

Web Comments 11/05/21 - 11/07/21



Submitted Time	Full Name	Subject	Message
11/05/2021 - 06:45	Ashley Hill	Keep Scottsdale Separate - No Redistricting!	<p>I am a resident of North Scottsdale (zip code 85255). In learning recently about the proposed redistricting ideas, I was shocked to hear that there is an attempt to merge Scottsdale with areas such as Desert Ridge and Deer Valley. It absolutely makes NO sense for Desert Ridge and Deer Valley airport to be in my district. I live, shop and conduct all of my personal business in the Scottsdale area. The Western Boundary for Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and the Rio Verde district should be the city line which is Scottsdale Road, not the I-17!!!</p> <p>Scottsdale, Fountain Hills and Rio Verde are quite different areas and populations age wise than Desert Ridge and near the I-17. I do not support this change nor see value in the merge. Our communities have different needs and therefore need to be separated, not paired into the same district.</p>
11/05/2021 - 11:00	Frank Cople	Maps 7.1 and 10.0	<p>Thank you.</p> <p>I am a Sun City West resident and believe both the CD 9 and LD29 maps as drawn do not meet the standards for competitiveness nor for community interest. CD9 is almost entirely rural except for the Sun City West/Surprise portion. LD22 is not a competitive District and needs additional Democratic voters added.</p> <p>I believe by trying to keep Yavapai County complete has resulted in a map, which effects the Northern, Western and Northwest Valley sections on the State as completely non competitive.</p>
11/05/2021 - 11:40	Fredi Olster	Fair Voting Districts	<p>The proposed redistricting map has split our town of Sedona into separate legislative districts. Our sense of community is important to us here and dividing us up like this risks pulling our community apart. I strongly feel that it would benefit us all to be represented by a single set of legislators. I ask you to please restore our unity.</p> <p>I appreciate this opportunity to express my thoughts and thank you all for your dedication and for the hard work you have already put in on this critical issue of redistricting our state.</p> <p>With sincere thanks, Fred Olster</p>
11/05/2021 - 11:49	Gary Johnson	LD8	<p>I reside in the southern end of Tempe near Guadalupe and Price roads. My community of interest for church, shopping, medical care, exercise, recreation, restaurants, etc. (same for many people in my neighborhood) is south Tempe, west Mesa, and west Chandler. The current draft map has my neighborhood part of LD8 with north Tempe, Salt River Indian Community, and northeast Scottsdale including Gainey Ranch, all of which we have zero common interest.</p> <p>LD8 has 8978 fewer voters relative to the target voter count. Just south of us is LD12, which has 8452 excess voters relative to the target vote count. My neighborhood should be part of the south Tempe LD.</p>
11/05/2021 - 12:22	Marilyn Bernhardt	Redistricting Northern AZ	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>It is absurd to keep Yavapai County whole, by sacrificing communities of interest, contiguity, and competitiveness in LDs 5, 6 and 7. You can easily correct all this issues by adopting the maps proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona. Please do so!</p>
11/05/2021 - 12:29	Peter Bernhardt	Redistricting Map	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Please adopt the maps proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona. Splitting up Sedona will cause irreparable harm.</p>

11/05/2021 - 13:46	Nicholas J. Bleser	Redistricting	<p>Flowing downhill northward from Nogales, the Santa Cruz River, I-19 teeming with produce and maquila trucks, and the BNSFRR nourish our smallest county. From the east, it's joined by the tributary from Elgin, Sonoita and Patagonia; north again through Rio Rico, Tumacacori, Carmen and Tubac, joined at Amado by Arivaca from the west. On to Green Vally, Sahuarita and finally, Tucson.</p> <p>We who live here depend on this lifeline for our food, shelter, transportation. For our education, safety, health care; for our representation in government; our entertainment, relaxation. We are alive and united by the arteries of this corridor.</p> <p>And now, the smooth continuation of all this is in your hands. We implore you, please do not derail the efficient functioning of this lifeline. Please, do not chop off pieces here and there, tossing them randomly into unwanted oblivion with unaccepting recipients. Allow the current calm and equitable operations to continue.</p> <p>Please. Thank you.</p>
11/05/2021 - 13:56	Ann Heitland	Congressional Draft Map	<p>The Draft Congressional Map turns CD2 which has been Arizona's most competitive district into a strong Republican district with no apparent justification. Prescott has been happily co-existing with the Colorado River district and should stay there. That helps Mohave County which doesn't want to be with urban Maricopa. Graham and Greenlee counties have more in common with northeastern and north central Arizona than those areas have with the Colorado River communities. There is no good reason to mix up the historical alignment of CD2 and two very bad reasons to use the Draft Map configuration: Reducing competitiveness and reducing the voices of our Native American communities.</p> <p>The Navajo Nation has submitted a proposed revision to CD 2 which I support. It is CDF010. The draft map of CD 2 does not honor the constitutional criteria of competitiveness or communities of interest. The map submitted by the Navajo Nation does so and gives our Native American Arizonans a stronger voice in Congress.</p>
11/05/2021 - 14:02	Rissel Langbecker	Redistricting	<p>Why are you trying to destroy the scottsdale that I know by changing the lines?? I dont live, eat, drive or even interact with people on the I-17 or that far away. I simply dont want my tax money/ school money to be spended on areas that I really dont have any gain or interest. The western boundary for the scottsdale, fountain hills, rio verde district should be the city line, which is SCOTTSDALE RD. not I-17. What is is the purpose of these??</p>
11/05/2021 - 14:35	Bernard Miller	LD Map 10.2 and CD Map 7.1	<p>My name is Bernard Miller and I live in Gilbert.</p> <p>In reviewing the Legislative District map I have many concerns. I have lived in NW Gilbert for over 27 years. The proposed LD Map 10.2 does not respect Gilbert's community of interest or town boundaries. It separates Gilbert into five different districts. The Heritage District of Gilbert is the heart and soul of the community with shops, restaurants, a farmer's market and many parades and special events throughout the year. Yet it is placed in a district with Ahwatukee which is on the other side of the county and shares no community of interest with Gilbert.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to respect the city boundaries and keep Gilbert whole. The northern boundary should be Baseline and the western boundary should be Arizona Ave.</p> <p>I would also like to request that a Draft Map Hearing be scheduled in the East Valley. Not a single hearing is scheduled in the East Valley and I can see no good reason why that is so.</p> <p>In reviewing CD Map 7.1 I also have concerns. It again groups Gilbert together with areas that share no community of interest. I ask that you keep Gilbert together with Queen Creek and Mesa. The district needs to stay within Maricopa County and not include parts of Pinal County.</p>
11/05/2021 - 14:37	Diane McQueen	Comment on the most recent maps	<p>As a 35-year resident of Northern Arizona (both in Coconino County and Yavapai County) I am sorely disappointed and very upset about the latest maps that take Sedona and the Verde Valley out of the same districts as Flagstaff. This decision by Chairs Neuberger and Commissioners York and Mehl truly reeks of partisanship and gerrymandering. Chair Neuberger can proclaim all she wants that she is an Independent, but she is only fooling herself because no one else believes it based on her voting record and siding with the Republican Commissioners on just about everything from the hiring of Brian Schmidt to these latest so-called "approved" maps. For Chair Neuberger and Commissioners York and Mehl to say that there is no consensus on keeping the Verde Valley separate from Prescott means that they are either completely ignoring the public comments from voters and local public officials who understand that keeping Sedona and the Verde Valley with Flagstaff is based on sound reasoning (economic, commercial, healthcare, geographic, infrastructure) or they really just don't want to hear about sound reasoning and instead are listening to their partisan buddies or are listening to members of the public who have no concept of the constitutional criteria or redistricting and think the commission is going to be redrawing County lines, or they too are looking to see these districts gerrymandered and not competitive because of their partisanship. This needs to stop for the good of the State. The commissioners need to start listening to all sides of the fence and stop with the gerrymandered districts.</p>
11/05/2021 - 14:38	Patricia Pellett	Redistricting of Scottsdale	<p>Hi, I'm an investment professional and mom of 5 in Scottsdale. We stay within Scottsdale for church, business and shopping. Deer Valley and Desert Ridge make no sense being part of the district. I'm against it. Scottsdale Rd not Hwy 17 should be the western boundary.</p>

