

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Morning Session
December 17, 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)	5
6	ITEM NO. II	6
7	ITEM II (A)	6
8	ITEM II (B)	
9	MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES	7
10	VOTE	7
11	ITEM NO. III	7
12	ITEM NO. IV	8
13	ITEM NO. V	8
14	ITEM NO. VI	9
15	MOTION TO START FROM LEGISLATIVE MAP 13.1	27
16	DISCUSSION	28
17	VOTE	30
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 9:00 a.m. on
3 December 17, 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. Randy Trott, Timmons Group
21 Mr. Doug Johnson, NDC
22 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC

23 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
24 Mr. Shawn Summers, Ballard Spahr
25 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer
Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer

* Spanish interpreter present

P R O C E E D I N G

1

2

3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Val.

4

MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

5

Vice Chair Watchman.

6

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

7

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

8

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye, here.

9

MS. NEUMANN: And Vice Chair -- thank you.

10

Vice -- our Chairperson Neuberg.

11

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

12

MS. NEUMANN: Thank you.

13

And for the record also in attendance is

14

Executive Director Brian Schmitt; Deputy Director Lori

15

Van Haren, who is appearing virtually; Community

16

Outreach Coordinator Alex Pena; Public Information

17

Officer Michelle Crank.

18

And from our legal team we've got Brett

19

Johnson and Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer, and Roy

20

Herrera and I believe Daniel Arellano from Ballard

21

Spahr will be joining us.

22

And our mapping consultants who will be

23

joining us at 10:00: Mark Flahan, Parker Bradshaw,

24

Brian Kingery from Timmons; Doug Johnson and Ivy Beller

25

Sakanski from NDC Research.

1 And our transcriptionist, Angela Miller in the
2 afternoon and Debbie Wilks in the morning.

3 And I would like to at this time introduce our
4 Spanish interpreter, Mark Canas, who will be our
5 interpreter this morning.

6 THE INTERPRETER: Good morning. My name is
7 Mark Canas. If you need me to interpret for you please
8 come see me in the back.

9 (Interpreter speaking in foreign language.)

10 MS. NEUMANN: And our Spanish interpreter for
11 this afternoon will Olinka Casalanos (phonetic).

12 That's everyone. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

14 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is
15 present.

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

17 Val, was the Notice and Agenda for the
18 Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance
19 of today's meeting?

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

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

22 With that we will go into recess, and we look
23 forward to joining with our other colleagues and our
24 broader team at 10:00 a.m.

25 (Brief recess taken.)

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
2 everybody. We were on recess. We had gone through
3 Agenda Item A and B.

4 I will ask, though, given that we have our
5 full Commission and additional guests, Val, if you
6 could please for the minutes and the public review who
7 is present at the public meeting and do a roll call.

8 MS. NEUMANN: Yes, Madam Chair.

9 So we have Vice Chair Watchman, Commissioner
10 Lerner, Commissioner Mehl, Commissioner York,
11 Chairperson Neuberg, and Executive Director Brian
12 Schmitt, Deputy Director Lori Van Haren, Brett Johnson
13 and Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer, Roy Herrera and
14 Shawn Summers from Ballard Spahr.

15 We have Mark Flahan, Parker Bradshaw, Brian
16 Kingery, and Randy Trott from Timmons; Doug Johnson and
17 Ivy -- no, Ivy is here -- Ivy Beller Sakansky.

18 Debbie Wilks is our transcriptionist this
19 morning. Angela Miller will be this afternoon.

20 And our Spanish interpreter, Mark Canas.

21 Thank you.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you.

23 We will move to Agenda Item No II, approval of
24 minutes from December 16th, 2021. We had general
25 session minutes. We did not have any minutes for

1 executive session.

2 I'll entertain discussion, and if there is no
3 discussion I'll entertain a motion to approve the
4 minutes from December 16th.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I move we approve the
6 minutes from December 16th.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
8 seconds.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further
10 discussion, Vice Chair Watchman.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
19 an aye.

20 With that the minutes are approved for
21 December 16th.

22 And, Val, as always, thank you very much.

23 Agenda Item III, opportunity for public
24 comments. Public comment will now open for a minimum
25 of 30 minutes and remain open until the adjournment of

1 the meeting. Comments will only be accepted
2 electronically in writing on the link provided in the
3 Notice and Agenda for this public meeting and will be
4 limited to 3,000 characters. Please note members of
5 the Commission may not discuss items that are not
6 specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore,
7 pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.0(1)(H), action taken as a
8 result of public comment will be limited to directing
9 staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism,
10 or scheduling the matter for further consideration and
11 decision at a later date.

12 We'll move to Agenda Item IV, discussion on
13 public comments received prior to today's meeting.
14 It's been tremendous. I want to give a huge amount of
15 credit to our public. There is a tremendous amount of
16 honest interchange of ideas, visions that are going on.
17 Yes, decisions are going to continue to be narrowed,
18 particularly, you know, Sunday, Monday, but I would
19 like to share I still have substantive meetings. I'll
20 be meeting with a representative from Navajo Nation
21 tomorrow. I'm still fielding phone calls. I presume
22 all of my colleagues are -- are listening and reading
23 all the letters that are coming in, and so thank you.
24 We're giving it very serious thought and deliberation.

25 With that we'll move to Agenda Item No. V,

1 potential update, discussion, and potential action
2 concerning polarization data and report presentation
3 from mapping consultants regarding U.S. and Arizona
4 Constitutional requirements.

5 Do we have an update?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: No new information this
7 morning.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you very much. I
9 presume soon as the maps begin to take form that --
10 that some updates may be forthcoming.

11 With that we'll move to the main event, Agenda
12 Item VI, draft map decision discussion. We'll be
13 discussing the legislative map drawing, congressional
14 map drawing. As always, the Commission does reserve
15 the right to go into executive session, if necessary,
16 for the purpose of obtaining legal advice.

17 As we bring up, you know, which map, I have a
18 slight preference today to start with legislative. I
19 don't want to -- you know, I like to balance the focus
20 and where our fresh minds are, but as always I like to
21 consider my colleagues' feelings and thoughts about
22 this.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't care.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All right. If people
25 don't have a preference let's start with the

1 legislative map. And what I would like to do before we
2 entertain a motion, in a very succinct way I would like
3 for all of us to maybe just provide a few comments
4 about the two options that we reviewed, share, you
5 know, the pros, cons, what we liked, what we didn't
6 like. Then after that very brief, you know,
7 interchange we can entertain a motion. So I'm going
8 to -- I'll go last. I would like to hear from the four
9 of you first, you know, what you liked about each map,
10 and if -- maybe we should, you know, do one map at a
11 time, or I'm also open to just each Commissioner maybe
12 sharing their pros and cons. That may be a little more
13 efficient.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: One of the -- well --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please start. We have
16 two options. Maybe the mapping team would like to
17 clarify exactly the numbers, because sometimes I get
18 them a little mixed up, and we are on the LDs.

19 MR. KINGERY: So yesterday we approved
20 Legislative District 12.1.1, and from that we received
21 feedback from you all and went on to the 13 series
22 where we made 13.0 and 13.1.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So I would like to hear
24 from my colleagues your general sentiments, focusing on
25 Constitutional criteria, as always, what you liked

1 about each map, what you didn't like, and from there I
2 think we'll have a more efficient motion for a starting
3 point. And I emphasize again starting point.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: One of the biggest
5 differences between the two maps is District 25. In
6 our map District 25 comes into Buckeye, and in the
7 alternative map -- in 13.0 it comes into Buckeye. In
8 13.1 it goes up and takes in part of Surprise and
9 swings up farther north. And a result of that is D28
10 swings to the east, and D3 ends up taking in the Deer
11 Valley area and the area north of the 101 around --
12 what was it?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Desert Ridge.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Desert Ridge. So there is
15 a number of things that -- that occur, partly from that
16 and partly from how D11 and D22 are configured. The
17 13.0 map I think just gives a much better division.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: 13.0.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The 13.0 map gives a much
20 better division in Maricopa County. I think it's a
21 better map for us to work from to get from here to a
22 finish.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: There is a couple
24 legislative districts that we treat differently. One
25 of our frustrations is that the Latino Coalition has

1 given us four suggestions. All four are different, so
2 I'm concerned they're not Latino Coalition suggestions,
3 that they're partisan suggestions. And so we have
4 stayed with suggestion 3, and so 24 and 26 stayed how
5 they suggested, and so we decided to make an adoption
6 to LD11 and LD22 that we believe treats the South
7 Mountain community more fairly. If you look at the
8 African American populations on the -- our map, the
9 percentages are higher in both consistently than in --
10 in the 13.1 map.

