

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

Morning Session

Phoenix, Arizona

Online via Webex

October 15, 2021

8:33 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 Wilks, RPR
Certified Reporter (AZ 50849)

I N D E X

	<u>PROCEEDING :</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	<u>PROCEEDING :</u>	
4		
5	ITEM I	4
6	ITEM I (A)	4
7	ITEM I (B)	5
8	ITEM II	5
9	ITEM II (A)	6
10	ITEM III	7
11	ITEM IV	7
12	ITEM V	8
13	ITEM VI	9
14	ITEM VII	11
15	ITEM VII (A)	50
16	ITEM IX	18
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
 2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 8:33 a.m. on
 3 October 15, 2021, at Sheraton Crescent Hotel, 2620 West
 4 Dunlap Ave, Phoenix, Arizona, and online via Webex, in
 5 the presence of the following Commissioners:

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

11 OTHERS PRESENT:

12 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director
 13 Ms. Loriandra Van Haren, Deputy Director
 14 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Administrative Assistant
 15 Ms. Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer
 16 Ms. Marie Chapple, Community Outreach Coordinator
 17 Mr. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator

18 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
 19 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr
 20 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer
 21 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer

22 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group
 23 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group
 24 Mr. Brody Helton, Timmons Group
 25 Mr. Colby Chafin, Timmons Group
 Ms. Sarah Hajnos, Timmons Group
 Ms. Anna Mika, Timmons Group
 Mr. Douglas Johnson, NDC
 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC

26 PUBLIC COMMENT SPEAKERS:

27 Nora Perkins
 28 Brenda Gifford
 29 Dorothy Todd

P R O C E E D I N G

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Good morning, everyone. Great to be here. Welcome. We're going to start this morning with the Pledge of Allegiance.

(Pledge of Allegiance recited.)

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We'll dive right in. Agenda Item Number I, call to order and roll call.

I(A), call for quorum. It is 8:36 a.m. on Friday, October 15th, 2021. I call this meeting of the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

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

Val.

MS. NEUMANN: Vice Chair Watchman.

COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehle.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

1 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

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

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

11 For our mapping consultants we have Mark
12 Flahan and Brian Kingery from Timmons; Doug Johnson,
13 Ivy Beller-Sakansky from NDC Research.

14 Debbie Wilks will be our transcriptionist this
15 morning, and Angela Miller will be our transcriptionist
16 this afternoon. Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please note for the
18 minutes that a quorum is present.

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

20 Val, was the Notice and Agenda for the
21 Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance
22 of today's meeting?

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

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

25 Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from

1 October 12th, 2021.

2 We have II(A), general session. We did not
3 have an executive session. I'll entertain any
4 comments, discussion from my colleagues, and if not
5 I'll entertain a motion to approve the general session
6 minutes from October 12th.

7 Do I have a motion to approve the minutes from
8 October 12th?

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So move. Commissioner
10 Mehl.

11 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
12 seconds.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
14 With that we'll do a vote.

15 Vice Chair Watchman.

16 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
24 an aye.

25 With that the minutes are approved.

1 Agenda Item Number III, opportunity for public
2 comments. Public comment will now open for a minimum
3 of 30 minutes and will remain open until the
4 adjournment of the meeting. Comments will only be
5 accepted electronically in writing on the link provided
6 in the Notice and Agenda for this public meeting and
7 will be limited to 3,000 characters. Please note:
8 Members of the Commission may not discuss items that
9 are not specifically identified on the agenda.
10 Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H) action taken
11 as a result of public comment will be limited to
12 directing staff to study the matter, responding to any
13 criticism, or scheduling the matter for further
14 consideration and decision at a later date.

15 With that we'll move to Agenda Number IV,
16 discussion on public comments received prior to today's
17 meeting. Colleagues, let me know if any of you have
18 any thoughts or opinions to share.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Just for the record,
20 several people mentioned that we did a meeting at my
21 hotel in Tucson, and I'm very proud of the hotel I
22 built. We sold that hotel in 1989, so I've not been an
23 owner of that hotel for 31 years, 32 years, but it's
24 still a gorgeous hotel, and I was happy to be there.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, the only thing

1 I would like to add is the volume of feedback is
2 extraordinary. It's appreciated. You know, people
3 wonder about our outreach. I can tell you that it's
4 been incredible, so we're deeply appreciative of the
5 feedback, and we're reading it and integrating it.

6 The other thing I want to say, and, you know,
7 I guess maybe because I'm a psychologist I want to save
8 the whole state's angst, there is a lot of intensity
9 and reaction about maps each and every day. Please,
10 this is really going to be a gradual process. It's an
11 organic process. We're not starting from the final
12 map. We're starting from random, and so we need to
13 target sections, and there isn't necessarily any order
14 by which we're targeting sections. And so obviously we
15 want everybody to continue to comment because the
16 data -- the data is valuable, but let's understand
17 that, you know, this is going to be many more days of
18 iterations of maps before, you know, we can make too
19 much sense. So just, you know, try to be a little
20 patient.

21 And with that if my colleagues don't have
22 anything else to add we will move into Agenda Item
23 Number V, potential update, discussion, and potential
24 action concerning polarization data and report
25 presentation from mapping consultants regarding U.S.

1 and Arizona Constitutional requirements.

2 I turn it over to our mapping team.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Just discussing what you put on
4 the polarization side, so as you remember for the last
5 day we got all the numbers and benchmarks on the
6 polarization report from Dr. Hanley, and those will be
7 formalized in a written report that we're hoping to
8 have -- well, our plan is to have it over for legal
9 review on Monday and then out to the Commission
10 probably shortly after that.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you very
12 much.

13 Agenda Item Number VI, potential report from
14 staff and mapping consultants regarding public
15 outreach, utilization of mapping software, and report
16 on public map submissions.

17 Is that you, Mark?

18 MR. FLAHAN: That is me. I'm just trying to
19 get the screen going.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No problem.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So quick update on where
22 we're at with the published maps. We have currently
23 have eight published maps in the system, and we can see
24 here that we have 36 congressional maps, seven
25 congressional focus maps, which is the single district

1 maps that we allowed the public to draw. We have 26
2 legislative maps, and we have 11 legislative focus,
3 which is, again, those single districts, but on the
4 legislative side instead of congressional side.

5 Here you can see that we have all the data
6 here presented in an easy-to-use format. And if you
7 come over here to the published viewer, you can easily
8 come here and add any updated points that you guys
9 would like to see that have been submitted from the
10 public.

11 Something to note here is that the district
12 colors are exactly the same on every submission, and
13 they correspond back to the redistricting system, so if
14 you want to compare districts in the same color you can
15 easily be able to see that.

16 One thing that we have added to this viewer,
17 if I remove this one and I come to this other plus tab,
18 here is the draft map versions that we have been
19 building here in the decision meetings that you can
20 refer back to and be able to easily put it on the web.
21 So if I wanted to look at Congressional Map 1.1, I can
22 add it here, and we can see exactly what it looks like
23 on the map. And you can see there is also the two X
24 series maps that are here, too, that we'll talk about a
25 little bit more. But those are all available outside

1 on the web. No registration on the redistricting
2 system just to be able to get there through a web app.

3 For the public submissions, that is what we
4 have gotten for the regional submissions out of the
5 redistricting system as of today. I believe that's all
6 we have for the public comment part of the report.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. With that --
8 sorry about that.

9 With that we will move to Agenda Item Number
10 VII, draft map decision discussion and possible action
11 concerning revisions to the Grid Map. We have (A),
12 legislative map drawing, and, (B), congressional map
13 drawing. We'll tackle them both today, but separately.

14 And just, you know, in terms of, you know,
15 direction to my colleagues, we need to start by, you
16 know, evaluating the newest iterations of these maps,
17 approving them as a new starting point. And then as we
18 engage in further deliberation in moving the lines,
19 remember, you know, each and every suggestion we make,
20 explaining it through Constitutional language. We also
21 have the opportunity to vote and lock in any changes
22 that we collectively feel we all want to, you know,
23 agree on and conserve. It does not mean that it's
24 permanently locked in. We have the ability to vote to
25 undo it as well. But I think that we should expect

1 that along the way as we're moving forward through the
2 maps that we'll be making many decisions along the way
3 in the process.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Madam Chair, I guess I did have a
5 couple of other pieces for Item VI.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, I'm sorry. I
7 thought you were --

8 MR. FLAHAN: I thought it was just the public
9 outreach part.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, okay. I'm so sorry.
11 Well, save all of that, because it's relevant, and I
12 thought you were going to be doing the training through
13 this, but go ahead and finish your VI item.

14 MR. FLAHAN: Oh, do you want me to do the
15 training now or do you want to wait --

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. I want you to do it
17 in exactly the order you want to do.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Gotcha on that. Let me
19 share my screen with Webex.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And while you're pulling
21 that up, I failed to mention earlier we do have -- as
22 usual at every public hearing and deliberation meeting
23 we have a Spanish interpreter. If the interpreter
24 could please rise and introduce yourself.

25 THE INTERPRETER: Hello. Good morning. My

1 name is Aine Camacho, Spanish interpreter.

2 (Speaking in foreign language.)

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So I want to go through
5 the redistricting system a little bit before we get
6 started today. And you can see we have template plans.
7 We have at the very bottom the test plans that you guys
8 approved back on Tuesday of last week. And if I load
9 into the plan, there is a couple of things that I think
10 we should all make sure we are aware of. So we have,
11 you know, the map here with all the different
12 districts, and down here on the bottom we have all the
13 different districts broken down by table. We can add a
14 bunch of different demographic points to these, and if
15 you -- the way you can do that is go to create tab. Go
16 to demographics. And there is two sections here at the
17 very top. The key election date here is the data that
18 will be used for competitive metrics. And the nine
19 races that you guys chose was President, 2020; Senate,
20 2020; Attorney General, 2018; Mine Inspector, 2018;
21 Secretary of State, 2018; Senate, 2018; State
22 Superintendent of Education, 2018; Treasurer, 2018; and
23 President, 2016. You will notice that I did skip over
24 the Governor 2018 race because that is not part of your
25 competitive metrics. That is the nine elections that

1 you guys chose.

2 So the way that you can turn this on is if we
3 just take the very top one, President 2020, Republican,
4 and turn on the sum and then turn on the percent, we
5 can easily see the sum is the actual raw vote count if
6 we looked at that historic election with the new
7 districts that would be assigned, and the percent would
8 be the percentage of the vote for the Republican
9 candidate with that new district, so we can see here
10 that it's 45.39 percent.

11 So the way that you can easily view the
12 competitive metrics is you go to demographics. Pick
13 one. It doesn't matter. But the easiest way is to
14 pick one party, so if we already have Republicans on
15 there we will use Republicans. Turn on all the
16 percents. And now we have our nine races here set up,
17 and now you can easily start to see when you're
18 counting on the vote spread if they are over 50 percent
19 that means they would have more than won that election.

20 If you want to look at the demographics
21 piece -- we can turn all these off. It will be easier.
22 And you can go over here to Arizona Standard
23 Demographics, and here at the very top with the OMB
24 Allocation and the Total Population, that is what
25 generates the total population numbers, and we'll show

1 it to you in a spreadsheet in one piece, and I think it
2 will make a lot of sense.

3 And then if you come down here to the ST1519
4 section, this is where we are generating the citizen
5 voting age for all the different demographic pieces.
6 And you can easily come here and turn that on in the
7 percentages.

8 We can start to see how the demographics turn
9 out the percentages for the Congressional District 1.1
10 draft map, so here for District 1 you can see the
11 percentages sitting here.

12 So, now, how does that translate to the
13 metrics that we are tracking? If we go over to the
14 Draft Map section -- actually, pull the Grid Map up.
15 So these are the demographics and competitive summary
16 that we have for the grid maps, and we can see a bunch
17 of things here. So when we talked about the total
18 population in the OMB allocations, that is this piece,
19 this total population piece that's right here. That's
20 broken down by all the different demographic points and
21 the ethnicities. Your total population is the actual
22 count of people that are in each district, and your
23 deviation here is the person per deviation from zero.
24 So you can see in the congressional district we have
25 nine districts, but we cannot divide a person in

1 thirds, so we have to have three different -- three
2 districts that are one more than 794,611.

3 Then what I was showing you about the citizen
4 voting age numbers in the ST1519, that is how we are
5 generating here the second piece that is the citizen
6 voting age population. You can see we have the raw
7 count, and then you also have the percentages. On the
8 competitiveness measures, when we talked about, you
9 know, the districts in an historical election would
10 that have a Democratic winner or Republican winner, and
11 we counted up those nine, that's what makes up these
12 two numbers, that 8 and 1. So in District 1 on the
13 Grid Map, out of the nine elections you chose if we
14 looked at that historical election with a new district,
15 a Democrat candidate would have won eight times out of
16 that election and the Republican candidate won one of
17 those elections out of the nine.

18 And then here we have the vote spread. So how
19 do we calculate the vote spread? It is the spread of
20 votes between the average number of Republican and the
21 average number of Democratic votes. So if the election
22 was 52 to one side and 49 to the other side, that vote
23 spread would be 3 percent, and that is how we are
24 calculating that vote spread. And just to review, you
25 guys consider a race or a district highly competitive

1 if it's a 4 percent spread or less, and you are
2 considering it competitive if it falls between the 4
3 percent and the 7 percent.

