

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Morning Session

December 9, 2021

9:03 a.m.

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

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

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ITEM NO. I	4
ITEM I (A)	4
ITEM I (B)	5
ITEM NO. II	6
ITEM II (A)	6
ITEM II (B)	6
MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES	6
VOTE	6
ITEM NO. III	7
ITEM NO. IV	7
ITEM NO. V	12
ITEM NO. VI	12
MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION	15
VOTE	15
MOTION TO GO INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION	55
VOTE	55
MOTION TO ADOPT MAP 8.1 AS STARTING POINT	60
VOTE	64

21
22
23
24
25

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 9:03 a.m. on
3 December 9, 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 (via Webex)
16 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group (via Webex)
17 Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group (via Webex)
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, everybody.
4 We're excited to get started with our second day of
5 deliberation, and welcome to our mapping team, who is
6 convened -- where exactly are you?

7 MR. FLAHAN: We are -- we are in Virginia
8 today.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. All together kind
10 of working as a team.

11 So we will get to business. Agenda Item I,
12 call to order and roll call. I(A), call for quorum.

13 It is 9:03, Thursday, December 9th, 2021. I
14 call this meeting of the Independent Redistricting
15 Commission to order.

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

21 Val.

22 MS. NEUMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair.
23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Present.

25 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Lerner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Present.

2 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner Mehl.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Present.

4 MS. NEUMANN: Commissioner York.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Present.

6 MS. NEUMANN: Chairperson Neuberg.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Present.

8 MS. NEUMANN: And for the record also in
9 attendance is Executive Director, Brian Schmitt; Deputy
10 Director Lori Van Haren.

11 Our legal team, we have Roy Herrera and Daniel
12 Arellano from Ballard Spahr; Brett Johnson and Eric
13 Spencer from Snell & Wilmer.

14 And appearing virtually today, our mapping
15 consultants, we have Mark Flahan, Parker Bradshaw,
16 Brian Kingery from Timmons, and Doug Johnson and Ivy
17 Beller Sakansky from NDC Research.

18 And we have our transcriptionists. Our
19 morning transcriptionist is Debbie Wilks, and our
20 afternoon transcriptionist will be Angela Miller.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you.

22 Please note for the minutes that a quorum is
23 present.

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

25 Val, was the Notice and Agenda for the

1 commission meeting property posted 48 hours in advance
2 of today's meeting?

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

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you very much.

5 Agenda Item II, approval of minutes from
6 December 6th, our earlier deliberation meeting. In the
7 week we have our general session minutes, Item (A) and
8 (B). We have one executive session item in which
9 counsel provided legal advice on VRA compliance with
10 our legislative and congressional maps.

11 Is there any discussion on the minutes?

12 If there is no discussion I'll entertain a
13 motion to approve the minutes.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So moved.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: A motion to approve both
16 general session and executive session minutes?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. I'm sorry. So
18 moved to approve both sets of minutes.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Second. Commissioner
20 York.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. With that we'll
22 take a vote on approving (A) and (B), general session
23 and executive session minutes from December 6th.

24 Vice Chair Watchman.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
8 an aye.

9 And with that we have approved the minutes
10 from December 6.

11 Agenda Item III, opportunity for public
12 comments. Public comment will now open for a minimum
13 of 30 minutes and remain open until the adjournment of
14 the meeting. Comments will only be accepted
15 electronically in writing on the link provided in the
16 Notice and Agenda for this public meeting and will be
17 limited to 3,000 characters. Please note members of
18 the Commission may not discuss items that are not
19 specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore,
20 pursuant to A.R.S. 38-431.01(H) action taken as a
21 result of public comment will be limited to directing
22 staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism,
23 or scheduling the matter for further consideration and
24 decision at a later date.

25 We'll move to Agenda Item Number IV,

1 discussion on public comments received prior to today's
2 meeting.

3 I open it up to my colleagues, if you have
4 anything you would like to share.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Public comments, again,
6 continue at a -- at a high pace, and we appreciate
7 that. A lot of the public comments suggested certain
8 groups are partisan and other groups are nonpartisan,
9 and there is a real self-selection of which groups to
10 declare one or the other. The Latino Coalition,
11 although we will pay lot of attention to what they've
12 submitted and they're an important part of our -- our
13 state, they're extremely Democratic. They're virtually
14 identical to the Democratic party. And so I don't view
15 the maps that they submitted as being nonpartisan at
16 all, and I don't think as a Commission that we should.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have a few things that
18 I would like to add, the first related to Commissioner
19 Mehl's point. What I -- what I would like to say about
20 it is just to reiterate to the entire public I -- I
21 view all maps as biased. Sometimes the best and the
22 brightest ideas come from those who study the state the
23 most and are demographics. They happen to be, on
24 average, partisans. So just like when we interviewed
25 executive directors and I made it clear that I didn't

1 want to rule out people with partisan connections
2 because I felt we'd rule out the most talented,
3 best-suited people for this particular task, I would
4 like to remain open and able to look at all maps.
5 And -- and I -- you know, given that I look at a map
6 from a presumption of bias, you know, let's stay
7 focused on the merit of the arguments that we're
8 making, the six Constitutional criteria that are
9 driving us, and make the best decision possible, but
10 how we handle what the Commissioner's will discuss, you
11 know, procedurally, how we want to handle which maps we
12 bring up and whether or not we allow certain sections
13 of maps to be inserted as a template or, you know,
14 maybe we just work a little harder to go only based on
15 our draft map and use city lines and, you know, get to
16 where we need to go the slower way.

17 I have received a lot of feedback from many of
18 the Native American tribes. I want to make clear I am
19 deeply focused and concerned about ensuring that they
20 have the opportunity to elect a candidate of their
21 choice in their legislative district. We're going to
22 have to study some maps. The overwhelming majority
23 that I've heard support the Coconino Board of
24 Supervisors' maps.

25 I would like to share, you know, because

1 people wonder why I like maps and why I don't like
2 maps, and I don't want to give anybody the idea I've
3 discounted these maps. Rather, I actually spent
4 significant time with representatives of the board of
5 Coconino supervisors so they could walk me through the
6 merit of the map and explain it to me.

7 I had two concerns with the LD on the
8 Flagstaff side. Is it LD6 or 7? I sometimes get them
9 a little mixed up. But on the legislative district
10 that they proposed that included Flagstaff, I asked two
11 questions that I haven't yet received answers that are
12 comfortable for me. One is I asked why in a
13 non-majority minority district should it be so
14 underpopulated. The population deviance was -- was
15 over 6 percent and, you know, that's -- giving an extra
16 power to your voice is a very serious, you know, thing,
17 and, you know, I think it's different when we're
18 looking at using it to empower minority communities
19 that have been marginalized, but very different when
20 we're looking at just a regular legislative district.

21 The other thing, I asked about the rationale
22 for the communities that they included in their map and
23 why they went in that southern kind of diagonal
24 direction, and the answer I received was, well, because
25 it made it competitive. And I -- I just -- that wasn't

1 a compelling explanation to me, because I believe that
2 protecting communities of interest and redistricting
3 based on organizing the communities of interest as
4 authentically as we can is the driving force.

5 So on the LD side as it relates to the Native
6 American legislative district, I would be open to
7 debating the Coconino submission, the Navajo Nation
8 submission, and all other submissions to consider, and
9 everything remains on the table.

10 One other response. I also received a letter
11 questioning my rationale for why I wasn't in support of
12 the Latino Coalition's initial submission of eight
13 majority minority Latino districts. The letter focused
14 on one aspect that I, you know, was concerned about,
15 that it would lead to less competitive districts around
16 the rest of the state. The letter correctly pointed
17 out that we're very capable of having all of the
18 majority minority districts and creating competitive
19 districts, but I don't believe we're capable of doing
20 that without causing significant detriment to
21 communities of interest. There is a simple
22 mathematical reality I've spoken about, and I think in
23 some ways maybe it just helps us to logically
24 conceptually understand the mathematical challenges.
25 When you take out the population in our majority

1 minority districts, they are so overwhelmingly
2 Democratic that the rest of the state is so
3 overwhelmingly biased in the Republican direction. It
4 makes it harder to come up with competitive districts
5 that truly match communities of interest. But we will
6 continue to do our best to honor all six Constitutional
7 criteria, and I am deeply committed to doing right by
8 the Latino Coalition, doing right by our Native
9 American community, and doing right by creating as many
10 competitive districts as we possibly can, provided that
11 it doesn't violate my interpretation of what our
12 Constitutional responsibilities are and considering
13 communities of interest.

14 And with that, thank you. We will move to
15 Agenda Item Number V, potential update, discussion, and
16 potential action concerning polarization data and
17 report presentation from mapping consultants regarding
18 U.S. and Arizona Constitutional requirements.

19 I'm not sure, Doug, Mark, team, if you have
20 anything that would you like to add on this front.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: No update on this today.
22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. With that we will
24 move to Agenda Item Number VI, draft map decision
25 discussion. We will be diving into our legislative map

1 drawing, our congressional map drawing.

2 Just to bring it back to where we left off on
3 Monday, had we not run out of time I was going to make
4 a suggestion that we move to go into executive session.
5 We were beginning to deliberate about the northern
6 Native American legislative district. I have some
7 legal questions as it relates to honoring the VRA and
8 the opportunity for the Native American community, you
9 know, to elect somebody, so that's one possibility of a
10 starting point. I open it up to my colleagues, if you
11 would like to share any general vision or strategy or
12 preference with how we carve out the time today and
13 which areas you would like to highlight.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I would
15 like -- like the other day, I'd have a slight
16 preference with starting with the CD maps and -- and
17 hope that maybe even they could be doing some drawing
18 on some comments that we could then look at later in
19 the day.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, CD would be fine.
21 That's kind of what -- taking turns, I think.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, CD would be fine,
24 but I would like to maybe entertain your thought about
25 executive session and discussing in more detail the

1 Voter Rights Act and how it impacts not only the Native
2 American but other parts of the state, so I think
3 that's timely at this point. I think that could help
4 guide our discussion when we get out of the executive
5 session. So having said that I move to go into
6 executive session.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Well, one
8 question, though. So I agree that before we start
9 deliberating on the legislative maps I would like to go
10 into executive session. If we're going into -- if
11 we're starting deliberating congressionally, you feel
12 that we still need to go into -- you're asking still
13 for executive session to discuss --

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think it speaks to
15 both legislative and congressional and so --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then I will second the
17 motion.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Let me explain to
19 the public the rationale. My colleagues are requesting
20 to go into executive session, which will not be open to
21 the public, for the purpose of obtaining legal advice
22 to further implement and -- and/or advance our ability
23 to comply with the Voting Rights Act pursuant to
24 A.R.S. 38-431.03(A)(3).

25 Now I'll entertain a motion.

1 Vice Chair Watchman, you --

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman

3 motions to go into executive session.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl seconds.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We'll take a vote.

