

THE STATE OF ARIZONA
INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF FINAL DECISION PUBLIC MEETING

Afternoon Session

December 21, 2021

12:38 p.m.

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

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

Miller Certified Reporting, LLC

I N D E X

<u>AGENDA ITEM:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ITEM NO. VI - CONGRESSIONAL MAP	124
ITEM NO. VII	253
ITEM NO. VIII	253
ITEM NO. IX	253
MOTION TO ADJOURN	253
VOTE	253

1 PUBLIC MEETING, BEFORE THE INDEPENDENT
2 REDISTRICTING COMMISSION, convened at 12:38 p.m. on
3 December 21, 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 Ms. Michelle Crank, Public Information Officer

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

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

* Spanish interpreter present

P R O C E E D I N G

1
2
3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome, everybody. Thank
4 you for your patience doing our lunch recess.

5 We are returning to Agenda Item Number VI, draft
6 map Decision discussion. We are in the midst of
7 deliberating our recent iteration of the congressional draft
8 map.

9 I will turn it over to my colleagues. I believe we
10 were diving deep into the borders of CD-6 and 7.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I have one comment to make just
12 to get it on the record regarding the changes we made to
13 CD-4 and 5.

14 As you recall from 12.1, we tried to incorporate
15 the majority of the senior living communities in CD-4; we
16 missed three on CD 12.0: La Paloma Senior Living, McDowell
17 Village, and McGavin Ranch. Our current iteration of CD-4
18 misses 12 villages that I can count: Villa Vista Senior
19 Living, Sunrise Village, Legacy Retirement, Palmas del Sol,
20 Orchard Active Senior Community, A-C-O-Y-A Mesa, Oasis at
21 Mesas Palmas (verbatim), Dreamland Village, Discovery Point,
22 Brookdale Spring, Citadel, and Heritage Village Assisted
23 Living.

24 Just wanted to make that point. We tried to
25 accommodate most of the north Chandler in the original CD-4

1 and all the retirement communities; we've now split them.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I just want to wonder -- I
3 was wondering why the previous iteration of the map you had
4 them in D5, then you chose to move them into D4 worked
5 pretty nicely together as a community in D5, why did you
6 move them?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Why did I move them? Because I
8 was trying --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They were all together in D5
10 and then you shifted them all. I was just wondering why you
11 shifted them.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't think they were all
13 together, I think we did a good job of getting them all
14 together. We also included Mesa down south of the 60 in
15 Guada- -- to Guadalupe, which is the Mesa boundary and that
16 gave us what I thought was a more compact district and it
17 also made it a little bit more competitive.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But the communities that you
19 mentioned all had requested to be in D5, which is why you
20 had been placing them there in previous iterations, and then
21 this map all of a sudden shifted from what you had been
22 doing in all of your other -- other maps.

23 So that was the only -- I understand what you're
24 saying, but your previous maps, all of the versions, had
25 been putting them in the other area where they had requested

1 to be in that district and then all of a sudden they shifted
2 into this one. And so that was my only thought, my only
3 question.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: My recollection is they
5 requested to be together more so than they requested to be
6 in east of the 202 loop.

7 I also recollect on your version of 12.0, you went
8 even farther into what I would consider the
9 Gold Canyon-Copper Corridor area to incorporate population,
10 and so I thought our map did a better job of keeping that
11 area compact with CD-5.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We were -- we went in CD-5
13 into Gold Canyon because they specifically have -- and I
14 assume we're not addressing making big changes at this
15 point, but just to answer that question --

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: You were asking me about --

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I just was --

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- asking about previous maps,
19 so I think the senior community is a very robust voting,
20 outspoken community and we created an area for all of them
21 to be together except for three areas, and we'd be more than
22 happy to add those three to CD-4 and take some population
23 off the western boundary to match that if you'd like.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, the western boundary we
25 just added in the community that was being split right in

1 half, a specific community that was being split right in
2 half.

3 I was just -- I just was asking that question and
4 just in answer to your question what was done in D-5. But
5 again, I don't want to relitigate all of it.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, we could easily move --

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm just going to finish the
8 one thing that we were connecting Apache Junction to
9 Gold Canyon, that's what we were trying to do in that area,
10 that's all.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I thought Apache Junction
12 wanted to be connected with the San Tan corridor.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They all wanted to be
14 together.

15 But we can go back to 12.0 if you like.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, but that's what we're
18 debating right now.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you can add the community
20 that you added to the lower corner of CD-4 into 5 and that
21 -- and take more population east on CD-4 and include those
22 other three senior living communities. I mean, that would
23 be a solution also.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: What are you suggesting?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Adding the boundary of the

1 minority district that you -- area that you tried to
2 increase in the lower corner of CD-4, you could add that to
3 5 and then you could take more population to the east in 3
4 to add the other three community -- I mean, excuse me, east
5 in CD-4 to increase the -- add the other three senior living
6 communities so they're all included.

7 There's over 55 senior living communities in east
8 Mesa.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's basically going back
10 to your map by taking them out of the district that we just
11 added them into, because that was a district better serving
12 them and that was combining them.

13 And we're talking about blocks here, like we're
14 talking about people who were literally living across the
15 street from each other and keeping them whole as a community
16 versus -- and I totally understand your comments about the
17 senior living, but the neighborhood that we were talking
18 about is true neighborhood where people literally walk from
19 house to house versus communities that they have to drive to
20 get to.

21 So I just want to make that point that it's not --
22 we were -- we basically had split a true community, and this
23 was just designed to put them together.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: 44,000 people.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We were trying to find a

1 compromise. I had mentioned that we don't have to move as
2 many and we could have adjusted it slightly. Once we got
3 moving, we were trying to do some things that would align
4 with city boundaries.

5 I'm fine with a compromise as long as we make sure
6 that that community ends up in D4, and that I -- we've been
7 always working on a way to find a compromise with that.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And -- and can I just clarify
9 that the compromise that we're talking about is having
10 direct effects on D4 and D5 but not on the other ripple
11 districts; am I correct?

12 So let's make sure -- I just want to make sure that
13 we're bifurcating the specific arguments that we're having
14 and keep them relatively contained.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: It is, I just wanted to go on
16 the record to state that the fact that the retirement
17 community was not whole with these moves in D5.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: This doesn't seem to be a
19 major issue with a major impact on the map.

20 If -- does -- do you want to just succinctly say
21 the pros and cons of your argument and make a decision, or
22 would you rather move to other points of the map.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We'd like to know if there are
24 other issues on the map. We're comfortable with the other
25 districts.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So we have one thing that we
2 wanted to -- and it was going to be addressing D3; and I
3 know you had mentioned it earlier Chairwoman, and I don't
4 know if you had a suggestion or comment before we make a
5 comment about it.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I'm aware that there is
7 some discord around D3. Part of that was my recommendation
8 of uniting historical districts per a recommendation from a
9 councilwoman that I found very compelling. Obviously,
10 that's one perspective around a community of interest; if it
11 causes significant detriment to other communities achieving,
12 you know, expression, I'm open to negotiating that. So the
13 exact borders of CD-3 are open.

14 Having said that, I am a huge fan of some of the
15 decisions that we've made. I know not everybody is happy
16 about CD-1, but it is a highly competitive district that
17 literally is a toss-up, could go any way, made a lot of
18 compromises with uniting urban and suburban communities, and
19 so I don't want to relitigate other things. So if we are
20 going to open up smaller conversations about things like
21 CD-3, I want to limit it to how it will not have ripple
22 effects throughout the entire map.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the current CVAP on
24 CD-3?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 51 percent.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: It would be 51 -- 50.56 or 51.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We are comfortable leaving this
3 area alone.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We have a -- we have couple
5 comments because we would like to make a couple of minor
6 adjustments.

7 One -- one thing is that we just received a letter
8 from the city of Glendale -- and this is something that we
9 have had in CD-3 for a while, it would mean taking some
10 population -- and this would be a -- there would be some
11 minor changes, I will tell you right up front this will not
12 change District 1 to a Democrat-leaning district, the
13 changes that I'm suggesting.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But it will change.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It will change. My
16 recommendation is to make a change. But it will not -- it
17 will still be more an R-leaning district.

18 But this goes to an adjustment that we just
19 received, and we had had District 3 up at Northern in the
20 past and the Republicans had moved it south. Glendale, the
21 city of Glendale mayor and two council wrote a letter and I
22 yesterday spoke, 'cause their staff were here and handed me
23 that letter, and they asked that the congressional district
24 include the boundaries between 43rd Avenue and 73rd Avenue,
25 Northern Avenue to the north and Camelback Avenue on the

1 south.

2 Everybody should have received this letter at this
3 point.

4 So the boundaries are in their letter. And
5 basically they had -- I remember actually have spoken --
6 spoken to their staff, they had called about wanting that
7 Northern boundary to exist. That particular area they say
8 is significantly different than -- and this is just directly
9 from their letter, significantly different from the rest of
10 the city.

11 They feel it's more appropriate to have it in CD-3
12 than in CD-8.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can I -- can I make an
14 observation?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sure.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: This boundary Northern from
17 19th Avenue to 75th was in the Latino Coalition original
18 request. So, yes, we took some population out of the top to
19 balance 8 to accommodate Commissioner Neuberg's request to
20 have CD-1 be more urban, and now you're going to take it
21 completely out ignoring their request?

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We are pretty far from their
23 first request at this point on their maps, right? We were
24 at Latino Coalition 4.0 not 1.0 anymore. And they do
25 support this -- this request as well. And the Northern

1 boundary had been there, I don't remember which one, but one
2 of their -- their requests.

3 So this -- this is basically just a few changes
4 in -- it would mean moving -- doing some minor changes in
5 District 8, it doesn't affect Cave Creek, Carefree -- it
6 doesn't affect anything in the north in District 1. And as
7 I say it does not change District 1 to becoming a D-leaning,
8 it makes it more balanced; and this would be -- this is
9 endorsed with the Latino Coalition because they've had a
10 Northern boundary on map -- on some of their maps.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, but you're taking it down
12 to Camelback.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I'm getting it to
14 Northern.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: So you're putting population
16 into D3?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm putting population in and
18 I'm going to take some out.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Lerner, just to
20 confirm, it's to Northern at the top and 75th on the west?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, sou -- they want to
22 be -- I'm going to read this exact information.

23 So it is -- I'm just looking in their letter. The
24 Glendale boundaries between 43rd Avenue and 75th Avenue,
25 Northern Avenue to the north and Camelback Avenue to the

1 south.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Perfect. Thank you.

3 MR. FLAHAN: As drawn on the screen there?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Sorry, I never look -- I
5 forget to look at the screen, I'm always looking at my map.

6 Yeah, that's what they're requesting.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Demographically they say this
9 is significantly different than the rest of the city, shares
10 much in common with the Latino Voting Rights Act
11 Congressional District 3 in the area north -- south of
12 Northern Avenue, Glendale has a nearly 55 percent Hispanic
13 voting age population where Glendale north of Northern is
14 less than 21 percent.

15 And this is straight from their letter, from Mayor
16 Weirs. Is that how you say...

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: So that would be 40,037 people.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And just the voting rights --
19 okay.

20 So that's -- this area also has strong ties to west
21 Phoenix he says, and so -- and he said residents of this
22 area are also connected to west Phoenix via transportation
23 corridor with Grand Avenue. I just wanted to make sure I
24 got that in the comments from the mayor.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And what Commissioner Lerner,

1 would we be taking out to compensate that, just so I can
2 keep track of the various communities of interest going in
3 or out to make sure that this is a nonpolitical conversation
4 and a -- and a conversation based on people and their needs
5 for representation?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, yeah. This is the
7 area that -- I mean, this came from them. And we had talked
8 about with District 3, so if we have this population being
9 added, we'd be making just slight changes. You had
10 mentioned that you might be open to some changes of pulling
11 down a little bit of District 1, that would remove some of
12 those -- that population.

13 So it would take Indian School -- let me find this.

14 And again, I am telling you, this is not making
15 this -- changing this significantly from the competitive
16 district that it is now. It is not going -- I would love to
17 say it's going to make it a D school (verbatim) -- D, but it
18 wasn't.

19 So this would be to Indian School in the area west
20 of 16th Street.

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: So you're talking about how
22 District 1 would come south or how District -- oh. Yeah,
23 you're talking about District 1 south?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, pushing the boundary of
25 District 1 south to Indian School west, just west of 16th

1 Street.

2 I'll give you all the changes, Madam Chair, and
3 then you can decide.

4 And then to McDowell Road in the area east of 16th
5 Street.

6 And then I have one more change and that's it and
7 that will -- should balance.

8 MR. FLAHAN: Is this the change that you're talking
9 about that's on the screen?

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes. Indian School area west
11 of 16th and then to McDowell Road, yeah.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: And then when you're talking about
13 down to McDowell Road, you're talking about 16th coming down
14 on the east side of McDowell Road -- I'm sorry, the east
15 side of 16th Street down to McDowell?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That -- just that block that
19 you have there. And that has got --

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: That --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's not quite -- it has a
22 mixed population in that area. It has -- so it actually
23 works nicely in -- in that community as part of it.

24 So just what you said, Doug.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: So if we add in -- so taking that

1 area plus down to McDowell on the east side of 16th is going
2 to be too many people. There's -- the first piece was
3 31,000 and now there's 29,000 here, so it would leave
4 District 3 short by 20 -- almost 21,000 people.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which would be short?
6 District 1?

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: District 3.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, District 3 would still be
9 short.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: By --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh. I'm sorry --

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: If we're also taking the McDowell
13 piece.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Did I get all of that?
15 Can you go back to that boundary between Glendale
16 in District 1? I mean, District -- the one that they
17 suggested, that the Glendale mayor suggested.

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yep.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I think they wanted to
20 go -- I'm sorry if I didn't get all of that in there. They
21 wanted to go west to 75th Avenue.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, we did get that.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You did get that?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, so we added essentially an
25 "L."

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. All right.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: That added 40,000 -- 40,037; and
3 then the first piece, the Indian School west -- going down
4 to Indian School west of 16th added 31,700, and so we're --
5 so we're needing another 8,200.

6 You're going all the way down to McDowell on the
7 east side of 16th is 29,000.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you show that on the map
9 again, please?

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, yeah. Put it in.

11 So as shown we've got the -- the Indian School west
12 of 16th to 19th Avenue piece in, and then we're short -- I'm
13 sorry. District 3 is still over by 8,600.

14 So if we take it down to McDowell, going to make
15 District 3 short. But maybe, I don't know, go down Thomas?

16 Even coming down to Thomas is -- is 13,000 -- is
17 too many people coming out of 3, it's going to leave 3
18 short.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So we could -- you
20 mean in terms of moving that to D1?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, and so if you -- and
23 that population just -- I'm sorry, I'm pulling it up on mine
24 there.

25 So you went on the other side of the freeway. If

1 you didn't go on the other side of the -- I mean, if we just
2 took that one piece, which is a little bit different than
3 the rest of District 3 and fits nicely in terms of the
4 neighborhoods.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, that would be 11 -- so in
6 the area Brian is showing in blue, it's 11,008 people. That
7 would leave District 3 short by 2,387.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So we're pretty --
9 we're getting a lot closer there, so we could make some
10 minor adjustments.

11 And then I think District 8 may be short. Because
12 we just took that out of -- we added District 3 into there.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct. Short by 21,100.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So one thing that we
15 could do would be to take some of Peoria outside Loop 303
16 and put it into D9, but we could also balance it a little
17 bit between D1 and just some slight changes in that area in
18 the northwest corner south to Bell Road between 19th Avenue
19 and Cave Creek Road into D8, and that might balance it right
20 there.

21 These are just on-the-margins changes, they're
22 not --

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Which -- which one do you want us
24 to look at first?

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Do the one on the Northern

1 boundary in northwestern corner south to Bell Road. Just
2 enough population to balance it. Between 19th Avenue and
3 Cave Creek. I don't know how much population and whether
4 you'd need all of that.

