

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC MEETING

AFTERNOON SESSION

Phoenix, Arizona

October 28, 2021

1:16 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

I N D E XAGENDA ITEM:PAGE

ITEM NO. VI

78

EXECUTIVE SESSION

131

ITEM NO. VII

167

ITEM NO. VIII

168

ITEM NO. IX

169

ITEM NO. X

169

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, reconvenes at 1:16 p.m. on October
3 28, 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: Okay. We can get started
4 again back to our public hearing.

5 We are on Agenda Item No. VI, draft map decision
6 discussion. We are discussing legislative districts. I
7 believe we were on 9.2 which was the approved newest
8 iteration, and we have the ability to make some
9 modifications on this map if Commissioners would like to
10 give Mapping some direction, you may have a little bit of
11 data to share with us first.

12 MR. KINGERY: Yes, we do.

13 So during the last break I put the schematic
14 overlay onto the map and what this is showing is looking at
15 the number of Democratic votes symbolized as a percentage on
16 a red/blue scale. So it matches up: If it's red, it's more
17 Republic-leaning, blue more Democrat-leaning; and so, I
18 mean, ideally if the entire state was purple, that would be
19 50 percent competitive. So the task at hand was to look at
20 District 18 and 17 and see where the population could
21 potentially be balanced.

22 So I'll zoom in to that area and looking at the
23 Democrat-leaning census blocks of District 18, here you can
24 see that they're in the -- the central portion.

25 So if we were to look at that northern edge of --

1 the northern piece of District 18 or even some of the other
2 sections it's more in the purple, so it wouldn't bring the
3 spread closer to competitive. So with this it does give it
4 an odd shape.

5 If we targeted the -- the more bluer census blocks,
6 and you can see I used the proposed two-stage selection and
7 here's the change if this were to be committed.

8 So everything that's in this dark blue outline
9 would essentially move to D-17 and that's right now roughly
10 9,600 people with a competitive spread of 8.12, dropping it
11 from 9.8 I believe -- 9.9.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: So what you're seeing here is --
13 or showing is essentially the most we could do within the
14 number of people that we can -- we can move in just
15 balancing the two districts. Obviously, you know, we're not
16 looking at compactness, we're not looking at communities of
17 interest when -- when showing you this, we're just saying
18 what's -- what's the biggest increase in competitiveness we
19 could get and that's moving it from 9.8 to 8.1 with the
20 impact of almost splitting District 18 in half. What that
21 means is that we can get to 8.1 with this maximum approach;
22 if we took a more compact version, we would end up somewhere
23 between 8.1 and 9.9 depending on how far we went.

24 So we -- so we could get a couple tenths of a point
25 or get it down, you know, maybe to 8.9 or something that

1 wasn't so extreme looking, but that's as -- that's as far as
2 we can get within the -- the numbers that are available from
3 population balancing.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Given that this is just a
5 draft map it doesn't -- from my perspective it doesn't make
6 sense to invest too much time into something that's not
7 going to substantively change the overall conception of the
8 map.

9 I don't think that's going to solve Commissioner
10 Lerner's concerns.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you for checking into
12 that. Since -- since there's nothing that's going to
13 resolve that particular one, are -- can we look at one other
14 shift in thinking that doesn't relate to 17 and 18?

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Mm-hm.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if you recall in map 4.0,
17 which is the one I think I was just -- right? 4.0 is the
18 one I think I asked -- just asked about recently, if we're
19 talking about communities that aren't -- and we're concerned
20 about representation, we had a map and I know it had an odd
21 shape but it basically addressed the representation of
22 communities that often would not be represented, and that is
23 down at District 21 and 19.

24 This doesn't really significantly -- we're not
25 talking about major changes necessarily in Republican and

1 Democratic votes, that's not what we're looking at here.
2 We're looking at communities of interest, and the Latino
3 Coalition had proposed a map that had basically this arm
4 that extended along the border, recognizing the fact that
5 Douglas and Bisbee with their populations were more aligned
6 with District 21 than District 19.

7 The communities that are there are more aligned,
8 there's a connection in terms of communities of interest
9 that are there; and I'm proposing that in recognition of
10 those communities of interest we go back to taking a look at
11 combining those as they had been initially. Those were
12 border communities that have high Latino populations.
13 Placing them in District 19 as it's currently configured
14 would disenfranchise them from that, they would not have a
15 voice, so it would provide them with that opportunity of
16 common interests. It was part of the Coalition's initial
17 map that they put together because of those connections for
18 that. So it would basically prevent their
19 disenfranchisement; and then adjustments could probably be
20 made for Cochise County for District 19 that could pick up
21 some things in the -- for the population balance. I don't
22 have those specific, but we could probably figure that out
23 on how we would balance that.

24 But we've been talking about disenfranchisement of
25 groups and I see this as a way to provide those people with

1 a voice that if they are in District 19 they would not have.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Just roughly is there -- I mean
3 District 21 is already long.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: We're checking that right now.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I don't know the exact
6 population for that, but it -- it goes back to just what
7 we've been talking about.

8 MR. KINGERY: District 21 is currently 10,000 over
9 in 9.2.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct. How much -- what's
11 the population if we add the suggestion to 9.2?

12 Because 19 is currently short.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, it -- the system is giving
14 us a little bit of trouble, but it may be around 20,000.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: All right. So that means it's
16 going to be along 30.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could District 19 pick up --
18 looking back in here.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: The problem is 19 is already
20 short.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: District 19 potentially could
22 pick up Vail as part of the population -- I'm just kind of
23 scrolling through.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, could it go up -- could
25 it go up into 7? I don't know.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we need to keep it kind of
2 internally contained; otherwise, we're going to get up --
3 end up back in Coolidge -- trying to draw things up.

4 But 19 could -- either 17 or 19 could go -- you
5 know, as you're saying, 19 could go into 17 and then 17 go
6 into the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base area again, or 19
7 could go straight into Davis-Monthan Air Force Base area to
8 balance it.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could -- oh, sorry.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Of those two it would be better
11 to have 19 go back up into Davis-Monthan if that's what's
12 needed, and then you could -- there's enough population
13 there that you can make it be whatever you needed to be.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, as long as it's -- it
15 depends on the communities that it's picking up that's
16 around there, we won't -- we -- there are some communities
17 in there, communities of interest around Davis-Monthan, that
18 we may not want to move out of there.

19 But couldn't -- I don't -- where is District 17 in
20 terms of -- I'm trying to see population right now.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's -- sorry.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's -- District 17 is a
23 little low, right?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: So we have a more refined number
25 here.

1 The -- the -- the piece past Sierra Vista is 27,000
2 people, so.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is the original map that
4 the Coalition put together, right?

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think what's happened is
7 that since they put that in there things have been modified
8 a little bit here and there, right, so that's why it's now
9 maybe out of balance in terms of population?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, a lot has changed obviously.
11 Santa Cruz County is divided, being a big one.

12 So -- so the part from the neck south of
13 Sierra Vista to the east, that's going to be 27,000 people,
14 and then there's going to be more on the other side that
15 would need to be balanced.

16 Okay.

17 So Mark is just saying that the whole Cochise
18 County piece is 27,618 and then there's -- I think that
19 eastern Santa Cruz is pretty sparsely populated, so we're
20 somewhere around 27- -- 29,000 people.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if we took and -- so 21
22 would be overpopulated by how much by adding that in?

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: 21 is currently over by nine --
24 by -- am I on the right map? Around 10,000, am I getting
25 that right?

1 Yeah. By 10,000 so it would be over by 30 thou- --
2 almost 40 -- 37,000. So we have to pick up 37,000 people
3 somewhere out of -- out of 21 and into -- either directly
4 into 19 or into some combination of 18, 17, and 19.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well and that's what I would
6 be suggesting would be taking a look at 17, 18, and 19 to
7 see what we could do to balance that as part of it.

8 I'm -- I'm basically trying to address the fact
9 that we've removed that, but those are really strong
10 communities of interest and they will not have a voice in
11 the current District 19 as part of it.

12 So if we can find a way to balance that, I know
13 that there's an interest in keeping Tanque Verde in
14 District 17, but if we shifted that a little bit, I -- I
15 don't have really complete specific ideas on how -- I mean,
16 moving districts -- moving things over a little bit as part
17 of it.

18 I guess maybe I'd like to see if you could come up
19 with an iteration as part of that. We could potentially
20 move some things from 21 into -- wait, where's 23, how's
21 their numbers? They're down a little bit but not a lot,
22 right?

23 I'm trying to look at the districts that are a
24 little low.

25 MR. KINGERY: Short 2,500.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That doesn't take care of
2 21,000.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But, you know, there may be
5 some ways to move thing -- some things around, and I guess I
6 would like the feedback on whether or not a move like this
7 is possible from the other Commissioners in terms of
8 addressing these communities of interest because that's part
9 of what we're looking at here is getting -- making sure that
10 those communities which are in the current iteration would
11 really feel somewhat isolated because that district is a --
12 currently District 19 is a 19 percent spread.

13 So if we can get them to where those -- they have a
14 voice, which was what was the intent of the Coalition,
15 that's what I'm asking for here.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I appreciate the voice. One of
17 our guidelines is compactness and that doesn't strike me as
18 a compact district but the -- the only thoughts I had,
19 Commissioner Lerner, around this is that maybe there's some
20 thoughts when we go out to the community after we accept
21 draft maps that can help us with this, because 37,000
22 population swing in southern Arizona is going to be a lot of
23 movement and -- which would make it difficult to maybe --
24 right now 21 performs, I believe, as a -- as a
25 minority-majority, and so I'd argue to sort of leave it

1 as-is and then go to market and see if there's any other
2 thoughts in the communities.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think in the final draft map
4 stage, looking at that and moving 19 up into the
5 Davis-Monthan area is something that I'm certainly willing
6 to look at.

7 But I -- I wouldn't want to -- I won't change my
8 mind at the Tanque Verde area, it belongs with 17. But
9 going -- having 19 go up into the Davis-Monthan area in
10 order to accomplish what you're trying to do is something
11 that I would certainly -- I think we would all be willing to
12 take a look at. But it's going to be complicated to try to
13 figure that out correctly today and I'd rather get some
14 testimony before we tried to make that change.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let's ask Mapping first,
16 though, before we -- we draw that conclusion.

17 The changes that Commissioner Mehl --
18 Commissioner Lerner, you know, are -- she's getting at, is
19 this something that's doable within a shorter period of time
20 or do you need like a day?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, if it's a straight trade
22 between the two districts of -- of Davis-Monthan for
23 Douglas-Tombstone, that's definitely faster than working it
24 through two or three other districts.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let me ask Commissioner

1 Lerner how important some of these changes are to you; and,
2 given time constraints, are there a few, you know, priority
3 issues you'd like to see we could get in before we do an
4 alternate vote today?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is -- to me this is
6 speaking to the same issues we just spoke about, and so
7 it's -- it's important to me to address that.

8 And it's an important change as far as I'm
9 concerned. When we speak about compactness that we just
10 heard as a point, I will still say that I feel -- I know
11 we've voted on it, I'm not going back to it other than to
12 say I feel the previous iteration of District 17 was more
13 compact.

14 So I don't want to use that in this particular
15 case. I recognize here what we're doing is linking
16 communities of interest that I think are very important and
17 were separated out early on. We're looking at a few
18 communities in that area that are very aligned. If there's
19 a way for Mapping to play around a little bit with this this
20 afternoon, I would appreciate that while we're talking about
21 the congressional.

22 I do not want to wait and see whether we negotiate
23 this later by approving 9.2 without making every effort to
24 see if we could do this for District 21.

