

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Morning Session

December 6, 2021

9:01 a.m.

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

Reported By:  
Deborah L. Wilks, RPR  
Certified Reporter (AZ 50849)

	<u>I N D E X</u>	
	<u>PROCEEDING:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3	ITEM NO. I	4
4	ITEM NO. I(A)	4
5	ITEM NO. I(B)	6
6	ITEM NO. II	6
7	ITEM NO. II(A)	6
8	MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES	6
9	VOTE	7
10	ITEM NO. III	7
11	ITEM NO. IV	7
12	ITEM NO. V	13
13	ITEM NO. VI	18
14	MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION	19
15	VOTE	19
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT  
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 9:01 a.m. on  
3 December 6, 2021, at the offices of Snell & Wilmer,  
4 400 East Van Buren Street, Phoenix, Arizona, in the  
5 presence of the following Commissioners:

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

11 OTHERS PRESENT:

12 Mr. Brian Schmitt, Executive Director  
13 Ms. Lori Van Haren Deputy Director  
14 Ms. Valerie Neumann, Executive Assistant

15 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group  
16 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group (via Webex)  
17 Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group  
18 Mr. Doug Johnson, NDC (via Webex)  
19 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC (via Webex)

20 Mr. Roy Herrera, Ballard Spahr  
21 Mr. Daniel Arellano, Ballard Spahr  
22 Mr. Eric Spencer, Snell & Wilmer  
23 Mr. Brett Johnson, Snell & Wilmer  
24  
25

P R O C E E D I N G

1  
2  
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome, everyone. It's  
4 great to be here. It's a little strange to be leading  
5 a meeting in person and virtually, but we'll get right  
6 to it.

7 Before we dive into today's agenda just a  
8 piece of administrative news. We are aware that the  
9 first four items from our meeting on Thursday,  
10 December 2nd, was not captured live to our audience.  
11 No business items were addressed. There were no votes,  
12 I should say. What was discussed were the very first  
13 four items that are generally discussed each meeting:  
14 our call for quorum, our approval of minutes, opening  
15 up public comment, and then addressing or commenting on  
16 public comment. Everybody can go onto our website,  
17 irc.az.gov, and the videotape is available, and you  
18 could watch, if you'd like, the first four items.

19 And with that we will start today's meeting.

20 Agenda Item I, call to order -- call to order  
21 and roll call. Agenda I(A), call for quorum. It is  
22 9:03, Monday, December 6, 2021. I call this meeting of  
23 the Independent Redistricting Commission to order.

24 For the record the executive assistant,  
25 Valerie Neumann, will be taking roll. When your name

1 is called please indicate you are present. If you're  
2 unable to respond verbally we ask that you please type  
3 your name.

4 Val.

5 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

6 Vice Chair Watchman.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

8 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

10 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

12 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

14 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

16 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record also in  
17 attendance is Executive Director Brian Schmitt; Deputy  
18 Director Lori Van Haren.

19 From our legal team we have Brett Johnson and  
20 Eric Spencer from Snell & Wilmer; Roy Herrera and  
21 Daniel Arellano from Ballard Spahr.

22 Our mapping consultants we have Mark Flahan,  
23 Parker Bradshaw, and Brian Kingery from Timmons; Doug  
24 Johnson, Ivy -- and Ivy Beller Sakansky from NDC  
25 Research.

1           And our transcriptionist is Debbie Wilks for  
2 this morning, and our transcriptionist this afternoon  
3 will be Angela Miller.

4           Thank you.

5           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you, Val.

6           Please note for the minutes that a quorum is  
7 present.

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

9           Val, was the Notice and Agenda for this  
10 Commission meeting properly posted 48 hours in advance  
11 of today's meeting?

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

13          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you very much.

14          We'll move to Agenda Item II, approval of  
15 minutes from December 2nd, 2021. We have, (A), general  
16 session. We did not have an executive session.

17          I will open it up for discussion, if there is  
18 any, on the minutes.

19          And if there is no discussion I'll entertain a  
20 motion to approve the general session minutes from  
21 December 2nd of last week.

22          COMMISSIONER MEHL: I move we approve the  
23 minutes from last week.

24          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I'll second. Vice Chair  
25 Watchman seconds.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further  
2 discussion, we'll take a vote.

3           Vice Chair Watchman.

4           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

5           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

6           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

7           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

8           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

9           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

10          COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is  
12 an aye, and with that the minutes are approved.

13                 We will move to Agenda Item Number III. We  
14 will now open public comment. Public comment will open  
15 for a minimum of 30 minutes and remain open until the  
16 adjournment of the meeting. Comments will only be  
17 accepted electronically in writing on the link provided  
18 in the Notice and Agenda for this public meeting and  
19 will be limited to 3,000 characters.

20                 Please note members of the Commission may not  
21 discuss items that are not specifically identified on  
22 the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H)  
23 action taken as a result of public comment will be  
24 limited to directing staff to study the matter,  
25 responding to any criticism, or scheduling the matter

1 for further consideration and decision at a later date.

2 We will now move to Agenda Item Number IV,  
3 discussion on public comments received prior to today's  
4 meeting. I will open it up to my colleagues.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the only thing I will  
6 say, which I know we've said before, but I want to just  
7 thank everybody for the feedback that we've been  
8 receiving. It's almost overwhelming how much we've  
9 been getting, but in a -- it's a good way, in a good  
10 way that we've gotten that. I just want to say I  
11 appreciate the feedback and the engagement and  
12 participation of people, both by submitting public  
13 comments virtual -- through our web method as well as  
14 attending 64, you said, public hearings?

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Mm-hmm.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Including the satellites,  
17 yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, 64 public  
19 hearings. So very appreciated to receive all the  
20 comments. It shows how the public is paying attention  
21 to our work and providing feedback.

22 And I will say that by and large I appreciate  
23 the fact that the tone has been civil and appropriate,  
24 with obviously only a few exceptions, so I do want to  
25 acknowledge that there have been some things that maybe



1 we as Commissioners would appreciate more of a civil  
2 and -- the civil tone that we received from 99 percent  
3 of the public, so I do appreciate all of your  
4 involvement as part of that.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair  
6 Watchman. I echo what Commissioner Lerner is saying.  
7 I appreciate all the comments. And, yes, there is  
8 quite a bit, but there are some themes that obviously  
9 are coming out of it, so I appreciate that, and  
10 hopefully we can use the comments in our deliberation  
11 over the next couple of weeks, and so I just want to  
12 say thank you to the public for submitting not only  
13 on -- on the public website, but we also have emails,  
14 so there has been a variety of ways for the public to  
15 comment. So I just want to thank the public again for  
16 being a part of this process, and so I just want to  
17 have those comments.

18 Thank you, Madam Chair.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: There has been a lot of  
20 public comment, and I know that like all of the  
21 Commissioners I've spent a lot of time reading through  
22 it, so we appreciate the effort.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would like to thank the  
24 public for reaching out, continuing to try to educate  
25 us on your needs, and the feedback has been a little

1 bit overwhelming, but appreciate the input.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

3 I also want to thank the public. It's been an  
4 honor. And, I promise you, I've done a lot of  
5 listening. I'm not going to respond to the substance  
6 of -- of the lines. That is all going to come out in  
7 the deliberations.

8 I do want to address some of the questions  
9 that were asked of the process. I stand by this  
10 process. I think it's a very ethical, transparent,  
11 collegial, honest process. The broader staff, my  
12 fellow commissioners, our counsel, the mapping team, I  
13 have complete confidence that we have embraced this  
14 challenge all in good faith with the highest of ethics.  
15 Reason is going to be what drives decision-making. I  
16 understand that the deliberative process last time was  
17 flawed in some ways.

18 We're new at this. We're a lot more  
19 experienced now, and I promise we will do the  
20 deliberative process in the fashion and way the state  
21 deserves. We'll slow it down a little bit. We'll  
22 deliberate on all maps that my commissioners, my fellow  
23 commissioners, feel are worthy and in need of  
24 deliberation, and we'll do our best to explain the  
25 decisions along the way. Please understand we have

1       been thinking about these issues for months. Sometimes  
2       we draw very quick conclusions, so, but we will try to  
3       articulate and say out loud some of the steps that  
4       sometimes are going on in our mind.

5               I've heard the cry for competitive districts.  
6       We understand our Constitutional mandate. It is not  
7       about a similar number of R seats and D seats. We  
8       understand and will commit to trying to make each and  
9       every district as competitive as possible as long as it  
10      does not cause significant detriment to communities of  
11      interest and other Constitutional criteria. There is  
12      no one region in the state that is entitled to a  
13      competitive district. We will look at all districts as  
14      fairly as possible. Sometimes it's harder to get  
15      competitive districts in more -- in areas that are more  
16      spread out because you have to carve out just  
17      funny-looking districts that are much less compact and  
18      contiguous. We will wrestle with this with integrity  
19      and effort.

20              I'm a little confused -- you know, I just want  
21      to point out one of the -- one of the questions I asked  
22      the former chairwoman from the last commission -- she's  
23      been gracious, as Steve Lynn has been gracious, but  
24      prior to that last deliberation one of my first  
25      questions to her was, You know, you all worked so hard

1 at increasing the number of competitive seats to the  
2 best of your ability. How come we don't have more  
3 competitive seats? And it was, wow, it's actually a  
4 really tough process.

5 I also want to say that we have received all  
6 of the individual letters, map submissions, requests.  
7 We can't provide time for each organization to have the  
8 opportunity to present to all five commissioners. It  
9 would be a little too complicated coming up with some  
10 kind of equitable process. That would open up a can of  
11 worms. However, we remain accessible. I remain  
12 accessible.

13 And I encourage every organization to spend as  
14 much time with all five commissioners. We're going to  
15 have intellectual debate and dialogue by one vote of  
16 five, and reason and the merit of the argument will win  
17 the day. So please reach out to all the commissioners.  
18 We do have downtime in between deliberation dates, and  
19 I will be as accessible as possible.

20 We will be as consistent on the Constitutional  
21 criteria as we can. We understand, you know, that it's  
22 important to the community that if we're going to be  
23 using -- you know, keeping counties together that we  
24 respect that all across the board. It can't be perfect  
25 because managing and, you know, integrating all six is

1 a bit of an art along with science, but I know that I  
2 am going to do my best in being consistent, and I ask  
3 my colleagues to do the same.

4 Again, we will establish a new deliberative  
5 process. Every district, whether congressional or  
6 legislative, will be based on this deliberative  
7 process, and if there are questions, bring them up as  
8 we're going along.

9 Please don't ascribe motive to every decision  
10 we make. For example, population deviance in the draft  
11 maps, there is absolutely no meaning behind those. I  
12 believe that the commissioners are committed to  
13 allocating population deviance to those communities  
14 that are most in need, and for me that's communities  
15 who are most at risk of being marginalized.

16 And with that I am super excited to turn it  
17 over to the next agenda item, unless there is any other  
18 responses or comments from my colleagues. We'll move  
19 to Agenda Item Number V, potential update, discussion,  
20 and potential action concerning polarization data and  
21 report presentation for mapping consultants regarding  
22 U.S. and Arizona Constitutional requirements.

23 I turn it over to Doug and Mark.

24 MR. FLAHAN: Thank you very much.

25 Good morning, everyone. I will just say from

1 the online public comment mapping tool we've got 1,874  
2 comments to date, and 400 on the legislative draft map  
3 approved and 323 on the congressional draft map  
4 approved, so lots of data coming in.

5 With that being said, on the polarization side  
6 I will turn it over to Doug, who can walk you through  
7 the polarization data.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Good morning, and welcome to  
9 this round. It's good to see all of you again, even if  
10 virtually.

11 So what I have, following our last discussion  
12 we have had our team and the Timmons folks and then  
13 Dr. Handley all look at five additional statewide  
14 elections. You may recall we focused -- we focused  
15 early on on elections that involved a Latino candidate,  
16 so the governor's race, the attorney general's race,  
17 primarily because the law says those are more heavily  
18 weighted in the evaluation. But while they're more  
19 heavily weighted, they're not exclusive, and so we  
20 wanted to see what patterns might show up in citywide  
21 elections, even if they don't involve a Latino  
22 candidate.

23 So I'm going to put on my screen the tables  
24 that came out of that. Make it a little bit bigger.  
25 So the races we looked at were -- are listed over here

1 on the left. They're 2018 and 2020 general elections.  
2 You can see it's a U.S. president election, U.S. Senate  
3 election from 2020. And then from 2018 the statewide  
4 elections for mine inspector, superintendent of  
5 education, and state treasurer. So these are listed by  
6 map and district. So first we have Congressional Map  
7 7.1, which is your official draft map, District 3.

8 In looking at these elections, the first four  
9 came in as not polarized, and then the treasurer's  
10 election came in as polarized.

