

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

AFTERNOON SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona

October 20, 2021

1:58 p.m.

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 95340
(P) 623-975-7472 (F) 623-975-7462
www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Reported by:
Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR
Certified Reporter No. 50127

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

I N D E X

	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	ITEM NO. V (continued)	120
4	EXECUTIVE SESSION	121
5	ITEM NO. VI	169
6	ITEM NO. VII	169
7	ITEM NO. VIII	169
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, reconvenes at 1:58 p.m. on October
3 20, 2021, at the Sheraton Crescent Hotel, 2620 West Dunlap
4 Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona, in the presence of the following
5 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, Executive Assistant
15 Mr. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator
16 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr
17 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr
18 Mr. Shawn Summers, Ballard Spahr
19 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer
20 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer
21 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group
22 Mr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographics Corp.
23 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, National Demographics
24 Corp.
25 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group
Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group
Mr. Brody Helton, Timmons Group
Mr. Colby Chafin, Timmons Group
Ms. Sarah Hajnos, Timmons Group
Ms. Anna Mika, Timmons Group
Mr. Ken Chawkins, National Demographics Corp.

P R O C E E D I N G S

1

2

3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.

4

Thank you for your patience during our break. Our mapping team is still busy working away.

6

We are still on Agenda Item No. VII, draft map.

7

Actually I'm looking at the -- that's what happens.

8

MS. NEUMANN: It's No. V.

9

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What item were we were on?

10

MS. NEUMANN: V. No. V.

11

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We are on Number V,

12

deliberation with the legislative and congressional map.

13

At this point, I'm going to suggest we make a

14

motion or I'll entertain a motion to go into e-session to

15

get legal counsel as it relates to getting advice to

16

honoring our responsibilities with the VRA, which will not

17

be open to the public pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

18

I will entertain a motion to go into e-session for

19

legal advice.

20

COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York. I

21

so move that we go into executive session to obtain advice

22

-- legal advice.

23

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

24

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

25

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No further discussion. We'll

1 take a vote.

2 Vice Chair Watchman.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
11 aye.

12 And with that, we will move into executive session
13 for legal advice to discuss the Voting Rights Act as it
14 relates to us moving the lines.

15 Please turn your microphones off.

16 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive session
17 from 2:01 p.m. until 2:39 p.m.)

18

19

* * * * *

20

21 (Whereupon all members of the public are present
22 and the proceeding resumes in general session at 2:51 p.m.)

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay, it is 2:51; we are
24 resuming public session, Agenda Item No. V.

25 Thank you for your patience while we were in

1 executive session. It's an opportunity for us to seek legal
2 advice as we are applying responsibilities to, you know,
3 redistrict majority-minority districts.

4 And with that, we are going to resume back to
5 mapping and -- and congressional map drawing.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, so there so many maps flying
7 so fast, we were just checking, like, did we work on
8 something or not, so.

9 So the discussion we're coming back to today is the
10 maps that were presented yesterday. So we have 5.1, 5.2,
11 and 5.3, which are the new maps.

12 Happy to bring up discussion on whichever one you'd
13 like.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Why don't you walk us through
15 each briefly just so that all Commissioners and public are
16 aware of what we're going to vote on and we'll vote on a --
17 you know, for a starting point.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sounds go.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I believe some of them didn't
20 balance, so just walk us through what -- the viable options
21 are.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We vote on any of them
24 yesterday?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Although a couple of them they
2 said didn't work No. No.

3 5.2 is one they said didn't work. We were trying
4 to move Maricopa down to Pima.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 5.1, you have -- you have to
7 make minor changes.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: They're going to walk us through.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I didn't remember voting on
11 it.

12 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah a series of maps that we're going
13 to talk about now are the maps that we showed you at the
14 very end of the day yesterday.

15 So the first --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That -- that was a long time
17 ago.

18 MR. FLAHAN: And we'll be brief because this will
19 be the same thing that we -- we discussed yesterday, so
20 hopefully it will be to jog our memories and then we can
21 have a conversation.

22 So the first map that Brian has put up is 5.0. The
23 goal of this was to build off the CD 4.2 map and was to
24 fulfill, you know, multiple requests, uniting the Ak-Chin
25 Indian Reservation, Gila River Indian Reservation and the

1 city of Maricopa moving into District 2, the blue district.

2 We wanted to increase the competitiveness between
3 Districts 4 and 5 -- yep, there you go, the purple and the
4 orange -- in the East Valley of Maricopa County.

5 We wanted to take parts of Avondale and Tolleson
6 and move them into District 3, which I believe came out of
7 District 9.

8 And then we wanted to move all of the Casa Grande
9 area and the University of Arizona area into District 6;
10 which is the yellow district there.

11 So the sort of the quick synopsis of it is Gila
12 River, Ak-Chin Reservation and the city of Maricopa went
13 from 7 to 2.

14 All the Casa Grande, Red Rock, Saddlebrooke, Oracle
15 was moved into District 6, which is the yellow district
16 there.

17 Santa Cruz County and Green Valley and Pichaco were
18 moved into District 7 for balancing. And when I say
19 Santa Cruz County, I mean all of Santa Cruz County.

20 6 and the University of Arizona area was moved from
21 D-6 to D-7, and that dividing line that we used was east of
22 Sixth Avenue.

23 District 6 and 7, 7 got balanced along the Tucson
24 border that was south of the university.

25 Most of Gold Canyon out in the East Valley was --

1 was moved from D-5 to D-2.

2 D-4 in Maricopa County was moved further east into
3 District 5 and reaching Power Road and, in turn, District 5
4 moved further north into District 4 east of the 101
5 corridor; and this was to increase competitiveness.

6 District 4 moved slightly north into
7 South Scottsdale into District 1 to offset some boundary.

8 Tolleson and part of North Avondale were moved into
9 District 3.

10 South-of-the-border District 1 moved into
11 District 3 down to the Loop 101 and slightly west to I-17,
12 and this was all for population balancing.

13 Glendale also was moved from District 3 into
14 District 9 west of the 75th Avenue line.

15 The eastern border was pushing into District 1 for
16 population balancing.

17 El Mirage was added from District 9 and moved to
18 District 8; and then District 9 took into Sun City West, Sun
19 City Grand and some of North Peoria from District 8 for
20 population balancing.