4 And like I said, this is all available in the
5 redistricting system, and the Commission and the public
6 are able to view this data live and turn on any other
7 demographic points that they would like. And that's
8 where we have also built out a Draft Maps page that is
9 now on the hub that is available to the public, so if
10 you do not want to make a redistricting account but
11 still get to the data, you are more than welcome to
12 come here and get to the data.

13 So we can see here is a Draft Map Series 1.
14 There is the links to all the services. If you want to
15 look at the maps, you're more than welcome to. It
16 might take a second to draw here because that is a
17 statewide map. So there is the statewide map that the
18 public can get to without actually having to make an
19 account in the redistricting system. And the same
20 thing with that first application that I showed you:
21 You can get there without having to make an account in
22 the redistricting system.

23 If you want to compare maps, you can go over
24 here to the review tab and click on the Open Plan
25 button, and you can pick any plan that you would like

1 to compare it against. And if I just grab one of our
2 draft maps that's 1.1, we can compare it against 1.0,
3 and what the system is doing is basically taking the
4 plan I have open, putting it on the bottom, and taking
5 that compared plan and putting it on top. And you can
6 see in the picture here the areas that are checkered,
7 so if you see the checkered piece between District 9
8 and District 2, that is what has changed between the
9 two plans.

10 So I can turn off the differences and turn
11 on -- here is the active plan, so here is what the 1.1
12 version looks like. You can see that there is --
13 District 2 extends into the Kingman area and then up
14 this way to the north. If I turned on the 1.0 plan, we
15 can see here what the difference is, that this piece
16 that jutted out into Kingman did not exist.

17 Once you're done with the plan, hit the close
18 button, and you can go back to doing what you were
19 doing on that first open plan that you had.

20 And with that, I will pass it back to you.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you. And we're
22 actually going to take another detour, and I'm going to
23 jump to Agenda Item Number IX, which we may revisit
24 again later in the day, but we had expected to discuss
25 conceptually in-person public comments, but I

1 understand that people in the public may have
2 interpreted that as open to public comments, and we
3 have some people that I believe drove a long way. And
4 so we're going to move Agenda Item Number IX and open
5 it up to those who have traveled here to give public
6 comments. How about, you know, maximum of three
7 minutes each, please.

8 MS. VAN HAREN: I apologize, Madam Chair. We
9 don't have public comment cards just ready yet so we'll
10 ask each of the speakers to fill out a card at the end
11 so that we can have a record of their public comment.
12 But we'll start first with this lovely lady right here.
13 I'll give you the microphone, and we'll start with
14 three minutes. Okay?

15 MS. PERKINS: I guess I'm the oldest so I get
16 to go first.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: You've got to tell us your
18 name.

19 MS. PERKINS: How old are you?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: You've got to tell us your
21 name.

22 MS. PERKINS: My name Nola Perkins. I am
23 retired, and I live at 145 South Palo Verde in Apache
24 Junction, Pinal County. Most of my time is spent in
25 Apache Junction, the Gold Canyon area. I attend school

1 board meetings and participate in Table Of Grace
2 community events. I attend a lot of youth activities,
3 like the AJ Idol and open mic night for students. My
4 great-grandchildren and my grandchildren and I use the
5 public library there, which is a really good library,
6 by the way, and the multigenerational center.

7 It is my understanding that districts should
8 be compact to accurately represent the communities of
9 interest of those who live and work together. It
10 appears, though, the maps that I have seen that the
11 lines are now drawn that our community of interest is
12 greatly diminished by the agriculture, mining, and
13 distant areas included in our district, and this
14 doesn't seem to be a -- an appropriate redistricting.

15 And after listening to this gentleman I'm even
16 more confused because I didn't think the redistricting
17 was according to Republican and Democrat demographics.
18 The thing that I had read said the Arizona State
19 Commission requires the Independent Redistricting
20 Commission to respect community of interest when they
21 draw the congressional and legislative district
22 boundaries, and it sounds to me like they're more
23 looking at Republican and Democrat demographics than
24 our community of interest. Thank you.

25 MS. GIFFORD: My name is Brenda Gifford. I

1 live in Pinal County. I'm actually in the county
2 island north of Apache Junction. And I -- I don't need
3 to repeat anything she said.

4 As far as the communities of interest, I was
5 in retail in the East Valley for 35 years. I owned two
6 furniture stores. We did deliveries all over the state
7 of Arizona, predominantly in the East Valley, but also
8 really statewide. As I reflect back on many of the
9 places that we went to deliver furniture, we were
10 everywhere. But having said that, it gives me a very
11 great appreciation for the unique communities
12 throughout Arizona and the color and character at each
13 one.

14 So when you look at communities of interest,
15 that's the thing that speaks to me the greatest. I
16 realize that population density has got to be a factor
17 in this, but when you include Globe, Miami, Superior,
18 those far -- the mining corridor is in no way similar
19 at all to the suburban area of Apache Junction, Queen
20 Creek, San Tan, so to include those areas in our
21 redistricting -- which the most recent map I've seen
22 does include us in that. We are more similar to
23 Oracle, Florence, Coolidge, San Tan, Queen Valley, Gold
24 Canyon, Peralta. That area on this side of the
25 mountain is completely dissimilar to the farming and

1 mining communities on the other side that really are
2 more similar to the reservations.

3 And so that's my only comment is communities
4 of interest really needs to be looked at carefully
5 because our focus and the color of our communities are
6 so completely different from the Copper Corridor and
7 the mining communities and agriculture. Thank you.

8 MS. TODD: Can I just sit? Okay. Thank you.
9 Maybe not. This doesn't count in my three minutes.

10 Good morning. I'm Dorothy Todd. I live in
11 Gold Canyon. My husband and I moved there over
12 20 years ago. The only thing that was out there was
13 Apache land where they made the Western movies with
14 John Wayne, Elvis Presley, all of that, and a dirt
15 road. And there was no grocery store, nothing, just a
16 few homes. And it's really changed, really changed a
17 lot. We used to have to drive into Apache Junction if
18 we wanted a loaf of bread or gasoline or whatever, and
19 then that was all day. But -- but Apache -- Gold
20 Canyon has changed. Apache Junction has, also.

21 Recently DR Horton just bought a lot of land.
22 They're out of Texas, and they are going to be putting
23 in 27,000 homes, and that's annexed to Apache Junction,
24 so we're really growing. And we got Peralta next to
25 us, and they're putting in another 700, and it's --

1 we're growing. This really is probably the last area
2 where the greater Phoenix area can grow. Everything
3 else is pretty well built. And we're right now working
4 with ASU on community development. They work also with
5 Apache Junction. And all vacant lots in Gold Canyon
6 right now, you cannot find one that's not being built
7 on.

8 So at one time Mesa many years ago tried to
9 annex land south of the 60 across from us. They had a
10 whole town planned, and there were going to be a
11 million people there. So there is a lot of flat land
12 on the other side.

13 Let's see. What else here? Not to go over my
14 three minutes.

15 So since the census was taken, there are a lot
16 of changes going on out where we are. And also our
17 congressman is Paul Gosar. And he not only represents
18 us; he represents all of Arizona. I imagine everybody
19 knows who he is. And he also goes federal. So not
20 everybody in Washington likes him, but he works really
21 hard for all of us. We would hate to lose him. And I
22 know that whenever you're making these districts that's
23 probably not a factor, but just kind of wanted to say
24 that. Thank you.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we have any other

1 speakers?

2 I would like to thank you for driving all this
3 way and for your civic engagement. It's another
4 example of democracy at work, so it's a pleasure seeing
5 you.

6 With that I am going to turn it right back
7 over because I believe we're moving into Agenda Item
8 Number VII, which I introduced earlier, draft map
9 decision discussion and possible action concerning
10 revisions to the Grid Map. I already gave my
11 introduction to that item, and so with that I'm going
12 to turn it right back over to mapping.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Brian is getting set up right
14 now, but Brian is going to go ahead and walk us through
15 the three options that you had us draw from the last
16 meeting, and he will walk you through the maps and the
17 changes that we've made. Just give him a second to
18 bring that up.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.
20 Perhaps we should start with the legislative map since
21 there is only one.

22 MR. FLAHAN: There we go. Now we can see it
23 on the projector here.

24 Lori, can you switch to Brian for Webex.

25 MR. KINGERY: All right. So let's start off

1 with the draft maps page that Mark had previewed
2 earlier. We put some language on the hub site to
3 include the process for these draft maps. The files
4 that the public can look to access, such as the
5 shapefiles, the rest services, the PDF print maps, both
6 poster size and 8 1/2 by 11, as we make them, and the
7 audit logs. This is followed by language about what
8 the audit log is and why we are keeping track of the
9 changes as we make them, based on Commissioner input.

10 The next section of this page talks about how
11 the audit log is broken up, the different columns and
12 what they mean, and there is a quick link to the
13 Constitutional criteria of when we make a change to the
14 map, A through F, which one of those criteria is the
15 reason why we're making the change, whether that's
16 community of interest or population balancing.

17 And then it talks about the version numbering.
18 So last time we met on October 4th and 5th we voted --
19 or we presented Series 1, and both a congressional and
20 a legislative Series 1 map was approved as the next
21 iteration of the Grid Map, and so now we're looking --
22 going to be reviewing Series 2, the next set of draft
23 maps that we've updated.

24 And then I just want to point out within the
25 redistricting system everyone that has an account are

1 able to access a couple different groups. Shown in the
2 screenshot you have the Draft Maps Public, which allows
3 access to all the draft maps as we make them. Even
4 before they're voted on you have -- as a citizen have
5 access to them, and you can continue editing these
6 versions.

7 We also have the RXO underscore Submitted
8 Plans group, which gives you access to every single
9 plan that's been submitted by anyone. And then also
10 the Everyone group, and this one is a little bit
11 different because users of the system can share groups
12 that they haven't fully submitted yet to this group so
13 everyone can see it, if they so choose.

14 We are still working on turning the audit logs
15 and PDFs and then hosting them on the website. So the
16 audit logs I'm showing now, they will be on the website
17 shortly. We will post them when they are ready.

18 For every draft map you're able to access the
19 files that I spoke about earlier, the PDFs. You're
20 able to open a web map with that specific one added
21 outside of the redistricting system, and as of this
22 morning you're also able to provide feedback, so you
23 can -- there is now a form where you can provide direct
24 feedback to the grid maps, to any of the draft maps,
25 and to any submitted plans as well.

1 So we have the first series here, and you can
2 see that Version 1.1 -- 1.1 of the Congressional
3 District was accepted as the next iteration of that
4 Grid Map, and Legislative 1.0 was accepted as the next
5 iteration of that Grid Map.

6 Moving into the Draft Series 2, we do have
7 three congressional versions ready to present, and all
8 of these links are active except for the audit log for
9 now where you're able to, as I speak about them, go in
10 and explore on your own. So we have three
11 congressional draft maps and one legislative to present
12 today. And then Series 3, when we get there, those
13 materials would be posted as well.

14 If you look at the descriptions of all the
15 different versions here, they match what's in our audit
16 log as well as what's in the redistricting system. So
17 if you go here to Draft Maps Public page, you can see
18 the plan name as well as the description, and this
19 description matches what is on the website. So we
20 wanted to keep everything streamlined and ability --
21 and be able to -- if you see something on the hub site
22 it matches what's in the redistricting system and
23 you're able to access, edit, save as, and go from there
24 with your input.

25 So let's go ahead and start out with

1 Legislative 2.0. So when we presented Legislative 1.0
2 it was not yet population balanced. This one is. So
3 if I were to submit this -- or do the integrity checks
4 right now it would pass and be a valid plan that could
5 be submitted.

6 So now I'll switch over to the audit log.
7 Here are the same plan names and plan descriptions.
8 The audit log for Version 1.0, I know it's hard to
9 read, but essentially we made it through 31 steps to --
10 in sequence of making these changes, and so when that
11 was approved or when that version was accepted as the
12 next iteration of the Grid Map we went into Version 2.0
13 and picked right up at Sequence Step 32.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Brian, can I just ask a
15 clarifying question? When you record all of the
16 movements and the rationale, do you also record when
17 you cannot do something that we've asked for a specific
18 reason? Do we keep a log of those?

19 MR. KINGERY: Not right now.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is that something that
21 we ought to be doing in the future so we can keep a
22 record of why something is not happening in addition to
23 why something is happening?

24 MR. KINGERY: Right. We definitely can make
25 note of that. Usually the methodology that we follow

1 is -- let's take Flagstaff, for instance. There is a
2 lot of discussion about tribal reservations in the
3 north and eastern Flagstaff having a high percentage of
4 Native Americans, and that potentially should be split
5 to include the eastern part of Flagstaff in the
6 northern District 1, I believe it was -- or 2. Sorry.
7 So let's say in Step 40 we did that, but it threw -- by
8 including half of Flagstaff or the eastern half of
9 Flagstaff with already the tribal reservations in that
10 district it made the population exceed the total
11 variant that we were able to have in a legislative
12 district or in a congressional district. So then we
13 made that change. We might have made one or two more
14 changes after that. But then we look at the population
15 as the focus of the next change, and if there is
16 900,000 people in a congressional district, it can't be
17 that much, so then we have to think about population
18 balancing, so we might have to move where we made that
19 original line further east to include more of eastern
20 Flagstaff in the western side of that -- of that
21 district, so then that would show in the next step
22 that's in this audit log. So there might be a step or
23 five in this audit log in the 30s or 40s, and then very
24 easily in the 50s and 60s it might have not negated it,
25 but for a different Constitutional criteria undone it

1 or overrode it, right.