11 Scroll down a bit. That's too far.

12 Looking in that same map, your official draft  
13 congressional districts, District 7 came in as  
14 polarized in all five of these elections. And I have  
15 just -- just put together summary table, bringing this  
16 information together with the earlier analysis as well  
17 that I'll show you after a walk-through.

18 In Congressional District 7.2, which primarily  
19 is just the earlier version of District 3 that focuses  
20 more on Central Phoenix rather than moving over into  
21 Peoria for the northern piece of it, that District 3  
22 came back as not polarized for all five of these  
23 elections. District 3 came back as not polarized for  
24 all five of these new elections.

25 District 7, no surprise. It was very similar

1 to the adopted District 7 and came back as polarized.

2 Looking at the legislative map, scroll up  
3 here, which seeing over on the right-hand side is  
4 Dr. Handley's summary. Again, District 11 in the  
5 adopted map is not polarized, and the voting in these  
6 five elections was not polarized.

7 Same thing with Legislative District 20.

8 Legislative District 21 was polarized only for  
9 the treasurer's election.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Did we just lose Doug?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think so.

12 MR. FLAHAN: Doug, I think we lost you.

13 Brian, can you hear us?

14 MR. KINGERY: I can.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Let me call Doug.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: He's dropped off.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can Ivy -- can Ivy hear  
18 us?

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: He's back.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry about that. My main  
21 internet dropped so now I'm on my backup internet line.  
22 So did you see me get through District 26?

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We went to 21, I think.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We went to 21 and you went



1 blank at 21.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, okay. Sorry about that.

3 Okay. So scroll back up. So 21 I mentioned  
4 it was polarized in the treasurer's race.

5 Then looking at the remaining districts, 22  
6 and 23 are polarized on all five elections, while 24  
7 and 26 were not polarized in these five elections.

8 So moving to the summary table, as you can see  
9 here this is the map. Which map it is is listed on the  
10 left. So, again, Congressional 7.1 is our official  
11 draft.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Doug, we're not  
13 seeing --

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: We can't see it.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're not seeing the  
16 summary table.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Get this right eventually.  
18 There we go.

19 So on the left is the Map 7.1, and 7.1 as the  
20 official draft. 7.2 is the other congressional map  
21 that we had analyzed, and then Legislative 10.0 is our  
22 official legislative map.

23 So you can see in our adopted draft map,  
24 District 3 came back as polarized in two of the  
25 elections that we've looked at so far, two of the

1 eight, while 7 came back as polarized in all eight.

2 In the 7.2 map we had zero in District 3 come  
3 back and seven in CD 7.

4 And then for the legislative map, all the  
5 districts came back as polarized in at least one  
6 election except for Legislative District 11. But  
7 Districts 20, 24, and 26 came back as polarized in just  
8 one of the elections analyzed.

9 So it's a lot of information. Obviously, you  
10 can get more information on how to interpret this and  
11 what this means from legal, but we do have a quite a  
12 bit of data now available showing where polarizations  
13 shows up and in two exceptions where it did not.

14 Any questions about any of this information?  
15 The summary table I just put together this morning so  
16 that is not yet shared publicly, but that will  
17 eventually be shared, and all these reports will be  
18 shared publicly on the website.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you. Anything  
20 else, Doug, along any of the items related to agenda  
21 Item Number V, the polarization data?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: I don't believe so.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If there are no  
24 questions from colleagues we can move forward to Agenda  
25 Item Number VI, draft map decision discussion.

1           We'll be discussing both the legislative map  
2           and the congressional map. I would like to remind us  
3           that we may go into executive session, which will not  
4           be open to the public, for the purpose of obtaining  
5           legal advice to further implement and/or advance these  
6           legal issues pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3). And,  
7           in fact, I would like to suggest that -- or encourage a  
8           colleague to entertain a motion to go into executive  
9           session so we can seek legal advice to discuss  
10          polarization data and VRA compliance.

11           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, Vice Chair  
12          Watchman motions to go into executive session.

13           COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner York seconds.

14           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?  
15          Vice Chair Watchman.

16           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

17           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

18           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

19           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

20           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

21           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

22           COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

23           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is  
24          an aye.

25           With that we will move into executive session

1 to seek legal advice in our efforts to honor the VRA.  
2 Thank you.

3 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive  
4 session from 9:24 a.m. until 9:55 a.m.)

5

6

\* \* \* \* \*

7

8 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general  
9 session.)

10

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you,  
12 everybody, for your patience. We are just working on  
13 some audio issues, and in executive session we had a  
14 discussion on the polarization and were able to seek  
15 legal advice regarding VRA compliance.

16 With that we will return to Agenda Item Number  
17 VI, draft map decision, discussion. I would like to  
18 ask my colleagues if you have a preference with  
19 discussing first legislative versus congressional. I  
20 have a slight preference for congressional, but I can  
21 be swayed if anybody has strong preferences.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have a preference for  
23 congressional as well.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I did. I had a slight --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Congressional?

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Congressional would be  
3 great.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Good.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We'll start with  
6 congressional.

7 Doug, just asking you first do you have any  
8 questions, guidance, anything in mind with  
9 recommendations for how we can best approach this, or  
10 do you want the five of us to just kind of go at it?

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: The only suggestion I have is  
12 I suspect there are a lot of things you heard over the  
13 meetings so I would keep things I would say at the high  
14 level. I wouldn't worry about this street versus that  
15 street being the boundary of neighborhoods as much as  
16 just if this city could move to this district or those  
17 kinds of larger shifts that will leave all kinds of  
18 smaller ripples.

19 Brian or Mark, if you have anything to add to  
20 that.

21 MR. FLAHAN: No. I echo what you're saying.  
22 The bigger ripples are better to get out now.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. Bigger ripples.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Go for big ripples.

25 MR. FLAHAN: But we'll take all your feedback.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Then I'm going to turn  
2 it over, and, you know, I will allow each of you maybe  
3 some opening remarks and maybe share priorities, and I  
4 will go last and share kind of some ideas of what I  
5 would like to work on today as well.

6           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest that it's  
7 important for us really to dig into Maricopa County  
8 because I think we really -- that needs more time and  
9 more work. But as a starting point, in the hearings  
10 there was -- the Yuma mayor had a map that he presented  
11 that divided Yuma in a certain way, and it might be the  
12 only place in the state where I heard consensus by both  
13 parties on that map. Now, I may have -- others may  
14 have heard it differently, but that's what I thought I  
15 heard. But if there was consensus there we could start  
16 by -- by saying let's use that Yuma map for how to  
17 divide Yuma as a starting point because I think that  
18 then ripples up immediately into Maricopa County, and  
19 then I would suggest we go into Maricopa County. But I  
20 turn it over.

21           COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I was thinking that  
22 we might want to begin with the VRA districts, which  
23 would relate to Yuma, but we have the two VRA  
24 districts, and I think if we could get those figured  
25 out that would be helpful.

1           And then I am particularly interested in areas  
2 in the north as well, the congressional areas in the  
3 north, our District 9 and current District 2. I feel  
4 that we didn't really spend much time on the north, to  
5 be quite honest, in our deliberations. We focused a  
6 lot on the south and a lot of Maricopa County, but we  
7 sort of left the north without much discussion, so I  
8 would like to see us spend some -- some time really  
9 talking through that because I think that we heard lots  
10 and lots of comments in our deliberations on those as  
11 well. So that would be my preference would be to kind  
12 of do VRA and then go to the north and come back to  
13 Maricopa County later, because a lot of what we do in  
14 the north and the south, really, I think is going to  
15 impact what ultimately happens in Maricopa County.  
16 There will be -- it will affect that as we -- the  
17 connections that are there, and then kind of work  
18 through Maricopa after that.

19           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And just a reminder, we  
20 could use different strategies for congressional versus  
21 legislative.

22           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's true. And, Madam  
23 Chair, I also support what Lerner is saying, and that  
24 is focus first on the VRA districts. I think that's  
25 important, and but I also agree with Commissioner Mehl

1 about Yuma. I think looking at the north districts and  
2 Yuma helps us to address -- address the rural  
3 districts, because we heard a lot about that, and I  
4 think, you know, from a land standpoint Arizona is a  
5 rural state, notwithstanding Tempe and Phoenix and  
6 Tucson and the metropolitan areas, and so starting with  
7 VRA looking at north and Yuma I think would be -- and  
8 then I think that will get us into Maricopa County, and  
9 so the VRA for me is most important.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York, do  
11 you have any preferences or thoughts to share?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no, I'm just -- I  
13 think the whole contingency on our success depends on  
14 how we establish and settle the VRA boundaries, so if  
15 we start in Yuma and get CD District 7 organized and  
16 then move into 3 and then work on the north.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I get clarification  
18 before we -- on the Yuma one? I thought this map was  
19 on legislative, not congressional.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: They printed it on  
21 legislative and said that they would like to see it on  
22 both.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Just wanted to  
24 clarify. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That was my understanding.



1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. I just thought it  
2 was legislative, so thanks.

3           MR. KINGERY: Do you by chance know the plan  
4 number?

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's called Yuma Gold,  
6 the one for the mayor that you're alluding to.

7           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, here are my  
8 thoughts, and I think that we're in some amount of  
9 agreement. I would really like to start with CD 7 and  
10 3. The Latino Coalition submitted new maps, gave some  
11 very thoughtful narratives, and that fits in with my  
12 colleagues' desire to, you know, kind of focus on the  
13 VRA districts. I think that lends itself to addressing  
14 Yuma, and I think that there are some nice compromises  
15 there.

16           I would also like to potentially look at the  
17 East Valley and maybe fix that little panhandle. There  
18 is some ideas and shifts with how to better I think  
19 decrease the number of districts that cut through  
20 Chandler, Gilbert, Mesa, and if we get that straight,  
21 you know, I'm just thinking there could be a lot of  
22 consensus around there. I understand the north is very  
23 difficult. We can start, you know, deliberating on it.  
24 I imagine it's probably going to be one of the most  
25 contentious discussions. And, you know, if there are

1 other areas we could at least start and get our feet  
2 wet, I wouldn't mind that. But obviously, you know,  
3 decisions are going to be made and we need to discuss  
4 everything, so I'm prepared.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Madam Chair, can I --

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- I have a comment I  
8 wanted to make. I had written it out, actually.

9 Before we get going and get to that  
10 contentious point, which hopefully we won't, before we  
11 do I just want to say thank you to the staff, all of  
12 the staff and our attorneys, our legal counsel, for all  
13 the hard work that they have done to date and for  
14 managing and organizing all the hearings and everything  
15 that has been done. I really appreciate that, all the  
16 travel, the thousands of comments and other tasks,  
17 because we all know how busy it's been, so I want to  
18 say that as we begin.

19 And I also -- as we begin I want to thank my  
20 fellow commissioners, because we have worked really  
21 hard to develop a collegial relationship, and I think  
22 one of the things we have done is showed the state of  
23 Arizona that we can work together toward a common goal,  
24 and after the last -- we know that the last  
25 commissioners -- two commissions, you know, had -- and

1 we may end up in that way, but right now I feel we are  
2 in a very good place for beginning our deliberations,  
3 and I wanted to make that comment.

4 I think some of that or a lot of that has to  
5 come with you, our chair, with the way you approached  
6 this from Day 1 where you came to us and said you want  
7 to work in a very collegial way. And you've worked  
8 hard, I think, to make sure that we all have a voice  
9 and an opportunity to express our opinions, so I want  
10 to get that out up front because I feel -- I think we  
11 all feel the same way. And so I just wanted to say  
12 that thank you, and thank you to staff, our attorneys,  
13 and to our commissioners. As we begin our  
14 deliberations I'm hoping this great collegiality that  
15 we have continues to the best that it can. So  
16 that's -- I just wanted to make that comment. Thank  
17 you.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Concur with it entirely,  
19 and I have every reason to believe that we can continue  
20 to model for the state very healthy, reasoned debate on  
21 what's right for 100 percent of our state. This is a  
22 "we."

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I agree.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So where would we like  
25 to start? I would love to look at Districts 3 and 7.

1 I would like to pull up the Latino Coalition districts.  
2 I have to say, and maybe this is giving too much  
3 information out front now, the Latino Coalition, on the  
4 CDs we have different versions. They submitted a  
5 version upfront, and then in deference to some of the  
6 discomforts from the community they submitted an  
7 alternative. The main difference in the CD 7 is in  
8 terms of their new submission one comes up and picks up  
9 more of the Latino Coalition up through Buckeye. The  
10 other, if I'm remembering correctly, the first one came  
11 up through Tolleson. And I think many in the  
12 community, including maybe some of us, looked at, you  
13 know, the extensions, and there was some real  
14 complaints with people in Maricopa County about not  
15 wanting, you know, southern, you know, MOC to represent  
16 them. But, you know, I think the Latino Coalition  
17 knows their population the best. If we are not  
18 capturing enough of the Latino population, that's a  
19 very serious problem in my mind. And I want to make  
20 sure given the compactness, you know, the geographic  
21 realities, to include as many in the districts as  
22 possible.