21 This has balanced all the populations assigned.
22 There was no request that we could not meet.

23 And that is 5.0.

24 5.1: 5.1 was built off 5.0, but just had some
25 slight changes in the southern half of the state. And the

1 couple changes there were the University of Arizona area was
2 moved from District 6 back into 7 into the brown district.

3 Santa Cruz County was split again between District
4 7 and 6, as you can see on the bottom. Two districts -- the
5 two districts were then balanced along the Tucson border
6 south of the river.

7 And this map also has all of Casa Grande inside of
8 District 6, but it did not include Mar- -- the city of
9 Maricopa. So we got to Casa Grande, but we could not get
10 into the city of Maricopa. That still stays in District 2.

11 This is balanced, populations assigned. There was
12 no request we couldn't fulfill on this map.

13 5.2 built off 5.1, but this had the goal of
14 incorporating the city of Maricopa into District 6 with Casa
15 Grande, however, we could not fulfill that request because
16 the move of the population to get the city of Maricopa into
17 District 2 was not possible. There was no area to pull in
18 the extra population from once we took it out of District 2.

19 So we were unable to fulfill that request.

20 I don't know if you want to add anything to that,
21 Doug.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Nope, we're good.

23 MR. FLAHAN: Then we had 5.3. 5.3 went all the way
24 back to the 5.0 map on a different track. And what the goal
25 of 5.3 goal was, is it looks to break the Prescott corridor

1 into District 9 using Mingus Mountain as a border. So put
2 that onto the western Colorado River district.

3 The other major points here is that Graham and
4 Greenlee moved into District 2, as you can see there in the
5 blue.

6 Casa Grande was moved from District 6 -- or moved
7 into District 6, excuse me, and Apache Junction got moved
8 into District 2.

9 The status is it's an unbalanced map, but it did
10 achieve the goal of looking to break the Prescott corridor
11 into the District 9 on the Colorado River.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: The only thing -- two things that
13 notes on this one: One is that it's not yet balanced, but
14 we know we could balance it, it would work out within your
15 other instructions; and the second one is up in Yavapai
16 County, up to the north --

17 MR. FLAHAN: You mean Prescott.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- you may notice that there's a
19 very rough border through there, it's not the clean Prescott
20 Valley valley border that we used, that's because of time.
21 There's no population in that area so we could clean that up
22 to the smooth edge you've seen before with no impact on
23 either district.

24 So it was a test to show you the impact and give
25 you a sense of what would happen to finish up the map; and

1 we certainly could finish up the map if that was the
2 Commission's desire.

3 MR. FLAHAN: And those are the four maps we have
4 for you.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'll open it up to
6 impressions or comments.

7 MR. KINGERY: And we do have the demographic
8 competitive analysis ready that we didn't have at the end of
9 yesterday.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and just prior to
11 making a motion, I encourage you to maybe emphasize which
12 version you like and why, and then we'll entertain a motion.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Thank you.

14 I -- I guess I want to start by saying I have
15 concerns about all of the maps, the five -- the new map that
16 we had. We had -- I just have concerns overall. There's --
17 there's issues with each of them, which as we discuss them
18 we can certainly talk -- talk about.

19 My preference would be to actually go back to 4.0
20 and continue to work through that as we had been doing
21 before we decided that we were going to actually go back and
22 restart, but I -- that would be my preference would be to
23 not accept any of these maps based on the major changes that
24 we see with them and the -- and the issues that -- that we
25 have, that I'm happy to talk about as we go through -- I

1 kind of think we could go through each one.

2 But some of the -- some of the issues pertain to
3 how this affects our VRA districts; how District 6 ends up
4 looking; the competitiveness for District 2 is a great
5 concern for me.

6 I -- we were working there to -- to try to give
7 voice to many of the Native American communities, but the
8 way that most of these districts, other than 5.3, really
9 is -- is a noncompetitive, it would be very different for --
10 difficult for them to have much of a voice.

11 If anything, 5.3, if we went -- continued to move
12 in this direction, I would say I would want to take
13 something, 5.3 as a starting point. I know it's not
14 balanced because you only were looking to sort of a test run
15 to see if you could do that; but I like that -- that piece
16 with Prescott being attached to the -- which is pretty much
17 what -- what it is today, taking that community and placing
18 it in District 9 as they've been for the past ten years and
19 as they said that they appreciate.

20 Most of these districts have a very noncompact
21 District 6. They have -- the different five versions all
22 have District 6 with this arm that reaches out that would
23 not, I don't think, fits compactness very well. So I think
24 that's one of my big -- one of my other concerns that goes
25 with that, would be the lack of compactness.

1 So right now I -- I find it difficult to support
2 any of these versions as a result of a number of these
3 issues as I've mentioned.

4 So, I guess I will leave it at that with throwing
5 out there as the option to -- or motion to have us return to
6 4.0 and continue our work with 4.0. We had made some
7 progress with that I felt, and we could continue to make
8 some progress using that strategy.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I am not in favor of 5.3. I
10 think that -- that it --

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, there's a motion
12 on the table. I'll second it.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know what, I --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I just heard the second -- I
15 didn't hear one.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- I had requested that we
17 have dialogue first about what everybody, you know, liked,
18 pros/cons, before we entertain a motion.

19 If we want to entertain a motion, we certainly can.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, if we're going to have a
21 full discussion with all of us without a motion on all these
22 options --

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's fine.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- that's fine.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So you rescind your motion?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'll rescind it.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So let's have full
3 dialogue --

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I'll rescind my second, too.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You'll rescind it --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: For the record.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I don't think we have to
8 vote, do we? There's consensus.

9 So let's just have dialogue first and then we'll
10 entertain motions.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think 5.3 does real negative
12 to District 6 down in the -- down in the southern part of
13 the state in separating Graham and -- the portions of
14 Graham/Greenlee that are there I think is a real negative.

15 Shockingly, this -- the 5.1 map has five out of the
16 nine districts being competitive. Which -- now I know
17 they'll all keep changing and it won't necessarily end up
18 exactly like that, but at least for this version of the 5.1
19 map, it would be the most competitive map ever approved in
20 the state of Arizona. So I don't think we want to ignore
21 that factor.

22 And -- and that combined with District 6 -- and I
23 do think that -- that it just works better, it's a better
24 map. So I will end up supporting 5.1.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if I could just make a

1 comment about that. I mean, we obviously are going to have
2 changes with whatever map we select as part of that.

