

1 empowers the extremes of political rhetoric and action and
2 it makes governance very difficult; not impossible, but at
3 times so.

4 Bipartisan coalitions can't form because the
5 partisan stakes are so high with so little margin. Every
6 member's vote is decisive and defectors get what we would
7 say "flamed" in quotes, threatened, intimidated so that
8 every member's range of legislative motion is compressed.

9 The same is true when I served in the -- in the
10 Senate when it was 15-15. The resulting gridlock magnified
11 personal ambition in the Senate and it in turn fostered more
12 tactical and intense partisanship across them all, in the
13 House.

14 Wider margins in contrast relieved that pressure,
15 lowered the stakes, and thus make cross-partisan
16 maneuverability -- depending on issues of course -- but
17 allow that to be more possible and more productive. More
18 compromising is available without being so intimidated.

19 The same is true, I would proffer, for individual
20 districts. An excessively competitive district within the
21 narrowest possible margins will be a very unhappy district
22 with very unhappy lawmakers. And why is that? Because
23 there's no room for error.

24 The range of motion again is severally stricted
25 (verbatim) when there is no room to make a mistake.

1 Legislators who are constantly looking over their shoulders
2 trip more often. Legislators who must constantly walk a
3 tightrope cannot focus on representing the broad
4 constituencies of a district and nor can they do so
5 effectively.

6 And in practice hypercompetitive districts can be
7 contrived only -- hypercompetitive districts can be
8 contrived only when disparate communities of interest are
9 forced together in unhappy marriages.

10 I would therefore urge that we adopt a final
11 legislative map that is as sensitive as possible to these
12 realities but also reflects the political facts of our
13 state.

14 Numbers are numbers. Rural Arizona should stay
15 rural. Tribal Arizona should stay tribal. And district
16 lines should use city, town, county boundaries and other
17 geographic features wherever practicable as the constitution
18 requires.

19 Critically, the legislative maps should also be of
20 equal population -- this is my second point -- equal
21 population as our constitution also requires.

22 The legislative map that the IRC produced ten years
23 ago failed to do this and achieve this goal, systematically
24 overpopulating Republican majority districts and
25 underpopulating Democratic majority districts.

1 This Commission should avoid making the same
2 mistake and instead focus on producing a map that would
3 fairly represent the population of our state.

4 It is a truth about small things, that small things
5 many times have the largest consequences.

6 People looking back at this new -- relatively new
7 construct of the Independent Redistricting Commission will
8 make decisions on what you do and it will affect, as we
9 said, with significant repercussion, Arizonans for decades
10 to come.

11 So I wish you more than good luck. I wish you more
12 than good luck. If providence has any interest in the
13 affairs of men, then it must be in their details. And
14 surely this effort would merit that interest.

15 And, therefore, I wish you Godspeed, and I thank
16 you again for your diligence and the work and balancing and
17 the evaluating of all that's brought to you and to the
18 service of our state, I wish you Godspeed.

19 Thank you and I stand for any questions.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you so much,
21 Speaker Bowers, for joining us. I'm sure we have a bunch of
22 questions.

23 If my colleagues will allow, I'll start off with a
24 question.

25 You spoke about competitiveness as something that

1 we need to be a little cautious about and -- and focusing on
2 communities of interest.

3 As you look at the draft maps, do you feel that we
4 have caused any significant detriment to any communities of
5 interest in order to pursue competitiveness in these maps?

6 SPEAKER BOWERS: Well, in the East Valley the --
7 the nature of the communities across the state where they
8 grew, how they developed, the order of their development;
9 some are very new, they have new infrastructure, more
10 cultural morals and thoughts and dynamics, and I think
11 the -- the districts in the east side of town have been --
12 there's some communities there where we are not -- we would
13 propose and think that a tighter boundary configuration
14 around existing community boundaries might be in order for
15 your review.

16 I would say that competitiveness is a con- -- it's
17 a conditional kind of subsidiary criterion; it's not the
18 guiding criterion and it cannot harm, it cannot do detriment
19 to any of the other criterion, and I would -- I would
20 especially say to -- to these communities of interest.

21 And at times they may be difficult to define. But
22 there are shared common characteristics in goals and history
23 and values and even public virtues of education, an emphasis
24 on different types of application of education.

25 And I'm sure -- I can't imagine the thousands of

1 people that have stood before you on your tours to try to
2 describe what they feel is important, but I don't know of
3 any instance where they have been so significantly
4 diminished that -- that it becomes -- I don't want to use
5 the word farcical, but damaging. Damaging.