6 Vice Chair Watchman.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is

15 an aye.

16 And with that we will move into executive

17 session to discuss VRA compliance.

18 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive

19 session from 9:18 a.m. until 9:53 a.m.)

20

21 * * * * *

22

23 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general

24 session.)

25

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.
2 Thank you for your patience while we went into
3 executive session to seek legal advice on Voting Rights
4 Act compliance.

5 With that, my colleagues expressed a
6 preference to begin deliberation with the congressional
7 map drawing. We have some new maps that we have
8 received, and so I open it up if anybody has some areas
9 that they would like to start with.

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair?

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I know we have four
13 versions -- or five versions, actually.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

15 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Five versions. Based on
16 our conversation and discussion on Monday, I would like
17 to start with congressional version 8.4 that we raised
18 on Monday, and a couple of reasons why I would like to
19 start with that. One is that I think it believes -- it
20 mirrors the Navajo Nation proposal that we talked
21 about, but also addresses the tribal interests, and I
22 think also, very important, is the rural interests,
23 rural Arizona. I think that's also important.

24 I noted the other day, you know, the
25 differences or similarities between reservations and

1 rural Arizona, and rural Arizona and reservations have
2 a lot of agriculture, farming, and so there is a lot of
3 commonalities when you speak to communities of
4 interest, and so, but when you look at 8.4, I think it
5 creates a compromise to the other versions that we
6 talked about.

7 And so if you look at 8.4 it puts the Native
8 American voting age at 21. I think it's 21 points.
9 It -- I think it splits Pinal and Yavapai County in a
10 I'll say logical way. It kind of divides the
11 communities of interest and the different industries
12 that -- that those two counties reflect. It keeps
13 Pinal County more whole. I know we talked about that.
14 8.4 in my opinion provides and keeps the tribes
15 together, including -- and this is what I think is
16 very, very important for me -- it keeps Navajo Nation,
17 Hopi, Hualapai, Havasupai, the Kaibab Paiute, Yavapai
18 Apache, White Mountain Apache, San Carlos Apache, Tonto
19 Apache by Payson -- which a lot of folks don't realize
20 there is a tribe right next to Payson -- Gila River and
21 Ak-Chin. It -- it puts these communities of interest
22 tribes together, which I think is very, very important.

23 There is a lot of issues that tribes have to
24 deal with nationally and federally, and so by grouping
25 these tribes together I think it creates a very

1 significant interest, which would benefit not only the
2 tribes, but their neighbors. And we heard about that.
3 You know, when we went to Honda, a lot of compliments
4 about the tribes working locally, and that is very,
5 very important.

6 And so -- and I think, yes, we did talk about,
7 you know, which way the tribes lean, but 8.4 version
8 leans so much toward the Republican side, which, you
9 know, that's probably the compromise, and 8.4, from
10 what I can see, has probably a lesser ripple effect
11 than the other counties, you know, including Maricopa
12 County, because I know we were talking about that. And
13 so I would like to start back, Madam Chair, as a
14 discussion point, 8.4.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

16 MS. NEUMANN: Excuse me. We just lost
17 ourselves here. I don't know how we got disconnected.

18 MR. B. JOHNSON: I'm still on.

19 MS. NEUMANN: Okay.

20 MR. B. JOHNSON: And, Ivy, of course, is
21 there.

22 MS. NEUMANN: Okay. Mark just called and said
23 he can't see us or hear us, and all I see is Ivy.

24 MR. B. JOHNSON: I see Brian. I see Mark.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Don't see anybody here

1 on this screen.

2 MR. B. JOHNSON: You know what -- who I don't
3 see? I don't see us. All right. Let's take a pause
4 real quick and go off the record.

5 (Brief recess taken.)

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
7 everyone. We apologize. We had some technical
8 challenges, but we are all back live, and we will
9 resume exactly where we left off in public. Vice Chair
10 Watchman requested to view Congressional Map 8.4 and
11 has made -- started to make his case for what he likes
12 about the new district.

13 Vice Chair Watchman.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah, thank you, Madam
15 Chair. If we could put it on the screen here that
16 would be helpful, Version 8.4.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Does he have to repeat
18 what he said before, do you think?

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think just summarize.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you summarize
21 your --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It was all -- it was all
23 covered before.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I made the argument and

1 then I basically said can we look and start with
2 version 8.4, and so --

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So let's open it up for
4 conversation about 8.4.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So if I can add just a
6 couple of things to Vice Chair Watchman and then -- or
7 I can have my colleagues go first, but just a couple of
8 points.

9 In addition to the Native American concerns
10 and comments that Vice Chair Watchman -- and this is a
11 very competitive district as well. It brings
12 communities of interest together. I think it does a
13 really nice job of -- for District 2. It makes it very
14 competitive, but it actually ripples to other effects
15 of other districts, which actually helps CD 6 become a
16 little more cohesive than it was. It takes -- District
17 2 is not in Pima County, as Vice Chair Watchman
18 mentioned. It does a really nice job for Pinal County.
19 It unites Florence with Coolidge and Casa Grande, which
20 are split in all of the other maps, 8.0, 8.1, and 8.3,
21 so that helps quite a bit there. It actually allows
22 nice competitiveness and communities of interest to be
23 drawn together in the other districts.

24 So one of the -- the really good things about
25 this particular version is how much it also does for

1 the other districts. It's not just about -- although
2 this was a good part of it was about how to realign
3 District 2, but it does a really nice job of bringing
4 the other districts together as well, and it's almost
5 all completely balanced. The only two congressional
6 districts that are not balanced are 6 and 7, which
7 could be worked out, and they are almost equally
8 unbalanced with 9,900 people, so that would be an easy
9 fix for that. But it really creates a nice argument --
10 a nice connection for all of the districts with
11 communities of interest and population and
12 competitiveness, so that's -- I'll stop there to allow
13 my colleagues to provide their feedback.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Let's take a step
15 backwards and realize that this conversation started
16 from the CD2 that we had agreed to in our draft maps,
17 which we thought was a compromise, or at least some of
18 us thought was a compromise, has come into question.
19 Similarly, CD7, which I thought had been settled that
20 it wasn't going to go up into Maricopa County, is now
21 being -- the chairwoman asked us to re-look at that
22 going up into Maricopa County. So I really object to
23 both of those things quite significantly, and I also
24 recognize that at some point we need to start
25 compromising and try to figure out how can we reach a

1 middle ground that's best for the state.

2 So I'm willing to try to look at ways of doing
3 each of those things, but I have -- I would -- I would
4 want this work from Map 8.1, because it has the Tucson
5 changes in it. And on either -- on either of these
6 maps what was taken out of Yavapai County was way more
7 than what Commissioner Watchman and Commissioner Lerner
8 had asked for, so if we put some of it back into
9 Yavapai, if we look a little bit about how D7 comes up
10 into Maricopa, if we return to the Tucson changes that
11 I suggested, we can do all of that from 8.1 and try to
12 accomplish the big picture things that Commissioner
13 Watchman wants out of CD2, but I think do it in a way
14 that is better for the state.

15 And what I will -- I would like to go through
16 the map and ask our mapping consultants to do specific
17 changes from 8.1 and have a version that comes out of
18 that. And if my fellow commissioners would like to do
19 the same thing from 8.4, then we will have two maps
20 that we can take a look at and see how that turned out
21 for the state, or maybe you'll like my 8.1 so much that
22 you won't feel compelled to go back to 8.4. But I
23 would like to -- at whatever point is appropriate in an
24 effort to try to compromise and just -- the 8.2 map, my
25 very original, you know, include Yavapai and the

1 northern counties, I think is a beautiful map that
2 really cleans up things for the state.

3 And I realize I don't have support for that
4 8.2 map so I don't want to waste a lot of time arguing
5 for it, but it's in my mind the best of any of the
6 maps. For us to try to go to a compromise, it needs to
7 be a real compromise where we take a look at a number
8 of things around the state. And at whatever point you
9 want me to try to go through what we would like to see
10 on the 8.1 map, I'm happy to do that, or however else
11 you like to proceed.

12 MR. FLAHAN: Would you want mapping --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excuse me, Mark?

14 MR. FLAHAN: All I was going to say is did you
15 want mapping to do a full read-out of the eight
16 congressional district series?

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Not right now.

18 MR. FLAHAN: Okay.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I mean, I think we're
20 all taking -- do my commissioner colleagues need
21 anything on that front?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York, is
24 there anything you want to add before I add my two
25 cents?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: No. Commissioner Mehl
2 summarized.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Yeah, from my
4 perspective I feel that our original D2 was a
5 compromise. I've been on record already for many of
6 the rationales for why I felt the configuration and the
7 groupings of communities of interest makes sense.

8 And I also want to be honest about where I'm
9 leaning with an issue that I know is very sensitive. I
10 am leaning towards the direction of feeling that
11 Yavapai County is best kept whole. I just had another
12 conversation with Supervisor Donna Michaels, the -- I
13 believe she may be the lone Democrat supervisor
14 representing Yavapai County, and she made some
15 compelling arguments about issues related to the
16 watershed, communities of interest, the value of making
17 that county whole. But I say making the county whole
18 isn't my top reason, because I know we need to split
19 counties for various reasons, communities of interest,
20 et cetera.

21 But when I listened to the, you know, multiple
22 testimonies I was compelled by the age ranges of the
23 different communities that would either need to go with
24 the Flagstaff and Native American area or Yavapai, you
25 know, particularly looking at Verde Valley, Sedona,

1 Cottonwood, those communities of interest that have
2 expressed a very strong desire to stay together. And,
3 in fact, they have more of a desire to stay together
4 than where they're placed, in which CD. And I think
5 the average ages are in range of about, you know, late
6 50s, early 60s, where in Flagstaff the average ages are
7 dramatically lower. And if there is one thing that
8 I've learned is that the political needs of communities
9 of interest are dramatically different based on where
10 you are general -- generationally, retirement.

11 And so, you know, I would not like to have to
12 relitigate all of this. It will slow us down. But,
13 you know, we can keep debating. But that's how I feel
14 about this map.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I think some
16 of the arguments you just made are more applicable to
17 the legislative map than to this one.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh, okay. Maybe I'm --
19 maybe I'm --

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Because I --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- I'm lumping all of
22 them together. I'm sorry.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And this Yavapai was
24 in our D -- D2 map was all in with Flagstaff and the
25 Native Americans, either in whole or -- pretty much in

1 whole.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But I like your arguments
4 on the legislative side.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I apologize. I'm
6 getting confused.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I could make a couple
8 of other points about this map, on why I like this map.
9 One of the things we heard, first of all, from -- we
10 heard loud and clear from a lot of people in Mohave
11 County that they do not want to be tied to Maricopa
12 County, that the other map that -- that we had that --
13 I will say that -- that we're working off of I did
14 not -- as I've mentioned, that was the map that we
15 agreed to we wanted to go back to at some point, and we
16 said once we heard from the public we would go back to
17 it, so to me that -- that was just -- we're letting
18 that go for now, and it wasn't something that we
19 want -- that at least I was comfortable with, that
20 previous -- for District 2.