3 I do see, there certainly is some competitiveness
4 in some of these and that's part of what I am looking at as
5 well as part of it; but because 5.3 is not yet balanced,
6 District 6 is just not going to look good until we work
7 through that. So I totally agree that right now as 5.3
8 looks it -- it doesn't look good for District 6, but I'm
9 confident that our mapping team would make those
10 adjustments.

11 The other piece about Graham and Greenlee that I've
12 -- I've mentioned before, I'll say again, I really still
13 believe that they belong more in the northern district. I
14 feel that their interests are more aligned with the areas to
15 the north that -- than they are to the border. I don't feel
16 that they are as connected to the border communities, and
17 that's why -- I know I'm a broken record here, but I keep
18 thinking that those two -- those two counties should
19 actually be connected to the north more than to the south.

20 The other concern I have about 5.1 is that actually
21 in speaking about District 6 since you mentioned that one in
22 particular, it actually -- District 6 goes over five
23 different counties, has a number of county splits as part of
24 it. So I think it -- it does impact those communities.

25 District 7 in 5.1 also is not -- would -- will

1 create challenges under VRA, it does not meet the VRA
2 standard at this point as part of it.

3 It also -- I think it also just remains my concern
4 about what happens in District 2, the -- if you look at the
5 spread on that, it would be really difficult -- we'd have a
6 difficult time, I think, finding balance for that, for
7 District 2, in terms of what we've been trying to accomplish
8 with the tribes as part of that.

9 So District 2 right now is -- is like a -- is
10 plus-10 spread. Is that right?

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I may be wrong on the spread.
13 Seven.

14 Oh. Wait. In 5.1 it's a 7.4 percent spread on
15 that.

16 And when we look at the -- the table that we
17 receive as part of this, it does show a pretty strong bias
18 that would -- may make it difficult because of the
19 communities that are there.

20 That was part of why -- and, you know, maybe
21 there's a way to combine a little bit of 5.3 and 5.1, you
22 know. Maybe we can find some balance with that. I'm
23 certainly open to seeing if there's a way to do that.

24 But I do think the concerns you have about
25 District 6 could be resolved if we played out a little bit

1 to see what would happen with 5.3.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Just I think I think District 7
3 is a strong VRA-compliant district under 5.1, so.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, District 6 is
5 competitive.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not based on what I'm seeing.
7 It's at a 47 percent.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's 46 percent; but -- but
9 when you look at the performance, it's way over.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think we'd have to
11 still make some adjustments in there with the way it's laid
12 out, as well as the other piece again goes back to the
13 concerns I have about splitting the counties. For example,
14 Santa Cruz County does not need to be split, which it is,
15 and that's part of adding it -- putting some of that into
16 District 6, but it's a very high Latino county.

17 So I -- I also -- I'll just raise this question
18 because as we were looking at our earlier maps of District 7
19 where it -- and I know we had a number of different reasons,
20 but where it reached into Maricopa County, I look at that
21 arm in District 6 and it just -- I don't know how we adjust
22 that, but that's a concern I have with all of these -- these
23 maps that we have in the 5 category, 5.0 to 5.3, is just how
24 irregular that looks.

25 Maybe there's adjustment; maybe we move some of

1 that arm into District 7, and we take some of what
2 District 7 is and move it over to I-10. I don't know
3 exactly what we do, 'cause I haven't worked with through
4 that.

5 But those are some -- those are where my concerns
6 are about, in particular, 5.1.

7 On a -- if we were compromising and which one we
8 would start with and if I -- if we can't get 5.3, then I
9 would say we could take another look at 5.0 perhaps, as a
10 starting point, because I think there's some potential with
11 that one.

12 But -- but at this point, I just really don't --
13 I'm not comfortable with any of these maps in their current
14 configuration.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioners York, Watchman,
16 do you have anything you'd like to add?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, a couple of things. This
18 is Commissioner York.

19 I notice on the division of Santa Cruz County, it
20 basically follows the mountain range, seems like a natural
21 divider from a geography standpoint.

22 You know, our goal, based on our direction from
23 Commissioner Watchman, was to include the Gila Reservation
24 into District 2 to combine that in the northern tribe --
25 with the northern tribes, so I think the trade-off for that

1 was to go up into Casa Grande for District 6.

2 I feel these maps are close. I'm not a fan of 5.3,
3 but 5.0 or 5.1 are super competitive as far as I'm
4 concerned. If you look at District 3 and District 7 and --
5 and some of the other districts, I feel pretty comfortable
6 with either one of those.

7 So that's kind of where I'm at.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Vice Chair Watchman
9 here.

10 I certainly support what Commissioner Lerner is --
11 is suggesting and that's go back to 4.0. But, you know, if
12 we were to look at 5 -- 5.1 through 5.3, I do think that 5.0
13 is -- is a better -- better map and, you know, what -- if we
14 can pull it up here.

15 And yes, you know, I do appreciate us looking
16 and -- and incorporating in District 2 Gila and Ak-Chin, I
17 think that that improves the Native American count; and so
18 the -- but to do that as -- as Commissioner York said, he
19 had to put that -- that arm out of D-6 and so.

20 But I -- I in my opinion the way 5.0 looks, I think
21 it's strong, it's competitive, it does favor more tribes in
22 D-2. It -- it puts the four tribes that include Tohono
23 O'odham, Pascua Yaqui, Cocopah, and Yuma in District 7 which
24 I think those tribes have border issues, various and
25 separate from what tribes in D-2 would have.

1 So I think that, at least in my opinion, 5.0 is a
2 better starting point than 5.1, 5.2, or 5.3, but my
3 preference is, and I agree with Commissioner Lerner,
4 starting at 5 -- 4.0.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not a fan of going back
6 to 4.0.

7 It's -- it's obviously we've created a precedent
8 that if we come upon, you know, a dead end and we feel that
9 the map can no longer provide an avenue through which we --
10 we can, you know, achieve success, then I think that
11 warrants us taking a step back.

12 Listening to the conversation as well as my own
13 opinion, I do feel -- while none of these maps obviously are
14 ideal, I do feel we can move forward with them. I have a
15 preference for 5.1. I -- I like the demographics. I
16 thought that there were -- you know, the competitiveness
17 appealed for me.