2 All right. So let's see. We presented steps
3 1 through 31 last time. I can quickly go over some of
4 the key changes we made. We looked at -- when we were
5 doing this instead of looking at specific districts we
6 wanted to look at communities of interest. We wanted
7 to look at in our consolidated notes key things that
8 you guys have said. So we looked at North Tempe. We
9 looked at Mesa, how to handle Flagstaff, where best to
10 split Tucson, how is Yuma city, Yuma County divided or
11 included in the district, so what all of that looked
12 like, and hopefully our audit log reflects the changes,
13 the actions that we've taken, how it's affected the
14 district that it's taking from and the districts that
15 it's adding to.

16 So there are situations in here, if you look
17 at Step 33, when we were looking at Sun City, we looked
18 at Sun City, we looked at Sun City West, and we
19 actually pulled from three districts that were in
20 Legislative 1.0, the accepted version, and we actually
21 moved them to District 29. At that moment in time that
22 was 29. And I say at that moment in time because I can
23 scroll down and there can easily be a Sun City change
24 in this audit log from say 29 back to 28.

25 And so I just want to make that very clear

1 that these are sequences in our work flow and how we
2 approach this. It's not necessarily let's take out
3 Steps 36 through 45, because we might have already done
4 that later in the audit log. Can't really pick and
5 choose. We can definitely take into -- into
6 consideration for future steps. Like if you focus on a
7 specific line item and say, well, northwest to Santa
8 Cruz, don't really like how that fits, it would fit
9 better this way, we'll take that into consideration and
10 apply that moving forward so you'll see that change in
11 the audit log in the -- in a subsequent version.

12 So on here I zoomed in. If I zoom out a
13 little bit you'll see that the Constitutional criteria,
14 most of theses were community of interest, but you can
15 see we started to -- once we took communities of
16 interest into account then we -- we needed to balance,
17 so that's what the "Equal population to the extent
18 practicable" line item is.

19 And then you also see some of these where we
20 did look at existing county boundaries. We did look at
21 geographic elements, roads, rivers that were mentioned,
22 and those were taken into account in the shaping of
23 these districts and also how districts were split
24 between districts.

25 So just scrolling through here, we wanted to

1 focus really each one of these changes on either a
2 specific town or city, community of interest. And with
3 that I will hand it over to Doug and Ivy for specific
4 points of interest, and I can pan around the map. And
5 for discussion and talking points if it would be
6 helpful we could, you know, zoom in to specific areas
7 such as Flagstaff, such as Tucson, and see how -- in
8 this version how we've modified it and then get your
9 feedback that we can incorporate into the next version.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you, Brian. So --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have a question.

12 Commissioner York. Don't we have to approve this map
13 before we give you feedback? Isn't that the process?

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think, Commissioner
15 York, they want to walk us through what changes were
16 made, and then from that we can move to approve it and
17 then after that begin to deliberate.

18 And just for sake of organization, because
19 we're diving into the legislative map, are we going to
20 just -- are you going to lead us through this iteration
21 of the legislative map and then we're going to begin to
22 deliberate on the legislative map and we'll deal with
23 congressional later, or would you prefer to approve
24 both as a starting point and then dive into the
25 deliberation? Does it make it a difference to you?

1 MR. JOHNSON: I don't think it makes much of a
2 difference to us at this point. The two maps have
3 diverged quite a bit, so where on the grid we had kind
4 of universal issues to address so we addressed both of
5 them at once, I think now we're down to very
6 map-specific questions for you, but -- and request for
7 direction, but we're happy to work with whatever you're
8 comfortable with. We can introduce both maps, and then
9 you can start deliberating on one or the other, or we
10 can do -- introduce just the leg. map and then do
11 deliberation.

12 MR. BRETT JOHNSON: Madam Chair --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do my colleagues have a
14 preference? Should we just dive into the legislative
15 map? Since we opened it up we'll begin to --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Legal has a question.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excuse me?

18 MR. BRETT JOHNSON: Oh, no. Continue --
19 continue that dialogue. I apologize, Madam Chair. I
20 do have a point to make, but after you're done.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. All right. So
22 we'll continue. And then, Brett, what's your point?

23 MR. BRETT JOHNSON: So real quick, Brian,
24 through the list -- and I apologize if I missed it --
25 can you explain -- before you go into what the changes

1 were made can you explain what was not able to be done?

2 MR. JOHNSON: I think that's more what I'm
3 going to talk about. So the key thing with the list is
4 it is very -- as you saw, it's very detailed, so it's
5 each map change. So it's not at the high level of the
6 goal let's unite X, and the audit log doesn't say we
7 united X. It's the individual changes to each Grid Map
8 district that we made in pursuit of that goal. So
9 this -- as Brian mentioned we can certainly make a list
10 of goals we weren't able to do. We can summarize that.
11 And that's part of what I was going to present now. It
12 doesn't work in the audit log format just because you
13 can't do that kind of big picture answer in such a
14 detailed report.

15 So if we can zoom out. One of the key issues
16 that we all wrestled with extensively was taking from
17 the previous version, the previous approved version of
18 the legislative map. There was direction going down to
19 Graham and Greenlee and to the Cochise County line.
20 Those areas make more sense -- when you get off the
21 reservation in Graham and Greenlee those might make
22 more sense with Cochise than with the Navajo in north
23 Coconino, and the discussion and direction was it was
24 okay to divide Flagstaff if that was the only way to
25 make that happen.

1 So we wrestled with this a lot. And we did
2 obviously take Graham and Greenlee out, as requested.
3 Most of 6 and 7, the purple and green northeastern
4 districts that you see on the screen, worked out pretty
5 well. We're following reservation lines. We're
6 following county lines. Obviously there is flexibility
7 there, because we did divide Flagstaff. Essentially it
8 works out that it's divided at the -- the, what is it,
9 I-80 -- I-80 and I-40 intersection there. If you're
10 northeast of there it's in 6. The rest of Flagstaff is
11 in 7.

12 The challenge was that -- oh, and then the
13 left-hand side, the border between 5 and 7 is the Verde
14 Valley versus Prescott division of Yavapai County. The
15 border is very jagged because you're up in the hills.
16 We're using the hills as a border so the census blocks
17 are jagged in there. The challenge was that 6 and 7,
18 once we got down to the lines that you see in the north
19 and then you got down to the reservation in Graham
20 County and Gila County in there, was we're still short.
21 And obviously 6 could take from 7, but that didn't
22 solve the problem. Then where did 7 go? So as you can
23 see here we ended up getting that last population in
24 Superior and Mammoth in eastern Pinal County.

25 The other options would be to take a piece of

1 Mohave County up north, to partially cross over and
2 take some of the -- the Prescott Valley side and
3 I-17 -- or I-17 corridor down into 7, or to bring 7
4 down into the New River, North Phoenix area, or to come
5 in and essentially get like the Fort McDowell
6 Reservation, or to come over to 15 and get Florence.
7 Anywhere you go along that border, 6 and 7, we need to
8 get a little bit of population. It could be going back
9 to the old version, if the Commission wants, going back
10 in to get Graham and Greenlee.

11 It could be as shown here, the kind of
12 Superior and Mammoth area. Not getting into
13 Saddlebrooke. We're just -- we're not getting into
14 that area. We're just getting the Superior/Mammoth
15 corridor there. Or we would bring -- or coming west
16 over to kind of Florence area or west into Maricopa
17 County. That was a big challenge that doesn't work
18 out. It's all driven by, of course, the slow
19 population growth up in the current northeastern
20 district. That district needs to grow to add people,
21 as you heard about the conversation at the public
22 hearing about how all those numbers came in.

23 So that in the big picture is a big challenge,
24 and obviously it impacts a lot, because if you come
25 down into Graham and Greenlee again, well, then you

1 push 19 more into Tucson. That pushes up into, you
2 know, 16 and 22. That all -- everything kind of
3 ripples around as a result of whatever decision is
4 made, but that's a good choice. And so coming down
5 into Mammoth and Superior is the -- not a request of
6 the Commission, obviously. This is just where we had
7 to go to get the population, or one of the options to
8 go.

9 The other big challenge at the big level, we
10 did end up with essentially river districts. You can
11 see over in the west District 30 is those counties down
12 to the Yuma split that was requested, so that's good.
13 That meets kind of the Commission discussion and public
14 input for something along that line.

15 Then we get to D5, though, in Prescott and
16 western Yavapai. That's kind of hidden between the
17 Verde Valley and between the river counties, and so it
18 comes down into Maricopa along the I-17 corridor. It
19 does -- as the Commission requested we take both sides
20 of I-17. We're not using I-17 as the barrier there as
21 we had a lot of community testimony about how that
22 community crosses the freeway and not to use the
23 freeway up there. We are coming down there.

24 And the -- just to highlight, the D5, D28
25 border there, the red district and the yellow district,

1 the yellow district looks like it's coming up in an odd
2 shape. That's the city border of Peoria, so it's not a
3 randomly chosen thing. We're keeping all of North
4 Peoria together there, and that's the explanation for
5 that shape. For those that don't know the city
6 borders, the north tip of Peoria is actually in Yavapai
7 County, so that's why that district is extending up
8 there.

9 Then going to Phoenix, obviously there is a
10 ways to go. As Chair Neuberg was mentioning, this is
11 just the next step in the map. This is far from a
12 finished proposal, but there is a lot of discussion and
13 options that we can talk about in there, how to
14 specifically configure the districts. Can you zoom out
15 a little more? There we go. So we are moving over --

16 MR. KINGERY: Sorry.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Making me dizzy. So zoom out
18 more so we can just see all the -- there we go. Thank
19 you. And zoom down. There we go.

20 So we are looking in that area at shifting the
21 districts over and kind of talking about that South
22 Phoenix, Laveen region getting grouped into -- as you
23 can see in this map we're getting D11. There is
24 obviously a whole bunch of districts in there. The
25 individual configurations in there we haven't yet

1 implemented, like following the school districts or
2 something like that. It was more at this stage getting
3 those districts shifted over so we're not blending,
4 say, the central South Phoenix with Ahwatukee and Mesa
5 or anything like that. So we do have those districts
6 shifted into that area, but obviously looking for a lot
7 of direction on what specific community shifts within
8 that small geographic, but very densely populated, area
9 makes sense.

10 Oh, and I should highlight the request of the
11 Commission, D29, the kind of brownish district in the
12 sort of top left, that does unite the three Sun Cities
13 in one district, as the Commission requested, so we
14 were able to do that.

15 So we're making a lot more sense now in terms
16 of the Commission's direction and via the Commission's
17 direction implementing the community requests, starting
18 much more community oriented in this map. You can see
19 over -- oh, the other one didn't mention over on the
20 east side, District 4, the blue district is obviously
21 the reservations coming in with South Scottsdale and
22 Tempe. There was some direction about that.

23 And then down in the bottom right corner,
24 Maricopa County, District 14 and District 10 border
25 with District 15, is the county line, so at this point

1 the District 15 is the Pinal. It's essentially all of
2 the Pinal County suburbs down and then of Mesa --
3 suburbs may not be the right term, but the adjacent
4 communities to Mesa, and then coming down to Florence,
5 going down and getting the communities down the road.

6 So the big questions that we wrestled with and
7 didn't really come to conclusion on the directions but
8 just kind of took a stab at in this map and are looking
9 for direction -- we're obviously looking for direction
10 on everything, but looking for particular direction
11 would be how to finish that D6, D7, which currently
12 shows as Mammoth and Superior area, and then any
13 direction regarding the Phoenix area and finishing at
14 District 5, coming down from Prescott.

15 Oh, and then we didn't show Tucson. Let's
16 zoom in on Tucson. This actually worked out. We made
17 big strides towards looking at where the community had
18 offered the feedback, and then the Commission gave us
19 direction. You can see now we have District 21 coming
20 up from the south. That's Santa Cruz County. And then
21 coming up into South Tucson, District 23 keeps all the
22 reservation lands together, but they're not with urban
23 Tucson. They then extend over to Yuma, which was
24 discussed.

25 And then you can see we start to get there

1 with D20 keeping both sides of the freeway, the Marana
2 and those communities that cross the freeway together,
3 D17 being really the Foothills and then coming down the
4 east side of the Tucson, and D18 being a central Tucson
5 district, with D19 coming in from Cochise. That's
6 Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, and then coming in and
7 getting the air base and the affiliated areas. The
8 Commission talked about that being kind of an aerospace
9 corridor. That made sense to go together.

10 And can you zoom out just a little bit and
11 show the connection down to Santa Cruz County. And
12 then the whole corridor from Santa Cruz to South Tucson
13 is all united in District 21, so Sahuarita, Green
14 Valley, and all those areas.

15 So I think we made a lot of progress, achieved
16 most of the requests from the Commission for this map,
17 but obviously this is just our next big leap in the
18 progress towards the final map, and certainly look
19 forward to your questions and directions on the next
20 steps to take.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Questions? But, again,
22 we will not deliberate and move lines until we approve
23 this new starting point, so these are clarification
24 questions at this point, please.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

1 So I was wondering if we have a VRA analysis
2 of this at this point that we could hear about.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. So can we bring up the
4 spreadsheet. So all the numbers are available at the
5 bottom, if you pull up the data. It's a little easier
6 to review in the summary spreadsheet. But, yes, so
7 we've taken kind of big picture steps towards VRA
8 compliance, you know, consolidating South Tucson with
9 Santa Cruz, things like that. There is still work to
10 be done, obviously. There we go.