21 But what I heard a lot over the public
22 hearings in the last month that we were listening is
23 don't put us with Maricopa County. What I like about
24 this map is it changes that. If you look closely at
25 the border to the West Valley it really pulls out the

1 people from the West Valley.

2 If you recall, Doug Johnson said that District
3 9, without this configuration and the configuration we
4 had, would essentially be a Maricopa County district.
5 It would have a majority of Maricopa County, over
6 60 percent of the population. That is not a rural
7 district. Basically, district -- we would have two
8 nice rural districts by having this particular
9 configuration. It would give District 9 a voice for
10 the rural population in that area by reducing the
11 amount that it goes into Maricopa County.

12 If you look at the west side of the Valley in
13 that area, it really takes less of that in that area,
14 and that's one of the reasons I like this so much. It
15 pulls communities of interest together really nicely.
16 It creates really good -- we hear from the rural
17 districts all the time about wanting to be heard, and
18 this particular configuration doesn't put them so much
19 with the big urban areas that they talk about all the
20 time. They keep saying, Don't put us there. We heard
21 from Havasu saying, Please put us back with Prescott.
22 We want to be with that. And the boundary there is
23 Mingus Mountain, so it's not an off boundary that they
24 were doing. They were using -- in fact, I remember --
25 I mean, that's why Doug has said it's kind of a choppy

1 line, because they're using sort of that logical
2 boundary there that we heard about in a lot of
3 testimony. The other thing is a lot of folks from
4 Prescott said that they want to be with Mohave County.
5 We heard back and forth in those areas.

6 And the other point I'll make is we heard from
7 a lot of folks in the east part of the state, Show Low,
8 Pinetop, Eagar, those areas, saying, We don't want to
9 be in a district with urban areas, and we don't want to
10 be a district -- we don't feel that we're connected to
11 the west side of the state, that the people on the
12 Colorado River have different interests, different --
13 different needs than we do. We want to be separate
14 from them.

15 So, really, from my perspective -- and I'm
16 really focusing on District 2 right here because,
17 obviously, there are changes we could make in all the
18 other districts as part of it, and there are changes we
19 could make in this district as well. But the reason I
20 like this particular configuration is because it
21 answers so many of the questions for the rural areas
22 that we heard loud and clear about, Please keep us
23 rural. Let us have a voice where we haven't had. Let
24 us not be drowned out by Maricopa County. Those are,
25 to me, the reasons for this different configuration.

1 What happens to District 7, District 6 some of
2 these others, certainly there are lines that can be
3 adjusted. I'm real open, and I'm open to other lines
4 potentially that could be adjusted in this particular
5 configuration, but I think it answers a lot of what we
6 heard from the public, in addition to which when we
7 look at the overall -- and I'm bringing this up at the
8 end, the overall competitiveness piece, this is the
9 only iterations of all of the ones that we have that
10 actually creates a very competitive district for
11 District 2 that will allow Native Americans to have a
12 true voice in that district.

13 So these are some of the reasons that -- that
14 go way beyond competitiveness. There are many more
15 reasons than competitiveness, but competitiveness is
16 one of those. And I think from a Constitutional
17 perspective, this configuration -- recognizing there
18 will be adjustments in lines, but this configuration
19 meets all of the Constitutional requirements that we
20 have, like keeping communities of interest together, by
21 addressing some of the needs in each area with rural,
22 not combining rural and urban, competitiveness,
23 compactness. It has a lot of good things that go with
24 it.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to say one

1 thing about CD9 and then ask if my colleagues, you
2 know, agree that -- that CD2 really does the best job
3 of keeping communities of interest together. I did a
4 lot of thinking about CD9, and I happen to like it. I
5 hear that people are aware, and I -- you know, that a
6 significant amount, you know, upwards of 60 percent of
7 the population, will, you know, lie in more of an urban
8 area in Maricopa County. However, on a federal level,
9 when I look at the consistencies of what these
10 communities of interest would want and need from an
11 elected leader, I see tremendous political cohesion,
12 and I don't see inconsistencies with an elected leader
13 being able to successfully represent all of those
14 needs. I don't see anybody being marginalized in D9.

15 I am concerned about some communities
16 potentially being marginalized in D2 if we don't group
17 the communities of interest as effectively, and I want
18 to say I do want to make D2 more competitive, just like
19 you said we could look at all the districts around the
20 edges, and if there is a way that we could make it --
21 you know, it won't require that much change, if
22 possible, to actually get it into the competitive
23 range. And I'm not sold on the idea that any of the
24 minority communities in this district as it's crafted
25 are going to be marginalized.

1 So that's how I feel. I don't know if anybody
2 here would like to add or go to the other map and
3 explain why you feel the other map does a better job of
4 uniting communities of interest, because, look, at the
5 end of the day, all things being equal, if both maps
6 perfectly address communities of interest and both maps
7 perfectly fit in or well fit in with our visions for
8 the rest of the districts, I'm all for it. But I'm not
9 sure that's the case.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So just as a comment on
11 that in terms of communities of interest. We heard
12 loud and clear not only from the rural folks in D9,
13 Don't put us with Maricopa County, but we heard loud
14 and clear from the Maricopa County folks, Don't put us
15 with D9. So this iteration, and even with changes --
16 I'm open to looking at changes to this particular 8.4
17 version, but going back to the original one does not
18 help those communities of interest, because they were
19 the ones who spoke loudly at this last month saying
20 they were not happy with this configuration that's
21 there because they felt that the West Valley folks
22 didn't want to be with the rural and the rural didn't
23 want to be with them, whereas this, I think, tries to
24 address that, recognizing we could make changes to it.
25 I'm not tied to every line that's in this one, but I --

1 I listened loud and clear this last month, and I went
2 back and looked up, you know, all the letters and
3 everything that we heard, and we kept hearing the same
4 comment about those boundaries in that area.

5 And to me the fact when we talk about people
6 being disenfranchised, none of the other districts,
7 unless we can make them more competitive, give the
8 balance that District 2 does. None of the other ones
9 get close to being in that competitive range. They're
10 much further apart, and so then we would be
11 disenfranchising populations, where I think District 2
12 has the potential to address the urban, the rural, and
13 the competitiveness factors in that area that we've got
14 letters, testimony, that's basically asked to be split
15 more between those communities.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: One thing, Commissioner
17 Mehl, and then I'll turn it over to you.

18 I believe that the testimony in terms of
19 separating rural and urban was much more compelling and
20 focused on legislative districts, where I see, you
21 know, more potential for competing needs, fighting over
22 state water, fighting over, you know, state resources,
23 as opposed to a synergy of interests from a federal
24 leader.

25 Commissioner Mehl.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm happy with the CD2
2 generally drawn in our current approved draft map, and
3 if -- and would be happy I think -- I think that Doug
4 and I would be happy to support that if you just want
5 to stay with that.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like you,
7 though, to respond to why you feel our draft map better
8 captures communities of interest than this new proposed
9 map, because all things -- if both maps equally address
10 communities of interest, we'll take deeper looks at
11 competitiveness.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The -- the 8.4 map
13 definitely does a lot of things in the Southern Arizona
14 area that I don't like and I think splits communities
15 of interest that shouldn't be split.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can you share --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It takes SaddleBrooke out.
18 It takes Casa Grande away from the district in Tucson.
19 I think Casa Grande is a far better fit with Tucson
20 than it is with the northern area. And -- and if you
21 really want Mohave County in the rural area, if you
22 want to really listen to the most -- most of the
23 arguments that Commissioner Lerner made would actually
24 fit the 8.2 map better than they would fit the 8.4 map.
25 And so we have a number of alternatives, but I think we

1 need to make progress. I'm happy to work from our
2 current draft map and keep this pretty much the same
3 but tweak it, or I'm happy to go through a list of
4 things I would adjust to the 8.1 map, which would get
5 it closer to what Commissioner Watchman and Lerner are
6 asking for. It wouldn't do exactly what they've asked
7 for.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So do you want to pull
9 up the 8.2 map? I mean, just to make some of your
10 points, or you don't feel that's necessary?

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't think it's
12 necessary.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I just respond about
14 Casa Grande? I do not believe by any means that Casa
15 Grande is community of interest with Tucson more
16 closely. This map pulls Casa Grande, Coolidge,
17 Florence together, and they are -- and they have spoken
18 to that, that they are communities of interest
19 together, not --

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But you're putting them
21 together -- but you're putting them together with the
22 Northern Arizona. They're a much better fit put
23 together with Southern Arizona.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They -- they go with --
25 you could put -- we could put SaddleBrooke in with --

1 with CD6. We could move that. Like I said, I'm very
2 open to making adjustments. But they want to be
3 together in terms of that, and they -- they have --
4 they go with -- this -- this goes with the Copper
5 Corridor. It connects communities that are -- have
6 common interests, common values as part of it. You
7 would not be putting -- we already know, we've already
8 heard a lot from people about the -- our map CD6,
9 whatever we're calling it, the claw, the arm, whatever
10 that is, people not being happy with that. They don't
11 want to be drawn into CD6 the way that our current
12 version has, whereas District 2 makes a very cohesive
13 map that pulls in these -- the mining communities, the
14 communities that are outlying these areas that have
15 common interests, that have transportation corridors as
16 part of it.

17 I think we could easily make adjustments to
18 address some of those concerns, like SaddleBrooke. Put
19 SaddleBrooke in District 6 from there. That would be
20 an easy fix as part of it. But that, whatever we're
21 calling it, has been -- there is nobody that we've
22 heard from that likes that. They feel that they --
23 they've been pulled into that area, whereas this
24 basically modifies that.

25 The nice thing that this map also does is

1 we've heard from Greenlee and Graham, the counties,
2 they want to be together. This continues to have that
3 piece in the same way by keeping them in District 6.

4 So I'm really not hearing -- I'm not hearing a
5 lot about why -- when we hear from the public, District
6 2, with changes as we talk about, as we can talk about,
7 really addresses so much of what we heard. We got
8 letter after letter from Lake Havasu saying, Please put
9 us with Prescott. Please put us with Yavapai. We got
10 testimony from people in Prescott saying, We want to be
11 with Mohave. They have been together for the past ten
12 years, and it has worked very effectively for that
13 community, for District 9. And we heard a lot of
14 testimony from the West Valley folks saying, Please
15 don't put us with District 9. And I think this does a
16 really nice job.