11/05/2021 - 15:20	Diane McQueen	Splitting Sedona and the Verde Valley from Flagstaff	I just read the public comment submitted on 11/3 by Yavapai County Supervisor James Gregory. He states that "I strongly disagree with the Coconino proposal to split the county in half. This proposal is being pushed from a group in Sedona. This does not reflect the opinion in the rest of Yavapai County or the rest of the Verde Valley." The commission needs to ignore this comment because James Gregory is not speaking for the "rest" of Yavapai County or the "rest" of the Verde Valley. This is his partisan opinion. I live in Dewey (not part of what he calls a group in Sedona) and I do not agree that Sedona should be split in districts and that the Verde Valley should be in the same districts as Prescott and the rest of Yavapai County. If you read the public comments submitted, you will see that most of the people from these areas (who have submitted comments) feel the same way I do. Verde Valley Medical Center and Sedona Medical Center are part of Northern Arizona Healthcare (which includes Flagstaff Medical Center). These two hospitals are not associated with any of the medical centers in Prescott. It's presumptive of Mr. Gregory to insinuate that people in the Verde Valley only shop in Prescott Valley. That is not true. With the horrific traffic in Prescott Valley, it is actually easier for residents in the Verde Valley to go to Flagstaff to shop. With or without traffic, it takes less time to drive to Flagstaff from Cottonwood than it does to drive to Prescott Valley from Cottonwood. Again, read the comments of the people from these areas and you will see that the majority of these folks do not want the Verde Valley lumped in with the Prescott Quad-City area. They want to be with Sedona and Flagstaff because that is where their community of interest lies. Read the public comments.
11/05/2021 - 15:35	Laura Huenneke	legislative district draft map	I'm distressed that the draft legislative map ignores natural geographic and municipal boundaries and a preponderance of evidence related to economic, social, and environmental communities of interest in the northern part of the state. I know from watching/listening to most of your meetings and hearings that you have heard from MANY more people about interests uniting the Flagstaff/Oak Creek/Sedona/Cottonwood/Verde Valley corridor, than from those favoring keeping Yavapai County whole. I am enthusiastic about the proposal from the Coconino County Board of Supervisors to keep this corridor intact in a single district (subsequently keeping Flagstaff connected to most of its outlying areas, keeping Sedona intact, and also keeping the Yavapai - Apache tribal lands whole and connected with the Verde Valley. This plan reflects the wishes of the majority (including local government leaders in these communities), creates a very competitive district, AND makes more sense than keeping Yavapai County whole while ignoring all these other geographic, natural, and social connections. Please incorporate this proposal from the Coconino County Board of Supervisors into your northern Arizona map for legislative districts. The inclusion of Tanque Verde and Vail in LD 17 creates a significant barrier to participation in the democratic process. The geographic distances will prohibit participation for in-person events.
11/05/2021 - 15:44	Leslie Clark	LD 17	<p>The inclusion of Tanque Verde and Vail in LD 17 creates a significant barrier to participation in the democratic process. The geographic distances will prohibit participation for in-person events.</p> <p>In addition, Vail and Tanque Verde are not that similar to Oro Valley, in that both are more rural.</p> <p>This is not a map that provides good representation for these areas.</p>
11/05/2021 - 15:51	Steven H. Slaton	Future district 7	<p>Leslie Clark</p> <p>The best communities of interest are, on AZ Draft 1.0 Legislative District 7. That being said the communities of Winslow, Holbrook, Snowflake, Taylor, are not the same communities of interest.</p> <p>These communities are High Desert with ranching and farming. They should be excluded from AZ Draft 1.0. With the communities of Lakeside/Pinetop, Payson, Heber/Overgaard, Forest Lakes, Doney Park, Grand Canyon Staples, Parks are communities within AZ Draft 1.0 Legislative District 7, they need to be added. These areas who have unique individual requirements, different from those of metro/urban High Desert areas, including recreation, ranching, rivers and lakes, forest maintenance etc. which all have the same communities of interests.</p>
11/05/2021 - 16:08	Daryl Zee	Redistricting	We oppose the redistricting which would combine Paradise Valley with Tempe. Our family lives in Paradise Valley, and frequents many types of businesses in Phoenix and Scottsdale. This move is non-sensical.
11/05/2021 - 16:08	Patricia Hennessy	redistricting 2021	<p>the current maps seem to fracture established communities into districts that dilute common values...</p> <p>this doesn't make civic sense.</p> <p>what is happening??</p> <p>a</p>
11/05/2021 - 16:13	Carolyn McGinnis	Arizona Redistricting	I am against redistricting which would include Paradise Valley with Tempe. Tempe is a college town, while PV is residential. This makes no sense!
11/05/2021 - 16:34	Sherryn	Redistricting	Please reconsider and find to merge us with an area that has at least SOME thing in common with our area or with whom we can meet with to discuss our similarities/differences. There must be a means to do this.
11/05/2021 - 16:38	Vikki Marshall	Redistricting	I see nothing in common with the area drafted to merge with the Picture Rocks area. In addition it would be very difficult to meet with the area drafted so we can discuss differences or things in common. The area so far defined with our area really needs some attention and, I imagine, the other areas feel the same.

11/05/2021 - 18:32	Kathleen Dubbs	LD 17 and CD 7	<p>I hope enough people have commented on how bad the proposed LD 17 is. I thought the chair was particularly interested in creating competitive districts, which the proposed LD 17 is not. Competitive districts are so good for the electorate. If Commissioner Mehl wants it to be a Republican district, then he can create a better district and get out there and campaign for his chosen candidates.</p> <p>As for the proposed CD 7, I do not agree that the line should be pushed further east. Doing that will just pack the district with more Democrats than it needs.</p> <p>Again, thank you all for your terrific service to the state. It is a huge job.</p>
11/05/2021 - 18:34	Julia Olson	I do not support the current draft map	<p>I do not support the current district 17 as outlined in the draft map. It makes no sense to have such a large geographic district in an urban area. The people in these areas don't have much in common. The issues in Oro Valley are different than those in Vail. This map creates a solidly republican district. This is gerrymandering and unacceptable. Please fix this problem in the draft map. Thank you.</p>
11/05/2021 - 19:47	Amber Watson	Redistricting maps	<p>As a retired nurse I live and play in the family friendly Desert Ridge area. High Street specifically is home with it catering to urban, vibrant, young professionals. In stark contrast are the areas of Rio Verde, a rural, active adult golfing community as well as North Scottsdale and Fountain Hills, both elderly, quiet, retirement communities. The Representatives for each of these areas know their unique constituents and what each community needs; lumping areas together with such contrasting cultures and certainly contrasting needs is not in anyone's best interest. Referencing the proposed district map, please consider smaller, more manageable, more cohesive areas ensuring We The People are fully and properly represented. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
11/05/2021 - 20:28	Karen Van Sickle	Redistributing Green Valley and Sahuarita	<p>Please reconsider the redistributing putting Green Valley and Sahuarita in different districts. We are one community, even though Green Valley is a retirement community. Shopping and community involvement happens within both of these communities. People live in one and work in the other and the decisions made by one affect the other; it makes no sense to divide them up and put them in a district with Sierra Vista!</p>
11/05/2021 - 23:35	Christopher C	Redistricting In southern AZ	<p>I am completely disgusted with how this so-called independent redistricting commission got bamboozled by Pima County Republican David Mehl to gerrymander the new proposed districts!</p> <p>Not only does it geographically don't make any sense it's clearly intended to dilute any Democratic stronghold and build up Republican ones!! some of the rules that were not followed within the bylaws in the IDC clearly benefits commissioner David Mehl's intentions.</p> <p>It's clear that he wants to create a dominant Republican stronghold by insisting on keeping Oro Valley, Marana, Saddlebrook, and neighboring communities north of Tucson together in a single legislative district.</p> <p>Not to mention by taking away the Latino vote in Santa Cruz County by cutting it in half and combining the Republican stronghold of Cochise County together.</p> <p>It's clear as day on how much this is such a conflict of interest with him that he lobbied for legislative maps that were drawn by the Southern Arizona leadership council where he is a founding member!!!!</p> <p>Well I know that this is not easy and such a hot button issue for this council especially in today's political climate, but to clearly let somebody control it in a manner that is surgically designed to disenfranchise certain segments of the population because they can't clearly win any other way is disgusting and disappointing and not with this commission was intended to do!!!!</p> <p>I ask you to go back to the drawing board and figure something out because this is clearly not the answer.</p>

11/06/2021 - 05:00	Analizabeth Doan	Problem with dividing Interstate 19 into two Legislative districts	<p>AZ REDISTRICTING INPUT 11/6/21</p> <p>I am Analizabeth Doan. My greatgrandfather was the first territorial judge who presided over all the courthouses from Nogales to the NM border before Arizona became a State. I disagree with the way AZ Legislative District 21 has been outlined on your approved draft map. One of the most important indicators of a fair and cohesive Legislative voting area is respecting a "Community of Interest". Interstate 19 runs from Nogales to South Tucson, this "Community of Interest" brings in BILLIONS of dollars in revenue to the State of Arizona through tourism, trade and the produce industry. This Community of Interest needs decisions made, at the State level by the same State Senators and Representatives, people interested in our economic strength who benefit from a positive cross-border relationship. The area north of Rio Rico and south of Tucson has been moved into District 19 which covers most of Cochise County. The goals in the south east of the State are quite different from this part of the State. (I have worked in and driven through the south eastern part of the State where there are militia at the US/Mexico border, where the Hannigans were accused of torturing undocumented men walking through their property, where you see signs disparaging Mexicans (whether documented or not, from entering Arizona). Those opposite perspectives will come to nothing good for Arizona, if I19 is divided between Santa Cruz County and Cochise County.</p> <p>Another criteria for a balanced Az Legislative voting district is "incorporation of visible geographic areas and I19 is one of three major highways in Arizona, it should not be split between two voting districts. Another criteria of "compactness and contiguousness" is totally destroyed if you pull the middle of I19 into Cochise County, when the communities along I19 attend to their health care issues, business, recreation, the Arts mostly in Tucson, few people in this area use Sierra Vista as their main hub for economic and personal growth.</p> <p>The criteria of an "equal population" is non-existent by pulling out the middle communities of I19 from District 21, you cause a great disparity in socioeconomic income and also demographics, which are two other key criteria in redistricting voting areas so they can have a balance of ethnicities and incomes. The present map creates an issue with socioeconomic and demographic equality.</p> <p>An example of representation in the AZ Legislation is Gail Griffin who in 2019 proposed a bill to fund a US-Mexican border wall by levying a tax on Arizonans. I19 will have representation from people along with Joe Arpayo and the former US President's who would probably propose to add another US Border Patrol checkpoint north of the Tohono O'odham reservation, slowing down the trip for car and semi truck travel.</p>
11/06/2021 - 06:42	Barbara Lee Bloom	redistricting proposed maps	<p>I19 has to ALL be part of District 21 and not part of Cochise County.</p> <p>As an AZ resident, I understand how important redistricting is for the future of our state and our democracy. I was a history professor and I remember that AZ was the land of Native Americans and Latinx People before it was included in the USA. As a professor, I always reminded my students, "Democracy works best when all voices are heard and compromise prevails". I believe AZ voters spoke that message when they passed Prop106 and its criteria.</p> <p>The current proposed map does not fit the criteria. For example, LD 17 is not geographically compact and includes disparate parts of Pinal and Pima Counties. The new map must also consider communities of interest. Santa Cruz County, with its Latinx population, must be kept so the population and geographic area makes common sense.</p> <p>Currently, I live in LD 9 which has included all the criteria as well as being a competitive district with two different parts having had candidates elected to offices. This type of district should be maintained.</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:17	Misty Atkins	maps	<p>Please remember democracy fails and authoritarianism wins when different voices fail to have an opportunity to be heard.</p> <p>It is the job of Independent Redistricting Commission to uphold the criteria set by the voters. For one Commissioner to railroad through LD 17 for his own personal gain and for the independent chair to support an obvious and deliberate partisan map continues to erode public confidence in this redistricting process and in all of our public institutions. Integrity of the process should be the first priority. Personal greed, especially on the part of one of the selected commissioners, should be disregarded immediately in this process. As you have already seen, there are many ways to build an LD 17 that includes Oro Valley and the areas near it into a competitive district that reflects its 30R/30D/30Ind population.</p>

