent White, Non-Hispanic White, 15 percent
18 Hispanic or Latino by CVAP, 4 percent Black or African
19 American, 5 percent Asian American and Pacific
20 Islander, and 1 percent Native American by both citizen
21 voting age population and single race voting age
22 population.

23 On competitiveness, this is not a competitive
24 district at 24.5 percent vote spread, and it does not
25 have any swing elections. It's also not a district

1 we're tracking for Voting Rights Act effectiveness.

2 On compactness, again, very low area in
3 perimeter scores due to its urban densely packed
4 nature. Reock score is 0.58. Convex Hull is 0.92,
5 Grofman 4.31, Schwartzberg 1.22, and Polsby Popper is
6 0.68. So not quite as perfectly square as the previous
7 district, but awfully darn close as well.

8 Any comments or questions?

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think this is another
10 example of where we see a lack of competitiveness due
11 to the importance of keeping communities of interest
12 together, you know. It's a lot of like-minded people,
13 and it works quite well for that community. So I think
14 it meets the criteria very well, with the caveat that I
15 mentioned earlier, you know, trying to adjust maybe
16 small lines to keep cities together in East Valley as
17 much as possible.

18 MR. JOHNSON: If there aren't any other
19 comments we'll swing out a little bit to see District
20 15. In this case we're blending Maricopa and Pinal
21 County territory. There we go. In Maricopa we're
22 getting Apache Junction and Mesa population. In Pinal
23 we're getting the rest of -- getting Apache Junction
24 and Queen Creek and San Tan Valley, and there is one
25 zero population piece of Florence in there as well, so

1 it's a lot of the communities that are right along the
2 Maricopa border in Pinal County.

3 Population-wise, it's short by 5,900, or
4 2.48 percent of the ideal population.

5 And in terms of citizen voting age population,
6 we're at 77 percent Non-Hispanic White, 16 percent
7 Hispanic or Latino, 3 percent Black or African
8 American, and 2 percent each for Asian Pacific Islander
9 and for Non-Hispanic American. And then single race
10 voting age population we're at 1 percent Non-Hispanic
11 Native American.

12 Competitiveness score, it's not a competitive
13 district at 23.5 percent. In none of the nine
14 elections we're looking at did it swing. The
15 Republican candidate won all 9. We're not tracking
16 this for Voting Rights Act effectiveness.

17 Compactness scores, again, a fairly densely
18 populated district. It's area and perimeter scores are
19 relatively low, although not as low as its neighbors in
20 the -- fully in the East Valley. Reock score is 0.39.
21 Convex Hull is 0.71. Grofman is 6.48. Schwartzberg is
22 1.83, and Polsby Popper is 0.3.

23 Any comments or questions about District 15?

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Again, I think it meets
25 criteria very well. The lack of competitiveness is

1 understandable regarding communities of interest. I
2 think we -- along the communities of interest line I
3 think we could make some adjustments to do a better job
4 of keeping some communities of interest together, for
5 example, you know, just looking at Queen Creek and San
6 Tan. But, you know, again minor adjustments that just
7 go to perfecting adhering to the Constitutional
8 criteria rather than meeting criteria. There is just
9 small adjustments that can make it even better.

10 MR. JOHNSON: We'll jump to District 16 then.
11 There we go. Okay. So District 16, as you can see,
12 the report that Mark has on the screen starts in
13 Maricopa County with a little bit of Buckeye, a little
14 bit of Gila Crossing population. Then we get into
15 Maricopa County and the St. Johns community in Maricopa
16 County, not the better known St. Johns out east.

17 In Pinal County we're then getting Avra
18 Valley, Picture Rocks -- sorry. Yeah, I jumped my
19 counties there. In Pima County Avra Valley, Picture
20 Rocks, a piece of Tucson, Tucson Estates, and Tucson
21 Mountain area.

22 In Pinal we're getting Ak-Chin Village,
23 Arizona City, Blackwater, Casa Blanca, Casa Grande,
24 Coolidge, Eloy, Goodyear Village, all of the community
25 of Maricopa. I won't go through all of these, but

1 Sacaton is the largest of the last of the small
2 communities in there. So we are getting Maricopa,
3 Pinal, and Pima County population in District 16.

4 By the numbers it's a little short at about
5 3,300 short, or 1.39 percent.

6 Citizen voting age population, it's 29 percent
7 Hispanic or Latino, 54 percent Non-Hispanic White,
8 6 percent Non-Hispanic Black or African American,
9 2 percent Asian American and Pacific Islander, and
10 8 percent Non-Hispanic Native American by CVAP, and
11 6 percent Non-Hispanic Native American by single race
12 voting population.