6 But I would always start on the other end of the
7 scale. I wouldn't start on the competitive scale; I would
8 start on the community scale and then look to equalize the
9 numbers in -- by population. That would -- I'm now just
10 talking, you know, kind of thinking.

11 And I don't even know if that was an answer.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, and -- thank you. No,
13 it's a dialogue, and it's an exchange of ideas and
14 information.

15 So with that, colleagues, questions?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'll -- I'll start out
17 with pretty much a similar question that I had with our
18 Democratic colleagues.

19 Just on a rural-urban split, your thoughts on how
20 can we best achieve that knowing that populations in the
21 rural areas, you mentioned population deviations --

22 SPEAKER BOWERS: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- from last time, and we
24 know that in our rural areas, it's very difficult very often
25 because the population isn't there and, yet, they don't want

1 to be with urban areas. We don't want to be with -- you
2 know, urban areas don't want to be with rural areas. It's
3 vice -- you know, both sides we hear that, and we've been
4 hearing that as we've been doing our public touring, a lot
5 of concerns from people in both areas, urban and rural.

6 So we -- we are trying to figure that out.
7 Population deviation might be one way to achieve that, but
8 you were mentioning -- you know, your comment about
9 population deviation would -- would suggest we move -- we
10 don't move in that direction. And I'm not saying what
11 direction because we don't know, but I'm just curious about
12 your thoughts about how do we best achieve meeting the needs
13 of the population and communities of interest in both rural
14 and urban areas.

15 SPEAKER BOWERS: I -- I'm grateful for the question
16 and it is rather a conundrum because fewer people live in a
17 lot of communities around in rural Arizona. And I raised in
18 rural Arizona up until recently had some useful possessions
19 in rural Arizona before the barbecue, and -- and have a long
20 history of relatives and friends who live mostly in eastern
21 areas of the state, and -- and I -- I must echo what -- what
22 I'm understanding you heard from so many people, that they
23 don't want to be -- have the spoke-in-the-hub system where
24 they have to spoke into a heavily populated urban area in
25 order to get sufficient numbers to have some population

1 equality. That's the -- that's the nut, isn't it?

2 And -- and so I would just say: As little a
3 deviation as possible. Err on smallest on population
4 deviation and on the largeness of getting rural Arizona,
5 keeping it rural in its representation.

6 It -- there is a different ethic in rural Arizona.
7 And when they complain about, you know, the state of
8 Maricopa or -- or the state of Pima County or whatever it
9 is, it's real to them.

10 And so I -- I would just err on -- on smaller is
11 better on all the -- there's a lot of other questions that
12 you have great counsel that can -- that help you.

13 But I would -- I wouldn't compromise the other
14 criteria on the altar of competitiveness. There is going to
15 be plenty of competition, this is going to be going at it.
16 This is going to bring a lot of people's interests up in our
17 system, so.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. And again, thank
19 you for being here, I really appreciate your time.

20 SPEAKER BOWERS: Oh. You're the one that put out
21 the work. The workhorses are on that side of the screen,
22 I'm just a show horse right now.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have another question, but
24 I'm going to turn it over to my colleagues first out of
25 fairness.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is Commissioner Mehl.

2 Speaker Bowers, I welcome you to being here, thank
3 you. Thank you for your incredible service to this state.

4 And my question may be a hard one to answer, but as
5 you look at the map, I know that none of the five
6 Commissioners are happy with the draft maps, in case anyone
7 is wondering, and we all know we have quite a bit of work
8 that we'll be doing very quickly starting next Monday.

9 Is there any district or area of the state that you
10 think we particularly missed out on -- missed on or any --
11 any particular place you would want to point that you would
12 hope we'd -- to see a change?

13 SPEAKER BOWERS: I would be -- I would be -- hm.

14 I -- I would like to talk about one particular
15 population and it probably -- it's probably come up a
16 hundred times if you came anywhere near a retirement center,
17 retirement area, and that is age.

18 And there are areas of -- where elderly people feel
19 that their particular needs -- and now that I've stepped
20 over from fall into winter of my life -- early winter, early
21 winter, that I -- I would, Dave, as you -- with your
22 expertise and all the expertise of the membership, I would
23 use that a little bit, that might be a population to focus
24 on at least. There are many needs that go well beyond the
25 individual members living in a community: hospitalization,

1 access to healthcare.