23 So I'm asking if my fellow commissioners would  
24 be open to re-discussing those congressional districts  
25 and re-deliberating those submissions. I'm not asking

1 to just accept them blindly. Maybe we could look at  
2 them compared to our draft map and talk about pros and  
3 cons. And if we want to start with Yuma, that's fine,  
4 and then move up.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think I would suggest we  
6 keep in mind that Yuma split as we talk about District  
7 7, and I'm fine -- I think just by having said the Yuma  
8 split I think makes sense -- that's about as much there  
9 is to say about it. That takes some population out of  
10 7 and puts it up into 9, so let's keep that in mind as  
11 we have the discussion, that if we do like that that 7  
12 will need some more population, and there is multiple  
13 places that 7 needs it. And we -- we've heard from  
14 many people that 7 should extend into the city of  
15 Tucson more, and I strongly support that. And there is  
16 some things we can take out of 7 that I think will help  
17 that. I've not been a fan from Day 1 of District 7  
18 going up into the urban part of Maricopa County. And  
19 I'm happy to have everybody discuss it, but I would  
20 not -- I would lean against that.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So is this -- I think  
22 that the -- is this the Latino Coalition? This is not  
23 the latest one.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. That's our draft map.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's the approved map.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the approved map.  
2       So I think it would helpful to look at the Coalition  
3       submissions -- the submission, because it kind of -- it  
4       will help us address some of these questions, and I  
5       think that in their map that they submitted they did  
6       try to stay as far away from Maricopa County to address  
7       those concerns as much possible. I think the Yuma  
8       thing is going to be an issue, you know, because the  
9       mayor's split would take a lot of population out of  
10      this district. And I would also like to also be sure  
11      that we take into consideration the mayor of Tucson's  
12      perspective on this as well because she submitted a  
13      letter on the congressional, on what was the piece in  
14      Tucson, and so I would like us to take that into  
15      account as well because she was looking at it from a  
16      different perspective than -- than the others, other  
17      submissions that have been there, so --

18           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Those are complementary,  
19      because if you take some population out of Yuma it's  
20      taking non-Hispanic population out of District 7 in  
21      Yuma and leaving the Hispanic population predominantly  
22      in -- in 7, but it actually opens the door, then, to  
23      take more of the city of Tucson, as the mayor  
24      requested.

25           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, but she also

1 doesn't -- she requested some more, but there were --  
2 they were just minor changes, differences. They  
3 weren't huge differences in that, so I don't know that  
4 the population would actually -- and we can talk more  
5 as we look closely. I think we can look closely at her  
6 boundaries --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doesn't the --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- versus those other  
9 boundaries.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner,  
11 doesn't the new submission from the Latino Coalition  
12 suggest reaching up into Avondale to add Hispanic  
13 population to District 7? I can't remember.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: In this particular  
15 case --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think that was their  
17 first submission.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That was the first one.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They've -- they've  
20 adjusted that. If you look at -- I don't know if we  
21 can pull up that map.

22 MR. FLAHAN: Which one do you want to bring  
23 up, their first submission or the most recent  
24 submission?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Their most recent.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is it to possible look  
2 at them side by side?

3           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to see them  
4 both.

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: They've made  
6 adjustments. They still have to go up to some extent  
7 just to grab some population, but they're not going up  
8 quite the extent that they did.

9           MR. FLAHAN: Brian, is it possible to put them  
10 up side by side?

11          MR. KINGERY: Yeah. So the -- so let's  
12 identify them first. So the first one was submitted --  
13 submitted a couple of days ago, and it's labeled  
14 Congressional Map, so is this one of them?

15          MR. FLAHAN: Yes. That's the most recent one.

16          MR. KINGERY: And then the next one --

17          MR. FLAHAN: We might have to look at one  
18 district at a time because their original submission  
19 was only two districts, so it was the single district  
20 submitted each time. It wasn't a full map.

21          COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's why I think the  
22 other district -- the most recent one is sort of  
23 their -- their current perspective versus the old one.  
24 I mean, if we wanted to pull up --

25          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It's my understanding,



1 and this is an important point, and they can absolutely  
2 clarify, it is my understanding that both options are  
3 equally, you know, satisfactory to them. And they  
4 actually changed it in order to better accommodate some  
5 of our concerns, but if we like their first submission  
6 better and it fits with other decisions better that I  
7 believe it's going to meet their needs equally well,  
8 and, in fact, maybe even better. But that was their  
9 very first submission and what they felt initially was  
10 capturing the most of their community.

11 MR. FLAHAN: So would you like Brian to start  
12 with District 7 or District 3 to bring up on the  
13 screen?

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 7.

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 7.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 7.

17 MR. FLAHAN: Can you bring up the other one,  
18 Brian?

19 MR. KINGERY: Which one?

20 MR. FLAHAN: It should be Congressional Map 7,  
21 yep.

22 MR. KINGERY: Okay. There we go. All right.  
23 And then if this is just the single plan, let's go  
24 ahead and find out which plan number this was pulled  
25 into, and I can just add it to this one directly.

1           MR. FLAHAN: All right. Do you want me to do  
2 that for you?

3           MR. KINGERY: Yeah.

4           MR. FLAHAN: Hold on.

5           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl, can  
6 you -- while they're doing that can you help me  
7 understand and let's talk about who is marginalized?  
8 Who is hurt by having the district come up into  
9 Maricopa County if it comes up from Tolleson? Which  
10 populations are going to --

11           COMMISSIONER YORK: I can speak to that. I  
12 mean, basically the way that the original map comes up  
13 into Maricopa County, now that we're more familiar with  
14 the VRA, it actually goes straight up and grabs just  
15 the Hispanic population in Avondale. It does not  
16 include Tolleson, so we could do that if we need to get  
17 more CVAP votes. But the reality is that that's -- that  
18 finger, so to speak, puts that with like communities of  
19 Tucson and Yuma that it's carving out there. So, you  
20 know, from my standpoint originally I was challenged  
21 with the fact that Maricopa County, Yuma, and Tucson  
22 were in the same congressional district because I just  
23 felt like the -- the mindset of those three communities  
24 were going to be different, but if you look at the  
25 population they're almost the same.

1 MR. FLAHAN: Brian, it's CDF 006.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So I haven't yet heard,  
3 though, who would be hurt by this map.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think the people in Yuma  
5 feel like that they want that split and that a portion  
6 of Yuma would be hurt if we didn't do the Yuma split,  
7 which is easily correctible.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Within the city of Tucson,  
10 I think that the Latino map doesn't go far enough into  
11 the city of Tucson to meet either Mayor Romero's  
12 suggestion or further suggestions that I would have,  
13 because I think the city of Tucson is more cohesive and  
14 should be more in one district. And, again, we can  
15 make adjustments, and if we accommodate both of those  
16 things I would still disagree with going into Maricopa  
17 County, but I would be hard pressed to argue that there  
18 is major detriment found.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm going to -- I'm  
20 going to say that I don't believe that that's Mayor  
21 Romero's position. Mayor Romero's position is not  
22 trying to -- she wants both 6 and 7 in Tucson. She  
23 wants that split, as it's been --

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, either way they're  
25 going to both be in Tucson.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

2           COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's just a matter of what  
3 portion of Tucson, and she asked for all the way to  
4 Campbell, at least, she says, and the river to  
5 Campbell, and she says at least to Campbell. And if  
6 you know the university area, Campbell is an odd  
7 stopping place. Going at least to Alvernon would be a  
8 minimum stopping place, but I've -- but I think it  
9 would be better to have at least from -- and maybe from  
10 the river over to Alvernon, stopping at Alvernon, but  
11 from Broadway over, going all the way out to Kolb,  
12 where you catch that southern part of Tucson into that  
13 district. It's a better -- a better fit.

14           And similarly some of the -- I'm not sure  
15 where they show that split. We would have to look at  
16 it closer.

17           COMMISSIONER LERNER: She's -- I mean, one of  
18 the biggest parts of her letter -- I have that up in  
19 front of me.

20           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The most recent one. I  
21 just want to make sure you're referencing the correct  
22 one.

23           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, the first one was  
24 congressional. The second one was more legislative,  
25 right, so I'm looking at just the congressional.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   Okay.

2           COMMISSIONER LERNER:   And so in that letter  
3 she says maintaining the congressional district  
4 boundaries as they exist in their present form along  
5 Campbell Avenue best accomplishes the commission's goal  
6 of having two evenly balanced Tucson districts while  
7 ensuring communities in downtown 4th Avenue and  
8 University of Arizona and surrounding areas are not  
9 split up.  So that's -- that's what she's -- she's not  
10 trying to have District 7 take the majority of downtown  
11 Tucson.  That's not what --

12           COMMISSIONER MEHL:   Well, she is taking all of  
13 downtown Tucson.

14           COMMISSIONER LERNER:   She's taking that  
15 portion of that.  And so she wants -- but she goes on  
16 to say the change would more evenly balance the city of  
17 Tucson between District 6 and 7.  That's what I'm  
18 hoping to be able to provide for her is she feels it's  
19 important based on her letter.  And I also had a  
20 discussion with her as well on providing this balance  
21 of having both districts be part of Tucson, and as the  
22 largest city in the south she feels that that would be  
23 very important in terms of representation, so -- and as  
24 growth is going on.

25           So she says moving the boundary to Campbell

1 would make sure that downtown area that you're talking  
2 about, University of Arizona and 4th Avenue, are  
3 connected and not divided. So I just want to be clear  
4 to -- that that was a big part of what she was saying,  
5 that we're not trying to move it to take all of Tucson,  
6 but I would like to try to, if possible, follow to the  
7 greatest extent possible her perspective on that on  
8 Tucson.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I appreciate that, and I'm  
10 taking a lot of wisdom from what she is asking, but I  
11 am not trying to draw her map exactly the way she would  
12 draw it. And in my mind her comments that the inner  
13 core of Tucson around the university is more cohesive  
14 is totally true. My son lives four houses east of  
15 Campbell in a totally university area community, and  
16 that university area community extends to Alvernon at a  
17 minimum. And so it's just -- it's a better dividing  
18 line to take, and I would take it to Alvernon all the  
19 way up to the river, but then add Alvernon, still  
20 extend it out from Broadway to Kolb south of Broadway.  
21 And then there are some communities in there that --  
22 I'm not sure on which map now, but, you know, Rita  
23 Ranch and the Davis-Monthan, that whole southeastern  
24 portion should go into District 6. Way better  
25 communities of interest with District 6. And on some

1 maps they were and some maps they weren't, and I  
2 couldn't tell you where we are now on this, but those  
3 should be there.

4 And we heard a lot of testimony that  
5 Sahuarita, Quail Creek, and Green Valley would like to  
6 be in District 6, and I think -- and then there is --  
7 there was a tossup and a lot of discussion on the  
8 eastern Santa Cruz, and we had a lot of split testimony  
9 on whether Santa Cruz should be divided or not divided.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think a lot of  
11 testimony, though, was to keep it whole, even by  
12 Republicans and Democrats all saying we are a big  
13 community of interest, Santa Cruz. And so while there  
14 are some pockets that wanted to be separated, we heard  
15 from Republican leaders saying, We're really a  
16 community of interest as a group. We work together  
17 closely. But --

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That eastern boundary in  
19 Tucson is going to ultimately be adjusted for  
20 population balance so we need to pick a spot to draw an  
21 initial map and start drawing, and I would -- I would  
22 suggest following the Yuma split and going at least --  
23 I would like to see a map that does what I just said,  
24 where you go river to Alvernon all the way south, and  
25 from Alvernon to the east to Kolb goes south of

1 Broadway, staying in 7, hitting -- I think we -- in our  
2 map we hit Green Valley and Quail Creek and Sahuarita  
3 in 6 and not 7. I'm not sure in the Latino Coalition  
4 map they had it -- that's not an -- that's not an area  
5 that really fits with it, as we heard a lot of  
6 testimony.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I would say  
8 Craycroft is -- and she has even said the line is  
9 pushed too far east, and you're asking to move it  
10 further east than --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, Alvernon is west of  
12 Craycroft.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's west of --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Alvernon is a couple miles  
15 west of Craycroft, and then Kolb is a couple of miles  
16 east, so I'm saying --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, okay.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- only on the southern  
19 part take it out farther. On the northern part take it  
20 to Alvernon.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I've got to pull  
22 it up. I'm trying to look through their colors here.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: As you're talking about  
24 your priorities around the urban area in Tucson, I  
25 would like to reiterate my priorities in that I would



1 like to capture as much of the Latino population as we  
2 can so that we minimize the numbers who are not  
3 included in the Latino district. Coming up into  
4 Maricopa County happens to accomplish that. So if  
5 there are other ideas of increasing the Hispanic CVAP  
6 in D7 or ensuring, that other -- you know, if the  
7 Latino communities are better captured I'm open to  
8 that.