11/06/2021 - 07:35	Brad Saylor	Scottsdale districting	<p>Being a longtime Scottsdale resident, I appreciate the "one voice" we have for congressional representation. Dividing our community would be a disservice to our unity. As Scottsdale has grown, I have worried a divide between North/South could occur. Splitting the city into districts would be the beginning of what I have always feared.</p> <p>Please consider</p> <p>Thank you</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:43	Alison Jones	Proposed LD17 in Pima is a PARTISAN GERRYMANDER	<p>Brad Saylor</p> <p>I spoke in a previous hearing about the importance of competitive districts. Let's allow the voters to pick the candidate who connects best with the electorate.</p> <p>Imagine my horror when the IRC approved District 17 in Map 10.0 which-- LITERALLY-- was conceived of and drawn by the Pima GOP to give the Republicans a safe district. Gotta hand it to them, it wasn't easy. They had to include a mountain range and wrap it around the city like a boa constrictor. You can't drive from one end of it to another without driving through other districts. D17, as drawn, is a PARTISAN GERRYMANDER, plain and simple. It is unconstitutional.</p> <p>I urge you to use LD Map 9.0. The county lines are respected. Counties are important communities of interest. The Foothills area of D17 is also more compact and competitive in District 17 on Map 9.0. It could be won by any party who advances a capable candidate.</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:46	Katherine O. Bork	Sedona redistricting	<p>I continue to be appalled by the various redistricting maps that have been proposed for Sedona, with the exception of the one prepared by Coconino County. Flagstaff and Coconino County are communities of interest closely allied to Sedona and the Verde Valley; our ties to Prescott and to Payson are tenuous. Furthermore, splitting Sedona into two districts effectively mutes our voice for the next ten years, which is both divisive to our town and undemocratic. Please keep us whole!</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:48	Stephen Hanks	Keep the Verde Valley WHOLE	<p>I agree with the City of Sedona's letter supporting Coconino County's recently submitted district maps. These maps keep Sedona whole, keep the Verde Valley whole, keep the Yavapai-Apache Nation whole and align us with Flagstaff in the same legislative district.</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:51	Stephen Hanks	Verde Valley District Maps	<p>Please keep the City of Sedona intact and with our neighboring Verde Valley communities of interest as well as with Flagstaff. Please do not split Sedona into districts along County lines. We are one city and we deserve an intact voice in electing our representatives. We also need to be kept with the rest of the Verde Valley and Flagstaff as our interests are intertwined. Those interests include: business (retail and services), tourism, healthcare (we are in one system), education (NAU is our four year college opportunity), transportation (I-17 corridor and public transportation), history, natural physical features, and natural resources (Oak Creek and the Verde River.) Please do not separate us from the things that make us one community. Thank you.</p>
11/06/2021 - 07:57	Mary Dahl	D 19 & 20	<p>I write in opposition to the final redistricting proposal as regards splitting Santa Cruz County. We are a small county both in geographic size (1250 square miles) and in population (under 48,000). We share a fascinating, vibrant and cohesive heritage across our territory from the mountain empire in the east to the river valley that carves its path north to the high country on our western boundaries. Our human history is based on this watershed and it continues to shape us today.</p> <p>As a population, we may have our differences, but our striking similarities are what bind us together as a community. The current proposal divides critically important local political blocs such as school districts and fire districts. In a small county, these are vital organizing entities and provide community identity.</p> <p>The division of the community of Rio Rico in its northern sectors is just plain wrong. This community, though unincorporated, is the largest in the county, even outstripping Nogales in population. Rio Rico should not have its political ascendancy cut off just as it begins to find its identity within the county and the state.</p> <p>We care for each other in Santa Cruz County and we want to be able to be effective as a political community. Dividing our small county is not in our interest.</p>
11/06/2021 - 08:41	Fidelis V. Garcia	IRC - Support Latino Coalition Maps	<p>Dear Commission: I strongly support the maps submitted by the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting. The Latino community deserves equitable representation in its legislative process. The maps submitted do just that. Respectfully, Fidelis V. Garcia, Resident Town of Guadalupe</p>

11/06/2021 - 08:42	Fidelis V. Garcia	IRC - Support Latino Coalition Maps	Dear Commission: I strongly support the maps submitted by the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting. The Latino community deserves equitable representation in its legislative process. The maps submitted do ust that. Respectfully, Fidelis V. Garcia, Resident Town of Guadalupe
11/06/2021 - 08:44	Barbara Jennings	Redistricting	<p>Hello, my name is Barbara Jennings, I live in Maricopa County, and I am here today to give you information about my communities of interest. I live off of 56th Street and Sweetwater. My community is made up of families and elderly couples, young working people who shop, attend church and work in the North corridor from 75th Ave to Tatum Rd, and from Desert Ridge North of the 101 down to Thunderbird Rd</p> <p>The commission's proposed CD1 is currently excluding the area between Cave Creek Rd and I-17. Many of my neighbors and friends work and live here. Please extend the Western boundary to include this community. We need to have communities that have similar values and priorities otherwise it would make it very difficult for legislative representatives to be effective in serving its constituents. My friends and I have developed strong relationships with our Representative and we would feel very disenfranchised and bankrupt in all the efforts we have put forth to ensure proper representation of our values.</p> <p>I am asking that you please move the western boundary for CD1 beyond Cave Creek Rd to I-17.</p> <p>Please follow the Arizona Constitution when you are drawing districts this time. Your current map disrupts the main focus which is community of interest.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Barbara Jennings</p>
11/06/2021 - 08:53	Barbara Jennings	Redistricting LD15	<p>Hello, my name is Barbara Jennings, I live in Maricopa County, and I am here today to give you information about my communities of interest. I live off of 56th Street and Sweetwater. My community is made up of families, retirees and hard working individuals, who work in the North corridor from 75th Ave to Tatum Rd, and from Desert Ridge North of the 101 down to Thunderbird Rd</p> <p>I never travel south of Thunderbird into the Sunny Slope area, west of Cave Creek Rd. It is an entirely different community and the crime rate is very high in that area so I try to avoid it altogether. The Sunny Slope community is very different from the suburban single family housing you will find north of Thunderbird.</p> <p>The commission's proposed legislative map for LD2 is mixing communities that have very different values and priorities making it very difficult for legislative representatives to be effective in serving its constituents. I am asking that you please move the line for LD2 UP to Thunderbird and to encompass more population then extend it a bit above the 101 to include Desert Ridge community, then move the Western boundary to 75th Ave. I work from home, shop at Desert Ridge and also off Tatum and Cactus and my sons Doctor and Dentist have offices in the Scottsdale/Pinnacle Peak area. I am having a lot of anxiety over the thought that crime rate is going to increase in my neighborhood with the shifting south of my district.</p> <p>Please follow the Arizona Constitution when you are drawing districts this time. Your current map not only disrupts the main focus of community of interest but also competitiveness.</p> <p>Thank you for your time today.</p> <p>Barbara Jennings</p>
11/06/2021 - 08:54	Virginia M Marth	Map versions 9 and 10	Our new LD - LD16 - will not be competitive, guaranteeing we only have Republican legislators. I live in Picture Rocks (Pima County) and will have us in the same LD as Coolidge, Arizona City - hours away from here, This violates the mandate to create competitive districts that are fair and democratic - not gerrymandered for the purpose of securing an outcome in elections. Do we want to remain a democracy - let's start here by fairly drawing the maps. Stop ignoring the mandates.

11/06/2021 - 09:11	Ricky R Sage	Pima County District Boundaries	<p>My name is Ricky Sage. I have lived in Tucson since 2015. I am retired from the Air Force and also an early retiree from Boeing Military Aircraft in Kansas. I was a Reservist, so I have dual retirements! In fact I moved to Tucson due to the Davis Monthan Air Force Base, and I work at the base as a simulator trainer for aircrews. I live in Northeast Tucson, not far from Udall Park. I love it here and consider myself permanent!</p> <p>My daughter and Grandson joined me in Tucson a couple of years ago. They are now settled in Vail. In reviewing map 9.3 I think it is called, I realized that my daughter and I would be in different legislative districts. I would be in District 18 and she would be in District 17. A closer look at district 17 makes for a big puzzle. Half of district 17 is Northwest of Tucson - The Oro Valley/Marana group, and the other portion of district 17 is Southeast Tucson Vail, etc. This is a silly combination, to have these two regions tied together, with an intervening district 18 in the middle. My family can't even get from Vail to Oro Valley without driving for 30 minutes through other districts. The Santa Catalina mountains form a natural barrier of sorts. When we were making Halloween preparation, no consideration was given to going to Marana for trick or treat, or even to purchase candy. Oro Valley and Marana are OK, but to go there requires preparations similar to a trip to Phoenix - i.e. pack a lunch and if you have pets, make sure they are fed and watered before you go.</p> <p>Oro Valley and Marana have as transportation corridors I-10 towards Casa Grande and AZ77 towards Catalina, Oracle Junction and Oracle - to include neighborhoods such as Saddlebrook, Saddlebrook II, Red Rocks, Eloy, etc that form a natural contiguous grouping. By ignoring this natural grouping, and instead hop skipping over mountains and major cities, it is evident that the true agenda of some participants is to carve up the voters of Tucson and reduce their representation in the State Legislature. Correct me if I am wrong, but this approach is exactly opposite of the stated goals of this commission, and exactly opposite of the intent of the voters who enacted this bipartisan process two decades ago.</p> <p>In an earlier version of the legislative district maps, my neighborhood was in an LD that stretched to include Cochise county. I made an online comment about that, and I am happy to see that reason prevailed, and district 18 is an improvement. But it is clear to all observers that some entities are using this redistricting process to attempt to gain partisan advantage.</p> <p>My current Congressional District has had both a Republican and a Democrat in the past 10 years - very competitive. Competitive districts, I believe, draw candidates more closely to the center. The need to appeal to the large number of independent voters requires candidates to listen closer to the electorate. I believe that gerrymandering districts that are very very safe for one party or another can lead to extreme views and individuals getting into government. I would hope to not have elected officials legislate against aircraft contrails. I am told that comments have been made by during public discussions about the desire of the commission to create safe districts, and what is considered to be a "safe" district. I would hope this not true - I hope that the commission follows its publicly stated criteria. I am told that a map 9.0 keeps neighborhoods together, makes evenly balanced competitive districts and by most metrics does a better job at accomplishing the stated objectives of the commission. I urge the commission to revisit the districts as proposed in Map 9.0 by Commissioner Lerner in moving forward. Also, I urge that the community of Vail be connected contiguously with neighbors in Pima County as much as possible, though Wilcox isn't too far away.</p>
11/06/2021 - 09:25	Pam Moseley	Redistricting affects on rural areas	I live in Picture Rocks, Pima County and we rarely get appropriate representation on commissions. Redistricting in the draft will further alienate our community and swallow our elector voice with areas with much different needs.
11/06/2021 - 10:04	Conn e M. Williams	Urgent Questions re: draft map comments	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The comment link for the Southern and Eastern Arizona virtual town hall is open. Can we start submitting comments on it now? 2. Will there be an opportunity, as there is this morning, to testify? 3. Does the comment period for each town hall close at midnight on the date of the event or can comments submitted for a period afterwards. If yes, then for how long?
11/06/2021 - 10:07	Trevor Michael Johnson	Representing North Scottsdale	<p>Hello. My name is Trevor Johnson, and I'm speaking here this morning to represent North Scottsdale from DC Ranch.</p> <p>It's common knowledge that Scottsdale is a unique, tight-knit community. We share our schools, we share our parks, our shopping centers. We share our churches. We do not share the schools, parks, shopping centers, or churches of Phoenix. That is why we are here today to protest the legislative division of Scottsdale. It's more than just our values, our culture and our community. LD23 has been called "its own state" within Arizona by political experts because of our unique electorate. Scottsdale is a unique community with its own legislative demands. We are not politically homogenous with the rest of Arizona.</p> <p>I am speaking up because Scottsdale - as Americans, and as Arizonans - deserves to be represented by people who represent them.</p> <p>On behalf of Scottsdale, I implore this committee to recognize the legislative border on Scottsdale Road. We do not go to I-17 or Desert Ridge. That is not part of our unique, beautiful community. Keep our community together, so that we may stay politically engaged, and move our beloved LD, and our beautiful state, into a brighter future. Thank you.</p>