5 But that these are on the edges of the district and
6 should not affect any communities of interest.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So in three sentences
8 Commissioner Lerner, can you articulate exactly why you're
9 moving this population and why you feel it's enhancing our
10 adherence to the constitutional criteria?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: In this particular area?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So this ended up -- this
14 population actually is just -- well, the first population or
15 this one, I'm sorry?

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: All of it. I would like
17 to --

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: All of it.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- why you're doing it and
20 what you're doing it for -- for the record.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So the first part is
22 because we have actually had that Northern boundary in the
23 past, and I feel that the city of Glendale made a good
24 argument and they have been saying this, this is not the
25 first time they have commented about the fact that they feel

1 those folks south of Northern would be better served in
2 District 3.

3 The second piece is that that neighborhood that
4 we're talking about moving actually works really nice and
5 effectively with the other neighborhoods that it would be
6 aligned with -- let me -- if you just give me a moment, I'm
7 going to pull out my neighborhoods map.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: So Commissioner Lerner, just to
9 note, bringing all the areas shown, it comes all the way
10 down to Bell, is 75,000.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I don't want to have
12 all that. I was just saying it might be a small piece, I
13 definitely do not want all of those.

14 Okay. Just a moment while I just check my map,
15 please.

16 So that corner that I'd asked about between
17 District 1 and District 3, that one little piece that we --
18 I mentioned down there actually fits with the, again,
19 village planning that we have in the city of Phoenix and
20 with their communities that are there. So it adds -- it
21 basically aligns those neighborhoods that are in that -- in
22 the village plan for the city of Phoenix.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Deer Valley Village I think?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I'm talking about in the
25 south. I'm not up in the north.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Are you -- are you looking at
2 CD-3 neighborhoods? If we are, can we zoom out a little
3 bit.

4 I'm not sure what areas you're looking at.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is the area -- well,
6 they're up in the north right now, but this is the area
7 between D1 and D3 where we were just bringing that boundary
8 down a little bit.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: What we're finding is coming down
10 to 101 in that Deer Valley Airport area would be too many
11 people, that was 15,486; but just coming down to Deer Valley
12 Road is not enough people, 4,500, and would leave District 8
13 short.

14 So we could start figuring above Deer Valley and
15 start from the west and work across on the north side of the
16 freeway, or...

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I wanted to make sure
18 in terms of that neighborhood that we're not dividing a
19 neighborhood in that area.

20 The area in the south that -- so in that -- in that
21 particular area that's up -- it is up in the Deer Valley as
22 Commissioner York mentioned, but we're not trying to divide
23 that, we're just trying to do a little population balancing
24 in that little corner.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, we're open to your direction

1 on how you want to proceed there.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. I was just going to
3 answer Chairwoman's question about the neighborhood down in
4 that corner, and I'm just double-checking the boundaries to
5 make sure I say the right neighborhood.

6 Yeah, so this just aligns the Camelback east and
7 Encanto neighborhood, that one corner that I talked about
8 right there, that -- in that southern part of
9 District 3-District 1. That's what -- why that particular
10 corner works because of the neighborhood that's in that area
11 and that it aligns them together.

12 And it doesn't really disrupt a lot of the
13 historic, I think there might be one small historic, but
14 it's a different -- again, I think a 1950's historic; and
15 having been the historic preservation officer for Arizona, I
16 know there's different districts from bungalows in 1920s to
17 much more recent 1950s districts.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: But if we don't mind just
19 looking at where Melrose is? I just want to make sure that
20 with splitting the historic districts, with Melrose, that
21 we're doing right by those communities.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: It is --

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: In your consideration
24 Commissioner Lerner, in these changes in CD-3, are you
25 equally focusing on the historical districts and the LGBTQ

1 community?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I'm -- I have not
3 been -- I have not -- I have selected that particular corner
4 because I felt it was the least disruptive areas of any of
5 the historic areas and the LGBTQ community, and it was
6 aligned -- that -- that corner has a lot more in common with
7 communities to their east.

8 I'm looking at a historic map right now. Melrose
9 is not a historic, that's not what you're...

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's downtown along Central.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, Melrose should be
12 whole.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: But the Indian...

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Why am I not finding...

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Understand Melrose is a -- is
16 an LGBTQ community, correct?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right, we're not trying to
18 split that up at all.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, how does that work with
20 Fountain Hills or North Scottsdale?

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, you can say that about
22 a lot of the communities in the southern part of District 1
23 right now, because the way the district is in terms of its
24 size there's a lot of communities in the south part that are
25 also probably not going to work as effectively in that area

1 with Fountain Hills and all. But you know what, people
2 don't -- people stay, as we know, in their communities.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: But the -- you know, we don't
4 have enough state population to have another CD. You know,
5 I think what Mayor Gallego was interested in I think at some
6 point might make sense but today, this particular iteration,
7 it doesn't because we don't have enough population. So at
8 some point we're going to have to consider the fact that we
9 have competing interests in our districts and I think that
10 the fact this is -- this is way extreme.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, we've tried to be
12 patient but we -- we have as much pressure on us as I'm sure
13 that Commissioner Lerner has on her, and we have a lot of
14 people that believe there's a much stronger community of
15 interest of D1 going up into Anthem and New River rather
16 than coming down farther south into more of -- of the city.
17 So if we're going to look at this proposal, then we'd like
18 to outline a detailed proposal of Anthem and New River; or
19 we were happy with D1 and D3 and D8 the way we were. So we
20 need guidance from you.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: We took into consideration --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We are totally opposed to these
23 changes. And do you want us to present an alternative or --
24 or are you willing to reject these changes?

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm not encouraging of the

1 changes, I think we have made good compromise. Again, I
2 think CD-1 is not ideal, there's obviously groups that have
3 slightly different interests but I believe we have found the
4 sweet spot with trying to find urban interests that would
5 not be antagonist to suburban interests; and I feel actually
6 quite comfortable that we've met enough of the mayor's needs
7 to ensure that an elected leader from CD-1 would adhere to
8 the urban interest, and even more than that maybe even
9 partner with a CD-8 member to look at further deliver --
10 development of urban north central Phoenix area which will
11 be part of our future growth.

12 So no, I don't want to relitigate CD-1. I went on
13 record I love CD-1. There's weaknesses, but not only do I
14 like the community of interest, you know, configuration and
15 not only do I feel that it does not cause significant
16 detriment to other communities of interest, I believe it's
17 compact, I believe it's contiguous, I also -- I also believe
18 that it hits this remarkable sweet spot with highly
19 competitive not just within a number range but in
20 performance of elections.

21 So to change CD-1 for me would require great
22 conviction that we're messing something up and we need
23 something to better improve our overall map. From my
24 perspective, the best conversations that I think are most
25 needed to fine0tune what we need to go, you know, head to,

1 is are there fine-tuning with CD-3 as it relates to
2 navigating our community of interest vision with also
3 understanding the Latino Coalition's desires so we can meet
4 as many people's needs as possible; and again fine-tuning
5 CD-6 such that we can find it in that ultra-competitive
6 sweet spot.

7 I think those are our highest responsibilities on
8 the CD map.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: So I have a suggestion based on
10 some of the thoughts Commissioner Lerner had regarding the
11 top northern boundary of CD-3. You can push that north
12 along 43rd Avenue, and currently it's on 67th Avenue, up to
13 Northern which would be the corner of Glendale.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: When you say "the corner of
15 Glendale" you mean the city or the -- or the avenue?

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: The city. Right now you're on
17 Glendale Avenue, you can push that north to Northern along
18 43rd Avenue.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: In Phoenix?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

21 Take D3 north.

22 Where you going, Brian?

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Take 3 north.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: 3 north.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are we following the mayor's

1 recommendation or what are you doing, Commissioner York?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I am adding -- no, no.
3 Not that. No, no.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh. So where are you pushing?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, the Latino Coalition
6 suggested that the southern -- northern boundary of that
7 area was Northern Avenue.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, that's what he's drawing is
9 District 3 north to Northern after picking up that pink area
10 which is apparently in District 8.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

12 No. Talking about above CD-3.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, that -- you're talking about
14 in the city of Glendale or are you talking about in Phoenix?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: City of Glendale.

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, we're taking it north of
17 Northern?

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: I mean, this is just a
19 suggestion.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. I mean, the --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Corner of Northern and Grand,
22 60.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So you're going to take
24 District 3 farther north into Glendale?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, 12.1 District 3 is

1 western boundary of 67th Avenue.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: The map -- yeah, the map that
3 we're looking at here has already put the mayor's request to
4 put north of Northern and over to 75th.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Oh. Well, I'm looking at the
6 map on my computer and it is on Glendale.

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Yeah, that's the earlier
8 version.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: I'm looking at 12.1.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aren't we on the common
11 version now of 13?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: But if you've incorporated
13 Commissioner Lerner's changes, which I didn't understand.

14 Well here's my thoughts, just hear me out: If you
15 take -- if you move the CD-3 in 12.1 north to Northern along
16 43rd Avenue, that takes a certain amount of population out
17 of 8.

18 Correct?

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: So there's a corner of 8 that's
21 still not in 9, I would take -- I would put that into 9 and
22 I would take the population --

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Wait, which corner?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: You're looking at the wrong --
25 I'm not looking at that map.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, I got -- we're with you. I
2 just need -- zoom out so we can see what...

3 There you go.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was trying -- so you're up to
5 Glendale. The corner south of Grand, the map I'm looking --
6 I was basically going to put Maryvale in -- the town of
7 Maryvale above Camelback into 9, take some population from
8 3, and balance it with 8 and 9 along the western boundary.

9 That's a thought, Commissioner Neuberg, how to sort
10 of incorporate their suggestion a little more completely.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. I got it. So District 3 is
12 adding the area that the Glendale mayor requested and then
13 you'd balance it by District -- what population District 9
14 loses, it would make up by taking Maryvale?

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I would take that top
16 corner of Maryvale, that area west of the 101 --

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- the Camelback north, I would
19 put that in 9; and then I would balance along the eastern
20 boundary of 8 with 9; and I think 3 will still be a little
21 overpopulated, so --

22 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- you can move the...

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think, you know what, I
25 understand what you're trying to do, Commissioner York, I

1 appreciate it, but I don't think we want to be moving
2 Maryvale into 9.

3 And is there --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, there's --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I appreciate your effort.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- I was trying to accommodate
7 the 43rd to 67th Avenue request you made --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- in a way that didn't disrupt
10 1 and didn't change the map's outcome much, but it did move
11 population in a way that the Latino Coalition had suggested,
12 so. If you're not interested in that, the...

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then we're good leaving them as
14 they are.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yep.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is there something you
17 prefer?

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I mean, I was trying to
19 accommodate and I have -- and this has been a request for a
20 while to Northern, but it meant moving population in 1, 8,
21 and 3 to get them to align, and if you're not going to
22 accept those, I can tell you that we're not -- I mean,
23 that's what I was trying to do 'cause you can't just shift
24 them between each district or somebody -- somebody gets
25 effected.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I was just trying to make
3 those adjustments to do those balancing to accommodate that
4 community, but we've already talked about Maryvale being in
5 3 and we want to keep it there.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, it -- so the moves are
7 between 8 and 9 and 3, and we can do that with -- with my
8 suggestion but if -- and it doesn't affect 1 at all. And,
9 you know, we're happy with 1.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And we think there could be
11 improvements on 1 and the changes that we were talking about
12 would be in alignment. I'm also looking at the fact that
13 the mayor and Councilwoman Pastor had -- had made some
14 suggestions for some changes as well in 1.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well --

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I understand that there
17 may -- there may be no appetite for changing it, but I can
18 tell you that from our perspective I think we were trying to
19 make these changes using three districts where we wouldn't
20 severally impact any major -- add a community into
21 District 3, do some minor changes that would help population
22 balance between District 1 and District 8 to accommodate
23 that, and that's -- that's what we were trying to do.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: But you added people to 3 and
25 you took people from 9 and 8.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, we didn't do anything
2 with 9 at this point, we hadn't touched it, we hadn't gotten
3 to that. We had just gotten -- we had -- I had just gotten
4 between 1 and 8 to try to, again, do some population
5 balancing as part of that.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: But Commissioner Lerner, on
7 12.1 the boundary is 67th Avenue for CD-3, and we moved it
8 to 75th Avenue which meant that population came out of 9 --

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Right. Just -- just --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- and 8.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just to clarify, yes, part of the
12 mayor's request did take some population out of District 9.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's true. Okay. I just
14 had -- I just was looking at --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: For me the balance came in
16 Maryvale and the rest of the balancing would have been along
17 the top of --

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We aren't going to -- we
19 don't want to move Maryvale out of 3.

20 And honestly, I -- we got the letter when we were
21 talking yesterday but I hadn't taken -- I knew that this was
22 something they wanted to accomplish...

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then I would recommend we move
24 on 'cause -- and just leave -- leave this area alone.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- go ahead.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, and I -- and I want to,
2 you know, again defend CD-1 if there's going to be
3 implications there. I mean, we have a vote -- a vote spread
4 that, you know, is like -- like 48.8 to, like, I don't know,
5 it's less two and a half percent and it's equal with Ds and
6 Rs winning; and if we're going to start messing with this
7 district, it's going to have ripple effects. So I want to
8 be careful with not messing with things that we already have
9 right, I think, in -- in most of our collective opinions.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- go ahead.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I was just going to say,
13 where are you at with this map?

14 You've stated several times you're not happy with
15 it, we've continued to try to work with you.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- well, I am not happy
17 with this map as you know. We've made a couple of
18 adjustments that I feel help make it more competitive but
19 also help align communities of interest in a much better
20 way, and that's what we've attempted to do in a couple of
21 different places, but I'm not as comfortable with
22 District 1.

23 I feel at this point this map is still not as
24 competitive as I would like to see it, I understand that I
25 have a different perspective than others.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: District 1 is balanced.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. So just clarifying, a
3 point spread of 2 percent and 5-4 in elections, that doesn't
4 meet your criteria for highly competitive?

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's -- that's not what I'm
6 getting at.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What -- what --

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is highly -- it is
9 competitive.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So -- so actually before we
11 use different criteria to judge each district, can I ask:
12 What is your criteria for highly competitive?

13 Before we use different judgments for districts.
14 What would you view?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- my -- if you recall when
16 we first were establishing the criteria I wanted the
17 smallest number, which was that 2 percent number that we
18 talked about.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So we're at 49-51 it has to
20 be within 2 percent --

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's my view.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- other than THAT it's not
23 highly competitive?

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's my view.

25 That's my perspective, because I believe that when

1 you are within a couple of points anybody can win an
2 election at that point.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: But you can't --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And everybody has to
5 accommodate each other.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With that --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: I also --

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Please also extend that to
9 the tracking of races. So we have nine races, 5-4, that's
10 another objective --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Absolutely.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- measure. What would
13 define highly competitive for you?

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So either a 4-5 or 5-4 are
15 highly competitive, and I'm comfortable with it.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Only 5-4? So -- so 6-3 is
17 not highly competitive?

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not as much for me.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So with a 2-point range and
20 5-4, I just want to make for a record that we are -- that
21 Commissioner Lerner is establishing a criteria for
22 competitive that is between 49 and 51 percent and by
23 definition 5-4.

24 That's an extremely narrow view with statistical
25 noise, since what we do and as a social scientist I could

1 tell you that there's sufficient noise in our data, is
2 asking for a level of specificity that I think robs us of
3 real-world data because we simply don't have enough data to
4 get to that level.

5 So I'm deeply concerned a little bit about that
6 specificity of competition because, quite frankly, I don't
7 think we can satisfy it.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I -- I understand what you're
9 saying and I -- I do have some flexibility in it. You asked
10 me for what my criteria are, that's my criteria.