18 I understand that there's support for 5.0. You
19 know, if there's a way to, you know, split it, you know,
20 Commissioner York was somewhat open to 5.0. If there was a
21 way to find consensus, that would be my preference; but if
22 not, you know, I'm just going to call it as personally I
23 liked 5.1. But all of these five-point, you know,
24 iterations, it's a starting point and so, you know, I can be
25 convinced to do otherwise.

1 So -- so fill me in, colleagues, on the strength to
2 which you're committed to 5.0 versus 5.1.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm committed to 5.1.

4 I really think it's the better map. I think we did
5 have amount -- small amount of testimony from Santa Cruz of
6 people that did want to split it, there's a real difference
7 in the communities of eastern and western Santa Cruz. So I
8 think that split is actually a very positive one; and
9 there'll be only minor things other than that.

10 So I will defer to Commissioner Lerner if you want
11 to make a motion first or if you want me to make a motion,
12 whatever -- however you would like to go about it.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to make sure that
14 there's no other further comment.

15 I'll entertain a motion.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I'm going to move --
17 I'm going to move to -- to begin with 5.0. I think -- I
18 think it gives us a little bit more room to work with than
19 5.1. I think it's a better map for us to make adjustments
20 off of.

21 I'm -- as I said, I've -- I think, you know, we
22 went -- we made some changes yesterday or earlier about the
23 legislative where we went back and took another look at
24 another map which was my reason for asking about 4.0. I
25 understand that's not where we're going to go today, that

1 we're going to go with any of the five-point maps; and of
2 all of those, in my opinion, we'll start -- I would
3 recommend 5.0 for the reasons that I've already mentioned.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh. If I could just add one
6 more thing?

7 I'm sorry. I'm sorry, Chair.

8 I feel that that's a compromise at least from my
9 perspective because of my -- my other preferences where I
10 would prefer 5.3, I would prefer going back, I feel 5.0 is a
11 good compromise as part of this to say -- you know, for the
12 sake of compromise we'll start with one of these maps, and
13 5.0 would be the one that I would suggest.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I second the
15 motion. Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
17 Vice Chair Watchman.

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.
20 We're voting on --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Hold on a minute.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hold on.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl is a yes on
24 5.0 as a compromise.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is a
5 yes.

6 With that, a 5-0. We will start with 5.0.

7 I'd like to just thank my colleagues for their
8 compromise and collegiality. It's a pleasure working with
9 you.

10 Something that I want to bring up as we're going to
11 dive into these maps, we're very far along in the process,
12 and it's at the point where I think we need to more
13 seriously be thinking about our requirements to honor the
14 VRA and -- and those requirements.

15 Just as an introduction, I want to ask the mapping
16 team to make sure that as we go back and we look at
17 Districts 3 and 7, to make sure that those are the right
18 configurations or to question are there different
19 configurations that would better meet our requirement to
20 honor the VRA as it relates to communities of interest as
21 well as polarization reports and the subsequent data that
22 support it.

23 So we're far enough along; I know our experts have
24 been catching up with that data. So, you know, before we
25 finalize maps, we'll want to be able to dive deeper into

1 that analysis.

2 I don't -- I don't believe that that needs to slow
3 us down right now from diving into, you know, the broader
4 map, but I did want to, you know, just put that on the
5 record.

6 I open it up to my colleagues.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I can make one
8 suggestion to get started.

9 Taking a look at -- if we just take a look at
10 District 5, do we want to complete -- add in -- and I'm not
11 looking at populations right now. I know we probably
12 should, but this is pretty balanced, and I know we're going
13 to be moving things around quite a bit, so -- but my thought
14 was that we should potentially move San Tan Valley, keep it
15 whole, in District 5 -- as part of District 5, because I
16 think at this point right now I think it's split.

17 If we look at the southernmost point of District 5
18 we could move that over -- I know. I know we're going to
19 have to adjust D-2, but that's one thing we could do.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I -- I'm sorry -- I'm
21 just starting now to look at the area, sorry. What's the
22 explanation for -- what's the goal you're trying to
23 accomplish right now?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Have San Tan Valley be whole.
25 Keep it together. In that one area.

1 You see how it's split down there, I was just
2 thinking we put it all in District 5 -- I think that's where
3 it probably belongs in District 5, but it could go all into
4 District 2. I was just trying to keep it all together
5 because I think that that's a community that would prefer to
6 stay together as one.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it's going to -- yes;
8 I think it's also going to affect the competitiveness. I
9 imagine it will decrease -- whatever competitiveness there
10 is in D-5, but...

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree, D-5 right now is a
12 not competitive at all.

13 And I don't know how -- I mean, I would love to
14 hear from my colleagues on how to make that district more
15 competitive, if there are some ideas on that. I don't know
16 how to do that.

17 So I do agree that it's -- it would decrease it. I
18 think there are a few districts that we can work on in terms
19 of that, but some of these districts have a very large
20 spread.

21 I think we could work on District 2 to make it more
22 competitive and District 8. Those two are sort of at 7,
23 8 points, we could potentially make those a little bit more
24 competitive. But there's going to be some districts on both
25 sides that just -- I don't know how we get there with that.

1 District 5 is one of those, it currently has about
2 a 15 percent spread and, again, we have some on -- on both
3 sides of the aisle with that.

4 But if we focus on the ones that are within our
5 range and maybe try to narrow that range, I would be all for
6 that. And those -- the ones that I see that are on the edge
7 of our range are District 8 and District 2 where we could
8 potentially narrow that and make them within our lower range
9 of competitiveness. We have those two ranges that we've
10 talked about.

11 So that -- that one was just, from my perspective,
12 just taking a look at that community and not wanting to keep
13 it separate as part of it, so.

14 For District 2, I would love to see a way for us to
15 actually make it more competitive, if possible. One thing
16 would be to consider if we could make more of Pinal County
17 whole in that area. That arm that goes in -- I'm calling it
18 an arm, I don't know what else to call it. If Anybody else
19 has any other terminology...

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: The thumb.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Huh?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: The thumb.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay, we can do that.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Looks like a hitchhiker.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But that goes in, we could

1 potentially move some of that into District 2, if we wanted
2 to take a look at that.

3 I'm not -- and that would probably be taking
4 Coolidge and Florence and putting those together since they
5 are closely related. And potentially Casa Grande, but
6 certainly we could potentially move something like Coolidge
7 in there.