11 So there is two pieces to this. If you can
12 scroll down so that we can see more -- scroll down so
13 we can see more districts. Sorry. Wrong computer is
14 being shared.

15 So what it breaks down to at this point -- as
16 they bring up the numbers -- oh, here we go. So can
17 you scroll over to the right. There we go. So you may
18 remember Dr. Hanley talked about for on the Latino side
19 of Voting Rights Act compliance the best method, as she
20 recommended, was tracking the two statewide elections
21 that involved White and Latino candidates, the 2018
22 governor's race and the 2018 attorney general's race,
23 and looking at those results in areas that are heavily
24 Latino.

25 So if we go down the Citizen Voting Age

1 Population column you can see -- hard to get on the
2 screen. But District 20 I believe is the -- oh, I'm
3 sorry. 63 percent. You see that? There we go. Right
4 there. So we have district -- that district at
5 63 percent. Oh, that' 24. District 24 is at
6 63 percent.

7 And if you go over to the far right you can
8 see in the governor's race the Latino candidate one
9 with 71 percent, and in the attorney general's race the
10 Latino candidate won with 75 percent. So really big
11 margins in that district. Up a little -- the district
12 right above it and three above it are both 50 percent.
13 They're right at the 50 percent number. So those are
14 23, I believe, and 21. Can't quite -- there we go.
15 Thank you.

16 And if you scroll over to the right you can
17 see in 21 it does perform. So the Latino candidate got
18 50 percent in the governor's race and 58 percent in the
19 attorney general's race, so that would be an effective
20 district where the Latino-preferred candidate is
21 elected. And 23 below it, this is right on the edge,
22 so the Latino candidate for attorney general won, and
23 the Latino candidate for governor did not win, so it's
24 right on the edge there in terms of performance.

25 Interestingly, right above it -- and this goes

1 to what Dr. Henley was talking about -- it's not just
2 the numbers. It's voting patterns in the community and
3 the history and all that. The 47 percent district
4 there, which is 22, it's below 50 percent at 47, but it
5 performs. So the Latino candidate for governor got
6 53 percent, and the Latino candidate for attorney
7 general got 58 percent. So even though it's not a
8 majority Latino seat in voting age population, it is an
9 effective seat under this measure and would be expected
10 to elect the Latino-preferred candidate.

11 So as we're looking at this, we got 24 that's
12 over 50 percent. As we just talked about we got -- I'm
13 sorry, 21 and 23 at 50 percent, and then we have --
14 right above the highlighted ones you see the
15 38 percent, District 20, which also performs, if you go
16 to the right. That is that -- down in Pima the
17 Latino-preferred candidate tends to win with much lower
18 Latino percentages than we see in Phoenix or in the
19 Phoenix area.

20 So we have 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and actually 26
21 below it, which is 40 percent, but does perform, all in
22 order or close to that range. Now, this doesn't mean
23 they're done. Obviously, we can refine them, adjust
24 them for community of interest measures and all that,
25 and that primarily is what we're looking at when we do

1 these districts. We actually did not look at these
2 numbers as we drew them. This is just how they worked
3 out when we were implementing the previous set of
4 instructions. So on the -- and there certainly are
5 opportunities to look at other seats that could be
6 brought into this performance range. There is lots of
7 revisions still possible.

8 On the Native American side, if we scroll up
9 to District 6 -- there we go. You can see just to the
10 right of the 175 number is the Native American voting
11 age percentage at 57 percent. There we go. To the
12 left of what you highlighted there. Oh, no. I'm
13 sorry. That's the total. I was looking at total
14 population. So 56 percent of the citizen voting age
15 population of that district is Native American. This
16 is the one where Dr. Henley had talked about it is
17 polarized. Because it's so short on population as
18 currently configured, and as your direction is to kind
19 of look at those reservations and keep them together
20 again in one district, we're looking really at just
21 keeping that as high as we can with reasonable
22 decisions on the community side. So it's very unlikely
23 that we find a way to keep that number as high as it is
24 currently, but we clearly want to do the best possible
25 job we can, both from a percentage, and even more

1 importantly from communities that make sense to go with
2 reservations in that district.

3 So that -- that's kind of where we stand.
4 And, again, this was done -- you know, the directions
5 we had and as we implemented them we were looking at
6 kind of the big picture of Voting Rights regions and
7 areas. We weren't fine-tuning by the numbers. This is
8 really a first step.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. Just a
10 follow-up with that, I know we hired from the legal
11 perspective VRA experts to also look at this. Could we
12 get feedback -- is this the right time for feedback to
13 get some insight on that as well?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, should we not move
15 along?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'm just trying to
17 understand the numbers a little bit and then happy to
18 move --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I appreciate that.
20 We're just going to have five days of this, and this is
21 not the final numbers.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I understand, but I --
23 it's just helpful for me to at least get some insight
24 now. Doesn't mean -- I would like to just get some
25 understanding as we start.

1 MR. HERRERA: Madam Chair, Commission, I think
2 we can get sort of a process update on that.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Please.

4 MR. HERRERA: So a couple of things. Now
5 we're -- you know, as Doug kind of mentioned we were
6 talking about big picture items, and now we're sort of
7 at a district-by-district analysis point in the
8 process. So much of what the VRA analysis comes down
9 to is data analysis, and, you know, Dr. Hanley took us
10 through the various methods of statistical analysis.
11 That analysis is -- can be done by our experts. We
12 have finally reached a point -- and there has been a
13 number of sort of data issues I know that Doug's team
14 has had to work through the last couple of weeks. We
15 finally sort of finished with that, I think, and got
16 some clarifying questions answered just yesterday. So
17 I think we're in a position now where our legal experts
18 will be able to do kind of a district-by-district
19 analysis instantaneously going forward, so when we
20 enter next week I think, you know, with the iterations
21 of the map we'll be able to send to them and then we're
22 talking about within hours get an analysis back, so
23 that's kind of the latest.

24 Unfortunately, because we were still working
25 through the data up until yesterday, we haven't done a

1 district-by-district analysis on this particular
2 iteration, but I think my general observation would be,
3 as Doug has already pointed out, there is a number of
4 districts where we're sort of approaching VRA
5 compliance. The open question is can they be improved
6 in some way, because ultimately what we're talking
7 about with the VRA in a lot of ways is performance and
8 what's that threshold you need to meet for that
9 district to be performing for the minority group, and
10 that's part of the analysis that I think our collective
11 experts are going to be able to provide to you.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I think what
13 Commissioner York was probably getting at is it's just
14 very early in the process, and so if we do a full
15 analysis each and every step, I mean, that's not
16 efficient, but we do need to keep in mind how we can
17 maximize the minority representations, so thank you.

18 At this point, Doug, would it make sense to
19 ask the Commission to approve this new starting point,
20 or is there any further explanation, clarification that
21 you would like to give?

22 MR. JOHNSON: No. I think that's where we're
23 at on the report back.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Commissioners, so
25 I would like to entertain a motion to approve the

1 Legislative District Map 2.0 as a new starting point to
2 lock it in. Again, please understand this does not
3 mean that we are approving these maps. It doesn't mean
4 that we are locking anything in. Rather, we're
5 approving this as a starting point for today.

6 Do I have a motion to approve this Legislative
7 Map 2.0 as a starting point?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I move to approve
9 Legislative Map 2.0 as a starting point.

10 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman
11 seconds.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any discussion?
13 Vice Chair Watchman.

14 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
22 an aye.

23 And with that we have approved Legislative
24 District Map 2.0.

25 At this point we can continue to dive into the

1 legislative map and begin, you know, deliberations,
2 move lines, or alternatively for time management we
3 could dive into the congressional map, approve -- you
4 know, explain where we are, approve that, and then take
5 a break. We'll want to take a break in what, about,
6 maybe 15, 20 minutes. So any preference?

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: My preference would be to
8 stay with the legislative map but maybe take a quick
9 break right now.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If that works for
11 the team I'm good with that. Okay. Quick break and
12 we'll come back and dive into the map.

13 (Brief recess taken.)

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
15 everybody. I am going to turn it right back -- oh,
16 actually, I think we're at a juncture point where we
17 are ready to begin deliberations on the legislative
18 map. And so I understand that there is quite a bit of
19 data there. We have 30 districts. I'm going to open
20 it up to my colleagues, and feel free to dive into
21 specific areas, you know, one at a time and not feel
22 that we have to do all 30. And each and every, you
23 know, step will be progress. So I open it up to
24 initial thoughts or reactions.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Doug, you mentioned that

1 that northern district is a real key, so if it's okay
2 with everyone I'll make a few comments on that one and
3 we can all join in on that.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If you can say which
5 number.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's really 6 and 7.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to suggest we
9 take a little different look at it than what you had
10 talked about, Doug, and we have heard a lot of people
11 on the public comments and then on some of the
12 presentations we've made where I've heard people say
13 they don't want to split Flagstaff. I've heard people
14 in the White Mountains and Payson say they don't want
15 to be part of that northern district, the District 6.
16 We've heard people in the Verde Valley vociferously
17 argue both ways, to be part of Yavapai or to be part of
18 Flagstaff. And frank -- and then we have people down
19 in the Copper Corridor who don't want to be -- who they
20 have made it really clear they don't want to be part of
21 what is now District 6, that northern district. So I
22 don't think we can satisfy everybody, but I think we
23 can satisfy most people if we would include all of
24 Flagstaff in District 6 and take District 7 farther to
25 the east where you take in Eagar and Springerville,

1 take it all the way over to Highway 191, and drop
2 District 7 down to include Payson, and probably down a
3 little bit farther than Payson, but certainly to
4 include Payson. I don't know how the population all
5 shakes out. And that would probably put the Verde
6 Valley then back in with -- with Yavapai. But I think
7 that would be worth at least looking at that and see
8 how those populations go. And then the whole Copper
9 Corridor can go more into 19 or go -- or swing with
10 something else the other south -- southwest direction,
11 but certainly not be part of -- part of 6.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I resonate with some of
13 that. I mean, you know, I see Flagstaff as being a
14 better fit in 6. I see Payson as being a better fit --
15 I'm sorry. I want to make sure I have my numbers
16 right. Yes, Flagstaff and Payson with 7. And I
17 believe that's what I heard -- of the two things that
18 Commissioner Mehl mentioned those were two things that
19 I resonated with. Did I get that right?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, and I included
21 keeping Eagar and Springerville into 7, also, and
22 leaving a thinner line on that eastern side of 191 that
23 would connect the Apache Nation.

24 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I guess
25 I'll take that under advisement. My thought, though,

1 is just the Native American count. I think I heard
2 from Navajo wanted to look at least 60 percent number
3 there for that area, and so I'm not sure if that -- by
4 including Payson and Flagstaff would help, but --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think by taking a lot of
6 stuff out that may help.

7 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Right, right, but I
8 guess in the final count I guess I'm just saying it
9 sounds plausible, notwithstanding how the Native
10 American percentages come out, so that's important,
11 because they were very emphatic about having a district
12 that has a larger Native American population than
13 probably any other district in the state, and that's
14 probably the only district where we could have a
15 sizeable Native American vote count.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I hope it works out
17 that way. I think it will. I'll wait and see how it
18 turns out.

19 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: I'm not quick enough
20 to look at those numbers, but I just wanted to put that
21 up there.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I hear that point.
23 This is the legislative district to represent the
24 northern tribes, and that is of critical importance.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Watchman,

1 does Winslow resonate with the Navajo tribes as well?

2 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: At this point I
3 would -- fair to say yes. I don't know what the
4 population is of Winslow, but -- I don't have that in
5 front of me, but I know that there is a lot of Navajos
6 that do reside in that town. They have an Indian
7 health center facility there, so it could. I don't
8 have that information in front of me.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right now Winslow is in
10 District 7 on this map.

11 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Yes, it is, so --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just need to get some
13 clarification, because it's a little hard to hear,
14 so -- unfortunately, so could you just clarify,
15 Commissioner Mehl -- and I apologize having you repeat
16 some of that, but the sound doesn't travel as well as I
17 had hoped. So I think you're talking about moving
18 Payson -- moving -- keeping Flagstaff whole in District
19 6 and then moving -- the change would be for District
20 7, so that would be the major change, the main change
21 in District 6. Is that correct?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, 6 also would pull up
23 and not have the White Mountains in it.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: See, I can't -- sorry.
25 I can't hear it.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: District 6 would also --
2 wouldn't come as far south except for the Apache
3 Nation. That area below 7 would come into 7 in a lot
4 of that, and some of District 19 would come up. So
5 District 7 would come down. District 19 would come up,
6 or 15 over, but that area outside of the Apache area
7 would not stay in District 6.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. And then you
9 would have Payson move from District 7 to District 6.
10 Is that what you're talking about? Just trying to
11 understand.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Payson would move from
13 District 6 right now into District 7, and I think
14 that's important to them, as it is with Eagar and
15 Springerville.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So Payson, Heber, and
17 that whole -- along that road, along 260, is what
18 you're talking about?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: 191.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Would go to District 7?

