THE STATE OF ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF VIDEOCONFERENCE PUBLIC MEETING

Via GoogleMeets
October 26, 2021
8:00 a.m.

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC PO Box 513, Litchfield Park, AZ 85340 (P) 623-975-7472 (F) 623-975-7462 www.MillerCertifiedReporting.com

Reported By: Angela Furniss Miller, RPR Certified Reporter (AZ 50127)

1	<u> </u>	D E X
2	AGENDA ITEM:	PAGE
3	ITEM NO. I	4
4	ITEM NO. I(A)	4
5	ITEM NO. I(B)	5
6	ITEM NO. II	5
7	ITEM NO. III	7
8	ITEM NO. IV	7
9	ITEM NO. V	8
10	ITEM NO. VI	9
11	ITEM NO. VII	54
12	ITEM NO. VIII	56
13	ITEM IX	62
14	ITEM NO. X	58 & 62
15	ITEM NO. XI	62
16	ITEM NO. XII	62
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1	PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT	
2	REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 8:00 a.m. on	
3	October 26, 2021, via GoogleMeets, Arizona, in the presence	
4	of the following Commissioners:	
5	Ms. Erika Neuberg, Chairperson Mr. Derrick Watchman, Vice Chairman	
6	Mr. Derrick watchman, vice chariman Mr. David Mehl Ms. Shereen Lerner	
7	Mr. Douglas York	
8	OTHERS PRESENT:	
9	Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director Ms. Loriandra Van Haren, Deputy Director Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant Ms. Michele Crank, Public Information Officer	
10		
11	Ms. Marie Chapple Camacho, Outreach Coordinator Mr. Alex Pena, Outreach Coordinator Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr Ms. Jillian Andrews, Ballard Spahr	
12		
13	Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer	
14	Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group Mr. Douglas Johnson, National Demographics Corp. Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, National Demographics, Corp.	
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome, everybody. Hope everybody got great rest over the weekend. It was, you know, a hardworking week, and it's great to be back on Tuesday morning.

We'll dive right in. Agenda Item I, call to order and roll call.

I(A), call for quorum. It is 8:02 a.m. on Tuesday, October 26th, 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 are unable to respond verbally, we ask that you please type your name.

Val.

MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Vice Chair Watchman.

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

232425

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

1.3

MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

MS. NEUMANN: For the record, we also have in attendance today Executive Director Brian Schmitt, Deputy Director Lori Van Haren, Public Information Officer Michele Crank, Community Outreach Coordinators Marie Chappel and Alex Pena; our legal team is comprised of Brett Johnson and Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer who will be joining us shortly, Roy Herrera and Daniel Arellano from Ballard Spahr; and we've got our mapping team, we've got Mark Flahan and Brian Kingery from Timmons; and Doug Johnson and Ivy Beller Sakansky from NDC Research; and our transcriptionist Angela Miller.

That's everyone.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Val.

Please note for the minutes, a quorum is present.

Agenda Item I(B), call for notice. Val, was the notice and agenda for the Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance of today's meeting?

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

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from October the 21st, 2021, that was our deliberation day last week. We have (A), the general session; we also had II(B), we had

three separate executive sessions, the first one was seeking legal advice for VRA compliance, polarization and performance regarding the congressional districts, executive session two was regarding VRA compliance -- legal advice on VRA compliance, polarization and performance regarding the legislative maps, and then the third executive session was pertaining to legal advice regarding a procedural issue where there was a chain of custody, a chain of being able to document changes of the map in which we decided to no longer consider one of the maps.

1.3

So if there's any discussion on the minutes, I'll entertain that; and if there are no discussion on the minutes, I will entertain a motion to approve the general session and three executive session minutes.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is Commissioner Mehl. I move approval of all of those minutes.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner Lerner, I second the motion.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If no further discussion, Vice Chair Watchman.

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York. 2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye. 3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an 4 aye. 5 And with that, the minutes are approved. 6 Agenda Item No. III, opportunity for public 7 comments. 8 Public comment will now open for a minimum of 30 minutes and remain open until the adjournment of the 9 meeting. Comments will only be accepted electronically in 10 the writing and will be limited to 3,000 characters. 11 12 Please note members of the Commission may not 1.3 discuss items that are not specifically identified on the 14 agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H), action 15 taken as a result of public comment will be limited to 16 directing staff to study the matter, responding to any 17 criticism, or scheduling the matter for further 18 consideration and decision at a later date. 19 With that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. IV, 20 discussion on public comments received prior to today's 21 meeting. I will open it up to my colleagues if you have any 22 23 thoughts or reactions. 24 The only thing that I'd like to add or really say, 25 is, you know, thank you for the feedback, it's substantive;

and I want the community to know that your feedback still matters, nothing has been locked in, and even after Thursday when the Commission will hopefully approve a draft map, it will be just that, a draft.

Some of the locations, the communities of interest where there's back and forth and tension, we will have a tentative decision, but that is all that it is. We will embark on a fresh new tour after draft maps, and everything, every decision, will remain on the table. So I encourage the public to continue engage in the constructive dialogue of sharing feedback because we're learning.

And with that, we've move to Agenda Item No. V, potential updated, discussion, and potential action concerning polarization data and report presentation for mapping consultants regarding U.S. and Arizona Constitution requirements.

Do we have an update?

MR. FLAHAN: Yes, we -- we have an update.

Doug, you on the phone?

MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, I'm here.

And so just a quick update that Legal has reviewed Dr. Handley's report and -- and cleared it, so we will be distributing that and posting it on the website hopefully later today, as soon as we can.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Excellent. So that

report will be both available to the Commissioners and the 1 public today, it sounds like? 2 3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct. And then the thought is 4 on -- on Thursday we can answer any questions once you've 5 had time to read it. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. 6 MR. D. JOHNSON: But there's -- there's no new 7 8 substance or anything beyond what's Dr. Handley presented. 9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you for that. 10 Can you just clarify for the public where they can 11 find it on the website after it's put out? 12 MR. D. JOHNSON: I'll have to defer to Brian or 1.3 Lori on that. 14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 15 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: We'll make sure it is on the 16 newsroom sometime this afternoon or soon as we can. 17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Look on the newsroom 18 link at the top for the most current? DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Yes. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Excellent. 21 If there's nothing else on that item, we'll move to 22 Agenda Item No. VI, drat map decision discussion. 23 Before I turn it over to Mapping and my colleagues, 24 I just want to kind of orient us and remind us about what 25 this agenda item is and -- and, you know, the purpose of it. This is our chance to give, you know, hopefully which is, you know, find of our final or -- or most important, last thoughts to Mapping and direction on both the legislative and the congressional maps. Again, with the understanding that these are tentative ideas that we're presenting to the community and that we are not perfecting a map.

We collectively came to the conclusion at the end of last week that ongoing deliberation with just the five of us was -- was reaching a point of diminishing return, and that what we really need is to be able to get a meaningful draft -- not a perfect draft, not a final draft -- but something that makes more sense than a grid map, and then engage the community in thoughtful dialogue about what districts make the most sense to maximize communities of interest in all six constitutional criteria.

