

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Morning Session

December 16, 2021

9:00 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)

I N D E X

	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	ITEM NO. I	4
4	ITEM I (A)	4
5	ITEM I (B)	6
6	ITEM NO. II	6
7	ITEM II (A)	6
8	ITEM II (B)	6
9	MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES	7
10	VOTE	7
11	ITEM NO. III	7
12	ITEM NO. IV	8
13	ITEM NO. V	11
14	ITEM NO. VI	11
15	MOTION TO START FROM CONGRESSIONAL MAP 7.1	19
16	VOTE	20
17	MOTION TO START FROM LEGISLATIVE MAP 12.0.1	65
18	DISCUSSION	65
19	VOTE	73
20	MOTION TO START FROM LEGISLATIVE MAP 12.1.1.	74
21	DISCUSSION	74
22	VOTE	87
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT  
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 9:00 a.m. on  
3 December 16, 2021, at the Kimpton Palomar Hotel,  
4 2 East Jefferson Street, Phoenix, Arizona, in the  
5 presence of the following Commissioners:

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

11 OTHERS PRESENT:

12 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director  
13 Ms. Lori Van Haren Deputy Director (via Webex)  
14 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant  
15 Mr. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator  
16 Ms. Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer

17 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group  
18 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group  
19 Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group  
20 Mr. Doug Johnson, NDC  
21 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC

22 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr  
23 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr  
24 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer  
25 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer

\* Spanish interpreter present

P R O C E E D I N G

1  
2  
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome, everybody.  
4 Welcome, team. It's wonderful to have our mapping team  
5 back in person with us, and welcome to the public.

6 Agenda Item I, call to order and roll call.  
7 I(A), call for quorum.

8 It is 9:01, Thursday, December 16, 2021. I  
9 call this meeting of the Independent Redistricting  
10 Commission to order.

11 For the record, the executive assistant,  
12 Valerie Neumann, will be taking roll. When your name  
13 is called please indicate you are present. I presume  
14 you will be able to do that, but if you're unable to  
15 respond verbally we ask you please type your name.

16 Val.

17 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

18 Vice Chair Watchman.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

20 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

22 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

24 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

1 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

3 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record also in  
4 attendance we have Executive Director Brian Schmitt;  
5 Deputy Director Lori Van Haren, who is appearing  
6 virtually; Community Outreach Coordinator Alex Pena;  
7 and Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer.

8 From our legal team we have Brett Johnson and  
9 Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer; Roy Herrera and  
10 Daniel Arellano from Ballard Spahr.

11 From the mapping consultants we've got Mark  
12 Flahan, Parker Bradshaw, and Brian Kingery from  
13 Timmons; Doug Johnson and Ivy Beller Sakansky from NDC  
14 Research.

15 Our transcriptionists today will be Angela  
16 Miller in the afternoon and Debbie Wilks in the  
17 morning.

18 And our Spanish interpreter, Brenda Lopez, is  
19 here.

20 Brenda, would you like to introduce yourself,  
21 please?

22 THE INTERPRETER. Good morning, everyone. My  
23 name is Brenda Lopez. I'm here to interpret in  
24 Spanish. If you need me I'll be present all day.

25 (Interpreter speaking in foreign language.)

1 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. That's  
2 everyone.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Val.  
4 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is  
5 present.

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

7 Val, was the Notice and Agenda for the  
8 commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance  
9 of today's meeting?

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

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

12 Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from  
13 12/13/2021. We have our (A), general session. We have  
14 (B). We have two executive session minutes. One was  
15 Agenda Item V, summary and discussion of the U.S.  
16 versus Texas case. Counsel provided legal advice on  
17 any application to our Arizona redistricting work. And  
18 we had Agenda Item VI, map drawing, where we discussed  
19 the timeline in coordinating our work with the  
20 Secretary of State's office.

21 Is there any discussion on the minutes from  
22 December 13th?

23 If no discussion I'll entertain a motion to  
24 approve the general session and two executive session  
25 minutes from December 13th.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner  
2 Lerner. I move to approve both the executive and  
3 general session minutes.

4           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.

5           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further  
6 discussion, Vice Chair Watchman.

7           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

8           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

9           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

10          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

11          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

12          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

13          COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

14          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberger is  
15 an aye.

16                 And with that the general session and  
17 executive session minutes are approved.

18                 We move to Agenda Item III, opportunity for  
19 public comments. Public comment will now open for a  
20 minimum of 30 minutes and remain open until the  
21 adjournment of the meeting. Comments will only be  
22 accepted electronically in writing on the link provided  
23 in the Notice and Agenda for this public meeting and  
24 will be limited to 3,000 characters. Please note  
25 members of the Commission may not discuss items that

1 are not specifically identified on the agenda.

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

7 I also want to make note that we're aware that  
8 we're having some technological challenges so if you're  
9 unable to submit your public comments you will be able  
10 to do so at [irc.az.gov/contact.us](http://irc.az.gov/contact.us).

11 With that we'll move to Agenda Item IV,  
12 discussion of public comments received prior to today's  
13 meeting. I open it up to my colleagues.

14 Okay. I would like to say a few words. As I  
15 read through the public comments and we continue to  
16 get, you know, just a huge volume and a lot of letters,  
17 we're reading them and we're studying them, I think a  
18 lot of the people in the state -- it's very natural to  
19 see all of the work we're doing through a partisan  
20 lens, but as I look through the debate and the dialogue  
21 going on in our community, and, in fact, in our press,  
22 I see it as a really healthy dialogue and debate in  
23 Arizona about some Constitutional disagreements,  
24 some -- some fuzzy areas about what our collective  
25 responsibilities are about. There are very healthy

1 differences.

2 I have great respect for the previous  
3 chairwoman from ten years ago. We learn from each  
4 other. I have -- you know, I would like to remind  
5 everybody when I interviewed I went on record  
6 criticizing the press, the past commission, because I  
7 felt that their interpretation of the Constitutional  
8 criteria went too far in -- in prioritizing  
9 competitiveness. I'm the same exact person that my  
10 colleagues actually chose, and when I view these  
11 arguments I really see it through the lens of this  
12 Constitutional debate about competitiveness, about  
13 communities of interest, and I would say probably the  
14 most important words, "significant detriment." And  
15 there are just honest, good faith disagreements about  
16 what that all means.

17 I think there is no better example in our  
18 state than LD17. I hear arguments on both sides, the  
19 importance of the competitive district in that area,  
20 and yet I can't help but be compelled to look at a  
21 group of people that share such vested interests in  
22 unincorporated areas that have remarkable political  
23 cohesion, that are fighting against a city influence  
24 where there is implication for bonds. There is water  
25 fighting where they're charged more for money. They're

1 wanting political representation in order to be able to  
2 build infrastructure, in order to potentially build  
3 transportation corridors to unite these communities of  
4 interest. And we know that simply, you know, building  
5 a competitive district in and of itself does not answer  
6 community of interest fundamental political needs. And  
7 so while the community will look at this fight through  
8 a political lens, I believe my colleagues and I are  
9 truly looking at it through the lens of what is our  
10 Constitutional responsibility.

11           Similarly with the majority minority  
12 districts: How far do you lean into things? How far  
13 do you push to go above and beyond what's required by  
14 the VRA? The VRA establishes a floor, not a ceiling.  
15 When does something cross over to prioritizing certain  
16 groups that you're not able to offer to the entire  
17 state?

18           So I understand the remarkable debate and  
19 conversation. It's very healthy. I think we're an  
20 example of what's right about democracy in this nation,  
21 and I encourage the public, the media, everybody have  
22 faith in the motivations behind all of what we're  
23 doing, but understand that there are some gray area in  
24 Constitutional requirement, and you're going to see  
25 that play out.

1           With that, if there is no further conversation  
2 about public comments, we can move to Agenda Item V,  
3 potential update, discussion, and potential action  
4 concerning polarization data and report presentation  
5 from mapping consultants regarding U.S. and Arizona  
6 Constitutional requirements. I have no idea if there  
7 is any updates from our mapping team.

8           MR. D. JOHNSON: Just on the polarized voting,  
9 there is no additional information provided today. I  
10 did want to note, though, looking at some of the public  
11 comments, that doesn't mean you don't already have a  
12 ton of data on polarized voting. Some of the folks  
13 online thought that meant there was no data. It's just  
14 that there is no additional data to add today. Thank  
15 you.

16           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. We're constantly  
17 reviewing data, and I think some of that data, you  
18 know, we'll need to solidify some districts to be able  
19 to do further in-depth analysis about what those  
20 districts will look like. Thank you.

21           With that we'll move to the main event, Agenda  
22 Item VI, draft map decision discussion. We will have  
23 legislative map drawing and congressional map drawing.  
24 I actually would like to share with my colleagues that  
25 this morning I do have a preference to start with the

1 congressional map, but I can be convinced otherwise if  
2 there is pushback on that.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I guess not.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Okay. So before  
5 we begin to talk about the draft maps I just want to  
6 share that I'm not a fan of either version of the CD  
7 new maps. I have found the process of watching my  
8 colleagues build their maps to be incredibly  
9 informative, helpful. It taught me. I understand  
10 where everybody may want to go. I understand different  
11 options in our state. It was not a waste of time at  
12 all.

13 However, I have to say that I cannot vote for  
14 either of the maps. Both of them go too far from the  
15 principles and some of the, you know, decisions that we  
16 collectively already made, and just from the most  
17 expedient perspective, and I hope this resonates with  
18 you the most, I actually believe that starting from our  
19 draft map may help us get to where we collectively need  
20 to go the fastest.

21 Let me be clear: I am not saying I'm in  
22 support of the draft map. There are fundamental  
23 changes I would like to see. I'm compelled by the  
24 argument of Mayor Gallego to increase the level of  
25 attention that a CD1 member of Congress would give to

1 Phoenix. However, I am nowhere near comfortable with  
2 the shifts that were made to shift it entirely into  
3 Phoenix. I think Phoenix can be very well-represented  
4 by one, two, actually three MOCs, but I do not believe  
5 that the city of Phoenix should dictate the entire  
6 congressional map that has implications for communities  
7 of interest that are rippled all over.

8 I'm in support of the original Latino  
9 Coalition submissions of their CDs 3 and 7. After  
10 further review I think they fit the state better and  
11 actually fits, you know, the Latinos' needs the most.  
12 I'm very open to negotiating boundaries, but just as a  
13 starting point. I think that it gets us where we need  
14 to be.

15 I'm a big fan of CD2 and 9, open to changes,  
16 but we went through a lot of Constitutional debate and  
17 argument to get there. We could relitigate it. I'm  
18 open to it. But there is a lot positive.

19 We have to compromise around the lines around  
20 Tucson. I'm compelled by -- by what the mayor there  
21 said about the population shifting east, at minimum a  
22 boundary of Campbell, where those lines will be. Let's  
23 not worry about that right now. That's going to be I  
24 think a smaller piece of where it's going to go, but  
25 there is a lot right about CD6 if we can get rid of

1 that thumb.

2 I thought the Yuma Gold split was just really  
3 spot on for many, many communities of interest, and I  
4 do not want to lose the additive value of what that map  
5 provided.

6 I also liked a lot of the East Valley changes.  
7 I liked the Chandler district, the Gilbert district.  
8 You know, I wanted to modify 9 a little bit, but I  
9 believe that those are smaller modifications.

10 I would like to see D4 consolidate Ahwatukee,  
11 Mesa, most of Tempe. I think we can go back to  
12 moderating these districts without compromising  
13 communities of interest.

14 So, now, I have a list of very specific ideas  
15 with mapping, so I don't want to suggest to you that  
16 I'm asking to go back to a draft map void of  
17 capitalizing on the learning and progress we've made.  
18 I think that pretty quickly we could correct some  
19 things. I could guide the conversation, to be honest.  
20 I would -- if my colleagues can even agree on this  
21 general strategy I think we could make quick, good  
22 progress without arguing slight lines that are going to  
23 shift things a point or two here. Let's leave that for  
24 another day, so -- and just in terms of other visions I  
25 have with this draft map, I would like to see D5

1 consolidate as much of Gilbert and Chandler as  
2 possible, uniting Queen Creek and San Tan. They're  
3 communities of interest that ought to be kept together.  
4 And as I mentioned before, I would like to get rid of  
5 the thumb. And in D2 I would like to keep the Copper  
6 Corridor together, including Coolidge, Superior. We'll  
7 obviously have to work around some population balance  
8 with Tucson.

9 So given where we are, my colleagues may be  
10 incredibly frustrated with me right now, but you're  
11 welcome to put a motion on the table to support any map  
12 that you want and try to, you know, get support. And I  
13 have to be honest, if the four of you had mutiny and  
14 could agree on something, it would give me nothing but  
15 pleasure to sit back and -- and watch.

16 Do I have any reactions? I could put a motion  
17 forth to start deliberation on the congressional map  
18 from our approved draft map, or I'll entertain just  
19 discussion on what I shared with my colleagues. You're  
20 welcome to, you know, express frustration or, you know,  
21 whatever, but -- but feedback would be helpful.

22 And I do want to let everybody know that  
23 public comment -- the public comment document is now  
24 working.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Good morning. This is

1 Commissioner York.

2 Commissioner Neuberg, I appreciate your  
3 observations and desire to sort of maybe get back to a  
4 little bit more where we were started, but I would  
5 argue that 9.0, which incorporated the Yuma split, some  
6 of the Latino Coalition requirements in 6 and 7 and in  
7 3, would be a less disruptive place to start.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other thoughts?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I, too, I mean, I  
10 appreciate your perspective, and -- and I'll just say  
11 that I think the -- just like my colleagues on the  
12 other side feel that their map -- I guess when I --  
13 when I looked at the map that we created, the  
14 congressional, 9.1.1, the one that we developed is  
15 almost balanced completely, and it is a 5-4 map right  
16 now, so it's very -- it's got competitive districts.  
17 It has a 3 -- well, it's a 5-4, but with competitive.  
18 It doesn't balance -- move one or the other too far.  
19 So I -- I actually do like the map that we created.

20 I guess I just have a quick -- and I  
21 understand going back, I mean, there were -- there was  
22 a lot of overlap, and I think I mentioned this on  
23 Monday, that I found that there was a lot of overlap  
24 between 9.1.1 and our draft, so I do see some  
25 commonalities there that could certainly be aligned.

1 I'm curious on whether or not -- and this may be  
2 premature to ask, whether or not we're moving in that  
3 direction also for the legislative or not. I don't  
4 know if you'd want to comment on that at this point.

5 But I'm open to looking at the draft map  
6 again. I guess I just wanted to make the statement  
7 that I think that the 9.1.1 map that we put forth  
8 really provides some very competitive CD6. It's an  
9 even district, for example, and -- and really has  
10 balance between the two parties in terms of numbers of  
11 legislative seats with a 5 -- well, a 4-4 plus one  
12 extremely competitive district. I'm open to the other.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I don't have the  
14 same idea with the legislative map, and if you would  
15 like to propose a motion to support your map, please  
16 do.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm trying to absorb what  
18 is happening, so I'll start off by just -- we're in the  
19 final throes. We've got we hope five meetings left to  
20 try to decide these maps. We've been together since  
21 February. And I would like to first just thank all of  
22 my Commissioners.