11 I have flexibility as well within that. What I
12 would like to see is I -- I do like to look at these -- I do
13 have a 4-5, I do believe that's the most competitive we can
14 get is 5-4/4-5.

15 In this map that we have that we've put together, I
16 feel that we have -- we will end up with two competitive
17 districts that will be 4-5 -- and I'm saying four from a
18 Democrat, five Republican just for that understanding. I'd
19 be more comfortable if we had two very competitive
20 districts, one was 4-5 one was 5-4. I'm just being very
21 honest here with my perspective.

22 If we keep what we did down in District 6 --
23 between District 6 and District 7, which is a huge
24 compromise from my perspective because it's not the way we
25 would -- it doesn't fit everything that we had asked, we

1 have a 4-5 district. And I don't know exactly what the
2 numbers were, I think I wrote them down, 51 to 48, almost
3 49, it's almost a perfectly balanced district in that area.

4 District 2 is another 4-5 district and that's where
5 my concern is now we have two.

6 But these changes were starting with really not the
7 competitiveness piece, please understand. They were
8 starting with this community of interest that was there and
9 then trying to make a few minor adjustments as part of it.

10 So just I'm hoping that clarifies a little bit my
11 perspective.

12 So there's flexibility. I understand what you're
13 saying as a social scientist as well. I understand that we
14 can't always be precise, but you asked me for my, you know,
15 what that was, that's what my preference is is that
16 2 percent.

17 You know it may be, it's a 2.6 percent now,
18 correct? That's very close. But again we have another 4-5.

19 So from -- from a global perspective, an overview
20 perspective, we have four very safe very un- -- very safe
21 Republican districts, we have two VRA districts which are
22 very safe Democratic districts, one that is now also fairly
23 Democratic and two that lean Republican. Would everybody
24 agree that that's where we're at?

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, we haven't accepted the

1 changes on 6 or 4, so I'm not sure where we're at.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, and -- and you know
3 what, to be perfectly honest Commissioner Lerner, I don't
4 look at it that way.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I know. I know you don't, we
6 look at it different.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I look it from our
8 communities of interest who we're honoring, where it
9 holistically fits; and, you know, if we're really making
10 decisions based on if something rides within a .5 or .75
11 vote spread, we're not doing something right by the
12 constitution; that's just not part of our constitution
13 duties.

14 And -- and I would like to get back to communities
15 of interest, contiguity, you know, all of the constitutional
16 criteria that we use to be making these decisions; and I do
17 believe at the end of the day that when we do right by that,
18 we're going to get where we need to go.

19 I deeply care about competitiveness. I am fighting
20 for competitiveness. I am saying that when we began
21 deliberating this new iteration and were looking at the
22 boundaries east of U of A, I am deeply focused on
23 competitiveness.

24 So let's get back to the constitutional criteria
25 and -- and make decisions on each and every location on the

1 map.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, we are good with
3 the remaining districts and I don't know if
4 Commissioner Lerner has any other districts she wanted to
5 talk about.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, this was my last
7 comment was this --

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- this change I was
10 recommending which comes as a VRA request, it's VRA
11 argument, it's honoring a community that the city of
12 Glendale recognized --

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're already past that.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- it's honoring the Latino
15 Coalition request, so it was going to be a few minor changes
16 in the surrounding districts, that was my final request.

17 And it sounds like we're not going to be able to
18 honor what the city of Glendale was asking for or what the
19 Latino Coalition previously asked because we would be making
20 some minor adjustments in D1 and D8, which would not
21 significantly impact either one but would allow for a
22 significant impact for that community. That was my last
23 request.

24 Otherwise, the other districts we -- we would still
25 love to hear some options on, just because we have this

1 discussion before about District 2 and making it in the
2 competitive range, we haven't gone back to that, but we
3 don't have any suggestions because we don't have any idea
4 right now.

5 But that was the last we request we had was trying
6 to honor this population by placing them in a district that
7 both the city of Glendale, the mayor of Glendale, the Latino
8 Coalition all felt was more appropriate, and then making
9 minor adjustments to 1 and 8 to accommodate that population.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So Madam Chair, the practical
11 streak in me suggests that we've had about as much to say on
12 this -- these maps as -- as we can.

13 And Commissioner Lerner and Commissioner Watchman,
14 if I were to make a motion to approve your changes in 4 and
15 to approve your D6 and adopt this map other than the minor
16 population changes that we would be making just to balance
17 population, no other major changes, would either or both of
18 you vote for this map.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And let me add a condition:
20 For now. Because I might vote for this map for now.

21 I'm going to --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: But --

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hold on one second.

24 I'm going to need to look deeper into CD-6 and be
25 convinced that those reports meet I think what -- what that

1 area in -- in the state is entitled to.

2 So -- so I'm -- I'm very ready to vote and lock it
3 in temporarily so that we have a little time in case there
4 are some minor changes -- I'm just not quite ready to a
5 hundred percent, but I'm curious about your answer.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not -- I'm not sure yet.
7 But what I'd like to do is -- I don't know that we need to
8 have the vote yet, do we?

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We have to vote today --

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- that's what I've been told
12 today is.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are you ready?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I probably want to think more
16 about that because of the Glendale issue. I'm just -- I'm
17 just -- I'm just being honest. If -- if --

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I think it's a pretty important
19 question to this point because how we would try to react
20 would vary on this answer.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would suggest we take a break
23 and get an answer to that question.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Lerner, just to
25 review, the Glendale change does not touch CD-1 it's --

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's a balance of population.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: A balancing of population
3 should be done in those three seats and that would be moving
4 some population in 8 out of 9 and 9 out of --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It could be done in 1, 8, 3,
6 9. We can do it all of those because we don't want to
7 disrupt huge numbers in any one of those districts.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just --

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're done with that.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just if I may? If that -- if
11 Glendale mayor's letter is the -- the hang-up piece here,
12 the other alternative would be take District 3 up to
13 Northern and simply balance it by bringing District 8 south
14 between Glendale border and District 1 without touching
15 District 1.

16 So there is a way to get the -- if the mayor's
17 letter is a hang up, we can do that in that small rotation
18 without getting into the more sensitive --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that would affect
20 District 9?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: That would be the trickier piece
22 would do -- it's easiest to take it north to Northern, it's
23 harder to go west to 75th, but we could probably find a way
24 there.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Because that would only -- it
2 could be done in 3, 8, and 9 without touching 1 if that was
3 the Commission's desire.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. All right. Let's mull
5 that part over and if we can take just a 10-minute break,
6 would that be okay?

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We can take a ten-minute
8 break.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And that would be enough.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: There's one little part.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That way
12 Commissioner Watchman and I can speak.

13 I'm sorry.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: One little point that I want
15 to share as you're convening and discussing the overall maps
16 because they all interrelate.

17 We talked about D1, it seemed you had some
18 discomfort with D1 that's highly competitive and literally,
19 literally a toss-up. I just want to make sure you're aware
20 that D1 voted for Joe Biden, Sinema, and Kathy Hoffman.

21 So when you're looking at the performance of that
22 district that you're deeply unhappy about, I would like you
23 to explain a little bit about why you feel that that is
24 harming communities of interest that you care about.

25 With that, we will take, what, a 10, 15-minute

1 break?

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: 10 minutes.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: 10-minute break.

4 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: 10 minutes.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thanks.

6 (Recess taken from 2:36 p.m. to 3:14 p.m.)

7

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you. Welcome back,
9 everybody. We are resuming on Agenda Item Number VI, draft
10 map discussion. We are in the midst of deliberating our
11 congressional map drawing.

12 I don't know where we left it off with my
13 colleagues. We are staying on the same map and we are
14 struggling with some tough decisions.

15 I'd say the major decision focusing on CD-6; if
16 there are other minor modifications to be made with CD-4,
17 CD-1, I think there's general consensus and I'm quite
18 pleased with it. But if there is a way that we were able to
19 better wrestle with maximizing all constitutional criteria
20 as it relates to CD-6 and 7.

21 Compactness, some of the changes that we made to,
22 you know, accommodate Mayor Romero's request and then
23 additional population, have U of A go into CD-6 I believe
24 and all of that, it's changed things, so we need to come
25 back and really look at it from a community of interest

1 perspective, a citizen HVAP, the population density for the
2 Latino community in CD-7. And -- as we, you know,
3 deliberate on compactness and contiguity because when we,
4 you know, make changes that go against the basic nature of,
5 you know, geography we need a good reason to do it.

6 So I look forward to having an ongoing conversation
7 about that and hope to have consensus about this district if
8 possible. I -- we have already gone on record as saying
9 it's capable of being highly competitive; we may all
10 disagree a little bit about what that means.

11 From my perspective, highly competitive is not only
12 within a range of four points but seeing that the -- the
13 over -- voting over elections changes at minimum more than
14 just once randomly in nine elections, but you know
15 preferably four, five, six at the time so that it's a truly
16 a toss-up seat. So let's dive back into this and try to
17 find --

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yes.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like first to suggest
21 we relook at District 4. Because we're -- we are not -- you
22 know, we have not been pleased all -- all day with the
23 changes in 4 and we'd like to suggest an alternative on 4.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, instead of the population

1 that Commissioner Lerner was concerned about, if you take
2 the 12.2 map -- or 12.1 map, the southern boundary of 4 and
3 Chandler was Chandler Boulevard and the eastern boundary was
4 Arizona Avenue, and so if you move Arizona, the eastern
5 boundary west to Alma School and move the southern boundary
6 north to Guadalupe, I believe that encompasses the
7 neighborhoods that she was concerned about; and then if we
8 move to western -- eastern boundary of CD-4 and incorporate
9 those other retirement communities that are north of the 60
10 and east of the 202 into that district, that puts all the
11 retirement communities together and also puts the Latino
12 community into CD-5.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Into CD-5 or 4? You mean 4?

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: 5.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, the whole point is not
16 to have them in CD-5, that was why we requested that --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Half of them -- half of them
18 are in 5 currently.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They were not in 5 of the
20 maps that we've proposed, they were only in 5 in the maps
21 that you proposed.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: In 5 in the map we approved.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And proposed. I -- we did
24 not vote for that map.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: We approved 12.1.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So I -- I don't know -- the
2 community there is -- should be in a district that is more
3 aligned with them and has more -- District 4 is a much
4 better fit for that community of interest that is in that
5 area. They live -- you're literally would be taking them
6 apart from other communities that -- that are right there.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: It keeps the Asian community
8 together well, it also is --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: How do you think that
10 they'll be -- that this will be handled for a minority
11 community to be in District 5 with --

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner Lerner, we were
13 very patient with you today --

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Excuse me? A little --

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: -- on drawing changes and we
16 would like to at least outline our change before you
17 critique.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I thought Commissioner York
19 had already done so and please don't patronize me.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're not patronizing you,
21 Commissioner Lerner. This map, the original southern
22 boundary of CD-5 was Chandler Boulevard not Pecos.

23 And that community is along Arizona Avenue so if we
24 bring it whole to Alma School, you've said yourself the
25 boundary is McQueen to Alma School, so from my standpoint

1 instead of -- we were able to incorporate all the retirement
2 communities in the eastern boundary of -- of CD-4 as well as
3 the Latino community into CD-5, consolidate it with the rest
4 of Gilbert and Chandler.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We can't accept any change
6 like that.

7 That -- that would disenfranchise that community.
8 They should be in District 4. It's a district that is much
9 more aligned with their values, with their perspective.
10 There are other communities of interest very similar to them
11 in other parts of that district, District 5. You just
12 mentioned previously before our break about the connection
13 between some of the communities that we were trying to add
14 in District 1 and how they would be served by north
15 Scottsdale, this is the same argument that you just made.

16 These communities will not be well served in
17 District 5.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: I also --

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: They would be -- the
20 retirement communities which previous to this map had been
21 in District 5 per their request are -- should be in
22 District 5, as it aligns with their perspective and others
23 in that -- in that district and who they -- and this group
24 should be with District 4.

25 Now, there may be some other ways to make some

1 changes on the East Valley, I'm open to that suggestion, but
2 this particular group needs to be with District 4. If you
3 want to propose -- we can put them in District 4 if you want
4 to make some changes on the borders on the east. I'm open
5 to hearing your suggestions.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: My suggestion is to move one
7 block west from Chandler Boulevard and Arizona Avenue to
8 Alma School and north to Elliot, but that's a far smaller
9 change than you suggested, and then we have three
10 communities that we can pick up that are just east of the
11 202 into the senior living block that we've put together.

12 I think we satisfy both needs, it makes the
13 District 4 more competitive from a standpoint of -- and I
14 don't know, I think the Latino community needs to be in a
15 growth area of -- of Maricopa County. They continue to
16 provide labor and -- and work for the construction industry
17 that is so vibrant out in that part of Maricopa County. Why
18 would they not want to be represented by someone in that
19 area?

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You're --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Now you're trying to put them
22 with the Tempe, urban Ahwatukee, Mesa corridor.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm putting them with a very
24 diverse community that's in District 4. And this is -- this
25 community as -- you would have to redesign, this is not a

1 small change that you're talking about, but you would be
2 breaking up this part of Chandler as well where you have --
3 this is not just -- it's this piece that was left out,
4 there's a big piece that's still in, so you would be
5 basically taking -- it's not just taking that small
6 community over there, there's a much bigger area as part of
7 that.

8 They would be much better served being in
9 District 4 than in District 5. And this goes with your own
10 arguments that you made when we talked about the small
11 change I wanted to make from District 3 to District 1.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: District 1 was already very
13 competitive and we didn't need to touch District 1.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was a community of
15 interest change.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: The changes you suggested with
17 District 3 were with 3, 9, and 8.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're simply not going to
19 agree. This is basically -- what you're doing is going to
20 marginalize this population by putting them -- if you want
21 to put them into District 5.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Putting them together.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're putting them together
24 in District 4 with a population that is much more like them
25 throughout that district. If you look at the demographics

1 of that District 4, it is much more aligned with that
2 community than is District 5; which again goes with your
3 argument that you made about District 1 and the community
4 that I was suggesting move in from District 3.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: You were moving 55,000 people
6 around, Shereen.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I was moving a small
8 community area when you said how does that align with
9 Scottsdale. And I am -- I could ask the same thing here.

10 What I'm saying is the community we're talking
11 about here is much more aligned with the community in
12 District 4.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: We've made numerous concessions
14 throughout our process here, Shereen, and, you know, and
15 we're asking for this concession to include the senior
16 living community together and -- and make it more whole than
17 it currently is as opposed to disruptive as you currently
18 have suggested and also making the Latino community whole
19 and in south Chandler.

20 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I ask a question. Is
21 there any harm to this?

22 I guess I'm confused -- I mean, it's unfort- --
23 fortunate maybe that we're diving into something that I
24 actually think is not at the heart of major division, this
25 is a problem to solve. So I guess I'm failing to understand

1 and just every -- everybody could just be straight shooters,
2 who is the population, what are the pros and cons of moving
3 them? And it shouldn't be a huge issue because it's not
4 going to fundamentally change anybody's, you know, basic
5 elected leaders or the overall map.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: Our -- our original suggestion
7 had Leisure World and the retirement communities east to the
8 202 going down to Guadalupe and the Mesa city boundary south
9 of the 60, there are three other communities we left out
10 with that suggestion and so to incorporate them we would
11 like to take the Latino minority that is split, like
12 Ms. Lerner has stated, along Arizona Avenue to the west and
13 incorporate it going as far west as Alma School.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And the community that he is
15 talking about moving into a district where they would not
16 have any alignment. The community, putting them into
17 District 4 aligns --

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would disagree with that.
19 Chandler High School --

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And it's not --
21 Commissioner York.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- Hamilton High School, those
23 high schools could use the --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You made your statement,
25 Commissioner York.

1 You -- this is -- take a look at the demographics
2 of the map.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: We have.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: If you take a look at the
5 demographics, putting that community into District 5 will
6 disenfranchise them.