So the goal is use this time to share your directions to Mapping. They will work hard to get to get us whatever new maps we are asking for in a timely way, such that when we convene on Thursday morning at 9:30, we're ready to go with quick decisions about the maps that are there; and then work collaboratively to come up with a sense -- sense -- a consensus map by the end of the day.

And I want to be honest, I am really hoping and my goal is at the end of Thursday that we have a map that, you

know, really all Commissioners can support as a template, as a draft to get out to the community.

So that's our overriding, you know, kind of vision and goal.

Questions if you want, otherwise I will turn it over to Mapping if you want to give us any kind of direction or -- or preference for how to -- how to work.

We can start with legislative; it's first in the agenda and I think may -- may require a little more work or people may have more feedback on.

But Mapping, what -- what works for you?

Is there a certain system here that would be the most effective for you?

MR. FLAHAN: I think the most effective would be just splitting the maps up, and if you want to start with legislative that's fine, we can pull up the latest approved legislative map; and then it's listening to your feedback and your changes that you would like to incorporate it -- into it.

Once we're done with legislative, we can switch to congressional and the same thing: We can bring it up on the screen, we can talk about it, get the changes and feedback that you would like to make, and that will allow us after this meeting to go back and make these changes.

And we are striving to have the changes done by the

end of today, that way the Commission and the public has the opportunity to digest it all day tomorrow in preparation for Thursday.

So that is -- that is our current plan on the legislative side. The last approved version from our meetings last week was 8.0.

I think that's what Brian is bringing up on the screen now.

MR. KINGERY: Correct.

1.3

MR. FLAHAN: So with that, I will turn it back to the Commission to provide any guidance that they would like us to incorporate.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. I'm happy to go kind of around just the Commissioners. I can't see you. I don't want to put anybody on the spot, I don't like to always do, you know, the same order.

Does anybody want to chime in and start or do you want me to call on you?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chair Neuberg, this is

Commissioner Lerner. I have a few items if that's okay. If

not --

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm happy with you starting away.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So, as you know, last time when we completed our meeting there was concerns that

were expressed about the new Districts 17 and 18, and that's what I would like to start with in our discussion.

Those were the changes that had been proposed and I'd like to make some -- some modifications/suggestions to those. So -- and I think what they are going to do is create actually a much more compact district than the one in 8.0.

We'll start with District 17. So District 17, my recommendation is to again follow Commissioner Mehl's request to include Marana with Oro Valley; I know that has been a priority for him and I want to honor that request. I know we also received something from the mayor about that.

But what I'm -- my suggesting is that we adjust that to include Catalina Foothills, Casas Adobes, Marana, and Oro Valley, put all four of those whole; if popu- -- if there's room for population, add SaddleBrooke into that area. When we lay that out, it will be a much more cohesive district that goes east to west and will not extend as far south.

When you look all the way -- when you actually add up those populations, I think it gets pretty close. And, again, SaddleBrooke if possible.

This change will connect all of the population in District 17. These are communities that are contiguous; they're neighbors to each other as part of it.

Part of my concern last time as you heard was about Tanque Verde. Tanque Verde without traffic would be almost an hour's drive and a lot of the drive would actually take you out of the district.

Now, I realize that when we're in rural areas we're going a lot further; but when we're talking about more urban/suburban areas, that also is part of the concern and also just whether they are connected.

I think these communities are well connected. It would be mostly a suburban district, so it won't add areas from other parts of Tucson into it.

And so it honors the request to combine Oro Valley and Marana, and it actually makes it much more compact which is part of our constitution requirement.

So in terms of that, looking at our constitutional requirements, if it's more compact, contiguous, equal -- relatively equal population -- again, SaddleBrooke potentially could go in as part of that; it also uses the natural geographic boundaries of the Santa Catalina Mountains as a boundary. So instead of using it to connect two business communities on opposite sides of the Tucson metro area.

This proposal that I'm making also will keep the communities whole, so it won't split them apart. So it minimizes any splits; and also it will be a very competitive

district as well. So in this case, that 17 would become almost a 50/50, I think, but we'll see what happens when Mapping puts it together, I may be wrong. But I think that that will make it more competitive.

1.3

But I guess what I want to do is -- is ask that that be -- that -- what I'm suggesting be drawn for our next version and we can take a look at it as a Commission.

I am going to stop there because there may be some feedback before I move to how that affects District 18.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, given that we are not deliberating and -- and voting, we're making decisions, it may make sense, Commissioner Lerner and Watchman, if you want to, you know, play out your vision, you know, and then turn to the other side; because otherwise, you know, I can turn it over to York and Mehl but, you know, they're just going to provide a competing -- well, I don't want to presume. I imagine they're going to have a different set of ideas that are then going to have different ripples.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So -- so if it 's okay with my colleagues -- let me ask, actually, other Commissioners:

How do you feel about allowing this procedural process so that Commissioner Lerner can complete a comprehensive thought and then everybody will have that opportunity?

COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is Commissioner Mehl, I

1 greatly report Commissioner Lerner's desire to draw an alternative map, but I agree with you, Chairwoman, to have 2 3 her play out any of the changes that she wants and ask for 4 that map to be drawn. 5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And that's something that we 7 should then look at Thursday. 8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Please continue. 9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioners. 10 11 MR. FLAHAN: Can I ask a question on D17 if --12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely. 1.3 MR. FLAHAN: When you say "SaddleBrooke," does that 14 also include SaddleBrooke Ranch? 15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would think so. 16 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. 17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know what it will do 18 to population, I guess that's one of the things I don't 19 know. As you're looking at the population, that's one of 20 things we want to look at when you start putting that 21 together. 22 MR. FLAHAN: Gotcha. Okay, that's all I got. 23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. 24 I'm going to move to District 18 because that got affected by this modification I'm proposing. So District 18 25

actually then what you -- what we could basically do is exchange Casas Adobes and pick up Tanque Verde, so that joins it with neighboring East Tucson communities -- or neighbors, I should say.

So that's -- that's -- the primary focus there is that kind of switch that's there, it should be hopefully more compact and part of it is looking at these communities to try to make them a little bit more compact and contiguous and then honoring some of the geographic changes.

And then if we go -- so that's the only -- the only change, it's just basically a switch in 17 and 18 between Tangue Verde and Casas Adobes.

And then in -- just going to move down to 18 -- I just did 18 -- 20, right next to 18.

So with 20, one of the things that is there is -- actually, if you can pull in -- if there's a way to move Flowing Wells into 18 -- or into 20 as a way to balance the population, I think that might -- might help.

Putting Flowing Wells and a little bit of the

Tucson population, but basically pulling -- Flowing Wells

right now is I think in 16, which is much more of a rural

district, and so trying to put it back into 20 is what we're

suggesting.

And, let's see, I've done -- I'm just trying to go around in this Southern Tucson since that is where most of

the changes were last time that we discussed. Let me just make sure I've got...

We've done 17, 18. 19.