9 And I also thought the Yuma mayor made a great  
10 point. I mean, I thought the split made a lot of sense  
11 for different communities of interest, and I would like  
12 to start there as well and then build. And I would  
13 like to accommodate as much of Mayor Romero's, you  
14 know, arguments as possible to the extent that it  
15 doesn't cause detriment to other parts of the map that  
16 we're also balancing, so I hope the two of you can  
17 compromise on some of those boundaries in the urban  
18 area.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Nothing will happen that  
20 will make me like going up into Avondale, but --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I understand that.  
22 Propose an alternative.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- I'm willing to take a  
24 look. Let's see what happens if you do go up there and  
25 you go out into Tucson the way I suggested. Let's at

1 least draw a map and see what that looks like.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You got it.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So they have -- I'm  
4 sorry. Go ahead.

5 MR. FLAHAN: I was going to say Brian has the  
6 two Latino submissions on the screen if you want to see  
7 an overlay of them, but I didn't mean to interrupt your  
8 guys's --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's good. And just  
10 as a -- just as a quick point, by the way, they do --  
11 they are going up, but they're not doing Avondale if  
12 you look at this one. They basically are going into  
13 Buckeye now, the Latino parts of Buckeye.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's the second map.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the second map.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the first one --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The other one, you know,  
18 was that -- and so this was -- this, I think, is a  
19 little bit better in terms of not seeming so obtrusive  
20 as the other one had been. If we wanted to go back to  
21 that we could, but this does take that section, and  
22 that section of Buckeye that it takes has strong  
23 connections. It's an older part. It's a Latino part.  
24 It has strong connections with the Gila River area, so  
25 it actually in some ways has that logic for it. They

1 have done a bunch of work with areas just immediately  
2 south, so in that sense this was a response, I think,  
3 to the Avondale piece. And if you look at the other  
4 one that it still comes into Maricopa County, but maybe  
5 in a little bit more logical way.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I actually don't think  
7 it's more logical. And in my mind if we're going to  
8 come up into Maricopa County we ought to do what's best  
9 for the communities of interest. And when I was  
10 looking at the maps I felt that the first submission  
11 made it a little easier to keep other communities of  
12 interest in the West Valley together, but that was my  
13 impression.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it's only taking  
15 Buckeye south of I-10, so that's -- which is a strong  
16 Latino community.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: It doesn't include  
18 Avondale or Tolleson.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: So it's a contradiction in  
21 my mind.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But it allows Avondale  
23 and Tolleson to stay together in another -- in another  
24 district, so --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: In D2 what they recommend

1 takes away from the Navajo Indian, Native American  
2 connection we tried to create all along, so I don't  
3 understand how this new map is what we were working on.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The D2 actually will  
5 strengthen the opportunity for the Native Americans to  
6 be able to vote in their way, and they have talked  
7 about they have other folks in that area. By -- by  
8 swinging it around in this way it actually will give  
9 them a much stronger opportunity. And it takes in  
10 tribes in that area as well as those -- it's a much  
11 stronger District 2 for the tribes by doing this.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yep.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And so I look at this --

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: District for two tribes.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. And I also --  
16 you know, we had many communities of interest in D2,  
17 and we need to consider all of those communities and  
18 the implication of this for them.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Brian, you want to explain what  
20 you have on the screen there?

21 MR. KINGERY: Sure. So I can easily flip  
22 back. This is our approved draft map. So as you guys  
23 are speaking about any specific places, I can search on  
24 that location.

25 And then on this map what I'm showing is I

1 have the -- the latest congressional submission from  
2 the Latino community -- or the Latino Coalition, and  
3 then I have added this as a layer. This is their -- I  
4 think the previous one that they had submitted. And I  
5 can clear out the symbology if you need to see it  
6 clearer. But if you see that on -- let's see.  
7 Avondale is included in here, but it is not in the  
8 current one.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: It also includes, Brian,  
10 Tolleson.

11 MR. KINGERY: Correct.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it's interesting that  
13 that was a map that was a general -- no way to do this.  
14 Nobody wanted that because of the way it broke up the  
15 Valley, and it broke up the West Valley with the line,  
16 but now that seems preferable. I mean, I actually  
17 think that the new map, which the Latino Coalition did  
18 in response to the concerns and criticisms of their  
19 first map, actually is a more cohesive map. That  
20 portion of Buckeye that it takes is a different portion  
21 of Buckeye than the growth area that's about -- that's  
22 going to be on -- this isn't an established community.  
23 It's a community that has ties to the -- to the people  
24 to the south. That's part of it. They connect -- that  
25 community also connects to the tribal areas to the

1 south, the Gila Bend area to the south.

2 So this map actually respects the ties that  
3 they have with that, whereas the others were -- which  
4 is why the Latino Coalition modified it. It breaks the  
5 West Valley in pieces by having the Avondale, Tolleson  
6 area split into that way, whereas this Buckeye piece  
7 that's there is a much closer connection and community  
8 of interest than what we would see with Tolleson as  
9 part of it. And so, I mean, this northern piece that's  
10 there was drawn because of those communities of  
11 interest connections that are there between that part  
12 of Buckeye, that section of Buckeye beneath I-10 and  
13 the communities around there, the older, established  
14 communities and Gila Bend area, versus what was there  
15 originally. And if doesn't break up the West Valley as  
16 the Avondale, Tolleson area did, which is why --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Which of those two gets a  
18 larger amount of Hispanics that's going up into --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Here is my concern is we  
20 don't want to be packing a district and saying we're  
21 going to put all the Hispanics, all the Latinos into  
22 District 7 and District 3. That's not what we want to  
23 be doing. We want to make sure that they can vote for  
24 the candidate of their choice.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know what,

1 Commissioner Lerner, that's very different than what  
2 the Latino Coalition expressed to me. They -- their  
3 concern with our draft map was that we were failing to  
4 capture that big, large group of Latinos that would not  
5 be empowered, and they want them included in these  
6 districts. I don't want the districts overpopulated.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's all I was saying.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, I want to be  
9 very careful about that. But this -- this empowers  
10 them. And I don't believe that the Tolleson angle  
11 breaks up the West Valley. The West Valley is very  
12 large, and there is other implications as it moves up  
13 north. I actually think that first map best captures  
14 their community. And you're right; I didn't like the  
15 look of it. I mean, you know, you're focused on  
16 compactness and contiguousness, but as you sit and  
17 study in the months in between and you're thinking how,  
18 you know, in essence this is about maximizing the  
19 political expression of people, and I guess I'm willing  
20 to compromise a little bit on the compactness and  
21 contiguity here to honor the VRA and honor this need to  
22 empower as many Latinos as possible.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I guess my point  
24 there was -- I don't disagree with anything you said.  
25 I totally agree with that. However, they were

1 responsive to the concerns initially, and they now feel  
2 this is a good, solid map.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But that doesn't mean  
4 they feel it's a better map for that district. I was  
5 told that both districts are equally pleasing to them.  
6 They may prefer this whole map that they drew, and I'm  
7 deeply appreciative that they took responsibility for  
8 the ripple effects, you know, because I feel that maps  
9 that are submitted when you own the ripple effects are  
10 a little bit more thoughtful. That doesn't mean that  
11 I'm going to be influenced by their opinion of what the  
12 White Mountains need and what, you know, Yavapai County  
13 needs or Coconino.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Scottsdale.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All of that. I want to  
16 know how to solve their needs. And, you know, for me I  
17 feel like I've moved quite a bit, you know, to come to  
18 this notion of really trying to accommodate, you know,  
19 one of their -- their proposals as much as possible. I  
20 think it's -- it's a reasonable solution. When I  
21 tinkered with the maps and looked at implications all  
22 over, for me that first submission fit better with  
23 grouping other communities of interest. We can walk  
24 through it as we move north and west, but that's how I  
25 feel. I think first we've got to convince people --



1 well, I guess we could just vote, whether or not, you  
2 know, there can be some consensus in moving up a little  
3 bit into Maricopa County.

4 I mean, I don't want to -- you know what,  
5 look, here is my approach: You know, we could make  
6 decisions and vote boom, boom, boom, boom. I want as  
7 much consensus as possible so I'm not going to push the  
8 vote. So, you know, I want to see where my colleagues  
9 are willing to go. And, you know, I understand you're  
10 probably going to argue for the maximal perspectives,  
11 but give me some sense, also, of some compromise.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Brian, could we see the  
13 first submission, the Yuma outline of that.

14 MR. KINGERY: So it's LD 57. I don't have  
15 that up right now, but I do have that. Is that the one  
16 you're asking about?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are you asking for Yuma  
18 Gold or are you asking in the Latino first submission  
19 how many --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Latino first submission.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: They take most of Yuma in  
22 that submission, in both of their submissions.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But, actually, I think  
24 that we can help that map because we could better carve  
25 out the areas that will I think better empower the

1 Latino community in D7. So I think they were trying to  
2 respect our map, but we can improve it.

3 MR. KINGERY: So the original one outlined in  
4 blue did not include this bit of green both on the --  
5 or I guess just looking at Yuma County this bit of  
6 green that's included in their most recent submission.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the cusp for Yuma, if  
8 we're down there, I believe based on studying both  
9 maps -- and I wasn't a huge fan of the  
10 Avondale-Tolleson split even when the Latino Coalition  
11 put it in, to be honest, either, and so -- but I do  
12 believe I will say that that Buckeye connection is much  
13 better in terms of the community of interest piece.

14 I would -- I would be interested in looking --  
15 and I think that the Avondale -- Avondale would  
16 actually be -- Avondale and Tolleson would be better  
17 going into -- they could go into what could become a  
18 competitive -- more competitive district in the West  
19 Valley, if you keep them intact in that area and then  
20 placed in a competitive area.

21 But if we could look at the Yuma, I mean, the  
22 cuts that they're talking about in Yuma, the removal by  
23 the mayor, I would like to take a closer look at, if we  
24 could, to see --

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I ask a question,

1 Commissioner Lerner?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are you -- is part of  
4 your opposition to the Avondale-Tolleson thing because  
5 it interferes with competitiveness?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, no. I'm just saying  
7 I think that that's where they could go into a district  
8 that's potentially competitive, but that's not why. I  
9 actually -- my -- I feel that the Buckeye connection is  
10 stronger in terms of communities of interest, not about  
11 the competitiveness. That's not -- and I also feel  
12 that it makes for a cleaner -- in terms of, again, not  
13 having a district swing into Maricopa County, into Pima  
14 County, into Yuma. It allows well into that -- it's  
15 kind of cutting. I do look at it as cutting the West  
16 Valley. So I think the -- the current map is cleaner  
17 than the other one and ties in those communities of  
18 interest better than the other one.

19 So, yeah, I'm not using competitiveness, but I  
20 would like to look at the Yuma split and see whether or  
21 not those cuts or the changes that are being proposed  
22 by the mayor, which was a legislative request --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have to make a comment  
24 regarding Buckeye, the West Valley.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

1           COMMISSIONER YORK:  If you look at Tolleson  
2 and Avondale, they're sort of landlocked.  Most of the  
3 growth is going in Buckeye and Litchfield Park, and  
4 that continues to be the growth corridor for the West  
5 Valley, so to put that with another part of Yuma and  
6 Tucson -- so that's my hesitation for that as far as  
7 growth corridors, solar power, the nuclear power plant,  
8 all of that stuff.  Those employees all commute out  
9 Highway 10, work in that area.  There is a big airport,  
10 industrial district along 303.  I just think that you  
11 could keep that as far as CD 9 that makes more sense  
12 from my standpoint as far as like-mindedness and  
13 population.

14           The other problem with this map, from my  
15 standpoint it totally changes what we were doing with  
16 the Native Americans, and I have a hard time with that  
17 because that picks up quite a bit -- a little bit of  
18 population in Maricopa County all the way around, so --

19           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  You mean the map, the  
20 second version?  You have a problem with --

21           COMMISSIONER YORK:  The yellow there, the  
22 yellow on the screen that you all see is the new CD 2,  
23 which goes into a whole bunch of other communities in  
24 regard from my standpoint totally -- now it's pink.

25           MR. KINGERY:  Sorry.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: It actually places  
2 Avondale and Tolleson into that district.

3           COMMISSIONER YORK: I understand that. But  
4 that -- that's a community -- the Fountain Hills  
5 community, you know, you have Fort Huachuca. You have  
6 the Copper Corridor. There is just a whole bunch of  
7 things in that now CD 2 that originally we had in other  
8 CDs.

