

THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Afternoon Session

December 20, 2021

12:45 p.m.

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

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

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

I N D E X

	<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1		
2		
3		
4	ITEM NO. VI - LEGISLATIVE MAP	60
5	MOTION TO ADOPT MAP 15.0 AS A STARTING POINT	63
6	VOTE	64
7	ITEM NO. VI - CONGRESSIONAL MAPS	182
8	MOTION TO ADOPT MAP 12.1 AS A STARTING POINT	196
9	DISCUSSION	196
10	VOTE	197
11	MOTION TO ADJOURN	198
12	ITEM NO. VII	199
13	ITEM NO. VIII	199
14	ITEM NO. IX	199
15	MOTION TO ADJOURN	199
16	VOTE	200
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT  
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 12:45 p.m. on  
3 December 20, 2021, at the Kimpton Palomar Hotel,  
4 2 East Jefferson Street, Phoenix, Arizona, in the presence  
5 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. Alex Pena, Community Outreach Coordinator  
16 Ms. Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer

17 Mr. Mark Flahan, Timmons Group  
18 Mr. Brian Kingery, Timmons Group  
19 Mr. Parker Bradshaw, Timmons Group  
20 Mr. Doug Johnson, NDC  
21 Ms. Ivy Beller Sakansky, NDC

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

\* Spanish interpreter present

P R O C E E D I N G

1  
2  
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,  
4 everybody. Thank you for your patience; we have returned  
5 from executive session in which we sought legal counsel  
6 regarding VRA compliance.

7 We are returning to Agenda Item VI, draft map  
8 decision discussion. We have just given our mapping team a  
9 direction on the congressional map. I believe, at this  
10 point, perhaps my colleagues and I might want to turn to the  
11 legislative map.

12 We are on the same map, if you could please bring  
13 it up, the latest iteration.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner, would you  
15 like to go first or second?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'll go first.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That'd be great. Are we all  
19 ready? I want to wait until we are ready.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can we wait until we have the  
21 map just in front of us all, please.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

23 I'd also like to hear if you have anything to say  
24 as well, Chairwoman.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hmm?

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'd also like to know if you  
2           have any thoughts on it before we get going as well.

3           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I'd like to listen.  
4           Thank you.

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: We all set?

6           MR. FLAHAN: Yep, we're good.

7           MR. JOHNSON: 15. Oh, before we go into  
8           deliberations.

9           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, we all need to make sure  
10          we're deliberating on the same map so I believe we need to  
11          approve this iteration of LD-15.0 as our starting point.

12          I will entertain a motion to support deliberating  
13          from LD map version 15.0.

14          COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'll move to adopt -- well,  
15          we're actually moving to vote on this? Do we need to adopt  
16          this?

17          MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair, actually at the end -- at  
18          the end of legislative discussion yesterday, you voted.

19          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Oh. So we don't need to do  
20          any additional reaffirmation of this latest iteration?

21          MR. D. JOHNSON: It was a unanimous vote with a  
22          unanimous agreement on a lack of consensus I believe was the  
23          phrase.

24          MR. B. JOHNSON: The website -- the website is  
25          not --

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: You're not on mic.

2 MR. B. JOHNSON: Brian, can you just confirm what's  
3 on the website then, is that reflecting it as the most  
4 current map?

5 MR. KINGERY: I don't believe that we voted on 15.  
6 I think the Web -- the website is correct, if I recall  
7 correctly.

8 MR. B. JOHNSON: That means we would have to vote.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can we take a look at the minutes?

10 MR. KINGERY: Yesterday we also received the Navajo  
11 Nation tweak, and I had published that and added that. By  
12 the time I got around back to review this map, we switched  
13 over to congressional map.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think what we all can be  
15 certain of is we have been deliberating out of this one map,  
16 and we last left off with this one map. So as we review  
17 records, would it do any harm just for us to go on record  
18 and reconfirm that this would be our starting point for  
19 deliberation on the LDs?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm good with that.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know if we need a  
22 vote.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm waiting for the counsel  
24 to tell us.

25 MR. B. JOHNSON: That will be fine. We just need

1 to get something on the record that this is the map.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So let's just do a re- --  
3 reaffirmation.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Actually, we just figured it out.  
5 So the vote told us to -- it was all the changes but you  
6 asked -- and we advised on everything except the Pascua  
7 Yaqui change. So you voted on the map without the Pascua  
8 Yaqui change and so now it would probably be appropriate to  
9 vote on it with the change made.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Excellent. Now we  
11 have the most updated draft of LD-15.0, correct?

12 So I will entertain a motion to begin deliberation  
13 based on LD version 15.0.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Mehl. I move that  
15 we vote on 15.0.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Wait; we're beginning  
17 deliberations?

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: As a starting point.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, as a starting point.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes, not the final map.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's all. Just clarifying  
22 the motion that's all.

23 I'll second the motion that we are beginning  
24 deliberations on 15.0.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

1 Vice Chair Watchman.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
10 aye.

11 And with that, the iteration of LD version 15.0 is  
12 our most recently adopted template; and from that we will  
13 begin new deliberation.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I'm going to -- and I  
15 don't know if we want to -- I have a number of different  
16 changes, but they're in just a few districts if that's what  
17 we can do.

18 So yesterday, I did ask for Arcadia Lite to be  
19 added in, but it didn't get added in. I had made that  
20 request, and I thought we were going to do that. It was my  
21 understanding that you were adding that in.

22 I call it Arcadia Lite, but it's a part of Arcadia.  
23 It's that area between D-4, D-8, D-1.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, I want to talk  
25 about a strategy right here because we are on one map, and



1 -- and we are not at the point to diverge, and so we have to  
2 be thoughtful about how we're going to form decisions about  
3 this; and rather than each side getting full rein to, you  
4 know, just go off because I don't think it's productive, I  
5 think we need to have a collaborative conversation and then  
6 begin to vote on the specific districts and -- and specific  
7 areas that we -- we are done with deliberation.

8 So I -- I entertain the idea to hear the full,  
9 comprehensive rationale from -- from my colleagues about the  
10 changes you'd like to make and why you think it makes sense,  
11 and if Mapping can keep up and make a visual, great.

12 But -- but what I'm not going to support is -- is  
13 two different maps and -- and I'm, you know, focused on  
14 bringing sides in, not bringing sides out. And so with  
15 that, I trust, you know, you've all deliberated in good  
16 faith so I think you understand what I'm asking for.

17 Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, that makes sense.

19 So I had asked for this yesterday and -- I'm going  
20 to reiterate that, and the reason is because it's a  
21 community that's in that area that is all part of the same  
22 community. People move to Arcadia, and they move into that  
23 area to be part of that community. It's a really strong  
24 community of interest. The -- when you look at housing  
25 values, all of that connects people into that area and it

1           actually is connected by moving that boundary down which --  
2           just to capture the community.

3                       I'm saying that this is base -- this is a true  
4           community of interest that otherwise would be split.

5                       When I look at the village planning areas, in that  
6           area they are combined for the city of Phoenix. So my  
7           justification is basically to bring a particular  
8           neighborhood in its entirety into -- adding that into  
9           District 4.

10                      COMMISSIONER MEHL: And Chairwoman, I'm not sure  
11           how you want us to then do this, but you know we would -- we  
12           would not like that change and we don't think that advances  
13           things. So just to go on the record that -- that we don't  
14           think that would be a good change.

15                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So -- so let -- we could do  
16           one of two things. Commissioner Lerner, would you like a  
17           coherent period of time to be able to put your thoughts  
18           sequentially; or, you know -- and we could do both, you  
19           could have some time to put thoughts sequentially together,  
20           this side could have some time to put thoughts, you know,  
21           together, and then we can come back and have the literal  
22           debate over the districts we're talking about.

23                      And maybe that makes the most sense.

24                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well -- so how would that --  
25           because I was going to ask if they could give me -- I

1 didn't -- well, I can see --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right, but -- and that  
3 doesn't preclude you from asking for thoughts/opinions from  
4 others as you're putting together your thoughtful  
5 presentation of, you know, what you're wanting.

6 Because, you know, the change has ripples so -- so  
7 it doesn't make sense to just hear what you want to do with  
8 one specific spot; I want to know where it's all headed.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So to give the whole picture;  
10 is that what you're suggesting?

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Give the whole picture.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If you're open to thoughts  
14 and feedback along the way, I would welcome that; we'll  
15 provide the other side the same opportunity. From there we  
16 will return to the decision-making points, and then we'll,  
17 you know, vote or -- or have collective decision about what  
18 it's going to look like, but let's have each side be able to  
19 coherently express the whole argument and -- and holistic  
20 perspective for the map.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So I'll go through all  
22 the potential changes that we're going to ask, and I'll  
23 provide the justification as we move there.

24 So Arcadia is a very distinct neighborhood; it's an  
25 area people choose to move into, and it's -- this area has

1           been split for no real reason other than the boundary that's  
2           there. It's very logical to put an entire neighborhood  
3           together that -- that has a lot in common especially when  
4           most of it actually is already together. This is just  
5           taking a small piece of Arcadia and putting it in there.

6                        So that's -- that's -- then just looking at -- we  
7           were talking about economics yesterday, I kind of did -- I  
8           took a look at economics and, you know, that's another piece  
9           that binds these people. We talked about capital -- or  
10          capitalism, I guess, yesterday a little bit, and one of the  
11          primary things people do is in terms of spending their money  
12          is owning or renting a home, and in this area, this  
13          particular area of Arcadia, is an area that's very well  
14          connected -- the community is very well connected to each  
15          other. There's nothing really that separates them, there's  
16          no freeway there's no -- you know, they just are very well  
17          connected. It's a very strong community of interest with  
18          demographics, home values and incomes that go together.

19                       So that's one recommendation. And then on the  
20          other side of District 4 -- and part of this is that  
21          District 4 has that interesting bottom that was done to --  
22          to capture the Arizona Country Club, so it's interesting to  
23          capture that one neighborhood but -- but did not capture the  
24          others.

25                       So the other place then is on the southwestern

1 corner of District 4 in this area over -- we talked last  
2 time about the connection between people in south Scottsdale  
3 and in north Scottsdale and in those areas. So another area  
4 I would recommend is -- and this is a little bit of -- well,  
5 we'll get into the population piece. But bringing south,  
6 the southern boundary in this southwestern corner on the  
7 right there, down to Thomas Road as part of that.

8 And that also actually will connect communities.  
9 It basically brings Thomas Road as the border of District 4.  
10 So it makes a nice contiguous border that can exist in that  
11 area. That brings communities of interest together, it ties  
12 in those -- all of those communities that are longtime  
13 residents in that area. It's a little bit of older  
14 Scottsdale down in that area.

15 So that's -- that's the other piece down in  
16 District 4.

17 Do you want me to continue?

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: All right.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: So Commissioner Lerner, you want  
23 to bring that over to where the District 1 border is  
24 currently or did you want to bring that all the way over to  
25 19?

1                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: In the -- I'm bringing that  
2 border down all the way down to Thomas.

3                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

4                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: So basically making Thomas  
5 all the way across.

6                   MR. D. JOHNSON: So just the blue area that Brian  
7 has captured here or do you want to extend it all the way  
8 west?

9                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the Arcadia on the  
10 left and the other side we would go to the right all the way  
11 over on Thomas.

12                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think we're going through  
13 their thoughts and our thoughts and we're not redrawing  
14 anything until we then -- we then discuss them.

15                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Right, we're just trying to  
16 capture the population numbers as you go along so you have  
17 them in mind.

18                   COMMISSIONER YORK: No, to the west, Brian.

19                   MR. D. JOHNSON: No, no -- Brian.

20                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: The Arcadia really goes  
21 further. It goes all the way over to 16th Street, the  
22 entire Arcadia as part of that. But we're going at Thomas  
23 Road basically the southern boundary.

24                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Wait, but what's the western  
25 border of this step? 16th?

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 16th.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: There's a lot -- there is  
4 population balancing. It's really just between two or three  
5 districts that we're looking at here.

6 And I will say that, just to keep track of  
7 constitutional issues, this will make that District 4 a lot  
8 more contiguous and compact and make -- make more sense in  
9 terms of its boundaries.

10 It also will be more -- it will give it more of a  
11 competitive piece, and it brings neighborhoods together as  
12 part of that.

13 And then the other side.

14 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 9, too.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the total of all the area  
17 you're talking about in those two changes would be 45,500  
18 people.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That -- that we're putting  
20 into District 4?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, we're -- right, right.  
23 But we're going to make -- we're going to lose some  
24 population as part of that.

25 Okay. So on the -- let me see. I'm sorry. Where

1 is it?

2 So District 4 is going to lose population in --  
3 some population in south Scottsdale and maybe I spoke wrong,  
4 but you're going to push the Scottsdale boundary a little  
5 further north between District 4 and District 8 from  
6 Chaparral just up to Indian School -- Indian Bend, I'm  
7 sorry. I think I had given you the wrong information.

8 We're going to bring south the southern boundary on  
9 the southwestern corner to Thomas, that's the Arcadia Lite  
10 piece and then I think I misspoke on the other side, I  
11 apologize. I wanted to go north, not south.

12 So, the boundary -- the north boundary on  
13 Scottsdale from Chaparral to Indian Bend, that places more  
14 of south Scottsdale into District 8. This is something that  
15 we've heard before about that connection that south  
16 Scottsdale and Tempe have that we've talked about.

17 Indian Bend as a boundary is actually something  
18 that we've heard from Commissioner York, it's the southern  
19 boundary of the McCormick Ranch neighborhood so that's a  
20 reason for that boundary being recommended. It also can  
21 create a better connection to the Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
22 Indian community in District 8 because the road to enter  
23 Talking Stick Resort and Casino is actually at Indian Bend  
24 as well, so there's a couple good reason to actually have it  
25 go into that area.



1                   Okay. So there's -- I'm just going to move on up  
2 to District 3 and District 4.

3                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Wait, let us get a population  
4 number on this.

5                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh sure. Sure, sure.

6                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner, before  
7 you move on.

8                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

9                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I just ask conceptual  
10 questions because I'm trying to pay attention to all of the  
11 changes. But we have a good template, and I want to  
12 understand where are you going with this. So are there  
13 specific districts that you want to change for reasons and  
14 -- and what are the most important ones?

15                   I'm just -- it would be helpful to understand as  
16 much behind your interest in changing these lines as  
17 possible.

18                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm happy to do that.

19                   So there's a number of things -- there are few  
20 districts that could be truly competitive so I am looking at  
21 those districts. Right now the way the map -- the map is  
22 drawn, there's not very much -- there are not very many that  
23 are truly competitive so part of it is that.

24                   Another part -- a bigger part probably, is the fact  
25 that when we started some communities were not -- we were

1 sort of just adding in and out with some communities, and I  
2 don't think we were looking as closely at certain  
3 communities of interest.

4 There are a few districts that I'm mostly  
5 interested: District 2, 4, 9 and 13 are the four districts  
6 that I'm most interested in. And everything else would be  
7 population balancing that I would be trying to do. So but  
8 those -- those are the ones.

9 And I will say that I think it's because 2, 4, 9,  
10 and 13 are competitive -- potentially competitive districts,  
11 and the way right now they are I don't feel that they're as  
12 balanced as they could be. I'm also going to be honest, I  
13 know we don't normally talk about this piece, but I am going  
14 to say that this current iteration of legislative map 15.0  
15 had a 17-13 breakdown, and I'd like to make some changes but  
16 focus on the communities of interest as part of it.

17 But those are the four districts, I'm not trying to  
18 change the whole map at this point. Those are the four  
19 primary ones.

20 I have other thoughts on other districts, but I'd  
21 like to try to get us closer to finishing than make big  
22 overhauls in these areas.

23 I know we're going to have --

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm a little bit confused,  
25 though. But the three -- three of the districts you brought

1 up, 2, 4 and 9, I believe they're all toss-ups.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would not put 4 in a  
3 toss-up. 2 could be, but not I don't put --

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Based on just elections, I'm  
5 not looking at vote spread. If you look at nine elections,  
6 you know, 4-5 either way. You know, so I think to me that's  
7 a little bit compelling.

8 And we'll -- we'll go back and we'll tackle all of  
9 this, but this is helpful, you know. Let's just be direct  
10 about where we're going with, you know, our line of changes,  
11 and so you're focused on 2, 4, 9 --

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And 13.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- 13.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, yeah. Those are the  
15 main ones.

16 And as I said, I know that there are others I have  
17 tweaks, but those are things we can wait on.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm happy to answer any other  
20 questions.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And as you speak about that  
22 focus, you know, just make sure that you're -- if you're  
23 focusing on competitiveness, articulate how that relates to  
24 the other compromises with the other constitutional criteria  
25 so that we're doing due diligence to, you know, really

1 explain all of the decisions that we're making.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So just to -- just to  
5 reiterate then on District 4, the primary change there is  
6 the Arcadia area, and it allows a stronger south Scottsdale  
7 connection.

8 I'll come to District 13 but -- but basically my --  
9 and I'm not going to do that right this second, but  
10 basically I have an alternate configuration that we can take  
11 a look at which is much more of a -- trying to get Gilbert  
12 more whole and is more neighborhood driven in the  
13 configuration of Gilbert and to a great extent Chandler.

14 So those are some -- just some general comments.  
15 And again most of my comments will be more on what's on the  
16 ground versus the competitiveness. Competitiveness is a  
17 piece but not the only thing that's in there.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And as always we -- we do not  
19 focus on what the composition of con- -- of legislature  
20 would be in terms of Rs and Ds. That's not something within  
21 our constitutional purview.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I understand. I just wanted  
23 to make that comment, but I do understand that that's not  
24 what we're looking at.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So the primary thing  
2 with District 4 -- and again, there are a number of other  
3 minor changes that I could make. I don't know and I guess,  
4 Chairwoman, maybe give me your thoughts. Most of the other  
5 changes are for population balancing not so -- and -- or a  
6 number of the other changes. I don't know if you want me to  
7 go through all of those at this time or just make big  
8 picture comments.