Okay. So with 19 and, again, I'm just trying to complete this one southern area all at one time. 19 the suggestion is, again, as part of our effort to make things a little bit more compact as part of that, add Rincon Valley and Vail, which were -- previously had been moved out of other districts and the area around it from District 17, because remember if we're moving District 17 to being more compact. Take Rincon Valley and Vail and put it into District 19. That's much closer geographically to Cochise County.

And one of the ways I think we can work with that in looking at where Davis-Monthan Airbase is, those could actually move into 21. So the change could be balanced by taking Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and the neighborhood just east of the Base into District 21, and that should balance the population hopefully.

But also that's a nice piece, because each of the bases in the south there will actually their own legislative district which might be an advantage for them.

So that also will create a much more compact shape, that's kind of the goal of all of this is to make these more compact, but -- well, one of the many goals. I should say.

And then for 20, 21, and 23 those are the Southern Arizona majority Latino districts that were there, so we want to just try to balance them in terms of population. I don't have very specific suggestions on how to balance those populations, but I think as they keep an eye -- as the mapping team keeps an eye on the Hispanic voting age population and performance in the AG and governor's races, that can help balance the population in those areas.

So I think those were the main things I had for the south. I think -- unless I'm wrong -- oh. I'm sorry. We can go a little further north, that was mostly Southern Tucson area that we spent a lot of time on last time, and I want to focus on that first to try to complete that discussion.

As a result of some of this last time, remember, we added in District 17 partly to balance -- I think we were trying to balance some population and connections there, we had added Mammoth Sanuel -- San Manuel and Oracle into District 17. What I'm going to suggest is based on the new iteration that I'm suggesting, that we actually put them into districts -- we move them into District 7.

That's there's part -- there a number of other communities in there that are part of the Copper Corridor, and I think that's where they were originally and then we moved them out. I'm suggesting that this is actually a

better fit for them in terms of their communities of interest.

And I will say that in all of these changes, I've been very careful to consider the constitutional requirements, and communities of interest, and connectivity, compactness, all those areas.

So the suggestion here is to add Mammoth, Oracle, San Manuel, and Campo Bonito to -- back into District 7.

And hopefully that will balance population-wise. I'm not sure exactly where that will end up as part of that.

MR. FLAHAN: So you're thinking about cutting that district right on the county line?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Which is another reason to do that.

MR. FLAHAN: Gotcha.

whether we could -- because we've talked about this before as well, we talked about this last time, if we could add Coolidge to District 16, which would join Casa Grande, Maricopa, and Eloy. If it -- if it can't be because of population, I don't know whether it can be, it can stay in District 7, but I think otherwise putting Coolidge in there might be a good link, a good connection for them into District 16.

And if we're moving Flowing Wells out, it might

balance it in that area for District 7. 1 2 So that was --3 MR. KINGERY: So shows District 16 as 11,000 short 4 of target. 5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. MR. KINGERY: So with Coolidge being 13, it would 6 7 almost be an -- an even swap that no other change would need 8 to happen. 9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. That's perfect then. 10 MR. KINGERY: From first glance. 11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Great. And, obviously, I don't know if all of those 12 13 population changes will work. That's part of what you-all 14 will be able to let us know on Thursday. 15 And then we -- that's all I have for South Central 16 Arizona; and then I just had one suggestion for the Phoenix 17 area, and then that's all the suggestions that I had. And I 18 may rely on Commissioner York because he always knows these 19 areas real well as part of it. 20 So I don't know if there's any other questions or 21 anything on the south -- Southern Arizona piece or, Chair 22 Neuberg, should I continue with the --23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I'd like you to 24 continue, it seems like you have a whole vision; we'll let, 25

you know, your colleagues have a vision.

And I just want to share with my colleagues is the one concern we have is I hope we're not going to arrive on Thursday morning with two dramatically different maps than anything we started from that are so different from one another and we're left -- you know, just be cognizant of that, colleagues. But, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, and Chair Neuberg, I think the majority of the Southern Arizona is actually going to be very similar to what we have right now.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm just trying to paint a big picture of imagining us coming together and working together through the day to bring a consensus map that can serve as a template for the community.

So I just want to be mindful about the changes that we're making; we're not starting all over today.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's all. And that's not just for you, Commissioner Lerner, because, you know, there are three others after you that are going to go, so.

Go ahead. Please finish.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. Thank you.

Yeah, it certainly sounds like a lot, but I don't know that it will be as much. But I'm -- I'm as the same hope of you --

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

1.3

COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- I'm not trying to throw a bomb into the whole system and blow it up.

The only thing I'm going to suggest is we talked about a couple of districts last time, but just in terms of District 4 in trying to bring some communities together, I'm suggesting that we actually take District 4 and try to have Paradise Valley become whole in District 4. So if we extend, it's going to impact District 8 and District 4 only.

So basically what this would do is to extend

District 8 to Indian Bend to take in South Scottsdale, put

Paradise Valley whole into District 4; and it would take the

District 4 down to where the 143 dead-ends into the 202,

basically trying to keep those neighborhoods north of the

143 corridor together with similar communities in District 4

that are south of the 202.

So south of the 202, when we look at that, the area is much more commercial; north of the 202, it's more residential.

So trying to pull District 4 down to the 143 where it hits the 202, which will keep those communities, those the neighborhoods, together with similar communities in District 4 and then --

MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry. This is Doug Johnson.

1 I'm not sure we're following along properly on the 2 map. You're talking about bringing the north side -- the 3 north end of District 4 farther south; is that correct? 4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Just pull it back. 5 MR. D. JOHNSON: So you'll have the north side of it? 6 7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Just pull it down a 8 little bit. 9 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think we're already --10 COMMISSIONER YORK: She's talking about the north side -- the south side south and the north side -- east side 11 12 of 8 up to Indian Bend to incorporate most of McCormick 1.3 Ranch and all of Downtown Scottsdale into District 8. MR. D. JOHNSON: Except -- hold on. 14 15 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have some arguments around 16 that. I think the neighborhoods --17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Hold --18 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- neighborhoods --19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Hold --20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Hold on, Doug. I think the 21 neighborhoods south of Thomas more mirror Tempe and 22 Guadalupe and those kind of neighborhoods than what --23 what -- what she's -- what we're looking at. She's trying 24 to kind of blur... 25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I --

COMMISSIONER YORK: I appreciate what you're trying to do, but...

1.3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I ask a clarifying question, Commissioner Lerner, because I'm trying to understand what your primary goal motivation here is, and there may be one goal that I actually have in mind with what you're sharing.

I'm looking at District 8 and the Papago Park area north and then west. That to me doesn't fit in with the broader Tempe area. That to me is beginning to get more into Phoenix city, so I don't know if that part, that seems to be a part that you want to merge into a different territory; I don't know if it goes into 4, though.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry, Chair Neuberg, I was pulling up the map to get a close-up to get to that.

Could you clarify that? Could you just repeat that about the -- Papago Park, is that what you're saying?

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: On the very tip of on -- in D-8 on the western side where D-4 borders D-8, that -- that tip in the top towards the left Papago area moving left, that to me sits more with the Phoenix area, not the Tempe, you know, kind of suburban area.