11/06/2021 - 10:18	ANNE F WARD	Latest Map proposal	As a concerned citizen and long time voter in Arizona, I am frankly appalled at the way the latest version of the IRC map was created. The IRC law says that the chair of the commission shall be independent. On October 28, Chair Erika Neuberg failed to act in a non-partisan manner. She supported a map version proposed by Republican Commissioner David Mehl, which changes District 17 from a competitive district to a Republican district. She said she did so because she was impressed by a letter from State Senator Leach, a Republican. This violates her duty in two ways. First, by reducing the number of competitive districts in favor of another Republic district, she is clearly engaged in partisan gerrymandering. This change only benefitted one party. Second, and equally important, she violated the instruction of Proposition 106 that clearly instructs the Commissioners not to consider the preference of any given legislator. I urge the Commissioners to reject this version of the map and keep working to meet the requirements of federal and state law for the redistricting map.
11/06/2021 - 10:19	Annie J McGreevy	Redistricting, Communities of Interest	Important to keep all of Santa Cruz County together.....diverse population includes ranching, Santa Cruz County Fairgrounds, Little Red elementary and Elgin elementary schools send their students to Patagonia Union High School. Raising cattle throughout the County saves water in contrast to huge dairy farms in Cochise County which require a great deal of water. Mariposa Health Center as well as the affiliate Patagonia Health Center provide medical care for all of Santa Cruz County.
11/06/2021 - 10:23	Dorothy Taylor	District 16	LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT 16: As you know, the IRC is charged with complying with the US Constitution and the US Voting Rights Act. Because of this mission, Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous, boundaries shall respect communities of interest, and competitive districts should be favored, all to the extent practicable. Since District 16 as it is now mapped, spans 3 counties, includes communities of interest that are in no way related and are over one hour from each other, and favors the Republican party 100%, it is obvious that this map does not comply in multiple areas with the directives the commission has been given. My request is that it be completely redone to provide compactness, communities of interest that make sense, and a district that is fair and competitive.
11/06/2021 - 10:25	Eileen Hollowell	Proposed LD 17	I oppose the proposed map creating LD 17 which Commissioner Mehl has promoted. That district is unfair to me. I live in Oro Valley. I pay taxes in Pima County. I shop, worship and attend events in Tucson. My community of interest is not reflected in proposed LD 17 which is not compact, covering large distances and divided by the Catalina Mountains. I respectfully request that the District map be redrawn to more closely comply with IRC and Arizona Constitutional guidelines. Thank you for undertaking this difficult work. There is still time to draw better maps that are fair not just to the business community but to minorities and indigenous people. Please do so.
11/06/2021 - 10:43	Patricia R Hale	LD17	I live in Casas Adobes. I have lived here since 1985. New district 17 will place Casas Adobes with Tanque Verde and Vail. Few if any in this area shop in Tanque Verde or Vail which is miles away. New LD17 is not a compact district. It is 70 miles end to end. It seems this district was drawn to capture high income earners, who live near the mountains into one district. Additionally people in Casas Adobes send their children to Amphitheater schools. The school district boundaries include Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, part of Tucson, and Catalina. This new district breaks up the Amphitheater District into 3 LDs. Old LD2 was a compact district with a community of interest. In my opinion, the new lines for proposed district 17 seem gerrymandered to produce a Republican legislative district. Please keep our district compact and competitive Thank you. Patricia Hale.
11/06/2021 - 10:50	Barbara Burstein	Maps 9 and 10	The IRC is supposed to be independent and not partisan. The chair is supposed to be not from either political party. Here the chair supported Commissioner Mehl's map that benefits Republican State Senator Leach, and the chair specifically cited the letter from Leach and Marana Mayor as a main basis for her support of 9.2. Map 9.2 is not competitive whereas 9.0 is. Prop. 106 prohibits the IRC from considering the preferences of a legislator. 9.2 is clear republican gerrymandering.
11/06/2021 - 10:50	Sue Ellen Thorne	Don't Gerrymander my District: Current LD 17 map is a disgrace!	Chairman Neuberg, Commissioner Mehl, you are playing partisan politics with our majority Democratic County by manipulating LD 17 borders to include your selected Republican leaning suburbs in a widespread, noncontiguous and non-compact area from Marana and Oro Valley in the Northwest through selected parts of Catalina Foothills, Pinal County and over the natural divide of the Catalina Mountains to include distant Tanque Verde and even further distant Vail. How dare you so blatantly gerrymander the Catalina Foothills district where I live by supporting a partisan bid for a Republican stronghold. Arizonans went to court in 2010 after partisan districts were drawn. Experienced, non-partisan mapmakers and commissioners were hired by court order to make our AZ districts competitive, contiguous and compact. You have ignored the statutes of the Voting Rights Act by creating this Republican partisan mockery of equality and justice due to the screeching of extremist right-wing advocates for a pseudo-Christian, white-supremacist stronghold in Southern AZ. Your ill advised scheme is blatantly unconstitutional, both by state and federal law. It is gerrymandering at its worst!! Restore my competitive district, and let the Independents, however they lean, make the difference in the polls. Hopefully for Democracy's sake, they will understand the importance of re-establishing AZ government and US government with Democracy in mind!
11/06/2021 - 10:52	Jay Craghan	Future District 7	The best communities of interest are, on AZ Draft Map 1.0 Legislative District 7. We don't want Pinal County in northern Arizona district, they are not the same communities of interests!
11/06/2021 - 10:55	Louise Vista Michael	Do not change Santa Cruz County's legislative districts	The changes proposed dilute my vote here in Santa Cruz County to someone who isn't in our county. I think this gerrymandering of having districts go clear up to Tucson and behind it and Douglas and Bisbee is everything that's wrong with redistricting. Geographical areas that have a great deal of diversity and commonality of history and community are much more representative of the country and the county than these seemingly rigged maps.

11/06/2021 - 10:59	Marilyn Bernhardt	Issues with proposed maps	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Please, please please correct the damage done to the required factors of competition, community of interest and contiguity in LDs 5,6,and 7 by your proposed maps. These issues can all be cured by adopting instead the maps submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona. Hear us; this is what the voters of Northern AZ want!</p>
11/06/2021 - 11:11	Suzanne King	Ob ection to District 17 in the Adopted Draft Legislative Map	<p>I write to ob ect to District 17 in the Adopted Draft Legislative Map.</p> <p>District 17 in the Adopted Draft Legislative Map is problematic for several reasons. Its des gn disregards many important goals of fair redistricting set out in the Arizona Constitution; instead, it promotes the creation of a safe Republican district in a predominantly Democratic county. That goal is not in our Arizona Constitution.</p> <p>District 17 is not "compact and contiguous to the extent practicable." It is made up of selected Republican-leaning suburbs from opposite ends of the Tucson area that are separated by a mountain range and a long drive.</p> <p>District 17 does not "respect communit es of interest to the extent practicable." The residents of both Tanque Verde and Vail have little to do with the distant suburbs of Marana and Oro Valley, and have much closer t es to eastern and m dtown Tucson.</p> <p>District 17 is des gned to create a safe Republican district, but that goal violates the constitutional requirement that "to the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals." Democratic Commissioner Lerner proposed an alternative version of District 17 that was highly competitive, but it was re ected on the grounds that it failed to create a safe Republican district. The Independent Chair stated she was impressed by a letter from the Marana Mayor and a state Senator favoring the Mehl map and she wanted to make sure that æcenter rightâ voters have a chance of electing their candidate. But Prop. 106 clearly instructs the IRC not to cons der the preferences of a given legislator, and center right voters hardly need protecting in Arizona, where Republicans are known for pushing the Big Lie, advancing voter suppression bills, and even attending the January 6 insurrection. The Independent Chair needs to be reminded that safe partisan districts are the opposite of competitive districts envisioned by the Arizona Constitution and that fair competitive districts promote democracy and politician accountability.</p> <p>For these reasons, the IRC should use LD Test map v9.0 as proposed by Commissioner Lerner.</p> <p>Sent from my iPad</p>
11/06/2021 - 11:12	Justin Watson	District Maps Virtual Town Hall 6 Nov 2021	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>My name is Justin Watson, I'm Retired Military and I live in the community of Desert Ridge. I feel that the current district boundaries best reflect the proper representation for my area. The interests and priorities of Desert Ridge are not the same as Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, or Rio Verde. Each community is unique and requires separate representation to meet the needs of the residents. I do not shop, frequent, or visit the other communit es, therefore I do not want to be included in a blanket representation of them.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>
11/06/2021 - 11:27	Katherine Hornbach	concerns with LD17	<p>I live in Oro Valley, and have some ma or concerns with the sprawling proposed boundaries of LD17. The community of interest for us are Casa Adobes, Marana, and northwest Tucson. Including the rural communities on the other side of the mountains ust doesn't make any sense - they are very unlike our suburban/urban community cluster. The map as it stands gives an outsized representation to rural places with which Oro Valley has little in common. I suspect this gerrymandered district was designed this way to give Republicans an unfair advantage by packing Democrats into a few districts, ensuring Republican ma orit es elsewhere. I strongly urge that this map be updated to create a more compact and equitable district for those of us in the Northwest Greater Tucson area. Thank you.</p>

11/06/2021 - 11:31 Will am Bowlus-Root Use of Safe Districts in Draft Maps - 1

In the days before Proposition 106, the legislators drew the boundaries of the legislative districts and they did so to ensure their party had the best chance to retain power. They created as many "safe" districts as they could "districts where the party bosses could put up a candidate they could rely on to toe the party line, districts they could win time after time without much investment of effort or money, districts that were safe for their party's interests never mind the voters.