25 I think there's a few things that can be done. I

1 know this is where the compromises try to come in, and I'm
2 all for that, but we already know now that there's a line
3 being drawn about Tanque Verde not being out of District 17,
4 which could actually be a way to modify this.

5 Perhaps something in District 23 could be adjusted
6 as well.

7 There's -- there's border areas moving, as I
8 mentioned maybe Vail over into that area; there might be
9 some -- some areas.

10 We are only talking about -- we don't need to go
11 all the way up to Tombstone so it doesn't need to be that
12 far up, so that might help in terms of population. We were
13 looking really more down towards the border over to
14 Douglas -- let me just keep scrolling here -- and Bisbee, we
15 weren't going as far north as -- sorry -- Tombstone, so if
16 that might help a little bit with population.

17 If we went back to the original map that they
18 presented, did that include Tombstone because I didn't think
19 it did.

20 MR. FLAHAN: No, it did not. It just fell a little
21 north of the district.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So I would appreciate
23 it if we could sort of see what you-all could propose before
24 we do a final vote.

25 MR. FLAHAN: So I think we could do it, I think it

1 would take probably two hours or less to get done.

2 The -- to add that -- that tail down there that has
3 Bisbee and everything, the idea would be then to take the
4 population gain that 21 is going to get and take it away in
5 the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base area and add that to 19 to
6 do population balancing. That would be the most
7 straightforward way of changing population between those two
8 districts.

9 The second question that I would ask for some
10 clarification on is in the 4.0 map you can see that all
11 Santa Cruz County is whole, in one piece, and in the 9.2,
12 Santa Cruz County is divided. So the question that I would
13 like some clarification on: Are you thinking of also adding
14 all of Santa Cruz County or are you thinking about having a
15 small, narrow spot along the border to get to that other
16 piece in Bisbee and Douglas?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would encourage you to do the
18 narrow across the border because eastern Santa Cruz really
19 wants to be part of Cochise.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm -- I'm not so sure about
21 that.

22 Santa Cruz, I mean do we need to be splitting
23 Santa Cruz? I think that there was a reason that the
24 Coalition proposed all of Santa Cruz in there.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there's -- I mean,

1 there's some mountains along the southern border there and a
2 valley along down 19, Highway 19, and then there's another
3 mountain range. Sierra Vista sits in a little pocket which
4 kind of goes over there to the Santa Cruz area, so I would
5 argue that natural divide is that mountain range to the
6 north and to the south, so I still think that finger along
7 the bottom works better and that's just how I see that
8 geography fall.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Get the Patagonia wine area,
11 which seems to me resonates more with -- with that northern
12 Cochise area.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So again I'm going to go a
14 little bit with irony here because that's exactly what I was
15 talking about with 17, right? That we were talking about
16 the Catalina Mountains as being a divide similar to what we
17 see in Phoenix with South Mountains and similar here. So
18 I -- I feel like I would love to be consistent with our
19 deliberations in terms of that and -- and as consistent as
20 we can be, I realize we sometimes have to make adjustments.

21 But if we are looking at a mountain range there
22 that's dividing it, that is -- was exactly my point -- one
23 of my points about District 17 and 18 and what was happening
24 with that was the mountain range and, yet, that we approved
25 to go around it.

1 So the original Coalition map may be not messing
2 with the northern part, but if you took a look at the
3 original Coalition map for these districts -- these other
4 districts, could you see how that could be balanced knowing
5 that? Even though I would like to see 17 adjusted, we have
6 I think said that at least for now we're keeping it as it is
7 in 9.2.

8 But there may be room for adjustments based on what
9 the Coalition submitted in 20, 21, 18, and 23 to make
10 some -- some adjustments.

11 23 in particular might have some -- some
12 opportunity. But I -- I don't -- I want to be consistent
13 here. If we're going to say there's a mountain range, then
14 let's go back and rehash what we did before which I don't
15 think we want to do.

16 So my preference would be to take a look at what
17 they produced and hope that we can find that balance of
18 population to the extent that we can and ask Mapping to work
19 on that.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: The challenge is the -- the
21 northern piece of 4.0 with 17 and 18 and 20 and 23 is -- is
22 completely -- completely different from what we're looking
23 at now.

24 So 21 has -- has both the Douglas and Bisbee area
25 and the Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and actually Green

1 Valley and all that, you can see on the left there in 21.

2 And Tanque Verde is actually in 19 in this map.

3 So -- so I think the Douglas-Bisbee piece we can
4 integrate into this map; the -- the challenge is where do we
5 balance it and -- and, you know, within the -- the larger
6 structure of the map?

7 The -- the Davis-Monthan or as -- as you mentioned,
8 19 could go into Vail and east Tucson and then push, you
9 know -- push through there and then something else -- and 18
10 would pick up Davis-Monthan or something like that, or 19
11 could pick up Davis-Monthan.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So -- so 19 could pick -- I'm
13 just, like, pulling up -- which one is -- so the left is the
14 one that we're looking at, that modification?

15 MR. FLAHAN: On the screen there, the left side is
16 4.0 and the right side is 9.2.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

18 So if you picked up Davis-Monthan into 19, that's
19 what you're talking about?

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Davis-Monthan and, you
21 know, however many of the neighborhoods right around it we
22 need to get to the number; there are a lot of people in
23 there.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And where is 17 in terms of
25 population right now?

1 MR. FLAHAN: 17 in 9.2 is currently -- yeah, 7931
2 under. So 7,931 people under the target.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

4 So we could move -- so that -- so that needs to get
5 some population from somewhere as well, right? And that was
6 going to be the case either way.

7 It's kind of hard to...

8 I think moving Vail as I think I mentioned -- I'm
9 trying to find it again -- looking at Davis-Monthan and
10 taking a look at what you could produce would be helpful
11 from my perspective; you'd have to pick up something if you
12 take Vail out of D-17 into D-19, but there's probably
13 flexibility in that.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We have significant input from
15 Vail that they would prefer to be part of the Tanque Verde
16 Valley and not Cochise.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner Mehl, I respect
18 that but I'm trying to address communities of interest as
19 well and find that population, and at this point it seems
20 like there's no flexibility on District 17 on the way it's
21 now been drawn and I'm trying to be as flexible as possible
22 by bringing up certain areas.

23 We heard considerable amount from Casas Adobes
24 wanting to be with Oro Valley but we have chosen not to
25 address that, we've chosen to ignore that.

1 So somewhere we have to make a compromise on
2 communities, and from my perspective Casa Adobes and
3 Oro Valley were a natural fit; they are now in a different
4 district, so I'm trying to find some compromise here and if
5 every suggestion is going to be "we can't do that," then I
6 don't see where we can move forward.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have a question. Are we
8 moving forward towards compromise?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's my goal. But, you
10 know, if I make a suggestion --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And so if the Commission
12 continues to deliberate and make fine-tune adjustments
13 with -- with the reality of this map, 9.2, with these small
14 adjustments, do you think you can find yourself by the end
15 of the day supporting this map?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- that's -- that's my
17 goal.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And I am supportive
19 of -- of trying to get to this goal and I would like my
20 Commissioners to really work hard together for us to get to
21 this goal. It's not going to be a perfect draft map, not
22 everything's going to make sense, we can fix things, but
23 there's a higher value in the five of us being able to agree
24 on a draft so that when we go out in the public and ask in
25 good faith that they understand this is a draft and we're

1 using it as a means to gather feedback, that we have
2 credibility and that we ask everybody to be open-minded
3 because all of these things may well change.

4 Personally, I'm not sold on much of anything yet.
5 I can be convinced to go many different ways. The goal,
6 though, is not to come up with the most perfect map today;
7 the goal is to come up with a reasonable map that is the
8 best that we were able to do the first time around when we
9 didn't really understand as much as we do now the process,
10 and to give us a chance to then go for another month, learn,
11 and come back in good faith and start all over with -- with
12 big changes if you want.

13 But -- but my goal today, my deepest goal, if it's
14 possible, is to find compromise between my two colleagues on
15 the right, my two colleagues on the left.

16 I am putting some of my, you know, desires aside
17 for the sake of compromise, that's my goal today. So
18 Commissioner Lerner, if you can provide a few, you know,
19 guiding directions that Mapping can try to incorporate, it
20 moves it in a better direction, maybe not a perfect
21 direction, I -- I hope maybe we can come and rally around
22 that.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just going to do this
24 instead.

25 Appreciate that. Thank you, Chairwoman.

1 My goal is, because this was not a map that I
2 was -- I am supportive of, I'm trying to find this
3 compromise where I can support it. So I think going back to
4 that arm that we're talking about, I would love to see some
5 flexibility on what can be -- what can be moved around.

6 I know -- I have a suggestion that I know will
7 probably not be welcome, but one population -- one
8 population shift -- and -- and I really do think Mapping can
9 kind of take a look at some of this as well and maybe if I
10 throw out some ideas, maybe what you could do would be to
11 run a few and see what might work as part of that.

12 For a population piece, if we took -- and this --
13 I'm just trying to -- I'm trying to get close here.

14 If we took east Tucson and -- let me finish before
15 anybody objects to this line of thought, okay?

16 If we moved Casas Adobes back up into 17 and --
17 with Oro Valley and moved Tanque Verde and east Tucson
18 together into 18 as part of that shift, it would still have
19 a strong -- there -- the competitiveness would still be in
20 our large range, I think it would be closer to six, not --
21 it's now at ten -- almost ten, but it would still be a very
22 strong district in the way that it is leaning at this point.

23 So the other alternative would be to take
24 Casas Adobes and if Tanque Verde needs to stay where it is,
25 take Tanque Verde and swap it with the Foothills -- Catalina

1 Foothills in some way, do some adjustments in those areas.

2 I think that we'll still keep what some of the
3 intention of Commissioner Mehl's desire for this district to
4 be; it keeps communities who are neighboring communities
5 together, it would unite -- and it would not -- it would not
6 significantly shift in some of the things that we have
7 talked about in those areas but it would help us make
8 District 21 balance the population there a little bit as
9 part of it.

10 And prevent the disenfranchisement of some of those
11 communities as we've been talking about.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Of these ideas, Commissioner
13 Mehl, are there some that, you know, cross a red line or are
14 you comfortable with, you know, moving forward? Do you find
15 that -- that you might be able to see compromise with the
16 vision Lerner is presenting?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Frankly, I'm confused what
18 she's presenting.

19 I thought we were dealing with Douglas and trying
20 to move it into 21 and 19 up into Davis-Monthan, and it was
21 a disagreement on including Vail or not including Vail into
22 19; and even though I don't like it, I certainly would
23 consider that.

24 But when she -- when you leap back into
25 Casas Adobes and moving Tanque Verde out, now we're trying

1 to go back to 9.0 and that I do not understand going
2 backwards there.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was for population, not
4 for anything else at this point. I was just looking at
5 population. So I was throwing out those ideas for Mapping
6 really to see where they could balance the population. I'm
7 not trying to go back --

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If you take 17 -- if you take
9 Vail out of 17, 18 is overpopulated; that -- that same area
10 we looked at in the north part of 18 that pops up into Oro
11 Valley, you could get population there to balance taking
12 Vail out and I would be okay with that. I don't like it but
13 I would be okay with it.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So -- so let's give
15 that a shot.

16 I mean, I don't know if this is so confusing to you
17 now but -- but I would -- I would -- I would appreciate it
18 if you could come back with a couple of different ideas,
19 knowing that our goal is to align those communities; and I'm
20 open to different avenues to get there.