11 The other thing we do is we combine Laveen and
12 the agriculture community with the West Valley of
13 Maricopa County south of Tolleson and out towards
14 Buckeye and Goodyear, and so, you know, we feel that
15 that's a better treatment of that population.

16 We think the community of interest, Flagstaff,
17 being with CD6 -- I mean LD6 and Sedona being LD7, the
18 White Mountains get treated more fairly in our map.

19 The communities in the East Valley, if you
20 look at LD13 it's a nice square district. We've -- if
21 you look at the Asian populations in those
22 neighborhoods we actually treat them more fairly than
23 moving more of Gilbert into that district.

24 There is a few bedroom communities we've
25 treated fair, Lehi and the Mesa Riverview and LD8,

1 which is along the river. We've picked up Dobson Ranch
2 in LD9. We've done a nice job of incorporating into
3 LD10 the Leisure World and the retirement communities.
4 We think we've done a good job up in LD28 to pick up
5 the retirement communities of Sun City. And we heard
6 Sun Lakes wanted to be included in the Chandler
7 Hamilton area. We've included that in LD13.

8 If you look at how we've treated Casa Grande,
9 Coolidge and LD16, we've put those communities together
10 with Marana, and we feel really confident that we've
11 listened to the city of -- and the people of Arizona,
12 and we've done a nice job of incorporating those
13 considerations into this map.

14 This is a map that was a predecessor to what
15 was voted for yesterday as an approval, and we feel
16 confident that the continued enhancements make it even
17 a better map for the state.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And to be more specific on
19 the Laveen area, because that was one of the big
20 criticisms of our map, and the criticism was we were
21 splitting the Black -- the Black population into two
22 different districts, and the reality is that both maps
23 do it very similarly. So in the 13.0 map that we're
24 supporting, District 11 has a 19 -- a little over
25 19 percent Black population -- or, excuse me, a little

1 over 16 percent population, and District 22 14 percent.
2 In the 13.1 map they don't consolidate it all into one
3 at all. They split it nearly like we do. It's
4 19 percent and almost 11 percent. So both maps -- and
5 because of just where people live, not -- not for any
6 bad reasons. But both maps split that population, and
7 it's not an accurate criticism of our map versus the
8 other one.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm sure there are other
10 thoughts.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I guess my last comment is
12 that, you know, we continue to get letters from the
13 public that are convenient when we need them, it seems.
14 You get a mayor or city council, and in this case the
15 Latino Coalition sent us yesterday afternoon their new
16 desired outcome for the West Valley, and I just find it
17 odd that all of a sudden we're considering that now
18 that we've been so -- at this for so long.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the big picture is we
20 have taken -- we have taken very, very seriously the
21 input from the Latino Coalition, but the number of
22 different ways they've drawn it shows the reality that
23 it's -- it's not specifically how these areas are
24 drawn, but do we have successful districts when we're
25 done, and the fact that the lines move a little bit

1 here or there from whatever suggestion they've most
2 recently made is not the relevant point. The relevant
3 point is have we combined communities of interest
4 properly, have we created districts that we can -- that
5 people are going to be well-represented in, and I think
6 that we have successfully done that.

7 We're done.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not surprisingly, I have
9 some real issues with a lot of what was just said. I
10 actually have a problem with the concept of treating
11 people fairly. I don't know what that means in the
12 terms of our Constitutional requirements because that
13 doesn't really define that, and you mentioned that a
14 number of times, treating people fairly. Well, we are
15 supposed to follow the six Constitutional criteria, and
16 I think that's what we need to focus on here.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And that's what we meant
18 by fairly.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess -- but I
20 would -- at some point I'd probably want more specifics
21 about what that means as part of that. I will be
22 honest. To be quite honest, none of these map --
23 neither of these maps we're comfortable with because
24 they started from a place that I don't think gave
25 balance, so now we're at a point where we have to move

1 from a really difficult place from a Democratic
2 perspective where we had a difficult time trying to
3 find ways to balance the map. I do not feel that the
4 Map 13.0, which is what 13.1 -- let me get this right.
5 See, they're so similar in so many ways. I apologize.
6 13.1. That's the Democrat map. There are some
7 differences, but as we mentioned yesterday we know we
8 need to make a lot more differences.

9 Let's start with District 11 just as one
10 reason. Well, let me start, actually, with the Latino
11 Coalition maps, because you mention the fact that they
12 keep sending new ones. They keep sending new ones
13 because we keep changing the ones that they have. If
14 we were to go back to their original and just input
15 that I'm sure they would be perfectly happy, but every
16 time we make changes they look at it and say, well, now
17 that has disenfranchised people, and so they come back
18 to us with another set of maps. I want to be clear
19 that if we just accepted their first round or their
20 second round I'm sure they would be perfectly fine.
21 They sent new ones because we keep tweaking and
22 changing the maps, and the justifications that are
23 given for changing their districts are not for their
24 people as much as because there are other partisan
25 reasons to modify those districts. Do we need to take

1 anybody's maps whole? No. We know that. But the
2 modifications, the reason they keep sending them is
3 because primarily my Republican friends keep changing
4 them, and so they're modifying them to try to adjust to
5 the way that they have been changed as part of that.
6 So I want to be clear about that.

7 I also want to be -- so another issue that I
8 had with the Republican map, their map that they just
9 discussed, is how Yuma Gold went from being something
10 that we talked about for the Yuma split, which we all
11 said worked, that what was going on in Yuma as a split
12 was something we all could agree with, but they came
13 all the way up into the Valley. They modified the VRA
14 districts that had been placed in there. Are we saying
15 that the Yuma mayor knows the Latino population in
16 Maricopa County? Because pretty much that's what
17 happened. When you look at the Yuma Gold map it was --
18 and then the map by the Republicans from 12.1.1, that
19 map incorporated most of what Yuma Gold said in
20 Maricopa County, and that was one of the reasons that
21 we had a lot of trouble with that, because it
22 completely modified the -- the districts we had all
23 agreed on, that we had said that we were on target with
24 with our draft map.

25 District 11 there is -- is an area that we

1 have heard from the people who live in that community
2 should be whole. It is not -- it has a very high
3 African American population. Putting them in that
4 single district will consolidate their power. Yes,
5 they have coalitions with others, but splitting them
6 into two districts diminishes their vote as part of it.
7 There was no reason to split that other than to make
8 the other changes that were going to create a partisan
9 bias on this map.

10 Other reasons that I have trouble with this
11 map is where we are at this point. It gives us a 17-13
12 split, and I do want to mention that. I don't feel
13 that that's appropriate as part of -- of where we -- we
14 should be at this point. We came from a place with our
15 Legislative Map 10.0 where we were actually in a pretty
16 good place for that map. I felt that that draft map
17 that we had was a very good starting point that just
18 needed some tweaking. It had a lot of good population
19 balancing. It had -- was it perfect? No. But there
20 were a lot of things in there that we all had agreed
21 upon, even if we all weren't 100 percent happy. And I
22 wanted to make that -- that comment, too, because,
23 honestly, since then we're playing catch up as part of
24 what we have to do. We are going with maps that are
25 extremely partisan, that have districts that aren't

1 balanced, that divide populations and communities of
2 interest in ways that shouldn't be, like District 11.
3 South Phoenix is a cohesive community that shouldn't be
4 split as part of that. The -- I guess that would be
5 one of the questions.

6 The comment that you made about last minute
7 changes from the Latino Coalition, as I've addressed
8 that just now by explaining that they keep submitting
9 new maps because we keep changing their districts, so
10 it's -- in a way it's, okay, if you're going to do it
11 now, then here is another suggestion. We have taken
12 last minute suggestions before. Yuma Gold was a last
13 minute suggestion. District 17 was a last minute
14 suggestion. And we've incorporated those into our
15 maps, so I don't think that we should be criticizing a
16 community that is looking out for the interests of
17 their community as part of that.