23 And, Chairwoman Neuberg, you've been an  
24 incredible strong leader, and I appreciate that today,  
25 or at least I did until a few minutes ago. And -- and

1 Doug York and I have spent way too much time together,  
2 and I have really -- we've developed a really positive  
3 relationship, and it's been enjoyable.

4 Vice Chair Watchman, Chairwoman -- or  
5 Commissioner Lerner, in spite of our very strong policy  
6 disagreements we've become friends, and I appreciate  
7 that. And it's going to be a tough last five days, but  
8 let's -- let's have at it. But I do -- but I do want  
9 to just thank all of you.

10 Going backwards is never my primary thought  
11 pattern, so, yes, it is a bit frustrating, and, yes, I  
12 could argue at great length why our 9.2.1 map is really  
13 a compromised map already and is one that we should  
14 work from, but I don't know if that's going to be  
15 fruitful because it doesn't sound like that that would  
16 be a good direction.

17 So we do have the draft map. We have the 9.0  
18 map, or in my mind we have the 9.2.1 map, and -- but I  
19 think there is a number of things that are at least in  
20 the 9.0 map -- I just pulled it up; I'm trying to  
21 remember it -- where I think we made progress that  
22 was -- that was fairly bipartisan.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I would love to  
24 return to that. I would -- I believe we can simply --  
25 colleagues, I know you all feel your map is the best

1 map. I simply feel that you went too far, and -- and  
2 rather than sit -- I think it's a wasteful exercise to  
3 go through each map and debate every -- rather than  
4 come together and do the -- the deliberation just  
5 together. So, again, I mean, you know, I would love it  
6 if all of you can, you know, get the votes you need.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I --

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Go ahead.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry. No. I was going  
11 to make a motion so we can have that -- keep moving on  
12 that discussion.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm going to make a  
15 motion because -- and I'll just preface it. We could  
16 go back and forth for quite a while on why each of our  
17 maps were better, but we're not going to get to a vote,  
18 so for the sake of at least getting this discussion  
19 going, and we each can potentially -- well, I guess  
20 I'll make a motion for 7.1, to go back to begin with  
21 7.1. I'm not quite sure how we'll be moving that  
22 process forward, so I will be very interested in how,  
23 and I'm hoping that everybody will be receptive. I  
24 mean, we worked -- I think both sides worked very hard  
25 on their other maps. I know from our perspective we

1 worked really hard to try to find balance and not  
2 overwhelm one side or the other, so I'll make this  
3 motion for discussion.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And which one was that?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 7.1, the draft map that  
6 the Chairwoman is proposing.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair  
8 Watchman seconds that motion.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?  
10 Vice Chair Watchman.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is  
19 an aye.

20 And with that we will move back to the draft  
21 map.

22 Okay. I have some ideas to fix it, and I hope  
23 my partners are going to be real partners in this,  
24 because you're right, some of your draft maps -- each  
25 of your draft maps have really good ideas. Are we

1 ready to start?

2 We can start with D1. If we could pull up the  
3 draft map, the congressional map, please.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, Madam Chair, while he's  
5 doing that I will note the draft map that we're  
6 starting from does have four competitive districts with  
7 one that's very close to competitive. The two -- the  
8 9.1.1 and 9.2.1 both have three with one that  
9 was competitive, so we do have one more competitive  
10 map.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you remind us in the  
12 draft maps which are the competitive districts?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. It's Districts 1, 4, 6,  
14 and 8, and District 2 is at 7.6 percent, so just  
15 6/10ths of a percent out of our competitive range. So  
16 1, 4, 6, and 8, with District 2 being very close.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would still argue that  
18 District 3 and District 7 don't take into the Latino  
19 Coalition suggestions, so if -- we were concerned about  
20 the polarization numbers so we grabbed the community of  
21 Peoria and moved that into District 3, so that changed  
22 the maps prior to -- significantly, so I'm still  
23 concerned with that.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have an important  
25 technical question. Commissioner Lerner, you -- you

1 motioned to approve a draft map, but I'm not sure the  
2 number was correct.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 7.1.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is that the correct --  
5 the iteration we approved?

6 MR. KINGERY: Yes, 7.1.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 7.1. That's what I  
8 thought -- that's what I thought I said.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So we're working from the  
11 approved draft map.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, the one that we  
14 went to -- yeah.

15 MR. KINGERY: And then moving forward, if you  
16 look at the development history tree that I'm showing  
17 right now, we've gone through CD8 and CD9 series, so  
18 now moving back CD7.1, the first for many maps that we  
19 make will be in the 10 series.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York, would  
21 you like to start with the -- the --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: You said -- Commissioner  
23 Neuberg, before we jumped into the discussion around  
24 competitiveness I thought we should talk about  
25 districts first. You had some suggestions, and we have

1 a comment from legal.

2 MR. SPENCER: Yes. We discussed this over  
3 here in legal, and open to your thoughts. We thought  
4 it might be cleaner to move the next map back into the  
5 eight series, starting with 8.5, because in order to  
6 keep the chain contiguous we would be leapfrogging over  
7 the 9s, and where we're going to go from here is going  
8 to be derived off of 7.1, so our suggestion is that we  
9 start at 8.5 for the next map, but I want to throw that  
10 out there.

11 MR. KINGERY: I'm fine with that.

12 MR. SPENCER: Roy, if you want to add  
13 anything.

14 MR. HERRERA: Well, the reason for that is I  
15 think that the last map that the Commission voted on  
16 was 8.1. The 9 series has never been voted on by the  
17 Commission, so as a result sticking with the 8 series  
18 would be easier from a chain perspective.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. What are we doing the  
20 vote now? Will the next map be 9 point --

21 MR. SPENCER: I think the next -- the next map  
22 that you create would be 8.5.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. And then when they  
24 vote on that the next map after that would become --

25 MR. FLAHAN: 9.3?

1 MR. SPENCER: Yeah, that seems to be the next  
2 available slot in the nine series. Is that doable?

3 MR. FLAHAN: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aren't we getting  
5 confusing by using the 8s and 9s again and can't you  
6 just draw a tree down from 7.1 and do 15.1 or 10.1 or  
7 whatever? I mean --

8 MR. HERRERA: Yeah, but part of the -- part of  
9 the issue is zigzag back, because you were at 8.1, are  
10 going back to 7.1, and then are going forward. I mean,  
11 as long as it's clearly delineated on the tree where we  
12 went, and I'll leave it to you guys as far as graphics  
13 go, so we can either do 8.5, or I suppose we can go to  
14 10.0, but, again, you have to show how it moved.

15 MR. FLAHAN: I guess the question we have on  
16 the tree is we show that 8.1 was voted on, so if we go  
17 back to and make an 8.4 or an 8.5, if we voted on that  
18 how do we show that two maps were voted on in the tree?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Put a date under it.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: It would -- it would be  
21 simpler to me, I think, to just go with 10 and just try  
22 to avoid overlapping phases. But it's easy to show 10  
23 will come off of 7. I mean, we're spending a lot of  
24 time debating what number to assign to it, but --

25 MR. HERRERA: So I think that's right. Again,

1 just make sure that on the map itself it clearly shows  
2 the movement from 8.1 to where we're going.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Of course.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: It's another tree.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: We'll call it 10.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Whatever we call  
7 it, if we could put the draft -- congressional draft  
8 map up.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So, Madam Chair, Vice  
10 Chair Watchman here. I'm interested to hear your  
11 thought on D1. Let's just go down the list, because I  
12 don't think that Shereen and I will be able to come to  
13 any agreement with Commissioner York and Commissioner  
14 Mehl, so I suggest we go down your list, and we'll  
15 debate each point.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Is everybody good  
17 with starting with D1, or, you know, I could also start  
18 with the majority minority districts, if anybody  
19 prefers.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think it's easier to  
21 start with the majority minority districts to set the  
22 beginning.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Once we set those it  
24 really has an impact on everything else.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I think it's easy.

1       What I would suggest is I think the original  
2       submissions by the Latino Coalition for their two  
3       Congressional Districts 3 and 7 were really coherent.  
4       You know, it did come into Maricopa County. 7 came  
5       into Tolleson and Avondale. But it really was a  
6       cohesive plan to attach to CD3, which made an effort to  
7       make sure that some -- you know, some Latino pockets  
8       would not be marginalized. I think it's a good  
9       starting point.

10               I would like to add to some of the District 3  
11       and incorporate some of Councilwoman Pastor's comments  
12       to make sure we're keeping historic districts,  
13       bio design, light rail, and sensitive, you know, things  
14       like that. But at least just as a starting point from  
15       which to move the lines, I'm very comfortable with the  
16       original Latino Coalition 7 and 3.

17               VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: If we could, Madam  
18       Chair, could we pull that chart up, the one that --  
19       this chart here? Oh, there we go. Thank you.

20               CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would also like to say  
21       that regarding CD7, I would, you know, not be in  
22       support of just the flat Latino Coalition congressional  
23       district. I believe that we need to incorporate, you  
24       know, at least as a start the Yuma Gold split, and then  
25       there, you know, we have a great visual of a map that

1 highlights the differences between the Latino Coalition  
2 and Yuma Gold in that Yuma area. And I think as a  
3 second stage when we're looking at population balancing  
4 and things like that we could, you know, fine-tune it.  
5 But that's my general idea about those two districts.  
6 Roughly, no -- no specific lines, but conceptually, and  
7 I think that it fits with our broader maps as it  
8 relates to 1, 4, 6, and the others.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, if we have  
10 comments to adjust those districts should we make those  
11 now, or do you want to get those districts in as is and  
12 work around to other districts? How would you like us  
13 to proceed?

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So, you know, thank you  
15 for that. I think most efficiently if we can  
16 collectively get a vision to the mapping team of  
17 what -- just in a big picture what the districts would  
18 look like, and you could maybe come back to us with,  
19 you know, population balance or, you know, something  
20 that's closer to doable, and then we can literally, you  
21 know, argue the fine lines. But -- but I think again  
22 we're going to get to the end goal faster this way  
23 because, yeah, I believe that.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Would you want to go  
25 through all of the recommendations that you have?

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:    Sure.

2           COMMISSIONER LERNER:    Because that would be  
3 helpful to hear --

4           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:    That would be helpful.  
5 Thank you.

6           COMMISSIONER LERNER:    -- what your vision is.

7           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:    Sure.  And mapping can  
8 take notes, and then maybe collectively we -- you know,  
9 this is what I would love:  I would love for us  
10 collectively to take my ideas, try to put the most  
11 coherent plan together, and then the five of us debate  
12 it.  So -- so I shared my visions of the Latino  
13 Coalition congressional districts.

14                   Regarding CD1, I shared I would like to move  
15 the boundary west a little bit as it relates to picking  
16 up a little bit more of the urban area in Phoenix.  I'm  
17 thinking we could consolidate North Central from  
18 Missouri to Thunderbird, follow the 19th Avenue as the  
19 west side border, pick up South Scottsdale.

20           MR. D. JOHNSON:    Chair, can you slow -- a  
21 little slower, please.

22           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:    Sorry.  Sorry.  Yeah,  
23 I'm -- I've consolidated my thoughts so I don't have to  
24 look at a map while I'm doing it.

25           MR. D. JOHNSON:    So, yeah, we got --

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Follow the 19th Avenue  
2 as the west side border, pick up South Scottsdale, the  
3 Salt River Gila Indian community, and parts of North  
4 Tempe.

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are you including  
6 Sunnyslope?

7           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. I don't believe so.  
8 I have to look at my notes where they are.

9           With CD2 -- are you ready for that? I would  
10 like to consolidate Florence, Coolidge, and the Copper  
11 Corridor.

12           With regard to CD3 from the I believe it's  
13 Latino map, I want to take in the historic  
14 neighborhoods up to Missouri from CD1 and then take the  
15 boundary in Glendale north to Northern.

16           MR. D. JOHNSON: Take that into CD1?

17           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. And then the  
18 western boundary --

19           COMMISSIONER YORK: No. It's into CD3 is what  
20 she said. She wants the corner of Glendale in CD3.

21           MR. D. JOHNSON: For the -- yeah, for the  
22 Glendale to Northern you're talking about that north --

23           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That area, exactly.

24           COMMISSIONER YORK: She had the western  
25 boundary of CD1 as 19th Avenue.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, okay. In Glendale, okay.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: See, I knew we'd be a  
3 team. You guys can help me figure this all out. And  
4 then the western boundary of 67th Avenue.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: For the western boundary of  
6 67th -- oh, you mean the --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: The top part of CD3, where  
8 CD3 goes up to Missouri, across over to 19th Avenue  
9 there, picks up the corner of Glendale.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: So that puts the west side  
12 of Glendale together in CD9 or 8, depending on how she  
13 feels.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: See, we get each other.  
15 Okay. Ready for more?

16 CD4 I would like to consolidate Ahwatukee,  
17 most of Tempe, and all of Mesa.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: You want to go Mesa south  
19 of the 60, or just the east Mesa there?

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't know yet. What  
21 do you think?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, in my head south of  
23 the freeway on -- south of the 60 and Queen Creek, San  
24 Tan, Chandler fit together, whereas Tempe and north of  
25 the freeway of Mesa fit together.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to make  
2           sure that we can consolidate Queen Creek and San Tan  
3           Valley in CD5. I think that makes the most sense.

4           COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I think we had --  
5           had it at Elliot, which was probably a pretty good in  
6           between for everything. That was where the border was,  
7           right, in 7.0 is what I'm looking at. The one -- 7.1.  
8           I'm sorry. It was at Elliot.

9           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you have -- Doug, do  
10          my Republican colleagues have any issue with it being  
11          at Elliot?

12          COMMISSIONER YORK: Either Elliot or up to I  
13          think it's -- is it Baseline that runs along south of  
14          the freeway, which I think is the Tempe border?

15          Brian, can you drop Tempe in there real quick?  
16          No. Okay. Give me -- give me the Mesa border.

17          So I think it's Baseline, Shereen.

18          MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, the current east-west  
19          border between 4 and 5 is Elliot as -- as we're looking  
20          at it on the draft map on the screen.

21          COMMISSIONER YORK: It's the north-south  
22          border.

23          COMMISSIONER LERNER: The north-south border.  
24          And then the east-west is the 101.

25          COMMISSIONER YORK: But I was saying that if

1 you were going to go out to Mesa along the 60 do you  
2 want to go as far east as Apache Junction, Commissioner  
3 Neuberg?

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm thinking.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're currently at Power  
6 Road is where -- which is --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, which --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which will -- that's --  
9 that's the current 7.1.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think Sossaman gets you  
11 out all the way to the eastern boundary of Mesa. Is it  
12 Sossaman there, Mark?