13 This is a competitive district. At
14 4.2 percent vote spread it's just outside -- literally
15 0.2 percent outside our highly competitive range and
16 well within our 7 percent competitive range. It does
17 not, however, have a swing election in the nine
18 elections we're looking at, and it's not a district
19 we're tracking for Voting Rights effectiveness.

20 As we are getting out to a more rural
21 district, our area and perimeter scores have gone up.
22 By the Reock test it's 0.36 on compactness. Convex
23 Hull is 0.47, Grofman is 8.2, Schwartzberg is 2.31, and
24 Polsby Popper is 0.19 percent.

25 Any questions or comments about District 16?

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm presuming from my
2 colleagues that the silence implies that you feel that
3 it meets criteria. Should we just presume for the sake
4 of record that silence means approval?

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think all of us think
6 that these do meet the Constitutional criteria, and we
7 recognize that this exercise is to go through and
8 really to confirm and check that. All of us have ideas
9 and thoughts, and we're hearing more from the public on
10 things we're going to want to bring up when we revisit
11 the maps and try to look at the final maps, but that
12 doesn't change that I think we all are in agreement
13 that these meet the Constitutional criteria.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you for that
15 clarification. If anybody has a different perception,
16 please state.

17 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, this is
18 just a review to the agenda, and that's how I'm taking
19 it, so I agree with Commissioner Mehl. In terms of
20 approval or consideration, we're not there yet, but
21 good overview.

22 Thank you, Doug. Appreciate it.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, but I just want
24 to make sure that we're all on the same page that what
25 Commissioner Mehl clarified was that his silence

1 implies that he believes that it meets Constitutional
2 criteria. It does not mean that he doesn't have ideas
3 for improvement and change, as we all do, and that's
4 not what we're getting into here, although I'm alluding
5 to some things. But -- but, you know, if your silence
6 means anything other than you believe that it fulfills
7 the basic Constitutional criteria, you know, just say
8 otherwise if that is not the case.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I'm just going to
10 say it's a good review, Madam Chair, so thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I will concur. I
12 mean, I think that there are -- I really appreciate
13 this review. It's giving some really good background,
14 but there are some things where I might have some
15 concerns, but I'm not -- I'm taking it all in at this
16 time I guess is the best thing I can say. I'm trying
17 to best understand it as it relates to our
18 Constitutional criteria. And a part of why I want the
19 data after this is to go back and take a closer look at
20 that. And I think you've raised some important issues
21 that relate to Constitutional criteria regarding
22 boundaries of cities and counties and communities and
23 doing our best to connect those, so this review, I
24 think, has been really helpful for that.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I'll then continue

1 to articulate my clarification that I believe that they
2 adhere to the Constitutional criteria, again, with the
3 caveat that, of course, there is room for significant
4 improvement, which is the commitment of the Commission
5 moving forward and why we're doing public hearings.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. I agree.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. With that, move
9 forward, Doug, please.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. We'll jump into District
11 17 then. Moving down to the Tucson region here.

12 As you can see, this is a district that has
13 some Pinal County population. It has -- there we go --
14 so in Pima we're getting Marana, Oro Valley, Catalina,
15 Picture Rocks -- you can see the whole list here --
16 Tanque Verde, and a large population, 55,000 plus, from
17 Tucson, Tucson Mountains, and Vail.

18 In Pinal County we're getting Saddlebrooke,
19 Saddlebrooke Ranch, and a piece of Marana that crosses
20 the county line, and then the Red Rock area.

21 So numbers by geography, this district is
22 short on population at 7,900 short, or 3.33 percent.
23 There we go.

24 By citizen voting age population we're at
25 15 percent Hispanic or Latino and 78 percent

1 Non-Hispanic White, 2 percent Black or African
2 American, 3 percent Asian American or Pacific Islander,
3 and 1 percent Native American by both the citizen
4 voting age population and single race voting age
5 population.

6 This district at 9.9 percent is not in our
7 competitive spread, but it is not too far outside. And
8 of the nine elections we're tracking it does not have
9 any swing elections. The Republican candidate won all
10 9. And it's not a district we're tracking for Voting
11 Rights Act effectiveness.

12 On compactness scores, it's -- obviously you
13 can see the area and perimeter scores there. Kind of
14 a -- you might call this a suburban district, so not as
15 dense as some of the urban districts or as small as
16 some of the urban districts, but not too high, either.
17 Reock is at 0.27. Convex Hull is 0.65. Grofman it's
18 8.06. Schwartzberg it's 2.27, and Polsby Popper is at
19 0.19 percent.