8 And we'll have to find ways to balance -- I know to
9 balance population, but --

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to say -- I'm not
11 a fan of making D-5, you know, much more extreme, and -- and
12 in fact I'm wondering, you know, shifting 3 over slightly
13 moderate, you know, and shifting 4 over into 5 I think may
14 moderate -- moderate all of them.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Madam Chair, I can make a
16 suggestion on District D-1 and D-8. It's easy to adjust
17 lines if you can do them from one district to the other.

18 So if you were to pull D-8 down to Glendale. And I
19 don't know how much population is in there, then you can
20 take D-1. If you go up to the Cave Creek Road is, we talked
21 about having D-1 follow the canal on up to the -- the canal
22 is there just south of Cave Creek Butte, the recreation
23 area, and follow that canal up to the I-17.

24 You trade that population on with D-1 and D-8 and
25 you could go south on D-8 along that I-17 corridor there.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner York, so I just don't
2 know where that -- which canal?

3 Are you talking about District 1 coming into
4 District 8 along --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. Down along the I-17
6 corridor.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: So down to Glendale, that seems
9 like a pretty big population; and then in tradeoff for that,
10 you would follow the Carefree Highway or Cave Creek Road, I
11 guess. As a boundary you could -- if you look there's a
12 mountain preserve and a canal there about the freeway, I
13 think it is, off the 101, it goes north of Deer Valley
14 Airport and diagonal up towards I-17. And that north --
15 that north corner could be moved into D-1 as a tradeoff for
16 the population going south down; and it would probably give
17 us a little more balance.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What would you think,
19 Commissioner York, of taking that piece there that -- that
20 corner, the northwest corner of D-1, and moving that into
21 D-8 as part of that?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's what I was talking
23 about.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that what you were talking
25 about?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry. See.

3 So that would take New River, Cave Creek, Carefree,
4 some of that, and shift from D-1 over to D-8.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think that would make it
6 more --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That might be too much. I
8 mean, I don't know what the population shift --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was just cutting off that
10 corner of D-8 and trading it for that south piece, because
11 the southern piece will be more competitive.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think these -- am I -- I think
13 these are two different ideas.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: They are two different ideas.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They are --

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I was clarifying
18 what Commissioner York was -- was saying.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: So --

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you please summarize
21 this?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let me take a shot at it and see
23 if I understand correctly.

24 So District 1, starting at the New River/Anthem
25 area, would actually move south to the canal and to the

1 north edge of the city of Glendale; District 8 would then
2 move -- District 8 would then pick up District 1 territory
3 on the south side of District 8 with District 8 coming south
4 in the more Central Phoenix piece to balance out that
5 rotation.

6 Is that correct -- correct, Commissioner?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah. I just had you along the
8 I-17 and going to Glendale, but...

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. You're talking about only
10 moving the piece on the east side of I-17?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. Okay. Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think that's what I was
14 thinking, and that's where I'm -- I wasn't sure if I was on
15 the same page or not, I was looking at that -- it's not
16 showing up there.

17 That northwest corner of District 1 where we heard
18 a lot about people being connected -- New River, Cave Creek,
19 Carefree, Anthem -- and then I was thinking if we move that
20 into D-8; and then, Commissioner York, I may be getting this
21 wrong here, but were you thinking then of the areas like the
22 Camelback Mountain Preserve? Those areas, Moon River areas,
23 moving those from D-8 to D-1?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I was just moving down the
25 -- the Squaw Peak.

1 So keeping the same border, same eastern border of
2 D-8, just moving it down the Squaw Peak and picking up
3 Glendale that's a mile -- right now it's at Northern -- over
4 to D-3.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

6 I think -- I think what I'm hearing is that
7 Commissioner York's request is that the southeastern part of
8 District 8 would move south into District 1.

9 Whereas Commissioner Lerner's request, if I'm
10 understanding correctly, District 8 would pick up New River,
11 Anthem, Cave Creek, Carefree -- all that territory from
12 District 8 up to the -- the county line, and the District 1
13 would balance that by coming into the southern part of
14 District 8.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. It would take --
16 there were some areas in there that would have the Camelback
17 neighborhoods, things like that.

18 So I guess what I'm trying -- what I was trying --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well there's some geographies
20 there that --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Go ahead.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- creates sort of communities
23 of interest. If you -- along Carefree Highway to the north
24 there, there's a little bit of a mountain range and above
25 that is New River and Anthem is tucked in there, and Cave --

1 Cave Creek is over on the other side. So I'd like to keep
2 those in the same area with D-1, I think those people more
3 resinate with North Scottsdale and the Desert Mountain areas
4 than they do with south -- south, down into North Phoenix.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So what I was looking at --
6 and maybe we can try both options to see how those work out.
7 I think was thinking some of those movement might help.

8 I mean, D-1 right now as it is if we didn't touch
9 it --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's pretty competitive.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- it's pretty competitive.
12 So if we left it completely as it is, it's a pretty
13 competitive district.

14 I -- I was really trying to focus more on those
15 districts that were -- where there was -- I mean, in some
16 ways I almost want to keep D-1 the way it is, because I
17 don't know if we'd ever get anything better than that with
18 a .1 percent spread. So that's why -- I mean, I was
19 interesting in looking at your idea for D-8 moving it south
20 potentially.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: That was to make it more
22 competitive was one of the --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, no. I'm agreeing with
24 that is a possibility.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to -- I'd like to

1 keep open the possibility that if we keep it within a
2 4-point spread, which is very competitive, and it
3 significantly helps another district, that we at least keep
4 open -- you know, an open mind to that.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: And with just looking at the light
6 impact, Commissioner Lerner, what we're talking about with
7 District 8 moving north. District 8 right now is -- it's a
8 8.2 percent, so it's not far outside of our range, but that
9 is currently 8.2 percent Republican advantage.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Mm-hm.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: So if we move that north into New
12 River and Anthem, it's going to make it even worse, I think.
13 Or --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Got it.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: I don't mean worse -- larger.

16 So I don't --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, that's why I was trying
18 to move it south a little bit.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's why I was trying to move
21 it south a little bit.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

24 I'm just showing you, Commissioner Lerner, with
25 that -- given that that's the likely result, would you still

1 want us to draw that or not?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, no. That makes sense.

3 No, no. I -- I -- it's moving south a little bit,
4 it's just a matter of what happens with District 1 at that
5 point. So it's trying to keep the District 1 -- I would
6 still like to keep it really tight, if possible. So, it's
7 whatever those -- what those changes would do to District 1,
8 I guess.