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, there is
23 one small community, Native community, right south of
24 Payson, the Tonto Apache, which we have not had the
25 opportunity of hearing from them, but just know for the

1 record that there is a small community that adjoins or
2 not -- or parallels, sits right next to the city of
3 Payson, Tonto Apache, so I don't know how they feel.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think that's a good
5 point, and it looks like you could still connect them
6 into the Apache and still have that all be part -- they
7 could be part of District 6.

8 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Correct.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The other thing is the
10 Yavapai Apache submitted a map for that area, and I'm
11 wondering if we could pull that up and see the
12 difference between that for these districts, for
13 districts, because I think their focus was somewhat in
14 this area, so maybe we could take a look at that just
15 to see what they suggested.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: As the mapping team
17 brings that up, Commissioner Mehl, I have a question.
18 Eagar, were you suggesting that that's going to go into
19 7?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And so are you talking
22 about a tiny sliver on the eastern side moving up into
23 that Native American area south of Payson?

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I wouldn't call it a tiny
25 sliver, but it would be narrower than it is today in

1 this version. It would be everything to the east of
2 191. Outside of the city boundaries would then connect
3 down into the Apache area.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Actually, it's great if
5 you can have the tribal reservations on there. That
6 would be helpful for this discussion, if you don't
7 mind.

8 MR. FLAHAN: This is LD25 that they submitted.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Was LD25, is that the
10 one that Yavapai Apache -- and can we see then the
11 comparison between their map and the alleged map that
12 we're currently looking at?

13 MR. FLAHAN: Give us one second to bring it
14 up.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

16 MR. FLAHAN: All the differences between --
17 all the checkers there on the screen are the
18 differences between what the Yavapai Apache Nation
19 submitted versus what you guys have as your LD test
20 map, I guess now version 3.0 since we accepted the 2.0.
21 Do you have a specific spot you would like to zoom
22 into, Commissioner?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think their focus was
24 more on one part of the state than anything else from
25 what their letter said.

1 MR. FLAHAN: LD6.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was just curious on
3 how that--

4 MR. FLAHAN: So they did put in the submitted
5 plan name that it was LD6, which is the lime green
6 color in the top right corner. And so the checkered
7 would be the differences between the current District 6
8 in the LD test map versus theirs. Turn on the compare
9 map. Turn on the active map.

10 MR. JOHNSON: There is a lot of differences,
11 obviously, as you're looking at this, but the key
12 difference is that the Apache reservations are
13 connected via western corridor, so they're not coming
14 down the east side of the state to connect the Navajo
15 to the Apache. They're coming through Coconino and
16 Apache County, the west side of Apache County, to
17 connect.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And are they wanting it
19 to go all the way down south?

20 MR. JOHNSON: No. So, Brian, if you can zoom
21 up so we can focus on D6. So D19, the District 19, the
22 purple here, I think that's the result of how they've
23 drawn it. D6, as I noted, is their focus. That's
24 their proposal. But you do end up with the rest of
25 Apache and Navajo County needing to go somewhere.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's a very different
2 map. Because they submitted it I thought we should
3 take a look at it as we're discussing some of these
4 areas.

5 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Can we look at the
6 Hualapai section of this map here? I've seen -- this
7 is our version, version 2?

8 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, this on the screen is your
9 version.

10 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: The Yavapai tribal
11 map, I see a little -- little sliver on the west side
12 of the Hualapai, if you look at the far left of the --
13 of the LD6, that right there. I don't know what that
14 is, that little community. Is that a community? Is
15 that outside of the Hualapai reservation? I'm not
16 familiar with that little area, but I did notice that
17 on some of the tribal maps, and we don't have that
18 included. So is that tribal allotted land? Because
19 there is many forms of reservations, and so typically
20 it's just the trust lands that are included, and tribes
21 do have the ability to purchase lands, and it's not
22 necessarily trust land, but it's owned by the tribe.
23 Is that what that is? Yeah, those. Is that
24 off-reservation land?

25 MR. KINGERY: It's identifying as

1 off-reservation trust land.

2 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Okay. Predominantly
3 tribal member residents live there.

4 MR. KINGERY: You can see right here what I've
5 highlighted in the bottom left.

6 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Got it. So for our
7 purposes that would be included in the maps because
8 that is tribal land.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think that's an
10 excellent point. I would support including it.

11 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: I'm sure there's not
12 very many people there but I was curious about the
13 reservation boundary lines there.

14 MR. JOHNSON: I don't think there is anyone --
15 I don't think there is anyone in there. They catch as
16 many tribal lands. It's checkerboard, so it's one
17 tribal section, one non-tribal section. I think it's
18 all zero population, but that's the challenge.

19 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: The other point of
20 fact, which just kind of maybe zoom out, which I just
21 learned not too long ago is on the eastern side of
22 Arizona the Zuni tribe does have lands right south of
23 St. Johns, but I don't believe they have any Zuni
24 members there. It's on the New Mexico/Arizona border
25 in LD6. But just for point of information for

1 everybody here, it's south of -- well, I think you can
2 see it in New Mexico there, the Zuni reservation right
3 in that area, but they do have reservation lands that
4 come into Arizona, and so I'm not sure exactly where
5 that is, but I was told that there is no Zuni tribal
6 members that live in Arizona on their lands and so --
7 but, again, just for information purposes.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I wanted to look at, if
9 we can go back to the Yavapai Apache map and with more
10 of that western corridor moving south, are there
11 communities of interest that might be disenfranchised
12 along that corridor?

13 MR. JOHNSON: Brian, can you zoom in? Where
14 is Flagstaff in this map?

15 MR. KINGERY: It's in red.

16 MR. JOHNSON: So zoom out a little -- zoom out
17 a little bit. So the interesting thing here is that
18 the Verde Valley is not with Prescott, but it's also
19 not with Flagstaff. So Flagstaff is the red district
20 shown -- the Verde Valley is in District D6, I guess,
21 and then the Prescott -- actually, I think Prescott is
22 with Flagstaff.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you mind zooming in a
24 little bit more? Thank you.

25 MR. JOHNSON: So, actually, if you scroll down

1 a little bit, I think Flagstaff and Prescott might be
2 together in this. Can you scroll down to the bottom of
3 the red district? Yeah, so this district puts
4 Flagstaff and Prescott together in one -- in one
5 district.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And so that would keep
7 Prescott with the quad cities, but not with Cottonwood,
8 Verde Valley, et cetera. Am I correct?

9 MR. JOHNSON: Zoom out so we can see the
10 county line. Does the red come all the way down to
11 Maricopa? No, no. So, right, so it's Prescott and
12 Prescott Valley together, but it's not getting the I-17
13 corridor south of there into the same seat, just the
14 town -- you can see that, Mayer. It goes down to
15 Mayer.

16 MR. FLAHAN: It gets Dewey and Mayer on the
17 way down and comes in I think to the Cordes Junction
18 area. That comes down to the Cordes Junction area.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not -- I'm not sure
20 the map fits with some of what we heard from
21 communities of interest, to be quite honest, but I
22 was -- I thought that since it had been submitted we
23 should take a look at it as we were discussing this.

24 I do have a point just to make, because I
25 do --

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Brian, can you zoom out,
2 please.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just in general --

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Speak into your mic.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, sorry. Okay. Is
6 that better?

7 Just in general I know that this will be a
8 point of discussion that we'll have at some point, I
9 don't know when we start this, but I have been also
10 trying to keep a little bit on the competitiveness
11 piece, and right now both -- just the way it is
12 configured right now before the changes that
13 Commissioner Mehl proposed, it's actually a very
14 competitive district, District 7, which -- with a
15 slight lean towards Republicans in that district. With
16 these changes it would probably make it a less
17 competitive district. And I'm just -- I'm throwing
18 that out there because I think we should keep that in
19 mind as part of our overall discussions, so I did want
20 to mention that.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I hear that, and I
22 concur that -- I support constantly bringing in all six
23 Constitutional criteria. I also, though, think that we
24 need to tackle things in an organized way, and I think
25 understanding the communities of interest and logically

1 grouping them and then coming -- yes, to the greatest
2 extent possible keeping in mind competitiveness, but we
3 have the opportunity to tweak it afterwards. I don't
4 think -- I want to be careful. I think we need to be
5 careful not to allow competitiveness to drive the
6 entire organization of the map because if we dive in
7 through that lens I think we mess up what the
8 underlying purpose of this is, which is the 14th
9 Amendment, one person, one vote, which is maximizing as
10 many communities of interest to have representation,
11 and so that's all I want to say.

12 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, when you
13 mean logically organized communities of interest, can
14 you explain that for me? I don't understand, so --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We identified 182
16 communities of interest, and I would like to do our
17 best to maximize the extent to which all of them can
18 seek representation. My only point is if we start in
19 by constraining ourselves with competitiveness I'm
20 concerned that that will limit our ability to also
21 focus on the 182 communities.

22 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Okay. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't disagree, but we
24 want to have -- but I think we need to keep that in
25 mind as we move forward. I think it's good for us to

1 continually look at it because there may be times when
2 we say -- and I'll be honest. In this case when I see
3 something that's very competitive, leaning towards,
4 like I said, in this case it was leaning towards
5 Republican, I still feel that that's a pretty balanced
6 district as long as we are still keeping those other
7 pieces in mind. So I think we can certainly look at
8 this next iteration that Commissioner Mehl has proposed
9 and see -- and part of it is just to kind of get a
10 better feel for it.

11 For me I would like to be sure that we keep
12 Flagstaff connected to the Verde Valley as part of
13 that, whatever changes are made, because I think we
14 heard that Verde Valley, Sedona, that whole group said,
15 We all want to be connected, in that case, and I think
16 you basically are still keeping that.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. Actually, one thing
18 that would be sacrificed, of all of the -- we had about
19 five different areas of comments, and I think we can
20 satisfy four of the five. And there in the Verde
21 Valley, especially if you look at the most recent
22 comments, there is people that really feel strongly
23 both way on the Verde Valley being part of Yavapai or
24 part of Flagstaff. In this last week's comments the
25 part that wants to be part of Verde Valley -- I mean

1 part of Yavapai from Verde Valley was extremely vocal,
2 and I know we've heard just as vocal from the other.
3 But I don't think you can have Eagar, Springerville,
4 Payson, the whole White Mountain area is being
5 sacrificed for that Verde Valley where you have a split
6 opinion on Verde Valley, so that's -- my proposal does
7 put Verde Valley back with Yavapai.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I guess I will say
9 when you look at the elected officials from those
10 communities as well as the population, more of those
11 folks wanted and talked about the connection to
12 Flagstaff. If we look at Mayer, the council folks,
13 they were all emphasizing that area. It's not to say
14 there weren't people on both sides. Of course, we see
15 that with all communities, right, but there are people
16 on both sides. But I -- we heard very strongly with
17 that in terms of that, and the current configuration
18 that we have would still include that.

19 And basically I thought -- I guess -- and,
20 again, I apologize. Sometimes it's hard to hear, so I
21 apologize for that. But I thought we were mostly
22 focusing on including Payson into that but not
23 removing -- I did not realize you wanted to move them
24 into Yavapai, because I feel that they were pretty
25 strong about that -- that break, so I would suggest

1 that we see -- I mean, that's my view. I'm suggesting
2 that we don't move them out.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: My priorities were
4 including all of Flagstaff in 6; including Payson,
5 Eagar, Springerville, the White Mountain area in 7. I
6 think that we can then look at what then happens to the
7 Verde Valley.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We can see what happens.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Verde Valley is currently
10 in -- excuse me. This is Commissioner York. Verde
11 Valley is currently in District 7. The tradeoff
12 between populations was to add Flagstaff to District 6,
13 so the tradeoff would be Payson and Eagar and
14 Springerville, so that was the tradeoff. You know, I
15 guess that was from what Commissioner Watchman had
16 said, that I thought that he wanted Flagstaff to be
17 with the Navajos because of the Navajo population in
18 Flagstaff.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think we've been
20 talking about that there a lot of Navajo living in
21 eastern Flagstaff, which is included in District 6
22 right now. Parts of Flagstaff are included in District
23 6, and I understand the idea of trying to keep it
24 whole, but I would also like to see us -- you know,
25 maybe we can run it a couple of different ways to look

1 at could we -- could we keep the Verde Valley. I would
2 like to see a couple of different options from what
3 Commissioner Mehl has proposed with Payson -- Payson
4 being included, but also looking at what we could do
5 for the Verde Valley.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Brian, on your map for
7 District 6, District 7, you did not follow the I-40
8 corridor in Flagstaff; you went up into the northern
9 part of the city. Any particular reason why? You're
10 north of Campus there.

11 MR. KINGERY: So the map that's currently
12 being displayed is the compared plan. Switching over
13 to the active, we followed the I-40 until we got to
14 about central northern part of the city, and then we
15 took north of that, north of I-40.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's where all the
17 population is.

18 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. Over a majority of
19 Flagstaff is in 7. The northeast corner is --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there is not very
21 many people there is what I'm saying.

22 MR. JOHNSON: I can't hear.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: There isn't very many
24 people in that northeast corner, so realistically
25 Flagstaff right now is drawn in District 7. You make

1 the comment that part of Flagstaff is in District 6,
2 but realistically I don't think it is.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry. I couldn't hear what you
4 said.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: I said I don't think that
6 Flagstaff is in District 7 at all -- or District 6 at
7 all.