21 I do think that Santa Cruz County needs to be whole
22 and I would like to see that piece, that map, District 21,
23 with Santa Cruz County whole going across the bottom; and
24 then I'm open to the Davis-Monthan idea, to Vail -- I'm open
25 to some ideas that you might have on the population

1 balancing piece.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner, you
3 mentioned -- your second mention you mentioned earlier
4 mentioned something about the Foothills and we didn't catch
5 that.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, it was actually part of
7 the whole picture of trying to move some population from
8 District 17 into 19 and -- and trying to -- basically trying
9 to get the population all aligned, so I was trying to see if
10 we could move some shifting of Catalina Foothills and Casas
11 Adobes, Tanque Verde, all of that together, because I feel
12 like that would be a way to make some moves for the
13 population, but I'm not sure that that's going to work
14 because Commissioner Mehl is -- is not going to want to
15 revisit that at this time.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So -- so the direction if
17 I'm understanding it correctly is to look at kind of taking
18 the Vail, kind of southern piece of District 17 into 19
19 to -- to balance out from the change in Douglas and Bisbee;
20 and then 17 would be short, so 17 could pick up a -- a bit
21 from that north part of Casas Adobes that was discussed over
22 above -- over 10 I think was the street; and otherwise --
23 and then D-17 can make up anything else needed by going into
24 Davis-Monthan area.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And it's, you know --

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And then D-18 could -- no, on
2 the -- there's two -- two things. On the first one, 19 goes
3 into 17 I think and then 17 goes into Casas Adobes and
4 Davis-Monthan, and 18 would have to push a little bit into
5 the top part of 21 to balance out the Casas Adobes.

6 And then the second -- the second option would be:
7 Don't involve 17 and 18, just 19 into Davis-Monthan
8 directly. Is that -- am I understanding that correctly?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I'd like to see a
10 couple of options if you can because I don't know exactly
11 what's going to work out best. So you have two options you
12 just presented there much better than I, so if we -- if you
13 can produce both of those, I would appreciate it so we can
14 take a closer look at that and see how that works.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that sounds like a
16 plan.

17 It sounds like we'll have the opportunity to
18 compare 9.2 against a couple of different visions from
19 Commissioner Lerner and either have the opportunity to vote
20 on one of those maps; or if it's super simple, combine a
21 couple of ideas and reach some kind of consensus or
22 resolution next review.

23 And anything else on the LDs before we switch to
24 the CD?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Were we going to look at

1 Maricopa County or not?

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm just mindful of time. I
3 don't know if there are firm drop-dead deadlines with any
4 Commissioners. I mean, I -- I'm planning to be here until
5 we -- we get votes.

6 Okay. So what is it that you're asking for,
7 Commissioner Lerner?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I was just wondering --

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You want to look into
10 Maricopa County?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just...

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to be sensitive
13 that we're giving Mapping the right amount of work such that
14 they're capable of -- of delivering maps to us in a timely
15 way.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Of course.

17 Let me just take a -- if I can just take a moment
18 to take a quick look and see if it's worth taking the time.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, again, I want to say,
20 you know, I'm making mental notes of areas of the map that I
21 don't like that I don't think work and I'm putting them in a
22 notebook for the next time around because it's just, you
23 know, we're not going to be able to fix all of these things.
24 But I encourage my colleagues to do as well, just make
25 mental notes of: You know what, at the end map I can't go

1 with that and -- and write it down.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I had one area between but
3 it -- it may be a lot to do in this -- and this is something
4 we -- I talked about before, so I'm going to see if -- if it
5 does take -- if it takes too long for Mapping we may have to
6 hold it but I'm going to make the suggestion and see if that
7 works.

8 Because this is one I raised earlier and we never
9 got to it as part of it and this would be the only other
10 thing I would -- I would suggest today as a final note.

11 So we had talked at one point, if you recall, about
12 District 2 and moving it south to Northern Avenue and
13 putting Sunnyslope with the district -- just in terms of
14 alignment with the district that is northwest of the Phoenix
15 Mountain Preserve, just to align those. So District 2 would
16 shift slightly south to Northern Avenue, that would take in
17 that preserve, and we've actually gotten some things from
18 those -- that community asking for that.

19 And then that could be balanced, that little shift
20 there, that could be balanced by pushing District 1 a little
21 bit east into Papago Park -- I'm just pulling this down --
22 and I think from a population standpoint or from a --
23 District 8 could go all the way -- well, not very far --
24 District 8 already does, where District 8 is going into
25 District 4, it could go up to Indian Bend. Just a little

1 bit of a change. I'm just thinking population-wise these
2 are some changes, and District 4 to 16th Street.

3 So just as those three but the goal really was
4 to -- and this is what I had talked about I think last week,
5 the same change that we -- we put aside at the time is just
6 moving District 2 south.

7 You see where it kind of comes up like it does and
8 that helps put Sunnyslope with the district in that area and
9 then balancing that out between District 1, 8, and 4 --
10 balancing the population. So District 1 east to
11 Papago Park, District 8 north to Indian Bend, and District 4
12 West to 16th Street, and that would be the only other thing
13 I would suggest.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: So --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I was going to ask
16 Commissioner York what your feedback was.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I mean, that's -- that's
18 pretty aggressive. But my -- my feeling is I would push,
19 Commissioner, District 4 north up to the canal; I would
20 include the entire population -- entire boundaries of
21 Paradise Valley, which Lincoln Road runs over to the bottom
22 of the Phoenix Mountain Preserve; and then I would push
23 District 4 over to the 101 loop probably at Indian Bend or
24 we could go as far south as Camelback.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not sure what that does

1 in terms of --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it moves 8 into that
3 basically south of the canal up to Camelback. You could
4 take District 1 over to the Papago Park and part of that
5 lower Arcadia, 32nd Street, 16th Street neighborhood south
6 of the canal.

7 The concern there is there's just such a large
8 population move. The -- because the other argument could be
9 made that the Sunnyslope district needs to stay with central
10 corridor because that's the way those -- those communities
11 work as far as up and down the Central Avenue corridor; and
12 so my argument for all of this is that there's this area in
13 the middle of Maricopa County between District 11, 24, 1, 4,
14 and 8 that needs to be jostled a little bit and that maybe
15 we should go out and ask the people in Maricopa County what
16 their thoughts are regarding this map, because I -- I have a
17 pretty strong belief that 4 needs to move north, Paradise
18 Valley needs to be with McCormack Ranch and Scottsdale --
19 North Scottsdale to the 101 on the north boundary and that's
20 more people to move around.

21 And so I -- I don't know how we accomplish your
22 goal of just moving Sunnyslope south because I don't believe
23 that maybe that neighborhood goes together with Papago Park.

24 Now, I do think that Papago Park area does go well
25 in District 8 as it currently is, and so my -- my opinion,

1 Commissioner Lerner, is that it would be better served if we
2 went to market and found out where we -- those streets
3 should specifically be as opposed to just sort of
4 generalities.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We have -- we have some
6 overpopulation in there. I was looking at this and that's
7 part --

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, D-1 and D-2 are
9 overpopulated.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. And so is District 11
11 and that's part of why moving south actually helps that --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: D-8 is overpopulated as well.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's part of why I was
14 recommending moving things south is because of that --
15 there's a big overpopulation in 11 of 9,700.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: But D-2 is overpopulated as
17 well. So we move D-2 south, we pick up more population; we
18 take it from D-1, then we move D-1 east and pick up more
19 population; but, you know, so it's -- it's -- it is...

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If a lot of these headed
21 south not in other directions, they would take care of some
22 of the overpopulation that exists on a lot of these
23 districts.

24 11, 24 -- I mean, some of these -- there's --
25 there's overpopulation of a thousand here and there, but the

1 ones that I'm -- I'm thinking of are much higher numbers
2 than that.

3 11 has almost 10,000 people over, so you move it --
4 you move things south a little bit into that and that will
5 help some of that population.

6 24, 26 --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the "things"?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- also overpopulated.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Move D-1 into 11?

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, some of it is moving
11 D-1 -- that -- that's taking some of D-1 and that's part of
12 moving it east a little bit as well as it will go a little
13 bit south.

14 D-8 goes to, like I mentioned, to Indian Bend; D-4
15 -- I mean, when you kind of make all of those adjustments it
16 should help some of the overpopulation.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't -- I don't think so.
18 Because I would argue that you need to put the corner of D-4
19 into D-1 as well as part of D-8.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: D-1 -- D-28 is underpopulated
21 by quite a bit, so kind of -- that's something where if
22 things shifted south a little bit with some of these that
23 might help.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: But D-9 -- D-29 is
25 overpopulated.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. D-9 is --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I was going to make that
3 switch in D-28 and D-29 once we get a little farther along.
4 We leave out of D-29 currently Westwood -- that's not what
5 it's called -- parts of Sun City and parts of -- there's
6 another community in those.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: In the -- on the west?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: On the west side that needs to
9 be included in 29; 29 is overpopulated currently right now,
10 that's in D-28. So I -- there's just -- these little
11 adjustments that I would agree with you need to be
12 fine-tuned. But if you look at the middle of the map where
13 D-1, D-4, D-8, and D-11 come together, that splits up three
14 or four different neighborhoods and if you remember the
15 Latino Coalition map, D-24 went across I-10, underneath D-1,
16 and D-1 was moved north to incorporate more of the mountain
17 reserve, and so there is some argument to maybe look at that
18 as well, that's in map CD-4.0, but...

19 So I don't know how we...

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There's a lot of other
21 adjustments that can be made and I was only doing this one.
22 I certainly can go into a lot more.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I remember correctly when we
24 moved the current map on the Sunnyslope district up, that
25 was about 12,000 people if I remember correctly.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I -- as part of this
2 readjustment I would like to see what happens with this
3 because --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- I'm not trying to fix the
6 entire map because in Maricopa County we have lots of things
7 that need to be adjusted so that's the kind of thing we can
8 leave until later, because we do have a lot of population
9 imbalance that we recognize.

10 I'm focused on this one which I started last week
11 and then stopped and part of it was we wanted to move
12 forward in terms of time, so I'm revisiting it because this
13 was something that I had requested previously and I think
14 this actually brings this community -- again, it's this one
15 area that we're talking about in terms of the community of
16 interest.

17 So by putting Sunnyslope, by moving it down in the
18 way that I've described, I think that helps bring those
19 folks together that are naturally aligned instead of this
20 current boundary that we have, so that's why I'm requesting
21 this one more change.

22 And then the rest of it we recognize that there are
23 other issues. I'm totally with you, Commissioner York, on
24 there's lots of places that we need to make adjustments and
25 those we might wait until later and we can, as our

1 Chairwoman said, make a list that we can get back to. But
2 if we can have them as they're working on the southern part
3 of the map, try this one and see how that looks, I would
4 appreciate that.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I support that.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay. One more discussion
7 point.

8 I would argue that the -- the mountain preserve
9 that you're trying to incorporate into District 2, it would
10 be better served if District 1 moved north up to Thunderbird
11 and took in the rest of the mountain reserve as opposed to
12 moving the mountain reserve south -- south into the northern
13 district. I still say D-1 is more of a community of
14 interest with the central corridor, Brophy, Xavier, the
15 downtown area, than the -- moving District 2 down to just
16 across the mountain reserve.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I -- I -- I guess I have
18 to say I don't agree with that, so.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know what, given that
20 Commissioner Lerner is desiring this iteration and I think
21 my colleagues on the left were a little more satisfied
22 with -- with 9.2, I'd like to be able to focus this on
23 helping Commissioner Lerner be able to get to a map that
24 maybe, you know, she's a little more comfortable with and
25 then we'll compare them all and vote.

1 But yes, if Commissioner York and Lerner, if you
2 could join your minds and -- and agree here and now that's
3 ideal; but if you can't agree, I'd like Commissioner Lerner
4 to be able to have a map that -- that she can see in a
5 wholistic way to give her an option.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, Chair Neuberg, can I request
7 clarification in terms of the request.