7 You -- I have said if you have alternatives to
8 looking at how to combine the retirement communities, by all
9 means we're open to that suggestion, but I am not open to
10 not (verbatim) having that community be disenfranchised by
11 being placed in District 5, particularly when you made the
12 same argument when I tried to make a move of a community
13 that would be aligned with their neighbors between
14 District 3 and District 1.

15 This community belongs with others who have
16 like-minded -- this is very much like the comm- -- like
17 District 3, there are a huge amount of diversity in
18 District 4. This community should not be disenfranchised by
19 being placed in a community that does not have the diversity
20 that is in there. That is as clearly as I can state that.

21 The way you're describing that community and not --
22 not having it be in an inclusive environment. This is why
23 we made that change.

24 Open to how you might want to deal with the
25 retirement communities, I don't see why they get preference

1 over a diverse community that exists in this area.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: If we could expand that area,
3 there probable -- there's probably a border where I would,
4 too, be very uncomfortable. I mean, Commissioner Lerner is
5 exactly right about the demographics there that would be
6 entirely disenfranchised in -- in D5.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: The original border, the
8 southern border of that corner was Chandler Boulevard.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: No, I'm looking at the
10 eastern border between the blue section that you highlighted
11 and the gold.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's -- that's McQueen, I
13 believe.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, that is McQueen.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah. So west of McQueen.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And it was just going up to
17 the border of the city, that's why I think it went that far
18 north.

19 And again, Commissioner York, if you have a
20 suggestion on that population balancing on the east side, we
21 could certainly look at that.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: The people who live there,
23 it's very close to downtown Chandler, it's
24 majority-minority, extremely low SES, you know.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's SES?

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Socioeconomic status.

2 Highly Latino, single-family homes, some
3 Native American but it's a beautiful area in that it's so
4 connected to a top-notch school, public school, so it pulls
5 in just a great diversity of people that work very well
6 together.

7 And there are important pockets of people in D4
8 that if they were in D5 they really, truly will be neglected
9 and it -- and it would be incumbent upon their connections
10 in their home to do right by them, it's a sensitivity we
11 ought to have.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I appreciate that, but
13 what about the sensitivity in the northeastern portion of
14 that area up in -- north of the 60 in the East Valley?

15 I mean, there's 45 (verbatim) retirement
16 communities, some in D4, some in D5.

17 And I mentioned those on the record, the ones that
18 weren't included, there's at least 12, so I was trying to
19 include those into D4 to give them a united voice.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you could move them into
21 D5 if you want to give them that united voice.

22 And there are retirement communities in other parts
23 of D4, so it's not like the retirement community will be
24 disenfranchised. You have Friendship Village, you have
25 other areas within D4, so being split into two, there's

1 plenty of retirees in both areas, D4 and D5.

2 Most of those communities had requested D5 because
3 they felt that they would be more aligned with that group.
4 So splitting the retirement -- D4 has -- there are plenty of
5 retirees in both communities, both districts. That is not a
6 community that will end up being disenfranchised, they're
7 voters, they go to meetings, they're out there, and having
8 them in two districts we're going to split is not -- is not
9 going to disenfranchise those communities.

10 Remember, it's Arizona, we have retirees pretty
11 much everywhere.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: And we have Hispanics pretty
13 much everywhere.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And not all the Hispanics are
15 going to go into District 4 or District 3, they're
16 distributed. But when we have pockets like that, when we
17 have groups and neighborhoods like that, there's no reason
18 to split them up.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg, I just
20 saw it as an opportunity to consolidate two areas in two
21 different districts and basically follow along more
22 uniformly with the original map we had approved to make our
23 districts more competitive and also include communities of
24 interest together.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'm appreciative of the

1 competitiveness and the population balancing and -- and the
2 compactness, I just want to reiterate I think there's a
3 section in the Chandler area that isn't best being captured
4 and, you know, if there's a slight way and then -- and I'm
5 seeing it on the CD and the LD front, that there's a slight
6 way to put -- you know, look, when I think about the next
7 up-and-coming majority-minority group, I believe it's going
8 to be the Asians. They've already surpassed
9 Native Americans, they're 4 and a half percent of the
10 population and they're all centered -- I don't want to say
11 all, they're deeply centered in the East Valley.

12 Now, unfortunately for them, it's not in this one
13 exact corner, but it happens to be the northeast part of
14 Chandler and Gilbert and Mesa and this is an area that, you
15 know, ten years from now I'm going to be interested in
16 listening to how the Redistricting Commission is tracking
17 them.

18 But we ought to track them because they're also
19 intentionally aligning with Latino partners to maximize
20 their -- their collective voice from a political
21 perspective. There was a woman, Jennifer Chau, I spoke with
22 just to help, you know, educate me about, you know, the
23 Asian area, and -- and they're making remarkable strides in
24 registering people for voting and getting them engaged
25 because they're remarkably excited about democracy.

1 So when I see something going really right about a
2 particular area in our state, I want to, you know, do right
3 by them.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Thank you, Chairwoman.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Is there anything else in
6 this area? Do you want to go to other areas or do you want
7 colleagues to begin to tackle the challenging decisions we
8 have ahead?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Chair Neuberg, if I might. One
10 thing you see on the screen here is the border of Gilbert
11 and you can see there are -- there's a piece on the
12 northwest and a piece on the north that are currently
13 through all these various changes have been taken into
14 District 4, and I just want to confirm if you're comfortable
15 with those, they can stay as they are. I didn't know if you
16 want to take those back -- those pieces into 5.

17 They're not any of the Hispanic community or
18 anything we've been talking about today, and then you'd have
19 to balance it obviously, but 4 could come back down farther
20 south along the 202 as we were balancing earlier.

21 I haven't looked at how much would need to be done.

22 But if you're comfortable with it as it is, that's
23 fine. I just wanted to flag that that was a piece of the
24 city divided off.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would be comfortable with

1 that.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the bigger priority,
3 Shereen, the Latino Coalition or the retirement community?

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm not going to judge both,
5 I think they're both important. They're -- these are
6 different communities of interest and -- and I'm not saying
7 the Latino Coalition, I'm talking about a Latino population.
8 So I'm not going to put one higher than another. I am
9 saying this group has been -- this is a better fit for this
10 group.

11 As for the Gilbert border, can you provide that
12 just so I can see where you're talking about. I mean, I --
13 I think we're -- from my perspective, it's fine the way it
14 is, but --

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the population of the
16 Gilbert border on the north and in the west?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, those two places. So
18 what would happen to those would you suggest, Doug?

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would move those and take in
20 Leisure World and the retirement communities west of the
21 202.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Wrong way.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You would do what, I'm sorry?
24 What was your suggestion?

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would try to consolidate the

1 Leisure World and the 202 corridor.

2 I would just keep the northern boundary of
3 Baseline, I think that's what that is, or Guadalupe, one of
4 the two.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So put that into District 5,
6 is that what you're suggesting?

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then what would that do
9 from a population perspective?

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, you take it out of...

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Out of District 4.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Take it out of 4 and put it
13 into 5.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So the only question
15 I have is how would we balance the population? I'm not --
16 I'm not saying it's a problem, I'm just asking the question.

17 MR. FLAHAN: So the top section here without the
18 notch that goes up to the hospital and Higley Road is
19 16,829.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's that population on the
21 west?

22 MR. FLAHAN: Roughly 3,405.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Let us think about that.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: How would that be balanced?
25 Would that be to put more of Chandler into 4 or what would

1 you be thinking?

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would put -- I need to think
3 about it, but my suggestion would be to go north of the 60
4 and include the retirement communities of 4.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: You're not -- you're probably
6 not going to get all of them in there.

7 How much of Chandler north of Pecos is in 4 and 5?
8 Could you show us that breakout?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: North or south?

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, just the boundaries of
11 Chandler, maybe you could just show us that.

12 Otherwise from my perspective we could just keep it
13 the same.

14 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the population --
16 original map was down to Chandler Boulevard? The Chandler
17 down to the freeway east to the 101.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the area we just
19 added, isn't it?

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: That's part of the area you
21 added, yeah.

22 MR. FLAHAN: South of Chandler Boulevard, yes. The
23 area highlighted there is 27,690.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Is that the part that we just
25 added, though, to District 4 already?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: You added north of that and
2 south of Chandler Boulevard and you run north, original
3 boundary was Arizona Avenue.

4 MR. FLAHAN: So the Pecos area where it's south of
5 Pecos down to the 202, that is 5,526.

6 COMMISSIONER YORK: What was the original boundary
7 on the north?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That would actually work with
9 the eastern part if we wanted to do that -- of Gilbert, that
10 switch.

11 MR. FLAHAN: The original boundary as seen there
12 was Chandler Boulevard to 101.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Right, and what was the
14 population down to the freeway?

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. My notes...

16 From Chandler south was 27,690.

17 So it would be -- and that -- if we were uniting
18 Gilbert, we'd be putting 20,000 people over there.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But if we used Pecos as the
20 boundary that would be almost in alignment.

21 I mean, I guess I'm curious, though, we've made
22 some changes already --

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: Let's take --

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- in this area. I'm just
25 curious what you're talking about is just trying to get

1 those two spots of Gilbert into 5.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct, I was just wondering --

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: I was trying to get the
4 retirement communities into 4.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I don't know why they
6 have to move to 4. Again, Commissioner York, they were in 5
7 until this iteration. You switched them to 4 and I still
8 never heard a real good reason for it when you had them in
9 5, but I don't know that I want to relitigate --

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Can I please -- yeah, can I
11 please -- we're at the point where we're really close and --
12 and let's stay constructive with problem solving. Let's not
13 go back. Let's just move forward with figuring out what's
14 going to work with our collective vision.

15 Continue. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm comfortable with the way
17 District 4 is currently. I'm -- I'm -- and -- and
18 District 5, I think we've had that conversation.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, District 4 from the
20 approved maps of 12.1 was within a -- I think a four point
21 spread, this current district is not. I'm trying to find a
22 solution that you're okay with, which was to include the
23 minority district in the southwest corner -- southeast
24 corner of District 4. I just would like to move some
25 population out of District 4 back up into the northeast

1 corner of District 5 and unite the retirement community
2 so --

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I still haven't --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And that would do no
6 detriment to any of the other goals? Can you clarify that,
7 please.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: I don't believe so. It would
9 put a community of interest of the retirement communities
10 together in one district and it would still consolidate the
11 minority area that Commissioner Neuberg is concerned with --
12 not Commissioner Neuberg, Commissioner Lerner is concerned
13 with.

14 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And Neuberg.

15 And -- and it would not cause significant detriment
16 to levels of competitiveness. I mean, not that any of these
17 districts are extremely competitive anyway.

18 I just -- when we say --

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: It would enhance the
20 competitiveness maybe of District 4, I'm not sure.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: District 4 was one of our
22 competitive districts, it's not any longer, so we're trying
23 to bring District 4 back into a competitive range as -- and
24 one of the goals.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I will just ask then,

1 let's go ahead and start working on some of the districts
2 that are not -- not there.

3 I'd love to have --

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: 6 is there.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- District 2 to be discussed
6 because that's outside of our competitive range; and before
7 we make any changes to 4 and 5, I really would love --
8 because District 4 is in our competitive range, I would --
9 and even with these changes --

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I don't believe it is.

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- and I would love to hear
12 some suggestions on how we can modify District 2 because --

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Shereen, you said your
14 competitive range was two points and four and half --

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, my competitive range
16 is, but the Commission's competitive range is seven points.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I hate to squash this
18 conversation but, you know, there's a lot that I really like
19 about CD-4 and I went on record as saying that it so
20 captured Tempe and Mesa and -- and kind of that, you know,
21 light rail, and I felt so confident that that representative
22 would be partners with Phoenix.

23 You know, the more we mess with bringing in all
24 these different demographics for the sake of increasing
25 competitiveness, it's going to change the community of

1 interest and the value of what these people are wanting in
2 an elected leader.

3 So as always, I don't think I've had to do this
4 before, but I think I have to like bring my Republican, you
5 know, colleagues, rein them in here and say do not inject
6 competitiveness at the expense of the value of why we're
7 bringing these people together in the first place.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg, we've
9 tried hard to adopt all of your requests, I thought in our
10 listening tour that we heard that senior communities like to
11 be consolidated.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I would love that as long as
13 it does not cause detriment to this vision of this district
14 as being an urban representative for Arizona.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And -- and we especially
16 heard that from the communities in the West Valley, the
17 Sun City group, they want to be together.

18 It was not as clear from this group other than they
19 said that their preference is District 5 because they felt
20 it would be better represented with that community.

21 But they are not like the Sun Cities in the West
22 Valley where they're literally all right there, these
23 communities are separated to some extent; some are close,
24 some are a little bit further. They wanted to be in
25 District 5 which would be -- we could certainly look at

1 that, but at this point just to move them -- I agree with
2 Chairwoman's Neuberg's (verbatim) comments about the kind of
3 district that District 4 is. These communities would fit
4 probably better in District 5 in terms of the population
5 that they'd be in.

6 I would like to see if we could have a conversation
7 about District 2 if that would be possible to see if anybody
8 has any suggestions on that because the prior maps that we
9 had, had that district in our competitive range in the six
10 range -- 6.2 to 6.8 and now it's at 7.1 with this map. And
11 so I don't know if there's a way to do anything that would
12 make that a little bit more competitive, and I would
13 appreciate suggestions because I actually don't know that I
14 have any good suggestions on that one.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We don't have any suggestions.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's the population on those
17 two districts, Brian? Mark? 4 and 5?

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 2 is over by about 3,000 -- or,
19 I mean, under.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, I'm talking about 4 and 5.

21 MR. FLAHAN: 4 right now is over by 645 people; and
22 5 as drawn on the map, I should reiterate that right now, is
23 1,378 under.

24 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Just as a -- out of
25 curiosity, this is the first time I've heard you, you know,

1 kind of focusing on bringing down the extremism of districts
2 that are, you know, really out of reach of -- of
3 electability in terms of a candidate. So are you feeling
4 that the ability to shrink a percentage here and there from
5 districts that we already probably know the outcome, you
6 feel that that would be helpful from, you know, both a
7 constitutional perspective and really what it's about which
8 is empowering people?

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I would like to see if we
10 could make that attempt. I think that -- as you know, I
11 prefer the smaller competitive; knowing that we cannot
12 achieve that in that district, the closer we can get to
13 that, the more potential there would be for people to be
14 empowered.

15 Knowing that we can't go more than probably one or
16 two points, I think that's still going to be a better -- a
17 better piece than leaving it where it is where there really
18 is no -- I don't think much of a potential.

19 So yes, I -- from a constitutional perspective, I
20 think it does -- if we can do that, I think it would be
21 beneficial to the communities that live in that district.

22 COMMISSIONER YORK: Commissioner Neuberg, so this
23 is my issue. This is complete contradiction to the previous
24 argument about CD-4 and CD-5. I was making an effort to
25 make them a little bit more balanced by including some

1 communities I believe need to be joined together and -- and
2 Commissioner Lerner's suggestions have made them less
3 competitive, and now -- now we are going to CD-2, which the
4 outcome is going to be relevant to what the maps currently
5 are and -- and now we have to go listen to an adjustment in
6 CD-2. I'm not sure I'm following the -- the thought -- how
7 we can go back and forth on our -- on our thought process.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that's probably why I
9 asked the question, just out of curiosity of you,
10 Commissioner Lerner, have an opinion about a range of
11 competitiveness that's worthy of keeping, you know, on
12 target.

13 I've -- I've always said even if it's a ten point
14 spread or 12, I've always had the view that there was value
15 to moderate to all districts; that even if we knew one party
16 would win, that it would require people to be interacting in
17 ways and a candidate to be accountable. But -- but the only
18 feedback that I've heard from others is this, you know, four
19 point spread.