9           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I guess I'm most focused on  
10 the constitutional arguments for the changes you want in 2,  
11 4, 9 and 13. I want to have a constitutional, you know,  
12 conversation about why you think it should be one way, and  
13 colleagues here think it should be the other way. I'm  
14 thrilled that we're at the point where we're really narrowed  
15 down on just some fine, you know, points, and I want to  
16 understand it so that we do our due diligence to be as  
17 objective and as empirical as possible. You know, the  
18 closer it gets to the end, you know, the -- the harder it is  
19 to just -- you know, but the more important it is to stay  
20 true to those six criteria that have driven us from day one.

21           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Thank you.

22           All right. Final comments on Arcadia, then let me  
23 just mention a couple of other things on why I think it's so  
24 important for Arcadia to be combined and whole.

25           Arcadia basically looks -- I'm also looking at

1 school districts as another area just in terms of bringing  
2 those communities together. By bringing in Arcadia in its  
3 entirety as I mentioned, it brings the rest of the  
4 Scottsdale unified area that's north of Thomas together; it  
5 also will reduce the split of the Madison School District by  
6 bringing in everything east of 16th street. So it binds  
7 that community that has been together for a long time and  
8 was just arbitrarily split, so I wanted to mention that.

9 It also has, if we go all the way over to Camelback  
10 and Indian School beyond -- right now I suggested Camelback  
11 and Thomas. If we go also to Indian School again, then it  
12 brings -- reduces the split even more for Madison School  
13 District. It also brings all of Creighton Elementary School  
14 District north of Indian School. So a number of reasons for  
15 those to be put together.

16 So that's a District 4 piece. There's other things  
17 as I mentioned on District 4, but those would be balancing  
18 if we -- if we agree on adding Arcadia, which I had -- I had  
19 requested yesterday so I thought it was going to be in  
20 there, and then we would have been able to have taken a look  
21 at it 'cause it was on my list yesterday, and I didn't  
22 remember hearing any reason not to yesterday.

23 Another area just -- I mentioned District 2.  
24 Yesterday, Commissioner York had added into District 2 a  
25 small section on the northwest corner of Deer Valley and I

1 looked at a map of Deer Valley because Commissioner York had  
2 said that would bring three quarters of it into the  
3 district, into District, 2 but that's not the case.

4 Deer Valley is split pretty much in half. I looked  
5 at the village plans, right at the 101, and so putting that  
6 back; there is no reason to actually have put that in there  
7 other than it actually did add or make that district less  
8 competitive as part of it. There was -- there is really no  
9 reason to add that one piece. It should just go across  
10 north of the 101 as part of the overall Deer Valley Village  
11 that exists. And I can -- I'm happy to share the map that's  
12 what I looked at.

13 So that Deer Valley addition is what I'm  
14 recommending be removed because I don't feel that it aligns  
15 as well. I think that you'd want to have that other north  
16 piece of Deer Valley in there, and that would go with the  
17 Deer Valley Airport that's there as well as the fact that  
18 Deer Valley extends, that village, past Happy Valley Road  
19 and you can kind of see how far that goes.

20 So -- so that would actually --

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- you mind,  
24 Commissioner Lerner, since this is referencing something  
25 that Commissioner York intended deliberately. I'm curious

1 just to bring forth his intention, So as I'm tracking your  
2 arguments, I understand what the other side had in mind  
3 because I can't keep every fact straight.

4 Commissioner York, why did you feel that was  
5 important to be there?

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, when I look at the -- I  
7 just pulled it up on Google, Deer Valley Village covers all  
8 four quadrants of that intersection, so that was the -- the  
9 reason to include that.

10 Mark, can you pull that up?

11 You looked at Maryvale so you might as well.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right I have the same -- we  
13 both have the same pictures. I'm happy to share that if you  
14 want.

15 Did you want to see that?

16 So we do, we're looking at the same map,  
17 Commissioner York; and all I'm saying is that division at  
18 the 101 is a natural division for that and there was no real  
19 reason to add that piece because you actually -- when you  
20 look at where Deer Valley is, that piece goes just as well  
21 to the north with the north as it would to the south, and it  
22 basically could go just right back where it was in  
23 District 3, and it would be just part of unifying that part  
24 of the -- that north of 101 part of Deer Valley and there  
25 would be a south part of the 101 that would be in



1 District 2, and then the other part would be in District 3.

2 So this Deer Valley Village is split; there's also  
3 the north map village that's also got a split, I mean.

4 It also has a split in it, so.

5 That was my justification. I don't know.

6 MR. FLAHAN: That's the document from the city of  
7 Phoenix on the Deer Valley Village.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, so my intention was to  
9 get most of that into District 2, compromise yesterday with  
10 the Adobe Dam section.

11 Commissioner Lerner's doesn't agree with me, so  
12 that's fine.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I -- I it really  
14 doesn't -- it doesn't get most of it in there. And actually  
15 we -- it would be a really natural.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We would add some more in to  
17 make it even more incorporated in there.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that would make that  
19 district less competitive.

20 And I --

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's highly competitive, and it  
22 will still be highly competitive.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, it will not.

24 And District -- it was in District 3, and there  
25 really was no reason to move that one piece out of

1 District 3; it was naturally in there for Deer Valley. When  
2 you look at the boundaries of that -- of that village I'll  
3 call it because that's what they call it in Phoenix, there  
4 is a natural boundary where a little bit more than half is  
5 north of the 101 and less than half is south of the 101.  
6 And it's a natural boundary as part of that.

7 There's no way you could actually fit all of the  
8 Deer Valley into District 2 but more of it could go into  
9 District 3 which right now has, because of that move, lost  
10 population; and when you move that -- that population out of  
11 District 3, District 3 is now down almost 20,000 people. If  
12 you put that back in where it had been in District 3, and  
13 which is the natural boundary there, it would help  
14 District 3 as well.

15 Okay, so I don't know if they were going to answer  
16 anything else. I'm sorry.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, no. No, I sometimes -- I  
18 like to hear the alternative perspective so I understand  
19 things.

20 But please continue through -- through your ideas.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

22 Which -- which were the ones I said? 2, 4.

23 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 9.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So yeah, all I'm saying on  
25 this one for District 2 and the Deer Valley piece, to put it

1 back where it was at that boundary of the 101 which I think  
2 would be a natural boundary for that area.

3 District 9 --

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh. That's just my  
6 recommendation.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just to clarify -- that area was I  
8 believe was actually in District 28 before.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, all right.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: But just to clarify, the proposal  
11 was to put it in the area that is shown as being District 2  
12 north of the freeway would now go into District 3?

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It would be my recommendation  
14 to put it in District 3 since I think the majority of the  
15 Deer Valley Village area is in District 3 and...

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh yeah, I've seen it's bounced  
17 around in different maps.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, it actually goes into  
19 -- it's actually split into several districts come to think  
20 of it. It's going to be in District 3, District 2, District  
21 28.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: 27.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And 27, yep.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But -- but other districts,

1 again, you know, we can look at North Mountain; we've got  
2 that one split up.

3 So -- so my main point here just -- is these  
4 villages don't have to all be together but, since that was  
5 part of the justification yesterday, I just wanted to raise  
6 that point, that's all.

7 So -- so District 9 -- let me just pull it up.  
8 Well, maybe -- you know what, I'm going to jump over to  
9 District 13 just to explain what I'm hoping for in  
10 District 13. For District 9, it's just a few changes that  
11 are basically -- that I'm making suggestions on just to try  
12 to bring some city lines together and some communities more  
13 together in District 9 area.

14 So making a few changes to respect the communities  
15 of interest for the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian  
16 community and Lehi are the main things that I had been  
17 looking at in that area. And that's sort of the boundaries  
18 between District 9 and 10, which was maybe potentially  
19 moving some of Lehi into District 10 which tended to be the  
20 thought that people might been -- that that's what they  
21 initially expressed we thought they prefer to be in  
22 District 10 and then yesterday they were moved into  
23 District 9. But we felt that, from a community perspective,  
24 that District 10 would be more logical for them in terms of  
25 their interests.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: They're in 10.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So that was -- that was part  
3 of District 9. There were some other things that were sort  
4 of balancing some things and getting schools together.

5 We would want to leave Westwood High School, Carson  
6 Junior High, and some of those elementary schools in  
7 District 8 that the Salt River Pima-Maricopa community  
8 wanted, so I wanted to make sure that those stayed to honor  
9 their request.

10 So, I think, a big change that I wanted to talk  
11 about -- so District 9 just has some tweaks I guess is all  
12 I'm saying.

13 The big change that I think I want to discuss is  
14 District 13.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, Commissioner Lerner, do you  
16 have street borders or more specifics rather than just the  
17 school locations?

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, for District 9, I think  
19 one of the bigger things was pushing west the boundary  
20 between District 9 and District 8 -- and District 10, I'm  
21 sorry. District 9 and District 10 from the south canal to  
22 Country Club Drive, in the area between the Loop 202 and  
23 McKellips Road.

24 That's where the Lehi area was and again that's --  
25 we have -- we've been talking about the fact that that would

1           probably, District 10 would be a better fit for them so that  
2           was just trying to honor that request and moving that over.  
3           So it's just that little block that it is there.

4           MR. D. JOHNSON: Can you help us highlight that on  
5           the screen?

6           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, that boundary right  
7           where you have the canal, that's there; and you go to -- I  
8           think it's Country Club.

9           COMMISSIONER YORK: I think it's Mesa Drive.

10          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Between the 202 and  
11          McKellips.

12          It's -- it was added in to District 9 yesterday but  
13          it really should go back into District 10. It was in  
14          District 10 and I think that's a much more logical fit for  
15          it, for the community that's there.

16          And from what I understood, that's what we've been  
17          talking about is having them in District 10 based on their  
18          preference.

19          MR. D. JOHNSON: So you're saying the area north of  
20          McKellips from -- from District 9 would go to District 10?

21          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. That's my  
22          recommendation based on the community that's there.

23          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes, the community of  
24          interest of Lehi I think would be well served in LD-10.

25          COMMISSIONER YORK: But I believe the area south of

1 the canal along -- along Gilbert was not supposed to be in  
2 D-10; am I right on that?

3 That was supposed to be in 9 if I remember  
4 correctly.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was just that one corner  
6 that we were looking at.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, it was the funky little  
8 intersection I remember that. But it was just up there at  
9 the top there at Gilbert Road into 10, but this section  
10 south of the canal, that little triangle along Gilbert Road,  
11 was supposed to be in 9 if I remember correctly when we  
12 agreed to that.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We were -- we were talking  
14 about McKellips. That's a real nice clean border.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: South of the canal.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: East and south of the canal  
18 that area, and I think this is where the error was made,  
19 this was supposed to be part of District 9 and the Lehi area  
20 was supposed to be part of District 10 if I remember  
21 correctly.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not clear,  
23 Commissioner York. I had McKellips as a -- as a good nice,  
24 clean border.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's the south boundary of Lehi

1 west of the canal, correct? Over to Country Club.

2 If I remember, that was the --

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, yeah. But aren't we  
4 saying the same thing then, McKellips?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I'm saying south of the  
6 canal down to McKellips, east to Gilbert Road was supposed  
7 be in 9, if I remember correctly.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think you're saying exactly the  
9 opposite thing.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: We are, we are.

11 But you guys originally drew it with Lehi in 10,  
12 but then for some reason it showed up this way. I don't  
13 think we instructed you to move Lehi out of 10, but we never  
14 had that southeast triangle out of 9.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. We need to get just one set  
16 of instructions at a time, though. So -- so --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So from Country Club --  
18 taking McKellips over to Country Club and using the canal as  
19 that boundary on the east side, going up to McDowell Road or  
20 the freeway, whichever --

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: It --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- that's the area that I'm  
23 talking about that will go back into 10.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: So everything -- so all of the  
25 pink north of McKellips and I believe Country Club is the



1 western border of District 9.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: So everything north of McKellips  
4 that's currently shown as 9 would go into 10?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, east of Country Club  
6 Drive north of McKellips. That would make sure that we're  
7 getting all of it.

8 Right where Lehi Road is you've got that entire  
9 community.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's the old village -- that  
11 was what we originally had on there.

12 Wow. Yeah.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that's 5,500 people.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I have recommendations  
15 for population balancing if this is accepted. So I won't go  
16 into that now.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we -- we would not support  
18 this.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and what is your  
20 opposition, please?

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I thought  
22 Commissioner Lerner had two things she wanted to work on in  
23 the East Valley, and then I'll come back to talk about this.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. The last change that

1 I -- and -- and I know we're going to be making other small  
2 recommendations. These are just the big ones that I'm  
3 focusing on; I'm certainly focusing on Maricopa County.

4 So as you know, it's not been a secret that I've  
5 been suggesting some changes down in District 13, 14. I  
6 feel that it would be useful for us to reflect the Chandler,  
7 Gilbert, Mesa municipal boundaries, and the current  
8 iteration that we have there could be some adjustments that  
9 gets more of Gilbert in one district and also helps Chandler  
10 as well.

11 I have a few different options on how to do this,  
12 not just one. But basically that's my intent. This is to  
13 preserve communities of interest, to try to do as much as we  
14 can to get Gilbert whole and Chandler not split too much as  
15 well. We've certainly heard from Gilbert, a lot, as we all  
16 know, about trying to be as whole as possible.

17 So we're basically trying to -- to do that in these  
18 areas as well as District 13 could become a more competitive  
19 district as long as we're following the other constitutional  
20 goals.

21 So I have a few different options, but that's my  
22 intent is to basically kind of give these -- I can give you  
23 the different options and see if any of those are better  
24 than others if you'd like.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sure. Just -- just can you

1 clarify again what your objective is. You said you wanted  
2 to make D-13 more competitive. What are your other  
3 objectives?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, the others were all  
5 about trying to get more of each of those communities in a  
6 single district if possible.

7 So a lot of -- that was actually a lot of it has to  
8 do with District 14 where the majority of Gilbert can  
9 actually be in one district, which we heard loud and clear  
10 that that was something that they preferred.

11 I have another map here.

12 And -- and to try to get Chandler also more aligned  
13 with the shape of their community. So both cases we're  
14 real -- I'm really trying to align those communities.

15 And I'm just looking...if you can just give me a  
16 second to find my map.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, Commissioner Lerner, I  
18 just -- I'm very open to your arguments, I think better  
19 fitting the cities is not going to be compelling 'cause I  
20 think this map has done such a great job with fitting in,  
21 you know, the core elements of the cities, and I do believe  
22 that, you know, as we talked about, the local leaders in the  
23 areas were quite happy with this arrangement.

24 But I'm open -- I'm open to perfecting it to the  
25 extent possible.

1           And I have to be honest that the -- you know, the  
2           concern that I have looking at LD-13 is just are there the  
3           pockets of, you know, the minority communities that, you  
4           know, need to be shifted slightly.

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I -- I agree with you.

6           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And so -- okay.

7           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

8           COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we worked hard, I  
9           thought, on Sunday to balance the borders of 13 and 14. I  
10          mean currently they're within 800 people, plus or minus.

11          COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's -- they --  
12          population-wise they are, but in terms of their actual  
13          boundaries right now the way they look, there could be  
14          alternative approaches to it that would get 90 percent of  
15          Gilbert into one district and two-thirds of --  
16          three-quarters of Chandler as well. And that's part of it,  
17          and then also combining some specific -- excuse me --  
18          specific communities of interest in those areas.

19          So what I'm trying to do is respect the city  
20          boundaries and communities of interest, and that would favor  
21          -- or favoring a more competitive district as part of it.

22          But those are the first two comments are -- are  
23          basically looking at these boundaries and these communities  
24          that are in the area. And as you mentioned Chairwoman,  
25          there are some areas that could be better combined in that

1 area.

2 So again, I have three different options in that  
3 area and maybe I can just kind of give you an overview of  
4 each of those, because any one of those could work and they  
5 all -- they all try to bring communities of interest  
6 together a little bit better.

7 So one option is changing the west boundary -- I'm  
8 sorry, the eastern boundary between District 13 and 14 to  
9 the Chandler-Gilbert city line. And that would be between  
10 Germann and the -- Road and the Maricopa Pinal County line.

11 And then -- and it would be -- there's some zig  
12 zagging that has to go; and what I'd like to do is kind of  
13 give you sort of an overview of each of the options to kind  
14 of get a feel for it, but -- but what that would do is to  
15 make the city line much more cohesive in that area, and  
16 moving that boundary would just bring these -- kind of  
17 create that better boundary between Chandler and Gilbert.

18 And then I would push north the boundary of  
19 District 13 which would actually capture some populations  
20 that probably should be in there anyway. There are Latino  
21 populations up in that area that -- it's the older part of  
22 Chandler and --

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Which specific area are you  
24 talking about, please?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Arizona Avenue north of the

1 current boundary of the district. So going up -- could  
2 pretty much go up to where the district boundary is now, 13,  
3 and you've got some -- some significant populations that go  
4 all the way at least through Elliot, if not further, to the  
5 current boundary of District 9.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: So, Commissioner Lerner, just to  
7 make sure I get -- so D-14 expands westward to the city  
8 border and then -- obviously, it's a large population.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I know. There's a lot of  
10 population movement. I can adjust it all if that's  
11 something we decide to do.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: And then big picture, though,  
13 District 14 is then giving up what?

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: And to 12.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I can do. I wasn't going to  
17 population balance right now, what I was going to do is kind  
18 of give a vision of different options on how to make some  
19 adjustments in 13.

20 Because if we -- if we did move this one, then we  
21 would have to make some other adjustments as well all around  
22 there. And I guess I just want you to know I actually have  
23 thought about how to do all of those.

24 So what I was going to do right now if that was  
25 okay, I can give all the details. I was going to try to

1 conceptualize how to do all the changes and why the changes  
2 are important. Besides -- the competitive is one piece, but  
3 that's not the only piece, if that's okay.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: It is just a matter of how many  
5 thousands of people?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Unless we decide on this one,  
7 I have three different options actually so that -- that  
8 would do that.

9 So, so one area -- one --

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I -- as I'm listening to  
11 you and because I think that the, again, the cities were  
12 very well served as the lines are drawn now, I am very open  
13 to debating increasing competitiveness in order to provide a  
14 district, you know, more accountability for some of, you  
15 know, the minority communities and just, you know, the  
16 values that go along with a competitive district.