18 The -- the Gilbert map this -- that -- that we
19 always come back to is another one that was somewhat --
20 that was incorporated as part of it. There is a lot of
21 areas that we've -- we take suggestions, and our
22 Chairwoman has even said that. We look at other folks'
23 maps and we see what we like about them, and then we
24 can incorporate what we think is -- is positive about
25 that.

1 A couple of things just to comment on why I
2 prefer the Democratic -- well, I mean, I think it's
3 hard to go back to the Republican map because, again,
4 it will be a lot of modifications, and we're
5 struggling. Yesterday, as you know, we were struggling
6 to try to figure out where to even begin to make
7 changes on that map. I still have real concerns about
8 District 7 and District 6. I think that needs to be --
9 we need to take a closer look at what we can do in that
10 area.

11 I am going to be speaking about
12 competitiveness because it is one of our six
13 Constitutional criteria. We don't put it above others,
14 but it is an important criteria, and we need to be --
15 we need to be cognitive of it. So that's one area.

16 I also think there is a problem with having
17 Yuma come up into the Maricopa County area in two
18 districts, District 25 and District 23. There is no
19 reason for that. It really divides District 23 having
20 it go into -- it will be in Yuma, the Maricopa -- west
21 Maricopa County, as well as the Tucson area. That's a
22 really difficult district for a congressional -- for a
23 legislator to have to try to balance all of that. So
24 that's one of the concerns, another concern that I
25 have.

1 So and I think District -- District 16 is
2 another concern, also reaching all the way north into
3 the bottom of Maricopa County and all the way down to
4 Pima and to Tucson. That district should be
5 consolidated. It does not meet Constitutional criteria
6 for keeping communities of interest together or keeping
7 a compact, contiguous district in that area as well.

8 And there are other communities of interest
9 that I feel are split that should not be as part of
10 that. So I think these are -- we've looked at a number
11 of areas where communities have been divided for the
12 sake -- and not always for ways that we can -- we can
13 explain or justify as part of that. Just a second.
14 Let me pull up -- okay. Sorry.

15 Another area is -- I mean, I think the West
16 Valley just needs a lot of work. There has been a lot
17 of changes that have occurred in there that I don't
18 think are benefitting the West Valley. I think we need
19 to take a closer look at that. I think we need to take
20 a closer look at the Coalition's districts that they
21 have in there and see how those align. For example,
22 putting Maryvale -- I'm sorry. That was congressional,
23 Maryvale outside.

24 So I think those are -- those are some of my
25 big picture comments. I think we haven't done as well

1 as we can for meeting communities of interest. We've
2 done a lot of partisan divides in a lot of these, and I
3 think we need to take a close look at all of this.

4 I'll go back to the Coalition districts again.
5 I know we don't take anything completely, but we seem
6 to be doing it selectively. The fact that the
7 Republicans incorporated the Yuma Gold in there and
8 then took apart the Latino Coalition maps -- we have
9 changed their districts every iteration. Every time
10 they submit we change them, and I don't feel that we
11 have done a good job of justifying that and seeing
12 whether or not it really meets VRA requirements.

13 Thank you, Chairwoman.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman,
15 would you like to add anything?

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes. Thank you, Madam
17 Chair.

18 Big picture issues, one is that 13.1 addresses
19 the Navajo Nation consideration, which obviously I'm
20 supporting. 13.0 does not. And I feel that, you know,
21 one of the -- one of the issues that I've been looking
22 at is making sure that these maps reflect and improve
23 the -- not only the Native American but the Latino
24 Coalition and African American folks so that they have,
25 you know, the ability to choose their candidate of

1 choice.

2 And so, for example, if you look at the
3 difference between our map, District 11 and their map,
4 District 22 and District 11, in our -- in our version,
5 you know, we try to consider -- you look at District
6 11 -- you know, keeping whole the African American
7 community. We think that's very, very important, you
8 know, alongside the Latinos, and so that gets back to,
9 you know, making sure that we meet the Voter Rights
10 Act, and it's very, very important that we do that.
11 And so -- so I've been looking at and making sure that
12 we reflect and we consider all of the minorities, and
13 so I think that's important.

14 Now, if you get back to our map and you look
15 at District 7 and the split between Flagstaff and the
16 Navajo Nation, you know, one of the things that I
17 mentioned earlier is that, yes, there is some economic
18 ties, but when you look at the -- when you look at the
19 history of both areas, Navajo versus Flagstaff, for
20 example, Flagstaff -- and I think you said this
21 yesterday or the day before -- is very tourist and
22 urban focused, and it's very different than -- than the
23 rest of the Navajo Nation, the two Apache reservations,
24 Hopi, Havasupai, and Hualapai, very rural in nature.
25 And so -- so those connections I think are very similar

1 to what we see on the east -- eastern side of the
2 state, and so I think that splitting Flagstaff and
3 putting Flagstaff in -- in D6 is a better option, as I
4 mentioned earlier.

5 And I think Commissioner Lerner also mentioned
6 the Yuma Gold split, and so I think we need to
7 consider -- let me look at my map here. I'm sorry.
8 Okay. District 23 -- we have District 25 and District
9 23. They both represent Maricopa County, and so I
10 think we need to revisit that. I think one -- one
11 district is plenty. I think Commissioner Lerner
12 mentioned District 25 is probably a better fit.
13 That -- that does meet and connects Yuma and Maricopa
14 County.

15 And so the other big picture issue that I have
16 is just, you know, the various communities of interest.
17 I did mention the Native and the minority, but I think
18 we also need to look and make sure we understand the
19 rural versus urban nature of communities of interest.
20 I think it's very, very important. We've talked about
21 water and, you know, various communities have a water
22 need versus others. I think all -- all of our
23 communities in the state have water challenges, and so
24 I don't think any one community of interest, any one
25 district has a higher need than the others, so -- so

1 each -- each area does have huge, huge water needs, and
2 so we need to address that as we talk about communities
3 of interest.

4 And so I think, at least in my opinion, 13.1
5 better reflects our communities of interest, better
6 reflects the minorities, the Native Americans, Latinos,
7 the African Americans. I think it's very, very
8 important, so, but I'll stop there. I guess I want to
9 lend my support for our map, 13.1, so thank you, Madam
10 Chair, for the time.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

12 So in terms of my feedback I want to say I
13 kind of woke up in a good mood today when I looked at
14 the maps, and I thought, wow, there is so much in
15 common between these maps. Boy, are the Commissioners
16 really listening and working in good faith and trying
17 to find compromise. So to be perfectly honest, whereas
18 yesterday I'm like I can't -- well, I can't remember
19 which one -- I can't, you know, endorse either one. To
20 be honest, I could be convinced to support both because
21 of the integrity and good faith I believe our
22 colleagues have showed, and I want to particularly call
23 out my Democratic colleagues who really have taken to
24 heart some of the broader consensus that you've heard
25 and are now incorporating it into maps that allow us to

1 make very real progress in coming together.

2 I have a slight preference for the Democratic
3 version of the LD map. I do believe they did a better
4 job of incorporating the interests of the minority
5 communities. I'm very sympathetic to what my
6 Republican colleagues spoke about with the Latino
7 Coalition. I think we all receive maps with, you know,
8 skepticism and understand that everybody has multiple
9 interests. But I do believe that they are working with
10 us now in good faith to really hone in the districts
11 that are of most importance to them, and rather than
12 getting frustrated with the number of iterations
13 they're providing, I'm actually appreciative because I
14 feel that they are listening, like so many pockets in
15 our community, to what's going on, and we have groups
16 all across the state trying to chime in to reach some
17 consensus, and so that's speaking to me.

18 I'm not -- I mean, there are things I'm not
19 sold about. I'm very concerned about the economic
20 impact of how we handle LD25, how that comes up into
21 Phoenix, Maricopa. You know, I'm not ready to make
22 some -- some firm decisions on that. I think we need
23 to attend to it a little bit more.