2 But -- but we did make specific written comments
3 that would probably be more -- you could refer to them
4 easier, Mr. Mehl. Specifically on Districts 9 and 10 and on
5 Districts 2 and 4. That would be areas where I would just
6 ask you if you might just give a little focus to.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Thank you.

8 SPEAKER BOWERS: Thank you, sir.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chair Neuberg, I have another
10 question if that's okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Speaker Bowers --

13 SPEAKER BOWERS: Yes, ma'am.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- I appreciate your long
15 history because that can actually provide some perspective.
16 I'm very interested in your whole comments about
17 competitiveness. We hear a lot about competitiveness,
18 different perspectives that exist very often, probably
19 because of the depending on -- on the party as part of it.

20 When Proposition 106 was created at the time, and
21 actually it was enforced and proposed in 2000, and it was --
22 and Republicans at that time -- many Republicans did
23 actually support this and help write the proposition, and it
24 did list competitiveness right in the statement. So that's
25 why I'm particularly drawn about your comments about that.

1 Part of my -- why my understanding was in doing my
2 homework in becoming part of the Commission is it became --
3 it was something that was important is because there was so
4 few candidates that were running for office because the
5 districts were so far apart within districts, and that's all
6 we're focused is within districts as our Chair has noted,
7 we're not looking outside of that. But there were actually
8 in 1998, there was a record low number of candidates because
9 the districts were so skewed. So there was less choice
10 actually for -- for voters, which is part of why the
11 proposition then was passed.

12 So I'm -- I'm particularly interested in when you
13 talk about competitiveness as actually and having within
14 your -- with within the Senate or within the House, having
15 more of above even split or one- or two-vote split between
16 that, that that makes it more difficult to actually
17 legislate? And also why having districts within districts,
18 why that competitiveness would harm the people in those
19 districts?

20 I'm not sure if I'm being clear on my question, but
21 I'm intrigued by the fact that you feel that when you have
22 good competition that actually will harm folks within their
23 districts more and harm the legislative process more versus
24 bring compromise when you have people who have to actually
25 sit down and talk to one another because it is an even split

1 versus something where we say we don't actually have to try
2 for their votes, we just -- we know we have the votes
3 already.

4 So if you could clarify or give some examples of
5 how that worked. 'Cause I do remember when -- when the
6 legislature has been close, it seems like more compromise
7 does occur. Because you may not be able to get every vote
8 in your own party, so you have to reach across the aisle.
9 Which is really what Arizonans want, we want to have balance
10 in our perspectives. And -- and, really, most Arizonans
11 agree on most things when you look at studies that have been
12 shown on what the direction of our state should be.

13 So -- so you mention how competitiveness harms the
14 process and, yet, when I look historically, I don't see
15 that, so I would be is curious if you could give some
16 examples of -- of your perspective. That would help me
17 understand it a little better.

18 SPEAKER BOWERS: I will try to do that and thank
19 you.

20 One thing in your -- I will call it a little
21 prelude to your question, when you talked about when this
22 all began, I was there and -- and was approached and people
23 told me why they needed to do it. And one of the reasons,
24 frankly from my Democratic friends, they said we -- we're
25 going to look for every way we can to try to get a little

1 better shot at elections, we want to increase our -- our
2 capacity and so we think this is one way to do it.

3 But I would -- I would have to say that the intent
4 of the voter is not what I vote on, I have to look at what
5 the wording is in what was voted on by the voter. The
6 rhetoric of campaigns is so often reduced to three words on
7 a sign "It's for the children," "Save our schools," some --
8 not about the details.

9 And it's those details that I think are most
10 illuminative of what this construct and what your task
11 presents you, and it very clearly says that competitiveness
12 within districts is the last criterion. I shouldn't have
13 said it that way. That competitiveness is the last
14 criterion. And I think that applies within districts as
15 well as -- as the numbers statewide, that we are looking at
16 more than numerical equality of districts and their -- their
17 cohesive values that hold them together, what makes them a
18 community of interest whose representatives should represent
19 those values, concepts, cultural values, et cetera.