9 But I think the idea of moving it south is a good
10 idea, but if we can limit the impact to some extent on
11 District 1 where it's reasonable in terms of communities of
12 interest, I think that would be great.

13 Let's see.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I think an 8-point spread
15 in D-8 is -- is, you know, really reasonable. I mean --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think -- I think your idea
17 of a 4-point would be great. If we can get to those.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, even 5 would be better.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Or 5. Even 5, you know,
20 would -- would be great.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm happy with 8. I mean,
22 I'm happy with -- you know.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, I mean that -- that is the
24 purpose of these tests, to see if it helps; and, if not, we
25 go back.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: So, no problem. Happy to check
3 that out.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I'm going to propose
5 it, even though I pretty much know what the answer is going
6 to be, but I'll throw it out there anyway: I would like to
7 know if there's any way we could go back to the
8 discussion -- so I'm looking at District 9, and District 9
9 extends a great deal into Maricopa County, it extends over
10 into Sun City West, Buckeye, areas that we have been talking
11 about and it -- it doesn't necessarily fit.

12 And it didn't matter whether this was 5.0 or 5.1,
13 it doesn't fit with that district very well.

14 So I would like to propose to see if we can look at
15 what happens if we take that Prescott piece, put into
16 District 9, and then we open up those areas in Maricopa
17 County to be back with other Maricopa County.

18 I mean, it would cause a bunch of shifts, I know,
19 but it could potentially be with Maricopa County --

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner, I don't
21 think we can do that -- we can ask the consultants --
22 without going all the way, you take so much out of 2, that's
23 going to push 2 down into 6, and that was the discussion we
24 just had and voted the other way, so.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I realize that.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Unless they have another way of
2 doing that.

3 You're going to make me try to get Santa Cruz split
4 again immediately instead of trying to hold on.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, no, I realize that.

6 You know, I personally still feel that that would
7 be a great option if we can do it. But I do understand what
8 you're saying.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, and, Commissioner Lerner, I
10 guess the challenge we ran into 5.3, we did -- obviously
11 when we presented we focused on 9 and Prescott Valley. The
12 other piece that we wrestled with is the challenge of 2 --
13 we didn't really highlight this, but in order to make up for
14 losing that population, 2 actually comes into Apache
15 Junction and Mesa. So that's -- that's the challenge of
16 where else would we go for that.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Right.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest a minor look at
19 where 9 comes into Yuma. 9 actually still a little short on
20 population and 7 is a little over on population, and to the
21 extent we can increase the cohesiveness of 7 Hispanicly,
22 that would be good.

23 So if there's areas of Yuma or that I-8 -- again,
24 we're talking small areas -- that would be non-Hispanic that
25 could come out of 7 and go into 9, then I think that would

1 be a good adjustment.

2 And I think we have looked at some other map
3 somewhere that we did that a little different.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I actually think that's a
5 good idea. I think you got Wellton right there that you
6 could pull in.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm kind of stuck on
8 Commissioner's Lerner's problem that she brought up,
9 although I didn't like the solution of Sun City West and
10 Surprise kind of being a little isolated there.

11 And I don't know if there's any way to get them
12 into -- into D-8, shifting some population up to D-1, which
13 I know -- and then shifting some population of D-1 into D-2
14 without totally ruining everything.

15 But yeah, I -- I imagine that those residents are
16 not -- not going to feel that this is a great solution for
17 them.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I would argue that that
19 303 Loop that comes to the west of Sun City, it's a
20 brand-new corridor that I think those people resonate quite
21 a bit with I-10 as it heads west out to California. And so,
22 you know, the La Paz County is -- is primarily rural, the
23 west side of Maricopa County is primarily, I mean
24 agricultural and so is La Paz County; and so from that
25 standpoint, there's quite a bit of cohesion as far as

1 connecting the warehouse district along I-10 and the 303 and
2 the 202 Loop, as well as connecting the -- the sort of I-10
3 traffic that moves the freight across from California to
4 Phoenix.

5 So, yeah, geography-wise it looks a little funky,
6 but I think those people identify more with the people that
7 we have in District 9 than currently along the I-10
8 corridor, especially than they would anywhere else in the
9 state.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, it's not -- it can --
11 it can work. I mean, that's -- that's not a deal breaker
12 for me at all.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: And the other -- I was just doing
14 some quick numbers just so you have them.

15 It's a little different where over on the West
16 Valley, those areas are touching onto San Tan, District 2 is
17 really staying a rural district.

18 District 9, despite the area that you see on the
19 map, I was just looking at it, just bar- -- just under
20 30 percent of the population is in Mohave and La Paz
21 Counties, about 70 percent of the population of that
22 district is in the West Valley. So Even though it looks
23 like a rural district that is just touching the West Valley,
24 it's actually a West Valley seat that just happens to
25 include the rural areas in it.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: District 9?

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Yeah.

3 Yeah, just roughly 71 percent of the population in
4 that district is in Mohave -- in Maricopa County, so.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm not sure if we've made
6 any adjustments to District -- I'm sorry, District 2 and 8,
7 which were the ones that if we could narrow down that
8 competitiveness piece and keep communities of interest
9 together.

10 I guess we did that one change Commissioner York
11 mentioned, I guess we could take a look at that once it's --
12 once it's mapped and see if those helps us.

13 'Cause I think we get the smaller the spread, I
14 think the better it will be for all the communities as part
15 of it; and it keeps 1 and 6 pretty competitive.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and we also we have
17 Commissioner Neuberg's request for further analysis around
18 the other constitutional requirements --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- that needs to happen with
21 this map.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would like to table this
24 map and maybe move on in the agenda and let the mapping team
25 get to work.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Does that sound like a good
2 -- good plan?

3 I mean, it sounds like you got some additional
4 feedback as well as some additional work on the VRA piece.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think that works.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

7 In terms of moving forward, would you like to come
8 back and present us anything on the legislative front? If
9 not -- I mean, let us know if you're ready for anything.

10 MR. FLAHAN: We will have some legislative maps.
11 If you want to take a ten-minute break, we can go look at
12 them and bring them back in here.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. How about a ten-minute
14 break, and we'll go through the latest iterations of the
15 legislative map before we wind down.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Sounds good.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you. Ten-minute break.

18 (Recess taken from 3:44 p.m. to 4:06 p.m.)

19

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If we can get our team
21 together, we can resume the public meeting.

