



Web Comments 11.09.21 - 11.11.2021

| Submitted Time | Full Name | Subject | Message |
|--------------------|----------------------------|---|--|
| 11/09/2021 - 06 32 | Theodora D Schiro | Redistricting with consideration of rural communities | I urge you to keep in mind one of your primary goals, which is to create competitive maps in Arizona. I live in a rural community between Florence and Kearny and consider myself to belong to both towns and all of the land in between them. At this time our area is fairly evenly balanced between Democrats, Republicans, and Independents. If you throw larger cities into the mix, it will skew the balance and will not be fair to our rural communities. Rural communities have far different needs than large towns and cities and deserve your consideration. Please remain true to your rules by ensuring that your maps are fair and competitive and do not give any one party a measurable advantage. |
| 11/09/2021 - 06 50 | Sally connelly | Redistricting | As a resident and constituent of tubac, I like my representatives, feel they share my values & have improved our community There is no need, except political maneuvering to change our boundaries |
| 11/09/2021 - 07 35 | Paula Wittner | dividing Santa Cruz County legislatively | t is wrong to divide Santa Cruz County legislatively. |
| 11/09/2021 - 08 09 | Kathleen Susan Littlefield | Redistricting | I am a Scottsdale City Councilwoman, elected in 2014, and currently serving Scottsdale citizens on Council. Scottsdale is a very special city and we work hard to keep it that way. The current draft districting map would have a divisive and detrimental impact on it. As a City Councilwoman, Scottsdale is in my care and I take that trust seriously. Therefore, I ask you to carefully consider the following feedback. Scottsdale should not be divided into so many legislative districts. Instead, your goal should be to maintain as much of the city together as possible. In addition, Scottsdale should have a western legislative boundary at Scottsdale Rd. for the Northern and Central parts of the City. In the Southern parts of the city, our border dips as far as 64th St. to the West and touches Tempe and the unincorporated areas to the South. Voters in Scottsdale should be able to elect representatives who would represent them and to whom they can turn for assistance, if needed. Also, Scottsdale has a very busy and successful airport within our boundaries which should be the airport represented within our district. We ask that you keep Phoenix together by joining Desert Ridge and Deer Valley airport within a North Phoenix legislative district. My husband, Bob Littlefield, a former City Councilman, and I live near the 101 and Raintree Rd. We attest that we do not frequently shop in the areas of North Phoenix and believe those areas would be better served by Phoenix representation. Thank you for your consideration. Kathleen S. Littlefield Councilwoman, City of Scottsdale |
| 11/09/2021 - 08:41 | Cynthia Owens | re-zoning | We are retired and spend all our time; eating out, going to church, and shopping in north north Scottsdale- which is VERY different than Rio Verde, Fountain Hills or Phoenix. Do not lump all these communities together-our representation should be by those who live where we do and do what we do. |
| 11/09/2021 - 09:18 | Barbara D'Angelo | Draft Map | I have been a resident of Arizona for 23 years; I have lived in the Catalina Foothills area of Tucson for 2 years and consider my community to be Tucson (as a city and metropolitan area). I strongly object to the current draft map, in particular to district 17. The failure to meet constitutional requirements have been pointed out by others; as a result, if approved the map will likely lead to costly lawsuits. In addition, and equally important, this far flung district does not represent me and others as a community members and residents. This map should not be approved by the IRC. |
| 11/09/2021 - 09 39 | Marilyn Bernhardt | Proposed maps - effect in Northern AZ | As proposed the LD map disregards 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 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. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10 02 | Liz Levine | new redistricting maps | For those of us in Broadmoor-Broadway Village, the current legislative district map separates us from most of the rest of midtown Tucson, and bundles us with Southern Arizona, all the way down to Nogales and the Mexican border. THAT is not our "community of interest", and I have deep questions about how well our concerns and issues and needs will be represented in such a district. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10 02 | Liz Levine | new redistricting maps | 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. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10 03 | Liz Levine | new redistricting maps | I live in a competitive district, in the current LD10. Under these proposed maps, 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. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10 04 | Liz Levine | new redistricting maps | 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 midtown Tucson, and the critical importance of competitiveness. Make my vote count. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10:16 | Peter Bernhardt | Redistricting Map | I live in the small Coconino County portion of Sedona next to the Village of Oak Creek in the Verde Valley and a little over half an hour from Flagstaff. Your legislative map removes me from association with with ALL of those entities - Sedona, the Village of Oak Creek, the Verde Valley and Flagstaff and puts me in LD7 with communities with which I have no relationship whatever. This makes absolutely no sense. I feel totally abandoned by the current proposal. Please revise your divisions of this area to comport with the map proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona. |

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| 11/09/2021 - 10:16 | Andre Richard Newcomb | redistricting maps | <p>I sent a message to you folks about possible maps. I did not include reasoning. I thought you folks would be appearing in Sierra Vista, Arizona and I would use 'that' time to explain why. You weren't there and so now I'll offer an explanation. I'm 68 years old and I've now participated in 3 of these matters of process. I've been living in this area for 57 years. There are terms in criminal investigation: "Person of interest". I've been homeless for 43 years and one might say that I've been homeless all my life. When you folks 'happen' (in response to Constitutional process) the message from the hierarchy of this area is "keep us as one" . . . Cochise County. Well, I've been here 57 years and I've seen these people for quite some time now. You folks should address these people as community of interest . . . in the previously stated terms of "person of interest". No matter how things develop the 'mouths-that-Be' always seem to be doing just fine. And the census demonstrates, as fact, that while Arizona prospers and grows, Cochise County loses population . . . while the "mouths-that-Be" feed off Federal budgets and Capitol generosity. Growth around here occurs in cycles that seems to favor local growth spurts (generational). That is why I proposed the beams of light with electrons & protons. Divide this country club known as Cochise County. Make a pretty picture. Remove partisanship. Sterilize the treasuries. Do not allow them to waltz perpetually to the State "Capitol" as though 'they' are the United States of America. Individual citizens need some fairness.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 10:45 | Dawn Walker | LD17 | <p>I know you've seen this language previously, but the RC does not seem to be paying attention to the citizens of Oro Valley: LD17 doesn't meet the IRC's constitutional criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable – LD17 isn't contiguous when a mountain range sits right in the middle. You would have to cross at least two other legislative districts to go from Oro Valley to Vail. LD17 also isn't compact. Its perimeter is convoluted and sprawling. The constituents residing in one part of the district are hours away from constituents living in other places. • District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable. LD17 doesn't respect communities of interest. Oro Valley has commonalities with Casas Adobes and northern Pima County. They have similar demographics, economies, urbanization, and trajectories. Oro Valley shares a school district with Casas Adobes, as well as water and land concerns and transportation corridors. You can drive from any part of Oro Valley into Casas Adobes and northern Pima county and not notice. Oro Valley is urban-suburban, not rural. LD17 has an almost 10% vote spread which puts the legislative district in the uncompetitive range. Oro Valley's party affiliation mirrors that of the state, not that of a safe Republican district. LD17 is not representative of the citizens of Oro Valley. • To the extent practicable, district lines shall use visible geographic features, but LD 17 ignores the Catalina and Rincon Mountains. LD17 also ignores political boundaries by including Pinal County places. • To the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals. None of the constitutional criteria are negatively impacted by changing LD17, they are only enhanced. Commissioner Lerner s map (9.0) offers an acceptable alternative to the adopted Legislative Draft Map. |