20 So if we are going to use it as an argument, I just
21 want to be consistent across the board so we're treating it
22 fairly.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'm -- I'm actually in
24 complete agreement with everything you just said, and I
25 don't see that that's inconsistent either because we're in

1 an area that has a big vote spread and all I'm trying to do
2 is just make that a little bit tighter to fall within our
3 range to a greater extent. I don't see that that's a
4 different perspective.

5 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Good.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I know we're working off
7 of this map, I know we're not going -- and again, it's not
8 like I have any ideas, maybe it's just for the record that I
9 feel this district could have been different had we had -- I
10 don't know how we would make that.

11 I know -- I know when we had in our 12.0 map, when
12 we had shifted Casa Grande into that district it dropped to
13 6.2 as a change. Still with the elections at a zero to nine
14 but it seemed a little bit more competitive. If we're
15 unable to do that, I don't have other alternatives; I guess
16 it's more just a comment to make that it would be nice if we
17 could have come up with a way to make that district more
18 competitive.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think it would but my
20 recollection of deliberation is we gave thought to the Salt
21 River Pima tribe, we gave thought to what role that, you
22 know, community of interest more broadly would advocate for
23 for our state so there were many other logical reasons for
24 as it developed.

25 I don't think we have great disagreement on -- on 4

1 right now. Is it...

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're not very happy with it,
3 so there is disagreement.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Well, let's go back to
5 it.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, we are --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And we're at the point where
8 we need to make decisions, so I'd like maybe each side to
9 just maybe say what your fundamental, you know, ask is
10 and -- and why and, you know, why it's so important to be
11 affecting other aspects of the map.

12 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We would argue to go back to
13 where we started today with D4, that it combines the
14 communities of interest on the east side and that it is a
15 more competitive district and -- and fits with the -- the
16 rest of the map better.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: By doing that -- I mean, I
18 feel like we've -- we've had this conversation already, but
19 by doing that you actually have -- I mean, it would be nice
20 to have all of the Republican districts be more competitive
21 as well. It -- it seems that the only districts you want to
22 make more competitive are D-leaning, let's do that with
23 R-leaning if we're going to talk about competitiveness.

24 From my perspective what I like about D4 is the
25 fact it basically takes communities that have very similar

1 interests with -- that we have seen -- Ahwatukee, West Mesa
2 in particular, Tempe, north Chandler. It takes communities
3 that are diverse, that have a lot in common and has
4 transportation corridors; it -- it has a number of different
5 urban areas and suburban areas in those and that's what I
6 like about the District 4 with the addition of that diverse
7 community in north Chandler that belongs with District 4.

8 Those are the communities we've -- we've united the
9 communities in Chandler, the minority communities. There
10 are large numbers of minorities in this district as well
11 that would be aligned with that group that we are asking to
12 move into District 4. It has both an urban and suburban
13 perspective on it. And I guess those are the main points
14 that I'd like to make about those.

15 The -- the East Valley -- far East Valley, the
16 Apache Junction, east Mesa, is a different population than
17 the more urban population in the -- and that suburban
18 population that encompasses the west Mesa and the heart of
19 Mesa and Tempe and Ahwatukee. Those folks who live in the
20 easternmost part tend to do a lot of interaction with Apache
21 Junction, with San Tan, Queen Creek and those communities,
22 which is why they would be better aligned in that area.

23 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: My view is that we don't need
24 to go out of our way to make it more competitive. I think
25 Commissioner Lerner made a coherent argument for why it

1 works as it does. I know it would be nice to add a little
2 competitiveness as -- if out of good nature you want to add
3 a little bit to the map, but I would like to just be able to
4 move on and adopt Commissioner Lerner's vision of D4 and the
5 implications of it.

6 I'm presuming that it has the implications moving
7 east to D5. Correct?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yes.

9 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: There are no implications for
10 D1?

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think the changes that we
14 had recommended and as I told Commissioner York, if he
15 wanted to make some adjustments on the east side, if he had
16 some -- some modifications. We made those adjustments for
17 the communities of interest and population balancing on the
18 east, we did not go to the north.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I appreciate that. I was
20 trying to take some population out of that southeast corner.

21 You're all the way east to McQueen, if we go to Fry
22 Road to Pecos, you took that corner and the Gilbert north
23 corner -- the Gilbert north boundary on the west side.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Would you be adding that -- I
25 mean, I'm not sure -- that's the area that we're talking

1 about that has the high diversity, so I'm not sure what you
2 mean.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I'm talking about the
4 southern boundary of your add and the northeast boundary
5 there of Gilbert -- northwest boundary of Gilbert. I think
6 it was 8,000 people up there and about 16,000 people on the
7 south and I would go pick up a few more retirement
8 communities.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, why don't -- why don't
10 you move the retirement communities in District 5 and just
11 put them together as they've been in the past, pretty much
12 all the other maps.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: They go all the way to east
14 of -- west of Higley, Shereen.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I know. But they are
16 aligned, they --

17 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yes.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I guess I will just ask,
19 again the -- the retirement communities, you have a lot of
20 retirement communities in that area, if you have half of
21 them in one district and half in the other, I don't know
22 that retirees are -- I mean, because you actually have more
23 retirees as you go through both District 5 and District 4.
24 These are just the few in that one zone, but you have them
25 throughout both of those districts. You're not going to be

1 able to make a fully retiree district in this area.

2 And we're sort of -- I feel like we keep
3 relitigating that same corner that you keep trying to modify
4 over there versus what you might want to be able to do on
5 the east side. We keep going back to those same areas, I
6 think that --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, this map is balanced
8 right now.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. Both districts are
10 balanced so I think we could move forward with them.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: They were balanced before you
12 made these changes; you moved 55,000 people around, I was
13 just trying to only move about 15.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It was not an arbitrary move.
15 This was a pop- -- very specific population that we were
16 moving. This was not just taking a block and saying, "let's
17 move it," this is a population that should be together as
18 we've discussed.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: If we went to the Gilbert
20 boundary both on those two things you highlighted, on both
21 of those, and then put some of the retirement community back
22 in, can we at least just draw that quickly and see what it
23 would be?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Definitely, yeah.

25 And just looking at the numbers we were looking at

1 earlier, that would -- we'll confirm it right now, but it's
2 likely going to give you Leisure World back into 4 in
3 exchange for --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And -- and again, can I ask
5 why?

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, we'd be going to city
7 boundaries and we would be helping to consolidate some of
8 those retirement communities.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, but you're not going to
10 get all of them anyway and at this point I think what
11 you're -- so it's -- it's just interesting to me and I'm
12 going to be --

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You know, it reminds me of my
14 conversation with the Salt River Pima tribe --

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Would you please just keep
16 playing with it.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: -- when it was just a small,
18 little conversation and they said, you know what, this tiny
19 little boundary really means a lot of to us; and then
20 somebody else says this tiny area of Lehi really, really
21 doesn't belong. So I think it's actually kind to listen to
22 that. No?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I have no problem, it's
24 just I feel like we're -- if you're not -- if --

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Commissioner.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I feel like we're
2 relitigating some of these things that we've already had the
3 conversation and the effort is competitiveness on this to
4 decrease -- to change the number, but I don't --

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: That was your effort.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- see any of my Republican
7 colleagues doing that in their own districts to say let's
8 make this district more competitive. I'm -- as I had
9 mentioned, I was really open to the idea of let's go ahead
10 and look at that east area and see if there's some things
11 that could be done.

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Let's just cut through it
13 all --

14 COMMISSIONER YORK: You have four out of four --

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excuse me, colleagues.

16 If there are recommendations to keep retirement
17 communities whole, I have consistently gone on record about
18 how important it is that they feel united to express their
19 voice, that's a priority.

20 If there are political whatever maneuvers, that's
21 not a priority, it's not going to change anything meaningful
22 on the map, so let's just get on so we can finish the map.

23 So let's just focus on which communities of
24 interest really aren't being served, because competitiveness
25 is not going to make a difference in this area at this

1 point.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just to clarify, the numbers
3 we're running now would leave everything in District 4 that
4 Commissioner Lerner asked for and -- so -- 28 --

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I didn't ask for anything
6 right now, right?

7 MR. D. JOHNSON: I mean the earlier ask.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Previously.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I thought we had those and
11 they were pretty well balanced at this point, the districts.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, they were.

13 And so we're all -- the alternative we've been
14 asked to look at is simply leaving all that exactly as was
15 requested, then in -- District 4 would keep -- would keep
16 Leisure World -- not -- the area that we've shown is too
17 much, it's 20,000, so we couldn't come back that far south
18 and District 4 would lose its Gilbert population, so Gilbert
19 would be in District 5.

20 So this is 28,000 and we only needed 20,000.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So back off a little and I'd be
22 curious what it looks like.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And again, if you're not
24 accommodating all the retirees, then there's no real reason
25 to make the shift.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: Shereen, this incorporates
2 almost the majority of them.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And again, they asked to be
4 in District 5. And this district does not serve the same --
5 so this is -- you keep saying I'm being inconsistent, I will
6 say the same thing about when I asked for that change
7 between D3 and D1, it was the exact same argument.

8 This district is not aligned as District 5 is for
9 this community. The community of interest for the retirees,
10 as they have requested in many hearings in -- time and
11 again, was to be in District 5. Your move to put them in
12 District 4 was new in this -- in this iteration of the map,
13 and it was designed very specifically to change the
14 competitiveness, not because of a community of interest
15 argument.

16 COMMISSIONER YORK: But it did combine a community
17 of interest and it was not designed for competitiveness.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: But it is if you take them
19 out of the district they requested to be near.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This goes to town boundaries --

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: -- to compromise.

22 (Multiple speakers.)

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We're never going to get to
24 an agreement on this, I would say.

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL -- which has been a significant

1 thing all along.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: This is -- this is our --

3 MS. VAN HAREN: I'm sorry, Madam Chair. We have to
4 speak one at a time, otherwise the transcriptionist cannot
5 get everything.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Sorry.

7 How does this change affect competitiveness just
8 out of curiosity, this one change that we're talking about?

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the original request from
10 Commissioner Lerner had District 4 just within the 7 percent
11 spread.

12 We're just looking at population balancing and we
13 don't have the -- we're just counting the numbers to see
14 what would be involved, but this change would put all of the
15 Gilbert population into District 5 and then bring the area
16 north of Broadway over to 202 into District 4 and the
17 area -- yeah, perfect -- and the areas shown in blue into
18 District 4. The area in blue there and the area above it
19 over to 202.

20 COMMISSIONER YORK: What's it if you go all the way
21 across Broadway?

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: It goes over. We -- I think we
23 can get the -- I don't think there's anyone in the next
24 block over, the golf course, but...

25 Yeah, 20. Yeah, that's almost a perfect.

1 The area shown in blue now is almost a perfect
2 match for the Gilbert population in those two sections of
3 District 4.

4 COMMISSIONER YORK: If you take that block to the
5 east there, that one square that's Fountain of the Sun golf
6 course retirement community, I don't know how many people
7 are there.

8 Lower right-hand corner. No.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: That's going to be 23,000, so it's
10 3,000 too many --

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: -- for this spot.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Go back.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And let's make sure that
15 we're also looking at what happens to District 5 in terms of
16 competitiveness not just District 4, because this I think
17 significantly changes that as well.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Back that off and do the math
19 and see where we are.

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER YORK: Hold on. You need to leave
22 that community.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Back off something else?

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: Off by 3,000, we can find that
25 along the south Chandler border.

1 You need to -- you need to include the Fountain of
2 the Sun golf community if you're going to make this change.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I'm not in support of
4 this change.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, I'm not a hundred percent
6 supportive of your suggestion either.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, then we're even.

8 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I'm not -- I'm not sure
9 I'm supportive of this change, too.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Why would you not include the
11 Fountain of the Sun golf community?

12 Doug?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just taking it one step at a time.
14 So the area that we have to take from -- from -- to
15 unify Gilbert trades for the area we're looking at here and,
16 of course, if the Commission wishes we can look at an
17 additional trade.

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: We're trying to include the
19 retirement community and that one block is a retirement
20 community.

21 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we'll take it out somewhere
22 else.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, let us get you the number
24 for the first step and then we're happy to look at the
25 second step.

1 Population for District 5.

2 Almost there.

3 Okay. Okay. With those changes now -- oops.

4 District -- District 4 is over by only 327; District 5 is
5 short by a thousand, 1,060 to be precise; and District --
6 the competitiveness of District 7 is essentially unchanged.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: District 4 and 5 we're talking
8 about.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So District 4 would be at 6.96 I
10 think.

11 So the competitiveness -- so that change
12 essentially didn't change the competitiveness, so just
13 within 7 percent in District 4 and of course 5 is at --
14 stays at 18 percent spread -- or is now at 18 percent
15 spread.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So the difference in
17 5 -- and I want to draw this to your attention because I
18 think that's a lot of why you're making these changes.

19 COMMISSIONER YORK: For 5.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The difference in 5 goes --
21 is already at 16.6 in your map and it goes even higher which
22 is almost at a 20 percent -- it was 12.1, it was at 15.2,
23 and now it's at what, Doug?

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, it was at 18 and change
25 after the original -- after Commissioner Lerner's changes.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: And so it stays essentially at
3 18-plus.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, is it 18?

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Oh, I thought it was at --
7 okay, it was at 16.6 and that's already not competitive.

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, yeah, but neither is
9 CD-3.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, you know what, I like
11 these districts. Can we just stay focused on, you know,
12 refining them. I'm open to the changes, it didn't
13 fundamentally change what my needs are in the map. I don't
14 want changes to CD-1; I think CD-4 as our general conception
15 does a beautiful job of integrating the urban feel of Tempe
16 and Mesa-Gilbert and connecting into Phoenix and would be a
17 great partner with Phoenix and -- and it's within the realm
18 of competitive, maybe not unpredictable with who wins a race
19 predict- -- but, you know, competitive enough where elected
20 leaders are motivated to pay attention to their
21 constituents.

22 Now you guys are arguing about these little lines.
23 My request is it's 4 o'clock. Can we finish the arguments
24 about the little lines quickly; or if it's like part of some
25 major like, you know, "Oh, it's connected to my big dreams

1 about CD-6," just lay it on the line, please.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And CD-6, could you bring up
3 the -- the map that I worked from earlier? And I'd like to
4 go back and review when it was at Alvernon and see what --
5 what those numbers were again.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: The changes that --

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, we're talking about 12.1.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Well, 12.1 I don't think had
10 the Douglas-Bisbee in it yet.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, we'll open it to be sure.

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: Parker, Brian saved
13 Commissioner's Mehl's suggestions.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I thought 13 -- didn't you save
15 13.0 and that had a -- where I had made additional
16 concessions but at least it would be close?

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can I -- can I just make a
18 comment about the, quote, "concessions," please. We started
19 with the Republican maps that have been drawn today and we
20 have been making changes.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Our -- our maps. We vote.
22 We vote.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. The maps that had been
24 approved that had been initially done by the Republicans
25 that were approved, I will correct that.

1 These maps, when -- when Commissioner Mehl says
2 "concessions," I want you to realize that these are not maps
3 we are comfortable with and we are making a lot of
4 concessions, a lot of compromises, to work off of maps that
5 are -- we are not comfortable with.

6 Concessions that you're talking about are changing
7 the maps that have issues as part of it.

8 I just want to be clear that when we're working off
9 of maps that -- that we're uncomfortable with, we're asking
10 for some compromise here, and every compromise it seems like
11 that we've asked has been met with objection from our
12 counterparts.

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: We agreed to these maps. They
14 were pretty balanced, there were two districts were off by
15 2,500 people, and now we're moving around populations of 45-
16 to 50,000. Those are significant changes and, you know,
17 we're being convinced that we should accept those as they
18 are being proposed and we had already approved this
19 particular map, but I guess that's probably the reason why
20 we feel like we're making some compromises.