8 In terms of where District 2 is coming south into
9 District 1, is it across the whole top of District 1 from
10 D-4 over to --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: She's requesting down to
12 Northern as Northern intersects with the Squaw Peak Parkway
13 and move that up.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, no, I understand that but
15 the whole thing or -- or just west of the -- the preserve?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I'm basically saying to
17 the northwest of the -- going down to Northern Avenue, so it
18 puts Sunnyslope with the district to the northwest of the
19 Phoenix Mountain Preserve.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: But that's what I'm asking. So
21 the preserve would move as well or are you just moving the
22 area west of 7th Avenue -- or 7th Street, rather?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, no, we can go all the
24 way, the preserve, nobody -- nobody is...

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: But there's a lot of people east

1 of the preserve in the district.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: The northern east corner, I
3 would put that in D-4 or you can put it in D-2.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: I'm just asking for the request
5 from Commissioner Lerner, what she -- what she's asking us
6 to draw.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This would go -- this would
8 go all across Northern.

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

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, I see. You're saying on
11 the other side of the 51, is that what you're talking about?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, she's talking -- he's
14 talking about just north of the mountains there.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, I'm talking about all the way
16 over to 51. That's -- so...

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. All the way to 51.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. That's really...

19 MR. FLAHAN: So you're talking about -- about here
20 all the way over, over, over, down to Northern, up and then
21 up the 51? Does that -- that's what you're talking about,
22 correct?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We could -- yeah. I mean, I
24 don't think there's any population --

25 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- between 51 and the
2 mountain preserves, right?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes, no, there's people.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not a whole lot --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well...

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There's a few.

7 I'm just trying to locate...

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, there's neighborhoods. I --
9 I don't know if these names mean anything, but just seeing
10 on the map, there's --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There's a few people.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- Sony Mountain Villas and the
13 preserve neighborhoods.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: There's Moon Valley somewhere.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Moon Valley is -- is
16 separate -- it's up there somewhere but I think that's
17 further north.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. We got it.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

20 MR. KINGERY: Yeah.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You've got it?

22 MR. KINGERY: Yeah, I think we got it.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

24 MR. KINGERY: We just wanted to make sure we
25 understood.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Excellent. So at this
3 point what would you suggest, Mapping? You -- you -- you
4 have quite a bit of work to do now on the legislative map.
5 We do need to be just be walked through the congressional
6 iterations; and we'll likely go into executive session to
7 discuss VRA compliance, polarization and performance and
8 then vote on iterations.

9 MR. FLAHAN: So Mapping sees we got two changes
10 that are going to need to be separated in the south, two
11 different versions and one version in the north.

12 We would need probably a 30-minute break right now
13 to get the team in the other rooms to work on these as we
14 discuss the congressional.

15 The question is: Do I put both Phoenix changes in
16 both southern versions?

17 Yes, okay.

18 Yeah.

19 Okay. Then we have our marching orders and we need
20 to get the team working, so we need -- we need about a
21 30-minute break to get them going.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So a 30-minute break
23 for everybody and then we'll come back and do congressional
24 districts.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Correct.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Unless staff, there is
2 anything you would like to do business-wise during this
3 break, otherwise we could take a break.

4 Okay. Why don't we take a 30-minute break.

5 MR. FLAHAN: And -- and during the break all the
6 congressional versions are available, so feel free to check
7 them out; everything is also on the hub too.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. Thank you.

9 (Recess taken from 2:11 p.m. to 2:51 p.m.)

10

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
12 everybody. We are returning to public session. We are
13 still on Agenda Item No. VI, draft map decision discussion.
14 We will return to now to the congressional districts.

15 And I'd like -- as we did earlier, I suggest our --
16 our mapping team walk us through the options and then after
17 that we go into executive session to ask any remaining VRA
18 compliance, polarization, performance issues of our counsel,
19 and then we can come back and discuss the pros and cons of
20 the various options and take a vote.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Well, like this morning, the
22 last approved congressional map was 6.0. I'm going to pull
23 up 6.0.

24 So as Brian pulls up 6.0 here, 6.0 is built off of
25 map 5.0, and the goal for 6.0 was to move the section of

1 District 8 that is northeast of I-17 and the canal into
2 District 1, which would be the red district.

3 We did do that and D-8 would then move south into
4 District 1, and that's really to balance for the population
5 loss of D-8.

6 When we did that, one of the focuses of 6.0 was to
7 see if we could get better competitive numbers in District 1
8 and District 8. So once we performed that shift,
9 District 1's new competitive numbers was basically 49.18 on
10 the Democratic side versus 50.82 on the Republican side for
11 a spread of 1.64 percent.

12 The -- the old competitive numbers for District 1
13 was only 0.08 of 1 percent spread, but when we also made
14 that shift, District 8, which used to be an 8.22 percent
15 spread actually got better and decreased and now it was only
16 a 6.3 percent spread once we made the shift.

17 So basically D-1 for competitiveness went up a
18 little bit and D-8 came down almost 2 percent.

19 Pull up the demographics.

20 The -- the map is balanced and all the population
21 was assigned and we were able to fulfill all the requests
22 for 6.0.

23 On the screen here is the demographics, and looking
24 on the competitiveness side we have one, two dis- -- one,
25 two, three -- three districts that fall within our

1 competitive range of under 7 percent, one of those three
2 actually falls within our highly competitive range; and then
3 we have District 2, which is 7.4, which is just outside of
4 our competitive range of 4 to 7 percent.

5 Doug, you want to talk about demographics for 6.0?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure.

7 So in -- in this one we have obviously the -- the
8 Native American population is not going to be nearly as high
9 in the congressional districts, so we are 20 percent Native
10 American by CVAP or 18 percent by the non-Hispanic Native
11 American single race voting population.

12 On the Latino side we have District 3 at 54 percent
13 of CVAP and District 7 at 47 percent of CVAP and both of
14 those perform. District 3 at 68 and 73 percent in the two
15 elections we're tracking, and District 7 is at 53 percent in
16 the governor's race and 60 percent in the attorney general's
17 race, so both of those are effective Latino seats.

18 Should we jump to 7?

19 MR. FLAHAN: Show 7.0.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: So as we mentioned this morning,
21 when we did the polarized voting analysis just on CD-3 as
22 drawn, it turned out that by -- by most measures and -- by
23 three of the four things we were checking, it came out as
24 not polarized, and so that raises various questions about
25 the district's configuration, the percent over 50 percent

1 that it is on the Latino side and the high performance
2 numbers.

3 So one thought is to say: Okay, can we shift this
4 district around so it's on a bit of a stronger footing from
5 a Voting Rights Act perspective?

6 So go ahead and bring up 7.0 and zoom in on CD-3.

7 So in this map the -- generally speaking the -- the
8 northern portion of District 3 is shifted to the west and
9 extended north.

10 So we do have the -- the full change log but what
11 we're really getting -- can you -- can you overlay the
12 changes from the old version?

13 The southern portion of the District 3 is
14 unchanged, so the -- the freeway loop, Guadalupe, and South
15 Mountain and -- on the west side.

16 This will be easier, yes.

17 So you can see when we get north of I-10 -- zoom
18 way in on that north piece right here where it says
19 "Phoenix," yeah.

20 Closer. There we go.

21 So on the left-hand side we're seeing District 3 in
22 6.0 and on the right-hand side District 3 is 7.0, and so as
23 you can see the -- the -- the west end of the district, the
24 southern side of the district, and the eastern end of the
25 district are all the same. Where it changes is to the north

1 where we're getting the -- the less Latino area and focusing
2 on who else is in the district to bring it up to population
3 numbers.

4 So you can see the -- the proposed change really in
5 the central part right along there, along the 51st Avenue
6 corridor, we stop the northern edge of District 3 at
7 Camelback instead of continuing north all the way to
8 Northern. So that area between Camelback and Northern goes
9 into District 8, the pink district. That population loss
10 is -- is then shifted over to the west where we come up,
11 still have the portion of Glendale on the left-hand map,
12 coming up in Peoria, and then really coming to -- that green
13 width is really the width of Peoria.

14 We can't highlight the cities on this map.

15 There we go.

16 So we're shifting over, instead of taking kind of
17 Central Phoenix, now we're taking Peoria -- so zoom in on
18 that south piece there.

19 I believe we come up to Camelback there. Can you
20 zoom in right on the border? The border. Just zoom up to
21 the top of District 3.

22 Oh, yeah. So right about Thunderbird, that's where
23 it is, thank you, Commissioner York. So -- so yes, we're
24 taking -- Peoria, the south -- especially the southern chunk
25 of Peoria up to Thunderbird. There's a little bit of zigs

1 and zags at the top edge there which is simply population
2 balancing as we get that district very, very close to
3 balanced.

4 I believe -- yeah -- District 3 as drawn in this
5 map is -- is off by one -- one person from perfect, so
6 that's why those little jigs and jags are there.

7 Now, we don't have a polarization report done, you
8 know, we didn't have time to send this off to Dr. Handley
9 and have her run the precincts and all of that, but by
10 looking at the -- the tracking of how the district performs,
11 we can get a sense of the change, you know. The issue is
12 really are there -- are the folks who are in there with the
13 districts white Democrats who are voting with them and thus
14 the lack of polarization; or -- or other voters who would
15 not vote and who might vote in larger percentages for the
16 other -- for the non-Latino preferred candidate?

17 So when we look down at the tracking numbers for
18 the general -- the governor's race and attorney general's
19 race, it's still performing. It's 63 percent in the
20 governor's race and 69 percent in the attorney general's
21 race, but we've dropped down 4 or 5 percent in those
22 numbers.

23 And so if you remember from this morning that
24 spreadsheet -- actually, Brian, do you still have that up?
25 Can you put that back up?

1 The -- the white percentages or the -- I'm sorry,
2 not white. The -- the non-Hispanic voters percentages were
3 just under and just over 50 percent for Garcia, at 54 and 60
4 for Contreras, so the thought is that this would bring it
5 certainly closer to being a -- a district that the
6 polarization could justify, bring out Voting Rights Act
7 justification for the configuration of the district. We
8 won't know for sure until we can send off for -- for
9 polarization analysis and get these numbers back.

10 But -- and I -- and I think this -- if you scroll
11 down to the next window.

12 The next piece, yeah. There we go.

13 So yes, as you can see in the governor's race,
14 we're at 51 and 54 percent. So dropping those down by
15 4 percent would put it into a polarized state.

16 So again it's a -- it's a -- using the data we have
17 available in an attempt to draw a district that would be
18 more defensible from a Voting Rights Act perspective; and
19 I'm happy to take any questions.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and my observation is
21 that it still remains an extremely strong community of
22 interest with very like-minded people in a compact area.
23 And -- and so they're, you know, when I look at the
24 district, the district makes sense on many of the
25 constitutional grounds.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: You're exactly right. That --
2 that was kind of the thinking of staying in Peoria instead
3 of mixing -- you know, we didn't want to mix in some of Sun
4 City, and some of Glendale and some of Peoria. This is a
5 very clear community that we're -- we're keeping together,
6 just moving from one district to another.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have a question. This is
8 Commissioner York.

9 In the Latino Coalition the original map included
10 Glendale and now we've taken Downtown Glendale out of that
11 map, so I'm just curious why you decided to go up the 101 as
12 opposed to up 17 and take part of District 1 and just kind
13 of move up that central corridor and up the east -- west --
14 east side of District 3 and push 8 a little bit to the west?

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Very good question.

16 It's really the data we were looking at was trying
17 to look at the attorney general's race and governor's race
18 and trying to get into the numbers range that we were
19 trying -- drop that percentage down; and by moving -- moving
20 the northern portion farther west, that improves the numbers
21 that I was looking at more than coming right up kind of the
22 Ocotillo and -- and Cactus districts of -- of Glendale.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I just have a hard time
24 believing that people in Peoria have something in common
25 with the people in Guadalupe.