13 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, Sossaman would be the next  
14 major road over from Power.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean, I think that  
16 it's D4, D5 that we had in 7.1 worked pretty well, the  
17 boundaries that we had.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: But she asked to put the  
19 Salt River community into the -- into D1, so this --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm talking D -- oh, to  
21 move -- you want to move Salt River out of --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: D4.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- D4?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's what she has.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. I asked to put

1 Salt River Gila Indian community in CD1. They have  
2 expressed a comfort to go either way on the  
3 congressional side. They're very comfortable being  
4 represented by a member from the north of them.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: From our notes I've got the  
6 Salt River community of South Scottsdale and North  
7 Tempe all going into District 1.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Not Tempe. Tempe stays in  
9 D5 -- in D4.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. No. Parts of North  
11 Tempe can go into CD1.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Oh, so north of the river.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, again, we can argue  
14 some --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're just --

16 COMMISSIONER NEUBERG: -- of these finer lines  
17 together.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're starting--

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But this is a general  
20 framework of an idea.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would go --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So my feeling is before  
23 we start making changes I would like to hear Chair  
24 Neuberg's entire -- in fact, one suggestion would be  
25 since you have some very specific things you're looking

1 at have it drawn out for us so we can take a look at  
2 it, because otherwise I think we're going to get into  
3 what we're doing right now between Commissioner York  
4 and I, which is, well, is it Baseline, is it Elliot, is  
5 it Power, is it -- we're going to go back and forth,  
6 but --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But I'm okay with that  
8 because, you know, I don't have a specific map. I have  
9 ideas, and -- and my ideas will be better if you all  
10 interject your ideas while I'm fleshing it out, so I  
11 welcome --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- you know, the  
14 feedback. I think we're going to come up with a  
15 plausible map from which we can, you know, do some of  
16 the deeper, you know, disagreements, so let's just not  
17 get sidetracked by minutia right now.

18 Do you need further direction on that?

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: I guess from -- we'll see if  
20 we can get all of Mesa into CD4. If we -- if that's  
21 too many people would you rather that we get all the  
22 way to the Maricopa border and just have it a skinnier  
23 CD4, or that we keep it the way it's at Mesa and stop  
24 before we get to the border?

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What would be the pros

1 and cons of each? What would be the ripple effects?

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's just a matter of whether  
3 District 5 keeps kind of Mesa south of the freeway or  
4 whether District 5 keeps the far eastern part of Mesa.  
5 And, obviously, it would be easy to switch.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it's fine for D5  
7 to take the eastern part of Mesa.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The further in we go,  
9 the further east -- I'm just going to say the further  
10 east that that boundary goes for D4 the less  
11 competitive that district is going to be.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. We'll -- we'll  
13 work on that. I mean, that's -- you know, we're going  
14 to have to, you know, analyze the slight shifts of the  
15 lines, and I haven't gotten that. I mean, I have to be  
16 perfectly honest, I think my partisan colleagues spend  
17 far more time than me analyzing shifting streets. I  
18 focus on conceptual big picture communities of  
19 interest, you know, large, large things. I'm not as  
20 educated about, you know, how it shifts as quickly, but  
21 you guys will help me figure it out. I would like D4  
22 to be moderate. There is no reason for that to become  
23 more extreme. There is no communities of interest that  
24 would be compromised, in my opinion, by, you know,  
25 keeping that within competitive reach. And if my

1 colleagues disagree and feel that there is communities  
2 of interest that are being compromised, then please,  
3 you know, emphasize that.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I would just like to  
5 make one comment about I know that the Salt River  
6 Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, they are very  
7 interested in their connections with Mesa and Tempe.  
8 They have a lot -- they -- as I said before, they share  
9 a lot of common interests, and they serve on a lot of  
10 boards and commissions with those. Their kids go to  
11 school in Mesa. So I'm not sure why we would want to  
12 move them out of that district where they've been and  
13 where they -- they have those close relationships.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: From my perspective I  
15 believe that their priorities had more to do with the  
16 legislative map and where their children are going to  
17 elementary school. I think as it relates to federal  
18 representation and congressional, I think they felt if  
19 they could be kept whole that they could be  
20 well-represented by D1 or D4. And if there is  
21 different information I'm welcome to -- you know, happy  
22 to receive that feedback.

23 I think we all agree with CD6 that we need to  
24 get rid of the thumb, and I would like to argue over  
25 the borders around the Tucson area, Campbell, east of

1 Campbell, you know, Alverson, et cetera, at a later  
2 date.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: On this map would you take  
4 it at least to Campbell and work from there?

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct, at least to  
6 Campbell, incorporating at minimum the initial minimum  
7 suggestions of Mayor Romero and -- and combining that  
8 with Yuma Gold, as we said.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: That was going to be -- my  
10 thought is if you're coming to -- somewhere between the  
11 two versions in Tucson is where they population  
12 balance, so if it's okay with you we'll -- we'll fix  
13 somewhere in between, knowing that it's up to you to  
14 fine-tune that afterwards. We'll just get it balanced,  
15 if that's comfortable --

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm extremely  
17 comfortable with that.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman --

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- the -- the original  
21 Latino Coalition did not have Quail Creek or Green  
22 Valley in it, and -- and I would suggest that we would  
23 make that adjustment.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm very comfortable  
25 with that.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Into 7?

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Into 6.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Into 6.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: From 7 into 6.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 6 has got -- it already  
6 has Green Valley in there.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No. Green Valley is in  
9 7.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Am I looking at the  
11 wrong map?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is Sahuarita going to be  
13 unified? Where is Sahuarita?

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Sahuarita can go either  
15 way. For the moment I would leave it in 7.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We'll fine-tune  
17 that later. Nobody should make too many conclusions  
18 based on this initial --

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can I confirm? So that was  
20 Green Valley and what else?

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Quail Creek and the things  
22 east of them, then, connecting into 6.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think it was Green  
24 Valley in D6. Is that what you're saying, Commissioner  
25 Mehl?

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then Sahuarita in  
3 D7.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That's fine.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just to get  
6 clarification.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, the main part is  
8 Sahuarita. I think Quail Creek can technically be in  
9 Sahuarita, but Quail Creek would go with Green Valley,  
10 and then everything to the east connecting it, straight  
11 across to the east.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If we can jump to CD8  
13 when you're ready. I think we already talked about the  
14 Yuma Gold split, already CD7 taking in Tolleson and  
15 Avondale. With CD8, take in the area west of I-17,  
16 north of the 303, and on the southern end take in the  
17 area of -- west of 67th Avenue from D3.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Along the 60 corridor or  
19 Grand Avenue or all the way west to 303?

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You'll have to show me  
21 on the map.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you see the river  
23 there, the Agua Fria River there, Commissioner Neuberg?

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: So if you run up

1 diagonally along, that's the 60 Grand Avenue split, so  
2 on the north side of that is Sun City Grand. On the  
3 south side of that is Surprise and El Mirage.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Any  
5 recommendations from my colleagues?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I would just --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm unclear exactly.  
8 Could you just clarify again. I'm trying to find it on  
9 the map where you're talking about.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're talking about the --  
11 the retirement communities of Sun City, Sun City Grand,  
12 and Sun City West. El Mirage is the little thumb that  
13 sticks up there. If you would like to include that  
14 into CD8, all the way up along the 60 corridor, along  
15 Grand Avenue into Peoria.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So that's what I'm  
17 wondering, Commissioner York. Are you talking both  
18 sides of the 60?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I was asking  
20 Commissioner Neuberg if she had had a thought, because  
21 if you leave the south side of the 60 you leave Luke  
22 Air Force Base and the better part of Glendale,  
23 Goodyear in CD9.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. So I would like  
25 that unified in CD9.

1           COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. So the north side  
2 of the 60, which is the retirement communities --

3           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

4           COMMISSIONER YORK: -- would be 8. Okay.

5           COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, Chairwoman, I have a  
6 question on 7 coming into Maricopa, which I've never  
7 liked, but -- but I'm conceding to. In order for 7 to  
8 come into Tucson it's going to have too much population  
9 coming as north as it does, and, in fact, the  
10 communities of interest stop at the -- at the north  
11 edge of Tolleson and --

12           COMMISSIONER YORK: Avondale.

13           COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- and Avondale, so I  
14 would suggest taking that -- anything in 7 above  
15 Tolleson and Avondale out of 7. Otherwise you're --

16           COMMISSIONER YORK: The Latino Coalition's  
17 suggestion.

18           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Because their suggestion  
19 went beyond Avondale --

20           COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

21           COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- and Tolleson to the  
22 north, and there is no reason for it to. It's not --  
23 it's not a good community of interest, and you're going  
24 to need that population in order to accommodate going  
25 even to Campbell down in Tucson.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So we'll need to look at  
2 that. There is a strip, I think maybe southern -- I  
3 need to look at the boundaries of the Latino Coalition  
4 map, because I believe it's southern -- south of  
5 Northern there is a pocket around Glendale of more  
6 heavily Latino population that may be left out, so I do  
7 want to, you know, be able to go in there and make sure  
8 that they're put in an appropriate district. Doesn't  
9 have to be that district, but it needs to be a district  
10 that they will be represented well.

11           COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg, I  
12 think you picked up that little chunk of Glendale into  
13 CD3.

14           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

15           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, why would you want  
16 to change -- I mean, we don't want to overpack CD3.  
17 I'm concerned about that.

18           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

19           COMMISSIONER LERNER: And -- and I'm not sure  
20 why we would want to shift that northern boundary  
21 that -- that's -- I mean, that's -- for the CD 7. That  
22 takes in the Latino population. You're talking about  
23 shifting that south?

24           COMMISSIONER MEHL: But it took in more than  
25 the Latino population. It was --

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Of course it did,  
2 because you have to take in more than just one group,  
3 right, as you're doing any map, right, but that -- that  
4 actually is part of what Glendale has said, they feel  
5 that Northern is a good boundary for that district --  
6 for that -- for that population, I should say.

7           COMMISSIONER YORK: For CD3, yes.

8           COMMISSIONER LERNER: For CD7 works --

9           COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think so.

10          COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- as well. It goes  
11 right into there. And, again, are you going to pack  
12 CD3?

13          COMMISSIONER YORK: That's fine.

14          COMMISSIONER LERNER: So that's the concern.  
15 I just want to --

16          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's an area we're  
17 going to have to look at and do some population  
18 balancing. There is a difference with how far north it  
19 ought to go, and I'm not prepared to make that  
20 decision, nor do I think we necessarily need to hammer  
21 out that exact boundary before we lock into just a  
22 consensus of where we're going on -- on this  
23 congressional map. You're starting to fight about the  
24 specifics, and that's great. Maybe that means that I'm  
25 getting buy-in.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, if I can just  
2 clarify, you mentioned in CD8 adding the area west of  
3 I-17, north of 303. So do you want I-17 to be the  
4 border there between 3 and 8 in the north?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: 1 and --

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, I'm sorry. 1 and 8.  
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What do people think  
9 about that boundary?

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Of I-17?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think those are  
12 suggestions.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's logical.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Let's start with  
15 it.

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's fine.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: And can you -- you also  
18 mentioned west of 67th from D3 in the south part of D8.  
19 Can you give us more -- I'm not -- I'm not following  
20 where that is.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you show me on  
22 the -- on the cursor, please, on the map.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Is 67th Avenue the  
24 Glendale border on the west side, or is that -- or it's  
25 71st Avenue?

1 MR. FLAHAN: 67th is --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Got to speak up, Mark.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it's -- it's the  
4 effort to capture the Latino community in the north.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, I see. Okay. So I got  
6 it now, I think. So you're leaving the southeast --  
7 the southeast corner of Glendale will stay in D3.  
8 Everything west of 67th Avenue and Glendale would go  
9 to -- to D8.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: 8 and 9.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that will put -- that  
12 makes sense. So D8 will have all of -- that change  
13 will give -- make sure Glendale has all of D8 except  
14 for that southeast corner.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think that's not what  
18 she was saying. She wants that corner into D3.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. That area --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: She wants the -- the  
21 portion of Glendale to the west of that in D9, and the  
22 portion north up along the 60 -- scroll down, please.  
23 That north triangle in D8 up into pick up the  
24 communities of the -- of the retirement villages, the  
25 Sun City, Sun City Grand, Sun City West. She was

1 trying to put Luke Air Force Base and Glendale and  
2 Goodyear in the same CD. That's what I heard.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. I do want that.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And the retirement  
6 communities are going into D8 that weren't -- that  
7 aren't there right now, right, like Sun City --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- not being split?

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Now, you know, looking  
11 at these suggestions, changes, I really don't know to  
12 what -- I mean, I tried to be sensitive a little bit to  
13 population shifts and, you know, not creating ideas  
14 that would be impossible, but I -- but I think  
15 following these general ideas will lead us back to a  
16 map that respects communities of interest, but keeps,  
17 you know, a lot of good things. I think we can get D1,  
18 D6, you know, into the highly competitive range. I  
19 think D4 can be, you know, reasonably competitive. And  
20 the other thing when I look at the map that I think  
21 doesn't get enough credit, which is why I actually  
22 disagree with prioritizing, you know, competitiveness  
23 over other Constitutional criteria, I think you can,  
24 you know, run the risk of having your noncompetitive  
25 districts just get remarkably extreme, and I think when

1 we look at the numbers after this we're going to see  
2 some of the other districts that aren't competitive at  
3 least be within a range of not as crazy.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would suggest that we  
5 have given a significant amount of changes to mapping,  
6 that we would allow them to do some work.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: My feeling, too. I  
9 would at some point -- well, I guess we'll wait and  
10 provide comments at that point. I'm just still -- I  
11 still would like to see -- and maybe some of your  
12 changes did -- you talked about District 2, so I'll be  
13 interested to see how that works out, because I still  
14 have some of those concerns about where we are. But,  
15 yeah, I'm all for it.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to say, though,  
17 if -- I just want to reiterate, because we've been  
18 talking about CD from the very beginning of  
19 deliberation, we keep bringing up CD2 and the  
20 deliberations don't change, so we can keep bringing it  
21 up, but, you know, I'm not sure that it's a fruitful  
22 pursuit.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's -- it's something  
24 that we've talked about in terms of how to make it more  
25 competitive. That's the piece I'm talking about.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   Okay.

2           COMMISSIONER LERNER:   Because -- because  
3   it's -- I mean, I'm not -- I'm not talking about major  
4   changes, but things that we can tweak, just like we're  
5   talking about the others.

6           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   I really welcome that.  
7   I think part of what we have done so well is not  
8   shortchange any map and to give sufficient time and  
9   focus on competitiveness.  It's been right there up  
10   with all criteria constantly as part of our -- our  
11   conversation, and when we get, you know, the map and we  
12   look at all of, you know, the -- the variables we'll  
13   measure it by if there is a possibility of making it  
14   more competitive without causing detriment to  
15   communities of interest, because that's really in  
16   essence what, you know, empowerment is all about.  I'm  
17   all for it.