24 As everybody knows, I'm not ready to make a
25 decision on LD6 and 7. You know, I'm hoping that with

1 some creative dialogue and maybe my meeting with, you
2 know, the Navajo Nation tomorrow we can explore
3 creative ways to enhance their ability to have the
4 opportunity to elect a candidate of their choice
5 without compromising other highly important, valued
6 communities of interest in the White Mountains. I'm --
7 but -- but I'm open. I think we have so much more in
8 common.

9 So having said that, I have a preference to
10 start with, you know, the Democratic version. I
11 believe it's 13.1. I'll entertain a motion. But I
12 truly believe that either one could have been a great
13 starting point, and I think we're really understanding
14 where we're at and -- and can use this as a pivot to
15 further compromise.

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair
17 Watchman motions to start with, as a starting point,
18 Map 13.1.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner
20 Lerner. I second that motion.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
22 We'll take a vote.

23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have a discussion.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: I just want the public to
2 know that we're -- we're disappointed. We voted for
3 12.0 or 12.1 yesterday. This map is changing the
4 Latino Coalition's suggestions from what we were
5 working with the previous week.

6 The other thing is if you look at CD24 and 26,
7 those weren't the suggestions that were made yesterday
8 afternoon, so those changes weren't made to the map.
9 They only took into consideration CD -- I mean LD22 and
10 11 and 23 and 25, and so when they sent us that map
11 yesterday those two districts were different than what
12 they sent that we currently are voting on. That's my
13 comment.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I understand the
15 frustration. It ripples all over and --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's just
17 selective -- it's selective adjustment as far as -- as
18 far as that's what I feel.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I could, and that's
20 the case that happens with your maps as well; they're
21 selective adjustments. And not all of the changes were
22 made. There are a lot of similarities because not all
23 of the changes -- and as we mentioned yesterday we had
24 more changes, but we wanted to just get to a stopping
25 point where we could move forward yesterday. And from

1 our perspective, yes, the Latino Coalition maps have
2 adjusted, but they've adjusted, as I mentioned, as we
3 move forward. And we have -- this is basically a
4 starting point. I would be perfectly happy to have the
5 latest iteration of the Latino Coalition maps placed in
6 here to see what happens, but -- but this is a starting
7 point, just as we started all the others.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, and in response
9 to, again, I -- I sympathize with what's being said
10 because we are all receiving dramatic changes and --
11 and a remarkable amount of requests, and it throws so
12 much of what we studied and learn and decided on a
13 little bit up in the air. What some might view as
14 selective adjustments I call learning. I mean, you
15 know, I've said all along for, you know, whether people
16 want to believe it or not, this is truly an organic,
17 collective, intellectual process, and, you know, it
18 can't go on forever. We're getting at the end stages,
19 and I hope by the end of the day, you know, we're going
20 to be at a point where we're really fine-tuning, and I
21 believe we can get there. But I don't want to
22 discourage good, thoughtful resubmissions that may
23 actually make our maps better and our state better.

24 So any further discussion?

25 We have a motion on the table to approve LD

1 version 13.1. We'll take a vote.

2 Vice Chair Watchman.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
11 an aye.

12 With that we will start from 13.1. I miss the
13 5-0 votes. Anyway, just kidding.

14 Let's dive in. There are areas of real
15 disagreement, and let's fine-tune, you know, the map.
16 I'm open to -- you know, I'm really wanting to debate
17 25. I'm wanting to debate, you know, the boundaries
18 of -- of these -- of the majority minority districts,
19 doing right by the African Americans. I mean, you
20 know, we have multiple majority minority districts now
21 to be working with -- with groups that have gone on
22 record to say they not only have political cohesion but
23 they have communities of interest cohesion. They're
24 wanting to be in districts together because they share
25 similar issues like concerns about language and voting

1 and immigration and transportation and all of that, so,
2 you know, let's just keep that in mind.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I ask for a ten-minute
4 break?

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. How about we --
6 absolutely. Any time anybody needs a break. Let's
7 recess for ten minutes, and we will return at 10:50.

8 (Brief recess taken.)

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.
10 Are we live? Okay. Thank you for the patience during
11 our recess.

12 We are on Agenda Item VI, draft map decision
13 discussion. We are discussing the legislative map. We
14 have approved 13.1, and we will entertain deliberation,
15 debate, and suggested changes to improve our
16 legislative map.

17 I open it up to my colleagues and, yeah, I
18 will listen to you, where your priorities are, and
19 let's narrow in those areas of real debate and not
20 re -- relitigate other things that have led us to what
21 I said earlier is actually a map that is within reach,
22 so I open it up to my colleagues.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I would like to
24 address your comment about District 25. I think that
25 would be good to have a discussion on District 25 and

1 District 23, perhaps. And unless -- unless we want to
2 hold on District 25 until we learn more, but otherwise
3 I'm thinking we could actually talk about that a little
4 bit since that's -- both of those affect the West
5 Valley.

6 From -- from my perspective I think we
7 could -- as I mentioned, I don't think we need two
8 districts extending from Yuma into the Valley, and
9 especially District 23 coming into that area. I read
10 the letters that explained that they want to have a
11 connection between Yuma and parts of the West Valley,
12 so I think District 25 could serve that purpose. I'm
13 not sure if it completely gets the boundaries, but I
14 think District 25 as a north Yuma-Buckeye district
15 could be something that certainly we -- we can see
16 working.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: As we're debating this,
18 I mean, you know, in terms of the argument of not
19 wanting to come up into Phoenix or Maricopa County, I
20 think we've already gone on record as -- you know, for
21 the Latino Coalition with their two Congressional
22 district requests we've already gone on record to be
23 willing to extend into the main population areas when
24 for the sake of community of interest, you know,
25 purposes it makes sense, so I just wanted to point that

1 out as we're debating this issue.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: 23 currently follows
4 the -- more of what the Latino Coalition suggested.
5 The other thing is that it also follows the
6 congressional maps. Our concern with 25 is it goes all
7 the way up to Surprise and the outer areas of the 303
8 north of the retirement communities.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I actually think we
10 could make -- we could make adjustments I think to 23,
11 because the concern for 23 is that it extends into
12 three urban districts, so I think we could adjust 23 to
13 help 25 as part of that, and that's what I would --
14 would suggest, taking out -- out of 23, taking out
15 Goodyear from that. It's a very high Latino area.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: So push it into 22?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Put it into 22 as part
18 of that. We could -- if we move it into 22 then we
19 could make some slight adjustments in there. But if 23
20 loses, you know, kind of moves all of that Latino
21 population from Goodyear over it will mostly be out of
22 that -- that extension into the Valley.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: What amount of population
24 is up there? Do we know?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's a good-sized

1 population, so we would have to balance that, and we
2 could balance that as it goes further south. So if
3 Goodyear is removed from 23 I think it's -- well, I
4 don't know. You guys can tell us.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Goodyear is not 95,000.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It keeps Gila Bend, but
7 it allows that district to really serve Yuma and the
8 Tucson area. So we have a District 23 that would be
9 Yuma, Pima County, and then we have a District 25 that
10 would be Yuma, Maricopa County, and I think that would
11 be a really nice split since Yuma likes to have the
12 two. I think that gives them a really nice connection
13 to two urban areas where they have common interests.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Seems to be a
15 contradiction to what the Latino community wanted.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. This is exactly
17 what they want, actually.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's not the maps I looked
19 at.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: For District 23.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to
22 understand deeper the economic implications to the West
23 Valley with these different maps, because when I look
24 at the economic interests, that unites all communities
25 and something that is inherently positive for the

1 entire state. So as we're looking at LD25, you know,
2 can we focus on what implication this has for the
3 different communities of interest in their efforts to
4 collaborate on the business economic development front,
5 which, again, I believe is in the common interest of
6 100 percent of our communities of interest?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can you overlay Latino
8 Coalition suggestion map 4.0.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And just in response, I
10 think it's a really good point there. I think that we
11 read between Buckeye and Yuma that they felt that they
12 had some good connections. We heard that from some of
13 the industries, was it -- and you can correct me if I'm
14 wrong --