8 MR. JOHNSON: So the yellow highlighted --
9 Brian, can you zoom in on that northeast corner? So
10 that yellow highlighting is the city border, so it's
11 just that northeast corner in there.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: And there is -- there is
13 very few people there.

14 MR. JOHNSON: Right. There is one
15 neighborhood, essentially, just in there as you go
16 up -- is it I-80? Yeah. You can see the concentration
17 of streets in there. So that is a chunk of population,
18 but, yeah, we're not talking thousands and thousands of
19 people. It's definitely just the corner of the city.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: So back to Commissioner
21 Watchman's desire to get the population of the Native
22 American and Flagstaff included in District 6, in my
23 opinion that was not accomplished.

24 MR. JOHNSON: I mean, we didn't put the whole
25 city in.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

2 MR. JOHNSON: We just put what was needed.

3 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: It's almost like a
4 configuration --

5 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, the main goal we were
6 talking about in this map direction was to not have D6
7 go down into Graham and Greenley and then to population
8 balance the rest using Flagstaff as needed. So, yeah,
9 we didn't take the instructions as being to put all of
10 Flagstaff in or anything like that. We talked about it
11 being divided just to population balance that Graham
12 and Greenlee change, but we're happy to take the next
13 step and draw that, if that's something the Commission
14 wants to see.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not sure I'm
16 understanding Commissioner Lerner's suggestion or idea
17 here. Are you suggesting splitting Flagstaff more for
18 the purpose of balancing, you know, population and
19 competitiveness?

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't have any idea
21 what the competitiveness will end up being, so I'm not
22 using that at this point. I was just bringing up where
23 it is right now, that right now the current
24 configuration was competitive in District 7, but we'll
25 end up -- once they do some map drawing we'll see as

1 part of it. What I'm saying is I guess for me part of
2 the priority is we had talked at one time --
3 Commissioner Watchman had mentioned that there are
4 Navajo who live in the east side of Flagstaff so I was
5 just mentioning that.

6 My bigger issue here is the Verde Valley and
7 Sedona piece and seeing -- and that's what I'm saying.
8 I guess I would like to see a couple of configurations,
9 if we can, for the next one, one with Commissioner
10 Mehl's suggestion and then one which would see what we
11 could do in terms of the different communities there,
12 but keeping that group together as part of District 7.
13 I understand part -- what you're saying. I just think
14 that there are other communities of interest that I
15 feel have spoken pretty strongly about -- about that,
16 just as strongly as some of the other ones that have
17 been mentioned.

18 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I think
19 that also includes the statements from the City of
20 Flagstaff, the mayor, and then the Coconino County
21 board of supervisor chair and vice chair. They also
22 spoke. And I'm drawing a blank on what they mentioned,
23 but they're very vocal, because they were in attendance
24 at the Flagstaff grid meeting, so I think we need to
25 consider their thoughts as well.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I concur -- I concur
2 with some of Commissioner Mehl's priorities. I think,
3 you know, to accommodate Payson, the White Mountain
4 communities, to bring them further into, you know, 7,
5 I'm open to Flagstaff, depending on, you know, where
6 that needs to go. I think it logically belongs more
7 with 6, but -- and I think the Verde Valley is going to
8 be a little complicated and Sedona, and maybe reserve
9 judgment on that because there has been very different
10 testimony, and that, you know, because of that, you
11 know, maybe we hold off and see how the rest of the
12 iterations play out.

13 MR. JOHNSON: If I could, as we're looking at
14 the map -- Brian, can you zoom out so I can see D6 and
15 D7. So what I think I'm understanding is put -- the
16 first request from Commissioner Mehl, excuse me, was to
17 put Flagstaff into D6 and then take out Navajo County,
18 the Navajo reservation parts of Navajo County over into
19 I-98 and take out Payson and the White Mountain,
20 Apache, and that would likely pull D5 over into Verde
21 Valley and all that area and Sedona.

22 Looking at the alternative approach that
23 Commissioner Lerner is --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think we talked
25 about D5.

1 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, it's just -- we talked about
2 putting the Verde Valley with Prescott, so I guess it
3 could -- you're right. It could go either way. D7
4 could go west and take up Prescott. You're right.
5 It's not a district-specific mention. It's just put
6 those two together.

7 Commissioner Lerner, looking at your request,
8 if we did all of Flagstaff into 7 and then these other
9 areas, the Verde Valley seat is going to end up way
10 short. It would have to come down into Phoenix or
11 something like that to avoid going west into Prescott,
12 which obviously would be odd. The thing we could try
13 showing that I think would achieve what you're asking
14 for, and that's why I'm checking in here, is moving the
15 western Navajo County, Navajo reservation areas into 7,
16 taking the White Mountain out, White Mountain
17 reservation out, Payson out, all those pieces we've
18 been talking about, but then just balancing in
19 Flagstaff. So Flagstaff would remain split in that
20 case, if this works out as I'm envisioning it. Would
21 that be the scenario you want to see? I mean, I'm
22 presuming that would be better than going down into
23 Maricopa with the Verde Valley seat.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, we don't want to
25 go into Maricopa for sure. So I guess I'm not sure --

1 I almost will leave it to you to come up with sort of a
2 possible option, to take a look at what has been
3 proposed by Commissioner Mehl, and then to take another
4 look at what could we do if we wanted to keep those
5 communities together that we've been talking about,
6 because I honestly -- I don't know exactly how to make
7 that all fit, and I don't know if it will all fit, but
8 I would like to see just a couple of options in terms
9 of that.

10 MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Shereen, what I
12 understand, Commissioner Lerner, from what I can see in
13 District 7, District 7 is Sedona, Cottonwood, and Verde
14 Valley, and we're including Payson. I thought that was
15 a pretty good community of interest.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, but then my
17 understanding was by including Payson you were moving
18 them to Yavapai. That's what I am trying to
19 understand, where those lines are going into Prescott.
20 If you're not moving them, if you're just -- that's why
21 I was wondering, if you're just adding Payson into
22 that, but then you're moving Flagstaff out.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: But you'd have to move
24 Flagstaff out to balance the population, but if you
25 kept Flagstaff just from the I-40 corridor, most of

1 that population of I-40 is different.

2 MR. JOHNSON: So as I heard the original
3 request was to get -- to put all of Flagstaff into the
4 same district with the Navajo Nation. Is that what you
5 are saying?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to at least
8 look at that.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Sure.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other additional
11 feedback on 6 and 7, or would it makes sense, Doug,
12 would you like us to rotate to a different geographic
13 area and dive in? Or, I mean, you tell us, you know,
14 the pace and the direction, because there is many
15 different areas we could go into.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. I think the District 5
17 configuration as it's shown in this map where it comes
18 down and gets North Phoenix and goes over and gets
19 Wickenburg and those areas wasn't a request. It's just
20 how things kind of played out as we population
21 balanced. And I think the same thing will happen as we
22 implement the request we just got. District 5's
23 borders will shift a lot. So if you have a specific
24 input on that, we're open to it, but it's likely that
25 district is just going to change a lot just from what

1 happens next to it, so you don't have to open that.
2 So, yes, if you want to look at the Yuma split or look
3 at Tucson or look at Phoenix, whichever area you wish
4 to jump to next, we're open to that.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I suggest we jump into
6 Maricopa County, which really needs a lot of work.
7 Some of this was just still from the Grid Map. And
8 start by looking at the majority minority districts
9 that we're going to need to create because I think
10 everything else will sort of spin from there.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I was going to suggest
12 the same thing because I think Tucson is really
13 complicated, and I think that there are some -- we can
14 make some real progress in Maricopa County because
15 there is just some real logical communities.

16 MR. JOHNSON: One thing, just go back to the
17 comments I made earlier, if you look at District 11,
18 you know, we brought it into that -- I don't know if
19 it's actually getting Laveen, but it's South Phoenix
20 area, but it's also Ahwatukee. You know, we're
21 crossing South Mountain. Now, this district by the
22 numbers, I was kind of surprised. It performs. It
23 meets those effectiveness numbers for Latinos and
24 electing the preferred candidate in District 11. But
25 this goes back to that point I made earlier. The

1 numbers aren't the whole story, so very curious to hear
2 from the community and from the Commissioners your
3 views of that L-shaped District 11. I guess it's light
4 green, bluish green. The big open space without lines
5 through it in the middle is South Mountain, and then
6 it's getting Ahwatukee, part of Phoenix to the
7 southeast of that, and to the southwest it's going into
8 the South Phoenix region. So it's an interesting
9 district. I would not have expected that to perform
10 just looking at it on the map, but by the numbers it
11 did. So it meets our numbers, but we're open to
12 feedback on that and the surrounding districts on
13 whether it makes sense from the community perspective.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: This may be a good
15 opportunity to also bring up the Latino Coalition
16 submitted, I believe, a legislative map -- oh, no.
17 They haven't done their legislative map. I'm sorry.
18 They did their congressional maps. I have heard
19 feedback about not wanting to split between South
20 Mountain. I mean, that's a logical barrier, and, you
21 know, people are very confused about why that flow
22 would make sense. And they are very different
23 communities of interest.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I remember correctly
25 the Ahwatukee community wanted to connect with Maricopa

1 primarily because of the school districts.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Who couldn't connect?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm sorry. Ahwatukee
4 wanted to connect with Maricopa because of the school
5 districts, the Kyrene School District. Their kids were
6 going up there. There was a couple of testimonies to
7 that.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think we heard a lot
9 of things about school districts, trying to keep them
10 somewhat intact, and especially in that area, trying to
11 keep the Kyrene School District whole, so I think
12 that's -- that's the case in there, and I don't know
13 that that does all of that. So keeping the Kyrene
14 School District whole, and then there is a section of
15 the Gila River Indian Community where they do go in
16 south--

17 MR. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner, can you hit
18 the mic.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Am I not? I'm sorry.
20 I've got too many computers. I'm trying to look at the
21 demographics on one.

22 And with LD11 I think part of it was the -- as
23 you said that it maybe works, but there is Gila River
24 Indian Community and Maricopa go to the Tempe Union
25 High School District and also are part of Kyrene, at

1 least parts of it, the northern piece of that. And I
2 think the Gila River Indian Community would be okay, I
3 think, being split into a northern and southern,
4 depending on the more rural part, which is in the
5 south, versus the northern part, which is closer to
6 Maricopa area. But it basically goes down to the idea
7 of LD11 I think being more of a South Phoenix, Tempe,
8 Gila River versus that loop up that I think you
9 currently have on the other side of the mountain.

10 MR. JOHNSON: And, Commissioner Lerner, to
11 your point earlier, actually when I look at District 11
12 I would have guessed it might be a competitive seat,
13 but just for the record it's not. It's not in the
14 competitive measures by anything, so --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. It's not
16 competitive.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, let's talk --
18 because I think the overlay of the Hispanic Latino
19 community up the I-17 corridor, the Alhambra district,
20 hasn't been -- you split it in half, it looks like to
21 me, and so for me I think 11 should run up that
22 corridor and the piece below South Mountain should go
23 into another -- maybe D16 or whatever. I don't know
24 how the populations work. So I believe Alhambra --
25 it's Alhambra that's along -- it's the 19th Avenue,

1 32nd Avenue, up to Northern, basically down to the I-10
2 intersection.

3 MR. JOHNSON: Sorry. You know the roads much
4 better than I think we do. Are you talking in Tempe?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm talking about in
6 Phoenix. There is a Latino neighborhood, or I don't
7 what you want to call it.

8 MR. JOHNSON: We may actually -- I don't know
9 if we can.

10 Mark, can we put on the Latino Coalition's
11 congressional map?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I was pretty happy
13 with the Congressional District 3.

14 MR. FLAHAN: So the darker green -- or I guess
15 the darker color green, but it looks lime on the screen
16 to you guys, is the Latino Coalition's Phoenix
17 congressional district, so it is not a legislative
18 district, but this is their congressional.

19 MR. JOHNSON: And just to orient folks, as the
20 Commissioners were just talking, the South Mountain is
21 in the -- is in their proposed district, but it is the
22 border. It's not crossing South Mountain. The little
23 foot over in the southeast part of it, that's
24 Guadalupe, so that's why that's on there, and then
25 coming up the Phoenix, Tempe -- I believe that's the

1 city border.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And where is Guadalupe
3 on our current legislative map? Because that -- that
4 makes a lot of sense.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's in D12 -- no. It's
6 in D11. I'm sorry. So we could run Guadalupe into D8.
7 We can move D8 over a little bit.

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah, that bump where D8 and D11
9 kind of -- where D8 comes down into D11, D11 is coming
10 up there to keep Guadalupe into D11.

11 MR. FLAHAN: The white outline is the -- is
12 Guadalupe.

13 MR. JOHNSON: The congressional district that
14 they're showing on the Latino Coalition.

15 MR. FLAHAN: There you go. That is the Latino
16 Coalition's --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's the congressional
18 map, not the legislative map.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Correct.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: The numbers are the
21 legislative districts he has on top of it.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Yes.

23 MR. JOHNSON: So, Commissioner York, so I
24 understand what you were saying or requesting is the
25 idea is that Ahwatukee instead of crossing South

1 Mountain into South Phoenix would come up the edge of
2 this district, kind of come up Tempe, just like that.
3 Guadalupe would stay with the Latino's community's --
4 the rest of it, but otherwise we would really go right
5 up that city border. Am I understanding your request
6 correctly?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: You're talking about D8?