| 11/09/2021 - 10:54 | Fred Olster | Redistricting of Sedona/VOC | <p>Please restore the unity of our community. The proposed redistricting map has chopped up our little town of Sedona/VOC into separate legislative districts. We have concerns that will not be heard if our voice is diluted like this. Thank you.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 11:01 | Paul Messinger | CD2 and LD5 | <p>For CD2 I feel that it is necessary to keep Native American Tribes intact in one CD. I would suggest using Interstate 40 as a dividing line N/S. For LD5 I would suggest keeping Yavapai county intact since the Verde Valley has more in common with Yavapai Co. than its neighbors to the East. High School teams, commerce and tourism. Thank You.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 11:09 | Jann-Michael Greenburg | SUPPORT FOR PROPOSED MAP #LDF049 | <p>My name is Jann-Michael Greenburg, and I am the current president of Scottsdale Unified School District No. 48's ("SUSD") Governing Board, a nonpartisan elected body. I have lived in the City of Scottsdale since 2017 and serve as the vice president of business affairs for Tresóna Multimedia, LLC, my family's Scottsdale-based company. My grandparents, parents, and younger brother also live in Scottsdale.</p> <p>As an elected official, I believe elections and the voting process should be fair, neutral, and accessible to all legally eligible United States citizens. A critical component to achieving these goals is ensuring our voting districts are drawn in accordance with the Independent Restriction Commission's ("IRC") six criteria, namely, that districts must generally have an equal population, be compact and contiguous, comply with the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, respect communities of interest, incorporate visible geographic features, and be competitive. Based on these criteria, I support the proposed Map #LDF049 (also known as the "Keep Greater Scottsdale Together Map") because it meets these essential criteria.</p> <p>Notably, the final draft map splits the following voting precincts: Pine Valley, Mustang, Del Joya, San Simon, McCormick Ranch (in which I, my parents, and my younger brother live), Redwing, Pecos, and Pueblo. Proposed Map #LDF049 addresses this issue, while also offering the IRC the ability to meet all other criteria. Importantly, Map #LDF049 closely achieves my goal of fair and neutral districts by developing a near even split between our nation's two major political parties, with Republicans having only a slight voter registration advantage.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your service, time, and consideration. As always, it is greatly appreciated.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--|---|--|
| 11/09/2021 - 11:21 | Richard Lund, Chairman of the Greenlee County Board of Supervisors | Greenlee County's Comments on Final Draft Maps. | <p>November 9, 2021</p> <p>Arizona Redistricting Commission</p> <p>RE: Comments on Final Draft Maps</p> <p>Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the 2020 Census based redistricting maps. Greenlee County has reviewed them and find that generally speaking, the proposals in Draft Maps CD 7.1 and LD 10.0 are acceptable to Greenlee County. Greenlee County has been placed in proposed Congressional District 6 and proposed Legislative District 19</p> <p>With respect to Congressional District 6, Greenlee County would suggest that southern Gila County be included in this congressional district and the parts of Pinal and Pima County that currently are part of the proposed district be attached to another congressional district. We recognize that the population of southern Gila County may not be a one-for-one trade off with the portions of Pinal and Pima Counties and that some of these areas may need to remain with District 6. But southern Gila County has many common interests with Greenlee, Graham and Cochise counties, chief among them is a strong mining sector in the local economy. Additionally, there is a commonality of public lands: National Forests, Bureau of Land Management and State lands which is shared with the core of District 6. The majority of the areas in Pinal and Pima counties that are currently proposed are not as affected by mining and public land policy as is southern Gila County. For our local economies which are based in mining, agriculture, including ranching, and outdoor recreation, these common issues define much of what is the core of our communities in District 6. Therefore, Greenlee County asks that these common communities of interest be considered and the maps be redrawn to include southern Gila County with District 6 and make whatever adjustments are necessary in Pinal and Pima Counties to accommodate this adjustment.</p> <p>As for Legislative District 19, Greenlee County strongly prefers the adopted LD Draft Map, 10.0. If it were possible to exchange portions of Santa Cruz and Pima for southern Gila County, we would again prefer that as well for the same reasons set forth above regarding CD 6. Nevertheless, we feel it is imperative to keep LD 19 as set out in Draft LD Map 10 0 and not separate the border from the rest of the district. The areas along the Arizona-Mexico border share communities of interest with more than one neighboring community, however, to assume that this community has its strongest ties to Latino communities in Pima and Santa Cruz County over the Latino community in the remainder of Cochise, Graham and Greenlee Counties simply attempts to put form over substance while ignoring agricultural and ranching interests and border issues common to the Cochise, Graham, Greenlee communities. Additionally, having the border represented by three senators and six representatives gives a more effective and broader voice to these issues that are constantly at the forefront of policy issues in Arizona. More specifically, having state representation specific to the developing port of entry in Douglas is both significant and critical to advocating for state-wide support for an economic driver that will become an increasingly important factor as Arizona competes with other border states for its share of the border economy. Lastly, southern Cochise is rural, and in many cases remote. Issues pertinent to rural/remote communities, especially rural Latino communities are not best served by primarily urban legislators who will likely favor urban interests over rural simply by nature of where the majority of their constituents reside.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our comments. We hope you will consider our requests regarding southern Gila County but above all, we ask that you respect the communities of interest set forth in CD Draft Map 7.1 and LD Draft Map 10.0.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Richard Lunt, Chairman Greenlee County Board of Supervisors</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 11:38 | Michael Haboush | Redistricting | <p>The proposed legislative districting that splits Sedona into two districts is nonsense. Legislative representation should be about communities, not politics. Sedona is a community most often associated with the communities of the Verde Valley. To place part of Sedona or the Village of Oak Creek in communities associate with Flagstaff makes no sense whatever.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 11:42 | Ken Cole | Proposed Legislative Districts | <p>Your proposed Arizona Legislative Districts perpetuate the splitting of communities of interest by blindly following our antiquated county boundaries. Specifically, although Flagstaff and Sedona are very similar communities, you perpetuate the unfortunate split between Coconino and Yavapai Counties that runs through the middle of Sedona. You then further split Sedona into three districts by splitting it from the adjoining Village of Oak Creek, Cottonwood, and the rest of the Verde Valley. This is almost a ridiculous as what you have done to Tucson on both your legislative and Congressional districts.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 13:15 | Sallie Kladnik | RC Map Contractor | <p>Please consider the maps for LD6 and LD7 submitted by the Coconino County Supervisors on Oct 27. They have widespread support in Flagstaff, Sedona, and our surrounding area. Please consider the maps submitted by Navajo County and Nation for the CD districts. They are more fair and competitive. They address communities of interest, contiguousness, and competitiveness.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| 11/09/2021 - 13 22 | Deborah Blethen | Redistricting map | <p>Dear Committee, I am writing as a concerned citizen regarding the maps you are currently working on to establish Legislative District. I strongly believe we Yavapai County should be kept together and the Map should reflect this rather than deviate from County boundaries and convolute taxing authorities and related land use, road and related infrastructure maintenance. Splitting the county's efforts will also impede resolution of problems at the state level in these areas. Camp Verde/Verde Valley align more with Prescott/Prescott Valley and Yavapai County in general, in most respects, to wit:</p> <p>Proximity - travel to Prescott Valley shorter commute Sedona to Flagstaff is much shorter commute (43 mins vs, 1 hr. 10 mins to PV) Sedona and Prescott share strong interests in conservation- such as Save the Dells. Median age in Sedona 61, Prescott 58 vs. Flagstaff 25 Travel is much easier to PV due to snow, in winter and tourism in summer mos. Sedona is only a portion of Verde Valley. From Cottonwood and Camp Verde is much easier to get to Prescott Valley Prescott; Prescott Valley are generally much more accessible to Cottonwood and Camp Verde than Flagstaff Verde Watershed starts in Chino Basin above Chino Valley thus more closely aligned with the rest of Yavapai County- whereas Flagstaff is no part of the watershed under AZDEQ Black Canyon city should not be divided by I-17, their interests (rural, western) are more congruent with Prescott /Prescott Valley. Thank you for considering my concerns. Deborah Blethen</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 13 55 | jessica sierra | unhappy with the proposed redistricting and want to do something about it | Please do Not split Sedona and the Village of Oak Creek. What are the reasons this redistricting is so diffracted? |
| 11/09/2021 - 14 27 | Dianne Coscarelli | WebEX times are off | If you sign up to speak for a virtual meeting that starts at noon on Friday, November 12, the WebEx registration form says the meeting starts at midnight (12:00 am) and goes until 1:00 am. I think it is 12 hours off. |
| 11/09/2021 - 15 02 | patricia Hennessy | redistricting discontents.. | the coconino board of supervisors maps are an exemplar for fair redistricting..why not use them instead of unfairly splitting up longstanding communities and their cultures?? |