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: The ag.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- the agriculture
17 industry felt that they have a lot of relationships,
18 and Buckeye sees themselves growing in that -- that
19 way. The difference is Avondale and Goodyear are not
20 necessarily as connected, but I do feel that Buckeye
21 expressed that economic connection to Yuma and
22 agriculture industry, so I think that --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would agree with that.
24 There is the map currently, what they suggested
25 yesterday.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That was in response to
2 if we look at the previous one --

3 MR. KINGERY: Are you talking about 3.0?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They're responding to --
5 each time they change a map it's because of the maps
6 that we have changed. Their preference would be, of
7 course, to go to 1.0 or 2.0 or 3.0. They're not --
8 so --

9 MR. KINGERY: So on the right side of the
10 screen is the 4.0 submission that we received yesterday
11 and published. Is that the one you wanted to see?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I just wanted to see
13 where the Legislative 23 sits today currently.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: And to your earlier
15 question --

16 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: It includes more of
17 Buckeye.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- we have a number -- so the
19 Goodyear population in District 23 is --

20 MR. FLAHAN: It's roughly about 69,000 people.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That's a lot of people.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean 25, I think, does
23 a really nice job. The problem is with 23, which is
24 what I said, you have an incredibly difficult district
25 for a representative to be working on West Valley,

1 Tucson, Yuma, very difficult as part of that. And --
2 and the common -- the communities of interest don't
3 align, so we need to just balance that out is what
4 we're getting at and balance it with -- and -- and keep
5 the connection between Yuma and Buckeye, which they
6 have expressed as part of that, having a north county
7 Yuma connection over to the West Valley to Buckeye.
8 Those communities have said that, but they haven't said
9 this other piece.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you're being -- I
11 think the Latino Coalition outlined their desire with
12 their communities as it stair-steps through Buckeye and
13 Goodyear. My opinion, we've -- we've improved this
14 district quite a bit already, and now to make a
15 wholesale change to the northern boundary doesn't make
16 sense to me. This Latino suggestion goes up to I-10 at
17 the 303 intersection, picks up Goodyear, runs parallel
18 along Avondale. We know that's a heavily Latino
19 neighborhood. And then it stair-steps down along the
20 river, keeps the agriculture communities of Buckeye and
21 the fast-growth areas of Palo Verde and I-10 connected
22 with Yuma's agriculture community.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And 23 is one of our --
24 our VRA compliant --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- districts, and if you
2 take that population out of Goodyear you're going to
3 negatively affect them. I don't think --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It would be --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- that's a good idea.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It would be picking up
7 other populations.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But not -- you're not
9 going to come close to -- to doing that.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There will be other
11 populations over in -- and also as parts of Tucson that
12 could be picked up.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But you're not --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But the point that
15 they're -- the point that they're --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The Hispanic populations
17 in Tucson have been mostly put into 20 and 21.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The point that they're
19 raising with this is that they do not feel that it is
20 well-served for their population to be in all of these
21 different communities. There are agriculture ties
22 between Yuma and Buckeye that have been expressed by
23 both communities, and that's where District 25 comes
24 in. District 23 was a -- they have been modifying
25 District 23 every time we shift our -- our views of the

1 maps, our Coalition maps.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: We haven't changed
3 District 23 in a long time.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, but other -- other
5 districts have been, so we modify that to accommodate.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Commissioner Lerner,
7 you asked us to adopt -- to concede to your map for
8 LD11 and L22, which we have, and we agreed to this
9 Coalition's presentation of what would be D1, D4, and
10 D5. We did not take into consideration there D6 and D7
11 in the -- in the maps that we've conceded that, and now
12 you want us to change and ask -- you're asking us to
13 change again. And I don't -- and I hear what you're
14 saying as far as it's tough to navigate that big a
15 territory, but most of it's Tohono O'odham Nation
16 geography and the Yuma bombing range and stuff that's
17 done with the military, so a lot of this territory has
18 no population.

19 From my standpoint I would encourage mapping
20 to follow the Latino Coalition, stair-step through
21 Buckeye and Goodyear, which will give some more
22 population to 25. It will take a little bit of
23 population from 23, but I think it probably manages the
24 Latino Coalition and the Hispanic population better
25 than taking it 100 percent out of Maricopa County.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So where are you
2 suggesting, Doug? Can you --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Using the map.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Using just this map
5 exactly?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yep, because I know the ag
7 community, the --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The one on the right?
9 Is that the one you're suggesting?

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that 4.0? I'm sorry.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

13 MR. KINGERY: It is.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I'm okay with
15 adjusting the map to be the 4.0. And, in fact, you
16 know, from my perspective if we could just take those
17 districts and place them in this map and then make
18 adjustments as needed for all of the -- the five
19 districts, there shouldn't be that much difference.
20 District 22 is pretty similar. District 24 and 26
21 would need some adjustments. But if we could just take
22 those and put them in and see how that affects things,
23 I -- I think that would be fine. But I'm completely --
24 I'm comfortable with your suggestion, Commissioner
25 York.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Just for the sake of
2 clarification and -- and my slow thinking, can you
3 reiterate exactly why this is an improvement on the
4 map? And -- and use Constitutional language, if you
5 don't mind.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The most recent --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The debate between you
8 and Commissioner York and these suggestions. I would
9 like to understand exactly why you feel this is
10 improving the map.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: The improvement or the --
12 Commissioner Lerner has suggested that we pull all of
13 the top of CD -- or LD23 out of Maricopa County, and my
14 argument to that is that there is a fairly dense Latino
15 population along the I-10 corridor served at this point
16 by LD23 that runs adjacent to Buckeye as the Glendale
17 airport, Van Buren, that area north of the Agua Fria.
18 And then as you stair-step down through Goodyear and
19 Buckeye, that basically follows the ag community along
20 the river, which unites with also the ag community in
21 Yuma, so --

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And so you feel that map
23 aligns with the economic interests of the West Valley
24 and connecting down to Yuma.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can you give us a closer

1 up on the one on the right?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, that would --

3 MR. KINGERY: What area?

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm trying to -- trying to
5 see the -- what we call the D11 and D26, D24, just how
6 that all intersects in there, the one on the right.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's more compact.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can you overlay the -- the
9 Latino Coalition districts onto the 13.1?

10 MR. KINGERY: I'm not able to show the
11 differences and compare plans with the way that they
12 submitted this plan.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can you do the boundary,
14 or can you not do that, either?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It looks like, I mean --

16 MR. KINGERY: I'm not able to do the
17 comparison that's built in, but let me pull in the
18 feature service.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They're pretty minor --
20 you can kind of -- you can see that 22 goes -- in the
21 new map goes a little further east, cuts off the bottom
22 of --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: 26.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: 26 --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's probably one of
2 the major changes in -- in those two maps. I mean,
3 basically they -- they still are fitting together in a
4 way that honors their community.

5 So from my perspective, just in terms of
6 justifying, Madam Chair, the Constitutional criteria,
7 the new version of District 23 uses the I-10 as a line.
8 That's one of the bigger differences that are in it.
9 As you can see on that, they've done a nice job of
10 showing us those. But I think that -- that goes --
11 goes back to some earlier discussions that we've had
12 that basically empowers Latino voters a little bit
13 better, because there is a big population in south of
14 10 -- of 10, a Latino population in that area, versus
15 that north piece that comes up in the previous version,
16 so I think it empowers the folks more. It also just
17 slightly removes it from some of that West Valley by
18 going below the 10 versus above. And we had discussed
19 that before, that some of these areas have higher
20 Latino populations there in older parts of the
21 community, and they are aligned together, so that's
22 part of I think the difference in the 23 map.

23 So I think -- I think if we just make that
24 adjustment, which I think we're in agreement with our
25 Republican colleagues on, 25 at this point we can keep

1 in the West Valley for that Buckeye, Yuma connection
2 that was discussed. The other thing about 23 is that
3 if we go to Yuma I think it actually follows the split
4 that was requested in Yuma as part of that, too, so I
5 think we're accommodating that community of interest by
6 dividing that in the way that they preferred, or very
7 close to that. And then for 25 we have Buckeye and --
8 with that connection that we mentioned.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just -- just what we're
10 seeing on the screen on 22, the only difference between
11 what's in 13.1 and what was in 4.0 is that in the
12 Latino Coalition 4.0 they moved 26 and brought 22 over
13 farther east.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: So in our map 22 is short
16 7,000 because it does not pick up that piece of --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- 26. Otherwise they're the
19 same.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And is -- is 11 pretty
21 much the same?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 11 should have been back
24 to the way it was intended.