20 And, again, I -- I may be -- sometimes the more I
21 talk I think, nope, please translate what I just said.

22 We -- we are the -- let me speak then specifically.

23 It is my experience especially in very tight
24 numbers in the House and the Senate now, that one person is
25 the king and I get to meet that king often -- or the queen

1 in the case of a couple of bills that came through; and that
2 they insisted that while we had worked -- there are many --
3 there are many Democrats, and we don't have any -- that's
4 kind of a funny thing that we focus on Republicans and
5 Democrats, yet a third of our population is neither, or the
6 voting population. But -- but many of my Democratic friends
7 would come to me and say -- and they do, especially now, we
8 want to work together, and I say I'm for it, I want to.
9 We've got water issues, we've got border issues, we've got
10 educational issues, healthcare issues, surely there's things
11 that we can work on in here.

12 But when it comes through the process and gets on
13 the board, if one particular group party has said we're
14 taking a position on this bill, no one bucks that -- no one
15 wants to cross that line. And that's where I mean when I
16 say the legislative maneuverability; I can give a little on
17 this point but please consider this point; is there a
18 give-and-take?

19 That maneuverability is restricted because if
20 you're not in a -- I won't use names because there's been
21 a -- it's highly polarized right now. But if you're not
22 with us, you're against us and -- and we will do a listing
23 of all the poor votes you did and then show your poor votes
24 compared to so-and-so's poor votes in order to flame you and
25 primary you and beat you up.

1 And I'll -- I'll grant you, I don't know of many of
2 my colleagues who don't have some ambition to be elected and
3 that they want to represent their district, but not all
4 districts have the same community of interest and so they --
5 they're thinking is diverted away from their personal
6 constituencies towards a partisan value.

7 And with the -- the difficulties of what we face
8 and some very large challenges coming at us, I'm -- I'm more
9 sensitive maybe to this -- to this right now.

10 I think of a very good friend of mine that I gave
11 away turkeys with -- somebody else's turkeys, I got to be
12 there and hand them to people as they came by, but I served
13 with him early on, his first years, and he has become very,
14 very dis- -- disconnected, disappointed, disjointed. He
15 wasn't of my party. But he just says it's so -- it's so
16 highly polarized that one person will vote maybe a more
17 conservatively radical or liberal radical depending on what
18 flip of the coin moniker we want to hang on somebody; but if
19 the vote depends on that person, then we will not get the
20 broad base coalition that we have. We can't get there.

21 And so it's kind of along those lines that my
22 frustration and focus has -- has developed on.

23 Did -- was that of any help?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I guess I'm still not
25 understanding -- and that may be just me --

1 SPEAKER BOWERS: Well, no --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- so I don't want to belabor
3 the point, but it might be my -- I don't understand how
4 one -- we -- we're certainly watching this in Congress,
5 right? We have the one vote. And my thought is if you, my
6 question was kind of some examples perhaps 'cause I guess
7 I'm not grasping how if you have to reach across the aisle
8 that's -- to get the votes that you need, that's a problem.

9 I don't understand why if -- if you have somebody
10 in your own party who says "no, unless I get this," but you
11 know that all you need is one or two from the other party
12 because you're close in votes, why that's a problem?

13 Nor -- or in the same way that if I'm in a district
14 and I -- I know I have to serve all Independents,
15 Republicans, and Democrats within that district because it
16 was a close vote and we share, that I -- that I can't just
17 focus on one or the other?

18 I -- that's where I'm struggling to understand that
19 perspective. But, again, it might be my struggle. But --
20 if -- but I'm serving within the district and I know the
21 only way I get elected to that district is if I listen to
22 all the voices not just one party, I don't -- that's where I
23 look at competitiveness within a district, that I can only
24 be elected if I hear from my Republican, my Democrat and my
25 Independents. I can't be elected if I just listen to the

1 Democrats or the Republicans. And that's, I guess, that was
2 kind of my question to you on that.

3 And I don't want to belabor this because others
4 have questions, but that's where my -- my question was
5 coming from was trying to understand why that's a problem
6 versus saying "I will now listen to everybody that's in my
7 district"?

8 SPEAKER BOWERS: That's -- that's --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I apologize to you, Speaker,
10 for -- for belaboring this point.

11 SPEAKER BOWERS: No, I think what you have
12 presented is an intellectual view from the outside looking
13 at how it should happen, and I think it's absolutely
14 supportable and the -- but the reality does not match the
15 proposition. The reality is that if I have to reach across
16 the aisle, then the person I go to is immediately
17 identified, and that the intense pressure brought by the
18 narrow margins of the district is felt on -- on individual
19 members not to defect.