| 11/09/2021 - 15 30 | Glen A Grant | Competitive Distrts | The most important criterion for the new districts, be they federal or state, is that they be competitive. Our democratic system only works if the districts are competitive. Districts that are firmly Republican or Democratic result in governance by the minority, the extreme of either party. Those elected from non-competitive districts answer to their extreme base and not to the electorate as a whole. When districts are competitive, the majority governs. Those elected from competitive districts have to answer to the entire electorate. When districts are competitive, the resulting legislature is less polarized. The elected representatives are more likely to work across the aisle and compromise. Please do everything legally permissible to make as many of the districts competitive as possible. |
| 11/09/2021 - 15:49 | Louise Vista Michael | Redistricting of current LD 2 | I'm concerned that the current maps seem to cherry pick areas - Sonoita, Elgin, Amado, Tubac - and move them to an area that isn't contiguous and does not share a community of interest. The SE and NE areas in Santa Cruz county share historical, life style and natural profiles that are similar as well as direct connections to Nogales, Tucson and Rio Rico - not Sierra Vista or Davis Monthan AFB. These maps seem designed to create a numbers/nationality balance that does not representative these areas. Making 2 Legislative districts from the one seems needlessly complicated and strained to show a "community of interest" that does not exist. Please keep the current LD2 as well as CD3 in Santa Cruz County for the good of those residents/voters - not for the seeming good of a paper trail. Thank you for taking comments. |
| 11/09/2021 - 15 55 | Marty Light | Sun Lakes/Ahwatukee Redistricting | I have lived in Sun Lakes since 2019 having moved here from Ahwatukee where I lived for 20 years. I believe that the current LD 17 which will become LD12 should include all of the retirement communities in Ahwatukee, Sun Lakes and Friendship Village (Tempe) as "communities of interest". The senior population all share common issues: health care; security from scams and crimes; and safe and affordable housing. Also the piece in the north portion of the draft map which extends to Val Vista between Ray & Elliot should not be included. The reason is - Gilbert should be kept together. Thank you. |
| 11/09/2021 - 15 57 | Dee Peterson | Proposed Redistricting | I strongly oppose the proposed redistricting which would divide Sedona into two districts. |
| 11/09/2021 - 16 04 | Laurie Soloff | IRC - proposed draft map - " District 17" | <p>The proposed district 17 does not comply with federal and state law and is illegal. District 17 is not "compact and contiguous..": it is made up of cherry-picked Republican leaning suburbs from opposite ends of the Tucson area, separated by a mountain range and 45-minute-long drive.</p> <p>t does not "respect communities of interest to the extent practicable." The residents of Tanque Verde and Vail have much closer ties to Tucson than to Marana and Oro Valley.Why are these 4 areas being crammed together?</p> <p>In creating a "safe" Republican district, 17 is not competitive, violating the constitutional requirement that " competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals."</p> <p>Democratic Commissioner Lerner proposed an alternative version of District 17 that was contiguous and highly competitive, but it was rejected on the grounds that it failed to create a "safe" Republican district.</p> <p>Therefore - to meet federal and state requirements, the IRC needs to go back to LD Test map version 9.0 as proposed by Commissioner Lerner.</p> <p>A. Districts shall comply with the U.S. Constitution and the U.S. Voting Rights Act</p> <p>B. Congressional districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable. Ditto with state legislative districts.</p> <p>C. Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable. (You can't split them up any old way.)</p> <p>D. District boundaries shall respect "communities of interest" (the Navajos, your school district, your immediate neighborhood, etc.)</p> <p>E. District lines shall use visible geographic features (mountains, rivers, etc.) and city, town and county boundaries.</p> <p>F. Districts should be competitive ("fair and balanced" in political representation - each party has a roughly equal chance of winning an election.)</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 11/09/2021 - 16 06 | Steve Hetsler | Drawing Maps | I was looking at the Mapping Monday Video of 11-8 and at the 32:00 minute mark he begins to describe the process I'm looking for but cannot determine where in the system he's starting from. Can you provide a link or very specific instructions on how to get there. |
| 11/09/2021 - 17 54 | Brenda Bonine | Redistricting | I want fair and competitive districts that comply with the Voting Rights Act. This means NO GERRYMANDERING. Anything less makes a mockery of the term "Representative Democracy". |
| 11/09/2021 - 18:10 | KATHLEEN MAURO | Republican gerrymandering of AZ - District 17 | <p>District 17 in the LD test map 9.2, wraps itself around Tucson from the NW to the SE. It appears to provide the Republican Party with a strongly Republican base. District 17 fails to meet many criteria and is illegal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable. Mixing Marana, a NW community, with Tanque Verde, a SW community fails to achieve "compact and contiguous". Rather it appears to be made up of cherry-picked Republican leaning suburbs from opposite ends of the Tucson area, separated by a mountain range and 50-minute-long drive. 2. t does not "respect communities of interest to the extent practicable." Tanque Verde and Vail have much closer ties to Tucson than to Marana and Oro Valley. 3. District 17 creates a "safe" Republican district and is not competitive. Thus it violates the constitutional requirement that " competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals." <p>Therefore - The currently proposed District 17 is a sham. In order to meet federal and state requirements, the IRC needs to go back to LD Test map version 9.0 as proposed by Commissioner Lerner. His was as contiguous and highly competitive.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 18:13 | Peter Morin | Gold Canyon Reistricting | Please reconsider how Gold Canyon is being considered as far as changing to be in a proposed new district that will be some 200 miles wide and 400 miles long. This make no sense and violates the mandates of the state constitution. |
| 11/09/2021 - 22 01 | Sarah Walder | Comments on Draft Legislative and Congressional Maps | <p>My name is Sarah Walder. I was born in Flagstaff and grew up in Flagstaff and Chinle. I have been a registered voter in Coconino County for more than 30 years.</p> <p>Comments on Draft Legislative Map Prop 106 specifically directed the Commission to 'oversee the mapping of fair and competitive maps.' The draft maps for LD5, LD6 and LD7 do not achieve this goal. Rather, they split many different communities and are not geographically compact. Please do not separate Sedona, Cottonwood, Flagstaff and the Verde Valley! These communities have educational, cultural and geographic ties to each other and should be grouped together.</p> <p>I support there being a district that is dominated by First Nations people, but by adding Flagstaff you are depriving LD5 and LD7 from being competitive. Competitiveness is an important feature of any legislative district. I personally am extremely worried about the increasing extremism of our politics. The polarization of our communities is a primary cause of this extremism, and this polarization will only grow if districts aren't competitive, as elected representatives will have no motivation to be accountable to a large section of their constituents if they are in a non-competitive or 'safe' seat like the proposed LD5 and LD7.</p> <p>I support the map submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and endorsed unanimously by the City Council of Flagstaff and Sedona. This map makes the districts highly competitive and reflects the economic and cultural communities of interest in Northern Arizona, and will lead to better representation for our Northern Arizona communities.</p> <p>Comments on Draft Congressional Map As a resident of Northern Arizona, I find the Draft Congressional Map of CD 2 to be seemingly greatly out of compliance with the criteria for drawing district lines. The proposed CD2 turns Arizona's most competitive district into a strong Republican district with no apparent justification. There is no good reason to change the historical alignment of CD 2. Using the draft map of CD 2 would reduce competitiveness as well as reduce the voices of our Native American communities. As a resident of this area I object strenuously to being placed in a non-competitive district where our representative is very likely to ignore us.</p> |
| 11/09/2021 - 22 39 | Marie Wenzel | Please Don't Split Sedona | <p>Dear IRC,</p> <p>Splitting a small town like Sedona is absurd when the commission could make minor adjustments to include the Coconino County side of Sedona and residents of Oak Creek Canyon in LD5, and make some minor shifts to balance out the population representation.</p> <p>Think!</p> <p>Marie Wenzel Sedona, AZ</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 06:19 | Steven Hennig | Yuma County redistricting | I strongly believe that Yuma County should NOT undergo redistricting changes as proposed. The Yuma area is served much more effectively as is |
| 11/10/2021 - 06 53 | Celia Dubauskas | South Scottsdale | I am a recent ASU graduate and now working professional who lives in south Scottsdale. I don't think this area should be mapped with Paradise Valley because these are two entirely different demographics. A majority of people in my area are young individuals entering the working class or recent graduates of colleges who are starting their first jobs as well as young families. I feel Tempe and south Scottsdale are more similar and should be mapped together. Please do not map with people in PV as the lifestyle and income levels are very different. There is no way representation would feel appropriate for both groups |