8 MR. JOHNSON: Yeah. It's some combination of
9 D11, D8.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. So D11 would stop
11 at the South Mountain part.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Exactly.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: And then D8 would
14 follow -- I would just follow the highway there, the 10
15 highway around the loop there down into Guadalupe. I'm
16 all about clean lines.

17 MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not sure I'm
19 understanding, though. And, Doug, I would like your
20 advice. So if we're taking away the population from
21 Ahwatukee, you know, Commissioner York, where are we
22 picking up population? East of -- east doesn't make
23 sense, too far east. I don't know if you're going west
24 or north.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would go north.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You're going north?
2 Because the further we go west we're then bumping up
3 into the West Valley.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would go up the 51 and
5 then the 17, and I would push as far west as the 17.
6 Oh, I'm sorry. I'm looking at D8. Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, at the end of
8 the day, though, I mean what's going to drive this
9 conversation is this will eventually -- I mean, this
10 will be a majority minority district, correct, and
11 so --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Got to get four of these.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- I feel like we're a
14 little bit now giving suggestions blind, just by my --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. I got them in my
16 head.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I mean, I feel
18 personally I need to analyze the numbers before like --
19 but go ahead.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you had a map, a
21 voting -- the Latino voting map at some point. You
22 showed us that in blue, if I remember correctly.

23 MR. JOHNSON: It was the Latino percentage of
24 the voting age population.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

1 MR. JOHNSON: And the nice thing about the --
2 the -- having the Latino congressional district
3 proposal is it matches that area very well, but it also
4 incorporates not just the numbers, but the Latino
5 community, or at least the Latino members of that
6 coalition put on neighborhoods that make sense
7 together.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you see that little
9 western boundary on I-17 -- I mean the eastern boundary
10 on I-17 along that congressional district? That's the
11 border of Alhambra. Alhambra goes up all the way north
12 up to that -- I think it's Northern they have there,
13 right, or what is that?

14 MR. FLAHAN: This is Northern right at the
15 border.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. And so then it
17 goes over to roughly 32nd Avenue. You're at 19th
18 Avenue there.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, 19th Avenue.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: And then the west side is
21 32nd Avenue, I believe, or maybe not.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Depends which west side.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's a bigger
24 district, so you could --

25 MR. FLAHAN: Yes.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: But there is a
2 neighborhood up right along that corridor from Northern
3 down to downtown that's called the Alhambra area. I've
4 had it as far west as 32nd Avenue, but, so in a
5 legislative district we need to take that into
6 consideration from majority voter rights and the other
7 things we're trying to consider.

8 MR. JOHNSON: As you're describing the
9 borders, it's essentially that's the northern part of
10 their -- of the Coalition's congressional district.
11 Correct?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Mm-hmm. And I don't know
13 what number you make it or how you do it, but I just
14 think that is a voter block.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm having trouble
16 hearing. I don't if it's just the sound or --

17 MR. JOHNSON: We can't hear you now.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was trying not to put
19 that in the record, but I'm having trouble
20 understanding Commissioner York is the problem. I
21 think it's the way the sound is traveling, but by the
22 time it gets here I don't really -- so, I'm sorry, it's
23 just not -- if there is some problem with me
24 understanding it, and that's why I was trying not to
25 put this on the mic, either.

1 MR. JOHNSON: I think, Mark, if you can zoom
2 out a little bit so we can see that whole congressional
3 district.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And everybody speaks
5 super into the mic, please.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think we should do lapel
7 mics next time because this is like rock star stuff and
8 I don't know if we're used to it. Seriously.

9 MR. JOHNSON: So are you saying La Honda or La
10 Habra?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: La Habra.

12 MR. JOHNSON: La Habra. So I think we're
13 capturing -- there is an extension of the congressional
14 district west at the northwest tip that I don't think
15 is included. Am I correct, we're talking about the
16 green area where the numbers D26 and D24 appear?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: For very simple thinking,
19 I suspect we have a pretty good buy into what the
20 Hispanic Coalition or the Latino Coalition has sent for
21 the congressional map, and if that were the case, you
22 know, just mathematically there should be three
23 minority legislative districts that sort of get carved
24 out of that, or three and a quarter or three and a
25 half, and I would probably be taking a look at that on

1 the legislative map, also, even though they haven't
2 sent one in, that that is where the population is and
3 communities of interest are that we should be trying to
4 work with.

5 MR. JOHNSON: The one clarification or input
6 on that I have is it's -- they're identifying a
7 community of interest that is consolidated in the
8 congressional district. In terms of how many legislative
9 districts, part -- I will defer to them if I state this
10 incorrectly, but I think part of what they're looking
11 at is that there is no possibility of getting a second
12 congressional district in that area so they're putting
13 all those neighborhoods together. If we look at the
14 current districts and how those areas have performed,
15 there is I believe four or five, and that's -- so they
16 may expand those districts out somewhat because they
17 can get a couple more seats that would perform. But,
18 yes, in general I agree with that, but it may not be a
19 straight mathematical match. And I encourage the
20 coalition to weigh in and agree or disagree with that
21 summary of that.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: I disagree with your
23 thought process. You know, and if I look at this map
24 right here in Maricopa County, you haven't done a lot
25 of work there because it pretty much resembles what I

1 remember the Grid Map to be, so, I mean, we could start
2 with that.

3 MR. JOHNSON: You're right. The central seats
4 largely are just the Grid Map and then the population
5 balancing impact of things coming down, other than on
6 the congressional side we did much more, but on this
7 side not as much.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think in this area
9 what we're also looking at when we're talking about the
10 northern part, we're looking at Maryvale, right, we're
11 looking at Glendale, or parts of South Glendale,
12 keeping them together in a legislative like you've got
13 right there. Is that -- so keeping south, and then in
14 the northern part I think you have additional areas
15 there that can be part of it. I mean, I know we want
16 to start with this. We talked about that. But it
17 would be interesting -- is the Latino Coalition going
18 to be submitting their legislative maps? Because I'm
19 wondering whether or not instead of us trying to figure
20 out what they might like that we just say let's hold
21 off on that piece until we hear. Hopefully they
22 submit, and if not we'll carve out -- we'll do it
23 ourselves, but I would like to hear their feedback on
24 that because there is a little bit of guesswork that
25 we're doing right now.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: They are. They are
2 working on it. They will be submitting it. I don't
3 want to hold ourselves back too much. Just
4 conceptually we can work around these districts, but I
5 think we understand where the population is so we can,
6 of course, make fine, you know, adjustments down the
7 road based on specific feedback.

8 MR. JOHNSON: And the key thing from our
9 perspective if it's things that will ripple out from
10 that area is that District 11 perspective. If we do
11 want to separate that at South Mountain that will have
12 a lot of impact outside of the core area we're talking
13 about, so that's good to get your guidance on -- you're
14 right, the central piece of that is more flexible, and
15 we can wait for details on that.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So just to go back,
17 because we were on District 11, we are talking about
18 moving that further east, right, keeping it beneath
19 South Mountain, and then moving it over, taking a piece
20 of what is now District 12, which is to some extent
21 what they are today. Right? You got Ahwatukee
22 connected to suburban -- to West Chandler and South
23 Tempe.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, Commissioner Lerner.
25 We were talking about not moving it east to District

1 12. We were talking about cutting it off at South
2 Mountain, the natural border of the mountains, and
3 moving it up north. There were many communities of
4 interest south of South Mountain that felt that they
5 did not align well with those north and then west of
6 South Mountain.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree on that.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm sorry.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree. That's what I
10 was thinking, we were taking what was north of South
11 Mountain, putting it separate.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, you mean east,
13 moving --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because we need more
15 population in District 11 to make up for the part that
16 we will not be including in the north. That's --
17 that's what I meant. I may have misspoke. But I was
18 thinking if we were cutting it off on the north part,
19 taking away Laveen, for example, those north -- I'm
20 sorry, north of South Mountain pieces, keeping
21 Ahwatukee whole. We need more population, and we would
22 be taking a piece of District 12. That's what I meant.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: But I think District 11
24 was moving north of South Mountain, and we were
25 inputting the Ahwatukee South Mountain community in

1 with District 16 is what we were talking about doing
2 and getting Kyrene School District included in that.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I think that they
4 would be more aligned with District 12 because that's
5 all part of their same community. You have people who
6 are all going to the Kyrene School District in there,
7 the Tempe Union High School districts. You really
8 don't have -- you have a division right now.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: You wanted to add
10 Maricopa. Correct?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't necessarily have
12 to add Maricopa in there right now. I'm more concerned
13 about not splitting what is basically a community.
14 Right now the I-10 is not an absolute boundary in that
15 area. We don't have it as a boundary right now. But I
16 would see that there is a lot more in common with West
17 Chandler and South Tempe and Ahwatukee than with
18 Maricopa. That was just my thought, to make up for the
19 population that we're not taking from the north.

20 I will say I think the whole -- I think
21 Maricopa is going to have to be its own discussion
22 because it's a big population that's growing, but it's
23 south and separate from some of these other
24 communities, so that's something we probably need to
25 think about how that connects.

1 MR. FLAHAN: The red outline on the screen is
2 the Kyrene School District.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you -- can you
4 please zoom in so I can see the roads or the markers on
5 the brown part?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's down into the
7 reservation.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I want to know where
9 that border is. Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. FLAHAN: So the biggest road that you
11 see -- zoom in a little bit more -- is Riggs Road to
12 the east and Beltline Road to the west, which is being
13 split by the 347.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I didn't realize Kyrene
15 went that far south. I mean, that really is a very
16 large school district that encompasses several
17 communities of interest. I mean, it's just -- I'm not
18 saying -- you know, I know Kyrene is a very united
19 group. I'm just talking out loud that I'm noticing
20 that it's really -- it goes much further south than I
21 realized.

22 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: I don't think there is
23 any schools along the Gila River Reservation, although
24 Kyrene does include the Gila River Reservation, so --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, so, okay, so it's

1 just in boundary only.

2 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's actually an
4 important point, that, you know, is it just in name
5 only, or are there actually schools there?

6 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: From what I can see in
7 name only.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Mark, right now you
9 have D16 running all the way down into North Tucson.
10 Correct? You have D16 running down into North Tucson?
11 Can you guys give me a little more treble? This is
12 ridiculous.

13 MR. JOHNSON: The mic is not baritone
14 friendly.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. So it runs down into
16 North Tucson. I was wondering if maybe Laveen was more
17 like population with Casa Grande and Maricopa than the
18 North Tucson Foothills, if you're looking for
19 population. Are you following me?

20 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, you're talking about D16
21 that's running down that way, keeps rolling down --

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

23 MR. FLAHAN: -- that's going down there
24 towards North Tucson.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: You grab that population

1 in Tucson, correct, to balance it out, but if you move
2 11 around and up north up to I-17 then -- then you
3 could get more of the population that matches, I
4 believe, Casa Grande and Maricopa with Laveen. Laveen
5 is on the west side, Brian, of Phoenix.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And there is room for 16
7 down in the Tucson area to grab more population going
8 out to Marana, which would be -- combining Oro Valley
9 and Marana in 16 would be very good. I know that then
10 causes ripples into 20 and 23, but 16 shouldn't go all
11 the way as far as north and should --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Or as far south, you mean.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 16 shouldn't go as far
14 north up into the Phoenix area as it's showing here.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You're saying it should
16 not go as far north, 16? I'm thinking it's -- if you
17 got the Gila River Indian Community, Sacaton, Maricopa.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Casa Grande.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Casa Grande.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Marana.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It could -- and then it
22 goes all the way down to Catalina, but you could
23 potentially connect it a little bit further north and
24 not take it as far south as Catalina, maybe.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, if you grab Marana

1 that would shuffle around District 20.

2 MR. FLAHAN: So you're talking about picking
3 up this up little piece in this corner of Marana.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think before I shouldn't
6 have jumped into 16 in Tucson, so I apologize.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We're sitting here
8 going, Oh, my goodness. Now what do we do?

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So let's go back to
10 Maricopa and forget anything about 16 in Tucson. But I
11 do think some of the testimony we heard today and other
12 testimony we've heard, that Apache Junction, Queen
13 Creek, that whole area can come into a legislative
14 district into Pinal, which will then cause ripples
15 around 16 and others, but will be a lot better.

16 MR. JOHNSON: Well, you're right.
17 Commissioner Mehl, just on that, we did get testimony
18 along that. Just to note, though, can you show
19 District 15? That area, that Apache Junction, all that
20 section, you know, San Tan Valley has grown so much
21 that actually once you -- show all of 15, please. Once
22 you get Apache Junction, San Tan Valley, and Florence,
23 you're done. That's a whole district. You can see
24 that District 15 is really -- it's that whole part of
25 Pinal County except going around the reservation, so

1 you split --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you split Queen Creek
3 along the county lines? Is there -- does Queen Creek
4 want that? I would argue they want to be with
5 Florence, but they're growing communities.