9           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Well, that's --  
10 CD 2 is a whole discussion that we're going to have to  
11 have because that combines a lot of different  
12 communities of interest. And, actually, this -- this  
13 wraparound does -- and, obviously, there is lots of  
14 flexibility in terms of, you know, there could be some  
15 lines that are moved, but it actually includes a lot of  
16 good communities, solid communities of interest in  
17 this -- in this part to the south. As you look at the  
18 south area they have, like you said, the Copper  
19 Corridor areas. You have tribal areas in here. You  
20 have mining groups, all of those which are actually all  
21 throughout that CD 2, so it's a way to capture a lot of  
22 those communities.

23           And the piece with Buckeye that I will just  
24 mention is that you're correct with Buckeye being a  
25 very big growth area, but south of the I-10, that is

1 not where the growth is occurring. It's going to be  
2 north of the I-10. The south of the I-10 is the old  
3 part of Buckeye, and that's where the Latino community  
4 does exist, and that's why I see that -- that break  
5 there for Buckeye. It's going to allow that growth  
6 piece still to happen in a different district, and it  
7 will give Buckeye, which will have -- it could give  
8 them two congressional representation --  
9 representatives with one representing the area that's  
10 having a lot of growth and the other one that's part of  
11 the VRA district with those communities of interest  
12 that they have. So I think that's why that particular  
13 boundary works for --

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But then the business  
15 interests will be broken up. I mean, I can't imagine  
16 that that elected leader from D7 is going to be highly  
17 focused on major economic expansion in the West Valley.  
18 That's not going to be their priorities. I mean,  
19 they're responsible for the Native American tribes in  
20 the south. They're responsible for the Latino  
21 community in the south. You know, the interest with  
22 urban growth and development seemed remarkably  
23 different to me.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, but Buckeye is a  
25 Latino community, and you're saying --

1           COMMISSIONER YORK:   Some of it is.

2           COMMISSIONER LERNER:   Well, the south part is  
3 the focus of the Latino community.  And that's what --  
4 really, when you're looking at Avondale and Tolleson  
5 it's the same issue.  Are they going to be focused on  
6 Avondale and Tolleson?  Probably not.  But with Buckeye  
7 being connected to Gila Bend and those other  
8 communities, it's got the transportation corridor right  
9 there, that piece of Buckeye, with 85 going down to  
10 Gila Bend.  There is a lot of --

11           COMMISSIONER MEHL:   85 realistically is too  
12 far east -- too far west, if you're going to pick up  
13 the Latino community in old Buckeye.  You need to go  
14 farther east.

15           There is a bunch of agriculture that's  
16 not getting -- that isn't being picked up on this  
17 suggestion.  That 85 corridor primarily has trash and  
18 garbage collection areas.  You know, to me that Buckeye  
19 growth is south of the freeway and north of the freeway  
20 moving out west.  There is -- you can split a bunch of  
21 residential communities with this divide.  I don't feel  
22 comfortable with it.

23           COMMISSIONER LERNER:   This is an I-10 division  
24 right there, so you are looking at an I-10 and an old  
25 Buckeye part, and you have a transportation corridor --

1                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Brian, you've outlined  
2 Gila Bend. Right?

3                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: The Buckeye -- this  
4 piece on the top there divides Buckeye in an area  
5 that's not the high growth that you're talking about.  
6 I completely agree. You're having a huge amount --

7                   COMMISSIONER YORK: You're splitting an  
8 agriculture community. The other map showed the  
9 Hispanic corridor down in Tolleson, and if we have to  
10 comply with the VRA that would be the more desirable  
11 way to go as far as I'm concerned. That keeps all of  
12 Buckeye together in CD 9 and then also keeps Gila  
13 Bend -- there is some lines around Casa Grande and  
14 Arizona City that I might change, but that to me is --  
15 that matches more closely with what is the  
16 congressional district.

17                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let me ask a question.  
18 I mean, you know, I'm not exactly sure yet where my  
19 Republican colleagues are, if they're warming at all to  
20 one of these proposals.

21                  But, Commissioner Lerner, I want to make sure  
22 I understand: You're in agreement that one of the  
23 districts the Latino Coalition submitted is preferable  
24 to what we created in our draft map. Is that what I'm  
25 hearing from you?



1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. They are --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So that you do prefer a  
3 different version than what we created?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Well, our --  
5 yeah, a modification. I mean, I don't think that we  
6 were all off.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, right, but I --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There are modifications  
9 that -- and I think that -- and I think they responded  
10 to our feedback. They heard us. They listened to the  
11 fact that we didn't want Avondale and Tolleson in  
12 there. They came up with an alternative that they feel  
13 meets community of interest and meets the VRA as part  
14 of what they were looking for. The adjustments allow  
15 people to have -- them to have most of their  
16 communities connected by common interests, so I do feel  
17 that they listened to our concerns.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, at some point  
19 we will have expressed everything we're going to be  
20 able to express, and I look for your guidance as to  
21 what you want us to do.

22 MR. FLAHAN: So for the population numbers of  
23 Buckeye for the new map, so the green District 7, there  
24 is 54,806 people in District 7. In District 2 in  
25 Buckeye there is 6,606 people. And then in D9, which

1 is the gray area above I-10, there is 30,090 people.  
2 That's how they split up Buckeye.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Look, change my mind. I  
5 mean, you know, the first time around I learned -- I  
6 mean, you know, they convinced me, the Latino  
7 Coalition. And that's what this whole process is  
8 about, and I will remind the public you can change my  
9 mind before we -- you know, the 22nd. As I learn if  
10 I -- if I see something that makes sense to me  
11 that's -- to me the Avondale-Tolleson angle makes the  
12 most sense, and I do believe that that not only meets  
13 the needs of the Latino community, but I believe that  
14 it's better for West Valley growth and business  
15 infrastructure and all of that.

16 I don't know, you know, Commissioner Mehl,  
17 you're asking, yes, we've debated all of this. I don't  
18 think we necessarily need to vote on each and every  
19 angle of this. We can move then to maybe Yuma and then  
20 try to come up and eventually vote for what it's going  
21 to look like.

22 Can I -- can I get a sense from my colleagues  
23 where you're at on this? What are you willing to do?  
24 Do you have any red lines here?

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, first of

1 all, we started the discussion on looking at D7 and D3  
2 from a perspective of the Voting Rights Act, and so  
3 this is the latest submission from the Latino  
4 Coalition, which I think best fits, you know, kind of  
5 what we're looking at for the VRA.

6 In this district we have Gila River. We have  
7 the two -- the two tribes, the Yuma area -- I'm sorry.  
8 We have the Tohono O'odham Nation, which is south, and  
9 then we have Quechan and Cocopah. So I think the  
10 tribes will be okay in this district.

11 And then what my understanding is that the  
12 Tolleson area, yes, we were looking at that earlier,  
13 but this new version I think reflects a better fit to  
14 the Voting Rights Act. And so I think this approach  
15 here -- and I'm just looking at this here. I know that  
16 there is discussion maybe there is ripple effects to  
17 D2, and if we do get into that I think we need to also  
18 look at the Navajo Nation submission for the  
19 congressional, and we're not there yet. I think Navajo  
20 has their map, CDF 010, we need to also take into  
21 consideration, but right now for purposes of VRA, which  
22 is what I thought we were focused on right now, I think  
23 this meets what the community of interest -- which  
24 includes the tribes, which includes agriculture, and it  
25 includes the Hispanic community.

1           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, the tribes aren't  
2 affected. They're all covered here. So I guess I'm  
3 not exactly sure how this better meets the VRA  
4 responsibilities than the first one.

5           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: D2 has a whole  
6 separate -- has basically northern tribes, if you will.  
7 It comes down in the tribes south of the Phoenix area.  
8 D7 has three tribes, the Tohono O'odham, has Cocopah in  
9 Somerton, and it has Quechan in -- in Yuma. And so the  
10 Tohono O'odham Nation also has pockets of land in the  
11 Gila Bend area, you know, which they've outlined, but  
12 it's not adjacent to the reservation. But the Tohono  
13 O'odham Nation has land in Gila, and, actually, they  
14 have land over here in Glendale, too. But I think, you  
15 know, capturing what the Tohono O'odham Nation is  
16 considering, I think we're capturing that.

17           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So are you saying that  
18 in the first submission for the Latino Coalition CD 7  
19 that marginalized or excluded Native American  
20 communities?

21           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No. No, it didn't.

22           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So that one was --

23           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's fine.

24           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So here is where  
25 we're at. We have I'm guessing two people -- well,

1 maybe you're moving -- who don't want it to come at all  
2 up to Maricopa. We have two people who prefer the  
3 second version of the Latino, and we have one who  
4 prefers the first version. Is there a consensus here?  
5 I mean, is there something that we can come together  
6 on? And I want to remind you I'm not prepared to lock  
7 this in right now. I'm not going to ask for a vote on  
8 it, but I would like to at least come to some consensus  
9 as a starting point so we could maybe look at Yuma and  
10 the other areas.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I could -- all right.  
12 So if we -- can we show the Avondale, Tolleson -- I  
13 mean the one with --

14 MR. FLAHAN: The first submission?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The first submission.

16 Because my concern as we -- if we could show  
17 that that would be helpful. And I'm -- if we went back  
18 to this map -- I guess it's all of the other  
19 adjustments we make. Right? The Latino Coalition gave  
20 a map like this, and then we didn't like that piece in  
21 Avondale, Tolleson, so they made adjustments throughout  
22 to come up with the Buckeye. So now we have -- if we  
23 go back to their original map then the question is now  
24 what other tweaks are we going to be asking for, and  
25 that's where this Yuma concern concerns me.

1           My preference, of course, is the Buckeye, but  
2 if we -- if we -- because I'm hearing from my  
3 colleagues that there is a preference for this one, but  
4 then what's going to happen in Yuma? Because I'm  
5 concerned about the VRA. I'm concerned about how that  
6 will all fit together and then what other adjustments  
7 would be made.

8           So maybe -- maybe we can look at the Yuma  
9 piece now because that's where this -- there is new  
10 discussion. And I appreciate the fact -- I personally  
11 don't think we should be voting on any individual  
12 districts because I think they all -- so I appreciate  
13 that you are saying let's wait on those votes, because  
14 as we move around the state other things may change.

15           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't think we need to  
16 vote, but at some point we need to give direction for  
17 them to draw some things, even if it's alternative  
18 things, so that we've got -- so that we've got maps to  
19 look at.

20           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I agree. Or we  
21 have a couple of alternatives, which I think from my  
22 perspective it might be that we ask for two  
23 alternatives for this district based on what we see  
24 with Yuma. So I'm curious about the changes that --  
25 and I haven't pulled up the Yuma Gold, but I know that

1 that was a legislative --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the testimony was for  
3 both. And the -- and the whole purpose of the Yuma  
4 Gold map was to improve the division between the  
5 Hispanic and non-Hispanic population of Yuma. So it  
6 will improve District 7 by going with the Yuma Gold  
7 map. And, frankly, if we're going to push up into --  
8 either direction up into Maricopa we need to get some  
9 population out here in order to then satisfy moving  
10 into Tucson with population that has been requested, so  
11 that's why I think it all -- it all fits together.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. And I want to  
13 make clear I don't want to accept anybody's map that's  
14 submitted point blank without full deliberation and  
15 adjustments. Everything will be tweaked, you know, so  
16 of course we'll tweak it.

17 The other thing I just want to mention going  
18 back again, you know, to, you know, the argument about  
19 why I think the first map submitted by the Latino  
20 Coalition is better, and we'll end up having to study  
21 the data and look at the Hispanic CVAP, but I believe  
22 the populations in Tolleson and Avondale, the Latino  
23 populations are much higher than Buckeye. Avondale is  
24 52 percent Hispanic population. Tolleson is, I  
25 believe, 86 percent, and Buckeye is 38 percent, so just

1 as a starting point.

2 And the last thing I want to say regarding  
3 voting, yes, we can look at the entire map and we'll  
4 see all the ripple effects. At some point along the  
5 way we're going to need to lock some things in. It  
6 doesn't mean that we can't unlock them if there is  
7 consensus. But, yeah, there may be a point where when  
8 we decide what we are going to do with the Verde Valley  
9 we may vote to lock it in and then require the rest of  
10 the map to adjust. Otherwise, I don't know if we would  
11 ever get to an end point. And I'm not saying I want to  
12 lock in anything today. I have a very, very open mind.  
13 I honestly have such an open mind. But we can't debate  
14 this endlessly, and at some point we're going to have  
15 to make decisions.

16 So how about for now we entertain the idea of  
17 Tolleson and Avondale along the lines of the first  
18 Latino submission and we start fixing Yuma?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I -- I've already  
20 listed pretty specifically what I think would be good  
21 to happen in Tucson, and I think the Yuma mayor's map  
22 is a good starting point and maybe a good end point for  
23 what could happen in Yuma.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And if we can somehow  
25 magically fit in Mayor Romero's comments as well.