| 11/10/2021 - 06 54 | Robert Blackwell | Keep Greater Scottsdale Together | As a twelve-year Scottsdale resident, I am interested in accomplishing good outcomes for my community. That is why I serve on the board of my HOA and have volunteered on campaigns for city council. I am concerned that Scottsdale could potentially be split across three legislative districts (LDs), given the latest draft of maps. Splitting Scottsdale into three LDs diminishes the authority of the city council I have worked to elect. Under the current map, city officials would need to interact with nine people (six house representatives and three senators) on issues involving the city and the legislature. The Keep Greater Scottsdale Together map (# LDF049) fixes this problem. Thank you, RC, for considering my comments and working to produce fair and competitive maps. |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 11/10/2021 - 08 24 | Sarah Buck | redistricting | Sedona should NOT be split in half! The Village of Oak Creek (Yavapai County) must be kept with Sedona in redistricting. Same interests, same services, same resources. Link us with the Verde Valley and Flagstaff, NOT Prescott! We must keep our community whole, not chopped up into weird linkage, that would tear our communities and interests apart. |
| 11/10/2021 - 09:47 | Elizabeth England | Redistricting | Let the people of Northern AZ decide. The Commission's proposed maps makes a mockery of the factors of competitiveness, community of interest and contiguity in the districts of Northern Arizona. We urge revision of the proposed maps in accordance with the maps proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors and supported by the City of Sedona as well as the great majority of individual commenters at the IRC's public hearings. |
| 11/10/2021 - 09:47 | Ann Heitland | Compactness | Thank you for the demonstration of how to analyze compactness during Tuesday's business meeting. Following the meeting, I compared compactness scores of the Draft Map for LDs 6 and 7 with the scores for the LD6 and 7 maps submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors. Compactness is much improved for D7 in the Supervisors' proposal as compared with the Draft Map while the change in D 6 is minimal. This adds the constitutional criteria of compactness to the already evident advantages of the Supervisors' maps from the perspective of geographic features (Mingus Mountain), city boundaries (Sedona), communities of interest (overwhelming testimony), and competitiveness. |
| 11/10/2021 - 09 55 | Marilyn Bernhardt | Proposed Redistricting Maps - Northern Arizona | Dear Commissioners, Your proposed maps of Northern AZ have done a strong disservice to the factors of contiguity and competitiveness and particularly community of interest in LDs 5,6 and 7. Sedona, the Verde Valley and Flagstaff belong together. Please do not separate us from the things that make us one community: business, tourism, healthcare, education transportation history, natural physical features, and natural resources. You can correct these problems by adopting the Coconino County Board of Supervisors' proposals for Legislative and Congressional Districts, which are supported by the City of Sedona and I urgently request that you do so. |
| 11/10/2021 - 10 08 | Ryan Buckley | New Proposed Congressional Map | You think I don't know what packing looks like! I live in central Phoenix, yet I am now going to be in the same district as Fountain Hills? Disgusting! This looks like a blatant attempt to break up liberal and independent voters in Maricopa county and spread them out amongst more Republican leaning areas. If Arizona wanted gerrymandering it would have left this process to the legislature. Do your job and create a fair map that reflects the split nature of our electorate. Not whatever this partisan bullshit is! Warmest wishes, |
| 11/10/2021 - 10:11 | Roberta Callahan | Legislative District 20 | I have searched several maps looking for this District and have been unable to find LD20. Please advise where I can find a draft map showing LD20 or share information on why I can't find it. This is concerning to me as I made many friends in the past 10 years and now they appear to be located in several districts. Thank you for your assistance. |
| 11/10/2021 - 10 26 | Barbara J. Orcutt | Congressional District 2 | Before retirement, I had the privilege of working in the Tuba City Regional Medical Center where I delivered hundreds of Native American babies. I have lived in Coconino County near Flagstaff for over 25 years. I have a deep love and respect for our Native American neighbors and am distressed to see that the proposed Draft Congressional Map would diminish their voices in Congressional elections for the next 10 years. Placing our First Nations with the whole of Yavapai County means -- according to your own measure of competitiveness -- that Democrats would win ZERO out of 9 elections. This makes no sense and is unfair. Please divide CD 2 at Mingus Mountain and make it more similar to the map proposed by the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission. |
| 11/10/2021 - 10 36 | IRENE WILCOMB | REDISTRIC NG YUMA | I am a 20 year resident in The Foothills of Yuma and have been a realtor here for 14 years. I am deeply concerned about the proposed redistricting of my congressional district. We need Yuma County to be represented by people who have our particular interests at heart. We do not need to be lumped into districts where the elected officials are from metro areas who have little or no knowledge or interest in our community. We need local representation, not people from Phoenix communities. |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---|
| 11/10/2021 - 11:14 | Stephen Hirst | CD2 and LD6 | <p>My name is Steve Hirst. I first voted in Coconino County in 1972, nearly 50 years ago, and make my home in Flagstaff, where I am an active community volunteer.</p> <p>I want to thank you for your public service and dedication to producing the fairest possible voting districts for Arizona. I have just a few comments to guide you in finalizing your work.</p> <p>CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT 2 Flagstaff voters have benefited from a very competitive district (existing CD1). Competitive districts where voting makes a difference encourage voter participation. Competition also discourages extremism, because candidates must appeal to centrist voters in competitive districts. Extremism has fostered much of the harmful polarization in our politics today.</p> <p>The Commission's draft Congressional map now places Flagstaff into CD2 which is redrawn as a strongly Republican district by pairing a district which includes the largest Native American bloc in America with the Prescott/Prescott Valley metropolitan area. The Prescott area has no meaningful connections to Native American needs and would only act to stymie them, given its current support for one of the most backward and openly racist members of Congress. Including Prescott in CD2 does a great disservice to any representation of Native American voters and Flagstaff voters. To paraphrase Commission Chair Neuberger, "Progressive voters have a right to a voice too."</p> <p>The simple solution to this is to redraw the map for CD2 as proposed by the Navajo Nation. I strongly support the Navajo proposal for several reasons. First of all, it unites communities of common interest by including in one district the Gila River, Havasupai, Hopi, Hualapai, Kaibab Paiute, Navajo, San Carlos Apache, San Juan Southern Paiute, and White River Apache Indian communities. This would potentially produce one of the strongest opportunities for Native voices in the nation. That would do Arizona proud. The Navajo map also includes Flagstaff, Sedona, Winslow, and Holbrook—all communities with significant numbers of Native residents who share common interests with them.</p> <p>Just as importantly, the Navajo map is drawn to include more conservative portions of Apache, Coconino, and Navajo counties to keep the district competitive. Please consider redrawing CD2 along the lines of the Navajo Nation proposal.</p> <p>LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT 6 LD6 as drawn by the Commission places Flagstaff into a strongly Democratic district with most of Arizona's Indian reservations. Currently the reservation communities have enjoyed in LD7 the opportunity for a voice in the state legislature. By subsuming them into LD 6 with Flagstaff, they risk losing that voice if they get outnumbered by Flagstaff voters. The LD6 map also separates Flagstaff from its southern suburbs of Kachina Village, Mountainaire, Munds Park, and its sister city of Sedona. All of these communities have common economic and water management issues which require unified representation at the state legislature.</p> <p>The Coconino County's Board of Supervisors has offered an alternative LD6 map which preserves its competitiveness by including more conservative communities to the south and takes in Flagstaff's neighboring communities of common interest. I strongly urge the Commission to consider the Coconino County Board of Supervisors' LD6 map.</p> <p>Thanks again for your hard work. I know this has been a trying effort, but we all admire your willingness to step forward and take it on.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 11:22 | Tamara Miller | Redistricting in East Valley | <p>Dear Commissioners:</p> <p>First, thank you for your time and dedication to the task of redistricting and for your receptiveness to community comments. I am a retired public school teacher and have lived in South Tempe, in close proximity to Chandler, for over 30 years. I feel compelled to speak up regarding the good things and the concerns I have about the Approved LD Draft Map. I have 3 "asks" pertaining to the region in which I live and am familiar.</p> <p>I feel that the aim should be to keep like-communities more together within one district to reflect the shared interests of the community. For example, it makes sense to have the goal to keep within one legislative district the same school district, less-divided cities, and more cohesive population blocks of communities that share the same goals.</p> <p>It appears the Approved LD Draft Map does a good job of keeping the Kyrene School District whole within a single LD (LD12). Thank you!</p> <p>If you must divide Tempe, please divide it into 2 districts, not the proposed 4 LDs. Our city is small in relation to many other cities in Arizona. It may make more sense to divide the city into 2 legislative districts, an urban North Tempe district above Southern Avenue, and a suburban South Tempe, below Southern Avenue.</p> <p>Next, please keep the Latino population and community in Chandler together. The proposed new LD map divides the Latino community with shared interests into halves, between 2 districts, LD 12 and LD 13.</p> <p>To this end, please consider extending the new LD 13 northward, and please consider removing the extended "arm" along the 101 that was created in LD12 that stretches east to Val Vista Drive, cutting through the cities of Chandler and Gilbert. Please consider keeping this Latino population more unified and compact by removing that extended "arm" that will divide this district of West Chandler.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my suggestions.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--|