17 And, again, very open to adjustments and
18 recommendations from my colleagues. But as a starting
19 point, I feel making this split, I'm much more
20 comfortable with this than the -- the draft that we are
21 working off of. From my perspective that District 2
22 was always -- it was not a compromise. It was what we
23 settled on when we -- and I realize we can call it
24 whatever terminology. We can call it a compromise. It
25 was what we settled on to move forward. Just as you

1 said, we sometimes just have to move forward, and --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I would recommend we
3 try to move forward here, and --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- so I would suggest, and
6 open to alternative suggestions, is that you give
7 whatever series of changes you would want to make to
8 the 8.4 map to where you think it would fit better with
9 a compromise to us, and I will go through the 8.1 map
10 and make all -- suggest all the changes I would like to
11 see where I am hoping it will appeal more to everybody,
12 and then we'll have three maps to look at.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Actually, what I would
14 like to interject, look, the arguments are getting
15 repetitive. We're saying the same things over and over
16 again. I prefer a starting point of the districts that
17 we already created in our draft map, to start from D9,
18 D2. I've gotten very comfortable with the compromises
19 that I felt that we made, and I welcome each of you to
20 study these different versions of the maps, but take
21 the changes and bring them, and together we'll vote to
22 whatever modifications you want to make to D2 as it is
23 in our template.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- I understand what
25 you're saying, but I feel that's what we did with our

1 recommendation for this 8.4. So could we look at 8.3,
2 because that could be a -- because that's what I feel
3 we were doing. I felt that what we did when -- when
4 Vice Chair Watchman and I asked for these changes was
5 taking off our original map and saying, Here are the
6 changes we would like, and so it would essentially be
7 doing the same thing.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, but you're asking
9 us to then debate and deliberate based on your map, not
10 based on our map, and it seems like that's not
11 something the commissioners have been liking to do when
12 we incorporate just whole ideas, and I think it may be
13 a safer deliberative strategy to start deliberating
14 from what we already had in common and then make
15 change. But, you know, we can put it up to a vote, if
16 you would like. I mean, you know, Commissioner Mehl,
17 you know, is vehemently against DD7 -- CD7. We haven't
18 voted on that. We could vote on that as well.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, you
20 mentioned compromise and the work we did in October. I
21 think you basically said that these are decisions at
22 the moment and that we have plenty of opportunity to
23 make changes until we get to the final day. And so,
24 you know, that was an ending point and maybe a starting
25 point. But 8.4 basically is -- is basically providing

1 our recommendations off of 8.0, and so you gave us that
2 opportunity on Monday.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: And so that's why, you
5 know, basically where do we start this morning? That's
6 why I said let's start at 8.4 as the starting point.
7 Call it a new starting point, old starting point. You
8 know, that's -- that was basically how I understand the
9 discussion this morning. Where do we start discussion
10 this morning? What do you want to do? So I'm throwing
11 on the table 8.4. Not that it's negating everything,
12 but that's a starting point. So, you know, I think
13 8.4, again, is a great starting point, as my fellow
14 Commissioner Lerner has pointed out. It does, we feel,
15 represent what we heard from the public. You know, it
16 I think improves the competitiveness, as Commissioner
17 Lerner has pointed out. And so, you know, it was a
18 decision last month, and so now we're here today.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to
20 reiterate that you're correct. Everything is open to
21 re-deliberation. My view of the CD2 that we came up
22 with was a genuine compromise between two different
23 positions. I feel that each side really gave up a lot
24 to come to this, and now I'm being asked to compromise
25 with my colleagues on my physical left, and I feel

1 that's taking a compromise where I split the
2 differences and met each one, you know, half --
3 somewhat halfway, and now I'm being asked to keep
4 moving in the other direction that I'm not comfortable
5 with, and, you know, and sometimes, you know, maybe it
6 just makes sense to hear the feedback.

7 I mean, you know, like Commissioner Mehl, you
8 know, it seems like my colleagues are not fighting me
9 on CD7, are you? Are you agreeing to compromise? You
10 know, I want compromise all across the board here.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're definitely willing
12 to compromise, and we're willing to take a good look at
13 CD7 coming out of Yuma and going up into Maricopa and
14 coming into Tucson more, per the mayor's request in
15 Tucson and per what I suggested that we do in Tucson.
16 We are definitely willing to take a look at that.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And it's not --

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And I'm willing -- and
19 we're willing to get rid of the arm on CD6. We'll find
20 a different way of getting rid of it.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, that's -- I mean,
22 and that's -- I know, I'm belaboring the point, and I
23 won't continue anymore because I can sense that
24 you're -- but I guess maybe for the record I would like
25 to know that we are rejecting this 8.4. I feel that

1 this 8.4 is a compromise. It still is -- District 2
2 will still be a Republican district, but it will be a
3 competitive district, and it will meet the communities
4 of interest.

5 So maybe we do need to have it for the record.
6 I feel that I've made and Commissioner Watchman and I
7 have both made very compelling community of interest
8 arguments for this that go beyond saying we had a,
9 quote, compromise, but our whole point was it was to
10 move forward and listen to the public, and that
11 listening brought me to this map, brought us to this
12 map, because that's what we heard. So just to stay
13 with this because it was a compromise at the time, this
14 whole deliberation that we're doing, as you have noted,
15 we were out there listening, to hear, to get feedback,
16 so --

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we do our own study
18 on top of it --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Of course we do.

20 COMMISSIONER NEUBERG: -- because we hear from
21 very a small percentage of the state.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Exactly. And, honestly,
23 that's what I spent a lot of time doing was looking at
24 that as well. We asked our mappers to also make some
25 other maps. Can we take a look and compare 8.3 to our

1 original, because --

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Shereen, I remember the
3 original request was how can we get Prescott into
4 Mohave if we don't take all of Yavapai.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: And if I'm looking at my
7 maps right, the majority of Yavapai, including
8 Prescott, Prescott Valley, Camp Verde, Chino Basin,
9 moving into District 9, and that wasn't the original
10 request, and so to trade off that population we went
11 south, and for me it seems like that population
12 tradeoff should have been happening in Maricopa County.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I would be happy to
14 move that boundary over, if that's what you're saying.
15 In terms of the --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: I want to move that
17 boundary north. I think Coolidge, Casa Grande,
18 Florence are part of Southern Arizona, not part of --
19 not part of Northern Arizona.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you're not going
21 to get the population you need to not have it go --
22 reach down, which is part of it. The more that we
23 could -- we could certainly move over, because you're
24 correct, it was -- the idea was to have the break at
25 Mingus Mountain, which would take Prescott, Prescott

1 Valley, all of those. If it takes too much, I'm more
2 than happy to make those adjustments that you're
3 mentioning. I'm not tied to the exact lines on that
4 map; it's more of a concept.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we should agree
6 on a map that we should -- as it relates to CD2 and
7 potentially I guess CD9 since they're very
8 interconnected. Let's pick a starting point, what map
9 people want to use to begin deliberations and move the
10 lines, just a starting point. I like our original D2
11 because it was a compromise, and I think we can learn
12 from all of these other maps and integrate ideas and
13 see what it does for our larger goal. We'll take a
14 vote. Everybody can propose the maps that they want,
15 and we'll take a vote as a starting point.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: You like the original CD7?

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm just trying to be
18 fair. I mean, that's my bottom line. I'm trying to
19 come up with a starting point that people can feel is
20 in between my colleagues.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I -- I thought that
22 that's what we did on Monday, that we basically made
23 proposals for changes based on our starting point, and
24 so that's what we came up -- they came up with. They
25 have 8.0 to 8.4 that -- that our mappers did based on

1 that starting point, so I think that's what we -- that
2 was --

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That was the idea was we
5 looked at our starting point of our congressional. We
6 provided suggestions. They came back to us with 8.0 to
7 8.4. I'm hearing that 8.4 is not going to be
8 acceptable. What about 8.3 as another option, which
9 looks much more like our current District 2? It's not
10 something I'm as happy with. I'll be honest. But it
11 does do some things that might work. Can we take a
12 look at those as a comparison?

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And my response would be
14 that I'm totally happy just going back and restarting
15 again with the current map and making adjustments.
16 But, Chairwoman, if you really -- if you want to make
17 the changes to D7 that I heard you support, then I
18 think it makes more sense to go to 8.1 as a compromise.
19 I'm trying to -- and I don't understand why
20 Commissioner Lerner and Commissioner Watchman would
21 have -- I mean, to me I would be giving in to go to 8.1
22 as a starting point, but that has Tucson much closer to
23 where I think it ought to end up. It has D7 very close
24 to where I think it ought to end up. And it has D2
25 with everything you want in it that I'm going to try --

1 that we're going to want to try to chip away some of
2 that. Because I think that -- because even the 8.1
3 map, it has way too much Yavapai going the other way.
4 So I would suggest we then start at 8.1 and start
5 making adjustments from there, and I suspect we'll have
6 separate adjustments and we'll end up with multiple
7 maps no matter where we start.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I -- my compromise
9 is going away from 8.4, which I really believe is the
10 best map for our rural and urban areas. I could
11 compromise with 8.3. Which is that -- Brian, do you
12 have 8.3, and can you put 8.3 up there?

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can you do 8.1 and 8.3 on
14 the screen?

15 MR. KINGERY: 8.1 is on the left and 8.3 is on
16 the right.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I mean, I'm much
18 more comfortable with -- there is -- wait. Which one
19 is on the left, 8.1?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 8.1.

21 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 8.1.

22 MR. KINGERY: 8.1 is the top screen.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm much more
24 comfortable with 8.3. I'm obviously more comfortable
25 with 8.4, but I think it -- 8.3 does more -- it still

1 keeps that district -- I think it actually assists
2 other communities better, and it -- the nice thing
3 about --

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Could we ask them to
5 describe the difference between these two?

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Did mapping hear that?

7 MR. KINGERY: Yes.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Do you want to describe 8.0 first
10 and the changes we incorporated there before we went to
11 8.1 or 8.2, or do you just want to hear exactly --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No.

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No. 8.1 versus 8.3,
14 please.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Okay. So, you know, 8.1 brings
16 in the boundary between District 7 and District 9 in
17 the Yuma area, and, you know, that's changed to match
18 the boundary in the Yuma Gold submitted plan.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But is it the same in 8.3?

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Brian, this is Doug. Brian,
21 can you overlay the two maps? I think aren't the only
22 differences in Tucson? Oh, there is some slight --
23 yeah, there is some slight differences between 2, 5 and
24 7 in Pinal, but I think the other map --

25 MR. KINGERY: There we go. So we're looking

1 at 8.1, and we want to compare 8 point -- all right.

2 Go ahead, Mark.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: So there is no -- they're the
4 same in Yuma. Can you go up to -- to Phoenix? I think
5 they're the same. So there are -- you can see the
6 shaded areas, just population balancing changes along
7 the edge of D8 and right around the edges.