1 What does it look like if you run it up 17 and push
2 1 a little bit west-east and taking that?

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: I don't have the specific numbers
4 but it would be less of a change. Definitely less of a
5 change.

6 So it -- it's certainly possible that when the
7 polarization report comes back if we kind of, you know,
8 wait -- if this has gone much farther than we needed to go,
9 then we could shift that -- that neck eastward, it's just a
10 matter of knowing how much -- how much flexibility.

11 I'm actually concerned that we may not have gone
12 far enough yet. It's a large concern. But we'll know a lot
13 more once we can -- once we have the time to run the --

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Wasn't the original Latino
15 Coalition suggestion off of Northern, Mark? Six out of --
16 yeah.

17 So it's a big change.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Minority-majority.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: To -- to extremely polarize the
20 map.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think this is trying
22 to -- to provide some balance.

23 And you have other maps, right, so maybe we can go
24 through all three and then kind of look at how they all --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, they're not very much

1 different.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I know. They're pretty
3 similar, but --

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: We can touch on them.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- but this seems to be
6 addressing the polarization piece and also it takes an
7 entire community.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you could argue
9 suggestion from the community as well as the communities of
10 interest could offset the polarization piece.

11 So let's see the 7.1, 7.2, please.

12 MR. FLAHAN: If we can -- oh -- to answer the
13 question about Northern, yes, that's where the northern
14 border stopped of the Coalition map.

15 MR. KINGERY: Okay. You want to bring up 7.1?

16 MR. FLAHAN: So on the screen is version 7.1. 7.1
17 was based off of test map version 7.0, and the main goal for
18 7.1 is to actually population balance 7.0 to plus or minus
19 one person.

20 So bring up -- bring up 7.0.

21 And -- and we didn't -- we did not take any blocks
22 or people from the District 3 which is on 7.0 and we did not
23 take any blocks from any tribal reservations; we didn't
24 cross county boundaries or city limits when possible. So
25 those were sort of our goals to population balance this map

1 to plus or minus one person.

2 So to achieve this, District 9 was balanced out in
3 the Yuma area.

4 Though we did balance it out in the Yuma area,
5 the -- what's up? Oh, okay.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Have to zoom way in.

7 It's in the town along the freeway there on the
8 east side of Welton.

9 MR. FLAHAN: East side.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yep, there you go.

11 MR. FLAHAN: There you go.

12 So we -- we grabbed a couple blocks out in the
13 Welton area for District 9.

14 Keep going.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, what -- what you're going to
16 see as we're doing this, it's little -- it's one census bloc
17 here, one census bloc there.

18 No, there's nothing along that.

19 MR. FLAHAN: District 7, then, was balanced out in
20 the Tucson area.

21 So you can see right there, there's a small
22 difference there. Grabbed a couple more there.

23 District 2 was balanced in the area between Casa
24 Grande, Coolidge and Maricopa, but all the blocks that we
25 did grab are outside the city limits.

1 So you can see right there in the two corners.
2 District 6 was then balanced within District 2.
3 District 8 and District 1 were balanced inside the
4 Glendale area.

5 Scroll down. Scroll down. Scroll to the east.

6 So as you can see these are all small, little
7 changes to balance.

8 The -- the most the map was out of balance if I
9 recall -- there it is right in the corner -- was maybe just
10 under a thousand people. So these are all small, little
11 quadrants that we were getting to plus or minus one person.

12 District 2 and 5 were balanced out in the
13 San Tan Valley area.

14 So you can see right up there.

15 District 1 was balanced on the western border of
16 Scottsdale.

17 Yep, right there.

18 So there's a couple of pieces right there on that
19 District 4/District 1 line. And then District 4 was also
20 balanced down in the Chandler area.

21 So with all these changes, we now have a map that
22 is of equal population and the districts are either plus
23 one, minus one or at zero, so they are all within one person
24 of each other and that's what Brian has on the screen there
25 of the plan summary.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: This 7.1?

2 Yeah, so this shows the details. You can see in
3 District 3 for Hispanics citizen voting age population
4 we're -- we're still at 50 percent, slightly over
5 50 percent, but not as high. In 6.0 it had been 54 percent,
6 so we brought that number down a bit with the changes we
7 made.

8 District 7 is unchanged at 47 percent.

9 On the -- the VRA tracking, you can see as a
10 reminder in 6.0, the Dem governor race was 68 percent for
11 District 3, it's now 63.7 so it's dropped 4 points; and the
12 Attorney General race in 6.0 was at 73 percent and it's now
13 at 69 percent, so it's dropped down 4 percent.

14 For those with a sharp eye, the Dem attorney
15 general's race in District 7 has gone from 60.3 to 60.4 and
16 that's just -- we just tripped over the numbers. We made
17 those little, tiny 5 and 20 person changes for population
18 balancing.

19 Both maps -- well, I guess all three maps -- 6.0,
20 7.1, and 7.2 -- all have four competitive districts and a
21 fifth district that's just outside the range at 7.6 percent
22 or 7 -- it varies, 7.4 to 7.6 percent. So we've got four in
23 our range and a fifth just on the edge there, while bringing
24 those numbers down in District 3 to what we believe is a
25 more legally defensible position.

1 Any questions?

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Before we go into having the
3 Commissioners talk about, you know, the pros and cons and
4 what they're liking and not liking when Mapping is done, I'm
5 going to suggest that we go into e-session to seek legal
6 guidance as it relates to VRA compliance, polarization and
7 performance.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: We still have 7.2 to talk
9 about.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh and -- oh, yeah, do you want to
11 go through it?

12 Yeah, it's the same tiny, little changes made to
13 6.0 instead of 7.2. Do you want to walk through it?

14 MR. FLAHAN: Yep.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't know if you want to
17 walk through them so much as maybe go through the
18 spreadsheet?

19 MR. FLAHAN: Sure.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, sure.

21 On the spreadsheet the -- the little, tiny changes
22 took District 3 from 50 -- you know, again, it just tripped
23 in the decimals. District 3 goes from 54 percent Latino
24 citizen voting age population to 53 percent, but literally
25 that's just in the -- in the tiny changes tripping it over

1 and rounding a number there.

2 Everything else I believe is unchanged.

3 Yeah, there's a tenth of a percent change in the
4 competitive level of District 4 and same thing in
5 District 6, but overall it's just tenths of a percent in
6 each of those points -- a single tenth of a percent.

7 In -- in 6.0 the spread is 6.3.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry, in the other?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah, yeah, no. It's -- 7.2
10 the numbering is allotted, it came straight from 6.0.

11 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, so the goal was to basically
12 population balance down to plus or minus one person from 6.0
13 in 7.2.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Essentially what we're leaving you
15 with is two choices: You have two -- you have the 6.0 map
16 that's now been population balanced down to one person, and
17 the new 7.1 that is population balanced down to one person.
18 We wanted to be sure to remove the population balance from a
19 concern as a deciding factor.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I know you may have
21 just -- I guess I'm trying to understand why you did 7.2 if
22 7.1 and 7.2 seem so similar. Was it just a few places that
23 you -- you just decided that you would kind of reconfigure
24 in a couple places?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: So 7.2 is actually the old version

1 of CD-3.

2 You want to bring it up?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, got it. Right.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. So we're -- we're giving
5 you the old version of CD-3 and the new version of CD-3,
6 both population balanced.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 7.1 and 7.2 were the two
8 balanced plans?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly. Yep.

10 MR. FLAHAN: Correct.

11 And 7.1 is the new configuration of CD-3 and 7.2 is
12 the old configuration from 6.0.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Before we again deliberate, I
14 suggest we go into executive session just to check in with
15 legal counsel regarding VRA compliance.

16 But are there any other questions to understand the
17 maps and the demographics?

18 Okay. If not, I'll entertain a motion to go into
19 executive session, which will not be open to the public, for
20 the purpose of obtaining legal advice with respect to VRA
21 compliance, polarization, and performance. I will entertain
22 a motion -- and that's pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

23 I will entertain a motion.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: I motion to go in executive
25 session. Commissioner York.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 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 With that, we'll go into executive session. I do
13 not expect this executive session to last as long as the
14 previous ones.

15 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive session
16 from 3:19 p.m. until 3:44 p.m.)

17

18 * * * * *

19

20 (Whereupon all members of the public are present
21 and the proceeding resumes in general session at 3:53 p.m.)

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.

23 Thank you for your patience.

24 We are still on Agenda Item No. VI. We just
25 returned from Executive Session where we sought legal

1 counsel as it relates to VRA compliance, polarization, and
2 performance as it relates to the congressional map.

3 With that, we can begin conversation on the
4 congressional options. We have 7.0, 7.1, and 7.2.

5 I believe 7.1 and 7.2 are the balanced versions.

6 Major change -- or difference between them being
7 CD-3, the boundaries.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if I'm correct, 7.1 has
9 got the new boundaries for District 3 and is balanced
10 population --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- correct?

13 MR. FLAHAN: Yep, that's correct.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I'm going to say that
15 I think that this -- this -- actually this map does a lot
16 of -- of things to not only balance the population but it
17 addresses some of the -- some of the concerns from the
18 Latino Coalition; it -- it does some good things in terms of
19 competitiveness; there's still some -- there's still plenty
20 of room for adjustments and changes, I think. But I would
21 go ahead and make a motion if that's okay, Chairwoman, to
22 approve congressional map 7.1.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Before we entertain a motion,
24 I just want to make sure that my colleagues don't have
25 another map that they would like to talk about in terms of

1 pros and cons. So before we vote, I do like to have a sense
2 of, you know, other feelings about other maps.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York.

4 The changes to the maps you see take into account
5 some of the requirements from the Voters Rights Act. We do
6 recognize that the Latino Coalition actually proposed the
7 map that went up to Northern and across to the 51; we feel
8 that given the requirements in our Constitution and the
9 U.S. Constitution, that the map 7.1 is more amenable to what
10 we'll have to do, and so I just want to go on the record to
11 make sure that they understand the changes that we made.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'd like to go on the record
13 that I really don't like the change that's being made to
14 District 3 and -- and I really would not like to see that
15 change; on the other hand, I think we're close enough on
16 this map that if Commissioner Lerner is -- is proposing that
17 map and are we proposing it as a final draft map? If -- if
18 that's the motion, I do think that we're better served to
19 move on and get everything out to the public.

20 So notwithstanding that I really fairly strongly
21 disagree with -- with some of -- with that change and -- and
22 with some of other things in the map we will be -- we will
23 vote yes just to move this along.

24 And by "we," I will vote yes.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Is there a motion on the

1 table?

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm supportive of this
3 District 3. I think it improves again the VRA compliance,
4 it's a natural community of interest, it's reasonably, you
5 know, compact, contiguous; I think it helps, again as
6 Commissioner Lerner said, with issues of competitiveness;
7 and it's a good start.

8 And -- and I hear that -- that, you know, like many
9 of the districts, my fellow Commissioners are not going to
10 like aspects of them and, you know, but we're not going to
11 be able to like all aspects and hopefully we can agree on
12 something and then in good faith learn and fix the things
13 that we're really struggling with.

14 But that's my opinion, I'm comfortable with 7.1 and
15 there's another one that I eventually would like to -- to
16 make, even though I'm comfortable approving a draft map now
17 without the change.

18 I found the letter from Mayor Romero from Tucson
19 compelling in terms of the argument about moving U of A and
20 some of those other communities of interest that's right
21 affiliated with that area, that that probably makes sense to
22 go back. I'm looking at the district number -- into 7, I
23 believe.