20 Any comments or questions about this district?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, for the record, I
22 will say that I think this district has alternatives
23 that would better meet Constitutional criteria for
24 compactness and keeping communities together,
25 communities of interest and communities in general.

1 There are a lot of communities here who are split up in
2 this district, so from a Constitutional perspective I
3 think that this district could be redone to better meet
4 our Constitutional criteria.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: From my perspective, I
6 think this is an example of a district that requires
7 real struggle with Constitutional criteria. I see it
8 as, you know, an attempt to keep communities of
9 interest together, to help those who, you know,
10 identify as people that don't want to live in an urban
11 city a voice to elect, you know, a leader of their
12 choice. And sometimes, you know, in order to empower
13 communities of interest, you know, there are
14 adjustments in the other criteria, and I think it's
15 going to require, you know, additional study and
16 thought, and each Commissioner, you know, ultimately
17 will need to decide for him or herself, you know, where
18 things fall in terms of the Constitutional criteria,
19 but I think there is no easy -- easy answer here. But
20 in my mind it meets Constitutional criteria because it
21 is an explicit attempt to keep like-minded communities
22 of interest together around an urban area, and the
23 further you get outside of urban areas, to keep
24 communities of interest together sometimes the shapes
25 aren't ideal. So obviously we'll be spending a lot

1 more time, I think, debating the Constitutional
2 criteria and how to best configure lines in this area.

3 MR. JOHNSON: If there is no other comments or
4 questions, we'll jump into our final three for today,
5 so, with District 18.

6 District 18, as you can see, is all Pima
7 County. So we're getting Casas Adobes, Catalina
8 Foothills, and then the rest of the population is
9 Tucson.

10 On the number side it's somewhat overpopulated
11 by 5,600, or 2.36 percent.

12 By citizen voting age population it's
13 19 percent Hispanic or Latino, 73 percent Non-Hispanic
14 White, 4 percent Non-Hispanic Black, 3 percent
15 Non-Hispanic Asian, and 1 percent Non-Hispanic Native
16 American by both citizen voting age population and
17 single race voting age population.

18 The vote spread in this district is
19 17.3 percent, and it does not have any swing elections
20 in the nine we're looking at. The Democratic candidate
21 won all nine.

22 On compactness scores, its area and perimeter
23 scores are low. Reock is 0.27. Convex Hull is 0.68.
24 Grofman score is 7.66. Schwartzberg is 1.16, and
25 Polsby Popper is 0.21.

1 Any comments or questions about this district?

2 If you want we can jump to District 19.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The only thing I will
4 mention is that I think that we -- to better meet the
5 Constitutional requirements District 17 and District 18
6 could be looked at.

7 MR. JOHNSON: Going to District 19, this takes
8 us out into the southeast corner again. As you can see
9 on the map, we've got all of Greenlee County. All of
10 Graham makes up for the San Carlos reservation land,
11 all of Cochise County, the northeastern portion of
12 Santa Cruz county.

13 And then in Pima County -- challenging Mark to
14 keep up with me here. So in Pima County it gets --
15 there we go -- Corona de Tucson. Green Valley is
16 obviously the big population. It gets Sahuarita and
17 then about 5,000 people in the southern tip of Tucson.

18 Jumping over to the demographics, it's just
19 over 10,000 people short, or 4.23 percent short.

20 Citizen voting age population, we're at
21 26 percent Hispanic or Latino, 68 percent Non-Hispanic
22 White, 3 percent Non-Hispanic Black or African
23 American, 2 percent Non-Hispanic Asian or Pacific
24 Islander, and 1 percent Native American by both citizen
25 voting age population and by single race voting age

1 population.

2 On competitiveness, the vote spread is
3 19.1 percent, and the -- there are no swing elections.
4 Republican candidate won all nine elections here, and
5 we're not tracking for Voting Rights effectiveness.

6 As a much more rural district, this district
7 polygon area score is quite high, as is its perimeter
8 score. It's Reock score is 0.4. Convex Hull is 0.83.
9 Grofman is 6.14. Schwartzberg is 1.73, and Polsby
10 Popper is 0.33.

11 Any questions or comments about District 19?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think based on the
13 public feedback we're hearing there is -- you know,
14 some would like to see Santa Cruz County whole. It's
15 divided in our map. I'm not sure that it's possible to
16 keep it whole without compromising communities of
17 interest, so I think that there is an explanation for
18 why -- an appropriate explanation for why Santa Cruz
19 has been divided. It's to keep communities of interest
20 organized better together, but obviously that's
21 something we can continue to take a look at, and if
22 there is ways to improve it we will. That was a
23 tradeoff that I think, you know, we noticed but needed
24 to do.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Then offering some folks respite

1 from my fascinating voice, I'm sure, we've got our last
2 district today. We'll finish up the next ten
3 legislative districts in the next business meeting, but
4 we will jump into District 20 here.