17 So I just don't want to get lost too much in too  
18 many changes.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I agree.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So, so, you know, if you're  
21 really focused on 13 and the minority communities, let's not  
22 change what's really good about a lot of other areas.

23 Just my suggestion.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, it's a good suggestion.

25 So I -- so the other main area that I've been

1 looking at and part of the -- to be quite honest, was the  
2 eastern boundary to be able to go north, that's more of the  
3 reasoning behind it, and to give Gilbert more of its  
4 community in District 14.

5 The main other area is the north piece, which when  
6 we look at District 13 in this community at this, it should  
7 go north to capture the rest of that population. And if it  
8 could go up to at least Elliot, it should capture just that  
9 north boundary.

10 And again the main reason to move the west  
11 boundary -- the east boundary, was simply as a population  
12 shift. If we move the population over and then up, that  
13 would actually capture going up to Elliot Road in the area  
14 between McQueen and Lyndsay. It basically --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And why do you think this?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This area has a high  
17 population that was split in this current district right now  
18 on Ray -- and my computer goes bad. Sorry, my computer  
19 keeps doing this to me.

20 North of Ray up to Elliot Road there is a  
21 population of -- it's an older community, you have a high  
22 minority population in that area that could be combined into  
23 District 13 as a unit --

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- instead of splitting them



1 in half.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: On the west, I presume 101, what  
3 would be the east border again?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Again -- well again, the main  
5 reason I was moving the east border if we needed to move  
6 north, we need to move east a little bit and the east border  
7 actually gives more of Gilbert in its border.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, I mean the --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The east border -- the border  
10 on the east for District 13 -- what did I just say?

11 To Lyndsay.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Lyndsay.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It just gets stuck all the  
14 time.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: So moving north of Ray between --  
16 to Elliot between 101 on the west and Lyndsay.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes, so the west boundary,  
18 you're taking the Lyndsay Road between Ray and Ocotillo --  
19 and, again, most of this is being done because I would like  
20 to pull it north to capture that community and actually  
21 bring the community back together because right now they  
22 were split at Ray. But it's an older part of Chandler and  
23 Gilbert actually; and then it allows that community to be  
24 more aligned.

25 The change actually gives -- there are some

1 differences between northwest Gilbert and the rest of  
2 Gilbert and so that's part of what I'm trying to do.

3 Going back -- I have to re-up my computer.

4 So really, I mean, that's the major change. It  
5 improves competitiveness, but it also brings these  
6 communities of interest together because the -- at Ray they  
7 actually continue north at least to Elliot, and so I'm just  
8 trying to actually bring them together as part of that.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And when you say it improves  
10 competitiveness, can you -- can you quantify it and its  
11 implications for the districts around it? 'Cause...

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It won't -- and, again, I  
13 have some changes for the others, but I wouldn't -- it  
14 actually should not change the competitiveness in the other  
15 two -- in the districts that are aligned next to it. It  
16 actually might change District 14 slightly, but it's already  
17 at a 15.9 percent. So I haven't quantified, but it might  
18 increase that slightly.

19 And for District 12, it will probably reduce that  
20 number from the vote spread to make it a little bit more  
21 competitive as part of that.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And for 13, you have any  
23 sense?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think with 13, it actually  
25 just moves it into -- within a point. So it would actually

1 change it to being more competitive within our most  
2 competitive range of about a point.

3 I think it still would lean Republican but -- but  
4 it would be more balanced than it is right now. Right now  
5 it's got a 2.7 competitiveness, but I think it would be more  
6 of a -- I don't know. I don't actually know. I can't  
7 say -- I don't want to say.

8 But it would be more competitive, more balanced  
9 than it is right now.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and do you feel that,  
11 in this version, the Asian community in the northern part of  
12 Chandler is better taken care of? I mean, you know, I think  
13 the other map actually did a reasonable job as well, but is  
14 there anything you want to emphasize about, you know,  
15 because, the Asian community is a little bit in Gilbert,  
16 Chandler, Mesa, so is there any case you want to make about  
17 why this particular map works for that community of  
18 interest?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, based on the  
20 demographics that I was looking up when I pulled them up on  
21 the map, that's part of why I want to do those changes  
22 because there's a number of people located in those  
23 communities, in those areas -- again I'm having trouble.

24 I apologize, but I can't pull them up right now  
25 because I don't --

1                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's not a problem. Maybe  
2                   at some point you can just clarify for the record the  
3                   boundaries that you're particularly looking at. I would be  
4                   interested in just seeing the physical borders of -- of, you  
5                   know, that most important dens- -- density of that  
6                   community.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, and I will be happy to  
8                   do that if I could get my computer...

9                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: She's pulling that up.

10                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

11                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: But it's really about  
12                  community of interest in this area and competitiveness, but  
13                  it does have -- when we take a look at some of that and  
14                  they'll have that hopefully -- that's great to have the  
15                  socioeconomic report, we can take a look at that.

16                  I want to be clear I'm not being arbitrary about  
17                  any of these changes, that I'm really focusing on what I  
18                  believe is going to be a better fit for these areas. The  
19                  city of Chandler itself, you know, giving city of Chandler  
20                  and Gilbert sort of some clean boundaries and also  
21                  recognizing that even within each of those cities, as in  
22                  many communities as we know, there are older and newer areas  
23                  and -- and they often have some differences in terms of  
24                  their interests and their perspectives, and that's really  
25                  part of what I'm looking at.

1           Are you going to be pulling up any of those -- that  
2           data? And otherwise I can do that while -- and then pull it  
3           up again. These are the main changes; I've got other small  
4           ones, but I mentioned those four districts. I can pull  
5           those up while my Republican colleagues go. Would that be  
6           okay?

7           So that would be my main -- my main suggestion  
8           between those -- and all of them -- anyway, all right. I'll  
9           stop there.

10           MR. D. JOHNSON: So we do have the population  
11           numbers for each of those changes. We've been keeping track  
12           as we've been doing it.

13           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just -- just so you know,  
14           Doug, I know they're going to be wildly --

15           MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

16           COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- out there, but I have  
17           compensation each time. So -- so the main thing is I was  
18           trying not to give you all the lines because, unless they're  
19           accepted, I figured -- and if they are accepted, then I can  
20           make the down-the-line changes so I just want you to  
21           realize.

22           MR. D. JOHNSON: Gotcha.

23           COMMISSIONER LERNER: There's going to be some big  
24           swings, but I can do the big swings back as well.

25           MR. D. JOHNSON: That works.

1                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay. We'll -- when we look at  
2 this LD-15 map which we have spent an awful lot of time on  
3 and a lot of the areas we have talked about thoroughly and  
4 thoroughly. So from just a big picture perspective, we  
5 think this map is much closer to a finished map than what my  
6 colleague just -- just described.

7                   And I want to talk about competitiveness because  
8 it's really interesting on this legislative map. The 2011  
9 Commission, by their own statements, said that they  
10 prioritized competitiveness much higher. Much higher than I  
11 think the constitution says, but certainly they -- they were  
12 lauded by many people how they emphasized competitiveness.  
13 By the own measures, the 2011 Commission, they had eight  
14 measures on competitiveness, on most of those measures, four  
15 were competitive; on some measures, five competitive. In  
16 the subsequent elections of 2014 -- 2012, 2014, 2016 --  
17 looking at the general races, generally only three of them  
18 proved it to be competitive.

19                   When we look at this legislative map, we have five  
20 competitive districts. And, in fact, we have five highly  
21 competitive districts. District 2 is 1.3 percent vote  
22 spread using the measure that we've agreed to; District 4,  
23 3.5 percent; District 9, 2.3 percent; District 13,  
24 3.8 percent; District 16, 3.6 percent.

25                   So the suggestion we need to rewrite or redo the

1 East Valley or entire areas to increase competitiveness, I  
2 think we have done a remarkably strong job on  
3 competitiveness.

4 And in the East Valley, it was almost comical in  
5 our -- after our draft maps how we heard that Gilbert was  
6 split five times, and they were right to criticize us. We  
7 have -- Gilbert, in this map, has -- is in two districts,  
8 and it's really well placed in two districts. The entire  
9 East Valley is really well handled with this current map,  
10 and I think, in fact, that our Chairwoman has been very  
11 supportive of this map on how the East Valley has been  
12 handled. So to completely redo the East Valley, at this  
13 point, I do not think is -- is the productive or best way  
14 for our state.

15 On District 2, the whole purpose of adding Arcadia  
16 on the south is to pull the district down off of Desert  
17 Ridge; and we had a long conversation about this just a few  
18 days ago and added Desert Ridge and the area above the 101  
19 to District 2, and that was a decision that was arrived at  
20 after a long debate. So undoing that, I do not think is a  
21 good idea.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a note, Commissioner  
23 Mehl, I didn't recommend it.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I didn't say you did. I just  
25 said we debated it at length and that's what we chose to put

1 in map.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, just so it's clear  
3 that I'm not -- I'm not -- I did not say to remove that.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: There are things that we'll  
5 suggest and my colleague will go through them -- not in  
6 super detail but just to give a feel for it. We obviously  
7 have some balancing to do but between 2, 3, 27, 28, and 29;  
8 but it's not wholesale giant numbers balancing, but it is  
9 balancing that -- that we would want to do.

10 So, you know, overall we think this map has come a  
11 long, long way and -- and has got a lot of really positive  
12 features to it that have taken into account many, many  
13 discussions of communities of interest and, at the same  
14 time, achieves amazing high marks on competitiveness.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl, I want to  
16 just second that comment. I mean, I -- I think you're  
17 really spot on. I think there's a lot of good in this map.  
18 We have some fine-tuning and perfecting, but we have three  
19 as of now truly toss-up seats. Not only based on a vote  
20 spread but actually looking at performance in elections, we  
21 have additional competitive seats, and I think we've done,  
22 you know, right by as many communities of interest as we  
23 can, including the majority-minority, and I look forward to  
24 perfecting as much as we can.

25 But I think that there's so much more right about



1 this map than wrong and I expect you acknowledging that  
2 maybe you see it my way as well.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to be clear, I  
4 never said that this map needed to be overhauled. That's  
5 why I only selected four districts. I was not saying that  
6 there was an overhaul to this entire map nor did I say there  
7 was an overhaul to the entire East Valley; these were minor  
8 changes that I was recommending.

9 So I just want to be clear that it's not that I --  
10 it made it sound like we had a major difference. There  
11 are --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That's what I -- that's what I  
13 heard.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's not what I said. I --  
15 I specifically selected just four districts to focus on  
16 because there are a lot of other districts that don't need  
17 to have changes. So I -- I just want to be clear.

18 And I will just make one comment on the  
19 competitiveness piece. Right now, the way this is, that  
20 District 16, for example, you mentioned it's a .09 in our  
21 tracking in terms of competitiveness; District 13 is a 2.7.  
22 This is Republican -- strong Republican-leaning districts.  
23 So while they may have the vote spread percentage, they  
24 don't actually have the votes that are on there. To me a  
25 truly competitive would have 5-4, or 4-5, those would be the

1 truly competitive pieces.

2 So I just want to clarify a difference in  
3 perspective on that. It's not just the vote spread, but  
4 it's also actually the wins that are listed there the way I  
5 look at that.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I see it as a couple of  
7 things. One, the narrower the vote spread, the more  
8 opportunity there is for a candidate to break out and -- and  
9 win; it also ensures a level in my mind of accountability.  
10 And even the vote spread isn't wide enough that it makes it,  
11 you know, where one candidate isn't going to win, I mean you  
12 know it, it still doesn't mean that it doesn't moderate and  
13 have a positive impact on an elected leader catering and  
14 serving a broader public that they're more accountable to.

15 So again, let's not discount broader moderation all  
16 across the board.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and I would also say a  
18 lot of our responsibility is to follow the constitution, try  
19 to create compact districts, try to follow boundaries where  
20 we're able, try to continue to engage communities of  
21 interest. And so I believe that my colleague and myself  
22 feel the East Valley is a good example of that. We've  
23 included most of Gilbert in 14, most of Chandler and a  
24 portion of Gilbert in D-13, and in D-12 we've included a  
25 portion of north Chandler and the East Valley, but if you

1 look at the percentages of Asian population in those three  
2 districts are the highest in the state. So we've been able  
3 to give them a voice, I believe, in a way that they can  
4 represent themselves collectively as well as create --  
5 continue to evolve their community in that portion of  
6 Maricopa County.

7 One of the things I do believe we agree with in  
8 D-9, somehow Lehi district got moved out of that district  
9 and into -- or out of D-10 and into D-9, but if I remember  
10 correctly, we population balanced along the south side of  
11 the canal, so we moved the -- the eastern boundary --  
12 northeastern boundary of 9 up toward the canal to balance  
13 the population difference. D-10 is underpopulated and D-9  
14 now with the Lehi addition -- excuse me, D-10 was  
15 underpopulated but now D-9 will be. So we added Lehi, which  
16 made it now overpopulated, and so we'll get need to get some  
17 population back out of 10, along the southern border of the  
18 canal to balance there.

19 Does that make sense?

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. You have streets you want us  
21 to move? Are you talking about the whole --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner York, can I just  
23 ask -- are you guys --

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: We talked about it. Hermosa  
25 Vista Drive, at one point, I remember in our conversations.

1           MR. D. JOHNSON: Are you talking about the north  
2 side of the Lehi area or the south side?

3           COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm talking about the south  
4 side of the canal.

5           MR. D. JOHNSON: South side of the canal up in the  
6 Lehi area?

7           COMMISSIONER YORK: Lehi is north of the canal.  
8 It's a figure eight peanut-looking shape.

9           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner York, can I ask  
10 because Chairwoman Neuberg asked me to be specific about  
11 which ones I wanted to look at. So I have a lot of other  
12 suggestions that I could make on this map but I don't want  
13 to go there because I think we want to just look at it from  
14 a high level, what are the big pictures.

15           Can you tell me what your big picture items are  
16 that you-all are going to be looking at. I mean, I have  
17 others in the southern part of the state, but I was just  
18 focusing on this right now?

19           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like that too --

20           COMMISSIONER YORK: I intend to do that, but I  
21 thought that was area we could agree on. So I was trying to  
22 present that first. If you don't want to talk about that,  
23 then that's fine.

24           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you want to talk about  
25 that one area first and then --

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean, I think -- if that's  
2 one of your big picture --

3           COMMISSIONER YORK: It's not.

4           COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- but I think that's  
5 something we could always work out later.

6           COMMISSIONER YORK: It's just something you brought  
7 up.

8           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd be interested in the big  
9 picture.

10          COMMISSIONER YORK: So we have three --

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Before that, can I just give  
12 a response to Commissioner Lerner.

13                 Of the things that you shared of your priorities, I  
14 just want to be honest, you know, of the toss-up races that  
15 are generally toss-up based on your definition; they're 2,  
16 they're 4 and, I believe, it's 9 as well. So, you know,  
17 it's going to take a lot to convince me that there's, you  
18 know, that other communities of interest or other  
19 constitutional criteria are being harmed if we think we've  
20 hit a sweet spot. Now I'm not saying it is, I'm open, but  
21 there's a lot right there.

22                 I'm sympathetic to what you have concerned about in  
23 13. Not that I'm wanting it to ripple because, you know,  
24 there's too much else that's right. But I'm deeply aware  
25 there are minority pockets -- Latinos, Asians -- that are in

1 that area, they would be best served by a highly competitive  
2 district in which I think, you know, their voting will feel  
3 that, you know, will make a difference; and -- and it's a  
4 kind of cohesive community that I believe all -- I believe a  
5 member could so successfully represent this district, you  
6 know, moderately.

7 And so I'm open to the idea of better capturing  
8 that community, and I think it only enhances the cohesion  
9 actually of that community. But that's -- I just wanted to  
10 share feedback about, you know, my reaction to what I heard.

11 And now I believe that the gentlemen are entitled  
12 to some time.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: If I can clarify one thing just  
14 statistically on the competitive numbers. Commissioner  
15 Lerner brought up an interesting twist here, which is the  
16 2-7 split of District 13 is a function of how many elections  
17 were in each year. So it's not that the Republicans are  
18 going to win two-thirds of the races there, it's that the  
19 Republican won all of the 2018 elections in that district,  
20 and the Democrats won all the 2020 elections in that  
21 district. It just worked out there were seven races one  
22 year and two the other.

23 So the 7-2 is not a ratio of political power, it's  
24 just a count of how many seats were up in that -- in a good  
25 year for the Republicans versus how many contests were up --

1 a good year for the Democrats. So we wanted to clarify  
2 that.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So what is the best way for  
5 us to truly view, objectively, what a truly competitive  
6 district is without us counting numbers on -- like, you  
7 know, if we want to do it ethically and constitutionally?

8 Any guidance there? And I know this is a tough  
9 question.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: You know and -- and I think just  
11 kind of recalling from the -- when we had the panel of  
12 professors here and all that, it really is kind of a  
13 holistic thing, you know, some swing seats are good to see.  
14 If it was just one, well, maybe that was just one  
15 extraordinary candidate, but when you start to see like two  
16 or especially in this case where they won all the contests  
17 in the given year, that's a good indication.

18 A 5-4 obviously shows more. The Democrats -- well,  
19 if it's a seat the Republicans won -- the 2016 seats or  
20 whatever -- I'm confusing myself.

21 If it's 5-4, that shows that 2018 had some  
22 competitive elections in it as well. But certainly given  
23 the trends in Arizona over the last four years, there's no  
24 surprise that seats are becoming more Democratic in 2020  
25 than they were in 2018, and they're certainly more balanced

1 or competitive than they were in 2012.

2 But you do have to take all these pieces into  
3 account, look for signs of competitiveness, signs that they  
4 will swing with the right candidates and -- and then  
5 ultimately use your judgment to balance those different  
6 choices.