25 MR. KINGERY: So you can see the red outline

1 are the -- is the 4.0.

2 MR. FLAHAN: There is one difference on the
3 corner in District 11, between that and 26, that Brian
4 has got on the screen there.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Was that originally 4.0,
6 what you're showing us?

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: The -- the red outlines are
8 4.0, so 4 -- the Latino Coalition 4.0 would pick up
9 that one -- it's probably one census block.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You're talking about that
11 little corner?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the rest of 11 is the
14 same?

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

16 MR. KINGERY: Correct.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then you can show us
19 the -- a little bit closer on 22, 24, 26 -- I'm sorry?

20 MR. KINGERY: The -- the one difference in
21 District 11 is this one census block, and there is no
22 population there.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, then let's fight
25 hard over where it goes. We're drawing the line right

1 there.

2 What's the population that comes out of 23
3 that then is --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Out of 26 goes into 22.
5 The Latino Coalition map is actually more balanced than
6 ours, if you look at the numbers, so, I mean, it's
7 almost identical. I would be perfectly fine if we
8 adopted it and then try to take care of our VRA and
9 make the world a happier place.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're trying to get done
11 by Christmas.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's a cleaner map. It's
13 got straighter lines, a little more compactness on the
14 CDs -- on the LDs as far as the way it works, and I
15 think it handles the Black community better downtown,
16 South Phoenix, and so I'm perfectly fine adopting their
17 D1 -- D -- what is it, D1 --

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: There are four districts.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- D4, D7, D6, and D5.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you repeat the exact
22 districts? I'm sorry.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It ends up being --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Maricopa County moves.
25 D1, D7, D6, D4, and D5.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the one should be --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The northern line of D5.

3 We're not -- we don't know what happens when we get
4 down farther, but --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: These are currently 24,
6 26, 11.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And 22.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 22. Right?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And 23, that -- that
11 small change on the -- the north boundary. Correct?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So we are --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Complete agreement.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We are trying to cooperate
16 to make progress.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We appreciate that very
18 much.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I hope it is appreciated.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is very appreciated.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Because we need to get
22 some other things we need in order to have this map
23 have any hope. So here we go. We'll start saying --

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I would like to say
25 that there is so many compromises that are not captured

1 by our voting, so anybody who follows voting it's so
2 misguided about the level of compromise and negotiation
3 that's going on, so thank you.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just as you're looking at
5 what to do next, keep in mind the border between
6 twenty -- in our map 23 and 25 is -- South Buckeye is
7 the freeway, and just keep in mind just on the west
8 side of that is the 4,500 person prison. So if you
9 need -- if you want to do something that would involve
10 4,500 people moving around there that prison can move
11 to get your population numbers with no impact on
12 community of interest.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: On the northwest corner,
14 though.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, no. It's the far south.
16 Can you highlight Buckeye?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: The prison is on the
18 northwest corner of 10 and the 1 -- and the 303.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So, yeah, there is -- there
20 is two parts of the prison complex on either side of
21 the highway. The census counted all the people on the
22 west side, so the east side of 85 has zero, and the
23 west side of it has 4,500. So just so you have in the
24 back of your mind if you need to move 4,500 people from
25 we just need to use south -- the boundary of south

1 Buckeye instead of the highway.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: All right.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And it would go into what
4 district?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: It would go into 25. I
6 know what he's -- I understand what he's saying.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: It could go into 23.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So it goes from 25 to 23?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's currently in 25, yes.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: What did they count for
12 the horse track thing that sat vacant forever off there
13 south of I-10 across the highway from the prison?

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, zero. There is -- there
15 is zero down there.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: They used it in multiple
17 movies to blow up --

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Not suggesting the change,
19 just so you have in mind you have 4,500 people you can
20 move easily with not -- no affect on communities of
21 interest.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So we have some other
23 Maricopa changes we would like to suggest.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: There is a simple one --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hold on. Are we ready

1 to move on?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, what we're talking
3 about now, just to clarify, make sure we're all on the
4 same page, we are moving that boundary for district --
5 well, we're basically taking into account the Latino
6 Coalition maps that they just submitted.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what we're doing
9 right there?

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Not necessarily for south
13 of 23 when you get into Pima. We haven't looked at
14 that yet. Possibly, yes, but we haven't looked at it.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So I just --
16 I -- so I appreciate that, that we don't have to --
17 that we have that input at this time. This doesn't
18 really affect other changes that we have. This is just
19 accommodating the VRA districts at this point.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I -- I think you've used
21 up your quota now.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So if you want to
23 go ahead, we'll go back and forth, maybe.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: I had an easy one in
25 District 27 and 28. We continue to put -- split

1 Westbrook Village. Westbrook Village is -- we would
2 like to unite that into CD -- or LD28. We talked about
3 it yesterday. The eastern boundary is 83rd Avenue, the
4 northern boundary is Beardsley, southern boundary is
5 Union Hills, and the western boundary is 107th.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can you give us those one
7 more time?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which district, again?
9 Can you remind me?

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's half and half. It's
11 half in 28 and half in 27. I would like to put it in
12 28 with the rest of the retirement communities. It's
13 on the Agua Fria at the 202 bend there.

14 MR. KINGERY: Is it on screen right now?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Sort of, yeah. So if you
16 take the exit off the 202 at Beardsley. Beardsley runs
17 over the freeway, that little -- keep -- go all the way
18 over the freeway. That's going to go into 28, yeah.
19 There down to Union Hills, which is the next exit over.
20 That little chunk there needs to go in 28.

21 MR. FLAHAN: So instead of 83rd Avenue, 202
22 instead is the --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Excuse me?

24 MR. FLAHAN: I said instead of 83rd Avenue
25 you're talking to go 202 now?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's just cleaner if
2 you run it over there. I mean, there's just -- that's
3 all gas stations and convenience stores --

4 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just consolidates the
6 retirement communities.

7 MR. FLAHAN: 3,800 people.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think it goes north a
9 little bit along -- what's that? This is 13.0, right,
10 we're working on?

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 13.1.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 13.1.

13 MR. FLAHAN: 13.1.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: If you follow Lake
15 Pleasant up over to 28, it's the rest of the village,
16 Lake Pleasant Boulevard right there -- or Lake Pleasant
17 Parkway, I guess.

18 MR. KINGERY: There, and then shoot over east?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. There you go.

20 MR. KINGERY: 6,000.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: You good with that?
22 Commissioner -- Commissioner Neuberg?

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we're all
24 studying our maps while you're talking.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, that just puts the

1 rest of that little retirement -- it's split right now.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. I'm all in support
3 of uniting those retirement communities. Do you have
4 any opposition over there?

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No. We're good.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I thought I already -- I
7 thought I had already expressed that, but by all means
8 go ahead. We want to be combining those wherever we
9 can.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: The only other thing I
11 remember, Commissioner Neuberg, asking for, small
12 change, again, if you go to the western boundary of
13 D4 -- or LD4 right now you're at -- you take Camelback
14 to the 51. Actually, if you take Camelback to 16th
15 Street and you run north to Northern, that encompasses
16 the Squaw Peak and the Squaw Peak Resort, which then
17 puts the resorts together with the rest of D4.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Are you talking about
19 starting at Camelback, on the south end of that?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: You're just going over to
21 16th Street. Currently you're at like -- like
22 barely -- it's a sliver along the freeway there.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: But it gets the Squaw Peak
25 Resort and the -- that community, which is -- we've

1 tucked into Biltmore. That would be the rest of that
2 into D4, so Camelback and 16th, which is --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Gets -- gets the point up
4 there that way.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Am I looking at the
7 wrong --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Look at the screen in
9 front of you, Shereen.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If the boundary is down
11 there isn't it south of Camelback?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's Camelback Road on
13 the south.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, you're talking about
15 over there. I was hoping we -- I actually -- it's just
16 in that one corner that you're talking about. Right?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And can you repeat that
19 again, because, I apologize, I was busy trying to
20 figure out where you were.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: 16th Street, corner of
22 16th Street and Camelback, extending D4 west to 16th
23 Street, going north on 16th Street to Northern, and
24 that encompass the Squaw Peak Resort community with the
25 rest of the resorts that are along Lincoln in Paradise

1 Valley.

2 MR. FLAHAN: It's highlighted in blue on the
3 map now in the -- on the screen.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're talking about
5 on the other side of the 51?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just on -- just barely on
7 the east side -- the west side. I'm sorry.