20 I believe you mentioned that we usually agree, and
21 if you looked at all the bills that go on the board, most of
22 them pass by -- by larger margins than our -- our partisan
23 differences; but on the bills of real -- on the big stuff,
24 if I have to go across the aisle, it usually means it's
25 going to fail because the price for someone coming to help

1 us is really great.

2 There have been exceptions. A couple of times
3 that's -- that's worked. But it's -- but I remember back we
4 had what was called the "Sue nation" and there was several
5 legislators named Sue and this -- I can't remember who sang
6 that song, you know, A Boy Named Sue. But there was several
7 named legis- -- and they -- we could kind of say all right
8 this bloc and it was like five, six, we knew that they
9 would -- they were a very maneuverable bloc, and so we
10 didn't get into the tight stuff, we were already working to
11 get a larger net on -- of compromise on an issue because we
12 knew we had to go there; and then -- and then it was easier
13 to go across the aisle because they were not as intimidated
14 to join us.

15 And -- and so the -- maybe the fault is on my side.
16 I don't want to over explain it, but when there's not --
17 when you're restricted so tightly in what you can do and how
18 you can act and with whom you can be seen, it does affect
19 your ability to create a governance structure that lifts the
20 state and moves us forward. It's clunky. It's at times
21 goes in counter -- in a contrary direction.

22 I -- maybe I should stop.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think this has been very
24 constructive dialogue. I do want to bring it back to the
25 issues that the Commission is constitutionally mandated to

1 address. As much as we all are very focused on good
2 governance, that's something that goes a little bit beyond
3 our purview --

4 SPEAKER BOWERS: Yeah, sure.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- we must follow the
6 constitutional criteria as we are redistricting.

7 So along those lines, I know that I'm struggling a
8 little bit with the criteria in this particular space: I'm
9 looking at geographical boundaries, big mountain ranges,
10 rivers, et cetera. I'm looking at county lines, both of
11 which are very old. Meaning we don't control where the
12 geographical boundaries are, the counties were established
13 before the migration patterns of Arizona and our populations
14 have centered.

15 What is your opinion of balancing geographic
16 boundaries/county lines versus communities of interest?
17 Because these are going to be very issues that we're going
18 to have to debate back and forth and there will be
19 compromises on them.

20 SPEAKER BOWERS: I think that's an excellent
21 observation.

22 I've had occasion to see some very old maps,
23 there's a map in Globe that I like to refer to occasionally
24 that's hanging in a building, and the only road on the map
25 goes between Phoenix and Globe. I'm sorry, it's a railroad.

1 It looks around down south and comes up, and then there's
2 record lines going over, but no big roads across the state
3 like we see today.

4 So as populations grew, which I think speaks to
5 communities of interest, they didn't grow because they were
6 in Pima County -- they could have because it was a huge
7 county, as was Coconino, I think there was like four
8 original big ones, but they grew because of water
9 availability, natural resource usage. So the focus of the
10 community was very structured. There's things that they had
11 to do to survive and protect themselves and make sure they
12 had water, et cetera.

13 Now, as you rightly view and note, now with
14 advancing technologies, we're growing beyond county
15 boundaries quickly. Some of the supervisors may have to --
16 like in Pinal County and Maricopa County for -- for purposes
17 of creating transportation corridors when their tax base is
18 still greatly reduced, and Maricopa County has this mammoth
19 tax base and yet all of Maricopa County want to drive out of
20 town on a weekend and go to other counties. Those are
21 instances, Madam Chairwoman, that -- that illuminate that
22 communities of interest gets bigger in importance as a
23 natural consequence of time, and competitiveness is
24 important, but it isn't the fulcrum.

25 The fulcrum is where does the people live and how

1 do they relate to each other and what are their views
2 commonly about their -- the Gila Valley, the -- it could be
3 a tribal area, it could be an agricultural zone where we
4 have -- we used to have the largest agricultural output in
5 the world in some of our areas of our state. And -- and I
6 think you're right in your -- in your dissection of these
7 criteria, maybe county lines isn't the big thing anymore,
8 unless you had such a great disparity that you didn't see in
9 the next decade would change much in a tax base or in a
10 transportation capability, or that they would need to
11 leverage for schools and educational opportunities.

12 That's when, you know, boundaries really start to
13 matter.

14 Fire districts and access to medical care that way.
15 Sometimes districts really matter when it gets down to the
16 nuts and bolts of how to -- how to fund things.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So if I hear you correctly,
18 I'm hearing that some of the county lines, some of the
19 geographic boundaries, they're to be respected but not at
20 the expense of keeping the fundamental communities of
21 interest together?