22 It is 4:06, and we will dive right back into Agenda
23 Item No. V, and I believe our mapping team has some updates
24 for us on the legislative maps.

25 MR. FLAHAN: We have three new versions of the

1 legislative map in 6.0.

2 MR. KINGERY: Oh. Hold on.

3 That is the breakdown.

4 MR. FLAHAN: And that is -- that is the breakdown:
5 6.0, 6.1 and 6.2. We have 6.0 because both changes one and
6 two incorporated both the same Maricopa County changes, but
7 then make changes to the southern district. So for a
8 mapping perspective, it was easier for us to develop
9 Maricopa County and then build two versions off of that with
10 the changes in the south.

11 So we'll start with 6.0.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: These are not yet posted?

13 MR. FLAHAN: These are not yet posted, and if we
14 want to look at demographics or competitiveness data, we can
15 look at the table on the screen; I don't have the PDF
16 generated just yet.

17 So 5.0 [verbatim] it was built off of 5.1 and the
18 Tempe City boundary was used as a district boundary, the
19 city of Guadalupe was united into one district -- okay.

20 Zoom into the west side of Tempe. There you go.

21 So you can see there in District 8 and District 11,
22 we used the Tempe border, and then we also included the city
23 of Guadalupe into District 11.

24 The Phoenix airport district was moved into
25 District 11; and then we also united the communities along

1 the eastern border of the Gila Indian Reservation.

2 So it's balanced, everything is assigned, and we
3 used this as the precursor for building the southern
4 districts in 6.1 and 6.2.

5 Over on 6.1.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You didn't adjust 9 and --

7 MR. FLAHAN: What was that?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You didn't really make the
9 adjustments to 9 and 10 that we talked about at this point?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we -- so District 8 pushed a
11 little bit east over to the freeway, so the area between the
12 freeway; that was really all we could do within the
13 population balancing. We had talked about just using the
14 population balancing in there, so that -- that shows you how
15 small those population balancing changes are.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Go down to 16.

17 In 6.1, this is where we moved Marana into
18 District 16 which is the aqua color there on the screen; and
19 Oro Valley, Catalina, and Saddlebrooke moved into the orange
20 District 17.

21 Want to move in there?

22 Yeah, there. Zoom out now.

23 So that's what that area would look like if D-17
24 came up and D-16 went down to grab Marana.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: We have two districts that are the

1 same color?

2 MR. FLAHAN: They're very similar -- you talking
3 about 20 and 17?

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

5 MR. FLAHAN: Can you make 20 a different color?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, there you go.

7 MR. FLAHAN: So let's see.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: There you go. Thank you.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Also the southern tip of District 17
10 moved into the north -- I'm sorry, hold on. I lost my
11 place.

12 The southern tip of D-17 moved into District 19,
13 D-18 pushes farther north into District 17 and south into
14 District 19 for balancing, and District 20 pushes east into
15 District 18 for balancing.

16 The map is balanced, and that is Option 1 in the
17 southern half of the state in the Tucson area.

18 If we open up 6.2, this is a different alternate
19 way of doing the Tucson area.

20 Zoom down.

21 So the main purpose in this map is to combine
22 Red Rock, Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, Oro Valley,
23 Marana into a single legislative district which you can see
24 on the map there is District 17 in the orange color.

25 It is balanced.

1 District 16 had to move west into Yuma to do
2 population balancing; and District 18 moved east into Tucson
3 more for balancing.

4 The one thing that we couldn't do -- can you zoom
5 into the border of District 20 and District 17?

6 Keep zooming in.

7 The one thing we couldn't do -- you can see
8 District 20 encroaches into District 17 at the Casas Adobes
9 area. We had to split that for population balancing.

10 And --

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just -- just on that, just it
12 could be going into a Casas Adobes, it could be 19 coming
13 into Catalina Foothills, or 19 coming into -- or, 18 coming
14 into Catalina Foothills, just somewhere in there we had to
15 pick a population in order to get Marana and Oro Valley
16 united in 17.

17 MR. FLAHAN: And we had to cut a little bit of the
18 Catalina Foothills on the bottom of District 17.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: This is, as you've probably
20 spotted, this is Commissioner Mehl asked us to get creative,
21 so that's where the District 16 -- so the challenge in
22 putting Marana and Oro Valley together is that District 16
23 currently relies on that population. So the -- the way we
24 kept -- we achieved this was to essentially take 16 out of
25 the Tucson area. It comes to the border, but it doesn't

1 really have any population in Tucson; and now, instead, it
2 is a rural district that goes across and gets the north part
3 of Yuma County; then that then frees up 23 to go into Tucson
4 and complete the population circle there.

5 So that was how we had -- that's our way of getting
6 16 out of there so we could then put Marana and Oro Valley
7 together.

8 And this tradeoff actually -- now we have a lot of
9 flexibility to move around in Tucson now. We have all of
10 Tucson and it's extended area in a set of Tucson districts
11 so we can shift those around as you wish.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You have gotten creative and I
13 appreciate it. And it will take some -- it will take new
14 energy in the morning to -- to fully absorb it.

15 And then I did, I got an e-mail just a little bit
16 ago from Southern Arizona Leadership Council, which I've
17 alerted the Chairwoman to, from Ted Maxwell who is the head
18 of that council, and they have submitted a map for Southern
19 Arizona that -- that I would see if you could also bring
20 that up; and it's under Saguaro maps 002. Just submitted an
21 hour ago or so.

22 'Cause it has some interesting thing -- it's a
23 third creative alternative to the Southern Arizona; and --
24 and it has some things that appeal to me, but I haven't had
25 a chance to digest either of these two versions or that one.

1 But for the sake of closing out the day, I would
2 suggest if the Commissioners take a quick look at it and
3 don't object, to make it -- what is the -- the -- LD-6.3 so
4 that there's three alternative Tucson maps that are
5 officially entered; and then we can all sleep on this
6 tonight, and I'm sure we'll have some lively conversation
7 tomorrow. But --

8 MR. FLAHAN: Saguaro?

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

10 MR. FLAHAN: Before we jump there, go back to the
11 one other map, I did notice something.

12 District 16 did take the Fort -- or, the Fort Yuma
13 Indian Reservation and we can clean that up, but I did
14 notice it did get put into District 16 and separated.

15 So if the Commission allows, we will put that back
16 into District 23 to keep that whole.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Did they do a whole map or
18 just Tucson?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: They just did Tucson; but I
20 think they used our map from this morning to do it, so.