8 MR. KINGERY: Of D5 and D2?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, of all of Maricopa.
10 You got D3, yeah. And then the real differences are
11 down in -- in Tucson. So the two maps are very
12 similar. They really vary in what's in Commissioner
13 Mehl versus Commissioner Lerner's request for Tucson
14 and then population balancing that comes out of that.

15 MR. FLAHAN: Brian, why don't you zoom into
16 downtown Tucson. Zoom in a little bit more so we
17 can -- yeah. Zoom in a little bit more so we can read
18 the road, like right in the first block.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: We don't have to -- they
20 remember it, yeah, the differences.

21 So, Commissioner, in terms of like the
22 deviation between the two, they're very close, 6.75
23 versus 6.11 percent total difference. The same
24 districts try to balance 2, 6, and 7. They both have
25 the same number of competitive seats. It's just the

1 difference is in Tucson, and then the ripple effect and
2 those differences.

3 And in Tucson, if I can throw out, as we fix
4 the population deviation we may end up with a
5 compromise between the request the other day from
6 Commissioner Lerner and Commissioner Mehl just driven
7 by population anyway. I think the two maps will come
8 together as we balance them.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Explain that again, Doug.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: So 8.1 and 8.3 are both out
11 of balance, driven by the fact that the Yuma Gold
12 changes in Yuma versus the requested changes in Tucson
13 didn't -- didn't mix quite right. We couldn't fit them
14 together without going into some other requests from
15 the Commission, and so that's why we came back with 6
16 and 7 being out of balance next to each other. And
17 we're looking at 8.1 here. 6 is short by 25,807, and 7
18 is over by just a little bit more. The rest of it is
19 the District 2 shortage. So -- so we're looking at
20 27,000 person difference.

21 And in 8.3 -- do you have that handy?

22 MR. KINGERY: Right there on the right side.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, yeah. Perfect. So in
24 8.1, 6 is short and 7 is over. In 8.3, 6 is over and 7
25 is short, and 2 is also short in both maps, so as these

1 maps --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman --

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: As we balance these maps we
4 can do it wherever we like, but where they differ and
5 where you can bring those together is in between the
6 requests the other day.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, I would
8 suggest that these two maps are very close and that we
9 both have -- that people have strong feelings about the
10 differences there are. If we start with one of them
11 we're each going to want suggestions that are going to
12 go different ways. We're going to end up with two maps
13 to look at at the end of the day. I would suggest that
14 Commissioner Lerner and Watchman take the -- whatever 8
15 point -- whatever they want and suggest their
16 alternatives, that Commissioner York and I take the 8.1
17 map and suggest our alternatives, and then let those
18 two alternatives be what we're then looking at, because
19 if we -- if we --

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But you're referring to
21 these maps that more closely align.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm comfortable with
24 that.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I'm still

1 stuck on 8.4. We started -- you asked for a starting
2 point.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If you want to start with
4 8.4, I don't think it's a big enough difference that it
5 matters. What's the difference between 8.4 and the
6 8.3?

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 8.4 --

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No. 8.4 and 8.3.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 8.4 and 8.3, the big
10 difference is going to be the Yavapai split.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If you want to move to
12 8.4 and we'll fix it. I mean, you know, this is very
13 unconstructive.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Why don't you start -- why
15 don't you start with whichever 8 map you want and give
16 your changes. We'll start with 8.1 and give our
17 changes. That will be two maps that frankly we're
18 going to have some real differences on.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What I don't like about
20 starting with 8.4 is I've already said there are things
21 that I don't like about it, and you're going to -- my
22 concern is you're going to go off on a whole map and
23 then you're putting me in a situation where I may have
24 to say vote against you like eight times, not because,
25 you know, there is eight separate arguments. I made

1 one argument, and it's not being listened to, and so
2 it's just -- so I don't think it's the most effective,
3 efficient way to negotiate. I think these two maps are
4 the better start, but I'm not -- but I'm not going to
5 deny. If you really feel that that's going to provide
6 the most comprehensive best map to make your case and
7 win the commissioners over then -- then go based on
8 8.4, and you pick your map, and we'll -- we'll go from
9 there.

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair, we'll
11 have to vote in which way you think is most
12 appropriate, and so it's our job here to present what
13 we think we hear from the public and as independent
14 commissioners, putting our best case on the table, and
15 that's what we're doing here.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, right.

17 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: And so you as, you know,
18 the fifth vote here will have to decide. And so what,
19 you know, we've asked -- you've asked for a starting
20 point. We had a starting point on Monday, another
21 starting point today. And, you know, talk about
22 compromise. I believe Commissioner Lerner and I have
23 compromised quite a bit, you know, and so the vote
24 reflects that, you know, to a certain degree.

25 And so I hear what you're saying, and maybe

1 Commissioner Mehl does have a good point. You know,
2 let's pick two maps and start from there. I don't know
3 if we do it, you know, here, or do we need to take a
4 little break and we huddle for a little bit so that we
5 can, you know, gather our thoughts. That's maybe one
6 way to do that. But, you know, again, 8.4 is a good
7 starting point for me.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You're right that I'm
9 going to vote, and I would just like to share with my
10 colleagues that, you know, I think you're hearing how I
11 think and what my priorities are and all of that, and
12 as your fleshing out your ideas and building your maps
13 I just think it's a good strategy to take into
14 consideration some of the principles that I've been
15 consistent with, because it's more likely that the vote
16 will go your way if it's incorporating some of the
17 boundaries that I've said. But anybody can -- can
18 lobby and argue for everything, and we will. The five
19 of us will vote.

20 I just want the best maps possible, and I hope
21 all sides pursue the best maps possible that are
22 possible, that are more likely to get some degree of
23 consensus and agreement. So from there please pick
24 which maps you'd each like to start from.

25 MR. B. JOHNSON: Chairwoman --

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

2 MR. B. JOHNSON: -- if I understand what
3 Commissioner Mehl's proposal is is that we have two
4 different threads off of this. If that's the case I
5 would like to go into executive session.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: And, Chair, if I might --

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that I would
9 like -- excuse me.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry. It's Doug Johnson. I
11 was just going to note the -- the only difference
12 between 8.3 and 8.4 is the Yavapai split and then the
13 ripples that come out of that, obviously, as
14 Commissioner Lerner has detailed, so if that's what's
15 going to be the driving portion of the ultimate vote
16 then it may be better to have that vote sooner rather
17 than later.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I just ask Doug a
19 quick question about Yavapai split? Because
20 Commissioner York said we took more in that split than
21 what we had originally discussed. Can you clarify what
22 that split was, whether or not it was more than what
23 we -- we had talked about the Mingus Mountain split,
24 which would then still keep other communities together.
25 Can you clarify that split, please, that divide, where

1 you drew the line?

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure. And Brian and Mark
3 weigh in here, too.

4 But I do believe it is at Mingus Mountain,
5 yeah. It's in the direction. It is at Mingus
6 Mountain.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: It goes way north of that.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Cottonwood -- Cottonwood and
9 Camp Verde in the east and the whole Prescott Valley
10 region on the west.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So could that --
12 Commissioner York was wondering if -- if it goes
13 further north could it go -- could that be pushed down
14 on the top, on the north part, from where Mingus
15 Mountain break is, just --

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Where Chino Valley is, and
17 there is quite a bit of things around Chino Valley.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, down up by I-40,
19 probably, right? I'm just asking. I know this may not
20 be a map we're using.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the Chino Valley you're
22 talking about is north of Prescott, so that would be
23 bringing 2 into Yavapai County from the north to pick
24 up Paulden and Chino Valley. I mean, we can draw it
25 down to wherever you would like. If you just kept all

1 that in Chino Valley I guess you could get Bagdad out
2 in the west and then you -- and then you'd get to
3 Prescott and Prescott valley.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Colleagues, we have,
5 though, a more serious issue or question to answer, and
6 that is that if you're interested in pursuing different
7 maps I would like to suggest that we go into executive
8 session to seek legal advice for the purpose of helping
9 us implement in advance these legal issues so --

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I make a motion we go into
11 executive session.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Second.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Vice Chair Watchman.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
22 an aye. With that we will go into executive session.
23 Thank you for your patience in the public.

24

25 (Whereupon the proceeding is in executive

1 session from 11:07 a.m. until 11:31 a.m.)

2 * * * * *

3
4 (Whereupon the proceeding resumes in general
5 session.)

6
7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,
8 everybody. We were in executive session to seek legal
9 advice about procedural issues. We can now return and
10 return to our deliberation on the congressional map.

11 Colleagues, I believe you each may want to
12 advocate for a particular map, and we could talk about
13 what you have in mind.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, I would speak
15 to starting with 8.1, and I would have adjustments to
16 make to it. But, frankly, one of the key things on 8.1
17 is it does keep -- it keeps all of the area around
18 Prescott in the northern district, and obviously that's
19 one reason why we disagree on it, but I think that
20 splitting Yavapai -- any of the ways that we've looked
21 at splitting Yavapai splits communities of interest
22 that shouldn't be split up, and all of Yavapai makes
23 sense to be in the northern district.

24 Likewise, if you take Yavapai out, you come in
25 and you cut into the southern district in ways where

1 you're cutting up communities of interest. The areas
2 north of Tucson are very much part of Southern Arizona,
3 and the -- just you keep communities of interest far
4 better by -- by starting -- by using this 8.1 map,
5 keeping Yavapai County with the northern area and
6 cleaning up the Southern Arizona district.

7 And I will point out that in this map the
8 District 2 is a competitive district, and we've heard
9 that a lot of the complaints about our draft map that
10 District 2 had become a noncompetitive district. Well,
11 in this map it is a competitive district, so I think
12 there is just significant advantages.

13 And I don't know if you want me to now go
14 through the changes I would make in it, or if we want
15 to go back and forth? How would you like to proceed?

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm going to ask my
17 colleagues, you know, what your thoughts are. I mean,
18 you know, I have an opinion about the maps. I could
19 vote as soon as now based on the information that I've
20 heard. I do not want to deny you the ability to pursue
21 further, you know, a map of your choice. At some point
22 we'll need to, you know, converge again and make sure
23 that each time we begin a new negotiation from an
24 agreed-upon map, so I don't want to let the maps go too
25 far deviant, but how do you feel?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, very clearly our
2 preference is 8.4, as we've expressed, so we're not
3 going to review all of the details on that. I will
4 mention just that Yavapai split has historical
5 references. We've seen there many times over 40 years
6 they have had that split. Whether the split is exactly
7 as it is in this map, obviously those adjustments could
8 easily be made, if it means pulling something down from
9 the north part. We're more than happy to look at
10 adjustments to this map as part of it, but there are
11 historical reasons for that, as well as everything else
12 that we've expressed. I won't repeat everything that
13 was expressed. And -- and I would like it for the
14 record that that's our preference as part of it.