21 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, these -- and we are
22 compromising because we can't -- these are not -- you --
23 these were approved with a three-to-two vote, remember.

24 MR. D. JOHNSON: Can I say this, Commissioner Mehl,
25 is this the map you wanted to see?

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes. And is that boundary now
2 Alvernon or was it -- I don't remember 'cause we moved some
3 things around.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: I believe this one is Country
5 Club.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah. So I would like to see
7 that redone just to see the statistics again, taking it back
8 to Alvernon which means coming in from the East Broadway to
9 balance.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are we going back now to
11 relitigate this?

12 COMMISSIONER YORK: North of Broadway.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No one's agreed to this so
14 there's no litigation going on yet.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Well, I can say one thing is
16 we're deliberating it and I'm just going to reiterate what
17 I'm looking for, I'm looking for comprehensive conversation
18 about why constitutionally it makes sense so that when
19 you're making, you know, decisions about lines, does it
20 really make a difference if it's this line or that line and
21 all of that?

22 It is not compact, it's bringing it out, these
23 changes are having an impact on CD-7 and the Hispanic CVAP
24 there, and we have already seen that this can be a deeply,
25 highly competitive district.

1 So for me this is the type of district that I
2 expect a very high bar on all of the criteria and that
3 includes competitiveness.

4 So if there's something that isn't extremely
5 competitive, then it's not going to be something that I feel
6 that we have done our due diligence on with all of the
7 criteria.

8 So let's debate away but, you know, let -- I prefer
9 us to get closer to consensus 'cause, you know, I don't
10 really think that we're that far.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: I do want to remind the
12 Commission, it's -- we're past 4 o'clock and we need to have
13 a map tonight that we -- if you -- if you want to still have
14 time to balance it so you can vote on it tomorrow.

15 So Commissioner Mehl, this makes District 7, 20,000
16 overpopulated and District 6, 20,000 underpopulated.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And you come back on that
18 finger out on Broadway, you just come back there to balance.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: There you go. So that's balanced
20 within 940 people -- or I'm sorry, 740 over in 6 and 500
21 short in 7, so we just have to pick a couple of census blocs
22 in there to get it more balanced.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And it's still well under a
24 4 percent vote spread, it's still at a very, very
25 competitive district, it's a very clean line through Tucson

1 that I have argued at length is -- is the right place to
2 have the line in Tucson, so I would argue that this is the
3 correct way to do the Tucson map.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It is not a map we could
5 accept.

6 The -- the recommendations that we made earlier
7 with our compromise for that map gave stronger VRA
8 performance for CD-7. It actually followed your --
9 Commissioner Mehl, your original community of interest
10 concern about Alvernon as the boundary between Grant and
11 Broadway; it also listened to Mayor Romero's suggestions
12 about the boundary; it honored the differences in
13 socioeconomic status between communities north of Grant and
14 south of Broadway; it was also -- had a more competitive
15 performance at a 5-4 split versus a 7-2, and there's no
16 significant detriment in terms of doing that modification
17 that we request -- requested.

18 So if we follow the Constitution, those are all
19 reasons from a constitutional perspective, and when we talk
20 about competitiveness when there's no significant
21 detriment -- which there isn't because this follows, as I
22 mentioned, several different criteria -- then competitive
23 districts should be favored.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And this is a highly
25 competitive district.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Again, but this doesn't meet
2 all of the other criteria that I just mentioned. Your
3 original -- again, stronger VRA performance, the original
4 community of interest concern about Alvernon as the boundary
5 between Grant and Broadway; Mayor Romero's suggestions about
6 the boundary -- and we should not ignore the mayor of the
7 second largest city in the state; it also honors differences
8 in the socioeconomic status, as I mentioned, north and south
9 of Grant -- north of Grant and south of Broadway. So that
10 at that point then, competitiveness with a 7-2, that's the
11 part I'm looking at at this point. It's not just the 48.

12 I feel like I've given some great constitutional
13 reasons for this. And the original request that you had
14 had, had a 7-2 and we are -- with the modifications that we
15 have, we already acknowledge that the percentage isn't as
16 much different but the vote -- I don't know what we call
17 that, the vote count -- what do we call that?

18 COMMISSIONER YORK: Switch.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: The vote competitiveness
20 changes with these other changes to 5-4 and it is not at the
21 detriment of this community.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: The vote.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You took the Tucson mall out of
24 Tucson, out of that main Tucson district with downtown and
25 the university.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Both are in --

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's a better fit with the
3 urban -- with that more urban core. This is a very high
4 quality way to be dividing this map.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is still a 2-7 map and
6 we talked about that earlier about competitiveness. A 5-4
7 is a much more competitive and it does not harm -- and it's
8 a mall on top of that, okay? People go -- they don't know
9 what legislative district they're going to when they go into
10 the shopping mall, that is not the impact that we had. If
11 you recall it did not have a high population that was moved
12 when moving the mall. 18 people?

13 COMMISSIONER YORK: Community of interest, is it
14 not?

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I think we could
16 use a break, even a short one.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I would just make a
18 recommendation I think that from a -- we had -- Commissioner
19 Mehl, you had made a recommendation about whether to accept
20 this earlier, I think that -- and Commissioner -- Chairwoman
21 Neuberg had said she would want to accept this with a little
22 bit -- the potential for more study, but I think the
23 District 6, 7 that we had discussed earlier is something
24 that we could agree upon, the modification that we had had
25 even with some of our concerns about what happens in

1 Santa Cruz County. But I would suggest that we consider
2 supporting this one.

3 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What I would like to do when
4 we come back is I'm curious if we could use this vision,
5 this map we're working with right now, what Commissioner
6 Mehl has -- has started and if you could consider the
7 broader map of CD-6 and CD-7 and see are there other areas
8 in which maybe it makes sense to add Latinos into, you know,
9 one district or not or there are other small modifications
10 that could help us reach that threshold of that
11 competitiveness that I think would make you feel more
12 comfortable.

13 Because it is a constitutional criteria and I do
14 not believe that we need to cause any significant detriment
15 to anybody to achieve a high level of competitiveness, given
16 so many options that we have with population. So I would
17 welcome constructive ideas that are based on our
18 constitutional criteria.

19 And with that we'll take -- how many minute recess?

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Fifteen.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Fifteen, okay.

22 Fifteen-minute recess.

23 (Recess taken from 4:25 p.m. to 4:51 p.m.)

24

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Hello, everyone. Thank you

1 for your patience. We are returning to Agenda Item VI,
2 discussion -- I'm sorry -- yeah, VI, a draft map decision
3 discussion. We are in the midst of discussing our
4 congressional map drawing.

5 We will continue to debate and deliberate until we
6 are done tonight, so may be a bit of a late night but we
7 have a deadline for our mapping team to be able to do the
8 full population balance tomorrow and we will also have some
9 legislative work.

10 So I'm sure my colleagues will join me in being
11 really efficient and focused about fine-tuning our map and
12 thinking about what our higher priorities are at this
13 juncture.

14 So where did we leave off? I believe my Republican
15 colleagues may have asked for a recess.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes, I would like to bring up
17 that last map that we had.

18 Or if you saved the one where the line was Country
19 Club instead of Alvernon, I would bring that one up.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you scroll up so we see
21 5, 6 -- or I mean 6, 7?

22 Yeah. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So this map is at a 2.8 vote
24 spread. And what is the election split?

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: So we've got Democrat wins for

1 senator in 2020, essentially those -- the two 2020 elections
2 were essentially near perfect ties. Republicans won the
3 presidential race with 50.2 percent and Democrats won the
4 senate race with 50.27 percent.

5 And across the -- the Democrats also won the
6 superintendent of education election and so it would be a
7 7-2.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: A 7-2 with two of the others
9 being 49.8 and 49.7.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Correct.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: That's pretty darn close.

12 Can I ask, Commissioner Lerner, is there one slight
13 change you can recommend that would, you know, get us to
14 where we need to be?

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Chairwoman, the change that
16 we made was a huge compromise for us since this was not a
17 map that we were comfortable with and that change allowed
18 for a 4-5 split, still a Republican-leaning district with a
19 very similar vote spread but a difference on the competitive
20 measures and that -- I think that change works for this
21 district to provide that balance of a 4-5 and I don't have
22 an alternative to that that would give us that same result.

23 The difference is not in the percentage difference,
24 that's not -- we don't have much of a difference between
25 those, but we do have a big difference in the votes.

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: I thought --

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So all I'm asking is for us
3 to have a 4-5, preferably a 5-4, but that's not going to
4 happen here and I think that's a big compromise for us to be
5 saying it would be a 4-5 versus a Democrat-leaning.

6 And so I'm requesting that we go back to the
7 recommendations that we gave, keeping in mind this was -- we
8 had had other changes we would have liked, such as moving
9 Casa Grande, which would have made a bigger impact and given
10 us a real 50/50, 4-5 again district, but I think these
11 changes that we proposed are a really good balance and
12 provide that 4-5 and so I would request that we use that as
13 our marker.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we feel -- if you look at
15 this map, if you go up Country Club, there's major
16 university communities up Country Club all the way up
17 towards the river all the way up -- up to Fort Lowell is a
18 significant university neighborhood. So I just -- we're
19 still splitting university neighborhoods for no reason and
20 we're splitting hairs on what you've already identified as
21 things with margins of errors to them on data.

22 So -- so you look across the board at every
23 election, seven of the nine elections are within a point.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So then let's go to the 4-5
25 map. I don't understand why -- when that map, I gave you

1 all those good constitutional arguments for that. It's not
2 just about the university, there are other neighborhoods
3 within that that we are talking about and in the
4 modification that we requested.

5 So yes, the university is important, but it's not
6 just the university, there are other communities in those
7 areas and the university areas that you're talking about
8 applies primarily to neighborhoods south of Grant. And
9 there are other areas north of Grant that are different -- I
10 mean, in the north area. You've got working class
11 neighborhoods south of Broadway that fit better with D7.

12 There's a number of things that we already
13 mentioned as part of that and I don't see why we can't just
14 use -- this was a big compromise for us using this
15 particular layout instead of having the other splits that we
16 had requested which actually the Casa Grande split would
17 have actually helped District 2, the change with what was
18 happening along the border with District 7. I feel like we
19 have given quite a bit on this and -- and you're back to
20 basically the 2-7 split that you were before.

21 So my request is --

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then I would like --

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: -- that we go to the 4-5.

24 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then --

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: We used the border communities

1 in this map as well, creating a super robust CVAP for D-7,
2 you know. Your map does not consolidate the border
3 communities.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: No, I think they adopted it.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, they didn't.

6 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I would like to do a series of
7 small changes to this map.

8 So let's start with putting eastern Santa Cruz back
9 with D7, which should make Commissioner Lerner happy.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Honestly, I'll see what your
11 changes are. I mean, I'm not going to be happy overall
12 because this is a complete difference. We were ready to
13 compromise on the changes that we recommended which gave us
14 a close difference in terms of the competitiveness factor
15 and a 4-5, which you should be appreciating because it leans
16 Republican in that district.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd like to see
18 where Commissioner Lerner -- Commissioner Mehl is going and
19 then Commissioner Lerner if you have a plausible
20 alternative, I will give it one last consideration.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Are we leaving the part that goes out
22 to Bisbee in Douglas?

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER YORK: No, you're not leaving it in
25 Douglas.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I mean we're leaving it as it's
2 shown, yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're just adding -- down here
5 we're just adding the rest of Santa Cruz County to D7.

6 Then in Tucson go up to Country Club and Fort
7 Lowell, and from Country Club to Tucson Boulevard north of
8 Fort Lowell all the way to the river, add to D6. Tucson
9 Boulevard is halfway between Campbell and Country Club.

10 MR. FLAHAN: So you want us to go west on Fort
11 Lowell and north on North Tucson Boulevard all the way up to
12 the top of D7?

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes, and move that to D6.

14 And are we population balanced there? And what
15 happened on the -- on the elections?

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the Democratic vote for
17 president in 2020 went up from 49.8 to 49.94, so it's just
18 short of tipping, and the Secretary of State's election is
19 up to 49.85 percent; and then the Senate 2020 and the
20 superintendent of education elections remain Democratic
21 wins. It brought us closer but not quite there in terms of
22 flipping from a 7-2 to a 5-4.

23 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So let's -- let's fix some of
24 the university area and go -- take in the El Encanto
25 neighborhood at Broadway and Country Club, which is a major

1 university area, and take in -- so from Broadway to
2 Speedway, from Country Club to Alvernon, add that into D7.

3 And are you -- and did we take Santa Cruz, that
4 adjustment was made?

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah.

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Then let's go up to that Fort
8 Lowell neighborhood.

9 MR. FLAHAN: Is that the neighborhood you're
10 talking about drawn on the screen? That is Country Club --

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

12 MR. FLAHAN: -- to Alvernon all the way to
13 Speedway.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yeah.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And Commissioner Mehl, can
16 you just clarify on the constitutional reason for --

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Those are major university
18 neighborhoods. When moving from Alvernon -- it's one reason
19 I had originally been at Alvernon. El Encanto is a major
20 university neighborhood and there's neighborhoods right
21 north of El Con mall are almost all university area, so
22 that -- that is why I'm trying to combine those
23 neighborhoods.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And rather than put them into
25 District 6 you're moving them into District 7?

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With the university community,
2 yes, that's correct.

3 So then we need to balance on Fort Lowell, go over
4 to Campbell instead and see how we do.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: So the -- the first move was a
6 little over 4,000 people, the El Encanto move, and the
7 second move of north of Fort Lowell is about 2,100, so
8 District 6 remains about 2,100 short.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And we did flip at least
10 another election.

11 So we have -- we have 6-3 on the elections and --
12 and several other -- and another one 49.76 and two in the
13 48 -- over 48.5, so -- and this significantly improves the
14 university neighborhood by combining El Encanto that when I
15 backed up from Alvernon to -- to Country Club, it really was
16 a mistake on my part.

17 So this is -- this is a better community of
18 interest map, this is a very com- -- very, very competitive
19 district, it's only at 2.7 vote spread and it has a 6-3
20 election flip.

21 I think that --

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Commissioner Mehl, just -- I
23 believe it's still 7-2. So we get the senate race and
24 superintendent race are still there, but we didn't flip
25 another.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can you explain -- say what
2 the -- do we know what the CVAP is, the age VAP?

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes. In District 7 it's 50.88.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Madam Chair, I would -- so --
5 well, no, I'll hold off. I don't know if Commissioner Mehl
6 wants to say anything.

7 Could you -- could you just repeat where the
8 boundaries are right now, if that's okay, just so we can
9 take a -- I'm just going to pull up my -- my own map so I
10 can take a closer look where we're at with all these
11 boundaries because there's been a few changes and I don't
12 know if I've tracked them all. Thank you.

13 MR. FLAHAN: Sure. So District 7 took in the north
14 half of Santa Cruz County and District 7's boundary now is
15 at the north end, it's at Campbell Avenue, and on Campbell
16 Avenue it goes south to Fort Lowell Road, at Fort Lowell
17 Road it goes east to County Club Road, and then from Country
18 Club it goes south to Speedway, on Speedway it goes east
19 until it hits Alvernon, and at Alvernon it goes south until
20 it hits Broadway and then it takes Broadway all the way out
21 past Kolb to Prudence, takes Prudence south to 22nd Street,
22 at 22nd Street it stops at Kolb, goes south on Kolb until it
23 hits Golf Links, and then it goes back west into the
24 district.

25 COMMISSIONER YORK: If I remember correctly, that

1 little flag east of Kolb is 2,500 folks.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Let's try it.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: That -- that's correct, it's --
4 yeah, 2,400, so it would bring 6 and 7 almost perfectly
5 balanced.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think you did an excellent
7 job of making it more competitive and I am compelled by the
8 races just that, even though you don't get credit for it, I
9 don't think you'd be comfortable knowing that, you know,
10 you're at 49 percent. So they're all so incredibly close.
11 I mean, that's -- it's a remarkably competitive district. I
12 am sold.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So you are going to not use
14 our map, our recommendations that I gave I think very clear
15 reasons for ours?