22 SPEAKER BOWERS: I think that's fair.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

24 SPEAKER BOWERS: I think that's fair.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

1 SPEAKER BOWERS: Respect them where you can.

2 If -- if I lived in Gila County which has 3 percent
3 private property versus Maricopa County which has the -- the
4 reverse, I mean it's the big county so it's not like
5 97 percent, but you could see how, in that case, you may
6 want to be careful not to force one particular group who
7 need tax relief and help and more funds generated from one
8 that already had it. But where you can, you take those into
9 advice.

10 And you've got -- you've got a brain trust on
11 this -- on this committee and staff assistance that can do
12 that and be very helpful.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Colleagues, other questions?

14 SPEAKER BOWERS: Hey, I've been in meetings like
15 this.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I'm going to presume
17 that you did an excellent job of addressing everyone's
18 questions.

19 And, no, it's been an informative afternoon, and if
20 there are aren't any other questions and -- and,
21 Speaker Bowers, if there's anything you want to sum up
22 before we, you know, move forward, please do so.

23 SPEAKER BOWERS: Just to use the written comments
24 that Karen -- President Fann, it's not Karen, it's
25 President Fann, I'm sorry, that she and I have developed for

1 you, that might be helpful as well.

2 So thank you.

3 Again, it's not a thankless job because many of us
4 are very thankful, it's a hard job; and to be able to
5 balance all that you do requires a lot of wisdom and -- and
6 a lot of input, and you've certainly gone out of your way to
7 make sure that you've had plenty of that, and I'm
8 appreciative of you taking this assignment and I wish you
9 every good thing. Every good thing.

10 So thank you for giving me the time to be with you.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you very much for being
13 here.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, thank you
16 Speaker Bowers. We -- we deeply appreciate the -- the
17 thoughtful contributions from you; we look forward to the
18 remarks from Senator Fann and the minority leaders as well,
19 and I can promise you we will take all of this feedback to
20 heart and give it the deepest consideration.

21 And -- and as I said to, you know, your -- your
22 counterparts earlier, if as we're moving forward if there's
23 feedback or -- or, you know, any dialogue that you'd like to
24 continue along the deliberation process, please feel free to
25 chime in.

1 I'd like to remind everybody that not everything we
2 do is we're ascribing meaning to, meaning sometimes we make
3 mistakes or, you know, we can keep our eyes on many issues,
4 but if we're forgetting something or, you know, there's a
5 red flag, we do hope everyone in the community chimes in,
6 alerts us so that that we can do the best job that we can.

7 SPEAKER BOWERS: Thank you. Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you,
9 Speaker Bowers.

10 If there's no other questions, we will move forward
11 to Agenda Item No. V, which is the next meeting date.

12 I'd like to remind everybody that we have a public
13 hearing tonight, 6:00 p.m. in Mesa; and I -- then tomorrow
14 we have a virtual hearing from noon to 2:00 depending on the
15 number of people who are dialing in to speak; and then
16 Tuesday (verbatim) we look forward to being in Tucson, and I
17 believe we'll also be in Maryvale on Saturday; and then on
18 Monday morning, I look forward to convening with a formal
19 quorum with my colleagues to begin the deliberate -- the
20 deliberative process.

21 And so with that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VI,
22 closing of public comments.

23 We'll now close public comments. Please note,
24 members of the Commission may not discuss items that are not
25 specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant

1 to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action taken as a result of public
2 comment will be limited to directing staff to study the
3 matter, responding to any criticism, or scheduling the
4 matter for further consideration and decision at a later
5 date.

6 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VII,
7 adjournment.

8 I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman motions
10 to adjourn, Madam Chair.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,
13 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 an
22 aye.

23 And with that, thank you everybody for this very
24 substantive, I think, constructive dialogue. I look forward
25 to seeing everybody tonight in Mesa, tomorrow virtually,

1 Saturday Tucson/Maryvale, and Monday with our deliberations.

2 Have a great day. Bye-bye.

3 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 1:36 p.m.).

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 "This transcript represents an unofficial record.

22 Please consult the accompanying video for the official
23 record of IRC proceedings."

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

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

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

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 27th of December, 2021.



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

* * *

I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 27th of December, 2021.



Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058