But anyway, I don't know if that was -
COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, I would -- I would say

that's more like District 1 than it's like District -- like

1 District 4. But I would try to keep District 4 north of Camelback --2 3 I -- I agree. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. 4 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- more out towards 110 north. 5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I agree with you. I agree, I 6 wasn't saying where I wanted that population to go. 7 just saying that is a population center that I'm not -- that 8 I don't love being there, and I thought that may be in common with what Lerner was saying so I just wanted to throw 9 it out there. 10 11 COMMISSIONER YORK: She's trying to pull Paradise 12 Valley down to that --1.3 Okay. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 14 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- and I don't agree with that. 15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Well, let's --16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you know what, because 17 we're going to have these discussions, what I would suggest 18 is we can talk about this. Because most of my comments --19 this is the only thing for this area. 20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What I would suggest is let's have -- since -- let us have this discussion on 22 23 Thursday. 24 If -- I would be fine with holding off on this 25 particular suggestion right now and waiting until Thursday

when we could maybe discuss that if you'd like because we 1 might be able to find a compromise with all of us. 2 3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. COMMISSIONER LERNER: Would that work? 4 5 COMMISSIONER YORK: That works. Okav. So let's --6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. 8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So let's do that. 9 And then for the legislative changes, those are -again, most of it was basically what we had talked about for 10 11 last time -- from last time about the Southern Arizona. 12 I'm -- I'm -- I would be done at this point and with my --1.3 with my suggestions and, again, we'll just come back to this 14 on Thursday. 15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But for the sake of time 16 management -- hold on one second, Doug, 'cause I know 17 Commissioner York has a very short window. 18 Commissioner Watchman, are you okay after Doug 19 Johnson gives -- asks a question or whatever, are you okay 20 deferring to Commissioner York so he can get his comments 21 in? I don't mind. Go ahead. 22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's have Doug and -- and 25 Commissioner York.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Doug Johnson, I know you had a question or something you wanted to chime in 2 3 about. 4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just wanted to make sure we're 5 understanding the direction question. So at this point there's no request for District 4 at all? 6 7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. 8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. 9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm going to pull back on 10 that so that we can have the discussion on Thursday, I think 11 that would be better since we don't have the time today. 12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. Thank you. 1.3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. 14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So -- so Commissioners 15 Mehl and York, would you like to take some time to propose, 16 you know, alterations to, you know, 8.0. 17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Doug, is there anything you 18 want to suggest at this point? 19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think David has most of 20 the conversation for South Tucs- -- Southern Arizona. 21 I was happy to start -- no, I was just happy to 22 kind of start with this, I mean, I think we worked hard for 23 basically six days to get us at a balanced population and 24 good start and I felt happy -- I felt good about Maricopa

25

County.

There were a couple changes -- and what Shereen was talking about, we can move some stuff around. I still think that we've got the mountain -- mountain areas split up a little bit, and I want to make sure that gets fixed.

And so I was happy with Maricopa County.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YORK: I defer my time to David.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay. I think we may as well have a few alternatives to look at in Southern Arizona. I would be fine going forward with a draft map with the current 8.0. Given Commissioner Lerner is trying to improve some things, I have a couple of things that I think are responsive, so I would suggest we draw a third map for Thursday. So Thursday we'll look at 8.0, we'll look at a map with the adjustments that Commissioner Lerner's asked for; and then thirdly we'll ask for a map and the adjustments I'm going to call out I think get a little bit towards some of the things she's trying to do, but certainly not anywhere near what she's trying to do.

So the first one would be in the Flowing Wells area, to simply swap between 16 and 20, giving District 20 all of Flowing Wells east of I-10, and giving Tucson Estates and the area west of Tucson Estates that's currently in 20.

I think this actually helps the District 20 in a number of ways, and it gets the more urban population into

20. Tucson Estates is a quasi -- it's a less urban area and would fit better into 16; and I think the populations are pretty similar there, but I'm not positive.

A second swap -- or a second change would be to extend District 17 up to Red Rock and the vacant land between Marana and Red Rock, and that probably adds 3- or 4,000 people, so.

So and if that works, that's fine; if they need to shed population out of 17, the Mammoth, Oracle and San Manuel could go up to D-7, but I would leave that up to Doug sort of a balancing thing. To me that's not a priority to have those three in D-17, but it's fine to have them there.

And another possible add -- and, again, would have been on population balancing, would have been down below Vail, there's a little triangle of population that's 3- or 4,000 people.

There's Wentworth Road would sort of be the western boundary -- so if you go.

If you -- yeah, there's the line. He's sort of showing it there. That little area that's right now in D-19 that's -- is that your blue boundary? I think that's 3- or 4,000 people there, and that could go from 17 into 19.

So that one and Red Rock probably are about the same population as Mammoth, Oracle, and San Manuel; and I think that D-7 could use the population of Mammoth, Oracle,

and San Manuel; and I agree with Commissioner Lerner that that actually would be a good match going up there from a community of interest standpoint.

And then I would also like to test one other pretty significant change that may -- may prove to be not be thoughtful at all, but it would get to the issue Commissioner Lerner has raised about District 19 coming up into the urban part of Tucson.

So this would stand on its own, separate from the other changes, and it's either going to end up proving to be a good idea or bad idea, but it would be to take District 20 and take that whole Davis-Monthan area, and really have District 20 connect over to District 17 substantially -- you know, certainly down to I-10, and could even go down a little farther depending on population balance, but at least down to I-10; and then to take out of district -- excuse me, District 21 would come over there, not 20.

And then to take out of District 21 Quail Creek, which is right across from Green Valley. It's right now like a little stub that doesn't belong on the map; and it's a retirement community, very -- very similar to Green Valley.

So you take Quail Creek out and Tubac and Amado out and Eastern Santa Cruz out, and you swap all those for that whole Davis-Monthan area.

And I think that helps compactness quite a bit, I 1 think it helps communities of interest quite a bit, and I 2 3 think the population sort of kind of balanced out, but I could be way off on that. 4 5 MR. FLAHAN: And you want all those communities added to D-19 that you just mentioned? Quail Creek --6 7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes. So it would be a swap 8 from D-21 to D-19. So the Davis-Monthan area would go into 9 21 and those three areas come out, and I think that balances 10 or gets in the vicinity of balancing population. 11 And that set of changes stands separately from the 12 others, but you can do it all on one map and we can look at 1.3 it. 14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Mehl, just one 15 question. You mentioned the Mammoth/San Manuel area 16 possibly going to 7. If we need to, is that okay if that 17 area goes to 16? We take Red Rock out, we a need to put 18 something into 16. 19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I meant 16. I misspoke. 20 Yeah, sorry. But thank you. 21 MR. D. JOHNSON: No problem. 22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Do we want to put Coolidge into 23 16? 24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: At this point I think it's too

much of a population shift. It's something we can

25

definitely look at in a -- in a final mapping.

But I think Coolidge going into 16 is as good a fit in 16 as it is into 7, so if there's any balancing you need to do, I would be fine with Coolidge going into 16.

And that is for -- for me.

And that would really give us three maps to look at that would really have Southern Arizona differently on Thursday; and -- and then we can still also talk about any stuff in Maricopa.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman, before we, you know, close the conversation on the LD map, thoughts? Different opinions?