1           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, Mayor Romero -- I'm  
2 very fully taking into account Mayor Romero's comments.  
3 It's a fairly minor tweak I've suggested to her  
4 comments.

5           MR. FLAHAN: So what Val is passing out to you  
6 guys is the first one. We ran the normal plan sheet  
7 that we do for the maps that we create for your draft  
8 maps on the new Latino congressional submission.

9           And the next one, the thicker packet, is  
10 actually the city and the county splits for all of  
11 those districts, so if you wanted to specifically go  
12 and look for whether the city is fully contained in the  
13 district, it is in this document. If you see an  
14 asterisk by the county or by the city name that means  
15 it is split in another district.

16          MR. KINGERY: Mark, did you want me to show  
17 those?

18          MR. FLAHAN: No. This is on -- this data is  
19 on the new AZ Latino congressional splits.

20          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we remember what the  
21 Hispanic CVAP was for D7 in their first submission?

22          MR. FLAHAN: Hold on. I can tell you. Which  
23 district, 7?

24          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know what, don't  
25 even pull it up because without the Yuma fix it's

1 probably not even -- it's probably not a worthy data  
2 point. Forget it. I would rather wait and see after  
3 we reapportion Yuma and then look at a new CVAP.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So can you click --  
5 somehow overlap the Yuma Gold map with this piece of  
6 Yuma so we can see the difference? Because I think  
7 there is a slight difference. I just have this one  
8 from what the Latino Coalition pulled up. I would like  
9 to know the Latino Coalition district, the first  
10 submission. I don't know if I'm being clear here. If  
11 we could -- sorry. It's a lot of maps.

12 If we could pull up the initial Latino  
13 Coalition map which had the Avondale, Tolleson and look  
14 at what they have for Yuma and then compare that with  
15 the Yuma Gold, that's what I would like to see.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Brian is working on pulling that  
17 up.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

19 MR. KINGERY: All right. Let's make sense of  
20 this.

21 So this yellow and red is the congressional  
22 submission, original submission from the Latino  
23 Coalition -- Coalition, and this map that is loading  
24 right now is the Yuma Gold legislative plan.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Let's focus on Yuma, Brian. Why

1 don't you zoom into Yuma. That's where they're most  
2 interested.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because I think it's  
4 very similar.

5 MR. FLAHAN: Can you zoom in a little bit  
6 more? There you go.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So the red is what?

8 MR. KINGERY: Let me take off this. Yeah.  
9 All right. So we're just focused on the red outline.  
10 The red outline is the original Latino Coalition  
11 submission, and then the blue and orange is the  
12 dividing line between the two legislative districts  
13 submitted by the mayor.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What I would like to  
15 know is there a way to get at any of the demographics  
16 in those areas around Yuma so we know what the  
17 difference in the split is? Is that going to have a  
18 high CVAP in -- in that area? Is it possible to  
19 pull --

20 MR. FLAHAN: Sure. Brian, can you pull up the  
21 demographics?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We know from the mayor's  
23 testimony that he thought he was doing a better  
24 division of the Hispanic and non-Hispanic.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. That's why it

1 would be nice to see that visually to kind of get a  
2 feel for that.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: This is Doug. Let me ask one  
4 question: Is the mayor's testimony comparing to the  
5 original Latino Coalition map or to the current map? I  
6 mean, I think --

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: His testimony was just  
8 saying that his division of it was a better division of  
9 the 10.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: He thought.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: He submitted -- he  
12 submitted his own map.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: But better than the  
14 Commission's adopted draft or better than the Latino  
15 Coalition?

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: All of the above.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just his perspective.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just throwing my two  
19 cents, because we're actually in the middle of the  
20 redistricting the Yuma County supervisors right now,  
21 I'm pretty sure he's correct, because you can see  
22 Somerton here, so the heart of Yuma and Somerton and  
23 then down south San Luis are really where the Latino  
24 population is concentrated. That area that has red  
25 lines right through the middle of it has not been

1 heavily populated coming out of Yuma than your -- the  
2 population is all along the 10.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And, again, remind me  
4 the red is the Latino Coalition? Is that the outline,  
5 or is that the mayor's?

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The red is the Latino  
7 Coalition. The blue 10 is the mayor's.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is the mayor's. So,  
9 again, is there any way to see the demographics on  
10 that, or is that what you're working on, Brian?

11 MR. KINGERY: I think we're working on that on  
12 the back end.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Just curious to  
14 see how that ultimately would look.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: To be honest, from my  
16 perspective the most important question is looking at  
17 in the differences are heavily Latino pockets in the  
18 mayor's version that -- that leaves out Latinos.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I was --  
20 that's what I'm hoping to see as well.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doesn't this top finger,  
22 thumb, doesn't that include the Indian reservation?

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: It does.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Actually, to Commissioner  
25 York's point and Commissioner Watchman's point, yes,

1 the Latino Coalition gets in the -- those two little  
2 spots that are the -- where the reservation comes into  
3 Arizona, and then the mayor's proposal does not, but as  
4 you see in the past I think that's a 30 percent change  
5 or something that could easily be modified.

6 MR. KINGERY: Is the pause right now because  
7 you're waiting on me to pull up demographics?

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's what I thought we  
9 were waiting for.

10 MR. KINGERY: Sorry. I wasn't clear. I guess  
11 the -- because we're dealing with cross plans and  
12 legislative and congressional we're going to have to  
13 put that together. I don't believe that's going to  
14 happen right now.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

16 MR. FLAHAN: That's a good point, Brian,  
17 because they're a different population base.

18 MR. KINGERY: Sorry about that.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Even if we -- is it  
20 possible to pull it up just for one or the other or  
21 not, and not overlapping? Because if we even saw it  
22 for one of the districts we could probably extrapolate  
23 from -- but if that's -- if that can't be done right  
24 away that's fine.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I also want to mention

1 in the meeting with the Latino Coalition I did ask them  
2 to take a look at the -- at the Yuma mayor's division  
3 lines and let us know if they had any opposition to it.  
4 I have not heard explicit feedback one way or another  
5 so I can't say the fact that I haven't heard from them  
6 that means, you know, anything, but I'm sure they're  
7 listening and they'll let us know if they have specific  
8 opinions about, you know, those lines.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I mean, it's not a  
10 huge -- I'm not sure if it's a huge difference. I  
11 don't know. Maybe this is something you can tell us.  
12 What is the population shift in that? Maybe we could  
13 hear that piece, even if we can't get the demographics  
14 at this point. What does that change do between the  
15 mayor and the Coalition?

16 MR. FLAHAN: Just in the Yuma area?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just the Yuma.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Brian, is it possible to do a  
19 two-step selection and select the tan parts that fall  
20 within the original Latino Coalition map?

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is --

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you talk louder,  
23 please?

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is the map showing  
25 the Hispanic population density within that Yuma area.

1 I just went to that, so that -- and it shows you that  
2 the mayor's map is mirroring that quite well, but --  
3 and we can definitely do detail 3. I'm not saying that  
4 this should be, you know, a division, but I think it's  
5 a good starting place for a division.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: How would my colleagues  
7 feel about, I mean, you know, given that there is no  
8 overt problems or red flags, what if we did adopt this  
9 general principle of the mayor's suggestion as a  
10 starting point along with the Latino Coalition's  
11 initial submission of CD 7 and move on and see -- and  
12 see what mapping can come up with in terms of  
13 accommodating also Mayor Romero's comments and see how  
14 the population balances?

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Does the mayor of Tucson  
16 include the entire reservation of Quechan? I think --  
17 I think it was split in half.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't remember that she  
19 addressed that.

20 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think that's not  
21 included, so --

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Watchman, I  
23 would like to make that suggestion. You're right. The  
24 mayor doesn't include all of that reservation, but if  
25 you want me to include it in the suggestion the mayor's



1 map with that I think is about a 30-person shift.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right, right. I'm  
3 looking at including the entire reservation as one  
4 community of interest. I think they excluded the part  
5 of the reservation that's not heavily populated, but I  
6 think we should include it.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, in this district?

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: In this district that  
9 we're talking about. In other words, the mayor's --  
10 the mayor's proposal does not include the entire  
11 reservation, and I think it should.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's a minor shift to  
13 include it, so that would be fine.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Doug is saying it's 30  
15 people, but we should include that.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: All right. So I  
18 think -- I mean, I tend to feel at least for point of  
19 discussion at this point if we're going to be looking  
20 at the original Coalition map we can take a closer look  
21 at how the Yuma split works, the differences, and as  
22 long as there is -- once we can get the demographics we  
23 can move over to Tucson.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Now what area?

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Jump to 3?

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER:  What are we doing with  
2 Tucson?  Are we just going to keep it the way it is  
3 with the --

4           COMMISSIONER YORK:  The mayor's suggestions.

5           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  I've given my suggestion  
6 that I would like to see on a draft.  If you have an  
7 alternative suggestion you would like to see I would  
8 invite it, but I would like to see what I suggested  
9 being drawn up as something to look at, because frankly  
10 I don't know quite how it would work out, but I would  
11 like to see it.

12           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  I would like to see a  
13 couple of options with the -- with the areas of  
14 consensus that we identified, and then it sounds like  
15 there is two different versions about the more urban  
16 area of Tucson.

17           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  I'm not far off of what  
18 the mayor said.

19           COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Well, I would -- so I  
20 guess what I would like to -- maybe we can have the  
21 Latino -- if we're going to go back to this original  
22 proposal from the Latino Coalition let's keep that one  
23 relatively intact, knowing we might make some Yuma  
24 changes, but keep the Tucson piece, unless -- or I  
25 would like to have us take the -- Mayor Romero's piece

1 and incorporate that into the Latino Coalition. This  
2 is going to make no sense.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: It makes sense.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So many things, I'm  
5 sorry, and we've only been at this an hour.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We haven't got through one  
7 congressional district.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Let me see if I can get  
9 this clearer. I'll try.

10 So if we're going back to the  
11 Avondale-Tolleson split for right now for point of  
12 discussion and we have the Yuma piece that we might do  
13 the Yuma Gold, right, with the addition of the tribal  
14 areas -- we'll take a closer look at that when we get  
15 the demographics -- then when we move to the Tucson  
16 area we would take one version, which would be what  
17 Commissioner Mehl is suggesting, one version based on  
18 the mayor's suggestion --

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, the mayor's  
20 suggestion is not a complete suggestion so I think you  
21 have to develop --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No. Just for that  
23 boundary of that area.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think I've got it.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think it's slight

1 differences. And then -- and then at least then can we  
2 keep the Latino Coalition draft as one so --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Just as is?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: As is for the Tucson  
6 boundary, as is. The thing is I know that the reason  
7 I'm making that comment about the mayor is I know she  
8 had a few tweaks with that. That's what I was getting  
9 at.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And, you know what, we  
11 may not want to spend too much time because with just  
12 population shifts we may be constrained with what we  
13 can do anyway, and so I think we gave a lot of really  
14 fabulous ideas for this district. I want to thank my  
15 colleagues. I mean, everybody went in with not wanting  
16 any of this, and it seems like the five of us are  
17 reasoned on somewhat of a similar path, at least, with  
18 envisioning this district. So I think it was a good  
19 start, and I know it's frustrating and time consuming,  
20 but highly valuable when we hear how we're thinking  
21 about it.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Mark, you got that  
23 southern piece to Green Valley, Sahuarita, and all  
24 that?

25 MR. FLAHAN: I was going to actually ask you

1 guys for clarification exactly where you want us in all  
2 three areas. That way we can make what you're looking  
3 for, because we've gone back and forth.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to see at  
5 least one -- one map that shows the boundaries that I  
6 cited in the city of Tucson and then District 7 giving  
7 up Green Valley, Sahuarita, Davis-Monthan, Quail Creek.

8 MR. FLAHAN: Hold on a second. I can only  
9 write so fast.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The original Coalition  
11 actually already has Green Valley in the other  
12 district.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I've looked at so many  
14 maps that some have and some don't.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, the original  
16 one --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The original one did,  
18 yeah, so --

19 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So D7 give up Green  
20 Valley, Sahuarita, Davis-Monthan.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Which means everything to  
22 the east to connect it back over to D6. So Santa Cruz  
23 stays in 7, even though I would like it not to, because  
24 I would like to split Santa Cruz, but I'm trying to be  
25 compromising.

1 MR. FLAHAN: To D6. Santa Cruz -- hold on.  
2 Hold on. I'm writing it down. I can only write so  
3 fast.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, Brian, can you zoom in  
5 on Tucson so we can make sure we get the university  
6 change or the mayor's change or whatever we're calling  
7 it?