7 But, yeah, I would -- just the gut would be if  
8 it's -- if it's an 8-1, well maybe that one was just a  
9 quirk. Once you start getting 7-2, 6-3, 5-4, that's showing  
10 more than one candidate. It wasn't just one outstanding  
11 candidate; there were multiple candidates winning that seat.  
12 And as you talk about the 4 percent spread and 7 percent  
13 spread.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's my recollection that the  
15 panel of experts really pretty unanimously told us that a  
16 key focus, not the only focus, was that basket of elections.  
17 And the vote spread here ends up representing the math that  
18 comes out of that basket of elections, so I think the vote  
19 spread is actually a very important measure to be looking  
20 at.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, you're --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the 2011 Commission looked  
23 at similar baskets and felt the same way.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But they looked at number of  
25 different other options as well. They had way too many --



1                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: They had eight different  
2 things.

3                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- not just a few.

4                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: And the irony is that very few  
5 of them show that they had more than four and the most year  
6 that they had five, of the competitive districts.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: I mean, I think we -- oh. Go  
8 ahead.

9                   MR. D. JOHNSON: I was just going to say, the  
10 interesting twist -- eight different measures, but it was  
11 just eight different vote spread baskets. They didn't have  
12 swing measure or any alternative approach; it was just eight  
13 different baskets.

14                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as one last comment on  
15 the competitiveness and then I'll let my colleagues speak,  
16 but as long as we're talking about it, I do want to mention  
17 that we seem to be focussed on a lot of the same districts.  
18 And what happened and part of my concern is what happened in  
19 District 2 is it went from, you know -- and District 4, well  
20 District 4 in particular went from being a district that was  
21 leaning blue to now being 3.8 percent leaning red, and that  
22 was very deliberate changes that were made in that district  
23 which is part of why I was mentioning some other districts.  
24 'Cause some other communities -- 'cause some communities  
25 were literally pulled out of that district that should be in

1           there and the only reason was because they lean blue.

2                       So that's part of my concern.

3                       COMMISSIONER YORK: I disagree with that.

4                       CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm sorry.

5           Commissioner Lerner, which district?

6                       COMMISSIONER LERNER: District 4.

7                       CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You are saying that the only  
8           reason you feel the changes were made was for it to turn it  
9           more partisan?

10                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm saying that I think that  
11           was a big part of that when we look at the fact that  
12           something like Arcadia is split in half and that the  
13           district pulled north. Which I know I was outvoted, but  
14           I -- I think that that -- when you look at what was done in  
15           the south by dividing a neighborhood to add north  
16           Desert Ridge, I think that was a -- a -- that decision was  
17           made by -- to change the --

18                      COMMISSIONER YORK: No.

19                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- makeup of that district.

20                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I --

21                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's my opinion, that's  
22           all.

23                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to clarify for  
24           the record that was not my decision, the motivation behind  
25           my decision, and I would like to give my colleagues on the

1 right an opportunity to go on record to clarify your  
2 motivations just so that we're all clear about why we're  
3 doing what we're doing.

4 And I'm very aware, by the way, when partisan  
5 shifts happen and -- and there can be corrections along the  
6 way to get us where we need to go.

7 But I have always said that the other  
8 constitutional criteria need to be fully vetted first before  
9 we start compromising, and I gave leeway to my colleagues to  
10 make an argument based on a community of interest why it  
11 makes sense; and so, you know, after that happens if I --  
12 I'm compelled by an argument and it impacts a political  
13 score, we can come back and say are there reasonable, you  
14 know, arguments to make it more competitive where it won't  
15 cause detriment to the communities that I was protecting.

16 But -- but it's an honest process.

17 In my view and my decision-making, it -- the  
18 politics is not driving my decision.

19 I don't know if there's anything you would like to  
20 clarify or reiterate about your --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just --

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- about your line of  
23 thought.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I never questioned your  
25 perspective on that. I want to be real clear. That's not

1           what I was doing, but what I was saying, that when I looked  
2           at the reason some of these changes were being made like the  
3           Deer Valley, like some of those areas, that's what I was  
4           seeing because it did change those numbers.

5                        So it was not about -- I respect your -- respect...

6                        COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner, you  
7           continue to go back and forth to discuss LD-2 and LD-4. One  
8           of the things that we agreed upon all along is that LD-4  
9           should encompass Camelback, Piestewa Peak, Paradise Valley,  
10          McCormick Ranch and the south Scottsdale around the airpark,  
11          and Desert Ridge fits nicely with that; and I think that's a  
12          very compact community of economic and like-mindedness that  
13          needs to be together along the 51 highway.

14                      And so Arcadia realistically is everything north of  
15          the canal in -- in that Camelback Indian School corridor.  
16          We've been -- the map has included Arizona Country Club  
17          neighborhood because it's most like Arcadia and most of the  
18          people that belong to that particular country club live in  
19          Arcadia. Arcadia Lite is not the area you've described, in  
20          my mind, it's farther north than that and so --

21                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is.

22                      COMMISSIONER YORK: -- the way that LD-4 is drawn  
23          currently I believe fits the population, fits the  
24          demographics, fits the geography well; and that was the  
25          interest in what we were trying to draw there, not move it

1 one way or the other.

2 It is naturally, in my mind, a red district just  
3 based on the population, but that doesn't have anything to  
4 do with how we drew it. And so for that, I mean, I hope,  
5 you know, that that -- on the record, that we go from that  
6 standpoint we believe that we did the right thing for the  
7 people of Arizona and the population in that area.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I understand that  
9 perspective, I'm just saying if you're going to put in --  
10 you know, you could actually just have Country Club, that  
11 piece, not part of it and then keep that entire community  
12 together as well in District 4. That little piece that  
13 comes out is just a sliver that's out there. The reason I  
14 would like to have the entire community in there is it keeps  
15 them whole.

16 And Arcadia does go into that area as part of that.  
17 Going -- I've been there lots of times into that area with a  
18 lot of people I know that live there. They would -- they  
19 would definitely say they are in Arcadia.

20 So I'll let you move forward, I'm sorry.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Obviously and -- and decision  
22 is not imminent at least from me about how far north it  
23 goes, I just felt that it was important for us to get back  
24 to deliberating on the merit which is -- you know, just  
25 going back in time, you know, from my perspective there's no

1 magical line at the 101. I mean, you know, the growth and  
2 movement is moving north, and so, you know, I think that's  
3 just a reality of -- of change.

4 So I think that there were a lot of constitutional  
5 arguments for why the district looks the way it looks right  
6 now. That doesn't preclude us from again trying to even  
7 improve competitive -- competitiveness if we can, when it  
8 doesn't cause detriment, so.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: So our big -- our big  
10 philosophical adjustment to this map is that LD-27 is  
11 underpopulated, LD-20 -- LD-2 is overpopulated, LD-3 is  
12 underpopulated, and LD-28 is overpopulated.

13 And so the way we would consider addressing these  
14 four districts is that in the corner of Thunderbird and 43rd  
15 Avenue is ASU West, and we think the community to the east  
16 of there, over to LD-1 along the 19th Avenue, matches well  
17 with that community. It's on the top end of the Latino  
18 Coalition's districts. We think those communities go  
19 together along with LD-1, so we think that needs to be in  
20 LD-27.

21 So now --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Could you clarify where  
23 you're talking about? I'm sorry, I'm trying to see --  
24 Commissioner York.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thunderbird and 43rd Avenue.

1 43rd Avenue is the western boundary of LD-2.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: LD-2. I thought you were  
3 saying LD-1.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, Thunderbird is also the  
5 top end of the -- of -- runs along the bottom of the  
6 mountains there in C -- in LD-2. So there's a natural block  
7 there from 19th Avenue along Thunderbird on the northern  
8 boundary down to the southern boundary of LD-2 which is  
9 Peoria. Those folks put with LD-27 would be with the ASU  
10 campus and the canal and those neighborhoods. You also have  
11 the greenbelt along the 19th Avenue corridor-Carefree Wash  
12 all that goes together in LD-27.

13 Then now LD --

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Wait, sorry, before you go on. So  
15 Thunderbird --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Thunderbird is the north  
17 boundary.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: The Thunderbird is the north.  
19 What's the eastern boundary?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: 19th Avenue.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And those are moving from 2  
23 to 27?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

25 These are philosophical; I was going to talk

1 through this.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And is why again would you  
3 move it over there? It that just more for population  
4 balancing?

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, there's really no --

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no, no. There's a lot in  
7 common with that neighborhood with ASU West and that  
8 community as it moves east. It sits on the northern end of  
9 the Latino Coalition I think that's a pretty minority  
10 basket; LD-27 has quite a few minority communities as well  
11 as the campus. I just think they fit well together.

12 That moves the LD-2 north, which we talked about  
13 unifying Deer Valley Village. If you take Deer Valley  
14 Village up the Carefree Road north of the airport --

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let us -- let us keep up with you.  
16 So first of all there's just under 40,000 people, right?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. We're short -- we're  
18 short -- LD-2 is long 10,000. So now we're going to move --  
19 we're basically shuffling around 40,000 people.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That would make District 2  
21 not competitive.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Let me give you my request and  
23 then we can go look at this stuff.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and I'm going to  
25 reiterate that, I mean, I've already gone on record as



1 saying that I think the fact that D-2, D-4, D-9 are -- if  
2 I'm getting them right -- are toss-ups. I find that a  
3 positive.

4 And so something that's going to -- I'm open to the  
5 margins of highly competitive, but to take it away from that  
6 would be a big concern for me.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're not positive, but I'm  
8 pretty sure that it will still stay very highly competitive.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And just as a note you've --  
10 as you mentioned you're removing a very high minority  
11 community from that area that by moving them out, that will  
12 lessen that competitiveness.

13 And again, you know, I'll let you continue with the  
14 Deer Valley piece, but you added a piece in there and when  
15 you look at the village map, that was a natural boundary  
16 where that -- that is rather than extend it north.

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's a natural.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just one other note, also  
19 District 2 could still be seen as somewhat of city district,  
20 more urban, versus if you move it that much further north,  
21 it's not urban district which I think the city of Phoenix  
22 really should have.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: District 2 stays in the city of  
24 Phoenix with this change.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It goes way over.

1                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it goes north, but also  
2                   that's where the growth is; that's where the semiconductor  
3                   plant is being built, all those people along Happy Valley  
4                   Road, Pinnacle Peak.

5                   So I would go north along the Carefree Highway --  
6                   Cave Creek Road, I'm sorry, up to Dove Valley.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: So would you be moving those  
8                   folks out of D-3?

9                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

10                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because that's already under  
11                  by 20,000.

12                  COMMISSIONER YORK: But I was trying to unite  
13                  Anthem and New River into D-3.

14                  MR. D. JOHNSON: So -- so was your first step  
15                  District 2 moving north or District 3 moving north?

16                  COMMISSIONER YORK: District 2 moves north.

17                  MR. D. JOHNSON: To how far?

18                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Well I think it's Sonora, Dove  
19                  Valley Road. Sonoran Desert Drive. I think that takes in  
20                  the Casa Buttes area.

21                  MR. D. JOHNSON: So District 2 is moving north to  
22                  Dove Valley Road, taking everything that's on the east side  
23                  of the freeway?

24                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

25                  MR. D. JOHNSON: Over -- yes? Yeah?

1                   And are you saying every -- would that be  
2 everything over to Cave Creek Road or -- or how far over?

3                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

4                   And then I would -- I would take the Anthem Village  
5 and combine it with New River over to the freeway.

6                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

7                   So where -- where Sonoran Desert and Dove Valley  
8 split, do you want us to follow Dove Valley or does -- which  
9 is farther north or stop at Sonoran Desert?

10                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Sonoran Desert is fine.

11                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Did you want to do the  
12 population balancing now or --

13                  COMMISSIONER YORK: They're just trying to get the  
14 big --

15                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'd just love to hear your  
16 big -- you know, this is one. Do you have another?

17                  COMMISSIONER YORK: No, there's four LDs I was  
18 rotating around.

19                  MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

20                  COMMISSIONER YORK: So we unite -- you take  
21 population out of 3 moving it into 2; and then so you got to  
22 go 3 has to populate so it goes into 28; 28 has to add some  
23 population, so you go along the eastern -- or western  
24 boundary of 27. That's what I'm talking about.

25                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: So it's mostly population

1 balancing that you're focused on?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Once -- once we united the ASU  
3 community into the other part of the D-1 -- I mean, excuse  
4 me, D-2 with District 27.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So that area that was  
6 highlighted there was 37,500.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I remember correct, Anthem  
8 is about 22,000?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: We'll get that right now.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Roughly. And the New River  
11 area may be more.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: So then -- yeah, so you're saying  
13 District 3 you'd pick up everything over to the freeway?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

15 You'd need to include the outlet malls on the west  
16 side of the freeway and Anthem. That unites that with  
17 Carefree and Cave Creek corridor.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York, just  
19 similar to the question that I asked Commissioner Lerner in  
20 terms of your underlying goal, you know, what you're getting  
21 at here, are you -- is most of this population balance  
22 centered around your desire to have LD-2 moved up north for  
23 uniting communities of interest that you believe better --  
24 is that --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, no I think the community

1 in this southwestern corner of LD-27, that ASU pocket,  
2 heavily Latino matches well with the community to the east  
3 of it along the freeway all the way over to 19th Avenue and  
4 that's a big pocket. That also puts the southern boundary  
5 of LD-2 at Thunderbird and then you just basically have to  
6 population balance around the map to make that work.

7 We -- you know, we embraced the Latino Coalition's  
8 suggestion by letting them take the LDs up to Peoria, and  
9 we're trying to sort of enhance that neighborhood blend  
10 between LD-1 and 27 and 2, and we think that's a natural  
11 fit. And for, I mean, there are some arguments to be said  
12 that that would make it -- this will make 2 less  
13 competitive, but we also think it makes 27 a better  
14 district.

15 You know, we've tried to include every suggestion  
16 from the Latino community in our maps, including the  
17 inclusion of Bisbee and the southwest side of  
18 Santa Cruz County into the lower part of the state into  
19 their District 22, and so we think this is a good map that  
20 represents the state well.

21 LD-3 was under population -- underpopulated by  
22 20,000 people that we approved, so we had to get those from  
23 some place. So Anthem-New River unity seemed to make the  
24 most sense.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. We're going to need to

1 take a ten-minute recess soon.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We have one last really  
3 noncontroversial area of the White Mountains to deal with.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. And I just want to  
5 reiterate one thing in terms of the movement, and I'm very  
6 open minded, you know, my eyes are very much on keeping LD-4  
7 highly competitive.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Before we move to another area  
9 just to clarify, Commissioner York, did you want District 3  
10 to stop at the freeway or did you mention something coming  
11 across the freeway to pick up --

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you have that little  
13 outlet mall there.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: So...

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's part of Anthem.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So you want to go -- you  
17 want to take it all the way over to New River Road or  
18 just -- which is the diagonal road to the left on the screen  
19 there or --

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: New River Road might be too  
23 far. It seems to be.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's the other diagonal that  
25 probably works.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Do what?

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, that one. Just that --  
3 just that area.

4 Yeah.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. Yeah, that will -- that  
6 will put the total right about 50,000 into District 3  
7 between all the -- all those pieces.

8 And you have taken out a lot, so.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, and you'd have to balance  
10 along the 303.

11 Is 28 now light?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: When you say "along the 303" --

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I would start at Pinnacle  
14 Peak which is just north of the prison and north of Adobe  
15 Dam, I would head west over to the --

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Bring into District 29?

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, 27 is a little long, I  
18 believe.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we can -- we can figure out  
20 the balance.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: So Pinnacle Peak West and then  
22 you probably come -- stay north of the preserve, the  
23 mountain preserve there, head south on the 67th Avenue 'til  
24 I believe it runs into the 303 or maybe even go farther west  
25 than that.

1                   You have to put some population back into 28.

2                   Does that make sense?

3                   MR. D. JOHNSON: You're one step ahead of me.

4                   We'll have to figure out where things are and come back to  
5                   you...

6                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, 27 to 3 over to 28.

7                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Mark has got it.

8                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. At this point, I'm  
9                   going to suggest we take a ten-minute recess and we will  
10                  pick right back up.

11                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

12                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 2:40.

13                  (Recess taken from 2:29 p.m. to 2:44 p.m.)

14

15                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody.

16                  We're returning from recess and we'll dive right back in to  
17                  Agenda Item Number VI, draft map decision discussion. We  
18                  are in the midst of deliberation on the legislative map.

19                  What I'm going to suggest is that each side  
20                  continue to play out some of these ideas that you have. I  
21                  know Mapping has been tracking it, we can consolidate that;  
22                  without approving it or voting on it, we can come back and  
23                  look at the alternatives side by side and what I'm going to  
24                  suggest is that we start focusing on these very core  
25                  districts that are driving so much of our deliberation and



1 we begin to number one, put on the record our deliberative  
2 process for why we're reaching these conclusions; and then  
3 two, begin to vote to lock in the decisions such that all  
4 maps will further incorporate that, that will bring us  
5 closer to a -- a final point.

6 I do want to remind everybody that just when we  
7 vote to lock something in, if a better idea comes up, we can  
8 certainly vote to unlock it.

9 So at this point are -- I believe,  
10 Commissioner Lerner, you had some questions about where we  
11 were going to head and -- and I don't know where we have  
12 other --

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, can I recap the changes  
14 that we suggested with LD-2, LD-3, LD-28 and LD-27? So we  
15 can get that on the record.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, and I -- I just want to  
17 clarify again that I gave you overview and did not get into  
18 the whole population balancing, but I know there would be  
19 issues. If we accepted any one of those changes, I could  
20 give you all the ramifications or if we were considering  
21 accepting any of them, I could do that; but I tried to not  
22 get into detail but I'm happy to do so --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I appreciate that,  
24 Commissioner Lerner, we also tried to stay out of that  
25 realm.

1           I just want to recap what we felt. We felt that  
2           the southern corner of D-2 that comes below D-1 belongs with  
3           D-7 with the ASU campus and more aligned with the Latino  
4           Coalition LD-24 and LD-26, that meant that D-2 was now  
5           underpopulated; we also felt we wanted to unify the township  
6           of Deer Valley and so that goes up to the Carefree -- Cave  
7           Creek Road up north to Casa Buttes and that comes out of  
8           LD-3 and that puts Deer Valley whole, the majority of  
9           Deer Valley is now in its own LD with the people south of  
10          the 101, and that meant that that population needed to be  
11          balanced out of LD-3; so we united -- now, remember, there's  
12          a mountain range up along the northern part of the  
13          Deer Valley Village and that keeps that geography consistent  
14          with that balancing of that population, the airport; and so  
15          north of the mountain range we wanted to unite the remainder  
16          of New River and Anthem together with LD-3 and north  
17          Scottsdale and Carefree -- Cave Creek and Carefree so that  
18          was the suggestion.