6 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. We can take -- if you have
7 specific direction on that we can certainly work on
8 that, or it's kind of been this is how the other pieces
9 pushing in work out in that East Mesa area.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, you know, as a
11 strategy, I mean, you know, and, Doug, we don't want to
12 jump around if it's going to, you know, throw you off,
13 you know, course or whatever, I do think that that part
14 of town, that, you know, southeast valley, it will have
15 ripple effects, and some of that has very logical
16 legislative groups, so that may be a core area to dive
17 into at some point as a distinct group.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think we're jumping
19 around a little bit --

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We are.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- and it would be
22 helpful if we could maybe -- it's hard to keep track if
23 we go from one, and so we were talking -- we started
24 with District 11 and then we jumped from around, so
25 maybe we could -- at least from my mind. Maybe we can

1 go back a little bit to kind of -- if we're going to
2 start with District 11 let's kind of look at how that
3 might impact from one to another, which will get us
4 actually into Queen Creek fairly quickly because --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- they're all related.
7 But if we can maybe stay -- since we seem to have
8 started in the East Valley, Southeast Valley a little
9 bit, would that be okay?

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, absolutely. I
11 don't want to jump around. But my point is that when
12 we dive into a specific geographic area we may be able
13 to make only so much progress, and it may be great
14 progress. We may feel not as certain about expanding
15 it, and we may want to jump to another geographic area
16 where there is a little more clarity, and that's my
17 only point. Let's stay with 11. Let's build it out as
18 much as is reasonable, logical. Then let's not push
19 too far in areas where we really are uncertain when
20 there are other legislative groupings that I think we
21 could make significant headway, because then our
22 mapping team, if they can -- and I'm not saying we're
23 going to lock it in, but if they have a clear sense of
24 certain geographic areas that there is a lot of
25 consensus, then they can do another iteration where we

1 can make better progress on the middle, so that's my
2 only point. So with that, let's go back to 11.

3 MR. JOHNSON: And, Chair Neuberg, if I may, we
4 got a pretty good discussion on 11. I think the other
5 pieces -- sticking to that same area, as you're saying,
6 it would be nice to address the Southeast Valley, and
7 then I think we've covered South Phoenix pretty well in
8 kind of goals as far as we can at this point, but the
9 kind of Northern Phoenix, West Valley area would also
10 be another area you could discuss, right in that same
11 area.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Whatever Doug wants.
13 And we'll do about, what, maybe another 15 minutes of
14 deliberation, and then we'll take a break.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: My thoughts -- this is
16 Commissioner York. We talked about the Flagstaff D7,
17 D6 ideas, and now we talked about District 11 and the
18 smushing around that and kind of using the Latino
19 congressional district. That's a lot of work by
20 Monday. Right?

21 MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The catch is -- the reason
22 of kind of encouraging on this is -- if you can zoom
23 out so we can kind of see the region from Flagstaff.
24 As like Superior and Mammoth come out of D6 and as
25 Payson moves into D7, everything gets unbalanced

1 population-wise, and what we found last time is the way
2 we balance that all is coming into Mesa, passing
3 through Tempe, and up to North Phoenix, so whatever
4 direction you have in those areas that can guide us as
5 we're doing that would be useful in addressing -- even
6 in addressing just the D6, D7 areas. They all roll
7 together when we draw the maps.

8 So, yes, we've got a lot of work, but we'll be
9 rolling through these areas as we make the changes you
10 already asked us, so whatever guidance you have would
11 be useful, if you have guidance at this point on those
12 areas. I don't know if we've gotten -- if you've seen
13 much comment you want to share on that Southeast Valley
14 or --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: My only thoughts were on I
16 would reference District 28. As you push up 11 and try
17 to balance that Central Corridor along I-17, it seems
18 to me 28 should move up along the 101 boundary. I
19 don't know what that does to the population, but that
20 community underneath the 101, District 27, kind of --
21 there is kind of a dividing line there with industrial
22 and some other --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I'm going to ask
24 if we could kind of just take one more look before we
25 move -- I know there is going to be those

1 ramifications, I agree, but there will be trickle down
2 effects with that, but can we finish with the -- for my
3 sake with District -- we're going to move District 11 a
4 little bit -- just to kind of clarify where we are with
5 all of that, go back to District 11, if that's okay.
6 We're going to move it a little further east, but then
7 what happens with District 12 as part of that?
8 District 12, 13, 14 are all going to be impacted when
9 we shift District 11 as well. Right? We move it a
10 little bit further east. Keeping, I think, South
11 Chandler, South Gilbert in their own districts is one
12 thing to think about.

13 There is a number of different neighborhoods
14 in those areas that we could probably take a closer
15 look at, but as we look at moving District 11 a little
16 east so that we cut out that northern piece we can also
17 look at -- at least I'm looking at District -- all of
18 those that are related in there, District 9, District
19 8. The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community asked
20 to be a part of Mesa, but right now they're not, so we
21 want to move them into District 9 as well and keep that
22 North Tempe, South Scottsdale, West Mesa, or Northwest
23 Mesa piece with Salt River, which probably works when
24 we move District 11 east in terms of population, if
25 that makes sense.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: So, Mark, the directions
2 you're going to take, District 8 is going to pick up
3 Guadalupe. Correct? So is that --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's going to pick up
5 what?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Guadalupe.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, yes, yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. And then so what
9 are we going to call the district that's north of South
10 Mountain? Because that's where I was confused. I
11 thought that was 11, but Shereen is going 11 south of
12 South Mountain and Ahwatukee, so --

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The South Mountain one
14 that's now District 11?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it's divided in
16 half. South Mountain Park runs through the middle of
17 it.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. It's divided in
19 half. I don't know what -- I guess when they redraw
20 the maps they can probably figure out those numbers
21 again.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. In my conversation
23 I had 11 moving north, and you have it moving
24 southeast, so we'll--

25 MR. JOHNSON: The key question for you in your

1 request is do you want to take away from the numbers?
2 Because they will be shifting. Do you want Ahwatukee
3 going up through Tempe to the north, or do you want
4 west -- or should Ahwatukee go east and West Mesa go up
5 through Tempe to the north?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, Tempe is currently
7 got three or four splits. They have a north and a
8 south split, but then they have a small piece that goes
9 with Guadalupe as well.

10 MR. JOHNSON: It's not so much about Tempe as
11 which piece goes up through Tempe. Should Ahwatukee go
12 up and through Tempe and head north, or should D12
13 come -- or I guess you could do -- D12 could push north
14 into what's currently D9, and then D9 would come up
15 around, so really any of those three could be the one
16 that pushes north to pick up that population that's
17 going to be needed.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I think as you
19 move to replace the population you lost in D11 and you
20 go east then you'll see -- you'll probably be getting
21 south parts of South Tempe as a part of that.

22 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then the north part
24 of Tempe can go kind of as it is, almost, but with the
25 Salt River and South Scottsdale. Is that what you're

1 getting at? And then what happens in D9, that West
2 Mesa part is more aligned with probably parts of North
3 Tempe as well as West Chandler. We talked about this,
4 I think, at our last meeting, that there is a division
5 in some of these communities east/west or north/south
6 in terms of the populations.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: So isn't -- shouldn't West
8 Mesa go with Tempe? That's kind of what I think.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: And so if District 8 moves
11 west into the South Phoenix area, and you can move
12 District 9 to the west into Tempe, and then Ahwatukee
13 would slide over into District 12. That's how I would
14 do it.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree.

16 MR. JOHNSON: If that makes sense then I think
17 we have consensus on the direction. Well, that would
18 bring the two discussions together. I don't know about
19 the other three, but from the two of you that would
20 match.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have to be honest, I
22 didn't track each and every -- you know, I'm not sure
23 exactly what was discussed. You know, I think, you
24 know, Tempe, South Scottsdale, West Mesa is a logical
25 community that needs some -- some cohesion. Chandler,

1 you know, north, south, I don't know if -- right now I
2 got a bunch of feedback. I think Chandler might be
3 divided into, you know, four districts or multiple
4 ones. You know, we need to work on that, but there is
5 a northern and a southern, and that's what I want to
6 say about that geographic area at this point.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think Chandler could
8 be probably into just two districts ultimately. I
9 think there could be the west -- probably the northwest
10 part, which has been with Ahwatukee, and then you get
11 the other piece which is closer in terms of -- to
12 Gilbert and that area, so definitely shouldn't be into
13 four.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think the northern
15 part of Chandler can go with Ahwatukee. It can go even
16 a little bit with South Tempe. But the southern area
17 is a very different territory that's more aligned with,
18 you know, San Tan Valley, et cetera.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think once you make
20 some of these changes in this area there will be, as
21 you always say, Doug, other changes down the way, and
22 maybe we can just take a look at those once we've seen
23 these. We don't necessarily have to go into that
24 detail anymore on those.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I think, Doug, what

1 I was alluding to earlier about kind of diving into
2 different geographic regions, I want to be careful that
3 we don't, because we start in this one geographic
4 location, box us in with all the ripple effects and not
5 do justice independently to these other regions, so
6 that's why in my mind I want to make sure that we do,
7 in fact, jump around a little bit, to make sure that
8 100 percent of the population is getting 100 percent of
9 our focus.

10 This may be a logical breaking point. You
11 know, is there anything else as it relates to the
12 logical sequence of what flowed out of 11, which is now
13 moving into the Southeast Valley? Anything to tie up
14 these loose ends?

15 MR. JOHNSON: Just one I think quick loose
16 end, the question of the Gila River land. There was
17 discussion of maybe it being divided, that part of it
18 go with Kyrene and part of it go south of Pinal. Is
19 that something you want us to try? I don't know if
20 that was actual direction or just discussion.

21 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: Well, a couple of
22 things. I'm not sure if there is -- I'm not sure how
23 many Gila River members live in the Kyrene district
24 that's on Gila. My memory says there is -- the
25 community lives more south of that area, and so I don't

1 know how the lines are drawn, but I do recall that
2 Governor Lewis in his letters was suggesting that
3 they're more rural and keeping the reservation intact,
4 although they do -- they do -- they are adjacent to
5 Ahwatukee and South Chandler for the most part. I
6 don't think the Kyrene district, you know, really makes
7 in that -- in that part of -- because if you look at it
8 I think it's called Lone Butte Development Park.
9 That's more of their entertainment, casino, and
10 industrial park, and I don't think there is members
11 that live in that area.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Just given the numbers here,
13 exactly right. Of the 14,000 residents of the
14 reservation, about 150 of them are in Kyrene, so it's
15 just a handful.

16 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: A handful, yeah,
17 although important.

18 MR. JOHNSON: So does that mean you prefer to
19 keep the reservation together?

20 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: I got to recall what
21 Governor Lewis was suggesting, and so I think we need
22 to look at that, and maybe congressionally he was
23 thinking of one district and legislatively two, and so
24 let me go back to my notes. There is so many things
25 going on here at this point.

1 MR. FLAHAN: On the screen there is the Kyrene
2 School District from their website that's broken down
3 per school, so you can also see the dip down into Gila
4 River.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think the most
6 important thing is to track the population and to keep
7 that community on the northern part together.

8 COMMISSIONER WATCHMAN: That makes sense, yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other questions from
10 the mapping team?

11 And if not this may be a logical breaking
12 point, and I believe we actually have lunch, so we'll
13 take maybe a 30-minute recess.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Question: Are we still
15 staying with the legislative when we come back or --

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, so when we
17 come back it will be noon. We'll have four hours of
18 deliberation. To be honest, legislative is a little
19 more complicated. I saw Commissioner York shaking his
20 head no. Then again, maybe it does make sense to dive
21 in for another hour, and then that would still leave us
22 significant time for congressional.

23 I'm also open to diving into congressional and
24 then returning to legislative to make everybody nuts,
25 but --

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I suggest we spend at
2 least a half hour if we're wrapping up the legislative
3 and then go to the congressional.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: A half hour, an hour, I
5 agree.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: At least a first run
7 through of this, because we have only hit parts of
8 the --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: We gave them a lot of work
10 to do. That was the reason I was shaking my head.
11 They didn't get -- but they didn't get all the work
12 done last time, so, I mean, we were supposed to meet
13 again. I'm just worried about them getting work done.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Then that's actually an
15 empirical question. Let's pose this to the mapping
16 team.

17 What would be most constructive for you, if we
18 gave you additional feedback on the legislative front
19 potentially in different areas so there is not
20 conflicting information? Would that be helpful? Would
21 that be too much, or is this enough for, you know,
22 weekend work? And, you know, how would you advise us
23 to take advantage of all the time we have today, which
24 is until 4:00, but not waste any time?

25 MR. JOHNSON: I think -- I'll let Mark weigh

1 in on this, and he can veto what I say if he wishes. I
2 think the key areas we can certainly work -- and I
3 think we have a fairly isolated set of needs now. If
4 you do have time to go into Tucson and Yuma and give us
5 any direction there, that would be an add-on, but it's
6 not critical, so --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. We'll have
8 lunch. We'll come back. We'll give additional
9 feedback, thoughts about legislative districts, go into
10 other areas that will not impinge upon what you're
11 already working on. Then we'll do congressional maps.
12 So 30-minute recess.

13 (Lunch recess taken.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the proceedings had upon the foregoing meeting from 8:33 a.m. to 11:27 a.m. are contained in the shorthand record made by me thereof, and that the foregoing 109 pages constitute a full, true, and correct transcript of said shorthand record, all done to the best of my skill and ability.

DATED at Phoenix, Arizona, this 3rd day of November, 2021.

Deborah L Wilks

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

* * *

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

Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 3rd day of November, 2021.

MCR

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058