24 But -- but I'm happy -- again, along with
25 Commissioner Mehl's line of thinking, I'm okay approving

1 things that fundamentally I'm not happy about, with the
2 understanding that the map's not perfect and we're going to
3 have ample time to shuffle things up and make things even
4 better than they are.

5 So if there's no other discussion, Watchman, if
6 you'd like to add?

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I do; and thank you,
8 Madam Chair.

9 It is -- it is going to be a compromise if -- if we
10 do vote on version 7.1 and in the last couple days we're
11 certainly getting a lot of comments from the public which I
12 appreciate, and so there's not enough time to glean through
13 all of that and seriously consider. So as we're talking
14 about here, moving on 7.1 will allow us to have a final
15 draft map that we can then garner feedback from the
16 community.

17 I haven't heard -- and I said this before -- from
18 all the tribes; we've heard from a few, there's 22, so I'm
19 looking forward to the -- the other tribes and their
20 concerns if they have any, or support for -- for the maps,
21 so I'm looking forward to that.

22 And so I continue to urge the -- the public to
23 submit their comments; and, if they can, put it into maps as
24 well. That's easier to -- to decipher than, you know,
25 something that's written in a memo.

1 So with that, I do support version 7.1.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And Chairwoman, can I just --
3 I made the motion but I didn't really give that kind of
4 detail; is that okay?

5 So I just want to be clear I support this version
6 of the map but just as with all my fellow Commissioners,
7 there are a number of changes I would like to see with that
8 but I feel again, for the sake of moving forward, this is
9 our best map to put forward to the public at this time.

10 But we have received, as Commissioner Watchman just
11 mentioned, a lot of feedback -- and as everybody has
12 mentioned actually -- a lot of feedback from the public in
13 the last couple of days as these maps were out there and
14 there's a number of places that I think we can still make
15 some adjustments.

16 Just as an example, we received a lot of comments
17 from people in Lake Havasu. There was an article from
18 Havasu News about concerns about the current map. So I'm
19 confident that, you know, if we -- if we -- and from my
20 perspective I think the configurations of things like
21 District 2 and District 9, we have a lot of room to make
22 adjustments in those as we will with probably many of these
23 districts that we have.

24 So I -- and I support as well, Chairwoman, the fact
25 that we do want to take a closer look at what was proposed

1 by Mayor Romero. I think that's a great point.

2 We've -- we've all been compromising in many ways.
3 We've compromised on certain areas and certain districts in
4 here; so I support 7.1. I would like us to move forward but
5 I want to acknowledge the fact that there are a number of
6 areas for each of us that we will be looking to and looking
7 to hear from the public as well on -- on prospective
8 changes.

9 And from my perspective I also appreciate the
10 public providing us with that input; there were a lot of
11 things that I learned about Lake Havasu, for example. So
12 keep providing those -- that feedback.

13 Thank you, Chairwoman.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Before we vote, I'd -- I'd
15 like to check in with our -- our mapping team in due
16 diligence -- do due diligence to ensure that of these nine
17 districts we have done our best to maximize the six
18 constitutional criteria and you're not seeing any concerns
19 or anything that -- that you're flagging that may require a
20 little extra explanation for our decision-making.

21 As I look at all nine districts I think all
22 districts include all aspects of the six criteria. You
23 know, the districts are, you know, compact; they're
24 contiguous; very carefully, you know, divided with equal --
25 equal population; working on competitiveness to increase

1 accountability to, you know, for communities of interest,
2 you know, VRA compliance.

3 I don't know if anybody else wants to go on record
4 with, you know, explaining any of their decisions as it
5 relates to the criteria that we've used.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, I agree with what you
7 just said and say, you know, the -- as you noted the
8 districts are -- are quite compact, reasonable looking;
9 where there are odd shapes like, you know, top of
10 District 8, well, we're following the city borders of Peoria
11 there, the city is odd shaped.

12 The one thing that probably jumps out when people
13 look at the map is the District 6 arm coming into Pinal and
14 it is an odd shape but of course it's following the -- the
15 highway corridor, and so when you look at the residential
16 patterns and the transportation patterns in there, it makes
17 a lot of sense. It does -- people may wonder about it
18 because it dodges off the highway at one point but that's
19 because we're following the city line to keep Eloy together
20 and -- as we go along that corridor.

21 So it -- it's entirely explainable and I think the
22 one thing there's no -- no question about we have a very
23 extensive record of every decision and direction and change
24 made to get us to this point. So anyone who wants to know
25 why it looks that way, it's on the hub and they can have fun

1 reading through that.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Good.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So if there's no other
5 discussion I believe we have a motion on the table but I
6 need a second.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds
8 the motion.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

10 We have a motion on the table to approve
11 Congressional District Map 7.1 as our official draft map.

12 I will take a vote.

13 Vice Chair Watchman.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
22 aye.

23 And with that, a unanimous vote to adopt 7.1 as the
24 new draft map for congressional districts. Congratulations
25 and very nicely done.

1 I believe we can now turn to the legislative
2 districts that I'm sure will go just as smoothly.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: You don't have those on the...

4 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So we went back and created the
5 10-X series for the legislative map. We actually have three
6 maps to propose to you because the Phoenix changes were all
7 the same, so we took version 10.0 with all the Phoenix
8 changes and then split off of that version to build both of
9 the south Arizona changes.

10 So why don't you bring up 10.0.

11 They are accessible on the Web in the redistricting
12 system so the public, if you're watching, you're more than
13 welcome to go pick them up, they're available right now, and
14 follow along.

15 So 10.0's goal was to take the Phoenix change of
16 uniting the Phoenix Mountain Preserve into District 2.

17 So this is what the new District 2 looks like. It
18 follows the State Route 51 freeway, then cuts across
19 Northern and connects into District 26. So now the Phoenix
20 Mountain Preserve is tied together.

21 So with that, District 2 moves into District 1,
22 which goes down to Northern Avenue as we just talked about;
23 and then District 1 -- if you move the map south.

24 And then what District 1 did is it moves east into
25 District 8, moving all the way over and taking the

1 Papago Park area, so you can see now extends east into
2 District 8.

3 Then to keep going with population balancing
4 because now all the moves that we were doing is to balance
5 the population: District 8 is going to move north into
6 District 4, so you can see the arm that come comes up, the
7 101 freeway of District 8, we took that from District 4 and
8 put that in District 8 to do population balancing; the east
9 side is North Scottsdale Road and we did not split the town
10 of Paradise Valley.

11 District 4 then needs to move into District 2 --
12 bring the map up a little bit -- so you can see there the
13 northwest side of District 4, it moved over to population
14 balancing the District 2, because District 2 gained a bunch
15 of population when we united the Phoenix Mountain Preserve
16 and we had to go south.

17 So that move into District 4 went all the way over
18 to 7th Street and the south border is Bell. So we stayed
19 north of Bell Road, so that's what that top corner is.

20 And that's how we balanced out the request to unite
21 the Phoenix Mountain Preserve.

22 You want to bring up the demographics?

23 This is the demographics for 10.0; then again, this
24 does not have any of the Southern Arizona changes on it.

25 Doug, you have anything on the demographics?

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just that none of these changes
2 impacted any of our effective Latino or the Native
3 American -- the heavily Native American seat.

4 Districts 2 and 4 that were -- that were involved
5 in the shifting were already competitive seats and they
6 remain competitive seats after this change; the other two,
7 District 1 and 8, were not in the competitive range before
8 this and -- and continue to not be in the competitive range.

9 So we -- we shifted the communities without
10 impacting how many competitive seats there were or any of
11 our Voting Rights Act concerns.

12 MR. FLAHAN: And 4 is a very high -- highly
13 competitive of .5 of 1 percent in our vote spread.

14 10.1.

15 So 10.1 builds upon 10.0, so it takes all the
16 Phoenix changes you just saw and incorporates them into the
17 map. And the goal of 10.1 was to follow the Latino
18 Coalition's submission in southeast Arizona, so uniting all
19 of Santa Cruz County together, then going south and along
20 the southern edge of Arizona to get the cities of Bisbee and
21 Douglas together as you can see there on the map.

22 District 19 now, because it lost population due to
23 that change, 19 now goes north; and if you zoom into the
24 Davis-Monthan area, you can see 19 now goes north into the
25 Davis-Monthan area and takes that swath of population from

1 District 21.

2 It does split Davis-Monthan Air Base in half.

3 It is balanced; there's all the population
4 assigned.

5 And that is one way of incorporating the population
6 change with the Southern Arizona move.

7 Pull up the demographics.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the only district that this
9 impacts from a -- a Voting Rights Act side is District 21
10 which before this change is at 48 percent Latino CVAP and at
11 59.9 and 67.1 in the -- in the Governor and Attorney General
12 race. The -- 10.1 -- make sure I'm on the right one here,
13 yes.

14 In 10.1 it goes up -- the Latino CVAP is
15 51 percent.

16 Make sure I get the right one. I think I'm on the
17 wrong row there.

18 21, yeah.

19 Is 52 percent Latino CVAP and 62 percent in the
20 governor's race. So it goes up about -- it goes up
21 4 percent in CVAP and 2 percent in the elections that we're
22 tracking.

23 MR. FLAHAN: So now if we look at 10.2. 10.2 again
24 incorporates the same changes that we made in Phoenix in
25 10.0 but it population balances the changes in Southern

1 Arizona differently in the Tucson area.

2 Scroll down. Scroll down.

3 So you can see it's the same Latino Coalition
4 district, uniting all of Santa Cruz County and then going
5 east along Southern Arizona for Bisbee and Douglas,
6 connecting those, but the way we actually did with
7 population balancing was a little different.

8 Vail and the southern district of D-17 actually
9 moved into District 19 and you can see that's sort of where
10 the curved area that District 19 goes into District 17 just
11 south of Davis-Monthan Air Force Base; and then if you go
12 north to the north side of Tucson, in the Casas Adobes area,
13 we split it at Overton Road as requested.

14 So zoom in to that very top piece.

15 So you can see here we took some population and
16 split it, Overton Road, and took that out of 18 and put that
17 into 17 as requested; and then if we go back down to the
18 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base area, you can see that
19 District 17 for population balance actually moves west into
20 Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and bows into the yellow
21 District 21 there.

22 It's balanced, everybody is assigned for
23 population, and there was nothing that we couldn't do that
24 was requested.

25 So that's the alternate way of balancing the

1 Southern Arizona change of demographics.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you --

3 MR. FLAHAN: It --

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, it's in the --

5 MR. FLAHAN: -- It is in there.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's in Esri group.

7 MR. FLAHAN: It's in the draft maps public group.

8 It's in -- it's all groups.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's what?

10 MR. FLAHAN: It should be in every group that you
11 can get to but the template group.

12 MR. KINGERY: You might need to refresh.

13 MR. FLAHAN: You might need to refresh the browser.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Under "recent plans"; they
15 just posted it.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, it was -- it was hot off the
17 press five minutes before we got here back in the session.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can you bring up the spreadsheet?

19 MR. FLAHAN: Sure. And here is the demographics
20 for 10.2.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: So in -- in 10.0 you may remember
22 District 17 -- oh. Let me start with the Latino side first.

23 So this -- this change does take District 21 up
24 slightly in Latino CVAP, so it's up to 53 percent from 52 in
25 10.1; and -- and the performance rate numbers are, of

1 course, fine at 62 percent and 69 percent.

2 The -- the big change in this map is District 17.
3 You may remember District 17 was at 9.9 percent spread and
4 with this change it comes down to 5.4 percent, so it
5 actually is in our competitive range now after these
6 changes.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's 10.2?

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: 10.2, yes. Correct.

9 Yeah, 10.1 did not touch District 17 so that --
10 there was no change in there.

11 That's what we got.

12 MR. FLAHAN: And we will pass it back to you for
13 any questions.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any clarifying questions of
15 the mapping team?