19                 And so now we pulled -- we had pulled population  
20                 out of -- out of 28 so we wanted to pick that up along the  
21                 eastern boundary and northern boundary of 27 along the 303  
22                 down to -- it's Camelback -- not sure what that southern  
23                 border is -- and then up along the Agua Fria wash which is  
24                 sort of the geographical boundary in between the LD, the  
25                 eastern portion of LD-28 along Pinnacle Peak Road on the

1 northern boundary which encompassed the Adobe Dam area in  
2 LD-27.

3 That's -- that was the goal, and I hope that makes  
4 sense but -- and the only other area we wanted to talk about  
5 is 6 and 7.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Would you like me to do that  
7 now or would you like that to be separate from the Maricopa  
8 County discussion?

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, let's --

10 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Let's hear it.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- save 6, 7 for another  
12 conversation, please.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: And one other thing that we  
14 noticed on LD-23, you know, the -- the VRA district is 22  
15 and 23 and 24 and 26 and 11, we just didn't agree with the  
16 capture of Pebble Creek retirement village, we felt that  
17 needed to be with Litchfield Park. So that is the northern  
18 boundary of LD-23, north of the freeway. The western  
19 boundary is Dysart Road north of the -- the -- it runs along  
20 McDonald there -- or, McDowell.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry, District 23 is picking up  
22 from which district?

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: From -- District 23 is giving  
24 to LD-29.

25 It's Pebble Creek Retirement Community.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And what are the boundaries?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: McDowell Road which is right  
3 underneath the cursor all the way across.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. Everything north of --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: No not everything -- just to  
6 the western --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just in 23?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Western edge of 22.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And how much population is  
10 that? I guess we'll find out.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: So three -- three? Those three  
12 blocks.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: So it's just the District 23 piece  
14 north of McDowell is going in 29?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that would be just moving  
17 into 29?

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

19 That really needs to be with Litchfield Park.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's 10 -- just over 10,000  
21 people.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: So then I would push -- so now  
23 29 is overpopulated, so I would take -- I would take that  
24 from --

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And 23 will be under.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Not much. 23 was already over.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I know, but it will be under  
3 by 5,000. Just so you know, I don't have a problem of that  
4 change in and of itself, but it be will under so we have to  
5 figure that out.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right. So I would take the  
7 population out of 29 in the north finger. There's some  
8 population blocks that aren't in any township there, put  
9 that in 28.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: The same Surprise finger?

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I would go at least to  
13 Bell -- I don't know how many people that is -- that's  
14 just -- that was an observation.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That just leaves 23 shy, so  
16 we'll have to talk through where to get that.

17 It might be possible to get some from 25.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: The other item from before the  
19 break you were going to come back to was the Lehi area as  
20 well, in addition to the White Mountain.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So just as a note if we  
22 wanted to do that, we could -- this is one we can agree on  
23 fairly easily.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: 23 you mean?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 23, and since what will

1           happen is since 23 was over but then you took an extra 5,000  
2           out, we could add, there's a corner next to 29 and 23, we  
3           could probably add that.

4                     Or we could kind of see where we can add from into  
5           23, but we need another 5,000 to balance what you just  
6           removed.

7                     MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner, which --  
8           which district is the corner coming from?

9                     COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not quite sure yet.  
10          There are some -- there might be -- there might be a place  
11          either by 20 -- 29.

12                    COMMISSIONER YORK: What about in 21?

13                    COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'm looking at what's  
14          overpopulated in the area, right.

15                    COMMISSIONER YORK: 21 is overpopulated --

16                    COMMISSIONER LERNER: So 25.

17                    COMMISSIONER YORK: 21 is overpopulated by 6,000.

18                    COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, so is 25.

19                    There's a community over on Baseline Road it looks  
20          like -- I don't know. I mean we can come back to that, but  
21          I guess my point is only -- it's fine to remove that and  
22          then we'll just -- why don't you let us find where we can  
23          get another 5,000 in those surrounding communities --  
24          surrounding districts if that's okay.

25                    COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Look, we agreed on something.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Then -- well, no, we can go  
3 back to 9 and 10.

4 I believe on the original LD maps that were  
5 approved by Mehl and York, the Lehi district was included.  
6 I don't know if it was 10.1, 10.2.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: And what we're looking at on the  
8 screen here is what was drawn on the meeting yesterday, so.  
9 Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I just remember Lehi just  
11 being a smaller portion of LD-9. LD-10 is overpopulated --  
12 it's underpopulated, and so I'd like to see what that --  
13 what where our maps originally were. I don't think we went  
14 all the way to McKellips; I just think we went to Lehi Road.

15 Commissioner Neuberg, you're going to have to help  
16 me, I don't know quite where the Lehi neighborhood is. If  
17 you look at that corner of --

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm going to try to find it  
19 on my map.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just think it makes -- I  
21 was thinking it makes it a nice clean. You can see Lehi  
22 Road.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I know, but those districts  
24 were pretty balanced.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, D-10 is short by 4,000.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, and you added 10.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: D-9 is -- I mean, we're in  
3 agreement that we want to move that piece.

4 And maybe we just take it from Lehi up -- let's  
5 see. Up to -- wait. Up to McDowell instead of going all  
6 the way down to McKellips, we could do that. Is that what  
7 you were thinking maybe?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And move that over to D-10?  
10 We could do that.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, that's fine.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What population is there? So  
13 we see what happens to D-9.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Sorry, can you repeat that?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So would be taking --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, just --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- see Lehi Road south of  
18 McDowell?

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, in the middle of the pink  
20 there. The middle of the pink is.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Did you already --

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: There you go.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can you follow the boundary of  
24 that Google map you just put up there?

25 MR. FLAHAN: That's the City of Mesa's adopted



1 resolution for sub area Lehi from their website.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, so it looks like it  
3 doesn't come -- it stair steps down to McKellips, right?

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: And that's what you're looking  
6 for Commissioner Neuberg, correct?

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes. Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the question, is it...

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So -- everything showing on that  
10 map as Lehi should go into District --

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 10. Correct.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And this is entirely  
14 consistent again with the request of the Salt River Pima  
15 Tribe and Mesa. They all feel it's a good division.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: It doesn't go as far -- doesn't  
17 go as far west as you're talking about.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just the part north of Lehi  
19 Road; is that what you're thinking?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, just the dotted red line.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: So -- we're taking from D-9.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: It looks like Karl.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Into D-10.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Bates.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. Yeah.

1                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Mesa Drive up to Lehi Drive.  
2                   That's what it looks like.

3                   MR. D. JOHNSON: Do the stairstep. So everything  
4                   above Lehi Road.

5                   What we're wrestling with here is the -- this  
6                   stairstep showing on the city map is not following census  
7                   bloc borders so trying to pick out the best -- the closest  
8                   we can get.

9                   I guess the question is do you want to get a little  
10                  extra into District 10 or a little less into District 10?

11                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I think it's less to make  
12                  it more balanced.

13                  MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

14                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Do we know the population  
15                  size yet for that?

16                  MR. D. JOHNSON: Pardon me?

17                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Didn't know if you know the  
18                  population size or you're still calculating that?

19                  MR. D. JOHNSON: That's what we're trying to figure  
20                  out --

21                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

22                  MR. D. JOHNSON: -- given the lack of correlation  
23                  between the census bloc.

24                  MR. FLAHAN: So it actually doesn't go all the way  
25                  down to McKellips, you can see the red dotted line there.

1           Yeah, go up.

2           MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, so the -- the challenge is  
3           the stairstep shown on the map on the right doesn't follow  
4           bloc lines at all, so we're going around it on Lehi  
5           Boulevard there -- or Lehi Road; and we get 1,056 people.

6           And there was -- was there part of what's shown as  
7           being in District 10 that you wanted to move back to  
8           District 9 south of the canal?

9           COMMISSIONER YORK: No, 10 is overpopulated. 10 is  
10          underpopulated so 9 is a little over.

11          MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So just put that area in  
12          and leave it as is?

13          COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have a suggestion with sort  
14          of 8-9 that might help with the balancing because 8 is --  
15          I'm not sure. Where are with numbers?

16          MR. D. JOHNSON: I was going to say, are we  
17          comfortable with this? Is this --

18          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah.

19          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

20          COMMISSIONER MEHL: Consensus.

21          MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

22          COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I just have a suggestion  
23          how to balance 9 back since we just removed a little bit  
24          since 9 was low and 8 is high, we could just take a piece of  
25          8 and put it into 9. I could make that suggestion and see

1 what everybody thinks.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just -- just as you're going into  
3 that, District 9 is only short by 200 after we do this.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, okay.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's pretty balanced.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And what's 8?

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So District 9 is at 200 now?

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right, yeah.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But 8 is still over, correct?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct, yeah. District 8 is over  
11 by 4,700.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Those are our conceptual -- two  
13 conceptual -- one big conceptual change, our little tweak in  
14 Pebble Creek/LD-29 putting that community with Litchfield  
15 Park, and then obviously our big conceptual move between  
16 LD-2, LD-3, LD-28 and LD-27 in that corner.

17 We would like to have a discussion around LD-6 and  
18 LD-7 in the White Mountains, maybe we can compromise in that  
19 area.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Would you -- you know, I --  
21 I'm -- my intention was to be able to fully hear out my  
22 colleagues on your, you know, appeal for your visions of 2,  
23 4, 9, 13 and we begin to lock in things.

24 I'm perfectly fine if there's additional areas of  
25 agreements around the edges that my colleagues would feel is

1           worthwhile, I'd be willing to do that; and alternatively, if  
2           you feel that there's some compromise on LD-6, 7, I'll go  
3           any -- you know, I'll go where compromise is.

4                       So but in terms of my view of the time we have, you  
5           know, I do not want to have different maps, you know, at the  
6           end of the day. I want to stay on the same map, and we're  
7           going to need to consolidate these debates about the  
8           specific districts and then vote so that we don't have these  
9           endless possible chains, so.

10                      COMMISSIONER YORK: Well we didn't have much change  
11           to LD-9, 10, 14, 15, 13, and 12. We felt that this map  
12           discussed on Sunday treated it fairly. We did agree with  
13           Commissioner Lerner that we had left out the Lehi  
14           neighborhood; we've made that concession. We're comfortable  
15           locking in the East Valley and Maricopa County and part of  
16           Pinal County.

17                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I still want to make some  
18           changes in the East Valley that we've already talked about  
19           that we can talk in more detail, but we don't have to do  
20           that right this minute. I still would like to keep that a  
21           little bit open.

22                      There's one thing --

23                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If we are locking it in, why  
24           not go for what -- I'm really comfortable with a lot of the  
25           East Valley. The one area that I believe is on the table,

1           you know, is -- is 13.

2                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Mm-hm. That's the only area.

3                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I mean, I don't know you want  
4           to dive into that now since we're--

5                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Go ahead.

6                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it will feel some  
7           degree of completion if we can say: Hey, you know, we  
8           really like these group of districts.

9                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we think 13 is  
10          competitive.

11                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: As is 9.

12                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I just want to do due  
13          diligence. There are some minority areas there that I'm  
14          intimately aware of, there's some educational issues there,  
15          you know, a major high school that needs funding. I just  
16          want to make sure that I'm looking at the boundaries and,  
17          you know, making sure that the people there are going to be  
18          well represented by an elected leader who is motivated to do  
19          right by all constituents in that area.

20                   That's all -- just doing due diligence.

21                  COMMISSIONER YORK: Well --

22                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I make a suggestion then  
23          for that and see how that looks and have Mapping map out and  
24          see if it's something we can agree upon?

25                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd be open to it. You know,

1 I think my colleagues to the right have done that; are  
2 you-all okay with that?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Sure.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is just for District 13,  
6 14 because we have to make adjustments for each.

7 So I'm just going to walk through it and we'll see  
8 what we think and make this proposal.

9 So we would take the eastern boundary of  
10 District 13 and 14 and what we're going to do is just pull  
11 that west to Gilbert Road between Ray and Ger- -- Germann.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Germann.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Germann, thank you.

14 Gilbert Road is the division between northwest  
15 Gilbert and the rest of Gilbert is why I'm using that as a  
16 boundary; and then to Lyndsay Road from Germann and the  
17 Maricopa-Pinal County line.

18 That's the first recommendation.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: And I...

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And this achieves what?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is part of the overall  
22 shift to go north which is where a lot of that population  
23 that we've talked about exists, and this is purely for --  
24 this is for both giving Gilbert a piece of Gilbert --  
25 where's my map?

1           Actually helps the Gilbert boundary, so it actually  
2 gets almost all of Gilbert into District 14 'cause it widens  
3 that narrow path and Gilbert actually is -- goes west  
4 another couple of miles. So that particular change just  
5 lets Gilbert be more whole in District 14.

6           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And those changes are all  
7 compatible with the Asian, Latino communities in those  
8 areas? I'm presuming that this will further moderate,  
9 decrease the spread, make it even more competitive, so that  
10 constituents will feel that their elected leader will --  
11 will pay attention?

12           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes on all accounts.

13           And then there's a piece to the north and that's --  
14 so it's two basic -- two -- two changes. So that's one, and  
15 then the second one is on the north boundary of District 13.

16           MR. D. JOHNSON: Wait, I think -- wait. I think  
17 you had a second part of the first step, though.

18           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I'm sorry, I'll repeat  
19 it.

20           MR. D. JOHNSON: Something about Lyndsay.

21           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Gilbert Road between Ray and  
22 Germann and then to Lyndsay Road between Germann and the  
23 Maricopa-Pinal County line.

24           And when you think about the shape of Gilbert, you  
25 can actually see how that will align really nicely with



1           their shape; as well as do all the things you said,  
2           Madam Chair.

3                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:  You know, I'd like to say  
4           that I'm comfortable looking at these changes for now.  
5           We're at these late stages, I hope that my colleagues will  
6           allow me the luxury of remaining open minded and saying I  
7           would like to look at this without locking me into anything  
8           or feeling that it means anything, so.  I just want to say  
9           that I hope I have still some room to ask questions and  
10          explore without people overinterpreting, but I would -- I  
11          would like to see this.

12                   COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Absolutely, thank you.

13                   Let me know when you're ready for the next change  
14          because this is a two-parter, and then that's it.

15                   MR. D. JOHNSON:  Yeah, so the combination of those  
16          two is just short of 40,000 people.

17                   COMMISSIONER LERNER:  I know it's a big move, but  
18          we're making an additional move.

19                   So what we're going to do is the northern border is  
20          going to be Ray west of McQueen.

21                   MR. D. JOHNSON:  That's where it is now, right?

22                   COMMISSIONER LERNER:  Right.  And then Baseline  
23          east of McQueen.

24                   And it's going to take in a number of populations  
25          that I think will be better served in District 13.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, and --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Baseline Road is the city  
3 line between Mesa and Gilbert.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right, so --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: In the area between McQueen  
6 and Gilbert, so that's also part of that change.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: So how far east are you going?  
8 When we get up to Baseline, we are going how far east?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The eastern border will be  
10 Gilbert Road above Germann and then Lyndsay below Germann.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: But -- no, no. But north of Ray,  
12 how far -- so District 13 goes up McQueen to Baseline and  
13 then turns east and goes how far east?

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Gilbert Road.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. Oh, oh, just two miles.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Two-mile block, okay.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we could probably make  
19 some adjustments but just looking at the population in my  
20 demographic map and that picks up a lot of people that could  
21 do well in District 13.

22 So the eastern border of District 13 would still be  
23 Gilbert when you're north of Ray as well, right? You're  
24 just using that same border.

25 But this should balance District 14.

1           MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, and while he's getting a  
2           number on that, the only challenge is this is going to cut  
3           off District 14 west of McQueen. If you want to go in 12 or  
4           where that would go?

5           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Let's look and see.

6           Let's look at what population we need and how much  
7           population that is and then we can sort of see where that  
8           might go.

9           MR. D. JOHNSON: Sure.

10          COMMISSIONER LERNER: It probably can just go into  
11          13, all of that.

12          MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

13          COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I may need some  
14          population balancing and I might just ask you to help with  
15          that because you-all have done real well when you had to  
16          find ways with that. I've appreciated it.

17          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner, given  
18          that I signaled that I'm interested in exploring where you  
19          are going here, I'm wondering, are you interested in the  
20          perspective of other colleagues just that so if we're having  
21          collective debate, if it's going to be maybe a productive  
22          debate, if it's all five of us -- if it's -- if it's within  
23          the realm of possibility of being adopted or changed, I  
24          welcome, you know, feedback live about, you know, as I'm  
25          learning.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are you okay with that?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Always. Always.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Any other colleagues  
5 just want to chime in on what you're learning and listening  
6 to?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we thought out map, the  
8 map we agreed to 15.1, did a nice job of keeping the  
9 majority of Gilbert together. One of the issues we talked  
10 about for quite some time is that the Gilbert Unified School  
11 District goes as far south, I believe, as Warner, it runs  
12 east-west into the boundary of Gilbert and this cuts it off;  
13 and then the Chandler School District serves most of the  
14 southern Gilbert communities and, you know, we kind of have  
15 in 13 currently have a really high minority CVAP in the  
16 Asian community in all three districts, but definitely in 13  
17 is the highest in our map. So I don't -- I don't see quite  
18 the reason for this aggressive change.

19 You know, we talked about balancing in this corner  
20 of the 202 Loop on 13 to the east into 14 a little bit on  
21 Sunday and we spent quite a bit of time making sure that  
22 population balanced. I think we have two good districts  
23 well represented of the community north, south, east, west.  
24 I really like the compactness of 13; I think it's been a  
25 good district all along.