16 I would like to pull that up and take a look at
17 those. That is a true competitive district at a 4-5. A 2-7
18 is not true competitive; even if it's close, there's still
19 losses.

20 We would not accept this change and I -- yeah, we
21 would just not accept this change. I can just say that
22 right up front.

23 The 4-5, we were more than willing -- that was a
24 big compromise with us more than willing to work with that
25 one. This is a 2-7. This is...

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I didn't say I wasn't willing
2 to support your -- your plan. I was just merely
3 acknowledging that I thought the plan that was created was,
4 you know, really met the fundamental needs I set out and
5 honored communities of interest and constitutional criteria
6 and brought it down to the extremely highly competitive
7 range; and even though it was 7-2, the other ones were if
8 you're -- if you were in school, they'd average it up and
9 you'd get credit for it.

10 So, you know, it -- it -- given the imperfect
11 nature of this data, if that's not a highly competitive
12 district, I don't know what one is.

13 So that's all I was saying. Now, I'm open to
14 your -- to your, you know, discussion of why you think you
15 are -- your idea is better.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I think the map that we
17 drew instead as a compromise for using this map -- again,
18 I'm going to repeat the fact that had we been able to move
19 Casa Grande into District 2 it would have improved the
20 competitiveness for District 2 and also improved the
21 competitiveness in District 6 and we're not going to do it
22 because we've been informed we can't, so I'm just saying
23 that would have improved competitiveness all around and
24 aligned communities of interest.

25 It would have been one of the things we could have

1 done to, quote, "solve" the problem in District 2 that we've
2 talked about about the competitiveness.

3 The lines that we recommended took into account
4 significant communities of interest in that area. We
5 recognize that there are different communities and
6 neighborhoods north of Grant, that they fit better in
7 District 6, and so that was part of our argument in that
8 area by -- if we take a look at -- I don't know if you can
9 pull up the map that we did perhaps if you still have that.

10 Please.

11 Is that -- I don't know if -- so just to reiterate,
12 I don't have an alternative to this -- to what we had
13 originally proposed; I can probably come up with an
14 alternative to Commissioner Mehl's, but I don't think he
15 wants me to adjust any of his at this point.

16 Our view was that the changes that we requested
17 between District 6 and District 7 basically allowed us to
18 recognize different neighborhoods north of Grant that fit
19 better with District 6. Those are suburban neighborhoods, a
20 little bit higher-end neighborhoods that are in that area.

21 The university areas that Commissioner Mehl was
22 talking about would be areas -- the university areas would
23 be south of Grant. Again, that aligns with a lot of what
24 Mayor Romero wrote in her most recent comments that she did,
25 that south of Grant.

1 Again, using Alvernon, we were really trying to
2 think about the things that Commissioner Mehl had discussed
3 with the university and Alvernon and the communities that
4 were in those areas and the communities of interest in those
5 areas. We're just separating out different groups.

6 The south of Broadway area that we had -- again, as
7 a reminder -- were folks that were a little bit more
8 moderate in their income, they were more working-class
9 neighborhoods and fit better with D7 so that was the reason
10 for that divide. And that has a higher Latino population as
11 well as more working-class population.

12 So those were the primary changes that we made,
13 moving the Tucson line west when we're north of Grant;
14 moving the Tucson line east south of Broadway for specific
15 communities of interest in that area.

16 So that -- that's my justification, Madam Chair,
17 and it provided for communities of interest being aligned,
18 and it gave us a very, very competitive environment with a
19 4-5. I don't think we can get more competitive than that
20 and our number at that time was 40 -- am I seeing that
21 right? 48.98.

22 So I think the proposal that we put forth was as
23 competitive as it can get with an almost even split on the
24 elections and this two point spread and it meets the
25 constitutional requirements by recognizing and honoring

1 communities of interest in this area.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

3 Given that proposal was not approved and this is a
4 proposal that's on the table that for me meets my criteria
5 for ensuring that any candidate can win that seat and would
6 be accountable, in my opinion, to the entire, you know,
7 constituent group, so do you have any ideas to improve the
8 district from -- from your perspective or -- or...

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I have a couple of changes,
10 if Commissioner Mehl will accept these or if others will.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It's all of us.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: It's not Commissioner Mehl's
14 map, it's our map.

15 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Are you changing your map?

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, I'm changing yours.
17 That's what Chairwoman just asked, if I had any suggestions.

18 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: We're going to discuss it.

19 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Save where we are.

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm sorry?

21 I will -- I will say that -- I mean, I'm trying --
22 we've been trying very hard to reach consensus and very hard
23 to work with this, when it's very difficult when we're
24 working off of a map that is not our -- a map that we worked
25 hard to create -- I'm not saying "our," I know I need to be

1 careful on that.

2 But so one suggestion would be -- I'll wait for you
3 to pull that up.

4 MR. D. JOHNSON: Just to be sure we're pulling up
5 the right map, Commissioner Lerner, you're starting from the
6 map that Commissioner Mehl was just talking about where we
7 put Santa Cruz County back together?

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: That's the recommendation
9 Chairwoman asked us if we had any suggestions.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. Just want to --

11 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Because we --

12 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And I will -- and we're going
14 to be looking at Fort Lowell.

15 COMMISSIONER YORK: This map is balanced, correct?

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, it is.

17 We're all set, Commissioner.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. All right.

19 I will note that the changes that we had
20 recommended, that compromise that we had -- well, I'm just
21 going to move on right here but I will -- I just want to
22 make a point about District 6 in the first place.

23 This -- this district went from our draft map that
24 was approved with a 1.9 percent difference and a 6-3 vote
25 count that was Democrat to Republican and it is -- it went

1 12.1 -- the map 12.1 was a 3.8 Republican with a 0-9 vote
2 count. So this district completely shifted, CD-6, during
3 the various iterations that were proposed, and I just want
4 to make that comment that we've been moving that district
5 from one area to another, from what was very competitive.

6 So if we could go --

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: What was the latest iteration
8 that we just did, of point spread? I just want to write it
9 in my votes.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: The one we're looking at on the
11 screen right now with the Fort Lowell changes?

12 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Correct.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: So it's 51.34 to 48.66, it's 2.68.

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 2.68.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: And a 7-2, with two districts
18 right on the edge.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Thank you.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: 5-4 -- effective 5-4 if we're
21 rounding.

22 MR. D. JOHNSON: Exactly.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It's not 5-4.

24 So if we could -- we're basically taking the area,
25 the Fort Lowell area that's the northern section, let me

1 pull -- so we're going to bring District 6 west to First
2 Avenue in the area between River and Fort Lowell and I'll
3 give you the explanation.

4 MR. FLAHAN: Just like the area that you see in
5 blue on the screen?

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah. So we're going to
7 bring that -- bring District 6 west to First Avenue in the
8 area between River and Fort Lowell and we're going to bring
9 District 7 east to Pantano Parkway in the area between
10 Broadway and Golf Links.

11 There are fewer Latinos in that area, that first
12 area that I mentioned and the second area has more Latinos.

13 And we're just using that because that's kind of a
14 northern boundary of part of what Commissioner Mehl was
15 talking about.

16 MR. FLAHAN: And you're talking about Pantano
17 Parkway there, correct?

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: From Pantano Parkway, yeah.

19 These are small adjustments in the spirit of
20 compromise but I'm hoping that we can -- I have no idea what
21 this will result in. It could go the wrong way too, I don't
22 have...

23 MR. FLAHAN: So that's 11,863.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I honestly don't know the
25 population shifts that we're doing, these are just -- I'm

1 trying to make some changes that -- I mean, my first choice
2 would be the ones that we did previous that I think gave us
3 a very balanced competitive compromise with a 4-5 or 5-4
4 depending on your perspective.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: We're close on population.
6 District 6 is short by 2,000 and District 7 is over by
7 2,000.

8 On the spread we're at 2.42 and that did tip the
9 presidential race to both of the 2020 races now are Democrat
10 wins and the superintendent of education is still a
11 Democratic win, so we have 6 and 3 with the Secretary of
12 State's race at 49.92. It's a 6-3.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With three others that are
14 close.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: It might -- I'm sorry?
16 Commissioner Mehl?

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: With three others really close.
18 All of them really close.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: And it is, as we've talked about
20 before, you know, a 7-2 where the two are kind of won in
21 each election year is more random. A 7-2 or in this case a
22 6-3 where 2020 went Dem and 2018 went Republican is kind of
23 a classic swing where it swings with the voters. The only
24 reason it's not a 5-4 is because of the -- there were fewer
25 elections in 2020 than there were in 2018.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. So one thing that
2 I'll ask you to do if you can try to kind of play around
3 since they're evenly this -- the 2,000. What if you take a
4 look at what you could do by maybe going a little further
5 west of First Avenue in the area of north Fort Lowell to see
6 if you could balance it up there, please.

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Colleagues, I have a
8 question. Can we find consensus around this? Once we find
9 consensus around this I think everything else just falls
10 right in place and I am comfortable with both proposals that
11 each of you raised. I actually think the differences are
12 pretty meaningless; that, you know, that when you look at
13 the true data tracking the -- the races, it's as close as
14 could be and, you know what, may the best candidate win.

15 I mean, I -- I think they're remarkably competitive
16 districts that we've created in 6 and 1.

17 And if there's some fine-tuning around 4 to improve
18 competitiveness without interfering with the function of it,
19 we could do that, but...

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Once we see where these end
21 up, we can see if we can go with it and I'm comfortable
22 leaving 4 as it is and not reopening that one.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: What you're seeing on the
24 screen -- so we -- there must be a canal next to the Pantano
25 Parkway, so we'd use the canal rather than the parkway, so

1 we're just getting the parkway.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Getting the canal.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Well, this is going to put us an
4 extra 2,000 off. Should we just follow the -- I presume.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah, I was going to have you
6 just use some discretion in that area to try to figure out a
7 way to balance.

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, if we just follow the canal
9 rather than the parkway, that will keep us closer to
10 balance. I'm not sure if it's a canal or a creek or what's
11 there.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right. That's what I -- it
13 was --

14 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It's a wash.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: A wash.

16 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Actually a very large wash.

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER LERNER: We were just talking just go
19 a little further west of First Avenue, that's all, however
20 far you need to go.

21 MR. FLAHAN: Do you want us to start at the very
22 north corner or do want us to start off Fort Lowell?

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I think we were going right
24 in the area.

25 MR. FLAHAN: In the north.

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, I think I would suggest
2 starting in the north just because otherwise you're going to
3 end up with a notch in District 7.

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

5 West of First Avenue if we can, but -- yeah. See
6 what happens when you do that. But within that area that
7 you're talking about.

8 COMMISSIONER MEHL: This --

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I don't know if I'm confusing
10 you or not.

11 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I thought we were only a
12 thousand people off or something and now that's a larger
13 area.

14 COMMISSIONER LERNER: No, no, we're just trying to
15 just balance the population, I'm not trying to make any
16 major shifts. It's just -- they were 2,000 even so I
17 thought that that's where we could just balance that.

18 COMMISSIONER MEHL: You're not going to need much
19 to get...

20 MR. D. JOHNSON: One more. One more.

21 Bringing it down just to Lumber Lost Drive.

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Lumber Lost.

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. And one extra -- two extra
24 census blocs where you come down to Kyrene (phonetic),
25 Arizona, as you see that notch gets us essentially balanced.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Can we see -- I don't have
2 any idea what it did if it did anything to -- all we were
3 trying to do was try to balance here but can you -- can we
4 take a look at the competitive metrics.

5 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's still 48.81 to 51.18 so
6 2.3 if I'm doing the math right in my head. And then we
7 have one -- we still have the 6-3 with both of the 2020
8 races being won by the Democrats and then one of the 2018
9 with the second one being 49.95.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think we have hit a real
12 sweet spot where we have balanced communities of interest,
13 incorporated people's recommendations, considered
14 compactness, competitiveness and really wrestled with
15 putting them together. I am really comfortable with the
16 compromises that my colleagues are putting forth right now.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: And Chairwoman, could we take
18 another ten-minute break?

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Absolutely. And -- and
20 please, when you're taking a break, think through the last
21 parts of the congressional map. We can get to consensus I
22 think quite -- quite quickly. Ten-minute recess.

23 (Recess taken from 5:31 p.m. to 5:46 p.m.)

24

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. Welcome back,

1 everybody. Thank you for your patience. We are back
2 deliberating on Agenda Item Number VI, congressional draft
3 maps.

4 I believe we have done a tremendous amount of
5 deliberation. We have some great consensus ideas as it
6 relates to CD-6, CD-1, CD-4. Where are my colleagues at on
7 this in terms of preparedness to vote or needing to see
8 additional substantial change? So I'd like to check in with
9 where you are at.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner Mehl, you had
11 asked for a break so I thought you were going to have
12 something you wanted to say, I was going to punt to you.

13 COMMISSIONER MEHL: So I'll hear what you have to
14 say.

15 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: And I'm not asking for a vote
16 right now, just a general sense of -- well, actually we
17 could put it up to a vote. We're going to have to go back
18 and recreate the record because we had consensus maps going
19 and multiple maps, so we'll go back and formally recreate
20 what we did just for the record but, you know, we went
21 through a tremendous amount of compromise and I'm ready to
22 vote to approve the map if my colleagues are.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Commissioner Mehl, do you
24 want to go?

25 COMMISSIONER MEHL: I'd like to hear from you.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. So...

2 Actually I'm not sure I was quite prepared for this
3 question right at this moment.

4 So I feel that -- I guess I'll just start from
5 scratch on this. I do feel we've made some -- some
6 compromises on this map. This, as you know, was not the map
7 that the Democrats selected to -- but it became the map of
8 the Commission. We have concerns about this map, as we've
9 expressed. There's a -- there are a number of districts
10 that we are concerned about in terms of balance,
11 competitiveness and -- and other areas.

12 District 4 we're comfortable with -- and do we --
13 are we looking at the latest iteration of our version? Can
14 I just double-check.

15 MR. D. JOHNSON: It's the latest version of the
16 Tucson area.

17 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay. What about --

18 MR. D. JOHNSON: Oh, oh wait.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This doesn't incorporate
20 everything?

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: For the record it might be
22 helpful to explicitly mention what this does incorporate
23 from our feedback so that the other feedback that you don't
24 mention we can make sure and go back and address.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay. So this -- the current map,

1 this 13.6 live that we have on the screen, has the changes
2 you were just working on in Tucson but does not have the
3 Mesa changes.

4 What I would -- what I would suggest if you're --
5 if you're ready for a vote or whenever you're ready for a
6 vote, if this -- you've proposed which pieces we've looked
7 at today you liked, vote on that; we'll go take a quick
8 break and put that map together and bring it back for you to
9 confirm that we put it together the way you intended when
10 you voted.

11 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Actually, Doug, I'm asking
12 for a different vote. I'm asking for a vote for this
13 comprehensive map that we've put together. I'm asking for a
14 sense of: Does this map work for you? And then if not,
15 then we'll have to do small votes but...

16 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, sorry, if I wasn't exact -- I
17 meant, we don't have a map that has the Mesa changes and the
18 Tucson changes in it, so that would be my suggestion is you
19 tell us you want pieces A, B and C all one vote. And I
20 agree with you completely on that.

21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You want us to do that before
22 we discuss our overall views of the map?