16 And I will open it up to dialogue from my
17 colleagues about the versions, what you like, what you don't
18 like. Let's please discuss them all before anyone
19 entertains a motion.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I'd like to talk about
21 Maricopa County.

22 You know, Commissioner Lerner's original request
23 was to take D-8 up to Indian Bend.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Which map are you looking at?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm looking at 10.1 which is

1 the same as 10.0; I'm talking about Maricopa County, they're
2 all the same.

3 I would argue that the McCormack Ranch Association
4 and North Scottsdale along the Scottsdale airport corridor
5 that is now included in D-8 should be part of D-4. So where
6 would I take that population from in D-4, which would be
7 then west of the I-51 corridor from D-4 and I would move
8 that, and that's the trade off I would make.

9 I don't know where you get the rest of the
10 population for D-2, maybe you go north, but I think D-2 is
11 overpopulated at one point because you grabbed the
12 Sunnyslope area but...

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm sorry because I was
14 trying to get this up on my -- because I still can't find
15 that other -- other map on mine.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can you bring it --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're on 10.1?

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right there. It's on -- in
19 front of you.

20 So if you look at D-8 it goes all the way up at --
21 into Scottsdale Airpark area; your original request was to
22 stop at about Indian Bend, I would say one mile south, which
23 would be McDonald or Shea. We need to include McCormack
24 Ranch and the Scottsdale Airpark in with Paradise Valley and
25 North Scottsdale.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you please justify your
2 suggestions based on the constitutional criteria?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, McCormack Range is a
4 community of interest that is currently split; Paradise
5 Valley borders Scottsdale Road; and Scottsdale and Paradise
6 Valley to me are a community of interest, they vote that
7 way -- they vote accordingly and they share the same school
8 district, same -- same shopping corridors, they commute
9 along the 101 south down into Chandler for high-tech and
10 other parts of the city and those -- those need to be
11 together.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair, if I may just
13 procedurally, let me check with Legal on this.

14 I think -- first, I think the Commission needs to
15 decide whether to accept one of these three before we start
16 moving into additional changes.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We're not asking you to do
18 changes, we're just discussing the pros and cons of these
19 maps.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON. Ah, okay.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York --

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- so we can say what we like
24 and don't like and would change, but -- but our first task
25 is to vote on a map as a starting point.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But your confidence in the
3 ability to change the map in a way that you like is
4 obviously very relevant to the map you're going to vote for.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, none of these maps have
6 my comments, so.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Given that none of the maps
8 have what you're looking for, do you have a preference of
9 the maps? And, if so, can you please share with us what
10 your preference is and why, why you feel that map best
11 captures the six constitutional criteria.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: To clarify, Madam Chair. So
13 9.2 is the official approved map right now. So our -- our
14 choice could still be 9.2 or one of the 10 series?

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct. As usual we are
16 always able to stick to a previously approved map if we
17 don't like another map better.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner York, can you
19 clarify where you would move things around for that on
20 how -- and how that would impact -- because what you're
21 talking about is shifting District 4 I think, correct?

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes, along --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I unfortunately have
24 not -- I don't seem to be able to get what you're showing up
25 here, so I'm struggling.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: So District 4 along McDonald,
2 which is one mile south of Indian Bend, which then would
3 include all of McCormack Ranch in District 4, and then you
4 would take that corridor along the Highway 101 up to the
5 Scottsdale Airpark.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that north of the 101?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, the 101 runs north-south,
8 so it's --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, up in that corner --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- of D-4?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: That corner of D-8 right now.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I ask a question, if
14 Maricopa County is the same in all of the maps? Is that
15 what you've said?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Maricopa County is the same.
18 Why don't we pick a map based on the differences
19 first and then we can come back and fix Maricopa County.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I -- I --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, Maricopa County in 9.2 is
22 a map that I'm in favor of. So we took Shereen Lerner --
23 Commissioner Lerner's request to see what the Sunnyslope
24 area did to D-2; but in doing so, now we changed D-8, D-4,
25 and D-2 and D-1, and I'm not in favor of some of the

1 changes, that's what I'm trying to...

2 MR. KINGERY: Right. So just to quickly summarize,
3 both 10.1 and 10.2 are the different ways we handled the
4 southern portion of the state, but both of those are based
5 off the 10.0 which does include Commissioner Lerner's change
6 in -- in Maricopa.

7 So if we were to include just the southern portion
8 of that arm across the southern border, that would -- and
9 not include the Phoenix, the Maricopa changes, that would be
10 an additional version off of the approved 9.2 that we have
11 not made yet.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But you have made some of the
13 changes in the south, correct?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

15 MR. KINGERY: Correct, but that's --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, but --

17 MR. KINGERY: The foundational plan that was used
18 includes changes in Maricopa.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Well, from -- from my
20 perspective, it's all part of the same package; however,
21 when we look at 10.1 and 10. -- I mean 10.1 and 10.2 both
22 have the Maricopa changes, so it seems like we should focus
23 on those and then we could come back and take a look at what
24 Commissioner York is talking about.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It sounds like there may be

1 agreement of Maricopa County in 9.2 but with wanting to take
2 a look at the southern portions of 10.1 or 10.2. Is that
3 what I'm hearing from my Commissioners?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not from me. I'm -- I'm not
5 in agreement on that -- on the Maricopa piece. I'm in --
6 I -- which is why I suggested the changes up in the Maricopa
7 area. And then we were -- I mean, it was all part of the --
8 the same -- these were some -- some concerns, there's a lot
9 more than Maricopa that I could have proposed but chose not
10 to; this -- this is just the one -- only one I wanted to
11 make the suggestion, so.

12 But I guess what I'm saying is what if we take a
13 look at the southern part first and say -- see how we're --
14 how that is and then we can come back to the Maricopa where
15 Commissioner York and I can take a look at some of the
16 things he's proposing.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Mapping, what was the
18 population change with Commissioner Lerner's request to move
19 the Sunnyslope area into D-2?

20 MR. FLAHAN: Give us one sec.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: So 9.2, District 2, was
22 overpopulated by 3,977.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, from what I'm seeing
24 there's a lot of population shifts that will have to occur
25 to balance --

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- in -- in all of them. And
3 there were before in 9.2 as well, but we knew that for the
4 legislative.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, we're going to need to
6 make decisions on the south and Maricopa County. So let --
7 let's start with one and dive in.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: On the south I would have a
9 strong preference to stay with 9.2 so we would be -- I think
10 Commissioner York and I would both agree that 9.2 is just a
11 better map for us to be using as a draft map to be moving
12 forward.

13 The reason -- on 10.2. It's just wrong, in my
14 opinion, on community of interest to separate Rita Ranch and
15 Vail from the Tanque Verde area. I mean, they're just --
16 they are such close communities of interest and clearly want
17 to be together that -- that's just -- just a really bad
18 thing to do or wrong thing to do.

19 And even -- even 10.1 I don't think really -- I
20 think it -- 10.1 moves District 19 back into the urban area
21 and I don't think we gain much from it.

22 I guess we gain the southern -- I think in the
23 spirit of compromise I could agree with the southern portion
24 of 10.1; I definitely could not agree to the southern
25 portion of 10.2, but we would want to combine it back with

1 the northern portion of 9.2 which I think they could
2 probably do fairly quickly.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I -- I will say 9 -- just
4 as you said about 10.1, 9.2 is just a nonstarter for me and
5 that's why I asked for some changes, because when you made
6 the changes to District 17 I object to those changes
7 completely in terms of what they did.

8 I am in favor of looking at these maps to see if
9 they can bring some alignment and bring some compromise.

10 I feel that 9.2, it was just not a compromise from
11 my perspective. Those changes were made I think and did not
12 completely take into account what I believe there were in
13 terms of communities of interest and the factors that I
14 articulated earlier, which is why if we could move to
15 preferably 10.2, which I think is a better version, I could
16 support that compromise that we made on District 17.

17 I don't disagree there are some communities that
18 should be together that are not, but that's how I felt on
19 9.2. I felt we were removing the community of interest
20 Casas Adobes from the Marana area and Oro Valley and those
21 are things that I think should absolutely have been
22 together.

23 So I don't disagree that there are some places that
24 we are separating; and as we all know, these are just the
25 drafts and these are the first round, but I just have to be

1 honest with that that I feel that -- just as you're feeling
2 about 10.2, I feel about 9.2.

3 MR. FLAHAN: The question about the population
4 switch to unite mountain preserve was just over 51,000
5 people for population.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: That I guess is why I felt that
7 Maricopa County was acceptable as -- in 9.2 'cause at this
8 point I think we need to go, like I said originally, go out
9 to the market and hear what Sunnyslope wants to be part of.

10 I still think Paradise Valley, North Scottsdale and
11 McCormack Ranch need to be together, and -- and to move
12 51,000 people today just doesn't seem fair for the entire
13 process.

14 MR. FLAHAN: And if we were to do the change that
15 you just mentioned, from McDonald all the way up to the
16 airpark, that is just over 25,000 people.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Following Pima Road so we didn't cut
19 the Indian reservation off at 101.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And my feeling is we should
22 keep these changes that we have right now for Maricopa
23 County. We can make adjustments later on just in the same
24 way.

25 These were communities of interest that we were

1 looking at and that's why I had requested those changes.
2 They were just going to try to modify a little bit to adjust
3 to a few communities that were otherwise split; and I
4 understand, Commissioner York, what you're proposing as
5 well, but I -- I -- at this point, to make those changes, it
6 will definitely have a ripple effect and we'd have to take a
7 look at some others to see what -- what happens from there.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So are you saying you don't
9 want to go there and allow those ripples to happen for
10 points of expediency right now?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, my feeling is I'm --
12 I'm open to looking at 10. -- I'm just getting -- making
13 sure I've got this right, 10.1 or 10.2 on the south, one of
14 those options, but I'd like to keep these Maricopa
15 changes --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: In their entirety?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- the way that we have them
18 laid out.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner, you're
20 saying that you want all of the changes in Maricopa County
21 that you want, and you want all the changes in the south,
22 and that's the map you'll vote for?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I could -- well, I'm trying
24 to find a compromise with this, I really am.

25 So if we could keep the Maricopa changes in the

1 north -- I mean, the -- on the north side of the map and
2 then even though I, as you know, have great concern about
3 the changes in 9.2 on the south and have strong
4 disagreements with that, perhaps that would be the
5 compromise would be take the southern part for what -- what
6 happened in District 17 and District 18 and then keep the
7 top part in Maricopa County, that change, and then vote from
8 that perspective -- or -- or consider that perspective I
9 should say.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just for clarification, so the --
11 the map that includes the Maricopa changes but no changes in
12 Tucson would be map 10.0.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But what I'm hearing is
14 accepting the changes to Maricopa County -- what, on 10.0?
15 -- that Commissioner Lerner had suggested and maintaining
16 the southern boundaries per 9.2, is that what it is?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That would be map 10.0.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Which is map 10.0. And if I
19 could have my colleagues compromise on that where one side
20 is getting a little bit more of what they want in the north
21 and one side is getting a little more of what they want in
22 the south, and the five of us in good faith continue to work
23 together to bring all sides closer so we all feel more
24 comfortable with the north and south, that would be
25 remarkable.

1 It's also possible that it's easier to fix some of
2 these things when we start deliberations anew, because when
3 we start all over after public feedback we're going to be
4 more willing to literally blow something up with ripple
5 effects because we'll have sufficient time with all of the
6 extra knowledge.