15 If we have to choose a second map as a
16 compromise, which we're willing to do, if we can't get
17 8.4 as our next starting point -- because we're more
18 than happy to make adjustments to 8.4 -- I would
19 suggest 8.3, and I do that because I believe that it
20 actually accomplishes -- it connects better in terms of
21 the communities. It seems like we're sort of selecting
22 south versus north on who we're going to keep together
23 better as part of our choices.

24 If you could pull up 8.3 again. We've all
25 seen -- we know what 8.4 looks like, just if you don't

1 mind to compare it with 8.1. They look almost the
2 same, but there are some significant differences in
3 them. So our preference, we are looking to try to make
4 District 2 a little bit more competitive. That's not
5 the primary reason we were asking for 8.4, of course.
6 But we feel 8.3 does a little bit better job of that,
7 and we feel that there is room with 8.3. We're willing
8 to make some adjustments if we use that one as a
9 starting point, if we can't get 8.4. That would be our
10 preferred second choice.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I have a preference for
12 Map 8.1, I think for all the reasons, the compromises
13 we had in the past, keeping Yavapai more whole, keep
14 communities of interest together. I heard really
15 earlier on the most compelling reason to change D2 was
16 a concern that the Native American community as
17 22 percent of the population was nervous about if the
18 district wasn't competitive that they feel that they
19 would be marginalized, and so I do feel that one of the
20 driving forces behind this, you know, desire to change
21 CD2 is for the explicit purpose of, you know, making a
22 competitive district for the Native American community.
23 I did go on record earlier saying I just wanted to be
24 cautious about that because I'm not sure that we can
25 give a guarantee to all minority communities that if

1 they make up 20 percent of the district that they're
2 then entitled to a competitive district. That's very
3 hard.

4 Having said that, I would very much like to
5 narrow, and I do believe that in 8.1 it does begin to
6 shave off a little bit of the partisan spread, and
7 maybe we could even adjust it more. And I believe that
8 the communities of interest in Congressional CD2 would
9 be well-served, and I do not see any community of
10 interest that is at high risk of being marginalized.

11 Now, having said that, you know, I'm not going
12 to rule out starting from a different map and getting
13 to what I like about 8.1. May take a little longer. I
14 open it up to my colleagues on the right for your
15 thoughts on it.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, if it's
17 acceptable to you I would like to go ahead and make a
18 motion that we adopt 8.1 as our starting point and that
19 we approve that and that we then talk about adjustments
20 from that map.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't -- I would like
22 to comment before we move forward with that. One of
23 the key reasons, while the Native American issue
24 existed for D2, I think we made a really compelling
25 argument beyond that, and that was that the urban areas

1 of Maricopa County, of which compromised a majority of
2 District 9, would be adjusted by the split in Yavapai
3 County. The fact that we seem to be letting Yavapai
4 County, both legislatively and congressionally -- we
5 always are saying to keep it whole when we're not
6 saying that about other -- other counties. We're
7 splitting other counties. There is no reason that
8 Yavapai County is any more sacred -- I'm sorry, Yavapai
9 County -- than any other county. That split is a very
10 logical, natural divide.

11 So if we put aside the entire argument about
12 the Native American communities, I want to be clear
13 that we were looking at communities of interest. We
14 were looking at commonalities. We were looking at
15 rural versus urban as part of our argument for District
16 2, just to clear up for the record that it wasn't
17 about -- just about competitiveness. That was one of
18 several factors. I just want to be sure that that's on
19 the record. That's all.

20 As for the maps, I would like to hear more
21 about why 8.1 is better than 8.3. I don't
22 understand -- I would like to know from my colleagues
23 what drives you more to that versus 8.3.

24 MR. B. JOHNSON: Procedurally, there is a
25 motion on the floor. It either needs to be seconded

1 and discussed, or it needs to not be seconded and then
2 you guys can continue your deliberations.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I am -- I have
4 already --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would like to second the
6 motion.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We have a motion
8 on the table. I'll entertain discussion on the motion.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I would like a
10 clarification of what --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I've spoken to it before.
12 The biggest differences are keeping Yavapai County
13 without splitting it, and the differences -- the key
14 differences are in Tucson, also, on how the District 6
15 shares the city of Tucson with District 7, which is
16 what we've heard from the Latino community, from the
17 mayor of Tucson, from others. That's a difference, and
18 it can't do that as well if you don't keep Yavapai
19 County together. That's -- just like there is -- there
20 is reverberations spinning to the left, there is
21 reverberations spinning to the right, and at points we
22 have to choose which are our priorities. I think this
23 map is a terrific map that creates a competitive
24 District 2, a competitive District 6, and keeps
25 communities of interest together both in the north and

1 in the south better than the alternative.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So what I was asking,
3 Commissioner Mehl, is to clarify why 8.1 and not 8.3,
4 and I guess I would also like the Chair to speak to
5 that.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, everything I just
7 said is the answer to that.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But 8.3 is not splitting
9 Yavapai. 8.3 is a similar map to 8.1. It does not
10 split Yavapai, so I'm trying to understand when 8.3
11 would be our compromise, if we can't get 8.4 why we
12 can't begin with that one. That's what I'm trying to
13 understand, the difference between why you wouldn't
14 want to start with 8.3 versus 8.1, because if we move
15 forward that's what I'm asking.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: The Southern Arizona
17 differences are what I just articulated would be a key
18 part of that.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I believe it would make
20 us -- require us to make more substantial changes all
21 across the board to the whole map, and I think that
22 there are very logical explanations for the communities
23 of interest grouping in 8.1. I understand your logic
24 of the communities of interest. I just, you know, am a
25 little bit more attracted to the groupings in 8.1.

1 And as I've mentioned before, I'm not
2 concerned about CD9. I see a lot of synergy between
3 the communities of interest on the federal level and
4 believe that they're -- an elected leader could very
5 well represent the concerns of constituents in that
6 district.

7 And I like the other changes that we've
8 incorporated to the map. I'm appreciative that, you
9 know, my colleagues here have -- it sounds like you've
10 accepted and will approve and agree to the new CD7 of
11 having more of the majority minority district move up
12 into Phoenix, including Tolleson and Avondale. And
13 we've made some I think very nice changes accommodating
14 some feedback from Mayor Romero, and we can continue to
15 adjust the areas that you're very unhappy about. Let's
16 fine-tune.

17 But from a broader starting point, I have more
18 in common with 8.1 than 8.3 so would find it easier to
19 start from that point.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Take the vote?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any other discussion?

22 Okay. We'll take a vote on the starting point
23 with 8.1.

24 Vice Chair Watchman.

25 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is
8 an aye, and with that 3-2 vote we will start with 8.1,
9 and we are open to debate to modifying the lines and
10 bring in whatever areas of the 8.3 map that you would
11 like to consider that we change. It's all open for
12 debate.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, one of -- with
14 permission I can make a recommendation.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we can start with
16 that, or we can maybe even go to maybe a different, you
17 know, CD, a different part where maybe give us a little
18 break since it's been a little intense and differences.
19 I have some ideas about CD3, you know, to address some
20 issues in the Phoenix area, but I'm happy to keep going
21 here.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think diving into
23 Maricopa County would give us a break from what we've
24 been talking about.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I guess I would like to

1 make one -- one recommendation to start for, because
2 I've been part -- I will be honest, one of the main
3 reasons that I was not happy with 8.1 is because of the
4 Tucson area and how Tucson was broken up, so I would
5 like to get that out on the table right up front, and
6 that is that I would like to see that -- there is a
7 boundary that Commissioner Mehl had requested that I
8 feel goes way too far east, and I would like to move
9 the line in Tucson back from Alvernon, back to
10 Campbell, which is what the mayor requested in her
11 letter.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No, she did not. She
13 said --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: She says here --

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: She says at least to
16 Campbell Avenue.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: She says, "Keeping the
18 current line at Campbell boundary or a little bit
19 east," but Alvernon is quite a bit east.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's not that far east.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's -- it's far enough
22 east where it doesn't need to be in that area, as well
23 as taking it north. What it does by moving it to
24 Alvernon is it changes significantly that district to
25 basically having Tucson -- most of what's in District 6

1 will be outside of Tucson at this point. It changes
2 that, so what you've done is basically given Tucson
3 just the District 7 and moved most of it outside. And
4 so what I'm requesting is to move the -- this was the
5 big difference between yours and my visions, I think,
6 Commissioner Mehl, of the Tucson area in this -- these
7 8.1 versus 8.3. I'm requesting to move that back over,
8 from Alvernon over to Campbell. That was one of the
9 reasons, to be quite honest, I wasn't happy with 8.1.
10 If we could move it back, there is a lot more things
11 that -- that we could work on in other areas, but I
12 think that would be a really big compromise, from our
13 perspective. If we can shift that back to the west we
14 would appreciate that as part of it. And it would also
15 help -- I think it would help with the balance in
16 Tucson quite a bit.

17 It might also help with the population. There
18 is a population imbalance that was identified by the
19 mappers, and that would assist with that as well by
20 moving it. It would change that, because 6, according
21 to Timmons, is underpopulated by 25,000, and 7 is
22 overpopulated by 27,000, and by shifting that back over
23 that would help with that imbalance as well, so that
24 would be my request would be to shift that back.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is that the only change

1 you're asking for?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's one of them. I
3 just want to start with something. I'm happy to move
4 around, but that was one that was pretty important, and
5 that was -- I will be honest, that was one of the
6 reasons I preferred 8.3. So if we do that that
7 would -- that would help a lot as we move forward.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to, though,
9 hear just related to CD6 and 7 what other -- what you
10 have in mind so I can understand it from a holistic,
11 comprehensive perspective.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I hadn't spent as
13 much time on 8.1 because -- because of that, but there
14 is a couple of other pieces. I think in 8.1, if I
15 recall, it might be on the Timmons thing -- well, one
16 with the Timmons was the population.

17 The other thing I had looked up is I think
18 the -- and I need to double check it, because as I said
19 I wasn't -- I wasn't as focused on that, but I think
20 there was some problems with the school district being
21 split. We've heard a lot from Amphitheater and the
22 Marana School District, and 8.1 splits those, and so it
23 would be good to combine those as well.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Let me ask my
25 colleagues something. Since I think we weren't

1 prepared to, you know, start deliberating from 8.1, we
2 had a lot of things in mind, it sounds like you might
3 want to spend a few minutes being able to go and study
4 the other changes and come back. Might it be more
5 productive for us to go into a different area right now
6 and then at a break we can reconvene in our own minds
7 and gather our notes about how to fix or, you know,
8 revise CD6 and 7 boundaries?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, that might be good
10 to do all of -- maybe move from congressional. I mean,
11 honestly, I had focused on a lot 8.4 and 8.3, I'll be
12 quite honest, not much on 8.1, and so I do need some
13 time to study the differences between 8.3 and 8.1.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I have some things
15 that I have in mind that aren't as relevant, I think,
16 to anything we've even talked about that.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But I don't -- you know,
19 but I -- I received some just very interesting feedback
20 as it relates to CD3 and also want to share just some
21 thoughts about navigating CD3, 8 and 1, and so I can
22 lay out what's on my mind if would you like or --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: My other comment to that
25 would be I think we should unify Tempe into CD4, South

1 Scottsdale.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry. Commissioner York, we
3 can't hear you.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Sorry. I said my thoughts
5 were around unifying Tempe and South Scottsdale into
6 CD4 as it was.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would like to hear
8 your thoughts, Chairwoman.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So Commissioner
10 York, are you wanting to dive into this right now, or
11 can we start with --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: You're fine. I was
13 just --

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So I heard some
15 very constructive feedback, really from a combination
16 of Laura Pastor, a councilwoman from Phoenix, and I
17 think we're all, our communities, missing the presence
18 of her father, Ed Pastor, who for years has been such a
19 central piece of our redistricting process, and I do
20 think our community just feels that absence.