But that led to very poor governance. People were fed up with a government that failed to address their issues or provide the kinds of services that would help them and their communities prosper. The "safe" districts weren't responsive to their needs. They recognized that the "safe" districts were dysfunctional, that they produced voter apathy or disenchantment with government and low voter participation. Why bother voting when your vote wasn't needed to win or wouldn't make any difference anyway? Safe districts are the antithesis of Democracy.

In the election of 2000, they took back the power from the legislature and passed Proposition 106, which created a new Independent Redistricting Commission, which they charged with creating "fair and competitive" districts. Not safe districts. Competitive districts.

They knew that competitive districts would have the opposite effect. To win a district, the parties must put forth their best candidates, those who are familiar with the needs of the district and will put forth innovative ideas and programs to resolve them, those who listen to the voters and respond to them with policies they can defend in debate. When that happens, the voters become engaged in the political process, their government, their communities, and their elections. They vote in greater numbers and expect more of their elected officials (who are consequently more capable of delivering). All of that leads to more effective and responsive governance. But you only get that when you have districts that are competitive.

I know the commission feels like it's doing a good job with creating the districts. But if you look at the Draft Maps you've come up with, it's obvious that they have failed to carry out what the voters have charged you with "creating fair and competitive districts.

Yes, it's true that the current Draft Maps are not the final maps and there is work to be done. But if the current maps are any indication, you seem to be heading in the wrong direction.

Of the 30 districts in the current legislative Draft Map, there are 2 districts by your definition that are "Highly Competitive", 4 more that are "Competitive", and the remaining 24 districts are "safe" districts "districts that are safe for one or the other parties" 24 out of 30, that's 80%. 80% of the districts you've drawn are dysfunctional. That's exactly the opposite of what the voters said they wanted from you.

You say, "Oh but those safe districts are balanced between the Republicans and Democrats so they cancel each other out." That may be true when it comes to the political makeup of the legislature, but that's not the point. The voters sought to stop the corrosion of democracy that's the inevitable result of every safe district. Just because they balance each other out does not justify using them.

Two spoiled apples do not make a good pie.

The commission has a LONG way to go to turn as many of these safe districts into competitive ones as possible. Failure to do so is a betrayal of the spirit of Proposition 106 and is no better than the legislator-drawn partisan districts that it tried to prevent.

The health of our democracy must be defended and that can only happen by eliminating safe districts "regardless of the party they prop up" and restoring competition, as our Founders and the Arizona voters intended.

William Bowlus-Root
A concerned citizen

11/06/2021 - 11:58	Jacqui Bauer	skipped to speak at the meeting today	<p>I signed up to speak at the meeting today, and received a confirmation via email. However, I did not appear on your speaker list. Here are the comments I wanted to read into the record:</p> <p>Civility in American politics is at an all-time low, and this has terrible consequences for the tenor of our public discourse and in our ability to tackle our common challenges. In Arizona, our constitution gives us a tool that can help, but we're not adequately using it. That tool is competitiveness.</p> <p>In 2008 the AZ Supreme Court ruled that the competitiveness goal cannot be considered less mandatory than the other goals, ignored, or relegated to a secondary role, yet in shifting LD17 from a competitive to non-competitive district, the commission is doing exactly this, and contriving districts like LD21 so we can pretend that Oro Valley and Vail, separated by mountains, are somehow deeply connected to each other.</p> <p>Competition is good for business, and it's good for voting - it makes politicians better. When we make voting districts safe, we disenfranchise minority party voters and independents in those districts.</p> <p>I live in a competitive district, in the current LD10. Under these proposed maps, I'm in the head of the weird dragon that is LD21, and I feel like I've been gerrymandered. Not only am I in a neighborhood that's been unnaturally bisected from my surrounding community, I'm now in a district that's safely Democratic. This is a deep disservice to the 50% of voters in my neighborhood who are not Democrats - I say this as a Democrat who believes deeply in the importance of meaningful representation.</p> <p>Extreme polarization is counterproductive, and dangerous. When we make districts safe, we guarantee that our elected officials will speak only to their base, and never to the broad electorate. Please redraw Pima County's districts to recognize compactness, my community of interest in m dtown Tucson, and the critical importance of competitiveness. Make my vote count.</p>
11/06/2021 - 12:23	Robin Low	Keep Flagstaff and the Verde Valley Whole	<p>Please keep the Flagstaff and Verde Valley areas together In one legislative and one congressional district.</p>
11/06/2021 - 12:27	Steve Harvey	Redistricting	<p>I live in the Vistancia area of Peoria. If I read the proposed redistricting maps correctly, my district will include everyone from Vistancia all the way to the California and Nevada borders. I am strongly opposed to the current proposed redistricting map for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not believe that the issues important to those of us living in Vistancia, e.g. northwest metropolitan Phoenix, would be the same as those living in places like Kingman, Lake Havasu or Bullhead City and vice versa. 2. The issues most important to those individuals in any one community located within this district would be diluted by the issues important to those living in other communities thus nullifying the issues of everyone. 3. How would anyone elected to serve this massive district be able to look out for and serve the diverse needs and issues of importance to all the citizens every community included in this district. 4. As a constituent and voter, I believe that my voice could not and would not be heard over the morass of widely different community needs. 5. Districts should represent people of similar backgrounds and community needs, not just a lumping together a bunch of people with little in common just to satisfy a numbers game. 6. Logistically, how could constituents all meet to have discussions on issues in an effort to come to consensus on the issues? <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Steve Harvey [REDACTED] Peoria, AZ 85383</p>
11/06/2021 - 13:04	Judith Reisman	gerrymandering	<p>Why is Oro Valley being separated from other nearby communities and lumped with communities "over the mountains?" This seems like political gerrymandering at its strongest. Now that we know what this is, why are our elected officials fostering this destruction of democracy?</p>

11/06/2021 - 13:08	Nancy Musgrave	Latest draft maps	<p>I live in Picture Rocks, just outside the city of Tucson. This is Pima County, of course. The latest maps, including the "10" series, has Picture Rocks in with towns far north in Pinal County and not with any towns in Pima County other than sparsely populated Avra Valley. This is latest map is the proposed LD16.</p> <p>I strongly object to this proposed redistricting. This new LD would NOT be compact, contiguous or competitive. We are spread very far apart from the rest of this new district and are in two different counties. We are divided up, with another district in between us. Not compact or contiguous. And this ensures that we will NOT have a competitive district, which appears to the public that this is intended - gerrymandering. We deserve to be in a fair and competitive district. We belong with other Pima County towns with whom we have much in common. We have nothing in common with towns north in Pinal County.</p> <p>Furthermore, Commissioner Mehl made a big point of complaining that the area around Tucson is partisan so it must be changed to become competitive. But this new LD16 IS partisan. It seems he's only concerned with ensuring non-competitive districts.</p>
11/06/2021 - 13:17	Nicholas Collins	Competitive districts	<p>I implore you, the Commissioners, to follow and obey your mandates. This means, among other things, that you create competitive, compact and contiguous districts. Picture Rocks belongs in the new LD17 with towns and citizens who share common interests.</p> <p>My name is Nick Collins. I have lived in Ahwatukee just west of Chandler since 2003. I remember when the legislature used to draw the districts and my congressional district was made of Ahwatukee connected to Scottsdale by a thin strip across Tempe, obviously somewhat gerrymandered. So I really am glad that we have this independent redistricting commission to make districts fair and competitive. Making these districts fair and competitive was part of the language of Prop 106 in 2000 that created the IRC. And also part of the voting rights act. I think that competitive districts should be the primary goal when drawing our new maps. We just need to look at our most recent election to see how competitive our state is. One third are independents. Again, I am glad for the work of the commission and I want to stress the importance of keeping districts competitive.</p>
11/06/2021 - 13:44	Peter Bernhardt	Redistricting Map	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Please correct the damage done to the factors of competition, community of interest and contiguity in LDs 5,6,and 7 by your proposed maps. These issues can all be cured by adopting instead the maps submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona.</p> <p>Hear us! This is what the voters of Northern AZ want.</p>
11/06/2021 - 13:48	Betty Harris	Comment on LD Map 10.0	<p>I was just able to speak at the meeting going on now, Sat., 11/6. I think there is somewhere else that I am supposed to be able to post comments, but can't find it.</p> <p>I live in the south end of the Tucson Mountains in the house my late husband and I built almost 50 years ago. I am retired from teaching at Pima College. I am an active volunteer with Pima County Parks, Tumacacori Mission Park and hope to soon return to the Nature Conservancy and to Reading Seed volunteer work, activities shut down due to Covid.</p> <p>I asked to speak because I am unhappy with the form of the latest Legislative District Map 10.0, especially in southern Arizona. There seems to be little attention to meet the important goal of proposition 106 to create "Fair and Comparative" districts. I realize there are five other criteria you must attempt to satisfy, and that it is difficult to balance all. However, I strongly disagree with the idea that being registered Republican constitutes an "community of interest." Indeed, it seems to fly in the face of "fair and comparative."</p> <p>The currently strangely shaped District 17 not only seems to be configured to form a majority Republican district, but leads to distortions in other Southern Arizona districts. Tucson Estates is added to a district which extends to Goodyear, encompassing rural areas having nothing in common with this Tucson Suburban community. Santa Cruz County is split into 2 districts, to mention but 2 problems. Now, Map 9.0 does none of these things. District 17 is compact, contiguous, competitive and not divided by large mountains. Santa Cruz county is in one district, and Tucson Estates is in LD20, a Tucson district.</p> <p>Lastly I feel that the commission needs to pay attention to maps submitted by the Latino Coalition and by Native American groups. I live in Majority Minority congressional and legislative districts now and expect to in the future. Around half of my neighbors identify as Latino and I like it that way.</p>

11/06/2021 - 14:25 Analizabeth Doan

After listening to the public meeting...my comments

I disagree with the way AZ Legislative District 21 has been outlined on your approved draft map. I19 must ALL be part of Legislative District 21 and not be added to District 19, Cochise County. The area north of Rio Rico and south of Tucson has been moved into District 19 which covers most of Cochise County. The state, national and international goals in the south east of the State are quite different from those on the I19 corridor. The Commission has arbitrarily jumped over the railroad tracks and the Santa Cruz river to pull this area into Cochise County. It makes no sense. The input given by people on the online map shows the darkest are IN THE STATE over I19, that input has been disregarded. Including all of I19 communities would be diverse in all ways (socioeconomic, demographics, community, geographic size)

The following criteria for redistricting are not aligned to dividing I19:

Interstate 19 runs from Nogales to South Tucson, this "Community of Interest" brings in BILLIONS of dollars in revenue to the State of Arizona through tourism, trade and the produce industry. This Community of Interest needs decisions made, at the State level by the same State Senators and Representatives, people interested in our economic strength who benefit from a positive cross-border relationship.