1 Chandler is mostly consumed in 13, it's a small  
2 portion of Gilbert but this portion of Gilbert is served by  
3 the Chandler School District.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not hearing that you feel  
5 that any particular community would be significantly harmed;  
6 it doesn't work collectively as well for you, but it doesn't  
7 sound like there's a particular alert of -- of -- right?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Other than the Gilbert School  
9 District kind of goes across. You've split that in half, I  
10 believe. I think it goes -- goes all the way over to  
11 Country Club.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think this actually helps  
13 with the Gilbert School District just looking at it, because  
14 this is much more in line with the shape of Gilbert.  
15 This -- this change will actually align. If you look at --  
16 it will add some areas.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do you know what this  
18 suggestion does to the vote spread?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't actually know the  
20 exact -- I don't know how to do that.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But I think it will improve  
23 it because of the population that's moving, and I think  
24 because we're bringing in some populations that have more  
25 alignment with Chandler, I think it should improve that.

1 But that will be something maybe we can find out.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But the vote spread right now  
3 is only three and a half percent I think.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, but there are  
5 populations that I think will be better served in  
6 District 13 than in District 14, because the population in  
7 District 14 just -- it's a different mindset in that  
8 population there.

9 And, you know, a lot of this, the changes in this  
10 area, would create really solid districts for both Chandler  
11 and Gilbert, very -- more aligned with their city  
12 boundaries. It would become a very competitive district,  
13 communities of interest would be better served in this  
14 particular alignment, the districts would be compact in this  
15 area, and -- and it just seems to meet the constitutional  
16 criteria really well.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And would this be the only  
18 change to the East Valley then?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, this is the main change  
20 I have for that area, yeah.

21 The other -- the other things that we talked about  
22 are in the north like we talked about in Scottsdale, but in  
23 the East Valley I don't think I have anything else. It  
24 mostly are just -- it was mostly just this one.

25 It might be some population balancing but nothing

1 otherwise -- otherwise major in these areas.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would like to reiterate,  
3 you know, I would welcome minimal, minimal changes to  
4 decrease the point spread to increase competitiveness. I  
5 know, you know, so many of the communities of interest  
6 there, the Asian community, the Latino community have  
7 explicitly focused on ensuring that LD-13 remains entirely  
8 competitive and open, really to help motivate their  
9 communities to engage in democracy which I think is a  
10 beautiful thing.

11 And I do recognize, Commissioner Mehl, it is very  
12 highly competitive still and it's a 5-4 split in terms of  
13 performance, but if there's a slight, small way of improving  
14 it, I'm open.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And again, I don't have any  
16 other major changes in the East Valley, so we would be  
17 pretty -- this would be the major change if you would agree  
18 to that.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would be inclined, at this  
20 point, you know, since we're not officially voting, I'm  
21 inclined to, you know, go with Commissioner Lerner's changes  
22 for now as it we relates to LD-13.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can we see those?

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we can just incorporate  
25 it into a map and -- and, you know, we'll go through the

1 other districts that I'd also like to see incorporated into  
2 a consensus map.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Just as a note on the school  
4 districts, since, Commissioner York, you mentioned those,  
5 north Gilbert is in Gilbert Unified and South Gilbert is in  
6 Higley Unified just to kind of clarify those distinctions.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I also think there's some kids  
8 that are in the Chandler School District in South Gilbert.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we've seen this in a lot  
10 of school districts right unfort -- as much as we want to  
11 keep these as whole as we can, we do the best we can.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: You kind of center around that  
13 argument being a teacher, so I was just trying to point that  
14 out.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do we want to go to other  
17 districts to -- from a consensus point of view, kind of  
18 really move forward and put it in our map?

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I try for District 4  
20 since we already want to move out of Maricopa?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hm-mm.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which we --

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm very comfortable  
24 deliberating 4.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I wanted to just make



1 one -- obviously my argument is still Arcadia, but before we  
2 even do that if we can do the Arcadia switch, which I think  
3 would be an important piece because it goes with that  
4 neighborhood, that would be great.

5 If we can't, I would like to remove that -- it's  
6 not a lot of population, but that Arizona Country Club, and  
7 just make the alignment clean as a clean break right here  
8 across the way.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: We --

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because the Country Club is  
11 the northern part of Arcadia and if we're not putting all of  
12 Arcadia in, just make that a nice, clean piece. I think it  
13 it's only a thousand or 2,000 people.

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're good with that.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't think it affects the  
16 competitiveness a whole lot.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It makes it more compact; it  
18 doesn't interfere with any communities of interest, and it  
19 doesn't interfere with all of the other collective good  
20 things that we've done with putting the district together.

21 And it will be and remains extremely competitive  
22 on -- on all ways that we measure, not only in our tightest  
23 range but even in performance, so.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We don't really like the  
25 change, but we're not going to -- yeah.

1                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'd rather have the bigger  
2 one, but I know that that's probably not going to happen so  
3 I'm trying to go with the compromise here to make this one  
4 small change.

5                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we appreciate that.

6                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I like the district for  
7 now. I mean, unless there's any compelling reason to change  
8 it from my colleagues?

9                   Okay.

10                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you -- I mean, if we're  
11 not going to move the Arcadia, maybe that's something we can  
12 put in the back and we can always come back. But right now,  
13 I'm comfortable moving forward.

14                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Do we want to talk  
15 about 2?

16                  COMMISSIONER YORK: I'd like to talk about 6 and 7.

17                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

18                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: Let's get right --

19                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let's talk about 6 and 7.

20                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: Let's go to 2. We're -- we're  
21 -- we're going through Maricopa and we're -- we've made  
22 concessions in the East Valley and change, and I think our  
23 changes recommended for 2 are good changes and they're not  
24 going to move the needle much.

25                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I think they'll move the

1           needle quite a bit with that redesign and I am not  
2           comfortable with -- that's a massive change to 2. I'm  
3           really not comfortable with it, I will be honest. I don't  
4           feel that it -- I think it just changes the entire dynamic  
5           of that district by doing that. And I actually thought by  
6           adding that piece north of 101, that piece of Deer Valley,  
7           also changed the dynamic of the district, so I'm pretty  
8           uncomfortable with that change.

9                        COMMISSIONER MEHL: Can we look and see what  
10           happened to 13 when you made those changes? Just real  
11           quick. What happened to the vote spread?

12                      MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, we didn't commit the changes  
13           to the map that's - that's on the screen --

14                      COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

15                      MR. D. JOHNSON: -- but it brings the vote spread  
16           about one and a half. Before the changes, District 13 is  
17           about three and a half percent towards Republican; it brings  
18           it down to about one and a half. And I think -- don't hold  
19           me to this, quickly kind of scribbling it in, it looks like  
20           it goes from a 7-2 to 5-4 on the swing.

21                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I mean it...

22                      MR. D. JOHNSON: We'll confirm all that and come  
23           back to you with official numbers.

24                      CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It almost sounds like 6, 7  
25           will be easier than 2.

1           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I don't know if there's  
2 a compelling reason to change 2 at this point, to be honest.  
3 I would like to see that one piece removed, but otherwise I  
4 think this district really actually has a lot of people with  
5 communities of interest in common; it's incredibly  
6 competitive as part of it as well, and I'm not sure why we  
7 would need to make that -- it's a big change that's being  
8 proposed, and I do think that it would cause a lot of -- it  
9 would -- it causes a lot of disruption all around as well,  
10 it's not just in that one area.

11           But I think it doesn't mean need to move north.  
12 But I mean, I would like to get rid of that one piece, but  
13 if we even kept it the way it is it's still a very  
14 competitive district and fits very nicely with the  
15 communities that are in there demographically. This area  
16 works very nicely in terms of the groups that live in that  
17 area, so that's why making a big overhaul at this point I  
18 don't think is necessary.

19           The only reason --

20           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Even if we don't do the  
21 Deer Valley part, District 2 is 10,000 over. We should --  
22 we should move the ASU part. 'Cause that's a good fit for  
23 the ASU -- for the ASU West campus. So if we're not willing  
24 to look at all the changes we proposed for 2, I think that  
25 is a no-brainer that we should -- we should combine over to

1 27.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I will say the reason  
3 it's over is when you added that piece of Deer Valley. It  
4 was balanced until then.

5 And when you made that addition -- and it actually  
6 impacted 3 because it made 3 with less population, it had --  
7 it's now down 19,938, and District 2 is over by 10,000.

8 Can you give us an amount of that population that  
9 little quarter that's in the top?

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, and I -- and I would like  
11 to know population down in that ASU block.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Top corner is 18,000 people.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: How much?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: 18.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 18,000.

16 And that's exactly what was moved from District 3,  
17 which is why District 3 is so underpopulated.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: District 3.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then if it went right  
20 back into District 3, it would be part of the rest of the  
21 Deer Valley community that it was already in that goes north  
22 of the 101.

23 So when we look at what happened to District 3, it  
24 was that corner; and District 2 is overpopulated and that is  
25 part of that problem as well, you added that 18,000, you

1           said?

2                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, we'd like to balance 2.  
3           If we're not going to go up to Deer Valley and do what we'd  
4           like to do up there, we would like to balance 2 by taking  
5           the 10,000 people from the ASU West campus that are a better  
6           fit with D-27 and put them in D-27.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I would like to move the  
8           corner out from District 3 and balance the population in  
9           District 3 and then we can come back and take a look at  
10          District 2 if you like --

11                   COMMISSIONER YORK: I still think --

12                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- as part of thinking about  
13          whether there's anything -- because at that point District 2  
14          will be actually short people.

15                   But putting that one corner there really doesn't  
16          align with the Deer Valley Village.

17                   COMMISSIONER YORK: If you include the Deer Valley  
18          Village around the airport following the boundary of the  
19          canal on the eastern edge into Adobe Dam area, that would  
20          better align the Deer Valley Village with the city of  
21          Phoenix, and it will overpopulate 2 and you can then move  
22          the population of 3 east to the 17. Compensate for that  
23          'cause 28 is overpopulated.

24                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: All I'm saying is that before  
25          we made this change, District 2 was not in a situation that

1           it's in now.

2                       That one addition impacted the population  
3           considerably, and at this point -- if we just -- and it  
4           impacted District 3 considerably and District 3 needs its --  
5           it's actually at negative 8 percent in terms of population  
6           deviation. If we just put that back where it is it was --

7                       COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, let's --

8                       COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- then we can take a look at  
9           District 2 maybe and see if there's some things that we want  
10          to be adjusting. But my suggestion is not to move  
11          District 2 north which is basically causing a huge ripple  
12          effect of a map that is in pretty good shape and really at  
13          this point a lot of these districts are aligned with  
14          communities of interest that don't need to be moved around.

15                      COMMISSIONER YORK: But didn't we hear in testimony  
16          from the public that Fountain Hills, Fort McDowell, Cave  
17          Creek, Carefree didn't feel like they were part of the city  
18          of Phoenix and they didn't want to be included in that  
19          Phoenix corridor?

20                      They wanted to be --

21                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the District 3.

22                      COMMISSIONER YORK: That's right.

23                      COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, so you want to  
24          actually put that --

25                      COMMISSIONER YORK: Why do you want to put more --

1 why do you want to put more of city of Phoenix in District 3  
2 then?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I want to -- I want to  
4 put back what you took out of District 3.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: We never --

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What you said was it would be  
7 an impact on -- it would make Deer Valley mostly whole, but  
8 the reality is, it does not; and when you look at the  
9 village planning, the break between Deer Valley is you have  
10 a section that is south that is part of Phoenix and is more  
11 urban, and then you have a section that is north of the 101  
12 that is less urban, and that's the part that you added in to  
13 this district and that did the change the dynamics of that  
14 district and it affected District 3.

15 So my point only is put that back into District 3,  
16 let's take a look at it -- what it does to the overall  
17 population because that -- that was a big population shift  
18 and it didn't do what -- what you had been -- what you were  
19 saying 'cause it didn't make Deer Valley whole.

20 And to be quite honest, we don't have a lot of  
21 these whole, right? North Mountain is not whole, a bunch of  
22 these are split.

23 But just that one add on had a big impact on that  
24 surrounding district and on District 3 that wasn't -- let me  
25 look. District 3 before you took that out, had an



1 overpopulation of a few thousand and now it's an under  
2 population of 19 -- almost 20,000 just by that one corner.  
3 So that's my -- my suggestion for District 2 and if we --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Or just leave it alone.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner, we've  
7 worked hard to accommodate your thoughts in the East Valley  
8 and Lehi area, in the Latino Coalition areas of D-11, D-22,  
9 D-26, and D-24 and all we're asking is to unite the village  
10 of Deer Valley in D-2 and then adjust from there and you  
11 continue to, I think -- I mean, I have business north of the  
12 101 in and around that Deer Valley Airport, that is very  
13 much those employees, those people work up and down, across  
14 that freeway, and I believe that that corridor belongs in  
15 D-2.

16 And so you can -- you can argue with me all you  
17 want, I know your argument is maybe more driven by the type  
18 of voter population than it is actually communities of  
19 interest. If it was a community of interest argument, the  
20 Adobe Dam south of that is -- north of that is a mountain  
21 range protecting that little pocket of the Deer Valley  
22 Village and to the west of that airport area industrial  
23 area; Honeywell has a big plant there there's -- there's an  
24 abandoned dump, I don't know, landfill I think is the  
25 correct word, all along that 101 corridor.

1           Those demographics, the housing, all those people  
2           are single-family homes that have pretty much the same  
3           economic makeup and so I think those people should all be  
4           included in District 2. And to pull the northeast corner  
5           out of it to -- to put those people with the city North  
6           Scottsdale, Desert Mountain the sort of second-, third-home  
7           communities that are up in the North Scottsdale area doesn't  
8           make any sense to me.

9           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: For --

10          COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was --

11          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: For now, I believe it makes  
12          sense to incorporate the changes Commissioner York is  
13          recommending in our map. I think it's compelling on the  
14          community of interest front as we've discussed on other  
15          districts, you know, communities are moving north of the  
16          101; there's growth. 101 -- I'm not sold -- I'm listening  
17          to all of the debate, but I'd like to just see it, and I'd  
18          like to make sure we're on the same map.

19          So just like I wanted to encourage being able to  
20          look at, you know, the changes you suggested in LD-13, I'd  
21          like to, you know, allow these changes all on the same map  
22          and -- and move on to other districts.

23          Nothing is being locked in; we're staying on the  
24          same map. We can lock it in. If there's dissent, we'll  
25          take votes.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just --

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We have a lot of work to do  
3 so I'm trying to be expedient.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not going to -- it's fine  
5 to take a look.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: As long as we know we can  
8 potentially go back.

9 I just want to make a point, because I keep hearing  
10 how my colleagues have compromised. I want to be sure that  
11 it's clear that we're all compromising. We have compromised  
12 in a number of areas. Look at District 4, I did not want to  
13 go north of 101, and we are north of the 101. I wanted to  
14 add Arcadia and I was -- we are not adding Arcadia. I  
15 wouldn't say that's a compromise, but that's the way it is.

16 And so there are a lot of areas that we have  
17 compromised and moved around and said yes, move -- for  
18 example, move Liberty into a district. And so -- so I just  
19 want to be clear that it's not just one side that is doing  
20 that.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Absolutely.

22 Okay. Do we want to address 6, 7?

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I can at least outline while  
24 they're working on accomplishing this.

25 And the goal on 6, 7 is how can we continue to

1           respect the Native American interests and yet find something  
2           that is a bit of a compromise that would be more fair to the  
3           White Mountain community.

4                     And -- and what I'd like to suggest is fairly  
5           simple to describe, and that -- that finger of Show Low and  
6           Snowflake that goes up into D-7 now, to move that to D-7 and  
7           that's about 27,000 people.

8                     And then to take out Eagar and St. Johns from D-7  
9           and put them into D-6.

10                    COMMISSIONER YORK:   Springerville as well.

11                    COMMISSIONER MEHL:   And Springerville.   That whole  
12           eastern corridor, take that out.

13                    And that would be about -- about 8,000 people.   So  
14           you have a net of about 19,000 people; and I think that  
15           because we want to deal with this so badly in a good way,  
16           that we may be able to develop consensus to allow D-6 to be  
17           as underpopulated as it reasonably can be, so there may be  
18           room to underpopulate it by another 5,000.

19                    So it may be that if you just took 15,000 people in  
20           Flagstaff and right now there's 75,000 people total in Flag,  
21           25,000 are in D-6 and 50,000 are in D-7.   If you move 15,000  
22           roughly people from Flagstaff from D-7 to D-6, it would  
23           still be about half and half in Flagstaff.   I think it would  
24           give the Native Americans still a very, very strong position  
25           in any primary.

1           And by doing that, you've consolidated the core of  
2           the White Mountains into D-7. The rest of the White  
3           Mountains is not in D-7, but hopefully they will take some  
4           solace by the fact that the core of the White Mountains then  
5           had representation that, I think, would spill over  
6           realistically to help them out.

7           So this isn't an R and D issue; this isn't going to  
8           change anything at all there. I'm just trying to deal more  
9           fairly with this part of our -- our great state.

10           MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Mehl, when you're  
11           talking about St. Johns and Eagar you essentially -- would  
12           the county line work, following Apache/Navajo County line?

13           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair.

14           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Do you mean Springerville or  
15           St. Johns, just to be clear.

16           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I may not --

17           COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because Springerville is next  
18           to Eagar.

19           COMMISSIONER MEHL: I meant St. Johns and Eagar.

20           COMMISSIONER YORK: That's including Springerville.

21           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

22           COMMISSIONER LERNER: But Springerville -- where is  
23           Springerville?

24           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Springerville is south of  
25           St. Johns. Eagar in that area.

1                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: St. Johns. So just St. Johns  
2 and Eagar.

3                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well --

4                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to make sure I  
5 understand.

6                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Springerville, yeah.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's Springerville, isn't it?  
8 Because Springerville is right --

9                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah, so it would include  
10 Springerville also.

11                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's what I was wondering.

12                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Eagar, Springerville,  
13 St. Johns, yeah, the county line would take all of that out.  
14 Which may be moving more than the 8,000 people I said.

15                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: It may be that not as many  
16 people need to move from Flagstaff which would actually be  
17 beneficial.