21 But she shared with me some compelling reasons
22 for -- and I want to make sure I'm -- I may not get the
23 boundaries fully correct, but basically moving the
24 boundaries on the eastern side of D3 up north,
25 particularly to where the light rail starts to go west,

1 with the eye on uniting the historical neighborhoods,
2 uniting the arts and culture, Roosevelt Row, Melrose,
3 which we heard quite a bit of feedback from the LGBTQ
4 community. Even if it goes past Camelback, I think
5 this brings communities of interest together. I was
6 told about, you know, synergy and the economic engine
7 in this broader area. Keeping the biosciences
8 together, the hospitals.

9 And it also fit very consistently with what
10 Mayor Kate Gallego expressed. One of her greatest
11 concerns about the congressional map is ensuring that
12 at least more than one, hopefully two, you know,
13 federal members of Congress will really be focused
14 significantly on the urban needs of the city, and right
15 now CD8 and CD1, it carves up Phoenix quite a bit, and
16 I wonder if some of the changes that Laura Pastor has
17 suggested would maybe enable us to also move D1 a
18 little west to capture more of the Phoenix area so that
19 the representative from that -- from CD1 would be more
20 inclined to be advocating for city interests.

21 So that's -- those are some tweaks that I feel
22 are consensus tweaks that are just serving our
23 communities well.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, when you
25 say go west --

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I would want to
2 change CD3 first and then adjust CD1 above that, but
3 if -- if you overlay -- yeah, see, thank you for
4 overlaying the city of Phoenix. If you move the green
5 CD3 up north on the eastern side and then can shift a
6 little bit D1 to the west -- where is -- where is
7 Camelback Road? Can you highlight Camelback? Right.
8 Moving it up north maybe even past Camelback, but we
9 would have to study those implications, so that CD3
10 would encompass that, and then CD1 could shift a little
11 west into taking over area potentially in CD8 so that,
12 again, there is less division within the city of
13 Phoenix.

14 And I'm not sure it necessarily would
15 interfere with the competitive balances that we already
16 have, and we would obviously have to look into VRA
17 compliance as it relates to CD3, but Laura Pastor was
18 very sensitive to the VRA issues, so I imagine that
19 that was on her mind as she was making some
20 suggestions. She is going to submit a formal letter.
21 I don't believe we have that, so I'm unfortunately
22 paraphrasing.

23 Thoughts on that?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it would be just this
25 piece down here where it goes like this for District 3

1 that you're talking about shifting up, like making it
2 more even at the top? Is that what you --

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, shifting those
4 boundaries up north. I don't know where the eastern
5 border would be. I would want to consult again with
6 Laura because she --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Highway 51 probably.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, she didn't give me
9 the eastern boundary, and I can't protest to know as
10 much as she does, at least not yet.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So District 1 --

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: District 1 has 660.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And if you want, I mean,
14 we could wait, and maybe get the letter later this
15 afternoon and wait until we get the specific
16 boundaries.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And you mentioned Mayor
18 Gallego. Have you seen anything from her?

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I know she submitted
20 another letter that I haven't yet been able to see. In
21 terms of the congressional feedback that I've heard
22 from her, I heard -- here is what I heard from Mayor
23 Kate. The top priority, really just getting
24 potentially another federal member of Congress that
25 would be watching out for the urban interests of

1 Phoenix, and then she walked me through understanding
2 the geographic regions and some of the urban needs. It
3 was described to me just through this car analogy, you
4 know, those who are in need of light rail have no
5 public transportation, 100 percent relevant to public
6 transportation. Those who have one car, those who have
7 two cars, and then those above that, you know, go more
8 with -- with, you know, the lower urban areas. So she
9 helped me conceptually understand the communities of
10 interest and their needs as it relates to, you know,
11 transportation, urban quality of life issues.

12 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: So in this district,
13 Madam Chair, this map here, Phoenix is in 3
14 congressional districts?

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I can't see. They need
16 to --

17 MR. FLAHAN: Here is the map.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- expand it up.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah, so it's in 8, 1,
20 and 3.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, with a little bit
22 of D7, a little bit of D4.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's in D4.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. And the issue
25 isn't as much it being split into the number. I mean,

1 Phoenix is very large so it will be, you know, touched
2 into other districts. The key issue had to do with the
3 balance of CD8 and 1 in that, again, if you look at it,
4 it's -- it's -- the city is split in the middle of
5 those, and the concern is that either member of
6 Congress, D1, D8, would be much more focused on very
7 different constituents, and it's just a concern about
8 having a very urban voice to complement whatever urban
9 voices like need to be coming out of D3.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I just don't know why
11 we have to move -- this is the Latino Coalition map.
12 We'd have to probably see how that would impact the
13 VRA, as you mentioned. But I'm not sure why we have to
14 adjust District 3 to make the changes in -- you know,
15 to create this -- I mean, I see that there is -- I'm
16 just looking at my map. But District 3 already,
17 basically, is a good Phoenix -- solid Phoenix district.
18 The issue would be between D1 and D8, from my
19 perspective, by drawing over a little bit -- making
20 some changes in that district to provide the mayor and
21 Phoenix with two -- with two solid districts, but it
22 could probably be done without really making any
23 changes to D3.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I'll reiterate my
25 interest in modifying D3, and I'm not sure it's at all

1 incompatible with the Latino Coalition. Laura Pastor,
2 I believe, is very sensitive to the Latino Coalition's
3 needs and those of the Latino community. The point of
4 it was to unify historic neighborhoods, unite the art
5 and culture communities, Roosevelt Row, to follow more
6 the path of light rail and transportation, again,
7 carving it out based on transportation needs. Keeping
8 bioscience, hospitals, economic engines together.
9 Excellent for -- we received some advocacy requests
10 from is it Equality Arizona to watch out for Melrose,
11 keep the LGBTQ community together. That accomplishes
12 that as well. And Laura Pastor is chairing -- is
13 involved in some economic urban issues, and she felt
14 that her ideas would best empower that district
15 economically, best unite the communities of interest,
16 not in any way harm or marginalize the effect on the
17 Latino community, and would really be good for
18 everybody. So that to me was quite compelling.

19 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: But doesn't D3, Madam
20 Chair, capture that? I mean, it's still I understand
21 in Phoenix, but all those different communities of
22 interest are -- are in D3 right now.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No. That's why Laura
24 Pastor is requesting some changes in that area. Now, I
25 cannot -- again, I will need to rely on her, and I

1 cannot exactly point out to you in the map, but I don't
2 think that she would be submitting a letter and
3 requesting the changes if she felt that all of these
4 ideas were in included in CD3.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There would actually
6 only be a small piece, if I'm looking, when you said
7 Camelback. It would just be this little piece right
8 here. This is Camelback right here. So it won't be
9 actually evening it out all the way up. It would just
10 be this tiny little block that would -- but most of the
11 historic neighborhoods are south of Thomas and south of
12 this area. This is -- the area that's to that north,
13 that little block there that goes to Camelback,
14 includes Phoenix Country Club, Indian School Park,
15 those areas, you know, Camelback Village. Those are
16 really not part of those communities. The light rail
17 doesn't even go up into that area, unless we're looking
18 at a different area that I'm not thinking of. But this
19 area on -- on the west side of Piestewa over to
20 Camelback would not actually deal with most of those
21 things that she's talking about, those -- just looking
22 closely at this, you got the historic neighborhoods are
23 further south. The biomedical centers are further
24 south. The science, the Melrose, those are all further
25 south in what is currently CD3.

1 So I really -- I probably would love to see
2 her letter or something with that or her comments on
3 that to get a better understanding, because in looking
4 at that particular area I don't -- I don't see those
5 areas within this block you mentioned to Camelback.
6 They're not --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: She obviously feels that
8 there are additional historic neighborhoods or a
9 different -- additional pockets of economic drivers in
10 that area that she feels -- and, you know, I'll wait
11 until I can get a better direction for her. So I hope
12 my colleagues will consider, you know, what she's
13 asking for, because I feel that it's compelling.
14 Whenever there is an opportunity to empower a region
15 economically without hurting anybody, I don't see why
16 that wouldn't be a plus plus.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I mean, I'm always
18 open to absolutely looking at that. I would like to --
19 to also see what the mayor has in mind as well, if she
20 has submitted something, because she obviously -- as
21 you mentioned, she may have some very specific things,
22 and she knows what her city needs as well.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. I spent quite a
24 bit of time with Mayor Gallego, and her -- I think I
25 shared what her greatest concerns are about the maps.

1 I know she's weighing in now legislatively as well, but
2 I feel like I took notes and captured what her
3 priorities are. So maybe since we need to wait, and,
4 you know, I don't want to recommend specific lines, you
5 know, without the full knowledge, maybe we go to a
6 different part on the CD map, you know, quickly, or we
7 can turn over to LD.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, Madam Chair,
9 before you go, you mentioned there is a lot of history
10 here in town, and I haven't heard any -- any
11 suggestions about the former Phoenix Indian School
12 property. No one has mentioned that, but it's
13 historically been a part of Phoenix. And maybe someone
14 can speak to that, but I'm curious as to what plans are
15 from the Phoenix mayor and the other woman. I
16 apologize; I didn't catch the name. But great
17 references to the history, but one history element that
18 I'm not hearing is the Phoenix Indian School.

19 And for those of you that don't know, back in
20 the -- back in the '30s and '40s the government
21 basically picked up a bunch of Native kids, stuck them
22 in schools around the country. We have one here. I
23 think it's -- I think it's Indian School -- obviously
24 Indian School and Central. And so, you know, a lot of
25 activity happened there, some of it not so good, and

1 so, but it's been a parcel of land that has a lot of
2 significant value, and I'm not hearing anything about
3 that.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is it a whole community
5 of interest, like a whole group of -- like the historic
6 neighborhoods is a whole entire neighborhood.