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I guess a few things just looking back at what we did last Thursday and respecting Commissioner Mehl and -- and his desire to bring together Marana and Oro Valley, you know, I was supportive of that; but then when it came back it added a lot more change because obviously because of the population balancing. So I -- I support

Commissioner Lerner's thoughts and that version of a map because -- because of, obviously, it provides more compactness, it respects the communities of interest especially for the -- you know, the Latinos and maybe we need to -- on Thursday we need to go, you know, take a look

at what the Latino and the Latino Coalition is thinking, just so that, you know, we -- we check that because, you know, we need to look at all considerations.

And I respect what Commissioner Mehl has put on the table and that comes from, you know, a submission from the business community in Southern Arizona, which is great. I think we need to go back and also look at Latino community especially for the Tucson area, I think that's important.

And so I -- I support Commissioner Lerner's thoughts and process.

Now on the tribal side, I'm hoping that, you know, we've heard from Navajo and a few others from the northern tribes, and I'm hoping by Thursday if not, you know, discussion on -- on the draft maps, but I'm hoping that we will hear from the other tribes in the state. And so that's -- that's my hope; and I think our staff is trying to reach out to them, but we also have to consider them.

Even though, as you said Commissioner -
Madam Chair, that -- that it's a small percentage of

population in the state, I think we still need to give them

some consideration.

But, you know, it looks like today we're going to have to come up with several versions. So version 8.0, 8.1, and 8.2 is probably where we're going and I support that, and we'll have to regroup on Thursday, you know, to see, you

know, obviously as you've been saying, Madam Chair, meeting the six requirements of the Arizona Constitution. So we have to, you know, keep -- keep that in mind, so.

But I'll stop there, and I think we're ready to move on with several versions, again new discussion points on Thursday.

So thank you, Madam Chair.

1.3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

And, yes, everything remains on the table, and we will redistrict for the entire state. We consider everybody's submissions.

I do want to say, though, that once a group submits a map and an idea, whatever ideas that we take from that and vote and create our own map, that map is now ours. So I no longer see it as this person's map or that person's map, I see it as our map that we will continue to make changes to considering all groups' feedback.

And I look forward to the feedback between now and Thursday, and I look forward to the feedback from Thursday all the way through December 22nd, so.

And I -- and I think this is a great plan. I look forward to seeing, you know, what's going to be really two different iterations. We've had, I think, a good amount of time to study the -- the demographic variables, the maps of 8.0, and we can now contrast that against two different

options, it sounds like the bulk of it will be different in the southern area. We'll come up with a starting point that will be just a starting point, and I'd like to reiterate that we may have two different visions that ultimately my idea is we could bring them together to find something that we could all feel good enough about to, you know, get it out to the community.

So if there's nothing else with legislative, I'm going to suggest that Mapping, unless you have more specific questions, we bring up the congressional map 6.0, which was our last approved iteration.

MR. FLAHAN: I think we're good for the mapping side.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

MR. D. JOHNSON: Yep.

1.3

MR. FLAHAN: So Brian is bringing up the congressional map, and from last week the version that you guys last adopted was 6.0 and -- and that is on the screen.

There was some conversations about the Phoenix

Mountain Preserve area and trying to tie those two together,

but it was left as you guys would continue to discuss it

before giving Mapping any decisions.

And that's where we left off.

COMMISSIONER YORK: Were we were not looking for some direction on population and the VRA?

MR. FLAHAN: I -- I honestly don't recall. 2 Doug, do you recall? 3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I --4 COMMISSIONER YORK: We were hoping to have -- oh, 5 Doug, your gal look at polarization stuff? Or maybe that was by Thursday; I can't remember. 6 7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, so she has done just some 8 polarization numbers on District 3 as proposed, but -- and 9 she's finished her work, but we haven't -- Legal has not 10 reviewed that yet, I quess. I've briefed them a little on 11 it, but they haven't looked at it in detail. 12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we'll be able to again 13 review it on Thursday in terms of VRA compliance. 14 You know, from the perspective right now I would 15 focus on, you know, communities of interest, geographic 16 location, compactness, contiguity, you know, 17 competitiveness. 18 As is we have two, you know, Latino 19 majority-minority districts that perform, I believe. 20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. I can walk through the stats 21 if that would be helpful here. I have them on screen. 22 So we have -- as the Chair was just mentioning, we 23 have the Congressional District 3, where you see it says 24 citizen voting age population under Hispanic Latino is 54 percent, and District 7 is 47 percent; and if we go over to 25

the right-hand side, District 7, both the Democrat -- Latino Democrat candidate for governor at 53 percent, and the Latino candidate for attorney general is 60 percent; wins in District 7, so that district clearly performs.

And District 3 similarly, we have the governor and attorney general races, it was at 68 and 73 percent, so a solidly Latino seat.

On the Native American side, District 3 -- I'm sorry, District 20 is at 20 percent. Obviously, when we're talking congressional, that number is going much lower than the legislative.

I will note this is a spreadsheet that we prepared right after the meeting last week. We have updated the spreadsheet, so the spreadsheets you see on Thursday will include the additional column of data that

Commissioner Lerner and Vice Chair Watchman requested. So we have updated the table, but we haven't had a chance to go through and do the old maps yet.

But the maps you see Thursday will have the non-Hispanic/Native American voting age population added to them.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And just for the public's sake, Doug, do you mind explaining again why that column was asked for, why it's relevant?

MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. At the 10,000 foot level

there's a big debate. Now that people can mark multiple categories on the census, the big debate is how do we categorize those into something less than 155 fields; and so there are different ways of doing it. The way that we group them is how the OMB -- or the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of Justice use as their primary method, but there also is debate over looking at just the -- just the people who marked Native American.

1.3

The numbers were showing people marked Native

American or Native American and white. So we will generate
those numbers -- oh. And they already have it. Good work,

Brian.

So Brian brought up that new spreadsheet with that new field, so. It's not that one set of data are right and the others are wrong, it's just different ways of looking at the -- at the same giant data set and trying to put it in a way that makes sense.

MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, it's that column that Brian just highlighted.

MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly.

So you can see in the -- in the congressional map you get 20 percent non-Hispanic/Native American of cit- -- of citizen voting age population; but if the next column over when we go to Native American single race voting age population, it goes down about 2 percent, in part because we

take out the people that marked Native American and white, and because now the base we're using is larger because that's 18 percent of everyone 18 and above, not just as opposed to 20 percent of citizens of voting age.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

Colleagues, any direction to Mapping on the congressional map?

MR. KINGERY: And we do have that available for the legislative as well; and I'll update both of these PDFs on the hub site shortly.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is Commissioner Mehl.

It was my impression when we left our last meeting that the five of us were sufficiently comfortable to move forward with this map as a draft map, even though I think all of us would have changes we would want to suggest. If I'm wrong on that and either Commissioner Lerner or Watchman would prefer to make comments today, then I've got a set of comments for today, too. But I would be happy to say nothing and -- and let us go forward with this map on Thursday unless anyone wants to disagree with me.