| 11/10/2021 - 11:29 | Jon Benda | Redistricting maps | <p>We are making safe voting distDistrict 17 is not "compact and contiguous.":</p> <p>it is made up of cherry-picked Republican leaning suburbs from opposite ends of the Tucson area, separated by a mountain range and 45-minute-long drive.</p> <p>t does not "respect communities of interest to the extent practicable." The residents of Tanque Verde and Vail have much closer ties to Tucson than to Marana and Oro Valley.Why are these 4 areas being crammed together?</p> <p>In creating a "safe" Republican district, 17 is not competitive, violating the constitutional requirement that " competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals."</p> <p>Democratic Commissioner Lerner proposed an alternative version of District 17 that was contiguous and highly competitive, but it was rejected on the grounds that it failed to create a "safe" Republican district!</p> <p>Therefore - to meet federal and state requirements, the IRC needs to go back to LD Test map version 9.0 as proposed by Commissioner Lerner.</p> <p>HOW TO COMMENT to the IRC:</p> <p>> go to https://irc.az.gov/contact-us/ricts for republicans, this is against state law.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 11:56 | Aaron Jared Essif | District 17 | <p>I feel that the currently proposed District 17 does NOT follow the rules established. It is NOT Compact or Contiguous. t does NOT respect communities of interest. Nor does it even try to be a Competitive district. It must be changed.Thank You.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 11:58 | Cecilia Varela | CD8 | <p>I am so tired of being in CD8, Lesko s area and it appears I will be stuck there again. My vote has never counted since moving into this area and I am tired of it. It is more Republican than Democrat and the bitch wins. I am glad to see that we will not be in Sun City area which vote for her every time. Also happy that we won t be lumped in with Prescott. I guess you did the best you could and we Democrats will just have to work extra hard to get the bitch out of here!</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 12 07 | Kathryn Kaczmarek | New Redistricting Map | <p>Dear Independent Redistricting Committee Members,</p> <p>I am a voter who will be living in the new CD 9, and I am concerned with the lack of balance of voters in this new district. According to the 2020 presidential numbers applied to the new CD 9, this district will be skewed heavily Republican by 63/37. This is not a balanced map nor is it a fair map. Better balance encourages our elected officials to be responsive to all constituents. The AZ Constitution identifies 6 criteria in creating these redistricting maps and the last one is ' the creation of competitive districts where there is no significant detriment to other goals.' You have not met this criteria with the proposed CD 9 map.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 12:14 | Robin Low | Redistricting | <p>The Verde Valley, Sedona and Flagstaff have strong economic, geographical and socio-political ties. They are a compelling community of interest. Please keep these communities together.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 12 39 | Mary McKell | Maps for Flagstaff | <p>My name is Mary McKell and I have lived in Coconino County for over 40 years. My husband and I have been members of the Flagstaff Community for over 40 years.</p> <p>My comments on the Draft Legislative maps :</p> <p>I think that it is important for the LD map to be competitive and the current map is not competitive. I believe that the Coconino County Board of Supervisors redistricting map provides a positive solution for LD 7 (formerly LD6). This map has been endorsed by the Flagstaff and Sedona City Council and I agree with this proposal because it is competitive and groups communities of interest together. Their proposal is also geographically compact.</p> <p>My comments on the CD map:</p> <p>The draft CD map takes what was a very competitive district and changes it into a Republican district. This does not follow the criteria of competitiveness nor communities communities of interest. I support the map submitted by Navajo Nation, however does meet these mandated criteria. The Navajo Nation as well as the other Native American tribes in out state should not be ignored in the maps that are drawn. I feel that the needs of these communities and of Flagstaff will be ignored given the proposed maps.</p> <p>I appreciate the time and work that goes into drawing the maps but implore the commission to follow the guidelines to draw competitive legislative and congressional maps.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 13 07 | Christine Lee Oler | AZ Independent Redistricting | <p>I attended the IRC meeting last Saturday by Zoom. I had requested to speak but wasn't called on.</p> <p>My message is that the districts must be competitive. I listened to the speakers. Most said they want competitive districts. That means between different points of view. This makes better government because all sides must project their opinions in order to seek registered voters who are inclined to vote for them. One-sided, non-competitive districts are not productive for the people of Arizona.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 13 20 | Rick Hamilton | redistricting | <p>The current proposed redistricting map has Sedona/VOC split apart into separate legislative districts. This would be a great disservice to our community. We share common interests and needs and this would only serve to dilute our voices.</p> <p>Please reunite our town into a single district.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 13 21 | Kristina Geiser Smith | Redistricting | <p>I oppose any proposal that proposes connecting the districts of Prescott/Yavapai County and Sedona. The two have nothing in common: they each have distinctly different community personalities, populations, tourist draws and assets. Such a redistricting is completely inappropriate and is clearly motivated by absolutely nothing other than behind-the-curtain under-the-table politics and is in no way in the best interest of the actual very distinctive populations.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------|--|---|
| 11/10/2021 - 14 25 | steven H. slaton | Future district 7 | <p>My Name is Steven Slaton; I live in Show Low Az. Like to thank Chairman Neuberg, and Commissioners, 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.</p> <p>As for the future of Legislative District 7, By including the Northern Communities with a Southern district of Pinal County as shown in your approved Draft Map Legislative District 7, is not communities of interests or competitiveness.</p> <p>With the size of these districts half of our population is bound to feel unrepresented. And they are already!</p> <p>Districts should accurately represent communities of interest who live and work together.</p> <p>A new Legislative District 7 should accurately represent communities of interest which is required by State and Federal law.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>These communities are made up primarily of rock and high desert plateau, with a vast valley of ranchland, and agriculture, With 2 of the largest Marijuana growing facilities in the state, as well as large wind Farms, and Helium development from Holbrook Basin through the Navajo Reservation these differences separates the two regions, and they should be included in Legislative District 6 not Legislative District 7.</p> <p>The culture and way of life is different than those communities of interest of the White Mountain Communities.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>These cities include Lakeside/Pinetop, Show low, Heber/Overgaard, Forest Lakes, Payson, Pine, Strawberry, Cornville, Camp Verde, Clarkdale, Cottonwood, Williams, Parks, Sedona, Suburban and Rural Flagstaff only as in Doney Park, and West Flagstaff. All of These Communities would meet communities of Interests as well population requirements for Legislative District 7 according to Federal and State Laws.</p> <p>Thank you for your time Sincerely Steven Slaton</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 14 38 | Joseph Kerby | Redistricting | <p>I am contacting you because I want fair and competitive districts that comply with the voting rights act.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 14:47 | Diane A Talbott Mosier | RC maps and redistricting effects on Navajo county | <p>Honorable Commissioners,</p> <p>I truly understand the difficulty of the task you are engaged in. I also understand that you have been insulated behind the truth that it is impossible to make everyone happy. Fairness is not defined by making all parties happy or even select parties happy at the expense of some deemed less deserving. Fairness is, and ought to be, defined by obeying certain just principles. You have been acquainted with examples of these principles, such as compactness, contiguous, etc. You are compelled by law to address certain demographics classified as minority groups, as well.