8 MR. FLAHAN: Santa Cruz to District 7.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Santa Cruz stays in 7.  
10 Green valley, Sahuarita, Quail Creek come out of 7 and  
11 go to 6, in a -- in a pretty straight line connection  
12 to the south piece of that over to 6 --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I think in our draft  
14 maps --

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- to make -- to make it a  
16 clean district.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think in our draft  
18 maps we broke up some of those communities, so I think  
19 this does a better job of keeping communities of  
20 interest together.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We heard a lot of  
22 testimony on that.

23 MR. FLAHAN: So basically once we draw in  
24 Green Valley, Quail Creek, and Sahuarita, basically  
25 everything to the east of that also goes to --

1           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, just to make it more  
2 coherent.

3           MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Following the city  
4 boundaries?

5           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, so just drop down to  
6 the south area. Basically it's everything north -- in  
7 that quadrant it's everything north of the Santa Cruz  
8 County line, pretty much, if you want to just make that  
9 the southern boundary then of 6.

10          MR. FLAHAN: You can, if that's what you would  
11 like to do.

12          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, that's probably an  
13 easy way to do it.

14          MR. SCHMITT: Mark, do you need him to repeat  
15 Tucson?

16          MR. FLAHAN: Yes, but hold on a second.  
17 Okay. Drop D6 to --

18          COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the only thing west of  
19 I-17 that's being taken in there is -- there is pieces  
20 of Green Valley.

21          COMMISSIONER LERNER: And Sahuarita.

22          COMMISSIONER MEHL: And Sahuarita.

23          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. We heard them  
24 that they want to be in that area.

25          MR. FLAHAN: But basically this also takes

1 Davis-Monthan out here. We can go back to that, and I  
2 need to figure out where you're going with that.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know that  
4 it's --

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We can tinker with that  
6 later, but basically I think it's better for 6 to  
7 come -- Davis-Monthan being with Sahuarita in a  
8 congressional --

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Fort Huachuca.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I mean Fort Huachuca in a  
11 congressional district would be a very good thing, and  
12 I think it's easy to do that, and it helps 7 not  
13 come -- take as much of the city of Tucson, because  
14 with that you'll take a swath of the southern city of  
15 Tucson, Rita Ranch, and some stuff on the -- on the  
16 south there.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you're going to  
18 still have -- can you go --

19 MR. FLAHAN: Brian, zoom into Davis-Monthan.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- into that just  
21 general area. I just want to get clarity.

22 MR. FLAHAN: So we got Davis-Monthan there,  
23 right, and how do we connect D6 to it? Because right  
24 now that would sort of be a hole.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Through the I-10.



1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think could we hold  
2 off on the Davis-Monthan piece at this point and try to  
3 kind of --

4           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to see what  
5 it does to all the population because I think it will  
6 help because I think D7 needs to lose some more stuff,  
7 so --

8           MR. D. JOHNSON: So you're going --

9           COMMISSIONER MEHL: So if you find Rita  
10 Ranch --

11          MR. D. JOHNSON: -- everything south of  
12 Davis-Monthan.

13          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Along I-10.

14          MR. D. FLAHAN: I-10.

15          COMMISSIONER MEHL: That quadrant right there.  
16 Yes, that.

17          COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you're talking about  
18 picking up -- so that's essentially what the initial --  
19 I'm just looking at the initial map.

20          COMMISSIONER MEHL: This is off the stuff  
21 they've suggested.

22          COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I'm looking  
23 at right now, this Davis-Monthan piece going over  
24 there.

25          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER:  And then the only  
2  other --

3           COMMISSIONER MEHL:  I'm trying to find a  
4  middle ground to try to make this work.

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER:  The only difference is  
6  that they had Sahuarita, which I know we've heard  
7  plenty, but to put them together somehow into D7, and  
8  then they have -- I'm just trying to do a comparison in  
9  my own head about the differences between that.  So  
10 it's really --

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  Do you want mapping to  
12 pull it up in public so the public is aware of what  
13 you're thinking and how you're thinking and why you're  
14 thinking?

15          COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Yes.  It's -- it's the  
16 original Coalition map.

17          MR. D. JOHNSON:  Well, if I could pose a  
18 question, too.  So what about like the Tucson airport,  
19 the area between the two freeways?  Where -- does that  
20 all stay in D7?

21          COMMISSIONER MEHL:  Yes.  That would all --  
22 that could do whatever you need to do for population.

23          COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Could you pull up the  
24 original Latino Coalition map?  That might be helpful,  
25 that first -- that first submission, because I think

1 that goes with Commissioner Mehl's making the changes  
2 there not as -- they look very dramatic on the other  
3 one, and they're not as dramatic on this one.

4 MR. FLAHAN: So the blue is the original  
5 Commission -- or, sorry, Coalition submission. You can  
6 see it goes around Davis-Monthan.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

8 MR. FLAHAN: Then it comes down -- what's that  
9 road there, Brian?

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Kolb.

11 MR. FLAHAN: The one that's south that starts  
12 with a W.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: South of where?

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Is it Valencia? Does it  
15 start with a V?

16 MR. FLAHAN: It starts with a W.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Wilmot?

18 MR. FLAHAN: No. The one that goes south.  
19 That line that goes directly south of the border.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: More south it could be  
21 Wilmot.

22 MR. KINGERY: Where is the map?

23 MR. FLAHAN: You're good, Brian. The red and  
24 blue -- the red line is right on a road. What is that  
25 road?

1 MR. KINGERY: It's Wilmot. Yep, Wilmot.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So this would be  
3 helpful, I think, in general just to have us use this  
4 map right now since that's the one we're working off,  
5 with your suggestions, Commissioner Mehl.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And do I need to repeat  
7 the inner city of Tucson splits again?

8 MR. FLAHAN: Yes. We will need to go there.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So everything from the  
10 Rita River north of town. Go to I-10 -- go up to I-10  
11 and the Rita River.

12 MR. KINGERY: Do you want me to add the  
13 approved draft map showing --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't care which map.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Let's just use this one.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, this one is fine.

17 MR. FLAHAN: Just scroll up, Brian. Go north.  
18 Go north.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay, yeah. So I would  
20 take everything south of the river all the way to  
21 Campbell.

22 MR. FLAHAN: South of the river.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: All the way to Campbell --

24 MR. FLAHAN: To Campbell.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- into District 7 from

1 Campbell --

2 MR. FLAHAN: Campbell.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Actually, all the way to  
4 Alvernon. Excuse me. All the way to Alvernon into  
5 District 7, which is two miles east of Campbell.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: So we're not -- are we  
7 finding Alver --

8 MR. FLAHAN: Alvernon is --

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Alvernon, A-L-V-E-R-N-O-N.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, there it is. Just to the  
11 right of your cursor, Brian. There you go.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And go Alvernon down to  
13 Broadway --

14 MR. FLAHAN: Alvernon to Broadway.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- and include all of that  
16 in District 7.

17 MR. FLAHAN: Alvernon into Broadway into D7.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And then on Broadway go  
19 out to Kolb, which is --

20 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Broadway out to Kolb.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And everything south in  
22 between Davis-Monahan and Broadway out to Kolb.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You're going further  
24 east.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm going further east a

1 little bit but not a lot, and when we see the  
2 population we may have to change it.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. And I have a  
4 request. I mean, we need to give a starting point.  
5 Let's not spend too much time debating about this  
6 street or that street because the numbers may tell us  
7 what we have to do.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. I agree.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So, yeah, I mean, I -- I  
10 would like to make sure that we -- so what I would  
11 suggest -- okay, first of all, Commissioner Mehl, I'm  
12 sorry. Are you completed with your --

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I am, I think. If you  
14 understand enough to draw a map I'm complete.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. When we go Broadway out to  
16 Kolb you want everything west of Kolb to be in District  
17 7, everything east to be in District 6. Is that  
18 correct?

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: For the moment, yes. Why  
20 not.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Okay. Do these -- the changes  
22 you described do they capture everything that the  
23 mayor's letter asked for, or are there other pieces to  
24 the mayor's letter you want us to --

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It captures -- I believe

1 it captures everything she asked for and then goes a  
2 little more --

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Further.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- to the east, but not  
5 dramatically so. And the population is going to tell  
6 us a lot. I don't know what this comes out to.

7 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it actually goes --  
9 so if I could make a suggestion that we actually then  
10 take this Latino Coalition map, but then there is a  
11 couple of other adjustments. This is where I need my  
12 only Tucson map. Thank you, Commissioner Mehl, for  
13 that suggestion.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You're welcome.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're working on that.  
16 It would be to take the -- this map of the Coalition  
17 just as another map to look at from the Tucson area and  
18 make the changes -- the specific changes that she  
19 requested with one or two other modifications. So she  
20 had suggested -- I think it was for this one. It's  
21 hard for me to --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: She had more suggested on  
23 the legislative, but I -- sorry to interrupt.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The one that she  
25 recently did. Right. I just have her letter right up

1 in front of me here. She just wanted to extend to  
2 Campbell -- I'm looking at my map here -- Campbell  
3 north of Broadway but basically use Campbell as the  
4 dividing line, so not go further east. So I would like  
5 to just see both versions not go as far east as what  
6 Commissioner Mehl is suggesting but using Campbell as a  
7 dividing line north of Broadway to Grant.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: She goes farther east down  
9 below Broadway.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: She does go farther east  
11 down, and that's fine. So basically use Campbell from  
12 Broadway to Grant, and go Grant, go west to Oracle.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Crossing Grant west to --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This captures this area  
15 that she was wanting.

16 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. Grant west to Oracle.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then north on Oracle  
18 up to River Road, and then stop there for CD 7.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Out to River Road. Okay. This  
20 is District 7.

21 And then the other boundaries are just the  
22 Coalition boundaries?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm just double checking  
24 the letter to make sure.

25 South of Broadway -- what did she say? Let me



1 pull this up. Yeah, so south of Broadway she says that  
2 D7 -- and I think it does do that here, goes eastward,  
3 but she again wants Craycroft. She thinks it's too  
4 far. So she would like to see Craycroft as a good  
5 boundary point. So I think that's probably the biggest  
6 difference between Commissioner Mehl and myself is  
7 where that east boundary is, so --

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I agree.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- we could use  
10 Craycroft there or maybe as far as -- instead of  
11 going -- you were suggesting Alvernon. Right?

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Alvernon down to Broadway  
13 and then out to Kolb south of Broadway.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, so I think that  
15 that's part of the difference. So her point was to  
16 keep these -- that Broadway, 22nd Street corridor  
17 Latino community intact. That's what she was focusing  
18 on, and so that's really all I'm interested in is  
19 making sure that that works. So the district  
20 previously extended to Craycroft south of Broadway, and  
21 she feels that that's still a good connection.

22 You could also have -- go to Campbell, if need  
23 be, north of Broadway I think she suggests. So I guess  
24 all I'm asking is that that kind of piece be  
25 incorporated just so we can take a look at the

1 comparison.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Do whatever alternative  
3 you want there, and it will be interesting to look at.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, to see how those  
5 would work.

6 And then the only thing I would say that's  
7 slightly different from hers is the Oracle piece, using  
8 that Oracle piece, stopping it at River Road, not going  
9 all the way further up, just keeping it -- and I just  
10 mentioned that, just stopping it at River.

11 MR. FLAHAN: Hold on.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The northern boundary that  
13 I'm using is the river itself. She's using River Road,  
14 which actually takes it a little more north.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. It could be  
16 either. I'm fine with the river or River Road. I just  
17 threw it out on the map.

18 MR. FLAHAN: So let me make sure I 100 percent  
19 understand what you're saying, Commissioner Lerner. So  
20 when we look at the screen here we have the original  
21 boundaries for the Coalition up, and they use Broadway  
22 Road as that north boundary line, and they go to  
23 Craycroft and they go south, and then they cut back  
24 west right above Davis-Monthan.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. That's fine.

1 MR. FLAHAN: So that's the boundary you want  
2 us to follow?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, that's fine.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. And then pull the map  
5 north, Brian.

6 So then you wanted us to go north on Campbell,  
7 which I believe it is right now, the boundary road, and  
8 then from Campbell you want us to go up to Grant, and  
9 then Grant west to Oracle -- so that will be a change,  
10 so that will go over to Oracle, which is also State  
11 Route 77.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which is why I was using  
13 Oracle. It's a big boundary line.

14 MR. FLAHAN: Yep. And then we would take  
15 Oracle Road all the way up to River, and then River  
16 Road is not a straight line to the west. It sort of  
17 meanders west and north, so would you want us to follow  
18 that meander west and north up River Road that Brian is  
19 sort of highlighting on the screen over, and then when  
20 we get to the straight shot that moves west to I-10  
21 just go sort of straight west into District 7?

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, basically, all --  
23 you know, we just -- you can just stop Oracle right at  
24 the river, similar to what Commissioner Mehl was  
25 saying. Just take Oracle up to that point, and then

1 that's the edge of that -- oh, I see what you're  
2 saying, over to --

3 MR. FLAHAN: I'm trying to bring it back to  
4 west, back to the district.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have to pull that up.