5 And, again, this is entirely in the Tucson
6 region, entirely in Pima County. And as you can see,
7 we've got Flowing Wells, South Tucson, Tucson
8 Mountains, Valencia West, and then the overwhelming
9 share of the population is from city of Tucson itself,
10 about 194,000 of 243,000 people.

11 Looking at the demographics in District 20,
12 we're overpopulated by 4,600 and change, or about
13 1.95 percent.

14 Citizen voting age population, we are at
15 48 percent Hispanic or Latino, so this is a plurality
16 Latino citizen voting age population district. We're
17 at 42 percent Non-Hispanic White, 4 percent Black or
18 African American, 3 percent Asian American or Pacific
19 Islander, and by CVAP we're at 3 percent Non-Hispanic
20 Native American. By single race voting age population
21 we're at 2 percent Non-Hispanic Native American.

22 This district is not competitive. Its vote
23 spread score is 52.7 percent, and there are no swing
24 elections in this district. The Democratic candidate
25 won all 9.

1 This is a district that we're tracking for
2 Voting Rights Act performance, and it is an effective
3 district for electing the Latino-preferred candidate,
4 with the Latino Democratic candidate for governor
5 winning with 70.8 percent of the vote and the Latino
6 Democratic candidate for attorney general winning with
7 77.1 percent of the vote, so even though it's a little
8 short of majority by CVAP, it clearly is an effective
9 district.

10 By the compactness scores, it has a densely
11 populated urban district. This is a very low area in
12 perimeter scores. On the Reock it's at 0.49. Convex
13 Hull is at 0.72. Grofman is at 6.7. Schwartzberg is
14 at 1.89, and Polsby Popper is 0.28 percent.

15 Any comments or questions on this?

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it meets
17 Constitutional criteria, and I think the lack of
18 competitiveness is a result of the communities of
19 interest. It's a majority minority district, Latino
20 community, and it makes sense.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could you clarify what
22 you're outlining right now, Mark?

23 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah. That's the tribal
24 reservation. I wanted to show why we have the straight
25 line that goes up into District 20 from District 23, so

1 I just wanted to show you guys that we are respecting
2 the tribal nations reservation boundary.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are there any people who
4 live in that little piece right there?

5 MR. FLAHAN: In this strip right here? I can
6 tell you. Hold on a second. In that area, 313. Hold
7 on. This one census block takes up a lot of spots down
8 there, so 313. If I remove this bottom census block
9 here so I actually miss a little bit of the straight
10 line, it's 184.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

12 MR. FLAHAN: Mm-hmm.

13 MR. JOHNSON: If there are no other questions
14 or comments, this will wrap up our legislative review
15 for today, and as I said before, we finished going
16 through all the congressional districts.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Doug. It's
18 helpful to review them, and I think it will position
19 us, as I said before to, you know, be in a better spot
20 with our deliberations, and it better trains the
21 Commissioners to be thinking through the lens of the
22 six Constitutional criteria as we, you know, will again
23 deliberate, so very helpful.

24 If there is no other questions or comments
25 from my colleagues, we can move on.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to say thank
2 you. I did find when we look at these as units like
3 several at a time it really does help because we get so
4 caught up as we're going through with each individual
5 district, so I appreciate this review.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you very
7 much, Mark and Doug.

8 With that we will move on to Agenda Item
9 Number VI, discussion of future agenda item requests.

10 I have one. It looks like we are likely to
11 have one business meeting for sure before deliberation,
12 and that will be in two weeks from today. In addition
13 to, you know, the polarization report and finishing the
14 last 10 legislative districts, one thing that's on my
15 mind is we have not made any decisions or really
16 thoroughly discussed our approach to live public
17 comments during the deliberation phase, and so maybe we
18 should put this on the agenda just for us to have a
19 thoughtful conversation about the ways in which we want
20 to engage the public once the 30-day period is over and
21 we have formally started the deliberations. Do we want
22 live comments, not live comments, et cetera. Okay?

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And you're not asking us
24 to opine on that today; you're asking us to put it on
25 the agenda?

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm suggesting that that
2 might be a good agenda item for two weeks from today.
3 We'll be skipping next week. I'll announce that again
4 when we confirm our next meeting date, but, you know,
5 to have a thoughtful conversation about what the best
6 strategy is.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other thoughts about
9 a business item to add? Again, it may be our last
10 business meeting before we start deliberations so this
11 is our opportunity to get any business in that you
12 think is important.