18          MR. D. JOHNSON:   And just on that note, Madam  
19   Chair, in your request we have San Tan Valley coming  
20   out of District 2 and Casa Grande and -- and the areas  
21   in the thumb going into District 2, so it may very well  
22   make it a competitive --

23          COMMISSIONER YORK:   Well, who said that?

24          MR. D. JOHNSON:   Madam Chair.

25          COMMISSIONER MEHL:   She didn't say to take

1 Casa Grande out of District 2 --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- I mean out of District  
4 6.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Isn't that the thumb?

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: She said you can get rid  
7 of the thumb by going east with District 6 across --  
8 solid across. You don't have to take Casa Grande out.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: I guess I need clarification,  
10 then.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Casa Grande shouldn't be  
12 in District 6 anyway. It's so far north. It's not --  
13 not natural to be going that far into Pinal County. So  
14 I thought that that was the intent was to try to group  
15 those communities of interest together in that area.  
16 And Casa Grande --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I thought the intent was  
18 to go across so that the thumb is gone and all that --  
19 there is not a lot of population that goes in there,  
20 but --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl is  
22 correct. I think by getting rid of Casa Grande it  
23 helps eliminate that thumb.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: I guess if -- what I need is  
25 clarification of what is the thumb. Are you just

1 talking about the piece that goes up next to Florence?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg --  
3 Commissioner Lerner is correct?

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I -- I thought the  
5 solution that I believe my -- my Republican colleagues  
6 shared in their map was attractive. I just didn't want  
7 to, you know, add their solution because I wanted to  
8 start from scratch.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So the thumb is -- the  
10 thumb is not -- just to clarify what you mean by the  
11 thumb, it's just that northern piece coming up next to  
12 where it says Florence on the screen; it's not the  
13 whole Pinal County piece of District 6.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're --

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: I'm asking the chair for her  
16 definition of the thumb.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I -- I think it's below  
18 Florence where D6 is. You just take D6 straight --  
19 straight east to connect back in.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're still leaving  
21 Casa Grande in a Tucson district? That --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is not my map,  
23 actually, so the question is to the --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I'm just asking,  
25 because it seems like those communities there, Casa

1 Grande, Coolidge, Florence, they all have a lot  
2 connected, and Sacaton, all of that area it seems to me  
3 should be part of I guess District 2.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: D2.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then you can go  
6 south, south of Eloy or -- or something in that. That  
7 gets rid of that thumb or whatever we want to call it  
8 as part of that, and it seems like those communities  
9 are completely linked as common communities of  
10 interest, and their connection to -- in fact, they have  
11 more connection, probably, to Maricopa County than they  
12 do to down in Tucson, so that's what I -- I thought  
13 that that's what I was hearing was that we were going  
14 to take that block, Casa Grande, Coolidge, Florence,  
15 Eloy, all of those, put them into District 2, and then  
16 head south from there.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair, just to highlight, so  
18 the request to put Florence, Coolidge, and the Copper  
19 Corridor all together, as you can see on the map if we  
20 put Coolidge into District 2 Casa Grande is cut off, so  
21 we would either have to build a new connection through  
22 Arizona City and Eloy, or we'd put Casa Grande into  
23 District 2 as well.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm curious what my  
25 colleagues think would be the best fix here, and then

1 we can study it after the map comes out. I'm looking  
2 for my notes so, you know, I don't have a specific  
3 opinion right now.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So my feeling is that  
5 those communities all belong together. Florence -- to  
6 split that -- that group up in Pinal County would be  
7 splitting up groups that spend a lot of time back and  
8 forth in their communities, and I think that they  
9 should go as a unit. And that would also -- if we head  
10 south on that we would basically be taking that top  
11 piece off, and that would really condense CD6 in a  
12 pretty good way with very tightly knit communities, but  
13 the Casa Grande, Coolidge, Florence, Eloy, that whole  
14 group belong together, and they -- additionally you  
15 have Sacaton in that area that's close by. You have  
16 Maricopa in that area. They all belong in the same  
17 district. And then you could head south from there,  
18 whether it's Eloy or Picacho or wherever you want to  
19 take it at that I-10 corridor piece.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, Chairwoman, I think  
21 if you do move Casa Grande into District 2 you're going  
22 to end up having to need to come in and either take San  
23 Tan or Queen Creek and to start breaking up communities  
24 that I don't think you -- from what I've heard that you  
25 don't want to break up. Casa Grande has a very close

1 connection to Tucson. There is actually a lot of  
2 people in Marana that work in Casa Grande and vice  
3 versa. They are close communities, and I would  
4 recommend keeping Casa Grande in D6 so that we don't  
5 interrupt what happens in -- in the Maricopa area by --  
6 by D2.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I agree with that. I  
8 don't want to mess up D2, and I don't want to mess up  
9 San Tan and Queen Creek. Thank you for that.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm going to just  
11 make a statement that I think what we're doing is  
12 prioritizing some communities over others. These  
13 communities in this area are linked. San Tan, my  
14 understanding, would be going into District 5, where it  
15 actually works very naturally as part of that because  
16 of their relationships with the communities of Queen  
17 Creek and those areas, and it should be moved from  
18 District 2 into District 5 because those communities  
19 are all completely linked on -- on the Hunt Highway.  
20 They're linked with Queen Creek. So if San Tan is  
21 split from those I really am not sure which communities  
22 are getting prioritized for being together in this  
23 case.

24 The Casa Grande linkages with Coolidge and  
25 Florence, as well as their connection -- a lot of

1 people -- just as you mentioned, Commissioner Mehl, a  
2 lot of people work from Casa Grande and come up to the  
3 Phoenix area. They're connected to the Gila River  
4 Indian Community and Sacaton, which are right near by.  
5 They're connected to Maricopa. If we keep that in  
6 there, we keep that thumb or whatever we're calling it,  
7 heading way into Pinal.

8 It also, from my perspective, you're -- we're  
9 splitting up Pinal County into several congressional  
10 districts, which from a Constitutional perspective  
11 doesn't need to be to that extent, so I think that --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Part of Pinal County is  
13 going to be in District 6 no matter what we do, unless  
14 we totally destroy communities of interest, because  
15 southern Pinal is very much part of the Marana, Oro  
16 Valley, northern -- northern Pima community. So Pinal  
17 is going to be in District 6. Casa Grande is an  
18 excellent fit.

19 And, Chairwoman, I think it's your call.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I -- you know, for the  
21 sake of expediency I would like to just get this draft  
22 map new iteration done for the moment. I'm compelled  
23 by Commissioner Mehl's argument about where Casa Grande  
24 should go. I am really liking the fit in CD5, so let's  
25 just see where this goes, and we will open for debate

1 when we get the data back.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: She likes the fit with  
3 Casa Grande in CD6 because she likes what she suggested  
4 for CD5 I think is what she's trying to say.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct. See, we're a  
6 good team. You guys helped fix my, you know --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Translation.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- mapping weaknesses.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Apparently not on this  
10 side. I'm just going to say it, because it doesn't  
11 seem to matter what we're saying here. There are some  
12 things -- I mean, right now -- I know we're going to  
13 move forward, but I'm going to make the statement about  
14 San Tan Valley. Right now you've got a whole bunch of  
15 people in District 2 that really should be connected to  
16 Queen Creek. They are very -- and we've heard from  
17 them that that is their community, the San Tan Valley  
18 and Queen Creek, but by not moving them from District 2  
19 into District 5 is not honoring their community of  
20 interest. And by keeping Casa Grande in this area we  
21 are keeping that thumb or whatever we're calling it in  
22 that area as well, and we're not connecting communities  
23 that are back and forth all the time, so --

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I know you're  
25 frustrated, Commissioner Lerner, and --

1           COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and I would like to  
2 point out, Commissioner Lerner, hang on, is that a lot  
3 of these suggestions did take into Mayor Gallego's  
4 suggestions and Councilwoman Pastor's, so I think there  
5 is quite a bit of thought that's gone into the  
6 Commissioner's map, and so with the addition of some of  
7 the Mesa population in CD4, I do believe she requested  
8 that San Tan went into 5, so --

9           MR. D. JOHNSON: That's what I was going to  
10 clarify. We do have -- we do have the direction of San  
11 Tan is going into 5.

12           COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

13           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I would like to  
14 remind you, Commissioner Lerner, that I believe the  
15 other day you were commenting how much you would like  
16 to go back to the draft maps, so here we are. It's,  
17 you know -- but I may not -- you know, so I agreed with  
18 you on many, many levels about why my colleagues on my  
19 right, I didn't like their map. I agreed with you.  
20 I'm coming back to points that I think we worked very  
21 hard to get to. I think you're maybe underestimating  
22 how deeply unhappy my colleagues are to my right right  
23 here. I mean, you know, they may hide it better, but,  
24 you know, they're very unhappy. And so, you know,  
25 before we sit and fight and people think they're not

1 getting their way, let's give my vision a chance.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm completely fine with  
3 giving your vision a chance, and that's why I had said,  
4 as you noted, on Monday that I did have a lot that I  
5 liked on this map. And my only comment is related to  
6 Commissioner Mehl's points. That's what I'm talking  
7 about in terms of a different perspective of Casa  
8 Grande. That's all.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Well, I think we  
10 got a bunch of new ideas, so -- not really new, you  
11 know, but a new template. Let's see where it gets us,  
12 and then we'll fight another day.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And for clarification,  
14 Chairwoman, are we directing mapping to not worry about  
15 population balance so we can just see these ideas, see  
16 where we have issues, and that way they can do it  
17 quicker?

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, within reason. I  
19 mean, as we always say if there are ideas that you have  
20 that would simply solve population balances that fit  
21 within the general conceptual guidelines we're giving  
22 we would like you to, you know, lean in a little bit  
23 and/or just create a separate record of ideas that we  
24 could explore that would help us get on the same page.  
25 And then from there I welcome the fight and the debate

1 from my colleagues. We'll go for it, but let's --  
2 let's get a better starting point.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, I think the -- the  
4 direction is, as I understand it, at least in terms of  
5 District 6, because if that's not balanced everything  
6 kind of falls apart on the rest of the map, is we'll --  
7 we'll take your direction in terms of Pinal pieces as  
8 it's been discussed, and then we'll balance it somehow  
9 in Tucson, with the knowledge that whatever we're  
10 lining up in Tucson is going to need revisiting by the  
11 Commission, if you're comfortable with that, just so  
12 you have a starting point that's balanced for District  
13 6.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair --

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And 7, so I would -- I  
16 would combine that with you bring -- maybe bring the  
17 District 7 down a little bit in the north, if that's  
18 what it takes to balance it.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: That was actually my thought  
20 is District 7 has the flexibility. They can move  
21 around in Tucson and in Maricopa, so it's got  
22 flexibility later on to take lots of direction from  
23 you.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, could we go  
25 from there back to Salt River? I'm thinking your

1 suggestion is to place the Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
2 Indian Community into D1. As I -- as I look at my  
3 notes I think the Salt River president indicated  
4 that -- that their reservation they consider more of an  
5 urban reservation as opposed to rural, and so to me by  
6 considering putting Salt River into D1 makes it more of  
7 a -- of a rural. And Salt River, as Commissioner  
8 Lerner pointed out, has a lot of connections with the  
9 three cities of Scottsdale, Tempe, and Mesa, and there  
10 is a lot of -- there is a lot of commerce, as you know,  
11 on 101. And so I just want to note that looking at my  
12 notes President Harvier considers their reservation  
13 more of a an urban reservation.

14 Now, if you look at the Fort McDowell  
15 reservation, that's I guess -- I won't say  
16 categorically, but more of a rural reservation, and  
17 that will stay in D1, and so I think that's the first  
18 point.

19 If we go to the Yuma area, I'm not sure if --  
20 if the Quechan reservation is kept whole or not, so  
21 let's pay attention to that, because I would like to  
22 see our 22 reservations kept intact, including Quechan.  
23 I think it's known as the Fort Mohave -- I'm sorry, the  
24 Fort Yuma reservation.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: In terms of the

1 reservation with D1, D4, again, I believe that the  
2 higher priority was the LD map. I do believe that  
3 along our vision D1 is going to be very competitive.  
4 It's going to incorporate, you know, some urban, some  
5 suburban, and a little bit of sprawl. I can't imagine  
6 that they would be ill-fitted. You know, the question  
7 is would that, you know, shape of that district serve  
8 the tribe well, and my understanding -- and I'll go  
9 back and I'll get in touch with the tribe. My  
10 understanding is given the current configuration that  
11 they would be comfortable in D1. May not be their  
12 first choice, but I believe that it would be a very  
13 good fit, but we'll look into it.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: We'll look into it,  
15 Madam Chair, but, you know, obviously we have all kinds  
16 of choices, but just looking at my notes, again, you  
17 know, this -- this reservation is right -- right in the  
18 heart of the Valley, if you will, and so, you know,  
19 they work pretty hard to, you know, to develop  
20 connections with their neighbors, as they point out.  
21 They have great relationships with Mesa, great  
22 relationships with Scottsdale, and on the southern part  
23 of the reservation in Tempe, and so a lot of their  
24 activity is -- is categorically urban. And so I just  
25 want to point that out, you know, for the record.

1           And if you go, you know, farther east in D1,  
2   yes, I can see the fit, and the Fort -- the Fort  
3   McDowell reservation be included in D1, and so, but we  
4   can circle back with -- with the leadership of the  
5   Fort -- I'm sorry, with the Salt River Community, and  
6   so, but if you look at the tribes in this area, you  
7   know, they try not to be partisan because, you know,  
8   Native issues, you know, fit on both sides of the  
9   aisle.

10           And so if you look at like the Gila River  
11   Indian Community, they're okay with being in a couple  
12   districts because, you know, they -- they need to work  
13   both sides. Again, because of, you know, the -- the  
14   community of interest, the reservations are very, very  
15   similar to, you know, the needs and interests of their  
16   neighbors, water and agriculture and tourism and -- and  
17   so forth. And so but Salt River, again, let's look at  
18   it. I truly believe that they're an urban community of  
19   interest, so thank you.

20           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Any further  
21   direction from us?

22           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, again, I  
23   know we talked about this, but, you know, D2, again,  
24   you know, there has been some feedback about the  
25   Yavapai split, and I know that, you know, you said

1       there was a compromise, and I think in the interest of  
2       time we did compromise and put it to a vote, and that's  
3       why we have this version, you know, on the table. But  
4       the inclusion of Yavapai County, or at least, you know,  
5       the -- the Mingus Mountains to the west and separating  
6       Yavapai and putting it into D9 is, I think, at least  
7       for the Navajo perspective there -- you know, trying to  
8       balance out and improve the communities of interest for  
9       D2 I think is something that I would like to  
10      consider -- you consider as we move forward after --  
11      after the mappers do their work.