Another criteria, not being met is the "incorporation of visible geographic areas". I19 is one of major highways in Arizona, it should not be split between two voting districts, nor should the Santa Cruz River and the railroad tracks.

The criteria of "compactness and contiguousness" is totally dismissed if you pull the middle of I19 into Cochise County. The communities along I19 attend to their health care issues, business, recreation, the Arts, diversity mostly in Tucson, few people in this area use Sierra Vista as their main hub for economic and personal growth.

Two other key criteria of an "equal population" is non-existent by pulling out the middle communities of I19. The present map creates an issue with socioeconomic and demographic equality.

The proposed LD21 looks like a dinosaur made up of the left-over parts the proposed LD17 & LD19 both appearing to be gerrymandered districts to favor republicans.

(I have worked in and driven through the south eastern part of the State where there are militia at the US/Mexico border, where the Hannigans were accused of torturing undocumented men walking through their property, where you see signs disparaging Mexicans (whether documented or not). Those opposite perspectives will come to nothing good for Arizona, if I19 is divided between Santa Cruz County and Cochise County.

An example of representation in the AZ Legislation is Gail Griffin who in 2019 proposed a bill to fund a US-Mexican border wall by levying a tax on Arizonans. I19 will have representation from people aligned with Joe Arpayo and the former US President who would probably propose to add another US Border Patrol checkpoint north of the Tohono O'odham reservation, slowing down the trip for car, recreational, and semi truck travel.

I19 must ALL be part of Legislative District 21 and not part of District 19, Cochise County.

11/06/2021 - 14:27 Gail Kamaras

Access to meeting

I registered to speak at the 11/6 meeting but was unable to do so. When I clicked on the webex link, I was re-directed to register, which I had already done. Then I downloaded the webex app but it did not recognize the email I used for my registration. How can I participate in the next virtual meeting? Watching on YouTube does not provide the opportunity to testify.

11/06/2021 - 14:45	George Loughmiller	Keep Greater Scottsdale Together	<p data-bbox="745 141 1029 170">Keep Greater Scottsdale Together</p> <p data-bbox="745 186 1890 235">Our family has lived in Scottsdale for over 20 years. We are actively involved in our local community, my wife having served for several years on our HOA board.</p> <p data-bbox="745 259 1869 308">We are concerned that the final draft maps split Scottsdale into three legislative districts. It separates Northern Scottsdale from Southern Scottsdale and Eastern Scottsdale from Western Scottsdale. As much as is practicable, greater Scottsdale should be kept together.</p> <p data-bbox="745 332 1900 406">The final draft maps would place our community in D3. This district would stretch from the far east valley to Interstate 17, connecting disparate parts of several communities that have little in common. This map would seem to violate at least three of the constitutional criteria for drawing maps:</p> <ul data-bbox="766 430 1386 560" style="list-style-type: none"> (1) The final draft map does not take communities of interest into account. (2) The final draft map ignores Scottsdale boundaries. (3) The final draft map would create a non-competitive district. <p data-bbox="745 576 1890 625">We ask that you keep greater Scottsdale together and consider map #CDF009. While this map has a CD designation, it is a legislative district map that is fully consistent with all six of the constitutional criteria. It was developed and submitted by Scottsdale resident, Emily Wilson.</p> <p data-bbox="745 649 1900 722">The greater Scottsdale district would keep the geographic footprint of Scottsdale nearly intact. It would also incorporate all of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa community. These communities comprise a compelling economic community of interest that includes tourism, local business interests on the 101 corridor south of 90th Street, along with Scottsdale Community College - all of which are on tribal lands.</p> <p data-bbox="745 747 1890 820">Putting these two communities together also preserves their mutual interest in sustainable land use, respect for the individual character of diverse and distinct neighborhoods, a culture of citizen involvement, environmental stewardship & open space preservation, along with a citizen-centric focus on planning, community building & decision-making.</p> <p data-bbox="745 844 1879 917">Further, it creates competitiveness that the previous draft iterations do not. It comes very close to creating parity between the two major political parties with the advantage slightly favoring Republicans. Keeping greater Scottsdale together offers the opportunity for legislative candidates to run and govern from the middle, thereby serving the majority of voters in the proposed greater Scottsdale district.</p> <p data-bbox="745 941 1648 966">This greater Scottsdale district also complies with the Voting Rights Act in ways that the current LD23 does not.</p> <p data-bbox="745 990 1165 1015">Thank you for consideration of our proposed map.</p> <p data-bbox="745 1039 1134 1063">Your service to our state is greatly appreciated.</p> <p data-bbox="745 1088 1008 1136">George and Joyce Loughmiller Scottsdale Residents</p>
11/06/2021 - 14:56	Cathy Della Penta	Comments on the IRC recent draft	<p data-bbox="745 1161 1900 1286">My concerns are as follows: LD 17 is split by a mountain range. It is problematic because it is not competitive and is not geographically compact. It brings together disparate parts. Also, Santa Cruz County is divided, and there is a carve out in Pima County. Suggestions would be: districts should be compact and communities of interest whole. Maps that are fair and competitive encourage better representation, uphold the VRA [Voting Rights Act], and protect against extremism. Draft 9.0 is a good, and better option than the current one.</p>

11/06/2021 - 15:10 steven H. slaton Future Legislative District 7

My wife and I represent the White Mountain Conservatives. We represent thousands of folks who live throughout the White Mountains of Northern Arizona Mountain communities.

As for the future of Legislative District 7, By including the Northern Communities with a Southern district of Pinal County as showed in your approved Draft Map Legislative District 7, is not communities of interests or competitive.

With the size of these districts half of our population is bound to feel unrepresented. And they are already!

Districts should accurately represent communities of interest who live and work together.

A new Legislative District 7 should accurately represent communities of interest which is required by State and Federal law.

We the people of Northern Az. request you reinstate your Az. Draft Map 1.0 Legislative District 7. However the communities of Snowflake, Taylor, Holbrook, Joseph city, and Winslow, are not part of these communities of interested of the White Mountains.

These communities are made up primarily of rock and high desert plateau, with a vast valley of ranchland, and agriculture between the two regions they should be included in Legislative District 6 not 7.

The culture and way of life is different than those communities of interest of the White Mountain Communities.

The White Mountain Community which is outlined on the Az Draft Map 1.0 with their community of interest is commitment to bringing tourism to the region, along with common interest within other White Mountain communities, which share rivers and lakes, National Forest, winter sport activities, Hunting, Fishing with ongoing Economic Development of the White Mountain.

The White Mountain communities for Legislative District 7 need to be with other White Mountain communities of the same Interests. These interests are non-partisan and are for the common good in our locales and region.

These cities include Lakes de/Pinetop, Show low, Heber/Overgaard, Forest Lakes, Payson, Pine, Strawberry, Camp Verde, Clarkdale, Cottonwood, Williams, Parks, Sedona, Flagstaff, Doney Park, Grand Canyon Staples, All of These Communities would meet communities of Interests for Legislative District 7 according to Federal and State Laws.

Thank you for your time
Sincerely
Steven Slaton

11/06/2021 - 15:19 Jen Bryant Redistricting

As fifth generation natives, our family lives and works in Scottsdale since 1912. We do not want to see Scottsdale restricted to be grouped with Tempe or Phoenix in an attempt to remake Scottsdale . Nor do we want cave creek removed. The community needs to retain cohesiveness to include Scottsdale PV Cave Creek and fountain hills. There is no reason to separate the districts and certainly does not serve current resident interests or preserve the character and beauty that drives tourism to the area. The overwhelming push to change the area by redistricting is driven solely by political interests.

11/06/2021 - 15:22	Marilyn Weissman	Legislative and Congressional Draft Maps of Northern Arizona	<p>Chairman Neuberg and Commissioners,</p> <p>My name is Marilyn Weissman. I am a 29 year resident of the City of Flagstaff. Thank you for the work you are doing on this difficult task. I have watched some of your deliberations and have been surprised by the small amount of time you have spent discussing the maps in Northern Arizona. I have no idea what the criteria is that you used to decide the defining lines of our legislative and congressional districts.</p> <p>I am in the current LD 6. I have written and spoken previously of the importance of keeping the city and the communities that depend on Flagstaff in one legislative district. I have also asked previously that you consider the I-17 corridor that highlights the tourist communities above and right below the Mogollon Rim as a part of our Community of Interest. I have also asked that the greater Flagstaff area be put in a competitive district that allows the future possibility of electing someone from our growing town that represents our values and concerns.</p> <p>Instead you have created, using parts of our LD 6 and 7 district, three districts, LD 5, 6, and 7, that are not politically competitive or defined by communities of interest. For the City of Flagstaff our competition within your draft district 6 is now with our Native neighbors, a distinct community of interest, who I support in their efforts to be able to elect their own representatives without having the possibility of Flagstaff diluting their ability to do so. This is unfair to both the Native vote and the City of Flagstaff. I ask you again to create a legislative district that includes all of greater Flagstaff, including the communities of Kachina and Mountaineer, and join us with the communities below the rim lying East of Mingus Mountain in the Verde Valley - Sedona, Camp Verde, Clarkdale and Cottonwood. The map submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors, LDF050 and LDF051, does just that. It is supported by the City Councils of Flagstaff, Sedona and Clarkdale. Please consider replacing your draft legislative map of Northern Arizona with this submitted one.</p> <p>I was also disappointed to see that your current draft of Congressional maps puts Flagstaff and its native neighbors in a new non-competitive district 2 that will primarily reflect the policy priorities and concerns of the people of the Prescott area, very different from our own. Currently we are represented here in Flagstaff by a moderate. This is the result of the district being politically competitive. Districts that are lopsided in one direction, as the new CD 2 is, have the effect of electing extremists who rarely campaign in, visit or represent the values of the parts of the district that did not vote for them.</p> <p>Why have you eliminated the one competitive congressional district in Northern Arizona and added us to a non-competitive congressional district? The Flagstaff area and our native neighbors will now have no voice in the congress. Please consider accepting the map submitted by the Navajo Nation, CDF010, which restores congressional competitiveness to our area.</p>
Thank you,			
Marilyn Weissman Flagstaff, AZ			
11/06/2021 - 15:41	Diane McQueen	November 6 Hearing	<p>I have been listening to this hearing and to the speakers from the public all day. If, at this point, it has not become clear to the Commission that the latest maps that the Commission has approved for Northern Arizona and the Tucson area are gerrymandered to give the Republican party an overwhelming advantage, that these maps are a blatant violation of prop 106 and a slap in the face to our State Constitution and to the voters of Arizona, then the Chair and the Commissioners who approved these maps are, frankly, traitors of the State Constitution and traitors to all voters of Arizona (not just certain voters) and obviously are deep in the pockets of the Republican Party. We need competitive districts all over the state, not gerrymandered districts that will lead to ongoing extremism in politics. The Commission has a chance to prove that Arizona can move past this divisiveness. The Commission has the chance to prove that politics and different political parties in Arizona can co-exist and work together despite our differences of political opinion. If not, then these commission members and their reputations will forever be sullied by being remembered as the commissioners who were bought and paid for by one political party. No amount of saying "we did our best" will overcome that. Please don't let that happen.</p>
11/06/2021 - 15:51	Constance Levinson	You left me out of the presentation	<p>I have been online with today's virtual hearing since 10:00 am. That's almost six hours of waiting my turn--which somehow never came. Is this because Northern Arizona is united against your unfair and biased maps?</p> <p>You left me out even though I was on the list and appropriately registered. I think I deserve an explanation. Also, this will tell me if you ever read the comments we send.</p> <p>Are you so unable to listen to the very valid criticisms that residents of the North have made?</p>