18                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to move as few  
19 people from Flag as we can in order to make this work and be  
20 -- be a successful compromise.

21                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, thank you, Commissioner  
22 Mehl.

23                   I guess for -- for me, in looking at the  
24 Native American proposal, what they're trying to achieve  
25 is -- is to get as high as possible CVAP so that they can --

1 I -- well, so --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, Commissioner Watchman, it  
3 doesn't change their CVAP. Nothing we do is going to change  
4 their CVAP.

5 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, the proposal is --

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, it would actually  
7 increase their CVAP.

8 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Because I was suggesting to  
10 take advantage as much as we can of a little lower  
11 population. So my proposal would increase their CVAP in  
12 that area.

13 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, I guess we need to see  
14 it then. We need to see how that looks in the Flagstaff  
15 area.

16 And so I think the first Navajo proposal basically  
17 completely excluded Flagstaff and the proposal that came in  
18 this past weekend was basically cutting Flagstaff in half.  
19 And so...

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: That's why I'm trying to find a  
21 compromise to make this work.

22 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right. And so for the Native  
23 American proposal, what my understanding, what they're  
24 trying to achieve, is again a deviation of basically a  
25 negative 5 percent. So roughly -- what is that? -- 8,000

1 people or so?

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No, it's more than that.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Okay. Well, more than that.

4 And then a CVAP of -- I think the initial proposal  
5 was like 61 percent was what the Natives were trying to  
6 look, now they're down to 50 -- 56, and so what we're  
7 trying --

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: My compromise would move them  
9 from 56 to a titch over 56. It would help that slightly; it  
10 would not hurt it.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think the key is if we can  
12 see the population that's being moved, that might help  
13 Commissioner Mehl, and then we can see if we can not remove  
14 so much from Flagstaff, and it might be that that's exactly  
15 what you do, and then we could potentially keep the  
16 boundaries that the Navajo would want from Flagstaff which I  
17 think is a goal -- possible.

18 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right, it's a goal. And this  
19 is a tough issue. Basically, you know, the way I look at it  
20 is we're trying to continue to -- to look at the Voter  
21 Rights Act and make sure that the Voter Rights Act protects  
22 and helps enhance the -- the Native population in -- in this  
23 area.

24 And so because this -- this is a district that  
25 has -- has been in the past not beneficial to



1 Native Americans but in the last few years it has, and so  
2 how do we continue to do that. And in looking at the Voter  
3 Rights Act and what it says, I think we have a good argument  
4 to -- to support the Navajo Nation and the six other tribes  
5 in what they want to achieve.

6 And mind you, the other tribes have chimed in and  
7 they also support -- I think I said this the other day,  
8 the -- the other tribes that are in southern Arizona and the  
9 southwestern part of Arizona support the Native American  
10 position in D-6.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I appreciate that,  
12 Commissioner Watchman, but the entire -- the 75,000 people  
13 in the White Mountains are part of our great state also and  
14 I do think we should at least take a look at this.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, I applaud you,  
16 Commissioner Mehl, for trying to find this compromise. I  
17 mean, you know, I -- I think I want to be sensitive to the  
18 Flagstaff population where a sensitive split would be. You  
19 know, we -- you know, all of our plans are compliant with  
20 the, VRA, and I think, you know, we want to also not only  
21 look at it from, you know, that perspective but also group  
22 people based on communities of interest. There's, you know,  
23 tremendous, you know, synergy between, you know, outdoor  
24 activities and, you know, mining and all the rural  
25 commonalities.

1           So I really, Commissioner Mehl, feel that you  
2 tackled this from a perspective of -- of trying to enable as  
3 many communities to have a voice as possible.

4           I think it's a great starting point to have a  
5 conversation.

6           VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Right.

7           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I want to look at the  
8 population in Flagstaff to make sure those who are -- who  
9 are being removed and separated, that it -- it you know  
10 makes sense for them.

11          COMMISSIONER MEHL: And if it overpopulates 7 a  
12 little, just to sort of jump ahead, District 16 is short, so  
13 if 7 becomes long, District 16 could take a little bit more  
14 of Florence just to help balance.

15          So if this overpopulates 7, we've got a solution.

16          COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we could also -- I think  
17 we need to see. I think this is a good switch in terms of  
18 not having that little finger go up. I think that works  
19 nicely, but I think a goal would be to see what we can do to  
20 keep Flagstaff as close to what the Navajo requested as  
21 possible.

22          COMMISSIONER YORK: But we need to get a  
23 population.

24          COMMISSIONER LERNER: It may be a very good  
25 balance.

1                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I ask -- can I ask why?  
2                   The Navajo Nation I'm very curious about, you know, then  
3                   ensuring that their, you know, interests are protected as it  
4                   relates to the VRA, but why is it their, you know, role to  
5                   determine where Flagstaff goes?

6                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think their boundary  
7                   that they were doing was trying to make sure that they had  
8                   the proper CVAP, and that's really what I'm focused on is  
9                   just that piece.

10                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And us, too. We will -- you  
11                  know, I deeply value all submissions, but, you know, we're  
12                  keeping our eyes on all the communities in the area and  
13                  doing right by everybody and -- and absolutely fulfilling  
14                  our responsibility to comply with the VRA.

15                  COMMISSIONER YORK: So I think the request was to  
16                  see what the population --

17                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: See what it is.

18                  COMMISSIONER YORK: -- was in that little finger in  
19                  D-7.

20                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's -- see what the  
21                  population looks like.

22                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: How is that working on  
23                  population numbers?

24                  VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I think if you  
25                  are talking about communities of interest and

1       like-mindedness, I think the Navajo Nation and the six other  
2       tribal communities have probably a better relationship with  
3       Snowflake and Show Low when it comes to community of  
4       interest. Flagstaff yes, there is economic ties between the  
5       tribes and Flagstaff, but Flagstaff is the only place in  
6       town to get goods and services.

7                But, you know, when it comes to what these actual  
8       communities do -- I'm talking about Flagstaff and Show Low  
9       and Springerville and Eagar relative to the Native  
10      populations, there's a lot of similarities, and that's  
11      agriculture, mining and water. I think many Navajos respect  
12      Flagstaff but, you know, Flagstaff is a place to shop. And  
13      so -- so they do provide goods and services to folks on  
14      Navajo; but when it comes to sharing and trying to improve  
15      the economic standards in the area, Flagstaff is the hub and  
16      Navajo and other reservations, you know, don't benefit from  
17      that.

18               And so what I'm thinking is grouping, in this case,  
19      Navajo, the six other tribes with what we're talking about  
20      here is a better fit. It ties well those communities of  
21      interest and it separates, you know, with all due respect of  
22      Flagstaff, it separates Flagstaff because, you know, they're  
23      more of a tourist town, a college town, and it's the only  
24      place in Northern Arizona where you can shop.

25               So I'll stop there.

1                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So what do we need to do in  
2 terms of next steps Mapping to explore the solution that  
3 Commissioner Mehl has proposed that I think is an excellent  
4 one?

5                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Well, let's see what the  
6 numbers look like.

7                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: And another one that --  
8 depending on how the population looks, Commissioner Mehl,  
9 Pinetop-Lakeside was mentioned very specifically, and they  
10 mentioned their relationship to the San Carlos. So if need  
11 be we could potentially --

12                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: But their relationship is much  
13 closer to Show Low. That's one big community. I mean,  
14 that's what I'm trying to consolidate is Pinetop-Lakeside  
15 Show Low --

16                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I'm not -- I'm not  
17 disagreeing with your Eagar-Springerville solution at all.

18                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: That's working.

19                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's not what I'm getting  
20 at, I'm was just saying that if we needed to, that's another  
21 community that very specifically addressed when we heard  
22 them in the hearings, they talked about their relationship.  
23 That's all I'm mentioning.

24                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Let's see where the numbers  
25 come out.

1                   COMMISSIONER YORK: I think that was in relation to  
2                   -- it was stronger relationship with San Carlos than they  
3                   had with the Navajo. I think that was the discussion.

4                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes, they did mention --  
5                   that's exactly right.

6                   And I'm not -- I'm just saying that might be  
7                   something we can look at, that's all.

8                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I think we're talking about  
9                   the White Mountain. There's good, close ties between  
10                  Pinetop and -- and Show Low and the White Mountain Apache  
11                  Tribe, so.

12                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I mean I think the  
13                  Eagar/Springerville is a good option.

14                  MR. D. JOHNSON: So looking numbers just taking  
15                  from Show Low north in the -- in the Show Low-Snowflake  
16                  finger, there is 25,000 and some change; and then in the  
17                  Apache County part of District 7, which will be going into  
18                  District 6, is 13,664. So that would be a net loss for  
19                  District 7 of about 12,000 people.

20                  And so that would be -- those 12 -- the 12,000  
21                  shortage would be split, some of it District 6 would pick up  
22                  from Flagstaff and some of it would just go into a 5 percent  
23                  deviation, so.

24                  COMMISSIONER MEHL: It might just be 5 or 6,000  
25                  people in Flag that needed to move then.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So I'm really trying.

3 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely, we can see that.  
5 Appreciate it.

6 I mean, I think -- I think it's more logical. I'm  
7 not sure why the Navajo, you know, picked that particular  
8 area, but I do see where it's a cleaner line to have  
9 Springerville and Eagar. And, as you say, it doesn't really  
10 change the significantly the makeup of that district.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And it does create that core of  
12 the White Mountains that will be in 7 will be a fairly  
13 strong voice in that District 7 and gives White Mountain a  
14 voice even for those people on the White Mountains that are  
15 not in 7, so I think it's a really good solution.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think, Commissioner Mehl,  
17 you also raised such an important point. That sometimes  
18 even if your specific member of Congress won't represent  
19 your particular interest, there may be one in other parts of  
20 the state that are incredibly aligned.

21 So, for example, the majority-minority elected  
22 leader that comes out of CD-7 I believe would be highly  
23 attentive to the Native American interest on a federal level  
24 because they have the three major tribes in the south. So I  
25 think -- and like we talked about the concerns of the

1 Phoenix urban interest, I think our CD-4 is creating a type  
2 of elected leader who is going to be deeply sensitive to  
3 urban interests.

4 So I think it's -- it's a thoughtful analysis that  
5 helps us better meet more people's needs.

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Madam Chair, I think we're  
7 talking -- this is the legislative map, and so if you look  
8 at this from my limited knowledge, if you look at experience  
9 in the last five years, you know, because of the current  
10 representation, I think there's been improved representation  
11 for Northern Arizona in -- in the capitol of Arizona; and I  
12 think what the Navajo Nation and the six other tribes are  
13 impressing upon us is to keep, you know, the current CVAP  
14 and if not improve it, and that's basically all I'm trying  
15 to recognize.

16 Is because, you know, as far as I'm concerned, you  
17 know, the buck stops in Phoenix when it comes to sharing --  
18 and that's what we're talking about is sharing resources  
19 from the state to different parts of the reservations. And  
20 I recall years ago as -- as a representative of Navajo  
21 Nation I went to the state capitol and started to lobby and  
22 the chair of the finance committee said: Excuse me,  
23 Mr. Watchman, why are you here? You should be talking to  
24 Bureau of Indian Affairs. And I said: Excuse me, I'm also  
25 a citizen of the state here. So that comment threw me.



1           So basically what I -- what I'm suggesting here or  
2 saying is the 22 tribes, even though it's 5 percent of the  
3 state, do have as much right to the resources that the state  
4 has. So, you know, by improving the ability for the tribes  
5 to -- to select someone to go to Phoenix, I think that  
6 that's one of our jobs here.

7           And --

8           COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Watchman, I think  
9 that we have -- I've done so little to impact natively the  
10 Native Americans and so much to improve the White Mountains  
11 that I'll hope that you'll --

12          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: I appreciate that.

13          COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to see it drawn  
14 this way and I hope you can talk with people overnight  
15 and -- and take a hard look at this.

16          CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah.

17          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: We will, I'm just --

18          COMMISSIONER MEHL: I am curious what D-7 -- what  
19 the population is, D-7 is now over? What happened to D-7 in  
20 all of that?

21          COMMISSIONER LERNER: Looks like if you have made  
22 the changes on this or not yet?

23          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No, they have not.

24          COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think we can look at that I  
25 think it's a good option.

1                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   And Vice Chair Watchman, I  
2                   believe everyone's motivation is to maintain that high  
3                   Native American CVAP.   That's --

4                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:   Right, exactly.

5                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   -- that's all of our  
6                   collective goal, and all the -- all the options we're  
7                   exploring is seeking to do that.

8                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN:   Right, and we all have goals  
9                   and objectives here as Commissioners and so, you know, one  
10                  of my goals is to improve the representation for Natives;  
11                  and so just like Commissioner Mehl, you know, him -- him  
12                  coming from the Tucson area, you know, he's -- he has to  
13                  improve and increase, you know, how Tucson performs.   And  
14                  so, you know, I'm just expressing what the tribes are really  
15                  desiring.

16                  So thank you.

17                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG:   Okay.   So any other further  
18                  directives for this legislative map that continues to be one  
19                  map based on all consensus decisions up to now?

20                  COMMISSIONER LERNER:   So we haven't done  
21                  anything --

22                  COMMISSIONER MEHL:   Did we come up with a number  
23                  on 7?

24                  COMMISSIONER LERNER:   7 I think we're going to try  
25                  that change you suggested.

1                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah, let's -- let's look at  
2 the numbers and...

3                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: See how that looks.

4                   VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yeah.

5                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chairwoman, do you want to  
6 move to the CDs at this point? We can -- we have some other  
7 areas we can talk about tomorrow; that's fine, too.

8                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With the LDs?

9                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

10                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If there's going to -- again,  
11 each day it's getting more and more, you know, focused. If  
12 there's anything that's going to have any ripple, like,  
13 bring it up now, but I would like to be able to spend -- you  
14 know, it's coming up on 4 o'clock. It would be nice to  
15 spend some focused time on the CDs, and we are going to need  
16 a recess soon.

17                  So is there anything quick or succinct that you  
18 feel is really essential to get in right now?

19                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's probably not quick or  
20 succinct, but it's a -- it's more of an overview discussion.

21                  CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Like what?

22                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: D-17, I want to talk about  
23 that.

24                  MR. D. JOHNSON: So just real quick --

25                  COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not making any

1 recommendations for changes at this time, but I want to have  
2 a conversation.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just real quick -- we think --  
4 we're roughing it here, we think D-7 come out very close to  
5 balance even before we go to Florence.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I am totally open to having a  
7 conversation about it, I don't think now is the right time  
8 just because we're running short on time and we want --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's fine.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: How about we take -- does  
11 Mapping have everything they need from us?

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let's confirm that.

13 So in terms of agreement on the changes -- get the  
14 right spot in my notes here.

15 Okay. So we have agreement on removing the Arizona  
16 Country Club bump from the south side of District 4; we have  
17 agreement on the Lehi shift that was discussed; we have  
18 agreement on the retirement community in Legislative  
19 District 23 moving into 29, and then 29 giving up the  
20 northeast finger of Surprise to balance; and then we have  
21 direction to implement the D-6, 7 changes we were just  
22 looking at; and then if I'm understanding the direction  
23 correctly, we have direction to implement  
24 Commissioner Lerner's request down in District 13 and 14 and  
25 Commissioner York's request in terms of the -- how to

1 describe it, the District 27, 2, 3 and 28 rotation.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I know we'll need to come  
3 back but we can do that tomorrow, on balancing some of those  
4 population shifts.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Like 23, 25.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just -- so the -- for those  
8 watching, you know, we'll work on the numbers in Flagstaff,  
9 and I think we'll likely just take the most compact approach  
10 possible, but certainly hoping people will come in tomorrow  
11 with more specific, you know, equal population transfers  
12 within Flagstaff. Don't take where we draw the line as  
13 anything locked in in terms of where in Flagstaff that split  
14 happens. We'll just hit the number and call it a day for  
15 now.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: And that's all -- all going to  
18 come back as one map.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So are you saying that you're  
20 not -- you're not going to consider any of the demographic  
21 information in Flagstaff where, you know, if there are -- I  
22 mean the eastern part has more of a Native American, you  
23 know, community, more of a Latino community, so there are  
24 geographic regions within Flagstaff -- Sunnyside, I believe  
25 is. So I don't know if you're looking at carving up

1 Flagstaff about, you know, trying to focus on those  
2 communities that would fit best with the Native Americans.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: That's where I think we're  
4 probably better off putting a map out there and getting your  
5 reaction --

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And us going --

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- and the public weighing in on  
8 that. Especially if we get a map out in an hour or two  
9 without having to dig into those details.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We'll do homework.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Let's get the folks who know it  
12 really, really well to tell us where those should go.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With this, should we take a  
14 ten-minute recess and we'll come back and switch to CDs.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Thank you.

17 4:10.

18 (Recess taken from 3:59 p.m. to 4:19 p.m.)

19  
20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back  
21 everybody. We are returning to Agenda Item Number VI, draft  
22 map decision discussion.

23 We are shifting to our congressional maps. We have  
24 two options that we are able to review. My suggestion is  
25 that we succinctly and briefly discuss -- there aren't big

1 changes actually, so it will be easy to discuss, you know,  
2 the pros and cons of each version, and then we can elect --  
3 vote to start with the new starting point and begin  
4 deliberations.

5 So my suggestion is if we could bring up both maps.  
6 The new iterations, not -- and compare.

7 MR. KINGERY: So on the left side of the screen is  
8 12.0 on the right side is 12.1. I've added both of the maps  
9 on top of each other on both sides. As we zoom and pan  
10 around the map, you'll be able to see the differences.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So let's go around the table  
12 and I'll open it up to discussion to share pros and cons  
13 from each and -- and I -- each one can focus on both. I --  
14 I welcome what you like; what you don't like, and we'll go  
15 around the table.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'll speak in of favor of map  
17 12.1 and, once again, referring to the competitiveness, when  
18 we compare ourself to the 2011 Commission, which I enjoy  
19 doing because I think we've done well, this map has three  
20 very solid competitive districts, and another one only a  
21 tenth of a point out of competitive range. So we have four  
22 competitive districts out of the nine, and I think that is a  
23 strong achievement given that our main priority was  
24 communities of interest and how to draw the lines the best  
25 around the state, but we have achieved -- and had our eye on

1           competitiveness all along, but have achieved a very  
2           competitive map.