12                But I just want to raise again I -- I believe  
13      that parts of Yavapai County would be better suited and  
14      would be a better fit in D9, you know. Although that  
15      would bring challenges with the ripple effects, you  
16      know, maybe we go back to Graham and Greenlee, but I  
17      would like you to think about, again, you know, that --  
18      that Yavapai split and really trying to create a truly  
19      -- grouping together the communities of interest in D2  
20      versus D9. I think it would be better suited by -- by  
21      moving the Yavapai County as part of it into D9, so  
22      something to think about again, Madam Chair. Thank  
23      you.

24                CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You'll have to get a  
25      majority of your colleagues to want to relitigate D2.

1 I don't know if you're going to get support, but I'm  
2 always open.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I think you got  
4 two on this side, so, and two on the other. So it's  
5 really up to you, Madam Chair. That's why I'm raising,  
6 you know, this to your attention, because you'll be the  
7 deciding vote on all of this.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I just point  
9 something out?

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Please.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think you guys bring  
12 up the idea of relitigating D2 every single  
13 deliberation meeting. I don't think it's leading them  
14 much, but you can keep fighting for it. You know, and  
15 is that really -- I mean, if this is your most biggest  
16 priority in the entire map, I'll take -- I'll take that  
17 into consideration.

18 All right. Anything else? I think mapping  
19 has direction.

20 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. We would propose a 20- or  
21 30-minute break to get the team going to make your  
22 changes you just requested.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. And then we  
24 can reconvene, and then we can discuss whether or not  
25 we want to, you know, dive into LDs or just keep with

1 the CDs and dive in.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Twenty minutes? Is that  
3 enough, Mark?

4 MR. FLAHAN: Twenty minutes would probably be  
5 enough to get the team going. I don't think we would  
6 have a product ready for you in 20 minutes.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I understand.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So 20 minutes get  
9 it started, and then we'll come back and we'll do LDs.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

11 MR. FLAHAN: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So why don't we say a  
13 30-minute break for everybody. I threw a lot on to  
14 everybody. We'll regroup. We'll think through  
15 everything and --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: 10:50.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You got it. 10:50.  
18 Recess. Thank you, colleagues, for not killing me.

19 (Brief recess taken.)

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,  
21 everybody. We will return where we left off, Agenda  
22 Item No. VI, draft map decision discussion.

23 We gave some direction to the mapping team  
24 regarding our congressional map, and we will now move  
25 to legislative map drawing. We have two options on the

1 table. We could put them up, or we can have some  
2 discussion from my colleagues and entertain a motion to  
3 approve one of the maps.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner  
5 Lerner. I'm going to -- I will explain it, but I'm  
6 going to move to approve Legislative Map 12.0.1.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair  
8 Watchman seconds that motion by Commissioner Lerner.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Enter discussion,  
10 please.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the reason I like  
12 this map is it -- first of all, it honors -- well, I  
13 shouldn't say first of all. I would say that one of  
14 the features that I like about this map is that it  
15 honors communities of interest. It was really  
16 important as part of our consideration to basically  
17 honor a number of different areas, listening to the  
18 public where people said these were things that they  
19 wanted to as part of their map. It basically -- it  
20 provides a lot of areas where we combine -- looked at  
21 school districts, so we tried to make -- to not split  
22 up some school districts. We've been -- we always come  
23 back to Kyrene, but there were other areas where the  
24 school districts should be considered, and one area is  
25 in the northern Tucson area where we heard loud and

1 clear from Marana and Amphitheater school districts to  
2 try to keep them as much together as possible. I think  
3 that this does a good job, this map, of the East Valley  
4 in looking at the different communities of interest.

5 In looking at District 13 and 14 in  
6 particular, aligning -- even though it's not as clean,  
7 you know, we had the square for District 13, but this  
8 actually aligns much better with the shape of both  
9 Chandler and Gilbert. I actually ran some numbers on  
10 that, and it actually incorporates these -- these two  
11 districts, District 13 and 14, the way they were drawn,  
12 incorporates Chandler and Gilbert much more than the  
13 other map that we've -- we've been working off of, so  
14 that's another reason that I like this map.

15 It honors the Latino Coalition to a great  
16 extent, taking off of what their proposals were, and  
17 takes those communities together. It brings in  
18 communities of interest. For example, in District 9  
19 the Asian American community is kept together, and --  
20 as they have actually requested. We received a note  
21 talking about their interests in being considered. It  
22 looks at different communities of interest in the  
23 northern part of Maricopa County and nicely, I think,  
24 combines those together in ways that brings communities  
25 that have a lot in common as part of it.

1           So and I think in the north as well, we don't  
2 talk often about that, but District 6 and District --  
3 District 7 becomes very competitive, and District --  
4 it's still a Republican-leaning district, District 7,  
5 but it is competitive, so it provides for a strong  
6 Republican district in District 5, a very evenly  
7 matched, slightly Republican edge to District 7, and a  
8 Democratic district in the north, so that would really  
9 serve a lot of different groups in those areas as well  
10 as align them with their communities of interest.

11           I also like what it does down in the south  
12 with bringing Santa Cruz whole and aligning those  
13 communities together and providing for districts  
14 from -- of different -- different interests in those  
15 areas. Are there changes that could be made?  
16 Absolutely. Of course. But I think that the --  
17 this -- this map is actually very close, and it  
18 doesn't -- it won't require huge amounts of changes,  
19 and it actually provides, from a competitive  
20 perspective, which is what I'll finish with, which is  
21 another reason I like this map is it provides for seven  
22 very competitive districts that could go either way  
23 with not a huge number of population imbalances. But  
24 the fact that we have seven competitive districts that  
25 don't split up communities of interest I think is

1 another real positive. We've heard from a lot of folks  
2 about wanting competitive districts, and these would  
3 accomplish that with giving safe Democratic and safe  
4 Republican districts on both sides, but then a number  
5 of competitive.

6 So those are some of the reasons as part of  
7 it. I think that the map from a Constitutional  
8 perspective does a really good job of having compact  
9 and contiguous districts. It aligns with communities  
10 of interest. It takes into account geographic  
11 features, city, town, and county boundaries. It -- and  
12 it has the competitive piece as well, so I think it  
13 meets the Constitutional requirements. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other dialogue?  
15 Anything from my colleagues over there?

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, would you like  
17 me to present why we like our map first and then --

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let's just do pros and  
21 cons of this map. We'll vote. And then we'll do pros  
22 and cons of the other map, and we'll vote, and we'll  
23 see.

24 Well, actually, maybe I take that back. Maybe  
25 we should do pros and cons of both maps and then we'll

1 vote.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there is a motion on  
3 the floor.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, that's correct.  
5 Okay. So we're going to vote with this motion.

6 Would you like to discuss what you don't like  
7 about this map or what you do like about the map?

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I -- I think actually the  
9 map shortchanges a number of major communities of  
10 interest, and I think that it actually does not  
11 incorporate -- and you almost can't refer to this  
12 without referring a little bit to ours. Certainly in  
13 the Tucson community it cuts off communities of  
14 interest that I think are really important, and it  
15 eliminates the suburban ring around Tucson that I think  
16 we've heard a lot about and I've supported strongly,  
17 and I think for good community of interest reasons.

18 In the -- in the East Valley, it just doesn't  
19 treat the East Valley districts nearly as well as -- as  
20 the 9.2 map. It -- it divides things significantly  
21 more in the East Valley.

22 New River and -- well, Yuma and Buckeye, in  
23 this map Yuma is brought in with Surprise rather than  
24 with Buckeye, and we've heard from both Buckeye and  
25 Yuma that they want to be together. We've heard from

1 Surprise that they don't want to be with Yuma, so  
2 that's a significant issue with this map.

3 Even though this keeps the Asian community  
4 together, the other map keeps them together better.  
5 This one doesn't put Lehi in District 10, which has  
6 been requested. It doesn't combine the retirement  
7 communities as well in District 28 and 10. And I think  
8 we'll have things that we'll want to present as  
9 positives on our map when we get there, but I think  
10 those are the big issues that I see with this map.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could I just make one  
12 comment about Lehi? They basically wanted to be sure  
13 they were in a single district, which they are. I  
14 don't think they were clear, at least that was my  
15 understanding, unless I'm wrong, Chairwoman, because  
16 you were the one who spoke to them, but I thought that  
17 they wanted to be in a single district, which they are  
18 in District 9, but they could be moved to District 10.

19 And, in fact, the comments, Commissioner Mehl,  
20 that you made are things -- as we know this map is  
21 not -- not done, so there is lots of room for changes  
22 of the kind that you mentioned. These are just a  
23 starting point. All of these maps, I assume, are  
24 starting points, so certainly some of those areas, the  
25 retirement community, some of those areas are easy to

1 shift and move around. I just wanted to mention that  
2 these are -- this is -- this is just a map to start  
3 from, not to finish with.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The Lehi community did  
5 not express sentiments to me directly, but rather the  
6 mayor of Mesa shared with me insights about the  
7 different communities along the borders between LD -- I  
8 can't read the numbers -- 9 and 8, I guess. And I  
9 think it was everybody's consensus that Lehi would go  
10 with D10. I think it would make everybody happier, and  
11 to be honest I think it would make D9 more competitive  
12 and more friendly to your side, so --

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And any of those  
14 changes, again, this is -- all we're talking about --  
15 from my perspective all we're doing is basically saying  
16 why this is a good starting point, not that it's an end  
17 point, because we would need the other piece that I  
18 just want to -- I do want to mention, since we talked  
19 about the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community,  
20 this honors their -- their interests as well in terms  
21 of heading into Mesa.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It splits up neighborhoods  
23 in -- it splits up McCormick Ranch, which we've heard a  
24 lot about. It splits up Deer Valley, and it splits up  
25 Sunnyslope, and all of these are dealt with better in

1 communities of interest in the -- in the 12.1 map.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to share my  
3 thoughts. I agree with Commissioner Mehl that I feel  
4 like this map does split up many communities of  
5 interest, potentially, you know, in order to achieve  
6 competitiveness, and that's something that we want to  
7 be very careful about, to not cause any significant  
8 detriment to communities of interest.

9 I was very clear with some of the priorities  
10 of what I'm looking for in a legislative map, and,  
11 quite frankly, the map didn't match what I was looking  
12 for. I really, you know, am not comfortable with the  
13 LD25 as you have included. I'm more sold on, you know,  
14 Yuma not coming up through that area. I think it  
15 interferes with the agriculture, the cattle industry,  
16 some of the economic engines in the West Valley.

17 I have gone on record to say I'm inclined to  
18 keep Yavapai whole. I was motivated by, really, the  
19 age differences in the various communities between the  
20 Coconino areas, Verde Valley, Sedona, versus, you know,  
21 you know, the other parts of Yavapai, and I think that  
22 as a community of interest age, that generation of  
23 retirements and post empty nest, they really have  
24 unique political interests that I think are remarkably  
25 different than -- than the younger generation.

1 I'm not -- regarding CD6 and the Native  
2 American community, I'm not going to weigh in because I  
3 want to study that issue a little bit more.

4 But I also went on record as saying that I was  
5 very attracted to the Gilbert consolidated solution on  
6 the districts that I focused on in the East Valley, not  
7 the entire map, but 13, 14. I'm very focused on the  
8 Asian community, and I do believe that our maps do  
9 right with that split with both the Latino and the  
10 Asian communities in the East Valley, but we can  
11 certainly look into that.

12 And, finally, not surprising, given my  
13 comments earlier during the public comment agenda item,  
14 I am very sold on the unincorporated areas of  
15 Legislative District 17 as needing to have some degree  
16 of representation. They've been blocked. They have  
17 lacked political, you know, ability to advance the  
18 kinds of infrastructure, water needs. And, again, I do  
19 not believe that simply carving out a competitive  
20 district at their expense is going to solve those  
21 political problems. So for those reasons I do not feel  
22 that your map best captured my vision.

23 With that we can take a vote.

24 Vice Chair Watchman.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye. Excuse me. Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is  
8 a no.

9 And with that the motion fails 3-2.

10 I will entertain another motion if somebody  
11 would like to propose another starting point for the  
12 legislative district map.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I propose we adopt map  
14 12.1.1 as the new starting map.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we have a second?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I second, Commissioner  
17 York.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Open it up for  
19 discussion and debate.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think the 12.1 map  
21 really does a great service to the state in how the  
22 districts are drawn, and obviously there is population  
23 balancing that needs to be done and adjustments that  
24 will be made as we do that, but we did a number of  
25 things here that were -- you can either call them

1 compromises or just listening to -- listening to  
2 constituencies that spoke loudly. We incorporated the  
3 Latino Districts, 24 and 26, almost wholesale with  
4 really minor changes. New River and Anthem are with  
5 Maricopa County, which they loudly spoke about, and not  
6 with Yavapai County, which they did not want to be  
7 with. It keeps Yuma with Buckeye. It doesn't split  
8 McCormick Ranch, Sunnyslope, or Deer Valley. It  
9 minimizes the splits in the cities in the East Valley.  
10 The East Valley communities are kept together really  
11 nicely. It keeps the Asian community together very  
12 solidly in South Chandler and Gilbert. It puts Lehi in  
13 District 10. It keeps the retirement communities in  
14 District 28 and 10. We made compromises and took Vail  
15 out of District 17. We made compromises and took Santa  
16 Cruz County and moved it into District 21. Luke Air  
17 Force Base is kept in Glendale, as they've requested.  
18 This map keeps Sedona together. It keeps Wickenburg  
19 together, all things where we had a lot of testimony.  
20 It unites Dobson Ranch in District 9.

21 And when we get to the balancing, we see an  
22 opportunity to increase the competitiveness of District  
23 29 and also at the same time really improve the  
24 Hispanic community's position in El Mirage, and -- and  
25 the Mesa Riverview Park, which has been suggested go

1 into D8, we would have -- that would actually help our  
2 balancing and would give the Salt River tribe the  
3 connection to Mesa that they requested, so I would see  
4 us making that adjustment.

5 And all in all I think this map has -- would  
6 be a terrific map for the state of Arizona.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Discussion, yeah,  
8 please.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have real issues with  
10 this map, and I'm going to start with the competitive  
11 piece because -- and then move on from -- from the  
12 concerns that I have about this.

13 This map right now is a 16 -- is a safe  
14 16-seat Republican map as it stands right now. There  
15 are two somewhat competitive districts, but one very  
16 strongly leans Republican, so this really -- this map  
17 is actually a 17-13 map as it stands. And part of why,  
18 even with the other changes that -- that, you know, the  
19 other piece is I do believe competitiveness is  
20 something we have to be concerned about, and the other  
21 one had a lot of competitive seats that could be  
22 modified. Again, all of these are starting, but to  
23 start with a map that has 16 safe Republican seats, I  
24 don't know how we get to something that becomes more  
25 balanced. And we are not a state that should have a

1 17-13 split any longer of either side in terms of that,  
2 so that's one of my concerns.