23 MR. D. JOHNSON: You can do that whenever you want,
24 whenever you wish. I'm just saying when it's time for a
25 vote, that's my request.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm going to ask --
3 Commissioner Mehl, I know you -- I'm going to ask you to go
4 first because I know you -- you took the break right after
5 we did these changes and I would -- I would just be
6 interested in you going first while I pull my thoughts
7 together. I would be interested to hear what you have to
8 say. Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We would be prepared to support
10 this older version of Mesa and my earlier morning version of
11 the Tucson map if -- if we're going it alone; and if we know
12 there's going to be a unan- -- if we know that the two
13 Democrats are going to vote for these two compromises which
14 would be your Mesa map and this back-and-forth,
15 back-and-forth map that we just ended up with for Tucson,
16 then we're inclined to look favorably on that. But -- but
17 we're not inclined to do that; without your support, we
18 would push strongly for a different direction.

19 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I'm looking at the wrong --
20 well, I mean, the changes that we just did -- you're saying
21 that you would accept our additional changes in Tucson?

22 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Yes.

23 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And then the -- where are we
24 with District 4? Would those be the changes that we
25 recommended with the Latino community being in Chandler?

1 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think the final map that we
2 agreed upon.

3 COMMISSIONER MEHL: It had your changes and then it
4 had us going up to the Gilbert line.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Putting that in these.
6 That particular map.

7 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is the one that we're
8 looking at right here?

9 COMMISSIONER YORK: Correct.

10 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, the one that's on the
11 screen, it's 13.3, includes all the territory that
12 Commissioner Lerner asked down by Alma School moved into
13 District 4 and then it has all of Gilbert in District 5 with
14 the trade-off around Leisure World that we talked about.

15 COMMISSIONER LERNER: And can you give me the
16 election numbers on that one because I don't think we ever
17 actually got that. I know we looked at the votes -- the
18 point spread, but I just am curious on where that ended up.

19 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yes, happy to.

20 So the final change we made, the putting Gilbert
21 all in 5 and these really didn't move the numbers, the
22 competitive spread remains 53.47 to 46.53, so 6.94 -- yeah,
23 6 point.

24 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Right.

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: 6.9 something and -- one, two,

1 three, four, five, six, seven -- no.

2 COMMISSIONER YORK: Should be 9 and 0.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: I believe -- so we have one -- the
4 Gov race isn't counted, so I think it's 8, 8 to 1.

5 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Which I think it was previous
6 to that, correct? I think that district has been an 8-1.

7 COMMISSIONER YORK: Yeah, the voter spread was just
8 tighter.

9 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Yeah.

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: It was 4.9.

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah, 8 to 1.

12 COMMISSIONER LERNER: So we support the changes in
13 District 6 with the compromise that we have reached with
14 Commissioner Mehl in the Tucson area; and then we support
15 this modification to District 4. By adding the Latino
16 community into that area we can support that change of
17 District 4 as well.

18 And then -- oh, and District 4 and 5, those
19 changes; and District 6 and 7, the compromises that we've
20 made in that area.

21 Just real clear that we've worked really hard to
22 find a compromise and consensus.

23 COMMISSIONER YORK: I think we've all worked hard
24 to find a compromise, Commissioner Lerner.

25 COMMISSIONER LERNER: I wasn't saying you hadn't.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: So to be clear, am I hearing
2 that you're ready to support all nine districts?

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Well, I'll be clear, we still
4 have that concern about District 3 -- I mean, I know -- I
5 know that we may not be getting everything, I just want to
6 say what we have concerns about and I recognize not
7 everything will potentially be modified.

8 But just as a record, we had talked about a couple
9 of changes in District 3 that modified District 8 and
10 District 1 a little bit, so those are some things that still
11 have concern for us, as well as some things with District 2
12 as we've mentioned.

13 But I also am hearing from my colleagues that
14 they're not going to make any of those adjustments that we
15 have -- that we have concerns about. We've -- we've been
16 pretty clear on which districts and where we would like to
17 see some changes, so just -- just for the record to
18 understand that.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Yeah, we've deliberated over
20 and over and there's no productive use to further
21 deliberation. I believe decisions have been made.

22 I'm very comfortable with this full congressional
23 map, all nine districts. I stand by them. They've been
24 very hard-earned and I'm really proud of my colleagues.

25 So I would entertain a motion to support this --

1 unless we first need to go methodically, Doug, through the
2 process through which we created this map because we had a
3 couple of different maps going -- Counsel, what would --
4 let's go through that methodical step first.

5 If you could recreate for us the various versions
6 that led us to this point.

7 MR. B. JOHNSON: Chairwoman, do you intend on doing
8 that live right now or are you -- Mapping, are you able --
9 there's five different versions, are you guys able to go
10 through that right now?

11 MR. D. JOHNSON: I was just going to say kind of
12 the start point and the end point verbally for that and then
13 we'd -- if that's your direction, we would bring back the
14 resulting map and have you look at and review and confirm
15 that as well.

16 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: How long would that take?

17 MR. D. JOHNSON: It -- if it goes smoothly,
18 30 minutes.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I think that would be
20 incredible for us to be able to take a break, 30 minutes,
21 grab something to eat, come back and have a map.

22 Does that sound good?

23 MR. HERRERA: My only suggestion is before you do
24 that you do verbally go through the --

25 MR. D. JOHNSON: Definitely. Yeah.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay.

2 MR. D. JOHNSON: So obviously it's been many hours,
3 you've gone through a lot of different ideas and suggestions
4 and goals.

5 Where I believe we ended up is starting from the
6 12.1 map, I believe the only changes are between Districts 4
7 and 5 in Mesa as you're looking at on this screen. Where
8 District 4 picked up the area down around Alma School and
9 all of Gilbert went in District 5 and then the population
10 balancing and -- and over along between Power and the 202
11 loop.

12 And then the only other change to this map -- the
13 only other change to this map is the Tucson changes we've
14 been talking about between -- that are entirely between
15 Districts 6 and 7. That we -- that we walked through just
16 before this break.

17 So those -- those are encapsulating very briefly
18 hours of deliberation and debate and discussion of
19 communities of interest and all the other factors at play
20 here.

21 The -- I think in terms of population balancing,
22 everything -- most of it is pretty straightforward. We
23 still have about 2,000 people we have to get from District 9
24 to District 2. We can take a shot at that and -- and come
25 back to you with what we think are the absolute minimal

1 changes needed to do that.

2 COMMISSIONER LERNER: How many people did you say?

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: But we'll come back with that not
4 done in case you don't like how we do it and a version with
5 that done.

6 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Doug, how many people did you
7 say again?

8 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think District 2 is off by about
9 2,000.

10 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Overpopulated or under?

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: It's over by 2,300 and 9 is
12 under by 2,300.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: I think this map -- oh, I have the
14 PDF's. In 12.1, yeah, Brian's right. District 2 is short
15 by 3,175 and District 9 is over by 2,610.

16 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Not that I know that how --
17 how you would do this because I don't know how you would
18 know this, but because District 2 has been an ongoing
19 concern for us in terms of competitiveness, I don't know
20 that much can go from 9 to 2 to make that happen but as
21 you're just balancing population, maybe you could take a
22 look at that. It would actually help District 2 if we could
23 do that.

24 I don't think 2,000 people will make much of a
25 difference but...

1 MR. D. JOHNSON: And just -- top of the head -- the
2 easiest way from a straight line through -- through without
3 running into hopefully any bigger issues would be 2 can pick
4 up some of the District 7 territory in Pinal County that's
5 nonreservation, west of Casa Grande there's a few thousand
6 people in District 7 that are not part of the Tohono O'odham
7 reservation, and then 7 could pick up from 9 either along
8 that 7, 9 border in Maricopa or a small little piece of
9 Yuma, and then you'd be balanced.

10 COMMISSIONER MEHL: We're fine with that.

11 COMMISSIONER YORK: I would pick it up in Yuma,
12 personally.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: So we bring that map back, present
14 it to you, make sure we captured the right pieces and then
15 if you -- if you approve it, then tonight we'd get it down
16 to zero population.

17 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Excellent. Sounds like a
18 game plan. 30-minute recess. Thank you very much.

19 (Recess taken from 6:01 p.m. to 6:50 p.m.)

20
21 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Welcome back, everybody. We
22 return to Agenda Item VI, draft map decision discussion.

23 We had robust discussion on our congressional map
24 and actually achieved quite a great bit of consensus with
25 the potential map for our state.

1 At this point, you know, we could either take a
2 vote now or we could ask our mapping team to, you know,
3 maybe work on whatever type of pop- -- further, you know,
4 perfecting population balancing.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can we review the changes
6 first?

7 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: You'd like to do that first?

8 COMMISSIONER YORK: Well, to make sure the
9 combination works.

10 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. For the record, let's
11 go through the changes that have resulted in this map that
12 we're deliberating on right now.

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: Okay.

14 So the changes as you see on the screen here, so we
15 have the Bisbee-Douglas addition to District 7 and then --
16 that was discussed earlier on and then coming to Tucson --
17 oh, and Santa Cruz is whole so that didn't change in the
18 end; then coming to Tucson, the differences are on the
19 District 7 arm to the east and then the area north of that.

20 So you can see District 7 between Broadway and --
21 and Golf -- between Golf Links and Broadway extends east to
22 the wash that's just short of Fortuna Road; then above
23 Broadway it initially extends to Alvernon below Speedway --
24 I should say District 7 extends east to Alvernon south of
25 Speedway; comes west on Speedway and goes north on Country

1 Club up to Fort Lowell.

2 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Um-hmm.

3 MR. D. JOHNSON: Yeah. Fort Lowell and then comes
4 west on Fort Lowell to First, comes up north on First almost
5 to -- to Wetmore, there's a -- we take the areas just south
6 of Wetmore purely for population balancing.

7 So that -- that's the new District 6 and District 7
8 and -- resulting from today's discussions.

9 The rest of the District 7, District 6 border is
10 unchanged from the 12.1 map we started with.

11 The other area of the change in this map is in
12 Mesa, so you can see the neighborhood along -- there was
13 discuss -- Alma School has been moved into District 4 and
14 all of Gilbert is in -- in District 5 and then up along the
15 loop essentially -- obviously, this went back and forth over
16 the course of the day, but the end result is that District 4
17 follows the -- the 202 loop on the north down to Broadway
18 and then comes in west on Broadway, goes south -- not sure
19 of the name of that road, Sossaman. South on Sossaman to
20 Southern, west on Southern and then south on Power down to
21 the edge of -- of Gilbert.

22 Yeah. So we -- we went through lots of changes
23 today and these -- these are the two areas that ended up,
24 per your direction, being altered from where we started the
25 day.

1 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are these now where we can
2 see them?

3 COMMISSIONER YORK: We had some -- we had some --

4 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Are these available for us to
5 look on our maps -- on our computers or not yet published?

6 MR. D. JOHNSON: I don't believe they're published
7 yet.

8 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Okay.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: They will be shortly after we --

10 COMMISSIONER YORK: Can we check -- we made some
11 suggestions around 3, 8 and 9, were any changes made in that
12 area?

13 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, we actually carefully went
14 through the border along there to make sure there were no
15 changes made. So 3, 8, and 9 are still identical to how we
16 started the day in 12.1.

17 I guess you can -- can you zoom?

18 You can see Glendale Avenue is still the northern
19 border of District 3, in Glendale it's at 67th -- yeah --
20 and then you can see the District 1, District 3 border is in
21 the same place it was before and Maryvale remains united in
22 District 3 over to the Agua Fria River.

23 And the District 1, District 4 border is still the
24 -- in the western portion is still the city of Tempe border.

25 The other just tiny, little changes to show you if

1 there's no questions about this, is we can show you we
2 actually have 13.8 which is little our 2,000 person
3 population balancing gift (verbatim).

4 MR. FLAHAN: And the plan summary that you guys
5 have in front of you is for 13.7, the version that Doug just
6 went over.

7 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Okay.

8 MR. FLAHAN: I don't have one for 13.8, the second.

9 MR. D. JOHNSON: So 13.8, we started in Yuma.
10 Yuma.

11 The border between 7 and 9, you may remember in
12 this area -- yeah. There was a little piece over in -- at
13 the end where 7 came south of 24th. That -- that -- we just
14 continued that piece farther to the west, we extended to the
15 west.

16 So the eastern end of what you see on the screen
17 south of 24th was already there and we simply brought it
18 across, picking up all those streets north of -- what is it,
19 26th Place? Yes, north of 26th and there's a little jog
20 when 26 ends where we go up to 24th Street.

21 So that -- taking that population into District 7
22 balanced District 9 within 40 people and that left 7 with
23 extra population.

24 So on the border of 2 and -- and 7 right in
25 there -- 7 used to come into Pinal and be right up against

1 the Ak Chin reservation, the Ak Chin were in 2 but
2 everything west and south of it were in 7, so what we took
3 was the area west of the Ak Chin to the county line and then
4 going south.

5 Staying west of Casa Grande, we didn't touch
6 anything in District 6, but staying west of Casa Grande
7 we -- we picked up the few people here and there and ended
8 up balancing District 7 to 151 people.

9 District 2 is still a little short, we still have
10 to go back and do our balance to zero, but this gets the big
11 pieces to the extent that 1,500 people are big in a
12 congressional district.

13 So didn't come anywhere near -- other than the Yuma
14 change which obviously is a slight change from the original
15 Yuma Gold line, none of these other changes impact any
16 Commission direction coming throughout this process.

17 I was hoping that moving these few people might
18 trip District 2 into a 7 percent range, it was not enough
19 people to do that, though, and it left it at 7.2.

20 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I would suggest
21 and appreciate if we could have overnight just to look at
22 this, but I think we're so close and so optimistic to still
23 direct our mapping team to do the final population balancing
24 where we could come in fresh tomorrow morning and -- and
25 take a vote.

1 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: I'd be very comfortable with
2 that. I am comfortable with this map. I, too, would like
3 the opportunity to just, you know, look at it and -- and
4 review the -- the fine details and come with a fresh eye.
5 And I do get a very strong sense from my colleagues that you
6 are all equally unhappy and that maybe you are all equally
7 also motivated to find a consensus that does right by our
8 state.

9 And I know today was, you know, tense at times, but
10 you're remarkable colleagues that are doing really hard
11 work, public service work, and I'm deeply grateful and
12 appreciative.

13 So we'll have our information, we'll come tomorrow,
14 we'll be prepared for a CD vote and then we will have -- we
15 are on the same legislative map, so we'll do some
16 fine-tuning as it relates to that.

17 And it looks like we -- we will be on pace to be
18 meeting our deadline.

19 And -- unless, Mapping, there's something that
20 we're not keeping our eyes on?

21 MR. D. JOHNSON: No, I think -- you know, we have a
22 few challenges we'll run into in population balancing, but
23 we hopefully will have those be nice and clean and
24 noncontroversial as well.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Okay. If there's nothing

1 else as it relates to Mapping, we could move to Agenda
2 Item VII, next meeting date. We will reconvene tomorrow,
3 December 22nd at 9:00 a.m., right here at the Palomar for
4 what will be I think a consequential and rewarding day for
5 all of us.

6 With that we move to Agenda Item Number VIII,
7 closing of the public comments.

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

15 With that we move to Agenda Item Number IX,
16 adjournment. I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

17 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Madam Chair, I move that we
18 adjourn.

19 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Do I have a second?

20 COMMISSIONER LERNER: This is Commissioner Lerner,
21 I second.

22 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: With no further discussion,
23 Vice Chair Watchman.

24 VICE CHAIR WATCHMAN: Aye.

25 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Mehl.

1 COMMISSIONER MEHL: Aye.

2 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Lerner.

3 COMMISSIONER LERNER: Aye.

4 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner York.

5 COMMISSIONER YORK: Aye.

6 CHAIRPERSON NEUBERG: Commissioner Neuberg is an
7 aye.

8 With that, we will adjourn and I look forward to
9 seeing all of our friends, colleagues, and staff tomorrow
10 morning.

11 (Whereupon the proceeding concluded at 7:02 p.m.).

12

13

14

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 14th 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 14th of January, 2022.



Miller Certified Reporting, LLC
Arizona RRF No. R1058