</p> <p>I write to you about a minority group that is not protected by law. This is the rural citizens of Arizona. Our population minus the urban and metropolitan centers equals probably less than twenty five percent of the entire state population. I cannot speak for the rest of the state, but in the 5 Eastern rural Counties, this is a critical identifier.</p> <p>The fair and just principle that you must understand and not ignore is that Rural populations must not be subjugated to urban and metropolitan populations. The 2011 Commission did this consciously and deliberately. I do not know to what end they envisioned in doing so, but it was an unwritten crime against the voting power and minority voice of Rural Eastern Arizona. Your draft maps reflect that you have taken the 2011 travesty and simply adjusted it. The violation is still real, though somewhat mitigated.</p> <p>In 2001, the 5 Eastern Counties (Gila, Graham, Greenlee, southern Navajo and Apache) were united in a legislative district. In 2011, our voting power was eliminated by dividing up our former district into four other districts, each of which had an urban or metropolitan center. Graham and Greenlee with Sierra Vista. Globe-Miami and the Copper Corridor into Casa Grande and Santan. Payson and Snowflake into Flagstaff and Sedona. Show Low and Apache County into the Native American District (not urban, but just as foreign to these communities).</p> <p>The rural Eastern region of Arizona, the 5 East Counties with surrounding rural communities demand our voice back in the legislature. By continuing to divide us, you demonstrate that you do not understand nor respect our cultural minority. You do not understand the constant struggle our towns engage in to obtain resources otherwise available to urban and metro centers. These large population centers typically dominate the elections and thus the political voice. Rural areas become an after thought. Do not continue this error for another ten years.</p> <p>Reunite the 5 Eastern Counties and join us with our rural neighbors in Pinal, Cochise, and perhaps Yavapai counties.</p> <p>Please do not ignore us. Please do not repeat the violation of our voting power from 2011. Please reunite Rural Eastern Arizona in a legislative district and liberate us from urban and metro centers (Flagstaff, Sedona, Santan, Casa Grande, Sierra Vista, metro/suburban Phoenix or Tucson). Thank you.</p> <p>Diane Mosier, Realtor Show Low AZ</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|--|--|
| 11/10/2021 - 16:28 | Norman H. Fuchs | Redistricting map | <p>I am a resident of the Ahwatukee neighborhood of Phoenix, and have been so for more than 20 years. I am now retired, but I was an adjunct professor of physics at ASU for roughly 10 years, after retiring from my position as professor of physics at Purdue University. My daily activities are generally located in the current legislative district 18, with occasional forays into downtown Phoenix.</p> <p>Personally, I find the Final Draft Map 10.0 to be mostly reasonable, with some caveats. I am pleased that the Commission has kept Kyrene School District intact, located in a proposed District 12. I am, however, unhappy that the city of Tempe is unrecognized by the Commission as a political unit, as it has been split into 4 separate districts. I fail to see the logic in this. Moreover, the shape of the proposed LD12 is far from compact, stretching out a long finger to the east in order to trap parts of Mesa and even Gilbert. I believe it would be desirable to replace that eastern extension of LD12 with some precincts of Tempe such as DeSoto, Dobson Ranch and Water Works. That would increase the compactness of the district; even more could be done along these lines, and I strongly believe that would be an improvement.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 17:48 | Deydrek Scott | DO NOT INCLUDE PRESCOTT N CD1 | <p>Hello Commissioners,</p> <p>Please do not include Prescott in CD 1 For the last 10 years, our Congressional District has been the most competitive in the state. It also contains the largest population of Native American tribes of any Congressional District in the country. The map drawn by the commission for our new district packs many Native Americans into a district with Flagstaff, but by adding the entirety of Yavapai County to the district, it becomes a safe Republican seat. The logical western boundary for the district should be Mingus Mountain, not the western Yavapai County line.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 18:59 | Nohl Rosen | Redistricting | <p>Why does the commission insist on trying to put Wickenburg in LD28 and CD9? We should be LD5 and CD2. We have nothing in common with Peoria, Anthem or even Black Canyon City. We should be in the same districts as Congress, AZ and Morristown needs to be there with us. We're a western community known for roping, rodeo, and to a degree mining. Why on earth do you keep insisting on breaking up Wickenburg into two different districts? Wickenburg Ranch was annexed into the town limits and we need to all stay together.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 19:55 | Arlene Rheinfelder | Call to the Public | <p>While the Commissioners have generally done a good job keeping communities of interest together in the rural areas, I'm concerned that most of the metro area lines were drawn without respect to the different communities of interest and deliberately divided communities of interest in the metro area to promote competitiveness. The metro areas deserve the same respect for their communities of interest as the rural area.</p> <p>With respect to Sedona and the Verde Valley, I request that you do NOT use the Coconino Board of Supervisors maps. The Coconino Board of Supervisors, Mayor of Flagstaff, and Flagstaff City Council have no jurisdiction over the Verde Valley and do not speak for the Verde Valley. These communities have provided ample testimony from their citizens that they do NOT want to be included with Flagstaff. It's been stated repeatedly that the Verde Valley and Sedona want to be included with Prescott and Prescott Valley to which they have a greater affinity. I would ask that you keep ALL of Sedona together rather than dividing the city at the county line, and keep Sedona with the rest of the Verde Valley and with Prescott and Prescott Valley.</p> <p>Lastly, I ask that the Commissioners remember that keeping communities of interest together has priority over competitiveness according to our constitution.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 20:37 | Susan Ordway | Redistricting maps | <p>As a resident of Flagstaff I am dismayed that the in the draft Congressional map CD2 is not a competitive district. Competitive districts are important for representative democracies, and also constitutionally a high priority. And adding Yavapai County to CD 2 dilutes Native Americans' voice in government. I support the map submitted by the Navajo Nation on 10/27/21.</p> <p>The draft Legislative map divides the Flagstaff area by placing Kachina Village and Mountaineer in a separate district from the rest of Flagstaff. The residents of those communities work and shop in Flagstaff and are considered to be part of the Flagstaff community. They should be in the same district. I support the revised map submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my concerns and for your service.</p> |
| 11/10/2021 - 22:10 | Llama Habern | Keep Cottonwood with Sedona, Flagstaff, and First Nations! | <p>Currently, the RC is looking at separating Cottonwood from Sedona, Flagstaff and the Northern AZ First Nations (Navajo, Hopi, Apache). This would split up the Verde Valley needlessly! All of us make up a cohesive community with cultural, educational, and geographic ties to each other and we should be grouped together. Additionally, as communities that border the First Nations, we best understand their needs and problems and should therefore remain together. Please don't split us up!</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 00:07 | Shaikh Shams | Drawing border lines for East Valley Districts | <p>Hello! Thanks to the commission for their work in redistricting. They did a good job for congressional district. However, I think they should put more thought for legislative district maps. They should put the communities together in the same district as much possible. For example the retirement communities or Hispanic and Asian communities.</p> <p>Also dividing a small town like Gilbert into 5 different districts does not really make sense. It would be better if LD maps align with the school district maps as much possible.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 08:27 | Norbert Jones | redistricting Scottsdale | <p>I have lived in Scottsdale for about 30 years. I love the integration of living communities, horse communities, and business communities. Scottsdale ends at Scottsdale road. Please do not cut it in to three pieces and don't extend it to I-17. Thank you.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 08:41 | Diana A Henry | County maps | <p>Please accept the Coconino County proposed County maps: LD6: LDF050 LD7: LDF051</p> <p>These are in keeping with Flagstaff and Sedona's wishes to be kept whole. This is more fair and allows thenztives to have a voice whete they live, study and work. Thank you for listening and understanding.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 11/11/2021 - 08:41 | Claire Bickel | redistricting | <p>1-Keeping greater Scottsdale together is consistent with all six of the constitutional criteria for drawing a district. At roughly 240,000 people, it is within the margin of error for an equal population.</p> <p>2-Keeping greater Scottsdale together achieves compactness and contagiousness. It incorporates visible geographic features. The geographic footprint of Scottsdale remains virtually intact as does the Salt River Pima-Maricopa community. It includes all the unique features of urban, suburban and rural.</p> <p>4-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 Scottsdale district.</p> <p>image.png</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 09:09 | Steve Hetsler | Mapping tool | <p>Still looking for response about mapping tool. The Monday video seemed to show how to do it starting at the 32 00 mark but I could not tell where the starting point was. Can you please provide link to that spot or direct me to the menu cohoices that get me there.