3                   I think we have advantages of how we're dealing  
4           with the Tucson area. I think we have advantages as you go  
5           around the map in -- in different areas.

6                   And I think that the one change that we -- if we do  
7           move forward with this map, one change I would highlight we  
8           would then suggest is District 7 could be adjusted to  
9           include Bisbee and Douglas down along the southern border,  
10          and then pull back a little bit in Tucson and --

11                   COMMISSIONER YORK: And Santa Cruz County.

12                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: And also pull back on eastern  
13          half of Santa Cruz County how we've split that in the  
14          legislative map. With that simple adjustment, then we would  
15          be able to achieve a Hispanic voting population percentage  
16          that would be just over 50 percent, which I think would be  
17          an advantage for this map when we do that. And so with that  
18          change and we have a little population balance between 8 and  
19          9, but other than that this -- this map is -- is one that we  
20          would strongly favor.

21                   COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, so. So we -- we tried  
22          hard to keep the northern communities together in CD-2,  
23          including most of the Native American communities as well as  
24          the forestries and areas that share resources for fire and  
25          other things that are important to the northern part of



1 Arizona; and in CD-9 we've tried to keep the river together  
2 and keep the communities from Kingman to Blythe to portions  
3 of Yuma, along the Colorado River basin to like-mindedness,  
4 that stretches all the way west to what we call the I-10  
5 corridor and western Maricopa County. We have high growth  
6 along with the river, which makes sense.

7 We followed the Latino Coalition suggest in CD-7  
8 and -- with the Yuma split allowing the community to go all  
9 the way up into Avondale and Tolleson, as well as down into  
10 western Tucson.

11 We are eager to add the Bisbee-Douglas connection  
12 to that map to make it more conducive with the VRA.

13 We really think we did a good job in designing and  
14 helping put together communities of interest in CD-4 with  
15 the retirement communities of Leisure World, Fountain of the  
16 Sun, Sunland Village, Sunland Village East, put San Marcos  
17 in the south Chandler area of District 5.

18 We united Queen Creek, Gilbert, Mesa Gateway  
19 Airport, San Tan Valley in CD-5.

20 In CD-3 we have the historic neighborhoods per  
21 Pastor's request. In the old town areas of downtown  
22 Phoenix, we included the South Mountain region and would  
23 continue to go north along the Latino suggestions up to  
24 Glendale and up to Maryvale.

25 We cleaned up Glendale considerably into CD-9 and

1 CD-8. 8 goes north along the -- the Black Canyon Freeway  
2 all the way up to the 303. It does pick up Sun City Grand.

3 And so then along -- the request of  
4 Commissioner Neuberg, trying to make a greater Phoenix CD  
5 district with CD-1 including most of the Phoenix boundaries  
6 north along Carefree, Cave Creek Road up into also include  
7 Scottsdale, Paradise Valley, Salt River Indian Reservation,  
8 the Fort McDowell Indian Reservation.

9 So we think we've done a good job of balancing the  
10 state. We're pretty excited about this map going forward.  
11 We've kept the Indian communities as much together as we  
12 could in the northern part of the state and south Maricopa  
13 County, and -- and so we're eager to submit this.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I'll go last.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and while you speak,  
17 you're welcome to speak about what you like about a map and  
18 you're also what you don't like about a map.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Do my colleagues want to do  
20 that before we begin?

21 All right.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I just have one -- one  
23 thing to add maybe. I -- I don't agree that the treatment  
24 of the retirement communities in CD-4 moving them east made  
25 sense, 'cause the eastern part of Maricopa County and north

1 Pinal County are the fastest growing areas in the state, and  
2 I think Leisure World and those retirement communities are  
3 better fit in what I would consider an older portion of Mesa  
4 and in -- with Tempe.

5 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And by pushing D-7 up as far as  
6 they have, they've actually split Maryvale, even though  
7 they've got it in another VRA district, but it's still  
8 splitting Maryvale.

9 And down in Tucson, I don't like the way this 12.0  
10 map splits Tucson. I don't think it keeps the communities  
11 together. There's significant population east of where  
12 Country Club is that is a strong fit with the downtown area,  
13 with the university area. We had a lot of people testify to  
14 that.

15 So there are -- there are things that are done  
16 in -- in that map that I don't think handle -- handle  
17 southern Arizona nearly as well.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Unsurprisingly, we  
19 support -- I support map -- congressional map 12.0.

20 I'll just start with a couple of points since they  
21 were just raised just as a comment. Maryvale is actually in  
22 District 7 very much in the way it was in the Latino  
23 Coalition's submission. So I just wanted to acknowledge  
24 that, that that goes back to that point.

25 Leisure World is actually in District 5 in this

1 map, so it's not separated, and it is part of that  
2 retirement group that we had talked about in the East  
3 Valley. Just as a couple of -- of comments on that.

4 There's always room, as far as I'm concerned, this  
5 is a very much of a compromise map. Is this everything that  
6 Democrats would want, no. But that's not what we're  
7 supposed to do, we're supposed to try to find the best map  
8 for the state.

9 So when you -- you mentioned competitiveness, so I  
10 will bring that up first and then move on to some other  
11 reasons that I think this map serves our community very  
12 well.

13 This map actually is a 4-4-1 map. There are four  
14 districts -- there are actually a numb- -- there's let's  
15 see, four districts that are within our competitive range,  
16 even the upper range, but it actually is a very split map  
17 with four strong Republican districts and three strong  
18 Democratic districts, one split; and then one which is a  
19 truly competitive but leans Republican district.

20 And in a state that currently has five Democrats  
21 and four Republicans elected, just as an acknowledgment of  
22 where we are today, I think this provides us with a really  
23 good competitive and split for us to begin with as we  
24 continue to look at this.

25 In terms of specific, there are things that still

1           need to be adjusted but this does give us a very good  
2           beginning. I feel that District 2 is really nicely  
3           represented in this map, it brought a lot of -- I would like  
4           to see it become more competitive and we have talked about  
5           that.

6                     The part I like is in is southern part of the state  
7           where Casa Grande is whole -- it's supposed to be -- and  
8           aligned with the neighboring communities of interest with  
9           Coolidge and Florence and Sacaton and others in that area.  
10          I think the southern part is actually a really good boundary  
11          in that area. And I think it brings those communities very  
12          nicely together.

13                    I think District 5 does a good job of bringing very  
14          like communities together as well. It brings the southeast  
15          valley Queen Creek, San Tan, Gilbert, Apache Junction, all  
16          of those areas that have a lot in common together.

17                    I feel that District 4 does a nice job of serving  
18          the East valley -- I guess we'll call it the central East  
19          Valley. Again, bringing in north Chandler, Ahwatukee, Mesa  
20          as part of that -- that group that actually have a lot in  
21          common, that you've got some old communities in some of  
22          those areas. Communities with different populations,  
23          different types of population that are in that district.

24                    District 1 is large. I will say that it's -- is it  
25          my favorite? Probably not. But it does give Phoenix a much

1 greater presence. I like this -- the boundaries here  
2 because it actually has a very big presence in Phoenix; it  
3 actually does allow Phoenix to have really two good, solid  
4 districts with District 3 and District 4, and I know there  
5 are some boundary changes that potentially could occur  
6 between them.

7 District 8 does a nice job of bringing in some of  
8 the West Valley and the Northwest Valley as well as some of  
9 the northern I-17 corridor areas, and I think that that  
10 works really well for them in terms of representation.

11 I would say that District 6 just as a -- we made an  
12 effort to compromise with the Republican requests in terms  
13 of what they wanted for the boundaries within Tucson. The  
14 Tucson debate had been between Campbell and Alvernon, but  
15 12.1 goes past that all the way to Craycroft and Swan; it  
16 really takes in a much larger population. We could find a  
17 compromise with 12.0 and move -- move to something in  
18 between in -- as part of that.

19 So I think -- I think 12.0 what's -- what I like  
20 about 12.0 is that it actually gets us closer to being done.  
21 It allows us to have some truly competitive districts. It  
22 gives us a CD-1 that's a Phoenix dominant CD. It's a big  
23 compromise in southern Arizona with the dividing line that  
24 we have as part of how we would want to break up Tucson into  
25 two districts and it has District 6 leaning Republican.

1           District 4 is competitive as well and again goes --  
2 provides a lot of good context in terms of all the people  
3 that are in those areas.

4           So these are just some of the reasons that I feel  
5 12.0 I feel just does a good job of all of those issues as  
6 well as good, strong VRA compliance.

7           Thank you.

8           CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Anything you want to add,  
9 Vice Chair Watchman?

10          VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Yes, Madam Chair. I just  
11 want to echo Commissioner Lerner's comments, but also I  
12 think the 12.0 map does a good job in separating and  
13 recognizing the -- the rural versus urban settings, so I  
14 know we had a lot of talk about that.

15          And so I do support including the Casa Grande area  
16 into D-2, I think that's very, very important.

17          And of course I think my colleagues on the right do  
18 recognize the tribes, but it identifies all the 22 tribes,  
19 and so I think -- I think in the districts that they lie, I  
20 think it would be favorable to them.

21          The big area and I'll emphasize -- again  
22 re-emphasize Commissioner Lerner's point, is how do we deal  
23 with the issue in the Tucson area? I think that Tucson is  
24 going to need a little bit more discussion; I think that's  
25 very important, but I think our map does recognize the Voter

1 Rights Act; it deals with the constitution.

2 In terms of the population deviation, I think 12.0  
3 is closer to zero if you will than -- than the other map, so  
4 that's one of the constitutional provisions that we have to  
5 be concerned about. We tried to deal with compactness and  
6 contiguity and I think we did a good job in addressing that.

7 Then of course just -- just recognizing and  
8 highlighting what Commissioner Lerner is talking about, the  
9 competitiveness as -- as she said I think we're at a 4-4-1,  
10 you know, four Democrat, four Republican and one  
11 competitive; and I think that's what we're trying to do is  
12 bring -- bring fairness and recognize both parties to the  
13 state, and I think our map does that.

14 So 12.0 is -- is what I believe is -- the starting  
15 point should be for the rest of today and tomorrow.

16 Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I just add one more quick  
18 comment and then we're done?

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hm-mm.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to emphasize what  
21 Commissioner Watchman also said 12.0. I think there's a lot  
22 of room -- it's a compromise. It's much closer to the  
23 compromise we had before, the draft map before, and I think  
24 there's a lot of room there for adjustments as needed; and  
25 then his other comment he made about the deviation, that



1 we're really close to being balanced in this map.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So I'll share what I  
4 like and I don't like about each of the maps.

5 So starting with 12.1, which is I believe is Mehl's  
6 map, correct?

7 I -- I think they best incorporated my visions for  
8 CD-3 with incorporating the historic neighborhoods, the  
9 LGBTQ community, Melrose Place.

10 There's also a particular area in Phoenix in CD-8  
11 that I think their map did a better job of capturing. It's  
12 the state trust land that I think is this last area of  
13 undeveloped area that Phoenix will be able to, you know,  
14 create and develop, et cetera. It's between Scottsdale Road  
15 and Cave Creek Road as you head north, I think that's an  
16 important piece of land that we need a representative to --  
17 to be focused on -- on helping Phoenix.

18 I didn't understand in regarding map 12.0, some of  
19 the moves of moving Cave Creek and Carefree. And it seems  
20 particularly based on your commentary about what you like of  
21 the map, that a lot of the motivation had to do with  
22 balancing, you know, partisanship. You know, focusing  
23 primarily on competitiveness and you mentioned again, you  
24 know, that a value is that it balances Rs and Ds. That's  
25 not something that we're focused on or considering and so

1 that's not a selling point from my perspective.

2 You know, with CD-6, you know, just because I may  
3 like, you know, CD 12.1 better on other areas as it relates  
4 to CD-8 and CD-3 and CD-1, I am in no means comfortable with  
5 where the map is going in CD-6, we need to -- and part of  
6 why I encouraged, you know, the free rein is for us to  
7 understand the communities of interest and then to struggle  
8 with all of the other constitutional criteria to rein it in.  
9 So I'm appreciative that he laid out an argument, but now  
10 we're going to need to wrestle with the other constitutional  
11 criteria keeping in mind, you know, honoring responsibility  
12 for VRA compliance in D-7, compactness, contiguity.

13 So, as you're sensing, overall I think both maps  
14 are really quite fine. I mean, I think we are getting  
15 closer and closer to where we need to be. I could have used  
16 either one as a starting point. I think it's easier to use  
17 the starting point of CD 12.1 because it captures more of  
18 what the priorities I had going into it, but nothing is set  
19 in stone, in particularly CD-6 boundaries.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would just like to make a  
21 comment.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry.

24 I will tell you 12.1 is going to be very difficult  
25 for us. It is a 6-3 map, and I will say competitiveness in

1           this case. I don't see how we reach compromise. We have a  
2           5-4 split right now in our state with congressional.

3                     We're all for having some form of compromise, but a  
4           map that begins with a 6-3 split leaves very little room for  
5           adjustments.

6                     And just as a note, District 1 I mentioned is an  
7           urban and it actually has the exurban area. It has the  
8           areas around there.

9                     There -- as I mentioned, there are room for  
10          adjustments and compromise, but I find that if we go with  
11          12.1, there's a lot less room for that, and it will be a lot  
12          harder to make those adjustments in one day that we have  
13          left or we're going to end up having, from my perspective, a  
14          map that will be very difficult to find compromise.

15                    I'm sorry to sound a little strong on that, but I  
16          just want to make that point.

17                    CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think, at the end of the  
18          day, with toss-up districts, it's going to be possible for  
19          either side to potentially get to 6-3. I mean, that's just  
20          one observation. Second observation, I'm not focused on  
21          counting those numbers; it's not part of my constitutional  
22          responsibility. I need to, you know, ensure that all of our  
23          population, you know, receives representation.

24                    I would also like to say that what it looks like  
25          today doesn't mean that it looks like that tomorrow.

1 We're -- we're all focused in a very narrow range of  
2 competitiveness that can change with simple lines, and so  
3 just because I might view a starting point as being  
4 favorable to getting where we need to go doesn't mean I'm  
5 endorsing what the map implies.

6 People are welcome to look at what they think it  
7 implies, but I'm merely starting -- recommending a starting  
8 point. Everything is on the table; I'd like, at the end of  
9 the day, to have fair maps that we all feel proud of.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Chairwoman, given that then, I  
11 would like to make a motion we approve map 12.1 as our new  
12 starting point for the CD map.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is Commissioner York. I  
14 second the motion.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would like to say  
17 competitiveness is one of our responsibilities and one of  
18 our constitutional requirements, and the competitiveness  
19 factors in 12.0 are better than they are in 12.1, and I find  
20 that it's going to be difficult to find balance in that. So  
21 I'm -- I think it is a constitutional requirement.

22 Is it a constitutional requirement to count numbers  
23 of seats? Maybe not, but that reflects competitiveness. If  
24 we're starting off with a map that is so strongly one way,  
25 we're going to have to make a lot of adjustments in one day

1 to actually try to find more balance and I -- I have a  
2 struggle with how we can do that with 12.1.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Any further discussion?

4 We will take a vote.

5 Vice Chair Watchman.

6 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: No.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
14 aye.

15 And with that, we will start with 12.1, and we are  
16 open to fixing what colleagues are not happy about.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to suggest that in  
18 D-7 in order to even better comply with the VRA, although I  
19 think it already solidly complies with the VRA, that we go  
20 down to the southern border.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would actually request that  
22 we adjourn for the day. I'd like to take a closer look at  
23 12.1 on how we can make adjustments to that. I know we have  
24 to be ready and I could make a few here and there, but could  
25 probably be more comprehensive in looking at that because I

1           feel before we start making adjustments, there's some real  
2           key areas that I think we need to -- to look at it. It's  
3           just...

4                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It is 4:44. It is getting  
5           late. I'm -- you know, if my colleagues feel that by having  
6           extra study time to be able to come back and fine-tune lines  
7           and, you know, fix areas that they feel that don't make  
8           sense, you know, that's absolutely doable.

9                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I make a motion to  
10          adjourn.

11                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think we've got at least some  
12          procedural things before we --

13                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Right.

14                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Even if we.

15                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. You're right.

16                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'm okay with whoever --  
17          whatever the Chairwoman wants to do.

18                   COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry, I guess it's not time  
19          for adjournment yet.

20                   COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

21                   CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So it sounds like my  
22          colleagues feel that further deliberation at this point,  
23          would not be constructive, so I do think it's a good idea  
24          for us to -- to take a pause, go back and study, make sure  
25          we all have the full demographic, you know, reports of this

1 and come back with constructive ideas.

2 Again, we're not that far, and there are ways to  
3 bring this towards, I believe, where we can meet many more  
4 people's needs.

5 But with that, we conclude the Agenda Item Number  
6 VI.

7 We'll move to Agenda Item Number VII, next meeting  
8 date.

9 It will be tomorrow, December 21st at 9:00 a.m.,  
10 same location.

11 We move to Agenda Item Number VIII, closing of  
12 public comments.

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

20 With that, we move to Agenda Item Number IX,  
21 adjournment.

22 I will now entertain a motion to adjourn.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I move to adjourn.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Vice Chair Watchman seconds.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,

1 Vice Chair Watchman.

2 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an  
10 aye.

11 And with that, we are adjourned and see everybody  
12 tomorrow at 9:00 a.m. Thank you everybody for your hard  
13 work.

14 (Whereupon the proceeding concludes at 4:46 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

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



C E R T I F I C A T E

STATE OF ARIZONA )  
 ) ss.  
COUNTY OF MARICOPA )

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

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

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I have complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-206. Dated at Litchfield Park, Arizona, this 12th of January, 2022.

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

\* \* \*

I CERTIFY that Miller Certified Reporting, LLC, has complied with the requirements set forth in ACJA 7-201 and 7-206. Dated at LITCHFIELD PARK, Arizona, this 12th of January, 2022.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Miller Certified Reporting, LLC  
Arizona RRF No. R1058