8 MR. FLAHAN: First major block over to the
9 west.

10 MR. KINGERY: So that would add 5,800 to
11 District 4.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's fine. We can --
13 we can agree with that, but we have another change in
14 District 4. Yesterday I had asked for that line to
15 be -- to go all the way across to Indian School to
16 better reflect the communities in that area, the
17 Arcadia-Biltmore lines, but it wasn't taken all the way
18 across to 51, so basically just bring the southern
19 boundary down to Indian School Road all across, so it
20 would basically go all along to 51.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: At the risk of driving
22 you crazy because you guys have all moved on a little
23 bit from the West Valley, I have a question, and I just
24 need actually clarification and understanding. How are
25 we handling the military complexes surrounding D25 in

1 terms of uniting the proving grounds with Luke Air
2 Force Base? Are we doing right by those industries
3 with -- I believe they're cut up right now in this map.
4 I just want to make sure that we're giving some thought
5 to the overall -- there was an interesting article on,
6 you know, one of the airplanes that is important to
7 Arizona in the Tucson area, the Warthog. Let's make
8 sure that we're keeping our eyes on the military
9 industries in our state.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner,
11 that's a huge population in that. 4 is pretty
12 balanced.

13 Commissioner Neuberg, we heard you. We'll --

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I know. We'll come back
15 to it. It just popped into my head.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's something that
17 certainly the West Valley talked a lot about, Luke Air
18 Force Base.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: For sure.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't think we would
22 agree to this change, and so let's address Luke Air
23 Force Base.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't think so.
25 This -- this is a big population shift, but we're going

1 to -- we can actually modify that a little bit with
2 what happens in LD1 and LD2, but from a community of
3 interest perspective as a Constitutional requirement
4 comment that I want to make, and that is that basically
5 that allows that -- it gives that population cohesion
6 in that area if you have -- take it just across Indian
7 School over to the 51, and it's over by -- well, right
8 about where it's at, right, but you're taking it --
9 it's basically the request that I had yesterday that
10 just I think got lost somewhere, but it was to bring
11 that southern boundary down to Indian School and over.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: As a process suggestion,
13 we have a series of changes, and you'll have a series
14 of changes. I would suggest we tick through them and
15 put as many that we agree in into this map and hold off
16 the ones we disagree on and then decide what to do with
17 them.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm okay -- I think we
19 actually have two strategies. One is to absolutely
20 stick to areas of compromise, hone those in,
21 potentially lock them in, but that's not even as -- as
22 most important to me, but for us to collectively
23 understand realities of as we tackle other areas. I'm
24 hesitant. I could allow each side a little room to --
25 to maneuver, given that there is so many commonalities,

1 and as long as you respected those agreements I could
2 be convinced to go either way, provided that the
3 deliberation is productive and constructive in getting
4 us to final solutions.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I have a question for
6 my colleagues. Has there been any thought on how to
7 incorporate Luke Air Force Base with the Yuma Proving
8 Ground?

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's a big issue, in
10 my opinion, and I think we ought to give it thought.
11 That's why I brought it up.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no, I mean, 25
13 currently goes way up north of 28, up almost to
14 Wickenburg, I think. And I don't know what the
15 population is up in that part of the world, but
16 obviously they went up there for a reason.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I may, Commissioner, one
18 direction you've given us in the past that may be
19 useful here is that area of District 29 that's west of
20 303 and south of Bell has often come out of 29 and been
21 placed with 25 or whatever was over there. That's
22 probably more population than is -- is in north
23 Surprise, so --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the population from
25 the northern parkway south to District 23 in D -- in

1 D29?

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: He's getting us -- Brian is
3 getting us the number north of Bell right now for 25.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I guess -- I guess my
5 question would be -- I think it's a great question
6 about what we do with that. I don't know that we have
7 to align all the military bases together. It would be
8 difficult because there are lots of places around. But
9 the question is, you know, Yuma -- I'm sorry, Luke Air
10 Force, we heard loud and clear from Glendale that they
11 want a really good connection there. They feel very
12 tied in with that, so I would want to make sure that
13 Luke Air Force Base is with the community that works
14 there, that lives there as part of it.

15 We can certainly look at what would happen
16 with Yuma. I just don't know how that -- that goes,
17 and I think the folks in Yuma -- I mean, we want to
18 connect those, make sure they have the connections that
19 they need. I'm open to looking at it.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: There are very narrow
21 interests that overline with the military industry, and
22 there may be some general cohesion with other groups,
23 but I think nothing compares to uniting forces that are
24 advocating for, you know, similar attention. And I
25 understand that our military industries are not all in

1 the same area, but it's possible we could unite two.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I agree. I think
3 that's what we're trying to do in the south as well,
4 bringing those two together.

5 You know, Doug, can we have -- Doug Johnson,
6 can we have you review again that suggestion? That
7 might be a good way that we could look at it.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, all I was bringing up
9 is the direction it goes in past maps, which is that
10 area highlighted in blue, which is part of Surprise.
11 It's west of 303 and south of Bell. That could go into
12 25, and -- does that say 28,000?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: 29.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: 28.

15 MR. FLAHAN: 28,349.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, 28,349. And, actually,
17 Brian previously looked at the area of 25 that is --
18 wait, what just happened? There we go. That's north
19 of Bell, or what is that, West Valley Parkway?

20 MR. FLAHAN: It's basically a straight line
21 from D30 over to D29.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that whole green D25 area
23 that's the north part of Surprise and everything above
24 it actually is also 29,000 people that those two areas
25 trade. Sometimes you get lucky on the numbers. So if

1 that's something you wish to do, those two would
2 balance each other.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. We're trying to
4 figure out what to do with Luke Air Force Base.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, that would put Luke
6 with twenty -- 25.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Would that put Luke with
8 25, then?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: You're right. That would not
10 move Luke. We're just -- this is -- we're a step
11 behind you. This is the north piece of 25, what to do
12 with that. We could grab Luke. I mean, I don't think
13 there is many people between Luke and the eastern -- I
14 mean the western border of D29. There is something
15 built there, but I don't think there is many people
16 there.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The question only would
18 be -- if we can combine them that's great, but I know
19 we also heard Glendale, so we would want to make sure
20 that piece of Glendale -- that Glendale was connected
21 with Luke as well, and I don't know how that all --
22 haven't looked at that, so --

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. And keep in mind the
24 Yuma Proving Ground is not in 25; it's in 23.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Oh, that's right. That

1 should stay that way.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, so --

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So let's forget the --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I will say that, I mean,
5 I'm completely fine if we could figure out a way, but
6 there is -- there is an advantage to -- and this is
7 something that we hear sometimes, and we heard this
8 from Yuma, if you have multiple representatives you get
9 heard a little bit more, so if you have a
10 representative for Luke and a representative for Yuma,
11 that gives them double the firepower, to some extent,
12 but I'm open to looking at ideas.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's not our map
14 anymore.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, Mark is correcting me.
16 Sorry. Barry Goldwater is in 23. Yuma Proving Ground
17 is in 25.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, you know, just in
19 terms of our thoughtfulness, it's a very wide expanse,
20 LD25, and as we're discussing the boundaries let's do
21 right by the district, unite them based on their
22 communities of interest as -- as, you know, wholesome
23 as we can.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I could go back to
25 that one suggestion that I had for twenty -- for

1 District 4, that would take that block that's there on
2 the southwest corner. Do you have -- I'm open to a
3 compromise in that area. If you are not happy with
4 that entire block what would you --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, it's a change we
6 have made before. Where do we stand population-wise in
7 4?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: We added 58,000 -- 5,800.
9 She was talking about adding another 26,000, I believe.