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 09:13 | Rose Houk | Proposed redistricting | <p>I am writing to support Coconino County's recommendation to redraw the lines for northern Arizona districts. Their redrawn lines are much more in keeping with the goals of redistricting, and importantly will keep Flagstaff within one district. As a long-time resident of Flagstaff, I think this is a key move to assure fairness. Thank you, Rose Houk</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 09:34 | William Bowlus-Root | Map of 2011 districts for use with the Redistricting Tool | <p>This is for Mark Flahan. At the Yuma public hearing last night you indicated you may have a way to show the final 2011 districts in the new Redistricting tool we use to work with currently proposed 2021 maps. I've had numerous people asking me how to do that primarily so they can compare the district borders to see where there are differences. You said to send you an email about this.</p> <p>First, I found a place on the 2011 commissions site where they posted the shapefiles for their congressional and legislative districts (https://azredistricting.org/maps/final-maps/default.asp). However, when I tried to import those into the Redistricting tool, it complained that the necessary files were not present. Looking at the items in the ZIP file, it appears they are so I'm not sure why the tool could not import them.</p> <p>Next, to determine whether it was a problem with those files or the tool, I tried exporting the current 2021 Draft Maps as shapefiles to see if they would have the same problem when I tried to import them into the tool. After selecting the file I clicked the 2020 census year in the Import Shapefile dialog, expanded States in the geography tree and selected Arizona and then clicked OK. It reported no errors and successfully loaded the current maps.</p> <p>Thinking it might load the 2011 districts if I chose the 2010 census year in the Import Shapefile dialog, I tried that. It reported there were 45 missing blocks but asked if I wanted to continue with the import. I clicked OK and the Status dialog came up, but although it appeared to be processing, it never completed, even over night (and there was no way to cancel it at that point).</p> <p>It seems I've exposed a problem with the tool that you may want to look into fixing. However, my main question remains. How can users of the Redistricting tool see the boundaries of the 2011 districts so they can compare what cities and towns are in which districts and what their new districts would be?</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|---|
| 11/11/2021 - 09:51 | William Bowlus-Root | My testimony before the RC at the Public Hearing in Yuma 11/10/21 | <p>For the record (and to possibly help the transcriptionist), here is the testimony I gave at the IRC Public Hearing in Yuma last night, November 10, 2021.</p> <p>My name is William Bowlus-Root. I'm a retired software engineer in Yuma, 85365, which is currently in CD4 and LD13 and would be in the proposed CD7 and LD23.</p> <p>Chair Neuberg and Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to present my views to the Commission today. The point I want to address has to do with safe districts.</p> <p>In my Virtual Town Hall testimony I pointed out that Proposition 106 charges this commission to create "fair and balanced" districts. The voters recognized that the 'safe' districts drawn by legislators were inherently dysfunctional and caused the problems they were trying to fix – lack of government responsiveness, poorly qualified candidates, voter apathy, disenchantment, and low participation in elections.</p> <p>I know the commission feels like it's doing a good job with the hard task of creating the districts. Although it's true the current Draft Maps are not final, they raise a red flag that warns you're heading in the wrong direction.</p> <p>Of the 30 districts in the current legislative Draft Map, there are 2 districts that by your definition 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, the kind of districts the old legislators would have drawn – 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!</p> <p>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 overall balance of power in 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. Balancing safe districts between the parties and calling that competitive is a gross misunderstanding of Proposition 106 and does not justify using them.</p> <p>Safe districts are bad apples. And two spoiled apples do not make a good pie.</p> <p>The people are dismayed to see this process devolve into more partisan wrangling. The commission can regain credibility by turning as many safe districts as possible – regardless of the party they prop up – into competitive districts.</p> <p>Restore competition, as our Founders and the Arizona voters intended! That's your duty.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to speak.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 10:06 | Barbara Tellman | LD 0055 | <p>Chairman Neuberg said she welcomed suggestions about improving 10.0, especially in the outskirts. Here are some positive ones for southern Arizona.</p> <p>LD0055 is the 4th in a series of maps I designed to solve specific Community of Interest (COI) problems incrementally. It includes all of the former attempts listed below starting with LD0048. It is not an attempt to solve all the issues that arise in Pima County from LD 10.0.. It meets the constitutional criteria and the Voting Rights Act and results in more compact districts. The areas covered were identified as COIs in the initial process.</p> <p>Tucson Estates/Avra Valley COI. (15 min. drive to Downtown Tucson.) LD 10 0 divides this small area of about 10 precincts into three separate districts only one of which is likely to have legislators from Tucson. Some neighborhoods and precincts were split. LD0055 unites them with Metro Tucson.</p> <p>Tucson Mountains COI extends from Sentinel Peak (just west of Downtown Tucson) to the Marana Town boundary between the Santa Cruz River and the Tucson Mountain Park/Saguaro National Park boundaries. LD 10.0 divides this area at Ironwood Hill Road (an easy bike ride to City Hall and a block north of the Mayor's home). Residents west of I-10 and north of this line would be represented by someone from the Phoenix suburbs. LD0055 joins this area with Metro Tucson.</p> <p>Stranded Tucson Metro Precincts (part of which were defined as Drexel Heights COI. LD 10.0 places some of them in precincts where their legislator would be from Yuma (3-4 hours away) or Phoenix suburbs. LD0055 keeps all of those precincts (including the Yaqui Tribe) with Metro Tucson, where all their business and other activity occurs.</p> <p>Tohono O'Odham Nation (TON) As stated eloquently by natives at the Tucson Hearing, Tucson began at the site of the TON village of Tukson. All of their business (including two casinos) is conducted in Metro Tucson and many of the tribe's members live in Metro Tucson. They have virtually no connection with Yuma where LD 10.0 places them, a 3-4 hour drive away, separated by large unpopulated federal parks and military areas. LD0055 places TON with the Tucson Metro Area.</p> <p>Green Valley. I-19 runs directly from Nogales, through Green Valley, past TON casinos and the San Xavier District, to downtown Tucson. LD 10.0 takes this section of I-19 and Green Valley away from this direct line, along which Green Valley interacts with the Metro Areas. LD 0055 joins Green Valley with the Nogales and Tucson Metro areas.</p> <p>Thank you for inviting positive suggestions.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---|---|
| 11/11/2021 - 10:12 | William Bowlus-Root | My testimony I was unable to deliver at the RC at the Public Hearing in Yuma 11/10/21 | <p>Due to time constraints, I was unable to deliver these comments at the Public Hearing in Yuma last night, November 10, 2021, so I'll provide them via the Contact Us form instead:</p> <p>At the hearing in Yuma during the Listening Tour, most speakers testified enthusiastically in favor of the way the current boundaries split the city and county as evenly as possible between two districts. The split strengthens our ability to influence policies and laws that benefit our area and help us prosper. Both Republicans and Democrats can have representation that reflects their views.</p> <p>At first the commissioners respected this and early maps split Yuma – although not as evenly as it is currently – between the southwestern districts, CD7 and LD23, and those to our north, CD9 and LD30. However, over time the commission seems to have forgotten us and when the Draft Maps were approved, all (or most) of Yuma was lumped into the southwestern districts. That essentially wipes out our advantage. We'll have less influence.</p> <p>In addition, for some reason the congressional Draft Map includes a 'bump' that pulls the city of Wellton into CD7. Wellton is the hub of a cohesive Community of Interest with the areas that surround it, so the folks who live there asked not to be split. Dividing the area makes no sense.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 10:15 | Katherine O. Bork | Sedona's Community of Interest | Please do not divide Sedona into two districts; that effectively disenfranchises its citizens for the next ten years since we will be part of two districts whose interests do not match our own. Our community of interest includes Cottonwood, the Verde Valley, and Flagstaff; we have little in common with Prescott and Payson. |
| 11/11/2021 - 10:31 | Peggy Natiello, PhD | Redistricting maps | <p>I urge you to revise the proposed maps in accordance with the proposals of the Coconino County Board of Supervisors, which are supported by the city of Sedona as well as the great majority of citizens who have commented at IRC public hearings. Many of us are outraged by your redistricting plans!</p> <p>Peggy Natiello, PhD [REDACTED] Sedona, AZ 86336 Phone: 928-204-5509</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 10:52 | Richard Ruess | Coconino County maps | Please use the maps designed by Coconino County LD6: LDF050, LD7: DLF051. Flagstaff and Sedona should not be split up. Also, any native concerns should be addressed and should not be split up due to and redistricting. |