I will say that we got a letter this morning -- or

I first saw it this morning -- from Mayor Romero of the City

of Tucson, and I agree with a lot of what she has in her

letter, so I would like the public to know that we've

received that letter; and even if we proceed with this draft

map, that I would be committed to -- to looking at some of the changes that Mayor Romero has suggested when we do get into the final mapping stage.

1.3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are you suggesting,

Commissioner Mehl, that those changes were too

substantiative to be able to try to work on it on Thursday?

COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think it would trigger other changes that would be more -- that would then cause more of an issue and there's alternatives of different ways of going in order to accommodate it, and so because of that, I think we may be better getting the public's opinion through the public hearing phases and then dealing it with later; but I -- I could be talked into a different direction.

COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and I'll just make a comment. This is Commissioner York.

One of the things that I felt that we needed to wait and here was the legal analysis of Congressional District 3, because if there's -- there's some boundaries around the west of there that we could add or subtract based on what that analysis is to make that more minority-majority districts. So I'm sort of -- I'm fine with this map until Thursday --

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YORK: -- until we hear that report. So that's kind of where my head is at.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We can certainly do another legal review of VRA compliance, you know. That -- that's appropriate.

But, colleagues, any other substantive changes or suggestions before Thursday?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner Lerner.

Just as a -- oh. I'm sorry, Doug -- Doug Johnson,

did you have something?

1.3

MR. D. JOHNSON: Just on the voting age front, I was just going to ask if the Commission is comfortable as Legal reviews the numbers and if we do come up with a theory of something that might make the map more defensible, would the Commission be comfortable if we draw that today or tomorrow and bring it to you on Thursday instead of waiting to get direction on Thursday?

MR. HERRERA: Commission -- Chairwoman?
CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

MR. B. JOHNSON: Can I just make a comment real quick? I just want to clear the record and make sure there's no misunderstanding. That VRA data for which the Commission is going to be analyzing for CD-3, CD-7, whatever legislative district, will be coming from Timmons as well as Lisa Handley who is part of NDC.

Of course the Commission, at any time, can ask for clarification or legal guidance on that, but I didn't want

any -- anybody in the public to misunderstand there was a legal analysis that was outside of the scope.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct. We are seeking -- ongoing we have been seeking legal advice based on the data provided to us from Timmons/NDC.

I'm in -- I'm in favor of that, Doug. And, in fact, I mean, I wouldn't mind, you know, if we took a look a look at the letter from -- from the mayor of Tucson, I could take a look at some of the ideas, and if there are some ideas from the mayor of Tucson that are somewhat compatible or fit in with some of Commissioner Lerner's ideas -- you know, I don't feel the need to blow this map up and we do have a lot of changes, but if there's a way to fine tune it before the close of day Thursday, I find that to be attractive.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman Neuberg, if we were going to make any changes in Southern Arizona I would want to give some opinions, and so I would either like to sort of not do that or know that we're doing it and then I would speak up.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is it --

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What about what Doug asks, though, as it relates to the majority-minority?

COMMISSIONER MEHL: In District 3 I will leave -- leave that one to Commissioner York.

COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm in favor of looking at that if there's some way to make that more compliant.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

1.3

COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner Lerner.

I actually think that, because the Mayor's letter came in while we're still having these discussions, we should take a look at it while we're still deliberating at this point. It may be that we can't include everything, there may be some things that are little bit different than what we were thinking; but I think there's some things maybe there may be overlap between what Commissioner Mehl and I had proposed as well already, so it might be that we're already somewhat aligned with a lot of those things.

So I think on Thursday we should take a look at it.

I -- I looked at it very briefly this morning, the letter,
but I did not have time to study it to see how it compares
to both what I was suggesting as well as what Commissioner
Mehl has suggested.

But I -- I think it came in in time for us. I think it's worth us taking a look at.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Just as a clarification,

Commissioner Lerner. Her only letter only dealt with -- at

least on my quick reading, it only dealt with the

congressional districts.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MEHL: It did not deal with the LDs.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Ah.

1.3

COMMISSIONER MEHL: So that's why I was saying what I was saying.

COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and my concern is it was only -- I think we received it ten minutes before we started the call this morning, so we need some time to review it. I have no problem looking at it on Thursday or considering her suggestions on Thursday.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: That would be great. That's all -- and I -- I would agree, then. I had not taken a close enough look at it so I appreciate that clarification on that, but I think it's worth taking a look on Thursday because it might just be tweaking some boundaries here and there that -- and it relates to some of the -- the maps that have been submitted as well.

So if we can do that, that will be great.

COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: As far as the congressional -- and I -- and I know, Commissioner York, you need to head out, so I don't want -- my suggestion is that I do have a couple of thoughts, but to keep us moving today, if -- if it would be okay, my suggestions on -- and I tell you up front so, Commissioner York, you can always take a look in advance of that area.

But I was kind of looking at ideas of adding

Sunnyslope in the North Mountain Preserve into District 1,

and then we -- and we can talk about this more in detail on

Thursday; Cave Creek, Carefree, New River, Anthem, that

area, into District 8.

And because I think Sunnyslope and North Mountain areas are more aligned for District 1.

But, Commissioner York, for the sake of time, would it be okay for us to have that discussion then on Thursday where we take a little bit closer look at that, look at the -- some of the school districts, population changes, and all of that?

COMMISSIONER YORK: Sure.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just to give you an overview, that's kind of what I was looking at for just that one area as part of that.

But respecting your time, I don't want to...

COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I -- yeah, and we can look at that on Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And that sounds like that -those are small enough adjustments that we could -- well,
you know, I'm speaking for Mapping. I'm presuming that's
small enough adjustments we can do that in somewhat of a
timely way.

COMMISSIONER YORK: It's a big chunk of population

1.3

1 is the problem. 2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. 3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, I would then suggest that on Thursday, we quickly dive into the 4 5 congressional map first. 6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. 7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So that Mapping might would 8 have a chance to make some adjustments during the day; and 9 then with the LD maps hopefully we're picking between one of the three to move forward with and not making further 10 I think that would then work out well, and we 11 adjustments. 12 can still be timely on Thursday. 1.3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would just like to have 14 people have appropriate expectations. I expect that when we adopt a map and we vote on an 15 16 LD map, I expect that there's going to be ongoing 17 deliberation. 18 I have a --19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That's --20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Look, if we -- if we have a 21 5-0 vote on one of those three options to start with, we're 22 done. 23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. 24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If we don't, we're going to 25 be deliberating a while.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just one other quick spot 2 3 just to try to expedite. And, again, I'm trying to respect Commissioner York, but I could -- I could give the changes, 4 5 the proposed changes, so that they have it in advance on 6 Thursday for us to look at? 7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. All -- all 8 recommendations to Mapping must be done in public. 9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okav. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No -- no private 10 11 instructions. 12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I understand that. I 1.3 could do that now that I've given Commissioner York sort of 14 the overview, I just wanted to -- I could give specific ones 15 today so that he knows what I was -- I just wanted him to be 16 aware of sort of what I -- the direction. 17 But, otherwise, I can do it more specifically on 18 Thursday. Whatever is best. 19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thursday. 21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we have a great plan, 22 I think we're setting ourselves up for success on Thursday, 23 and we're really close. 24 And I -- I just really want to thank my colleagues.