6 MR. FLAHAN: Trying to figure that out.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry. I had to  
8 look at mine because it was -- yeah, it's harder for me  
9 to see it over there. So what you just said, just  
10 follow that meander over --

11 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- and over to the west.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Of the road or the actual river?  
14 One is a little more north so I want to make sure we  
15 hit exactly what you're saying.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know that it  
17 matters to me. Either one is going to be fine.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: He needs you to pick one.  
20 He doesn't want to pick one.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Good point.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If it doesn't matter just  
23 pick one randomly.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You need to pick.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you were saying

1 the river. We can use the river because the river is  
2 just a little further south. Right?

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

4 MR. FLAHAN: There is a little population  
5 between River Road --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, let's use the road  
7 then. Let's change the road -- use the road.

8 MR. FLAHAN: So we'll use the road, and then  
9 where it cuts over here directly over to I-10, we'll  
10 just take that straight across and connect back to the  
11 district?

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not sure there is  
13 much population right over in that area. Or we could  
14 just take on the left -- on the west side take  
15 Sunset -- continue to use Sunset Road, right, Sunset --

16 MR. FLAHAN: I got to look. Hold on.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Isn't there a city coming  
18 down there? Doesn't Marana come down on the west side  
19 of 10?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, near Orange Grove.  
21 If you cut over where Mark is suggesting I think you're  
22 south of Marana, but it would be worth looking at.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I will be honest. I  
24 hadn't considered changing the west side at all. All I  
25 was looking at was the east side, so can we just do the

1 east side? Do we need to change the west side?

2 MR. FLAHAN: I mean, we can leave I-10 and  
3 make I-10 the border to --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So can we just do that?  
5 I had not looked at that.

6 MR. FLAHAN: Sure.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's why I'm so thrown  
8 off on your map.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So --

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, if you --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just for now. Maybe we  
12 have to.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry. If you do that that  
14 will leave a D6 finger kind of coming down between I-10  
15 and what's shown as the border of D7.

16 So can you put Marana's border back on there,  
17 Brian?

18 So what we could do is just when we hit Marana  
19 just follow the Marana -- the south edge of Marana over  
20 to District 7 to get rid of that finger.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, down in that area?  
22 Is that what you're saying? So Marana would be in  
23 District 6. Correct?

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

1           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Did you say yes or no to  
2 that?

3           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I'm fine with that.  
4 The Marana boundary, that's fine, the city boundary.  
5 I'd only been looking on the east side, not on the  
6 west, so I wasn't completely -- but, yeah, let's follow  
7 the Marana boundary just like Doug suggested.

8           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So, Madam Chair, looking  
9 at that I know Pascua Yaqui had a submission. They  
10 have several land bases, and so, but if we could  
11 consider and make sure that we include as much of their  
12 lands in D6.

13           COMMISSIONER MEHL: 7.

14           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: D7.

15           COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think they'll be  
16 all -- almost all in D7.

17           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think so, but --

18           COMMISSIONER LERNER: There might be a couple  
19 of them that are separate.

20           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Why don't we take a look  
21 at that.

22           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's take a look at it,  
23 yeah. I didn't realize they had more land pockets  
24 before they sent their letter to us. 6, yes.

25           MR. KINGERY: Do we know what submission that

1 is?

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: They sent a letter.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Mark, do you actually  
4 want that? This literally defines the communities.

5 MR. FLAHAN: I'll come over there if you want.

6 COMMISSIONER NEUBERG: He got it.

7 MR. FLAHAN: Got it. So I'm looking at the  
8 sheet that you just passed me.

9 There is one, Brian, go to the corner of  
10 Barnett and Sandario in Marana.

11 MR. KINGERY: Should I switch over to the  
12 approved draft map?

13 MR. FLAHAN: No. Just use this. Hold on a  
14 minute. Let me see if I can Google that real quick.

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I know there is two  
16 close to the Tohono O'odham community. There is one in  
17 the -- in kind of -- I want to say middle part of town,  
18 the south middle part of town that's -- that's a  
19 challenge, and then I think they have a couple up in  
20 the Guadalupe, Tempe area that's separate.

21 MR. FLAHAN: So Grant and Fairview. And,  
22 Brian, I think we have their boundaries. We might need  
23 to load it up into the system to look.

24 MR. KINGERY: Okay.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's load it up and



1       then look at it and bring the results back.

2               MR. FLAHAN:   The ones that we definitely will  
3       not be able to put into District 7 is Scottsdale,  
4       Chandler, Guadalupe.  I'm just making sure -- I'm just  
5       making sure we're all on the same page.  Maybe Coolidge  
6       and Eloy.  But the ones in Phoenix we have to go  
7       through a lot of population to get there.

8               COMMISSIONER LERNER:  I think there are two  
9       that are significantly -- if I remember looking them up  
10      on the map there are two -- two that work really nicely  
11      in CD 7, but two that would be really difficult to put  
12      in there.  And I think because they are so -- but  
13      they're in the heart of Latino communities.

14              CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  I was going to say we  
15      can come back and ensure that their locations are with  
16      like-minded people and comfortable.

17              VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:  Yes.

18              MR. KINGERY:  Do we have the name of the plan  
19      that you want me to bring up?

20              MR. FLAHAN:  No.  I think we want to bring up  
21      the actual data on the reservation.

22              COMMISSIONER MEHL:  Can we look at that  
23      sort -- we got days to look at that, and it would be  
24      good to be moving on.  I agree we should look at it.

25              VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:  I think we are going to

1 look at it in the maps when they come, but I want to  
2 make sure we acknowledge the submission from the tribe.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. We have -- in  
4 fact, not only have we received it, but I actually  
5 brought it today with the communities to make sure that  
6 we look at them on the map.

7 MR. FLAHAN: And I know they did submit a map  
8 online, the tribe.

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: They did? Okay.

10 MR. FLAHAN: It is out there.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is that something you  
12 want to bring up, Vice Chair Watchman?

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: If you can find it.

14 MR. FLAHAN: Hold on a second. I can do that.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I mean, I think when we  
16 want to bring up maps that are submitted by the  
17 communities, organizations, people, you know, we can  
18 bring up all 200 plus of them, we want to have  
19 rationales, you know. So I'm very open to looking at  
20 all the maps, but I would like my Commissioners to --  
21 to explain why it's going to impact our decision.

22 MS. BELLER SAKANSKY: Mark, if you put the  
23 maps, the submitted maps chronologically, it was very  
24 near the top.

25 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. I'm just going to do a

1 quick search for it. Hold on.

2 Brian, it is LD 0068. If you're in the  
3 redistricting -- yeah, there you go, LD 0068.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I know it's a  
5 legislative, but if we could wrap that in the  
6 congressional side I just want to --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It still shows us where  
8 they are.

9 MR. FLAHAN: I apologize. It is a legislative  
10 map.

11 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right. The point is we  
12 don't want split Pascua Yaqui too much, so if we can  
13 keep it -- if we can keep the reservation in one  
14 district as much as possible that would be great.

15 MR. KINGERY: All right. So am I zooming into  
16 area --

17 MR. FLAHAN: Yeah, zoom in.

18 MR. KINGERY: Okay.

19 MR. FLAHAN: Go Grant to 15th Avenue.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Grant is east of Highway 77,  
21 isn't it?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Grant goes east/west.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes.

24 MR. FLAHAN: Grant is on each side. Okay. So  
25 it's basically Grant and Oracle Road, Brian. Zoom in

1       there. Zoom in. Go south.

2               COMMISSIONER LERNER: Kind of right where we  
3 were with that other piece.

4               MR. FLAHAN: Pull the map south.

5               COMMISSIONER MEHL: Quite a bit south of the  
6 river.

7               MR. FLAHAN: Keep going south, Brian.

8               MR. KINGERY: There is Grant, Oracle.

9               MR. FLAHAN: Zoom into that corner piece  
10 between I-10 and that little triangle pocket, Oracle,  
11 Grant, and I-10. Yep. Okay. So zoom a tiny bit more,  
12 Brian. Stop. Pull the map north.

13               Okay. So one little finger is here in this  
14 Grant Road to Fairview Avenue south, following Fairview  
15 around, which is a little -- below the peephole and  
16 then up 15th Avenue is one spot.

17               COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think in both of our  
18 suggested maps that goes into D7.

19               VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

20               MR. FLAHAN: Then the other one is 25th Street  
21 down to 8th Avenue to 40th, which is sort of right  
22 where I-19 and I-10 come together.

23               COMMISSIONER MEHL: And, again, those would  
24 both be in D7, so they would be where they want to be.

25               VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah. Well, the point

1 is I didn't realize that they had many different land  
2 pockets. At least we're looking at it, so I just  
3 wanted to make sure we all see that.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we could come back  
5 and see how they fit, maybe --

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes, exactly.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- once we take a look  
8 at those drafts. Would that be okay?

9 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's fine. But the  
10 two drafts we're looking at, I'm fine with that. I  
11 just want to acknowledge -- to my knowledge I didn't  
12 realize that Pascua Yaqui had such a -- you know,  
13 several land pockets, so thank you.

14 MR. FLAHAN: They do have one pocket into  
15 Marana city limits, according to this.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can't win them all. We're  
17 not going to split Marana in order to create that.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think there is  
19 Natives in some of these pockets.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, some of the  
21 pockets don't have a whole lot of population.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Frankly, they've been  
23 investments, and they've been good investors. These  
24 are land investments they've made. It's really not an  
25 extension of their reservation.

1           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: There is a few that --  
2 that are actually in trust, but I think the two trust  
3 ones, the -- those are the primary ones. I'm good.

4           MS. NEUMANN: Excuse me, Commissioner  
5 Watchman. Can you repeat that?

6           THE REPORTER: Can you repeat what you said,  
7 please. I didn't catch the names.

8           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Oh, the Pascua Yaqui --  
9 Pascua Yaqui tribe?

10          THE REPORTER: You said something else before  
11 that.

12          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Oh, the Tohono O'odham.

13          THE REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.

14          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are we good to move on  
15 now?

16          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I'm good.

17          MR. FLAHAN: So we got two maps into the  
18 Tucson area.

19          COMMISSIONER MEHL: You have a lot of  
20 commonality up into Avondale and Yuma.

21          COMMISSIONER LERNER: And both are going to  
22 use -- are they both using that -- what do we call it,  
23 Yuma --

24          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yuma split.

25          COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're going to see --

1 MR. FLAHAN: That was going to be my next  
2 question.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The only differences  
4 were around the urban Tucson area.

5 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So for both maps in Yuma  
6 you were using the split from --

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yuma Gold.

8 MR. FLAHAN: Is that --

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The mayor's map.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yuma Gold with the  
11 reservation.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With the reservation  
13 change.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Is that what we want to do?

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just so the Commission is  
18 aware the population deviation on the legislative side  
19 is probably going to stop us from following that line  
20 precisely, but we can see how close we can get.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I still would like to  
22 see the demographic differences between the Yuma Gold  
23 and the original split so we know --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Original Latino Coalition  
25 suggestion.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. I would like to  
2 see that before we finalize on that. I haven't been  
3 looking at the dates.

4           MR. FLAHAN: First -- the Coalition's second  
5 or the first submitted map?

6           COMMISSIONER MEHL: First.

7           MR. FLAHAN: The first submitted map, okay.  
8 And those were all the changes in Yuma, and then in  
9 Phoenix you wanted to use the Coalition's first map  
10 that goes up through Avondale?

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

12          MR. FLAHAN: Was there any other changes for  
13 Phoenix?

14          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No.

15          MR. FLAHAN: Original map up through -- okay.

16          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: CD 3?

17          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: CD 3.

18          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We'll take a break at  
19 12, although, I mean, if people really need a break now  
20 we could just --

21          COMMISSIONER YORK: Seems to be a good point.

22          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think the  
23 Commissioners want a break. So roughly how much of a  
24 break do we expect so we can let the public know? Half  
25 hour? Shorter? Longer?



1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Let's go 12:30.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You want longer?

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

4 COMMISSIONER NEUBERG: 12:30?

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We don't need that.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: He doesn't always listen.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 35 minutes. Let's split  
9 the difference. How about 35 just to give us some time  
10 to eat and then time to run to the restroom?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: 12:20.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 12:20 we'll see  
13 everybody. Recess.

14 (The morning session concluded at 11:46 a.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
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, Deborah L. Wilks, Certified Reporter No. 50849, 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 Phoenix, Arizona, this 20th day of December, 2021.

*Deborah L. Wilks*  
-----  
Deborah L. Wilks, RPR, CR  
CERTIFIED REPORTER (AZ50849)

\* \* \*

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

Dated at Phoenix, Arizona, this 20th day of December, 2021.

*MCR*  
-----  
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC  
Arizona RRF No. 1058