7 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right, right. It's a
8 parcel of land that I think is now shared by many
9 tribes, and so I'm not sure if there is any plans for
10 that. There has just been a lot of discussion about
11 that, but I'm just curious, because we're talking about
12 history, we're talking about neighborhoods, and a lot
13 of tribes, you know, have had a lot of good and bad
14 history from that Phoenix Indian School.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you think we should
16 take a look at that where --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Do you think it belongs
18 better in D3?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's in D1 right now,
20 and I think it's -- I mean, it's already been converted
21 into a park that's got a lot of history. There is a
22 lot of activities that are done there. It's an
23 historical park. And right now I think, you know, I'm
24 not so sure that we need to change it from where it is.
25 It's part of the whole neighborhood that's there. It's

1 just a park that's within the area, but it's got --
2 it's already been converted in terms of history. It's
3 a historical park.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: It would be more natural
5 to include that area, which also includes Pastor's
6 request, as part of D3, so if you take Phoenix Country
7 Club, which is 12th Street -- can you hear me, Doug?

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: 12th Street up to Missouri
10 and over to the current D3 district, that includes
11 Ms. Pastor's request as well as the Indian park. I
12 don't know what population base is there, so you would
13 have to get that out of probably 8 or something.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I don't know why
15 you'd want to go that far north. Those neighborhoods
16 up in that area are completely different than in
17 District 3. These are not --

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Definitely different
19 than District 8.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: When you go -- those
21 neighborhoods in that area do not align with District
22 3. Once you hit -- once you start going north with
23 Phoenix Country Club, with Camelback, all of that,
24 going up to Missouri --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Border of District 3 on

1 Thomas?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Phoenix -- it's right --
3 Phoenix -- what are you saying? I'm sorry.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Phoenix Country Club is on
5 Thomas and 12th Street.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, right, between
7 7th and 12th.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: And that's south of the
9 Indian School Park, which Commissioner Watchman
10 referred to. All I'm saying is that if we're going to
11 get to where the light rail comes across that's sort of
12 just south of Missouri along Camelback, my concern is
13 that the neighborhoods in District 8, which are south
14 of Sunnyslope, to the north there have not very much in
15 common with Sun City Grand or the east -- the West
16 Valley, so somehow we need to move those out of there,
17 also. So the suggestion to move D1 over towards the --
18 Highway 17 makes a lot of sense to me. There is also
19 some areas in D1 that I don't think belong together in
20 Tempe, so that would be a rotation that would work.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I think -- in
22 District 1 I think we need to move some of that --
23 parts of that piece can go south a little bit as well.
24 There is a part of that. It can go west to the
25 Phoenix-Glendale border. I think that that's --

1 District 1 should go west. I think District 1 could
2 also go north up to the 101. So there are definitely
3 changes that we could be making.

4 And then with District 8 -- could actually,
5 you know, this whole block to the west of the current
6 boundary of District 1, that could go west over, like I
7 said, to the Phoenix, Glendale piece, use the 101 as a
8 border, and then have District 8 -- because, really,
9 District 8 could swing around north of the 101 and
10 capture a lot of those communities. But that would
11 basically -- if we use the 101 as a boundary that would
12 give a really nice Phoenix district, and then District
13 8 could be those outlying communities. But that would
14 give a second really solid district for Phoenix.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Is 1 a Phoenix district?
16 Isn't D1 a Scottsdale, Paradise Valley district?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you would be
18 moving -- you would be shifting things around with
19 that.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, my concern is we
21 would be messing up way too many communities of
22 interest, and I think there was a lot right about D1
23 that I don't want to rule out, but I do feel that with
24 just a little bit of shifting we can increase the
25 connection and the motivation and the population in D1

1 of more of the urban group. So as long as we have
2 confidence that the member of Congress from either D1
3 or D8, but it may make sense D1, as long as we have
4 confidence that that member is going to be sufficiently
5 motivated to be concerned about Phoenix needs, I'm
6 comfortable and don't want to break up communities of
7 interest to -- you know, further.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't see that this
9 meets the needs the way this District 1 is currently
10 configured and provide the mayor with her request, as
11 has been mentioned, of wanting two solid districts.
12 This really doesn't do this at all. In looking at
13 this, Phoenix is a very long, narrow district. If you
14 shifted things over and shifted it around, right now
15 the way District 1 is it includes a lot of disparate
16 communities, and if you did a little bit of shifting
17 you're actually going to bring communities of interest
18 together. You would add Sunnyslope to District 1 and
19 Anthem and New River to District 8. That would
20 basically help solidify or condense a little bit more
21 of a Phoenix district by doing a few changes in that
22 area.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: But wouldn't you want to
24 put Tempe together?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Tempe has always been --

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: The district of Tempe has
2 always been Tempe, South Scottsdale. That's where the
3 entertainment campus --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right now D4 goes all the
6 way east to Power Road, which I don't think that --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Have to look more
8 closely at Tempe where --

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Wouldn't that --
10 wouldn't that require to be putting constituents that
11 would need to go into D2 that is going to hurt the
12 competitiveness on D2? I mean, if D1 takes on more
13 urban Phoenix people then the other parts need to go
14 elsewhere, so I'm just concerned about the impact.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: With, I'm sorry?

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm concerned about the
17 impact of these changes on D2.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: None of these would
19 impact D2.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If you're shifting all
21 the boundaries of D1 it will.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're modifying them to
23 move into D8. D8 would move into D1, some of those D1,
24 not -- it wouldn't affect D2 at all. By moving some of
25 this north of 101 into D8 and basically making the 101

1 the boundary, that piece, I'm shifting things west a
2 little bit and south a little bit. There would be no
3 impact to D -- to D2 at all.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I see your map?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is all -- all I was
6 talking about was basically moving Sunnyslope into D1
7 and moving Anthem and New River, these up here, into
8 D8, so having that be captured by D8. If anything it's
9 going to actually take a little bit out of D9, so D8
10 would extend up here. It would capture this piece of
11 I-17, which it already has a chunk of that in there,
12 so, and then Sunnyslope would come from D8 into D1.
13 That's all I was talking about was D8 and D1, not
14 anything with D2. There might be a little bit of an
15 impact on D9, but that might be okay, because right now
16 the way it's coming in is an odd shape, where it comes
17 in on whatever that memorial highway is, the Bob Stump
18 Memorial --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're going to take some
20 population out of D1 and move it into D3.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, what I'm talking
22 about here is moving Sunnyslope from D8 to D1 and New
23 River from D1 to D8. That's all I was talking about
24 right there.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: I know that's what you're

1 talking about. You're talking about satisfying
2 Ms. Pastor's request, and then I still feel that Tempe
3 needs to move out of D1.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I think we
5 need -- in order to make progress it would be great to
6 have new maps to look at before we get back here on
7 Monday, so is this another place where we should now
8 have anyone who wants to make suggestions create a map
9 off of this, and if we have competing maps that's fine,
10 so that we at least can then -- if we could do that in
11 a 20- or 30-minute period then we can take a quick
12 break and then go to LDs, but then actually it would be
13 great to see some new maps by Monday.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That makes sense. The
15 only thing is that I really wish we had testimony,
16 official testimony, from Councilwoman Pastor, you know,
17 before we actually make the specific request for
18 changes, because it would influence what I would ask
19 for, but if you all feel comfortable enough with the
20 conversation we had to give directions, I'm very
21 comfortable doing that, and then I'm also comfortable
22 shifting into the legislative maps.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think it would helpful
24 to get new maps drawn by Monday, so I would take -- I
25 would suggest we do that, and we'll take our best shot

1 at describing what we think Ms. Pastor indicated, but
2 we've got plenty of time to then adjust it on Monday if
3 we can find out more what she's thinking.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If I could -- if I could
5 request -- I was focused on 8.4, I was focused on 8.3,
6 not 8.1, so it's like looking at a map -- I looked at
7 the map originally, but for me to make immediate
8 changes, I'll take my lunch and look at stuff, if
9 that's okay, and work on that, because I need some time
10 to look at the difference between 8.3 and 8.1 in those
11 areas because that's what I had been emphasizing. So
12 I'm not really as prepared to go ahead and make a
13 bunch -- I mean, there are a couple of things which
14 I've known all along with the Sunnyslope area, for
15 example, that Commissioner York has also been
16 mentioning Sunnyslope. We have both -- we have
17 different places we want to put it, but we both talked
18 about it. So would that be a possibility where maybe
19 while I'm eating lunch I can focus on that?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Completely okay with that.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We will by the end of
22 the day, no doubt, make sure we have the time to give
23 directives to mapping to make the appropriate revisions
24 of the maps you would like so we have them to review
25 before Monday, and we'll, you know, return to it at the

1 end of the day. Maybe then they'll have additional
2 information.

3 So at this point we could break for lunch and
4 then come back and, you know, either dive into this or
5 start the legislative map and then return in the
6 afternoon to giving the directives to mapping.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could I ask the staff
8 have we received a letter from Councilwoman Pastor or
9 Mayor Gallego?

10 MS. VAN HAREN: Madam Chair, Commissioner
11 Lerner, we have received a letter from Mayor Gallego.
12 It was forwarded to you at 9:02 this morning, so you
13 may not have had a chance to review it, so that may be
14 helpful right now.

15 We have not received an official letter from
16 Councilwoman Pastor, but we will reach out to her
17 office and see if they can send that before the end of
18 lunch.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you. That would
20 be really helpful.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right. She essentially
22 gave me her testimony just personally when, you know,
23 meeting with her to learn her ideas, but it -- but it's
24 best coming directly from her. I'm sure it will be
25 more accurate.

1 So at this point do we want to break for
2 lunch --

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair --

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- and study?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Madam Chair --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- as you're thinking about
9 the changes you want over lunch, and we'll find out in
10 the next -- part of the shifting around as D8 is coming
11 up to New River is going to displace a big chunk of D9,
12 so as you're thinking about the changes, you may think
13 about where you want D9 to come into D8 from the west
14 side, too. Do you want it into Sun Cities or into
15 Peoria and Glendale? Just as you're putting that
16 puzzle together please include that piece as well.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Doug, not all of us are
18 thinking about D1 going up to New River, so --

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. I just wanted to be
20 sure that -- Commissioner Lerner mentioned she was
21 thinking about those changes. Be sure to include in
22 that rotation what to do with that piece of D9 that
23 would get picked up by D8 in this process if we go --
24 if we go forward with that map request.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Any other

1 questions from mapping before we take maybe a 30-minute
2 recess for lunch?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Maybe 45 minutes.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Forty-five minutes?

5 Okay. Forty-five minutes for lunch and study. Okay.

6 Recess. We'll see you soon.

7 (The morning session concluded at 12:19 p.m.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 This transcript represents an unofficial

23 record. Please consult the accompanying video for the

24 official record of IRC proceedings.

25

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 3rd day of January, 2022.

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 3rd day of January, 2022.

MCR

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. 1058