I mean, your -- your knowledge, your command of everything

```
that we're learning, it's -- you're doing an amazing job and
 1
         you're doing it in a collegial way and remarkably with
 2
 3
         remarkable good faith.
                  So I'm really excited for Thursday and -- and even
 4
 5
         more excited for what comes after that with, you know, a
 6
         whole new learning session, so.
 7
                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Thank you,
 8
         Commissioner Neuberg. I am going to bow out.
 9
                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:
                                        Thank you. Please note for
10
         the --
11
                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:
                                        Thank you.
12
                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- minutes that
1.3
         Commissioner York is leaving at 9:06.
14
                  Thanks for the accommodation, Commissioner York.
15
                  (Whereupon Commissioner York exits the meeting at
16
         9:06 a.m.)
17
                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:
                                         See you, Doug.
18
                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: Bye.
19
                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Safe travels.
                  Okay. Anything else, colleagues on Agenda
20
         Item No. VI?
21
22
                  Okay.
23
                  MR. FLAHAN: So just to confirm on congressional,
24
         there's no changes unless we need to make changes to
25
         District 3 for VRA compliance; is that correct, for
```

Thursday?

1.3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. Doug mentioned that -- that, you know, based on the data, there may be some ideas that he'd like to show us as it relates to honoring the VRA or just communities of interest, you know, our minorities communities of interest, and I'm very open minded to looking at that.

MR. FLAHAN: Gotcha.

Also, Brian has the redistricting system up. You will see two new columns that are in the table, G_AINH18, and G_AINH18_P, and that was the non-Hispanic/Native American single race VAP that was shown in the demographics, that new piece that was requested by Vice Chair Watchman.

So that is now found in the AZ standard demographics as the last column. You can turn on or turn off in any of the submitted maps. So that's where you can find that data in the redistricting system.

And I believe you're up to over 140 submitted maps.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: How -- how are -- how is our public response compared to other states around the nation?

How is our state engaging?

MR. FLAHAN: I have not checked the numbers lately, but I would say you possibly surpass other states.

But I can check the numbers, and I can let you know on Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We're keeping you busy, I think.

MR. FLAHAN: Yes, with all the changes and all the draft maps, yes. We've been gearing all of our focus to that and making sure that that's working.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we have a very active, engaged state and we're a very proud of everybody.

All right.

1.3

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chair Neuberg?

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have a comment. I don't know whether it's better to take it today, it's not requesting a specific change at this point for the congressional. I could make -- it's just sort of making a comment about -- sort of maybe setting the stage for the public to kind of be thinking about some things.

Do you think it would be better to do things on

Thursday as we completely finish our deliberations for each

of the maps? It might be a good context.

But it's a concern I have about one of the districts, but I'm not going to be requesting any changes to it at this time because I think we need to hear from the public on it.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, maybe -- if there's something you want to share, please share now. Otherwise, I

do think it may be appropriate when -- when we vote.

We're all going to vote and none of us are going to perfectly like the map. I mean, there's going to be parts of the map that we don't agree with. And I think that we can have an affirmative vote as a sign of, you know, good faith of putting a draft that's consensus.

And, look, I mean, everybody will make their own choices on that vote, but people can clarify, you know, what they like and what they don't like and what they want to work on, because we'll have, you know, six more weeks of -- of delib- -- of essentially deliberations.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I'll hold off until Thursday, then. I think -- I think that's a good idea.

Thank you.

MR. FLAHAN: Brian, could you -- could you walk through how to provide feedback on the maps, that way the public can -- can have a good tutorial on that?

MR. KINGERY: Sure.

There's a couple of different places that you can do that. Right here on the "publish plans" page on this dashboard there is a link to provide feedback on any plan that has been published, whether it's congressional, legislative or a single-district submission.

If you click this "provide feedback" tab, what will happen is you will taking -- taken to a form and when you

click a specific "provide feedback for a plan," that data will be ported over so that you can -- so you don't have to type out the exact number of the plan that you would like to provide feedback on.

Once you're in the form, you can change, so you can change your -- change what you want to provide feedback on. So if it's a specific draft map, you can put in which version of congressional or legislative; or if you want to go all the way back to the approved grid maps, you can provide comment on either or both.

And then it's the same general questions that we asked on the initial listening tour about name, e-mail address, are you submitting on behalf of an organization, are you being paid to submit comments.

And this survey is accessible both in English and Spanish.

MR. FLAHAN: Thanks.

And you can also do that from the draft -- from the draft map page, correct?

MR. KINGERY: Correct.

So here we have the different series broken out.

Below each title is "provide feedback," so it will take that same information of that specific plan and put that into the survey to go ahead and give you a head start.

Also on the bottom of the published plans page is

1 the form, is the blank form also available -- it's the same form, just blank; and then also in the published plan viewer 2 3 you can click the bubble icon next to it, and that's just 4 simply another way to access it. 5 So we put it in a couple of different places for ease of access. 6 7 Thanks, Brian. MR. FLAHAN: 8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I would like to really 9 thank you. Every week you continue to make all of our --10 our links more user-friendly, all of the different mapping 11 tools, and they're just constant improvement and ease of 12 use. So, thank you. 1.3 Okay. 14 MR. FLAHAN: With that, that's all we've got from 15 the mapping side. 16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you so much. 17 And with that, we'll move to Agenda Item No. VII, 18 Executive Director's report and discussion thereof. 19 We have two items: Listening tour and budget 20 I turn it over to Brian and Lori. 21 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am 22 going to let Lori discuss the tour just briefly. 23 She'll be there in just a moment. MS. NEUMANN: 24 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Thank you.

25

MS. VAN HAREN: I'm so sorry, Madam Chair. I don't

know if you can hear me, my device disconnected for a second.

So I wanted to let everybody know we are going to announce the final list of all of the locations, dates, times and everything at the meeting first thing on Thursday morning at 9:30. And so if anybody has any questions, please let me know.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The only thing that I want to add is I know the public and the Commissioners are waiting anxious -- anxiously for us to lock in this days.

What we're finding -- or what I'm learning, I'm sure event planners already know this, is doing a tour like this is kind of like doing a map, it's all a ripple effect. And so one little change then ripples through all of the other calendars; and we are trying to take in as much of the community feedback about the locations and so I appreciate everybody's patience, it's just a lot of moving pieces to try to, you know, get it as right as we can.

So thank you staff for -- for continuing to stay on it to make it work as best as possible.

Anything on the budget?

DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Not today. We will have an updated budget for you on Thursday.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. You got it.

If there are no other questions, we can hold off

the conversations on these issues until Thursday maybe when our mapping team is busy working.

If nothing else, we'll move to Agenda Item
No. VIII, discussion of future agenda item requests.

One thing that I know that I've wanted to make sure it's on a future agenda item is I would like for us to be able to talk through plans for deliberation in December both, you know, method and specific dates. I have some ideas in mind about, you know, what works, what doesn't work, what would better work for me; we also, though, just have the realities of time constraints.