11/06/2021 - 15:53	Eric Kramer	Northeast Arizona Legislative and Congressional Districts	Please accept the Flagstaff proposals for the LDs and CDs of Northeast Arizona. We need competitive maps, not gerrymandered messes designed to prop up failing politicians. The commission proposal for LD6 and LD7 disenfranchises 321,000 people either because they would be in districts so favorable that their votes would not matter or because they would be automatic losers. The Native Americans of Northeast Arizona should not be split, but should also not be packed into districts where their votes are meaningless in legislative elections. Flagstaff should not be split. The bulk of Yavapai County should be in a different congressional district, leaving the Verde Valley and Sedona with Flagstaff.
11/06/2021 - 16:28	Steve Robinson	Redistricting	My name is Steve Robinson, and I reside in Oro Valley. The map proposed and endorsed by the Republican Commissioner on behalf of Southern Arizona business interests violates several mandates the Commission is entrusted with adhering to. It does not protect the interests of people of color who are specifically protected under the law. It would not be competitive and balanced, and as a result candidates for office would need only to cater to the most extreme among the electorate. The map proposed by Republican interests simply repudates the very fact that those of us in Oro Valley are far more connected to the communities in Tucson around which the proposed map draws a tortuous, artificial boundary line. Connecting Oro Valley to Marana to the west, Tanque Verde to the southeast and Saddlebrooke to the north (and situated in Pinal County) is a blatant gambit to construct a district of affluent suburban whites. This is a disservice to people of color and to those of us in Oro Valley whose "community of interest" is firmly linked to central Tucson, not to homogenous subdivisions flung about the perimeter of the city. Thank you for considering my remarks and for the difficult work you are doing.
11/06/2021 - 16:30	Nelson Morgan	ordering of speakers for the Draft Map Town Halls	Having just watched the webex meeting today, I have a suggestion for both virtual and in-person meetings: please shuffle (i.e., randomize) the ordering of the speakers. The ordering by geographic area as was done today means that some group is inevitably going to feel disadvantaged. For the in-person meetings, the ordering has sometimes been first come first served, and sometimes has been shuffled. The latter is far better, as it precludes gaming by having an organized group dominating early on. While someone will always be first and someone else last, at least if the order is fairly random, there is no appearance of favoritism. And I further suggest that you announce this policy so that people understand what is being done. Thank you.
11/06/2021 - 17:27	Kathleen Wege	Legislative redistricting	I am currently a 20 year resident of Sedona. After reviewing the proposed State legislative redistricting, I see that Sedona has been completely cut off from the Village of Oak Creek and the rest of the Verde Valley, including Cottonwood, Camp Verde and surrounding towns. Everything that happens in our communities is reflected and influenced among our unique collective bonds. This is the community that we Sedonans identify most closely with ourselves with economically, socially and culturally. I feel that our State Representative should be the same person as these communities because of this and that we are represented as a community, with common goals that we will want to have represented at the State level. Sedonans have NOTHING in common with the areas represented in District 7, where the new plan has us placed. I feel that it would be a disservice to us to be included in District 7 and as we have a close community bond with other District 5 communities we would be much better served if included in District 5 with our very close neighbors. Thank you for your time, Kathleen Wege
11/06/2021 - 18:32	William Bowlus-Root	Thanks for sticking with us	Just a quick note of thanks to commissioners Lerner and Neuberger. Kudos to you for staying online the whole time through today's virtual town hall - and especially for keeping your video on the entire time. (I'm not sure where commissioner York was. Commissioner Mehl was also in the Participants list all day, but we couldn't tell whether he was really there or what he might have been doing during the testimony.) It was reassuring to see that you both seemed to be listening and engaged with the public. It gave me and I'm sure other people who testified at least some reassurance that their time waiting wasn't completely wasted, that at least someone on the commission was paying attention and it gave us hope we might have been heard. Thanks for sticking it out. It wasn't easy for any of us. William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen
11/06/2021 - 19:08	Fredi Olster	Fair Voting Districts	Sedona is composed of various small neighborhoods including West Sedona, Uptown Sedona, the Village of Oak Creek, the Chapel area, Big Park etc....but we are all a COMMUNITY of like minded citizens. We share common interests and concerns and I think it would be detrimental to our sense of community to be divided into two separate voting districts. Please to restore our unity. I appreciate this opportunity to express my thoughts and thank you all for your dedication and for the hard work you have already put in on this critical issue of redistricting our state.

11/06/2021 - 19:18	Joyce Riedell	Approved Speaker/Could not get online/technical problems	<p>Today I wished to make comments about the proposed redistricting in my area, but technical problems prevented me from doing so. I would still like to enter my comments into the record.</p> <p>I live in the Grayhawk Subdivision in North Scottsdale. My husband and I are retired. Upon retirement we agreed to move to the Scottsdale area for its friendly amenities for retirees.</p> <p>We are situated close to the McDowell Mountains where we can all enjoy many outdoor activities such as hiking, nature and wildlife watching. We also have nearby restaurants, shopping at the Promenade and along the 101 Corridor. We have good medical facilities at a close distance. Many retirees live in Scottsdale for the above reasons.</p> <p>So I am baffled that Desert Ridge, a bustling area of young energetic families with different needs would be included in our same district. We never go to Desert Ridge or east beyond that area.</p> <p>Even more baffling is the inclusion of the Deer Valley Airport, the Deer Valley Industrial Park and the extension to I-17. Much of these areas are fast growing commercial and industrial. They have little in common with Scottsdale, and are completely unlike the area we chose to live in.</p>
11/06/2021 - 21:57	Jeffrey Howell	Summary of 11/6/21 meeting	<p>So I am asking you to adjust the map to include Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, Rio Verde only. Our representatives can better focus on like communities of interest. Hopefully you will take these needs into greater consideration as you debate legislative redistricting.</p> <p>After listening to all 6 hours of the public comment meeting on 11/6/21, these are the points made very clear. Citizens were clearly unhappy with Neuberger for allowing Mehl to submit a map made from a political organization and approving it. A map that doesn't uphold Prop 106 and the laws of the AZ Constitution.</p> <p>Specifically in Southern AZ three things were addressed that were deemed unacceptable. The following should be fixed.</p> <p>Legislative Map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) District 17 must be redrawn going back to LD 9.0 as the preferred map. 2) Santa Cruz County should not be split up and remain as part of LD21 as in LD 9.0 map. <p>Congressional Map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) D6 is unacceptable in its currently approved Congressional Map. With D6 snaking its way up I-10 like a finger to include Casa Grande is gerrymandering. Doing so will make D6 compose of 5 different counties (Graham, Greenlee, Cochise, Pima and Pinal) which doesn't adhere to the "communities of interest" or "geographically compact" rule of Prop 106. 2) Reverting to CD Map 1.1 for southern AZ is the most logical and representational option keeping D6 south of Pinal County line. <p>We hope the entire IRC committee will listen to the communities and follow our requests. There have been MANY, MANY submitted plans that follow the rules of Prop 106 and the AZ Constitution that are being ignored. We don't want political parties having preference to submit gerrymandered districts like Mehl put forth. He should be reprimanded for even allowing it. He even admitted to his partisan proposal of LD17. How that can stand is astonishing.</p>

11/07/2021 - 06:28 Christine Emery

Final IRC Map Comments for Southern Arizona

I reside in precinct #84 in an Active Adult Retirement Community just outside Green Valley/Sahuarita. The community is located in a rural area surrounded by pecan orchards, BLM land, mines, and the Santa Rita Mountains. We choose to live in this area because of its location, we wanted a small community environment.

Comments regarding the Final Draft Maps for Legislative Districts and Congressional Districts:

1 - The commission has placed our area in LD19 which is a good match and choice. We have a lot in common with Cochise County which is also rural & semi-rural, with a lot of retirees, veterans, border patrol and law enforcement families. We need to be kept in LD19, it is a good fit.

2 - The commission has placed our area in CD7 which is a terrible match and a bad choice for our community. We have nothing in common with the City of Tucson, South Tucson and the Reservation. We belong in CD6, with Cochise County, and the eastern and northern part of Pima County. We have small rural and semi-rural community needs that will be overshadowed by "big city" needs in CD7. We will not have a voice if kept in CD7, we will be silenced. This is not right.

Summary: Please remove Green Valley, Sahuarita and precinct #84 from CD7 and place them in CD6. This can be done by moving Casa Grande out of CD6 and moving it into a CD in Maricopa or Pinal County. It would be an injustice to our retirees and small communities if they were left in CD7, we belong in CD6. Leave precinct #84 in LD19 with Cochise County, we have much more in common with this area than we do with LD21 and Tucson.

Thank you.