3 In this map Glendale is split into six  
4 different districts. Most of the city is split between  
5 24 and 27, but it's also split into a number of other  
6 areas, and they should be -- those kinds of things  
7 should be brought together.

8 It also splits the West Valley communities  
9 more than in the draft maps as part of it, and  
10 including Sun City and Surprise are split.

11 LD23 comes heavily from Yuma into the West  
12 Valley. That is also not something that -- LD23 in  
13 this map extends into both Tucson and -- or Pima  
14 County/Tucson area and the Phoenix area, the West  
15 Valley area. That's going to be very hard. You're  
16 going to have rural and -- rural and really three urban  
17 districts, Yuma, Phoenix area -- it may be, you know,  
18 whichever community is in that area -- and Tucson in  
19 that one district. It should not be extending -- LD25  
20 extending in there is fine. That's part of the  
21 connection that we heard. But not LD23. We shouldn't  
22 have that going in there.

23 Another real concern is that, as Commissioner  
24 Mehl mentioned, there were two Latino districts kept  
25 somewhat whole, but other districts were completely

1 split apart and modified. For example, South Mountain  
2 and Laveen District 11 and 22, the only reason to do  
3 that is partisan, to split those. That is a very  
4 strong -- that was one district. It's a very strong  
5 African American area in South Phoenix. They wanted to  
6 be together. Laveen and South Phoenix belong together  
7 because they share school districts, they share  
8 community in that area, and that split harms the Latino  
9 and African American population.

10 And the reality is that many of the VRA  
11 districts were significantly modified in this map, and  
12 that's a concern as well because they are -- they were  
13 somewhat arbitrarily modified as far as I can tell,  
14 because why would you split, for example, Laveen and  
15 South Mountain, that community?

16 The other thing is that it doesn't -- it  
17 doesn't completely do a great job in honoring what the  
18 Navajo Nation requested. It makes some modifications  
19 from that, and they have already put forth several  
20 proposals with modifications and compromises, so I  
21 think we need to look at that.

22 I know how you feel about LD17. You know how  
23 I feel about LD17. We're never going to come to  
24 agreement on that. I do believe that it is not  
25 arbitrary to put together Casas -- the communities in

1 this area who have actually indicated they want to be  
2 together. They share a lot of things in common. They  
3 share the school districts. They share the North  
4 Tucson area that is a very strong, cohesive community  
5 with Casas Adobes, Catalina Foothills, Oro Valley,  
6 SaddleBrooke. Those are all -- those belong together  
7 as a community and not split up, and in this map it  
8 splits up and removes some of those communities to  
9 create that long, over-the-mountain District 17.

10 District 17 in the other map is  
11 competitive-leaning Republican. There is a good chance  
12 that would go Republican to give that partisan lean  
13 that we've heard about, but right now it just swings  
14 around Tucson for -- for that reason.

15 The other problem is District 16, as a  
16 comment, just as a note, on how that swings all the way  
17 into Tucson, and it avoids Marana for some reason, to  
18 swing around and get Tucson Estates, so that's also  
19 something that concerns me is why is that in that  
20 particular -- there is just a lot of things that seem  
21 to be picking up districts, either to make them more  
22 Republican or make them more Democratic.

23 A lot of these districts are packing  
24 Democrats. When I looked at the numbers on our charts  
25 that we receive, the numbers are -- of Democrats are

1 extremely high in a number of these cases, and I feel  
2 that that was done to basically create fewer potential  
3 districts as part of that.

4           So those are just some of the concerns I have,  
5 and the fact that it doesn't honor a number of the  
6 requests, I don't feel that it meets a lot of the  
7 communities of interest in the way that it could. It  
8 also -- I'll just make a comment that it also really  
9 changes from our Draft Map 10. It really shifts some  
10 districts that were competitive to being no longer  
11 competitive, and I'll use District 4 as an example. In  
12 our Draft Map 10 District 4 was almost completely -- it  
13 was a 0.5 difference between Democrats and Republicans.  
14 In the Republican map it now goes 4.6 to Republicans  
15 with a zero eight potential to elect somebody, and we  
16 see that in other areas.

17           So we shouldn't be creating the maps -- I know  
18 not just for competitiveness. I get that. But we  
19 should be looking more closely at these communities of  
20 interest, and to divide up and change around the Latino  
21 Coalition districts, to move things around in some of  
22 the ways that were done, were done for partisan  
23 purposes and not for community of interest purposes.  
24 Otherwise, I don't know how things like D11 and D22 got  
25 split and why they got split in the way they do, as

1 well as some of the other communities that I've  
2 mentioned.

3 I think this would be a much tougher map for  
4 us to begin with as part of it, and I would say that if  
5 it's between 12.1.1 or -- I would recommend going back  
6 to our Draft Map of 10.0 instead, because I think that  
7 gives us more room to work. But from my perspective  
8 these are -- this map would be very difficult for us to  
9 go -- the districts -- some of the districts have been  
10 dramatically changed that can actually impact these  
11 communities of interest, like the D11, D22 split as  
12 just an example. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner, I  
14 want to respond to a few of the things you brought up  
15 and explain why a couple of arguments are not  
16 compelling to me.

17 First of all, to focus on a map as saying it's  
18 17-13, I don't see anywhere in our Constitution where  
19 it says that we're required to take a poll of how it's  
20 supposed to be apportioned. My understanding is we  
21 follow the Constitutional criteria, and I do believe  
22 that when we do so it will come out right. I don't  
23 know what exactly it will be, but I believe we need to  
24 follow our communities of interest as the driving  
25 force. And, in fact, a lot of what you commented on

1 again brings it back to competitiveness, and I  
2 understand, this is part of what I spoke to earlier,  
3 there is genuine philosophical differences about what  
4 that word "significant detriment" means, and we're  
5 going to, you know, debate it out.

6 I also have to say, you know, I do not believe  
7 anybody is discounting communities of interest who are  
8 expressing sentiments. We have incorporated a  
9 remarkable amount of the feedback from the Latino  
10 Coalition. Just because every single district they  
11 submit doesn't perfectly align with all other  
12 communities in the state doesn't mean that it's  
13 arbitrary, and I look forward to digging into each of  
14 those VRA districts and debating on the lines, honoring  
15 the VRA, doing right by our minority communities, but  
16 also doing right by the entire state.

17 And I would also like to just reiterate: I'm  
18 not weighing in on this Native American Flagstaff issue  
19 yet. We have more study. I'm deeply concerned about  
20 the Native American community being able to have the  
21 opportunity to elect a candidate, and if they can't do  
22 it in the primary that's a problem, so we're going to  
23 have to do some study on that. Gosh, and I hope my  
24 colleagues are going to be open-minded on it because,  
25 you know, I don't want to have to compromise

1 communities of interest in -- in the White Mountain  
2 community. You know, let's -- you know, is there  
3 potentially a way of splitting Flagstaff or whatever.  
4 All options are on the table.

5 But I just wanted to respond to that in  
6 further explanation for why I have a preference for  
7 starting with the map that Commissioner Mehl  
8 recommended. And, again, I just also want to say that  
9 the map happened to include the things that I expressed  
10 as a priority for me and what I want to see, and so I  
11 think it really probably shouldn't come as any  
12 surprise, you know, how I see the maps.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- I'm just going to  
14 say I think this is going to be an incredibly difficult  
15 map for us to accept. I would rather -- I would rather  
16 have us go -- just like you did before, go back to  
17 10.0. The draft map provides a lot of these same  
18 things, but it doesn't do some of the splits. And I  
19 will say that some of these are arbitrary. I do not --  
20 I do not know why some of these splits occurred other  
21 than to manipulate other districts.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner,  
23 we're not -- we're voting on a starting point. We're  
24 starting on a -- we're voting on a point from which we  
25 can make changes. There is nothing in it that would be

1 permanent. We're merely voting on what would be a more  
2 effective starting point, and I am not open to starting  
3 again from the draft map on the legislative. It's just  
4 simply too complicated. I have already gone on record  
5 far too many times with some of my priorities, and if I  
6 see a map that better captures a vision that I think  
7 can be right for the state I cannot in good faith ask  
8 all five of us to go back from scratch.

9 So in this -- I think I did my best with the  
10 congressional to get us back on track. I truly feel  
11 this is a starting point. I am not endorsing this map.  
12 Okay? I am endorsing it as a starting point. And all  
13 of those issues that you're bringing up that you're  
14 unhappy about, how about investing energy in debating  
15 it, the five of us, so that we can come up with the  
16 best lines.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm going to -- we're  
18 going to end up having to do that, but I think this is  
19 our opportunity, as you said, to comment, which is what  
20 we're doing before the vote. And I -- I actually have  
21 issues when it's -- when -- when we say we don't want  
22 to be considering competitiveness, when the whole  
23 purpose of LD17, and as you just mentioned and has been  
24 mentioned before, was to give people right of center a  
25 voice. That's part of the partisanship that goes on.

1 And I will say that part of my concern about that, it  
2 was drawn for that purpose, and it was drawn to -- if  
3 it's going to give people on the outskirts of Tucson a  
4 voice it can do that without having the partisanship  
5 that's in there.

6 So when I talk about competitiveness it's in  
7 the same vein of saying we're trying to give people a  
8 voice in certain areas that normally wouldn't. So, for  
9 example, in the D6, D7, D5, the northern area, giving  
10 people a voice so that they can have an ability to have  
11 somebody represent them. It's no different than that.  
12 And same thing in some of these districts that  
13 typically have not had that in the Maricopa County  
14 area.

15 So I find the same arguments, but they're  
16 not -- I may say the same arguments, maybe not the same  
17 words, but -- but I don't think that we should be  
18 discounting some of the concerns I have about this map  
19 and the imbalances that are there and the fact that we  
20 are starting with a map that I think is going to be  
21 very difficult to bring back.

22 And the other piece I'll just mention is that  
23 I understand what you're saying about the Latino  
24 Coalition, but the changes that are -- that were made  
25 to the Latino Coalition's districts were based on the

1 Yuma map, and why should the Yuma map have -- the Yuma  
2 mayor have the right to go ahead and change the Latino  
3 Coalition districts, because that's what ended up  
4 occurring in this case. These were not -- this -- this  
5 was not an arbitrary -- these were changes that were  
6 done without looking at VRA issues and how those would  
7 work, and that's where my concern comes as part of  
8 those.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No individual is  
10 changing the map. The mayor of Yuma isn't. The mayor  
11 of Phoenix isn't, the mayor of Tucson. We're relying  
12 on people who are smart and have ideas, and these are  
13 our ideas, and no single person, regardless of their  
14 political stature, has all the answers.

15 I would like to make a comment about LD17. I  
16 take ownership. I used a very poor word when we  
17 deliberated the first time. I think we're rookies and  
18 we sometimes just aren't as careful with language.  
19 What am I communicating in my vision of LD17 is a group  
20 of unincorporated, you know, cities, places,  
21 communities of interest that have such political  
22 cohesion and community of interest cohesion as it  
23 relates to water and infrastructure and transportation.  
24 I'm not going to -- we can relitigate it. I have  
25 already gone on record with my Constitutional

1 explanation.

2 I truly believe, Commissioner Lerner, that you  
3 are asking to prioritize competitiveness over  
4 communities of interest in LD17, and I do not believe  
5 that a competitive district is sufficient in order to  
6 answer the political needs of these groups that want to  
7 align themselves to have some political expression.

8 So with that, and if there is something unique  
9 or different to add to the deliberation process, I  
10 welcome it, and if not we will take a vote.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The only thing I'm going  
12 to add is that the LD17, and I'm sure the map lines can  
13 be adjusted, actually includes over 50,000 people in  
14 Tucson at this point. It is not a purely -- a district  
15 that's purely outlining -- outlying the city of Tucson.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And that's the eastern  
17 wards of the city of Tucson that are disenfranchised by  
18 how they do the ward elections, and they really align  
19 themselves with the Tanque Verde Valley much more so,  
20 that is exactly why they're included in there.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I believe we're  
22 ready for a vote. We have a motion on the table to  
23 approve map version I believe it's 12.1.1. Am I right?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Vice Chair

1 Watchman.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is  
10 an aye.

11 And with that we will start from 12.1.1 on the  
12 legislative map, and I again reiterate this is a  
13 starting point. There are a lot of things that I hear  
14 you're upset about. Let's argue, debate. I am very  
15 open to making changes.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And would you like us to  
17 start suggesting changes? How would you like to go --  
18 would you like to reiterate any changes you want to  
19 make first?

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I would love to  
21 hear your perspective on this map on the changes that  
22 you think would be useful before we go, just as you did  
23 with the congressional. It was very useful to hear.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I liked a lot more  
25 of this map so actually I'm not going to, you know,

1 have as much to criticize. If you really want to start  
2 I would love to talk about LD6 and 7, if we want to  
3 talk about the Navajo area and solicit some feedback  
4 from mapping and maybe even at some point talk to  
5 counsel. Is there a way to achieve some type of  
6 compromise between the Native American communities and  
7 the White Mountain, you know, folks?

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair --  
9 this is Vice Chair Watchman -- the Navajo Nation did  
10 put their map and this -- their proposal on the table,  
11 and that proposal considers not only the Navajo Nation,  
12 but as I said earlier --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. I'm sorry. Yes.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: -- other -- other  
15 tribes, so it is very, very important to consider the  
16 Native American coalition community of interest for  
17 many reasons. One, you know, tribes live on  
18 reservations, and -- and there is a lot of challenges,  
19 just like the other communities, water, access to  
20 capital.

21 I know that the comment was made earlier that  
22 there is -- there is economic connection between, for  
23 example, Navajo Nation in Flagstaff. And -- and, yes,  
24 that is, but -- but in terms of the way of life, if you  
25 want to compare Navajo versus Flagstaff, totally

1 different. I would categorize Flagstaff as more of an  
2 urban community of interest versus Navajo, which is  
3 very, very rural. I said earlier that there is a lot  
4 of farming and ranching and rural activities, similar  
5 to what you see in the eastern part of the state with  
6 the White Mountain areas. There is a lot of timber  
7 connections. And so Flagstaff for the most part is  
8 university focused, tourism, and so I -- I truly  
9 believe that we as -- as a Commission should honor and  
10 respect the Navajo Nation and the other six tribes and  
11 what they're advancing.

12           You know, as I said earlier, you know, there  
13 is -- there is a lot of historical wrongs. I'm not  
14 saying we should make it right, but, you know, history  
15 has put the Indians, the Natives in this state, you  
16 know, way behind, and so what we're doing here in the  
17 vote that we take could -- could during the next ten  
18 years advance tribes. I keep reading that tribes in  
19 general, especially in the rural part of the state, are  
20 20, 30 years behind when it comes to development, when  
21 it comes to quality of life, when it comes to things  
22 that I see here in Phoenix. Everything is convenient  
23 here. And so on reservations, because of the  
24 historical trauma, there is -- there is a lot of  
25 challenges. So we have an opportunity, if we improve

1 and address and consider thoughtfully and purposefully  
2 the Navajo Nation's proposal, which, again, includes  
3 seven tribes, I think we would help advance our tribes  
4 here in the state.