10 MR. KINGERY: So this initial change from
11 Northern, 16th down to Camelback into District 4, that
12 was 5,800, I believe.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

14 MR. KINGERY: Okay. And then also taking that
15 block down --

16 MR. FLAHAN: To Indian School?

17 MR. KINGERY: Yeah, to Indian School, and then
18 matching it.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Over to 51.

20 MR. FLAHAN: The question is would you want to
21 go over to 51, or would you want to go over to 16th
22 Street, because that's where the western border is
23 going to become with the last request --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I'm sorry. 16th
25 Street was fine.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: We were just trying to
2 take in the Biltmore. I would say Arcadia light is
3 what you're talking about.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I'm trying to
5 get the --

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doesn't go all the way --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm trying to make sure
8 that we get the other areas --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doesn't go all the way to
10 the freeway.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think we understand --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm fine with 16th
13 Street. That's fine.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think we understand it,
15 but we -- we would not agree to this.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, this combines that
17 community that's in there. You're talking about
18 Arcadia. You're talking about making sure of -- we
19 have --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, Arcadia is --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- Biltmore, we have --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Arcadia --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- communities that --
24 parts of Arcadia are not all part of that. You have
25 Camelback Colonnade being split in half, you know,

1 right outside, and yet that's a big part of where
2 people go when they go up into that area. So it really
3 combines -- this is a total community that's at Indian
4 School right there, because people -- it's not that --
5 people go both sides of Camelback. They live in this
6 community that basically spends a lot of time in that
7 northern District 4. That is part of their community,
8 and that's why -- why I'm making that recommendation.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Part -- part of D1 right
10 now is short of population, and now you're taking more
11 population out, so what did you have in mind to do to
12 fill in D1?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Shereen, I would go over
14 to 24th Street.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would just go to 24th.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You would go to 24th
18 Street instead of 16th?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm not sure that far
20 south makes sense, but, yeah, 24th Street.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And if you could just
22 tell me just why would you -- I'm just curious on that.
23 I mean, I'm not opposed to that, necessarily. I can --
24 but I just --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, 24th Street is the

1 corner -- 24th Street and Camelback is the corner of
2 the Biltmore. To be honest with you I would go across
3 Highland, to be honest with you, or Campbell, if I was
4 to include that area as opposed to Indian School. I
5 would feel more comfortable.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I still ask the
7 question: Where are you going to take D1?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We'll come back to that.
9 I mean, I do have ideas on that, too, but it's -- I
10 mean, to me I'm just looking at that -- and I can
11 probably go with that, your --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The fact that my colleague
13 is helping you with it doesn't mean we agree to it.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I like the colleague
15 helping, but I'd also like to, if we're -- we're at the
16 point where if there is major population shifts, let's
17 not punt that. Let's address that now so that we can
18 make very real -- even if we don't lock in a decision,
19 we at least understand the choices that are facing us,
20 so -- so let's be real with the map that we're
21 analyzing. And I wouldn't mind, actually, if you guys
22 summarize this argument about this strip right here and
23 see if there is any compromise to be had here.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: How many people?

25 MR. FLAHAN: 4,626, and that is 24th Street

1 south to Campbell and then east over into District 4,
2 so picking up that strip.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And what are the
4 populations of D4 and D1 at this point?

5 MR. FLAHAN: Hold on. D4 has -- is over by
6 only 17 people, and --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no. That's what you
8 currently drew. That's not with these adds.

9 MR. FLAHAN: True, true. I don't have the
10 number with all the different other adds.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, the corner there,
12 Brian, of Campbell and 36th Street and 40th Street I
13 would probably put back into D1.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just as what's highlighted
15 here is the 4,600 people, and then the -- going over to
16 16th was 5,800, so that would be --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: 10,000 more in D4.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So one thing would be to
19 move the boundary down, as we suggested before, for D4.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: I know that's what you've
21 been trying to do the whole time --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we would --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- push 4 and 1 down,
24 which we disagree with, and so --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's -- I mean, that's

1 my suggestion in terms of balancing that population --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think McCormick --

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- and keeping
4 communities --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- McCormick Ranch,
6 Paradise Valley --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- the Scottsdale Airpark
9 need to stay in the community.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was in the middle
11 of -- I'm sorry, but can I just finish my reasoning,
12 please? The -- as I know -- I know you don't agree
13 with it, but as I've mentioned, that boundary that we
14 have up in that area, that's a different form of
15 community north of the freeway that aligns much nicer
16 with the other communities that have been built in that
17 area, which is why I'm asking for that boundary. Those
18 folks on the north of the freeway are in newer
19 communities. They're in communities that they spend a
20 lot of time in that area, up in the mountain areas.
21 They -- they connect to the recreation areas that are
22 there. They connect to Fountain Hills, Rio Verde. And
23 there is a -- is a difference between the folks in the
24 north of the 51 -- not the 51, the Pima freeway, than
25 those to the south. We have older, established

1 communities, which is why I think that we should -- and
2 we've had maps. To be quite honest, some of our
3 earliest maps all had boundaries there. It just got
4 placed in this map that had been coming from one of --
5 one of your earlier maps it went north, but we have
6 been having that boundary to the south on other maps.
7 And it's -- it's truly a community of interest and a
8 geographic Constitutional comment as part of that
9 because of people who are more aligned in those areas.
10 So that's why -- I know you don't agree with that, but
11 that's why I wanted to make sure --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: But, Shereen, currently as
13 the map is drawn is what you requested yesterday.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is not --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is what you requested
16 yesterday, to bring --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I wanted -- I wanted
18 that southern boundary --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: To bring LD3 along the
20 freeway as they drew it. We heard plenty of testimony
21 that -- that North Scottsdale, Carefree, and Cave Creek
22 did not want to be with Deer Valley, and --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- and Desert Ridge, which
25 they are currently drawn with. So we have accepted

1 this map, including those areas into that D3 area, and
2 so I would argue that D2 needs to go pick up Deer
3 Valley and that village along the Adobe Dam, and it's
4 not drawn that way. Now you want to push CD4 -- LD4
5 down into south of the freeway to offset your
6 population grab to the south. And I think we've
7 included most of Arcadia. We've included the Biltmore
8 now. We followed 51. We take the boundaries of
9 McCormick Ranch and Scottsdale and Paradise Valley. We
10 stick them all together in a nice, very compact,
11 like-minded community, like housing costs, like
12 demographics. School districts align reasonably well.
13 I don't -- I don't understand why you need to go any
14 farther south.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I'm going to -- I
16 believe lunch is here, actually, and we're in the midst
17 of a very robust debate, and I have to be perfectly
18 honest: I need a little time to -- to absorb all of
19 this. I mean, we can keep going, but how would my
20 colleagues feel about maybe taking a, you know, 30,
21 40-minute recess and eating and regrouping and studying
22 and coming back in a constructive manner to seek
23 compromise?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm completely good with
25 that. I was going to say I'm actually happy to -- I'm

1 not tied to any one change, so I'm happy to take a
2 close look and see if we can find something. And can
3 you remind us, if you don't mind, just real quickly
4 before of the population shift that we -- that we were
5 just talking about again, because I've got --

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: 10,000 people.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're at 10,000
8 different, okay, over in D4 right now. Right?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we already added to D4
11 with the --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's the 10 we added.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. We'd already
14 added some. Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Let's take a --
16 I'm going to say a 40-minute recess, but, really, let's
17 try to convene at, you know, 12:25 so that we can go
18 live at 12:30 really sharply. We do have a lot of work
19 to do, but this has been remarkably constructive, so
20 recess for lunch.

21 (The morning session concluded at 11:48 p.m.)

22

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

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
2 STATE OF ARIZONA)
3) ss.
4 COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

5 BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings
6 were taken before me, Deborah L. Wilks, Certified
7 Reporter No. 50849, all done to the best of my skill
8 and ability; that the proceedings were taken down by me
9 in shorthand and thereafter reduced to print under my
10 direction.

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

14 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with
15 the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206.

16 Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 10th day of
17 January, 2022.

18 *Deborah L. Wilks*

19 _____
20 Deborah L. Wilks, RPR, CR
21 CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50849)

22 * * *

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

Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 10th day of
January, 2022.

MCR

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. 1058