And so before we conclude today, I'm actually going to ask Commissioners to go through our calendar. But that's a topic that I'd like on a future agenda item.

Anything else from our colleagues?

COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, to amplify what you just said on that, I think that's an important topic; and for me, personally, it was difficult doing basically five days in a row, Friday and then four days, without having time to really take a step back and getting -- and being able to stare at revised maps.

I would like everyone to at least think about two days, a break, two days, a break, two days. May be six total days with a couple of breaks in there if we can make that work calendarwise, but I think we will be more

productive and -- and have less chance of a heart attack if we did it that way.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl, I'm cracking up because that's it literal -- I literally said to, you know, some of the broader team: Two days on, one day off, two days on.

I think we all understand that we get fried, the information is flying by us very fast; Particularly for me needing a little bit of time to be understanding where my colleagues are going with their visions. There's a practical issue with Mapping and, you know, they have to set up and they can't just disassemble and set up and disassemble and the length of time here; but we'll work it out.

Let's set up a time to, you know, robustly talk about it, but I think we are all on the same page, and I'd actually suggest that we try to find eight days of deliberation ending the 22nd, so that we know that we have the full amount of time and don't feel pressure. And if we don't use them, we don't use them.

COMMISSIONER LERNER: And this is Sher- -- this is Commissioner Lerner. I just want to say I'm completely on the same page as well, that was the same thought of giving us a little bit of time in between here and there to take a breath, take a look, and think about where things are.

Sometimes the urgency of the moment isn't always as accurate as what it could be if you could say: Oh, wait, you know what, that could be okay.

So, thank you.

1.3

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

Any other item -- agenda items you would --

VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I agree. This is Vice Chair Watchman. And if we have to do it on a weekend, two days on, one day off, that's fine, too. But December obviously is going to be short because of the holidays and so, you know, if we can run through it, I'm okay with that.

I did share with staff a couple days that I'm not available, but generally I think I'm available for most of December, so. We can run it even on weekends, I'm okay with that.

CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If you have your calendars open right now, we can run through it.

It's Agenda Item X, next meeting date. You know, we can look through the our calendars. You guys want to look at the schedules moving back from December 22nd?

Or would you rather, you know, submit your dates to staff?

COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, Commissioner York isn't here so that would be the only concern. But we could still pull together some dates and then provide him opportunities

1 to get his input as well. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Why don't we just if you have 2 3 your calendars ahead of you. Is everybody free the 20th, 21st, and 22nd? I know 4 5 that's three consecutive days, but hopefully the 22nd will be celebration. 6 7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm available those days. 8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm available all those days. 9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I as well; I'm open. 10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And I believe actually that York may be as well, I don't have his calendar. 11 12 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: I do have it and he is available 1.3 those days. 14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So that's three. 15 The previous week. 16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: My only issue is on the 17th, I 17 would need to leave about 3 o'clock; it's a Friday. 18 Otherwise, I'm available the whole week. VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think -- I'm not available 19 20 on the 13th and 14th and maybe half -- on the morning on the 15th. 21 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: And Commissioner York is not 22 23 available on the 15th. 24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay. 25 Okay. So it sounds like that CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:

1 week the 13th, 14th, 15th is out. So we have the 16th and the 17th up until 3:00 p.m.? 2 3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That would -- that would be 4 good. 5 The previous week? 6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the only thing on the 17th 7 is if we could start -- I know it would make a shorter day, 8 but I have a board meeting in the morning at 7:30. So if I 9 could at least attend half of that, if we could just start 10 at 8:30 that day just instead of 8:00; I can leave the 11 meeting early. 12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I can already tell working 1.3 backwards we're not going to have enough days and we may 14 need to look at weekends. 15 So let's look at the week of -- of the 6th. COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm available the whole day 16 17 the 17th, just starting -- if we can just start a half hour 18 later on that day that's all. 19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. 20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 8:30 to 3:00. That day is 21 still a pretty full day. 22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. 23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. 24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So we have five days 25 so far.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm available --VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I'm open the whole entire 2 3 week of December 6th. 4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The 10th is the only day I have 5 a major conflict. DIRECTOR SCHMITT: And Commissioner York isn't 6 7 available the 7th or 8th. 8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm -- all week. CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Either the 6th -- so it looks 9 10 like the 6th or 7th and the 9th. 11 DIRECTOR SCHMITT: Not the 7th; York isn't 12 available that day. 1.3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Well I think we found 14 dates: 6, 9, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22. 15 And -- and -- and we can talk with Mapping about 16 efficiency. You know, we start on the 6th, we may not leave until the 9th, maybe the 6th is virtual, it's just going to 17 18 be maybe like today, sharing the initial, you know, visions, 19 which will subsequently lead to major shakeup in the maps 20 we're presuming; so then it would lead to few solid days of 21 map drawing followed then by the 9th where we can come in 22 and physically deliberate. 23 We don't have to talk the details, but I think this 24 is at least a helpful start and we can continue to make sure

that this stays on the agenda so that we can further, you

know, discuss what works for us.

Okay.

1.3

Okay. No other agenda item requests it sounds like.

Agenda Item IX, announcements. We have our deliberation day on Thursday, we will be starting at 9:30, and we will be going until we have a draft map.

Oh. And then the other announcement is there is no plan at this point to have a business meeting next Tuesday. There's -- we don't anticipate additional business that we won't be able to address this Thursday, so your next Tuesday should be free.

Agenda Item No. X, next meeting date. Thursday deliberation, 9:30.

Which moves us to Agenda Item No. XI, closing of public comments.

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

And with that, we move to Item No. XII, adjournment.

1	I will open up a motion to adjourn.
2	COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner Lerner.
3	I would move to adjourn.
4	COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.
5	VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.
6	COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay. Anybody.
7	CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Vice Chair Watchman
8	seconds.
9	We'll take a vote.
10	Vice Chair Watchman.
11	VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.
12	CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.
13	COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.
14	CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.
15	COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.
16	CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
17	aye.
18	And with that, we will adjourn, and I look forward
19	to seeing you all on Thursday.
20	COMMISSIONER MEHL: Thank you.
21	CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Have a great couple days.
22	Thanks for your hard work, everybody.
23	(Whereupon the meeting concludes at 9:26 a.m.).
24	"This transcript represents an unofficial record. Please consult the accompanying video for the official
25	record of IRC proceedings."

1	$\underline{C} \ \underline{E} \ \underline{R} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{F} \ \underline{I} \ \underline{C} \ \underline{A} \ \underline{T} \ \underline{E}$
2	STATE OF ARIZONA)
3) ss. COUNTY OF MARICOPA)
4	BE IT KNOWN that the foregoing proceedings were
5	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
6	thereafter reduced to print under my direction.
7	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.
9	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the
10	requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 12th of November, 2021.
11	
12	Angela Furniss Miller, RPR, CR
13	CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50127)
14	* * *
	I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has
15	complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 12th of
16	November, 2021.
17	γ_{a}
18	Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
19	Arizona RRF No. R1058
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	