5 Now, mind you, and I'll remind everybody that  
6 we have 22 tribes, and so the other tribes also have --  
7 have challenges. And tribes here in the state are  
8 about a quarter of the state. And everybody talks  
9 about gaming. You know, gaming, yes, has done, you  
10 know, some benefit, but I think the benefit has gone to  
11 the tribes here in this town, Maricopa County, and has  
12 benefitted the tribes in the Tucson area. But the  
13 balance struggle, and -- and a lot of those struggles  
14 have to be tackled not only in Washington, D.C., but in  
15 the state capitol here.

16 And so there has -- there has been a lot of  
17 progress in the last ten years, especially, you know,  
18 with this district here having three Natives, two  
19 representatives and two senators at the capitol. So I  
20 believe that we as a Commission need to consider and  
21 honor, you know, what the -- what the tribes have done.

22 And, you know, a little bit of history, you  
23 know, and I know that this is out there, but, you know,  
24 a lot of tribes have served their country. You talk  
25 about the Navajo Code Talkers. You talk about the code

1 talkers from other tribes. Even -- even before Natives  
2 were considered eligible to vote and actually being  
3 citizens of the state, they volunteered and they served  
4 the country. They served the flags behind us. And  
5 so -- and so this is obviously emotional for me and my  
6 brothers and sisters out there in Arizona, but the  
7 Navajo Nation, that's something that we need to  
8 consider.

9 And I think we should also, as we go and  
10 deliberate this, that we should see where each of the  
11 22 tribes sit, you know. And so -- and probably some  
12 other things that I'd like to put on the table as well  
13 is that the Latino Coalition as well as African  
14 American, a lot of similarities when it comes to, you  
15 know, to being categorized as minorities. I think we  
16 need to, you know, give due respect to what they're  
17 advancing.

18 And so but this map here, as my colleague  
19 Lerner has pointed out, it's out of balance to the tune  
20 of almost 100,000, so that means a lot of work that we  
21 have to do. And the Yuma Gold for District 20 -- I  
22 can't read -- 23, you know, that's advanced from a  
23 mayor, and, you know, which is good, and so, but, you  
24 know, we need to consider the other mayors and what  
25 they want, the Tucson mayor, the Phoenix mayor.

1           And so this -- this map is not a good map from  
2 my perspective. But, you know, obviously, as  
3 Commissioner Lerner has pointed out, you know, we -- we  
4 have to negotiate. Hopefully we come -- we come to  
5 some compromise. But right now for this map here, I  
6 don't support it.

7           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to defend the  
8 6, 7 boundaries that we show on this map. And I have  
9 great respect for Vice Chair Watchman. I have great  
10 respect for the Navajo Nation. I have great respect  
11 for the Native American tribes in general. And the  
12 reality is is that both maps, both divisions treat the  
13 Native Americans extremely well and have taken -- have  
14 taken into account their comments. The issue is is  
15 which non-Native American group is going to get grouped  
16 with them, is it Flagstaff or is the White Mountains,  
17 and that's our choice. Either way the Native Americans  
18 are going to dominate that district. They're going to  
19 have the opportunity to elect two representatives.  
20 They're going to have the opportunity to elect a  
21 senator. And it really is which -- which is a better  
22 community of interest fit of the non-Native areas,  
23 Flagstaff or the White Mountains.

24           We've heard usually from the White Mountains  
25 that they don't want to be part of this district.

1 Flagstaff we've heard -- we know there is a lot of  
2 community of interest cohesion between the Native  
3 tribes in Flagstaff. It's where they do their major  
4 shopping. It's certainly where they go for educational  
5 opportunities. Many of the Native Americans live --  
6 live in Flag. Now, admittedly, they're scattered in  
7 the White Mountains, also, but more of them live in  
8 Flagstaff. But our choice isn't do we treat the Native  
9 Americans correctly or not; our choice is which group  
10 gets put with them. And, frankly, these two -- the  
11 lines on these two districts don't seem to affect  
12 anything else.

13 So we could defer this decision and recognize  
14 we've got to make a call on this and get on to other  
15 parts of the map, or, Chairwoman, if you want to bring  
16 this to a head and finish it, it's up to you.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think we need to  
18 finish it. I wanted to start the conversation, and I  
19 also want to solicit input from a problem-solving  
20 perspective, including from our mapping team, so we  
21 can, you know, kind of have this marinate for a while.

22 I'm wondering if there is any creative balance  
23 in which we can, again, only in a logical way carve out  
24 some populations in Flagstaff to take it out of D6 to  
25 just empower the Native American voice a little in the

1 primary, and also maybe even consider some additional  
2 population deviance, and maybe a combination would  
3 allow them a little extra comfort in the opportunity to  
4 elect a candidate of their choice in the primary  
5 without compromising, you know, the communities of  
6 interest in the White Mountain. I don't know if that's  
7 possible, and if at the end of the day we need to make  
8 a choice we will, but I at least wanted to have this  
9 debate that's appropriate for us to be talking through,  
10 you know, who wins, who loses, what compromises are out  
11 there and what the best is for the whole entire state.

12 So, mapping, what are your thoughts?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. So as currently drawn  
14 District 6 is short of the ideal by 1.09 percent, so  
15 it's a little bit short, but not -- not much. You all  
16 have talked at length about the big picture, so I'm not  
17 going to go into big picture choices. As Commissioner  
18 Mehl mentioned the -- the question we're wrestling with  
19 is who else goes in that district.

20 But if we're talking about deviation and, you  
21 know, can we increase that deviation, take a little bit  
22 more out of 6 without replacing it, just make it a  
23 little short, there are some very small pockets of  
24 population down along the non-reservation part of -- of  
25 the White Mountains that go in that that I suspect are

1     only a few hundred people. I haven't looked at the  
2     numbers. But that would increase deviation a little  
3     bit more, put more non-reservation population into 7.

4             But once you run out of that then the question  
5     becomes, as you said, we can either kind of work around  
6     Flagstaff, which will get an odd shape where 7 will  
7     start picking up from north of -- you know, the few  
8     people that don't live in the incorporated area north  
9     of the city, or we can take a piece of the city and put  
10    some of that population into 7, so Flagstaff would be  
11    in both districts. The overwhelming majority of it, if  
12    we're only talking about messing with deviation here,  
13    it -- the overwhelming majority of Flagstaff would stay  
14    in 6, but we could take a few thousand just within the  
15    deviation, if that was the Commission's direction.

16            And then bigger picture than just a deviation  
17    question, I think you've laid out -- the Commission has  
18    laid out the debate fairly well, and that's up to you  
19    to give us direction.

20            COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I ask mapping a  
21    question? What is the population as you run up 17 to  
22    40 and the south side of 40 there in Flagstaff?

23            MR. KINGERY: Along here?

24            COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

25            MR. D. JOHNSON: You're talking about the

1 District 6 population, right, that would come into 7?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: I just want to know what  
3 the population is.

4 MR. KINGERY: That box?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, no. I'm talking about  
6 the portion that's in District 6 on the south end of 40  
7 and the 17 intersection, so that would be the golfing  
8 community. It would be Munds Park.

9 MR. KINGERY: Straight up. 11,000.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: How many?

11 MR. KINGERY: 11,000.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: 11,000?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: And you can see next to that  
14 on the screen that would leave District 6 -- does that  
15 say 5.97?

16 MR. KINGERY: Yeah, percent deviation.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: So 5 percent -- 5.97 short if  
18 you took all the area highlighted.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just curious.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I would like to  
21 just -- I would like to make a comment about some of  
22 the things that have been said as part of that. There  
23 is a relationship between the tribes and the  
24 communities that they live near, absolutely, just like  
25 we heard about people in Pinetop and Lakeside and the

1 Apache that live there. They are connected, and they  
2 talked about those connections with them, that they go  
3 to Show Low, they go to Pinetop-Lakeside from the San  
4 Carlos reservation, from that area.

5 What -- what we're talking about with some of  
6 these is the -- is basically saying are we going to --  
7 well, I guess one thing with Flagstaff: We already  
8 heard that there might be an ability-to-elect issue if  
9 Flagstaff is included in the Navajo -- we're calling it  
10 the Navajo District 6 district, that that might -- that  
11 there was a history that that -- in the primaries that  
12 might impact their ability to elect, so that's one  
13 thing I think we really want to be considering as part  
14 of that.

15 Basically, if we're talking about splitting  
16 Flagstaff, we're basically saying so which group are we  
17 going to honor, right? Are we going to do the White  
18 Mountain community? Are we going to do Flagstaff? Is  
19 there going to be that opportunity to elect? We can't  
20 really -- to remove some of those people in the  
21 south -- they spend all of their time up in Flagstaff,  
22 Munds Park. That whole group that you just highlighted  
23 are part of Flagstaff, as is Sedona. Just splitting  
24 some of these areas is like which group are we choosing  
25 over another, and that is something I think we really

1 have to think about, because from the tribal  
2 perspective they -- they drew it without Flagstaff for  
3 a reason, because of some of those concerns about their  
4 ability to elect.

5 It's not that they don't go to Flagstaff, but  
6 they also go to Show Low. They also go to Winslow.  
7 Some of the tribes in there go to Pinetop-Lakeside.  
8 They're not living in a vacuum. None of these live in  
9 isolation with each other. They work with the  
10 close-knit communities that they -- they go to. That's  
11 part of the communities of interest.

12 And so I do believe that the Navajo version  
13 sort of honors -- honors some of that as part of it, so  
14 I just wanted to mention that we're really talking  
15 about communities, on how we're going to impact. And  
16 to divide a community, take a group of people from  
17 three miles south of Flagstaff and put them separate,  
18 doesn't honor the fact that they spend most of their  
19 time in Flagstaff.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, it would be --  
21 first of all, Flagstaff wouldn't be in the district  
22 according to the Native American plan anyway, so they  
23 would be in D7. It would be trying to isolate and  
24 identify those residents of Flagstaff who would most  
25 identify and feel comfortable being in D6, so it would

1 be a compromise. It would be something that would  
2 approximate the most people getting what they want. I  
3 would imagine Flagstaff would be comfortable being  
4 in -- in D6. They talk about so many shared interests  
5 and all of that. And I'm just trying to minimize, you  
6 know, potential disruption to other communities in the  
7 White Mountains and just want to be creative with our  
8 thinking and think out of the box with possibly some  
9 splits in population deviance.

10 And we're not going to make a decision now,  
11 and after we collect the data we may well, you know,  
12 need our counsel to do some homework on, you know,  
13 thresholds and all of the kinds of legal jargon that we  
14 need to consider to adhere to the VRA. But I wanted to  
15 at least open this up and hear my colleagues' thoughts  
16 about it and get all sides -- get your engines focused  
17 on problem-solving, rather than just sticking to  
18 whatever idea you already had coming into this  
19 deliberation.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I like the idea I had  
21 coming into the deliberation, but in an effort to get  
22 creative I think D16 actually could take in a good bit  
23 of Florence, if not all of Florence, allowing D7 to  
24 take in whatever can come out of Flagstaff and still  
25 have D6 be an acceptable population, so that would be

1 something that you could perhaps take a look at and  
2 give us guidance on.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could you clarify that  
4 again, please? You kind of jumped into 16, and I was  
5 up in the north part on my map, so I need --

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, I was trying to -- I  
7 was trying -- if you took -- if you took population --  
8 if you split Flagstaff and took some of the population  
9 of Flagstaff and -- 10,000, 20,000, 30, I don't know  
10 where the number would be -- and put it into D6, and  
11 then -- I mean from -- took it from D6 and put it into  
12 D7. D7 is overpopulated. It happens that D7 comes  
13 down into D16 at Florence, and D16 is underpopulated,  
14 so we could -- and Florence is a good fit to go into  
15 D16 and so that could be a way to balance and allow a  
16 portion of Flagstaff to come out. It's just off the  
17 top of my cuff looking at the map.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that -- unless I'm  
19 looking at your chart, D7 right now -- we're looking at  
20 12.1.1. Right?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's balanced.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. So the argument --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So but you're talking  
25 about -- I mean, because I thought you were saying it's

1 not balanced, but it is.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If you want to take  
3 Flag -- population from Flagstaff and put in it then D7  
4 will have too much population.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, that's what you're  
6 saying.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And D16 is short, so  
8 Florence is a perfect place to then take care of the D7  
9 in order to accommodate a portion of Flagstaff coming  
10 out of D6, which I just -- I was trying to look at the  
11 map and come up with something, and that's -- off the  
12 fly that's the best -- that's the best I got.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, D16 I think we  
14 need to take a close look at anyway because it goes all  
15 the way down into -- into Tucson in a way that -- I  
16 mean, so that probably is -- it's one we could actually  
17 take a closer look at right now, if you want,  
18 because --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: I can go back to the  
20 divide. I mean, we are basically trying to compromise,  
21 to listen to the Navajo voice and their thoughts, but  
22 at the same time jeopardizing the thoughts of those in  
23 the White Mountain. And we are also looking at voting  
24 trends around a primary, and my concern is that the  
25 population in Flagstaff votes most like the Navajos

1 and -- and trends in that arena, and so for me their --  
2 those communities belong together, and so I'm still  
3 struggling to understand why we're trying to sort of  
4 juggle this to make it more competitive for the Navajos  
5 when it's already competitive for the -- for the  
6 Democratic party.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And what we've heard is  
8 that they're worried about a primary, but they're --  
9 they're 58 percent or 56 percent, depending on the  
10 numbers you look at, of the total district. There are  
11 some Republicans up there. So in a primary they're  
12 going to be like 70 or 80 percent Native American in a  
13 primary, so I -- and I would ask our consultants to  
14 help -- help us understand that, perhaps by -- at least  
15 by Monday to get some better data on that voting,  
16 because I think that may play an important role as to  
17 whether -- which direction we ought to go here.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we need -- and  
19 this comes back to an earlier question and point I had.  
20 I think we need to understand the demographic changes  
21 in Flagstaff between the late 2000s and now, because  
22 there is justifiable reason for the Native American  
23 community to be concerned. In the first iteration of  
24 the independent commission when Flagstaff wasn't  
25 included with them the last four years I believe they

1 were drowned out by the White liberal community in  
2 Flagstaff, and they lost their preferred candidate in  
3 the primary, and so they were unsuccessful consistently  
4 in the late 2000s. After the last redistricting  
5 commission when it was more favorable to them, they  
6 were successful. And so I think they appropriately  
7 bring up a very genuine concern that, you know, they  
8 will in the primary, with a very motivated liberal  
9 Democratic White group in Flagstaff, they will  
10 dominate.