13 Okay. We'll move to Agenda Item Number VII,
14 announcement. Let's make a bunch of announcements. We
15 are in the midst of our draft map tour. I encourage
16 the public to check out our website and participate.
17 Tonight the main location will be in Cottonwood and
18 also North Phoenix. Tomorrow will be in Sun City and
19 San Carlos. Please note that masks will be required in
20 San Carlos. These -- both of these hearings will start
21 at 6:00 p.m.

22 On Thursday -- oh, and I think we're going to
23 be in Wickenburg on Wednesday as well. On Thursday,
24 6:00 p.m., we'll be in Scottsdale and Anthem. Friday
25 we will have our virtual Town Hall hearing from noon to

1 2, and then Saturday at 10:00 a.m. we'll be in Prescott
2 Valley and also Navajo County at the home of the Hopi
3 tribe, and I believe masks are required on the
4 reservation as well.

5 And then we will -- as I mentioned earlier, we
6 will be skipping the business meeting next Tuesday, so
7 we will have the week of Thanksgiving mostly off.

8 And what I would also love to do, Brian and
9 Lori, can we also confirm the deliberation dates that
10 we have locked in for -- so the public, our broader
11 staff and all of us can make sure that we have all of
12 those dates earmarked and accounted for.

13 MR. SCHMITT: Let me just pull those up really
14 quickly.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And I also may
16 have just heard that public comments may have been down
17 for this meeting, and if that's the case, if there is
18 any issue with public comments you can always go to the
19 general website, the IRC comment page, and submit
20 comments that way. You could email the Commission. We
21 accept comments in many different formats.

22 MR. SCHMITT: All right. So the dates of the
23 decision meetings in December are December 6th, Monday,
24 December 6th; Thursday, December 9th.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you say -- did we

1 determine the hours?

2 MR. SCHMITT: I don't know if we decided on
3 hours yet. We'll get them posted as soon as we do.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

5 MR. SCHMITT: But I think we all talked about
6 having them pretty much all day with a few exceptions.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

8 MR. SCHMITT: Thursday, December 9th;
9 Thursday, December 16th; Friday, December 17th; Monday,
10 December 20th; Tuesday, December 21st; and Wednesday,
11 December 22nd.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. That's seven. Do
13 we only have seven, or did I miss one?

14 MR. SCHMITT: We will go back and double check
15 the dates.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I thought we had
17 eight, but we'll go back and double check, but let's
18 just make sure to all keep those seven dates for now
19 clear.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was wondering whether
21 it was also -- we have our business meeting. I have
22 something scheduled for December 7th, which I don't
23 know if that's the business meeting or if its a mapping
24 meeting, deliberation meeting, but I know I have
25 December 7th on my calendar as well.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Maybe that's the 8th
2 date and we're keeping it open for, I guess,
3 determination of how to best use time, so if others
4 have the 7th earmarked as well let's keep that.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If that's going to be a
6 decision date, then it changes my hotel rooms in
7 Phoenix, so if I'm going to -- if it's going to be a
8 business meeting I would come back to Tucson and do it
9 virtually. If it's going to be a decision day I'll
10 stay up and be there, which I can do, so if we can just
11 sort of make a decision if that's going to be a
12 decision day, which would be fine with me if we did.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We'll get this
14 nailed down in the next few days.

15 MR. SCHMITT: Yep. And we'll get it posted on
16 the website, too.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Any other
18 announcements?

19 So Agenda Item Number VIII, next meeting date.
20 In terms of a business meeting it will be two weeks
21 from today, and the public hearings we have announced
22 in our -- can be found, as always, on our website,
23 irc.az.gov.

24 Agenda Item Number IX, closing of public
25 comments. We will now close public comments. Please

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

8 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item Number X,
9 adjournment. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner
11 Lerner. I move to adjourn.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
13 I second.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If no further
15 discussion, Vice Chair Watchman.

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
24 an aye.

25 And with that, thank you, everybody, for your

1 service, for your time, and I hope to see many of the
2 public tonight in Cottonwood. That's where I'll be.

3 All right. Have a great day, everybody.

4 Thank you.

5 (Meeting concluded at 9:40 a.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings had upon the foregoing meeting are contained in the shorthand record made by me thereof, and that the foregoing 62 pages constitute a full, true, and correct transcript of said shorthand record, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 30th day of November, 2021.

Deborah L. Wilks

Deborah L. Wilks, RPR
Certified Court Reporter
Certificate No. 50849

* * *

I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206.

Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 30th day of November, 2021.

MCR

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058