21 So I think it fits in, but just changes Tucson.

22 MR. FLAHAN: The border of Tucson somewhere.

23 MR. KINGERY: Yeah, it's yellow somewhere.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, take that off if you can.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Take the yellow border off.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Zoom out a little more so we can
2 see 17.

3 Interesting. So, as I mentioned, the challenge
4 when we're trying to get creative is District 16 when it
5 loses Marana and/or Oro Valley, where does it then go? And
6 in our creative approach we it took over to Yuma; and in
7 their creative approach, they actually take it down -- can
8 you zoom in on Tucson then?

9 They bring -- 16 comes out and goes around Marana
10 and comes into, I guess, Northwest Tucson.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Does anyone object to just
12 making this a third alternative that we can then all look at
13 tonight?

14 Okay. Then if that's all right with you, we'll
15 just label this the third LD-6.3, and we'll have those three
16 Tucson alternatives that we can talk about as we talk
17 through the rest of the LDs tomorrow.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are we by public notice have to
20 start at 8:00? Could we start at 9:00 and have a little bit
21 of time to look at these in the morning before we come in
22 or...

23 MR. B. JOHNSON: I guess what I'd recommend because
24 we do have an agendized time is, is that basically we open
25 up and immediately go into recess. I hate to do it to you,

1 but we got to make sure for the open meeting stuff that
2 we're following the agenda. It sounds weird.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We could go to our rooms and
4 study it.

5 MR. B. JOHNSON: Oh, you know what? We could call
6 in, that's exactly right.

7 So everybody could call in at 8:00 a.m. and then do
8 a roll call and then immediately recess.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Perfect.

10 MR. B. JOHNSON: It's frustrating, but that's
11 unfortunately --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Is that okay?

13 I don't want to be presumptive on that.

14 MR. B. JOHNSON: Except for Commissioner York who
15 has to be here.

16 Just kidding.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm willing to go along.

18 So what's the plan? What -- what is the
19 suggestion? To...

20 MR. B. JOHNSON: I think the suggestion was is that
21 everybody could call in at 8 o'clock and start the meeting
22 and then, if the Commissioners so chose, immediately go into
23 a recess to further consider the maps.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. The issue that many of
25 us are going be commuting at the time, I'm just a little

1 confused how this is going to logistically work for all of
2 us. Is this really something that's going to expedite
3 people?

4 I mean, just personally I'm -- yeah. What are we
5 going to call in a cars and start a meeting and then go on
6 recess?

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This wouldn't be the first bad
8 idea that I've had if people want to reject it, so.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, how long are we
10 anticipating on -- on going tomorrow? Because I would like
11 to leave about 3:00 tomorrow. If -- if we get there.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, we had scheduled
13 8:00 a.m. through the entire day --

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- to deliberate as long as
16 it is necessary.

17 We don't -- it's an organic process. I mean, none
18 of us know. You know, when we'll receive these new maps,
19 and nobody knows how much work we're going to want to, you
20 know, ask for additionally.

21 I don't want to -- we can certainly start at 9:00,
22 call in at 8:00. I mean -- I'll personally come here, and
23 we'll start the meeting and we can recess. So if -- if the
24 Commissioners would like an additional hour to study, we --
25 we can certainly do that. That limits time on the tail end.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Vice Chair Watchman, do you
2 have an issue on the tail end? Because if you do, I'll just
3 get up earlier and we'll start at 8:00.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I do.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I have to start a Navajo
7 ceremony up in Tuba City.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then in respect to
9 Vice Chair Watchman, let's just start at 8:00. And we'll
10 make that work.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you. Appreciate that.
12 I can fudge a little after 3:00, but, you know, that's my --
13 that's not my drop-dead time, but at least in that
14 timeframe.

15 But if we could start at 8:00, I would really
16 appreciate it. So, thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just request in the future
18 to our entire staff, our Commissioners, when we schedule
19 these long days and blocks, if there are conflicts that do
20 come up, let us know as soon as possible because it has an
21 implication for a ripple effect with the number of people.

22 So it sounds like we're going to aim again for
23 tomorrow from 8:00 to 3:00.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well 3:00, 4:00-ish.

25 4:00-ish is the latest, but yes.

1 And this just came up today so I need to address
2 it. Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Before you -- you wrap. For the new
5 6.3, of the citizen submission, for the development history,
6 we are just going to add it as sort of a leg over here since
7 we don't know exactly where it came from being a citizen
8 submission.

9 And just so the Commission knows, we'll pull the
10 competitive and demographic data, but there will be no audit
11 log available for it at this time because there is no way
12 that we -- that we would have an audit log.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Or ever, actually.

14 MR. FLAHAN: Yes, you're right.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And so if we like it, you will
16 then go back and readjust something and create an audit log
17 and do it?

18 MR. FLAHAN: When we start touching it we can
19 create the audit log, but as of right now, but there is no
20 audit log that will be generated.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: At least that way we'll get to
22 see it and we'll --

23 MR. FLAHAN: Yep.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Thank you.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Just wanted to make sure we set that

1 up.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So if there's no other
3 further discussion on Agenda Item No. V, we will move to
4 Agenda Item No. VI.

5 Next meeting date will be tomorrow 21st from
6 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m., depending on the flow of our mapping
7 work.

8 Next Agenda Item, No. VII, closing of public
9 comments.

10 Please note members of the Commission may not
11 discuss items that are not specifically identified on the
12 agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action
13 taken as a result of public comment will be limited to
14 directing staff to study the matter, responding to any
15 criticism, or scheduling the matter for further
16 consideration and decision at a later date.

17 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VIII,
18 adjournment. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With joy, I make a motion to
20 adjourn.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I second with joy.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,
23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes -- or, aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
7 aye.

8 With that, we will adjourn.

9 And I want to thank our Commissioners, our broader
10 team, the public for your relentless energy and commitment,
11 and we look forward to seeing you at 8:00 a.m.; and for
12 Mapping, I hope you get a few hours.

13 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 4:25 p.m.).

14

15

16

17

18 ***"This transcript represents an unofficial record.***

19 ***Please consult the accompanying video for the official***

20 ***record of IRC proceedings."***

21

22

23

24

25

C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
COUNTY OF MARICOPA)

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

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

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 10th of November, 2021.



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

* * *

I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 10th of November, 2021.



Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058