11           There are voting challenges in the Native  
12 American community. We have to take a look at the  
13 threshold. They did an excellent job with getting the  
14 vote out in the presidential race. I don't believe,  
15 you know, the data show they get the vote out quite as  
16 well in the primary, and whether right or wrong, it is  
17 our responsibility, you know, to make sure that the  
18 district performs. It's a majority minority district.

19           So I think it's a very helpful debate we're  
20 having, and I think our mapping team and maybe even our  
21 counsel now kind of understands the questions that we  
22 have and -- and some of the creative solutions we want  
23 to explore to see, you know, what may be possible. But  
24 I do believe it's a real problem. I don't -- I don't  
25 believe this is trivial.

1           Doug, do you feel -- Commissioner Mehl, do you  
2 want to give further direction to the mapping team to  
3 flesh out this idea of yours? Because I am -- you  
4 know, it doesn't sound like it's an overly complicated  
5 change and something that maybe we'd want to just take  
6 a look at if it's not too much work.

7           COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I think it could be  
8 done just as a side change, not -- not a full change to  
9 the map, but just let us know what the numbers would be  
10 if you did that.

11           MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. I guess the question  
12 would be how much to take. So are we talking about the  
13 area that we just looked at really south of the freeway  
14 along the -- the I-17 corridor coming out of Flagstaff  
15 to bring it down to about 6 percent short? And then  
16 there are a couple of small pieces, if you look at the  
17 map over by Pinetop and see the bump where D6 comes up.  
18 I don't know how many people are in there. I think  
19 it's pretty small, if you look at the maroon bump over  
20 there. We can also look at how many people are in  
21 there and take them out as well, until we get to -- I  
22 guess the question is what -- what level of deviation  
23 are you comfortable with? If we go up to 6 or  
24 7 percent are you comfortable with that?

25           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I make a suggestion

1       instead of taking apart Flagstaff? Just, you know,  
2       right now Winslow is split. What if we looked at  
3       Winslow instead and maybe Holbrook in those areas. I  
4       mean, my preference is -- I mean, in this map I do  
5       think it's a problem to have Flagstaff in District 6,  
6       but we could look at some of what's going on in  
7       Winslow. Winslow has a high number of Native Americans  
8       that live there. So I'm just concerned about taking  
9       some of these folks that live right next to Flagstaff  
10      and moving them around like that.

11               MR. D. JOHNSON: Winslow is -- is already out.  
12      There is a little piece of it, but there -- I don't  
13      think there is any people in that little piece.

14               COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Then Holbrook is  
15      also out.

16               MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

17               COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I guess I'm just --  
18      then I get confused. Are you -- you're talking about  
19      just having a small piece of Flagstaff in is what  
20      you're -- and that would then be probably just the east  
21      part? Either that or I'm just very confused.

22               MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. So I think what --  
23      what we understand the direction to be is that for  
24      District 7 to add population from District 6 in order  
25      to bring the deviation of District 6 -- to make the

1 deviation of District 6 larger, which is what the  
2 Navajo have asked for, by, you know, picking up  
3 population -- picking up that South Flagstaff area we  
4 would go from D7 -- I'm sorry, from D6 to D7, and then  
5 maybe the -- the area where D7 comes down -- I'm sorry,  
6 where D6 comes down towards Winslow --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- is -- is -- that moved I  
9 think originally because there is some tribal lands in  
10 there. There is no real people in there, no real  
11 significant numbers of people. It's just there are  
12 some tribal -- it's not reservation territory. It's  
13 the trust areas I think was the issue.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I guess -- I guess  
15 I'm concerned. Those folks -- I just don't think we  
16 should be separating those folks just south of  
17 Flagstaff from Flagstaff. That is their total  
18 community. They come up there and they live there and  
19 they go to Flagstaff. What if we instead put all of  
20 Winslow into District 6 just as a movement?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's going the wrong way.  
22 We're looking to take population from 6 into 7.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Maybe we don't need to  
24 do the population balancing now, then, because I don't  
25 know that this is -- I don't think this is a community

1 of interest argument right here, and -- and I think  
2 Flagstaff needs to be out of District 6, so we need to  
3 find things to put into it instead. I mean, I don't  
4 think it's a good idea to have Flagstaff in there. But  
5 that's what we'll hear next week, right? We'll get  
6 information from our attorneys on that. But I'm a  
7 little concerned about making some of these changes or  
8 recommending some of these changes right now until we  
9 have a better handle on where exactly things like that  
10 should go, because we could be doing some things with  
11 Winslow and Holbrook instead which might align a little  
12 bit better, rather than doing some of these changes  
13 with neighboring communities in Flagstaff.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think what I'm hearing  
15 you say, Commissioner Lerner, is that you think the  
16 population of Winslow will be more favorable to include  
17 in D6 in terms of their political cohesion. They're --  
18 that they're more likely to prefer a similar candidate  
19 in the primary to the Native Americans. Is that what  
20 you're suggesting?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So that it's not even  
23 just an issue of the population deviance; it's an issue  
24 of including people that are more like-minded.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Thank you.

1           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  What is the population of  
2 Winslow?

3           MR. KINGERY:  9,000.

4           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:  10,000.  Nine.

5           COMMISSIONER YORK:  Of Winslow?

6           COMMISSIONER LERNER:  And it has a very high  
7 Native American population within that as well, so that  
8 to me is much more logical.

9           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  We would be okay with  
10 that.

11          COMMISSIONER LERNER:  With moving Winslow into  
12 D6?

13          COMMISSIONER MEHL:  Yes.

14          MR. D. JOHNSON:  Well, just the challenge is  
15 the -- the thought of moving Winslow and Holbrook into  
16 D6 is -- would mean taking more of Flagstaff or all of  
17 Flagstaff out.

18          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  Right.

19          COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Right.  That's the idea.

20          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:  That's the idea.

21          MR. D. JOHNSON:  Okay.  So --

22          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:  And I think also the  
23 Navajo Nation's proposal recommended a deviation of  
24 about 5 percent, so -- so if we take Flagstaff out and  
25 include Winslow and Holbrook I think we get to that --

1 that number that -- that represents what the Navajo  
2 Nation is proposing.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And it would have  
4 higher -- I think the folks in Winslow -- there are  
5 certainly a large number in Winslow of Native  
6 Americans. I think there is a decent number in  
7 Holbrook, not as many, but I think if we take that --  
8 that --

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's true.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- group then we could  
11 put Flagstaff back in District 7.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: So Winslow and Holbrook would  
13 add -- if we put both of them in that adds about 14 or  
14 15,000 people into D6. Flagstaff is 70,000, so we  
15 can't -- we can't trade those two. You'll be way  
16 beyond deviations we can do. That's why the Navajo and  
17 the other tribes' proposal takes Show Low and  
18 everything, in order to make up for taking Flagstaff  
19 out. So we could -- we could move Holbrook and Winslow  
20 into D6 and take not just the part of Flagstaff we  
21 talked about, but that plus more. Instead of the  
22 11,000 I think we looked at we could take 25,000, and  
23 you would have a one-third, two-third split.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to look at  
25 this. I mean, you know, I would like to, you know,

1 yes, we may be splitting Flagstaff, but if they're  
2 going to be in -- in reasonable districts where they're  
3 represented well and we can minimize the  
4 marginalization of other communities, you know, it's  
5 worth looking into.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: You've got Joseph City,  
7 also.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sorry?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just I'm looking at  
10 Google. You got Winslow, Joseph City, and Holbrook.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, just that I-40.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean, we're looking --  
14 all looking for compromises. This is a compromise from  
15 what the Navajo proposed.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, you know, and I  
18 like it. I love that all these groups are submitting  
19 ideas. But, you know, they don't represent the state.  
20 We do. So we take the best and incorporate it and --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a note --

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- I like to call them  
23 our ideas now. After we own them they're our ideas.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would also like -- as  
25 long as we're in this area, we heard loud and clear

1 from the mayor, the council, from people in Sedona that  
2 they wanted to be with something with Flagstaff. I  
3 would like to ask that as we're taking a look at this  
4 we take all of Sedona and put it back with -- in  
5 District 7.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is a whole new topic.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, it's the same  
8 area. We're just looking at -- I'm just looking at  
9 that one area in there, and that's -- that would -- as  
10 part of this whole population balancing, but we heard  
11 loud and clear from their elected officials as well as  
12 by far the majority of people that Sedona wanted to be  
13 in a district with Flagstaff.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I asked -- I got  
15 explicit feedback on this, because I remember on the  
16 listening tour I was being asked to keep all of those  
17 small communities together: Sedona, Verde Valley,  
18 Cottonwood, Cornville, blah, blah, blah, and we also  
19 want to be with Flagstaff. And I called them on it,  
20 and I said, "Okay." I said, "What are your priorities?  
21 Do you prefer to be together, all of these communities  
22 of interest, or do you prefer to be with Flagstaff?"

23 And I was told consistently, "We prefer our  
24 communities together."

25 So for you to take Sedona and put them away,

1 it's actually violating what was the higher priority of  
2 the same group, at least what I heard.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We have testimony from  
4 the mayor and council from Sedona asking to being  
5 with -- to be with Flagstaff, very specifically asking  
6 to be with Flagstaff.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Not at the expense of  
8 being separated from all of those other communities.  
9 That's my understanding. But we can ask for  
10 clarification. I mean, I want to again reiterate I  
11 deeply appreciate city council members and mayors and  
12 anybody else who submits feedback. We learn from them.  
13 Doesn't mean we listen to them.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I feel that  
15 what -- I would like to get clarification on that from  
16 those folks, but we are listening -- it seems like we  
17 listen to some, but not others. You know, we're  
18 listening to the people over in Show Low, Pinetop,  
19 those areas and their mayors and their elected  
20 officials, but then we're going to say to the Sedona  
21 folks who came to meeting after meeting asking to be  
22 with Flagstaff that we're going to say to them, no,  
23 we're not going to do that. So I would like to get  
24 clarification from them. Would they prefer to be with  
25 Flagstaff or with the other Verde Valley?

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Just for clarification,  
2 I've never had any conversations with any  
3 representatives from the White Mountains. I don't  
4 think anybody has communicated to me. I've had  
5 meetings with mayors in Phoenix and Tucson and Tempe  
6 and Mesa and Chandler. And so, you know, to -- I'm not  
7 listening to the mayors of the White Mountains. I  
8 haven't even heard from them.

9           COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. I'm talking about  
10 written documents from them. I'm not saying that you  
11 had meetings, but we have heard from their -- and from  
12 their testimony. So I would like to get clarification  
13 on Sedona about -- because we heard -- and if they say  
14 they want to be with the Verde Valley instead, okay,  
15 then we'll leave them there. But if they say they  
16 would prefer to be with Flagstaff I think we should  
17 look at that.

18           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm open to hearing  
19 from many sources if Sedona would prefer to be separate  
20 from the other, you know, satellite communities that  
21 area and be with Flagstaff. We can, you know, open  
22 that up. That's not a -- I mean, it's not a huge  
23 consequence, I think.

24           COMMISSIONER YORK: If -- this is Commissioner  
25 York. If my memory serves me well I remember

1 discussions from the Sedona residents wanting to be  
2 with Flagstaff, but I also heard a greater interest in  
3 the -- the water corridor of the Verde Valley and the  
4 Chino Valley, Oak Creek Canyon runs into that, keeping  
5 that -- that interest more contiguous and compact  
6 than -- than that overweighed the ability to move  
7 Sedona up into CD7. And so from my standpoint we have  
8 moved Sedona into D5 as part of Yavapai County, but  
9 also, more importantly, Verde Valley is involved with  
10 that, and that keeps that water corridor, that  
11 drainage, which is so important to the rural community  
12 up in that part of the state, and so I believe we've  
13 done a good job addressing what I think is one of our  
14 core responsibilities.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, again, I would  
16 like to hear from them specifically about this. I -- I  
17 don't know how Yavapai County has become we have to  
18 keep it together. It's been a little frustrating from  
19 my perspective when we don't seem to do that to all the  
20 other counties. Good for them that they seem to have  
21 that, but I don't feel that we're listening to all the  
22 communities of interest in that way to the same extent  
23 that we should. So I would like to hear back from  
24 Sedona. I mean, my concern about District 5 has been  
25 that I don't think we've honored what the Verde Valley

1 wants to -- wants, and we are honoring what the White  
2 Mountain communities are, so we're -- we're taking some  
3 and not others. But at this point I don't seem to be  
4 able to win that argument about doing anything with  
5 Yavapai, but I would like to actually see what we can  
6 do with Sedona and find out.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm open to that. I  
8 also just want to be clear on record the primary reason  
9 I'm for Yavapai staying whole is not to keep the county  
10 itself whole, although I think that's a positive. I'm  
11 open to splitting counties when necessary, when it  
12 makes sense. I think the age range just was compelling  
13 to me in terms of communities of interest and what they  
14 look for from their elected leaders, as well as  
15 learning about the water issues in Yavapai County and  
16 some of the fighting that goes on that I think is  
17 really probably reflective all over our state, so I am  
18 not basing my recommendation simply on making a county  
19 whole.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a -- as a quick  
21 note, I do understand the age range since I'm up there  
22 myself, but -- but we did hear from folks, and we  
23 actually just got a public comment on this, that from  
24 an age perspective part of why connections to Flagstaff  
25 are so important for some of those folks is because

1 that's where the hospitals are that they go to, so they  
2 do have connections with the health community, health  
3 care community up in Flagstaff, and so I do think that  
4 has to be considered as part of it as well for some of  
5 these communities. But maybe we can wait to hear a  
6 little bit. Maybe we can get something back from --  
7 about Sedona.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So it's about 12:18. We  
9 can move on to some other areas in the LDs and flesh it  
10 out, or, you know, I don't know, lunch break, what  
11 would be good timing for everybody and mapping. Excuse  
12 me? Lunch is ready. How would my colleagues -- excuse  
13 me? Do you want additional -- I'm not sure we're ready  
14 to give additional direction on the LDs so how would  
15 this work for you to take a break right now and --

16 MR. FLAHAN: I think lunch would work out  
17 great. The team has most of the changes done so we  
18 need to go and give them a couple more directions so  
19 that way we can finish the congressional up, so I think  
20 it's actually a great time to take a break.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Anything else my  
22 colleagues want to --

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I would love  
24 jump into Maricopa County when we return because --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

1           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  -- we just have a lot of  
2 work to do there.

3           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  We will.

4           Okay.  How much time for lunch, guys?  I want  
5 to respect my colleagues for, you know, if you need to  
6 regroup a little bit.  Half hour?  Forty minutes?

7           COMMISSIONER YORK:  Let's go 1:00.

8           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  1:00 sharp?  Can we say  
9 12:55 so we can actually start at 1?  Good?  Recess.

10           (The morning session concluded at 12:19 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23           This transcript represents an unofficial  
24 record.  Please consult the accompanying video for the  
25 official record of IRC proceedings.