7 So I'm not sweating whether or not this is the
8 perfect end-all map, I think it's a remarkable blend of
9 ideas; but I'd love if my Commissioners, I don't want to
10 make the mapping team go do more work, but if we could come
11 up with an LD map, the north according to, you know, my
12 Commissioners on the right, the south according to my
13 Commissioners on the left and we get a -- a consensus vote,
14 I'd call today a remarkable success.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that's something that
16 I -- I'm suggesting that we could do.

17 We can have this map, we'll take the south that we
18 had previously approved -- that was approved and then take
19 the changes that I recommended for the north for Maricopa,
20 combine those into one.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't know how to say
22 strongly enough that we don't like this but we will vote for
23 it.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And -- and Commissioner Mehl,
25 I'm right there with you. I -- I -- I also can feel very

1 strongly that it is not my ideal but in the -- for the sake
2 of compromise and to help us move forward, but there are a
3 lot of concerns I have throughout this map and so I'm -- I'm
4 with you on that.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I, too, have concerns but
6 I don't know a better way that better captures the
7 collaborative commitments that adhere to the six
8 constitutional criteria as much as the -- I think it's
9 remarkable.

10 And when the mapping team puts it together I'd like
11 to, as we did with the congressional districts, do some due
12 diligence, look through the districts, do a check on the
13 constitutional criteria, and make sure that, you know, all
14 of our decisions have been covered through as many of the
15 criteria as possible so we can feel good about this -- this
16 draft.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I propose a motion that we
18 accept 10.0 as the draft map for the legislative districts.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: My only request would be once
22 you -- once you've got that all done if -- if you can then
23 forward to us those summaries -- plan summaries, that would
24 be great. Thank you.

25 MR. KINGERY: Yes, we have plenty to -- to work on

1 for the hub site.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. Afterwards.

3 MR. KINGERY: Yeah.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I want to remind us that
5 once we do take this vote, that we want to talk about
6 renumbering the legislative districts.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And -- and as we take
8 the vote I'd like to give space to my colleagues to share,
9 you know, their -- their concerns. I mean, we're all going
10 on record and -- and, you know, we're not -- we're happy
11 with some things and unhappy with others and I want to give
12 a chance for you-all to really be heard.

13 So where are we? We have a motion to accept 10.0?
14 Did we have a second?

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We did.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?
17 We'll take a vote.

18 Vice Chair Watchman.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I've done this ten times
24 today.

25 Well, as you mentioned to make a statement and I

1 know I've said that but just in the context of the vote, I
2 will vote aye. I have significant concerns, especially
3 about certain areas of the map that I think will need to
4 be -- will need to be worked on. I look forward to hearing
5 from the public but right now what's the southern part of
6 the state maps, some of the concerns for the coalition map
7 recommendations and where they are, are of concern to me and
8 I'll want to take a closer look at those. But I vote aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: As a statement, Commissioner
11 York is concerned with the northeast corner of Maricopa
12 County and -- and in turn intends to address those thoughts
13 and get feedback from the public. We did receive a letter
14 today from the McCormack Ranch with a proposition I believe,
15 and we'll consider that as we continue to work on after the
16 draft maps have been approved and so I vote aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And Chairwoman Neuberg votes
18 aye.

19 I think it's a great compromise map. I need to
20 learn more about the Tucson area, I'd like to learn more
21 from the Latino Coalition about ideas on that southern
22 district, but I feel very proud of, you know, the levels
23 of -- again honoring the constitutional criteria. These
24 districts are, you know, compact, they're equal population,
25 we've done a remarkable job of grouping as many communities

1 of interest as we can, respecting as many physical
2 boundaries as we can, while all at the same time trying to
3 maximize competitiveness with due diligence to honoring and
4 respecting VRA compliance.

5 Mapping, would you like to maybe walk us through a
6 little bit your assessment of the map as it, you know,
7 honors the Constitution and if there's any, you know,
8 strengths, any weaknesses you see that we should take note
9 of.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg, members of the
11 Commission, again, I would primarily refer folks to the --
12 the giant record that the Commission -- at the Commission's
13 direction has been established to document each of the
14 changes that got us here.

15 But yes, we have lots of community of interest
16 testimony across the map; we -- the Commission has given us
17 direction on a number of competitiveness improvements in
18 various parts of the map; we have the -- the Native American
19 district has -- has been kept together as -- there are some
20 disputes in that -- in District 7 about -- I'm sorry, in
21 District 6 about what should be with -- which area should be
22 with the -- the reservation groupings, but we have got -- we
23 have all the reservations together as requested in there;
24 and then as you have -- as you probably have all seared into
25 your memories at this point, we have extensive discussions

1 in Maricopa and Tucson and in Yuma and across the map about
2 where those lines should go, that I think you've built a
3 very good record for how the decisions were made to get us
4 where we are today, so.

5 And on the screen you can see the -- the
6 spreadsheet from a numbers perspective.

7 Yes, we're looking at, you know, as -- as
8 Dr. Handley advised in District 6 for the Native American
9 percentages, trying to keep those as high as we can with
10 it -- with reasonable logical boundaries that follow the
11 constitutional criteria, and we do have that it -- depending
12 which numbers you use, 58 or 54 percent; as we discussed
13 this morning we have seven effective Latino performance
14 districts that -- that are both very high in Latino CVAP and
15 that perform by our -- our measurements.

16 And then on the competitiveness spread we have --
17 just run through this -- we have Districts 2, 4 -- one,
18 two -- I think we're at six -- six or seven at this point.
19 One, two, three, four, five, six -- yeah, six are
20 competitive by vote spread, a couple that are just outside,
21 we have an 8 percent, some others are very close; and then a
22 seventh that is not in the vote spread. Let me see, what
23 number is that?

24 I believe it's 12, can you highlight 12 across
25 there?

1 That has -- that it is not competitive by vote
2 spread but does have a swing seat.

3 Perfect. Thank you, Brian, yeah.

4 So, we have a good -- good number of -- of
5 competitive seats and -- and we're looking on the voting
6 rights front as well.

7 Obviously as the Commissioners have expressed, the
8 community has lots of input on changes they would like to
9 see as well and I look forward to hearing from them, but at
10 this point we have a very solid map that's well-grounded in
11 the constitutional criteria and a very extensive record of
12 the details of how that -- how that is.

13 COMMISSIONER NEUBERG: Thank you.

14 And again, Commissioners, thank you for setting an
15 example for our state. One of the most exciting things for
16 me is being able in a unified voice to come to the public
17 and ask the public to engage in civil discourse right along
18 with us and, you know, there's no better example than what
19 we just set. And so from the bottom of my heart I really
20 thank you and I -- I think it's going to help lead and
21 continue to encourage remarkable Democratic discourse in our
22 state. There's something very right going on, our public is
23 highly engaged and really giving us fabulous intelligent,
24 constructive feedback.

25 So I -- I draw that line directly to the behavior

1 and attitudes of my Commissioners.

2 So thank you.

3 And if there's no other questions -- or I don't
4 know if Legal has any commentary on these maps that we just
5 approved?

6 MR. HERRERA: No legal commentary, but if I can
7 make a suggestion in that we wait on renumbering the
8 districts and I say that primarily because there's a lot of
9 analysis that has been ongoing that's associated with the
10 current numbers, so it might be easier if we actually wait
11 on that, Commissioner Mehl, per your request.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But don't we want to go out
13 with draft numbers that does have it renumbered?

14 MR. HERRERA: It's not required at this point from
15 any legal perspective and so I think it would just introduce
16 a bit of confusion on our end and maybe on Timmons' end.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So will you call Senator Fann?

18 MR. HERRERA: I will definitely not be calling
19 Senator Fann.

20 That's a suggestion, Commissioner Mehl and
21 Chairwoman. We can obviously adjust if you think it is
22 important to make the -- the changes now.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It would be my -- I mean, I
24 think it would be confusing for the public but I think we
25 make a commitment -- of course we know that the numbers will

1 change because that's tradition; but I'm -- I'm a little
2 worried about making all the -- the adjustments now when
3 everybody's been looking at these maps, finally got used to
4 not talking about their old numbers are now looking at
5 these.

6 So that's my only the concern, unless we --

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I think we're going to just
8 extend that issue, so do we wait and after the final maps
9 then we change the numbers?

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I'm okay with -- I mean
11 changing the maps --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay, then. This is
13 announcement to Senator Fann and the public: We promise
14 Prescott will be number one at the end of this process.

15 Thank you.

16 MR. KINGERY: So we still have documents to post to
17 the hub site. All of the PDFs will be referencing in the 10
18 series the numbering as they are right now.

19 And if you choose not to vote, the approved
20 legislative draft map that I have up on screen that I have
21 not shared yet with the public, are still the old
22 numbering -- the only numbering -- the current numbering
23 system that we have. So if there is no vote -- and that was
24 the announcement to the Senator -- I will go ahead and share
25 this with the public.

1 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's wait on the vote.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Anything else on this
4 issue?

5 I believe we can move to Agenda Item No. VII,
6 Executive Director's report and discussion thereof.

7 We have (A), our 30-day listening tour; and (B),
8 discussion of final map deliberative dates -- deliberation
9 dates.

10 MS. VAN HAREN: I apologize. Chairwoman and
11 Commissioners, I apologize for the delay.

12 We are super excited that we have several locations
13 booked; we're still adding more as we get confirmation from
14 several of the venues. And so we are posting on our
15 website, we'll have it up within the hour, all of the
16 locations we've confirmed. We will e-mail all of you the
17 locations and venues we confirmed, the dates and times, and
18 then we will be continuing to do outreach to make sure that
19 all of the communities that we will be visiting are on
20 notice, we'll post them on our agendas, on our website as
21 well, and then we will be making sure that we blast it out
22 through social media.

23 If there are no other questions, that's all the
24 information I have for you.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Will you also e-mail those

1 dates to us?

2 MS. VAN HAREN: Yes, we absolutely will.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is everybody clear to -- one
4 thing that's helpful is it sounds like every Saturday event
5 is going to start at 10:00 and every weekday event will
6 start at 6:00 p.m.

7 So that in terms of our calendaring we know what to
8 expect.

9 MS. VAN HAREN: That's correct, Chairwoman.

10 And with that, I have no further discussion unless
11 there's any other questions.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Anything we want to
13 discuss on the final map deliberation dates?

14 We did look through our calendar the other day,
15 began to discuss, you know, kind of strategies. I don't
16 have anything I need to add at this point but if any of my
17 colleagues -- you know, we're really becoming experts on how
18 to do deliberation, next time around we're going to be even
19 more efficient.

20 Okay. We will move to Agenda Item No. VIII, next
21 meeting date and future agenda items.

22 So actually we are not having a business meeting on
23 Tuesday as we alluded to earlier, so our next meeting will
24 likely be a public hearing.

25 Do we have the first one set?

1 MS. VAN HAREN: Yes. It's Saturday, November 6th,
2 is the first one.

3 Okay. So Saturday, November 6th, 10:00 a.m.; and
4 then I would presume that we may want to schedule a regular
5 business meeting on the Tuesday the 9th for everyone's
6 calendars and that Tuesday time can be, you know, our
7 regular business meeting at, you know, 8:00 if that works.
8 Okay.

9 Okay. If nothing else, we'll move to Agenda Item
10 No. IX, we will now close public comments.

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

18 And with that, we get to Agenda Item No. X,
19 adjournment. I'll entertain a motion to adjourn.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So moved.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
6 aye.

7 With that, we will adjourn.

8 Thank you, everybody. Thank you to the public, to
9 the media, for coming; and we look forward to seeing you on
10 the road and starting the process over and beginning to
11 learn all of what the state has to share. Congrats.

12 (Whereupon the meeting concludes at 4:50 p.m.)

13

14

15

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

17 ***Please consult the accompanying video for the official***
18 ***record of IRC proceedings."***

19

20

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 16th 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 16th of November, 2021.



Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058