Christi Emery

11/07/2021 - 08:47 Jeffrey E Tucker

East Valley Redistricting

Dear Commissioners: My name is Jeffrey Tucker and write to you from South Tempe. I have lived here for 8 years, I work in North Chandler and, as an Ahwatukee property owner, I have been a taxpayer in the Kyrene School District for over 15 years. I first want to thank you for the Approved LD Draft Map recognizing and representing the Kyrene School District so well. After over 20 years of being excluded, you have finally made the school district whole within a single LD (LD12) by including the Lone Butte precinct from the Gila River Tribal Lands. Thank you!

I'd like to raise a few major concerns that I see with the Draft Map.

First, as a Tempe resident, I want to tell you that my city of Tempe is small. It's so small that with its 204,000 residents, that it could actually be within a single district of its own. Yet, the current map splits us up into four new districts when it seems that really only two districts are warranted: an urban North Tempe district and a suburban South Tempe district representing the neighborhoods below Southern Avenue.

My next issue with the Draft Map concerns the area where I work, North Chandler. This is a highly concentrated Hispanic and Latino area of Chandler that has effectively been split from the new District 13. This Hispanic community of interest population has now been lumped into LD 12, when instead, it seems to make more sense to extend the new District 13 northward, and effectively remove the LD12 "arm" that was created.

About that LD12 arm, it's not very compact. It stretches all the way east to Val Vista Drive, and cuts through the cities of Gilbert and Chandler. Going westward, LD 12 ends at the base of the western point of the South Mountain area. This stretch of land is 21 miles long. Even the city of Phoenix at its widest point is no bigger than 20 miles! Let's please make this densely populated suburban district far more compact, by removing the LD12 arm at the 101 and simultaneously accomplish the goal of not splitting the Latino district of West Chandler in half.

In summary, please consider these three changes:

1) Please split Tempe into only two districts at Southern Avenue.

2) Please keep the Latino community of Chandler whole, by moving the north Chandler section of LD12 into LD 13, and

3) Combining these 2 points, effectively make LD 12 much more compact by please removing the eastward arm at the 101, and stretch the LD12 district further northward into Tempe instead.

Thank you so much for hearing my suggestions. Further, thank you so much for the tireless work and the many miles you have each traveled for the past year! I appreciate your efforts to make these maps fair, balanced, and representative of the Arizona we live in.

Jeff Tucker

11/07/2021 - 09:30	Laura Huenneke	Congressional District map submission CDF010	As a long-time resident of northern Arizona, I write to register my strong support for the congressional district map submitted by the Nava o Nation Human Rights Commission (CDF010). This map is highly preferable to the Draft Congressional Map for the northern part of the state for many reasons. It unites many of the northern and eastern tribal nations (from Hualapai and Kaibab through Hopi and Nava o all the way to Fort Apache and San Carlos). It avoids diluting the voting power of these Native Americans (as the draft map does, by incorporating Prescott's population). It keeps this region highly competitive (by your metrics) - which I greatly appreciate - while the draft map consigns us to a highly Republican district and disenfranchises the largely moderate population center of Flagstaff and northeastern towns. I also believe it is very important to have congressional representation with real expertise in tribal issues, given the many key issues where tribes play a major role in federal relations (from water rights to energy development) - this region of the state presents a unique opportunity to elect a representative with close connections to tribal interests. Please maintain competitiveness and the electoral power of the largest Native American population center in the US - adopt the key features of submission CDF010.
11/07/2021 - 09:43	William Bowlus-Root	Thanks for sticking with us - 2	I realized that I unintentionally omitted mention of Commissioner Watchman from my earlier email thanking the commissioners who stayed with us all the way through yesterday's Virtual Town Hall. Thank you, Commissioner Watchman! William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen
11/07/2021 - 11:13	William B Hubbard Jr	support for proposed district changes	We are in Precinct 82, Broadmoor - Broadway Village neighborhood. This precinct is dominated by far-left voters, many affiliated with the university. We tend to vote centrist but feel that gamesmanship by the far left has deprived us of any meaningful choice of candidates. So redistricting that counteracts such gamesmanship is welcome, even if it makes our precinct even more leftist.
11/07/2021 - 11:31	Dianne Coscarelli	Draft Maps for Public Comment- Pima County area	I moved here from another state seven years ago. One of my first positive impressions of my new community was the vibrant, competitive nature of elections. For example, the party of my congressperson has changed not once, but twice in a short time. But now I am very concerned about losing all that during the next 10 years. Why? Because proposed LD17 would take that away. LD17 disregards many of the goals of the Arizona Constitution: It is not at all compact or contiguous. Its communities of interest are far-flung and desperate. And it lacks competitiveness. It encircles the outskirts of Tucson in an oddly configured fashion, to create an obviously safe Republican district. I really fear that this version of LD17, will not only chill voter participation, but it will also encourage extremism. What can we do? There is a viable alternative. I urge the Commission to go back to test Map LD 9.0 that Commissioner Lerner proposed. That test map corrects the Constitutional shortcomings found in the current LD17 and it ensures that all of us voters have an equal voice. Thank you Commissioners for your commitment and hard work in addressing this important redistricting process.
11/07/2021 - 12:02	Marilyn Bernhardt	Redistricting Northern AZ	Dear Commissioners, I am most perturbed by the way your proposed LD maps distort competitiveness, community of interest issues and contiguity in northern Arizona proposed LDs 5, 6 and 7 in conflict with the expressed wishes of most of the voters in these areas. You can correct this - easily - by adopting the maps proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona. We ask only that you meet your obligations to the voters and adhere to the 6 factors required of you.
11/07/2021 - 12:23	Peter Bernhardt	Redistricting Map	As proposed the LD map makes a mockery of the concept of "community of interest" as well as stretching the bounds of the interlocking requirements of contiguity and political boundaries. In proposed districts 5 and 7, Sedona is split in two and divided from neighboring Village of Oak Creek. The map places most of the Verde Valley and Sedona within the more distant town of Prescott and disassociates it from its close companion of Flagstaff, it splits the Yavapai Apache Nation and generally shatters the existing relationship among all of these entities - in opposition to nearly 85% of the citizen comments made at the Commission's public hearings. Please adopt the LD map proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona which corrects all of these problems and keeps our area whole.
11/07/2021 - 13:52	Fred Oster	proposed redistricting	The proposed redistricting map has split Sedona/VOC into separate legislative districts. We are one community with shared goals....I strongly feel that it would benefit us to be represented by a single set of legislators so our needs are not diluted. Thank you for your consideration of this issue.
11/07/2021 - 15:01	Joan Marie Steninger	AZ Legislative Redistricting	It does not seem appropriate to me to have towns such as Sedona split and put in separate districts or to have the Village of Oak Creek, where I live, separated from Sedona legislative districts. We in the Verde Valley, Cottonwood, Cornville, Camp Verde, McGuireville, Rimrock, the VOC and Sedona have common interests that are distinct from say, Flagstaff, the Reservations, or Prescott, Prescott Valley and the Chino Valley. Please reconsider these divisions and allow the Verde Valley to have a unified voice with our state government. Thank you for considering my thoughts on redistricting. Joan Steninger

11/07/2021 - 15:37	Mary Lynne Shroyer	redistricting	The most important thing to consider with redistricting is that each district should be competitive between Democrats and Republicans.
11/07/2021 - 17:00	Dora Harrison	Redistricting -	My name is Dora Harrison, a 24 year resident of Coconino County. Having worked for the county, I have been aware of my districting status for many years. I am in support of the map submitted by the Coconino Board of Supervisors and supported by the City Councils of Sedona and Flagstaff. I urge your adoption of the maps and communities presented in this document. These past ten years have been years of total alienation from my legislative "representatives". I would love to have my district be one that understands my views, needs, and culture; I have not had that in more than 10 years.
11/07/2021 - 17:12	Dora Harrison	Congressional Redistricting	Please support the proposed revision of CD 2 - CDF010. This has been proposed by the Navajo Nation and seems most appropriate for the district serving that area.
11/07/2021 - 17:37	J Mark Howell	Redistricting for D19	I don't understand how the new D6 district on the Congressional map can be allowed. There are plenty of other ways to draw this district to meet the requirements of Prop 106. Look at these submitted and published plans that are competitively drawn: IRC Plan Name: CD0059 (its a 51% to 48%) IRC Plan Name: CD0058 (its a 51% to 48%) IRC Plan Name: CD0057 (its a 53% to 46%) IRC Plan Name: CD0056 (its a 53% to 46%) IRC Plan Name: CD0032 There are options out there other than having a snake head pop northward just to gain the population of Casa Grande region. The people of SE Arizona has nothing to do with this issues that face Pinal County and this entire center of the state that is really becoming more of a Phoenix suburb than anything to do with Tucson and SE Arizona. Please don't go north of the Pima County line or close to it.
11/07/2021 - 20:24	Erich Dea	Scottsdale Redistricting	I live in north Scottsdale. My family lives, shops, go to schools, go to church and play in Scottsdale. It is not logical to have Desert Ridge and Deer Valley Airport to be in my district. Why is there a need to move the western boundary past Scottsdale Road, the city boundary? What is the compelling urgent need? The communities are different and the current district boundaries should remain unchanged.
11/07/2021 - 23:17	Susan Breen	Greenlee County should be included in proposed CD2, not CD6	I have lived in Greenlee County for the past 38 years. We have no "community of interest" with the southern counties. We in Graham and Greenlee don't have any part of our boundaries on the southern border; don't have military bases; don't have wineries; don't have any urban or suburban areas. Our rural needs will be overwhelmed by those of larger population areas in the district. I feel that because all of Greenlee is rural, we should remain with the rural parts of the state in the proposed CD 2. As primarily a mining and agricultural county, we have more "community of interest" with parts of Gila, Apache and Navajo Counties as well as Graham. Our topography is similar, our water, employment and infrastructure needs are similar. Thank you for your consideration.
11/07/2021 - 23:41	Walter Mares	Congressional map should have Greenlee with northern counties as it has been this decade	In my opinion, Greenlee has more in common with northern counties such as Apache, Navajo, and adjoining counties of Graham and Gila (what is being called CD2). We have no "community of interest" with the southern counties. In Greenlee there is no part of our boundary on the southern border. Our economic base doesn't include military bases or wineries; additionally we don't have any urban or suburban areas. I fear that if we become part of CD 6, our rural needs will be overwhelmed by those of larger population areas in the district. Greenlee is one of the most rural counties in AZ. It should therefore remain with the other rural parts of the state that have primarily mining and agriculture as the top industries in the proposed CD 2. Thank you for considering this.