| 11/11/2021 - 11:22 | Patricia Ann Cervantez | 2021 Approved DRAFT Map Concern - CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT | <p>Graham County and Greenlee County are currently in CD1 (proposed CD2) and I disagree with the proposal. We have NO "Community of Interest" with the southern counties. We don't have any part of our boundaries on the southern border, we don't have any wineries, we don't have military bases, nor do we have any urban or suburban areas. Our RURAL needs will be overwhelmed by those of larger populations in the district.</p> <p>My argument is that both Graham and Greenlee are RURAL they should remain with rural parts of the state in the proposed CD2 (currently CD1). Our counties have primarily mining and agricultural areas which is more "community of interest" with parts of Gila, Apache and Navajo Counties. If you consider our topography, water, employment and infrastructure needs you will note they are much more similar with these counties.</p> <p>I don't understand why a county as small as Graham which is the third smallest in population of our state, should be divided up into two (2) different Congressional Districts when Yavapai, the 4th largest is kept whole. Native Americans on the San Carlos Apache Reservation share their cultural heritage, employment and consumer needs with the rest of Graham and we should be included in the same Congressional District. In addition, many citizens from our local area are employed on the San Carlos Apache Reservation.</p> <p>Any consideration given to my comments in the redistricting process will be greatly appreciated.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 11:30 | Margaret Gallagher | Comments re Draft Map | <p>I am a resident of Scottsdale, writing to ask you to please Keep Greater Scottsdale Together in your next iterations. Your current draft map creates unnecessary and inappropriate divisions.</p> <p>You already have an alternative proposed map (Map LDF049 submitted by Emily Wilson of Scottsdale) which better reflects the boundaries of the City of Scottsdale and of the Salt River Tribal Community, and respects our shared natural and economic interests, particularly along the 101 corridor from 90th Street to McDowell. This map LDF049 is far more representative of our shared interests than your current proposed map which splits our community into multiple districts. Map LDF049 would appropriately keep Scottsdale's elected representatives focused on supporting the shared interests of the City and the Salt River Tribe, including protecting our desert and mountain lands as well as our mutual economic and community interests.</p> <p>Dividing the City of Scottsdale into multiple legislative districts does not properly serve the people in our community. Please Keep Greater Scottsdale Together.</p> <p>Thank you, Margaret Gallagher Scottsdale</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 11:49 | Kathryn Louise Kaczmarek | New 2020 Redistricting Maps for AZ | <p>Dear Committee Members,</p> <p>I have been studying the new proposed redistricting maps, and I am concerned from a statewide perspective, only 6 districts fall in the 7% vote spread between Dems and Republicans. As a commission, you adopted this spread, but only 3 lean Republican and only 3 lean Democratic. Your goal should be to make MORE districts competitive. You can certainly do better than 6 competitive districts. These maps are not fairly balanced.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|---|------------------------------|--|
| 11/11/2021 - 12:09 | Mary Lou Moore | Proposed LD12 Modification | <p>Hello, My name is Mary Lou and I have been a resident of Phoenix since childhood and lived in the Ahwatukee area for 25 years. I retired from Intel and have been involved in my community, in both non-profit (i.e. Duet Partners in Health and Aging) and in various volunteer efforts/groups.</p> <p>I am concerned that the current proposed LD12 draft map will not result in a competitive district. Therefore, I am proposing that the committee modify the LD12 map to include the Sun Lakes area SE of us and ensure Friendship Village, located in Tempe, is also included. I would like to ensure the population reflects the single, family, and retirement constituents that are located on our area. The Gilbert area east of us that is currently drawn into LD12 seems out of place and could be removed.</p> <p>In summary, the goal is to have competitive districts that reflect our population and constituents. Please consider the suggestions made above.</p> <p>Thank you for all of your time and efforts.</p> <p>Mary Lou Moore</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 12:36 | Nancy Meister | Yuma Public Hearing, Nov 10 | <p>I was appalled when some in the audience booed Ms. Ballard as she made her 2 minute comments at the Yuma public hearing on the draft maps. When no one on the dais reminded the audience of the agreements read at the beginning of the meeting by a staff of the AIRC I was even more troubled. The booing was followed by a gentleman verbally attacked Ms. Ballard. The gentleman was not reminded that he was there to address the maps and to direct his comments to the Commission. My hope is that the Chair, Commissioners and Staff at future public hearings do not allow harassment of speakers. All points of view should be respected. Thank you for under taking a very difficult task.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 13:45 | Kurt Schmidt | Proposed Boundaries of LD 17 | <p>My family has resided in the area of unincorporated Pima County known as Casas Adobes for 17 years. We object to the exclusion of Casas Adobes from the proposed boundaries of Legislative District 17. Considering the commonly accepted definition of a community of interest, i.e., a group of individuals who have similar legislative concerns and could benefit from representation through a single individual in a given legislative body, Casas Adobes, Marana, and Oro Valley ought to be joined politically within one Arizona legislative district. From geography to demographics, it really cannot be disputed that Casas Adobes shares much more in common with Marana and Oro Valley than Vail and Tanque Verde Valley do. Furthermore, by virtue of how many dollars in sales taxes are paid into the general funds of Marana and Oro Valley by Casas Adobes residents who purchase the amount of goods and services that they do from businesses located within the adjacent commercial districts of these two municipalities, Marana and Oro Valley each gain significant financial benefit from having Casas Adobes residents living contiguous to their respective, incorporated limits. This certainly makes unincorporated Casas Adobes a community of interest to the incorporated towns of Marana and Oro Valley. Lastly, as was stated by at least one elected official from the Town of Marana, the relatively recent reconstruction and reopening of the I-10/Ina Interchange has created a dynamic by which the entire Ina Road corridor that passes through Marana, Casas Adobes, and Oro Valley from west to east joins these three communities together. Why then should they not be joined together in one legislative district?</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 14:10 | Barney Charles and Barbara Lynn Herring | scottsdale redistricting | <p>Having lived through some of the most difficult of times, we hope, through the redistricting process, that the Commission's concern for Scottsdale, its citizens and its future glory will focus on its being a source of our arts, culture, livability and availability of all the good things that make us a wonderful town, and NOT simply restructuring to guarantee power to elected officials. Enough is enough. Please don't cut Scottsdale up into predictable political bastions. Rather focus on the unity best served by adopting Map LDF049.</p> <p>Barbara and Charles Herring</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 14:19 | SALLY A HARVEY | Maps | <p>I am concerned about the current maps. Sedona should not be split up and should remain with Flagstaff, the community with which they identify more strongly. The Tucson map is a complete disaster and the result of obvious gerrymandering. Please try again and respect the rules for drawing competitive districts.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| 11/11/2021 - 14:20 | Thomas William Sonandres | Comment: LD3 Non-compliance With 4 Criteria & Proposed Statewide Fix | <p>Chairman Neuberg -</p> <p>I am Tom Sonandres, AZ resident and voter since 1983, a Cave Creek resident since 2012.</p> <p>Did you say at an 11/9 public comment session that you believe the proposed LD3 fulfills Competitive Criteria Six "quite well" because sometimes "we have to compromise on behalf of COI"?</p> <p>Please clarify How can LD3 competitiveness be "quite well"</p> <p>----When you say it is subject of "compromise"?</p> <p>---- When LD3's minority party has NO hope of electing a representative given the Republican +20.4% spread?</p> <p>---- When that spread is +13.4% above the Commission-set competitiveness standard of 7% or less spread?</p> <p>---- When LD3's minority party is asked to accept a third decade of Commission-mandated no hope of electing its representative?</p> <p>Please clarify how LD3 meets COI:</p> <p>----When the Commission has replaced our previous non-COI lumping with Yavapai -- THANK YOU - with an even more nonsensical non-COI lumping with Lake Roosevelt and Gila County on our eastern border</p> <p>---- When this eastern expanse appears to make LD3 in non-compliance with the 2nd Compactness & Contiguous and with the 5th Geographic Features Criteria. To travel 100+ miles to Lake Roosevelt from Cave Creek, one drives south through Scottsdale and Phoenix, our NATURAL COI, then up the Beeline Hwy to near Payson before south again to Lake Roosevelt, a trip through vast acreage, through well over half of the proposed LD3, that includes the Tonto and Sitgreaves National Forests, the McDowell and Matzatzal Mountains, and that replaces our current LD1 non-COI link to Yavapai County -- again THANK YOU -- with a non-COI to Gila County?</p> <p>----When this expanse is not in compliance with the 4th COI Criteria because this 60+% acreage of LD3 is not where we shop, send our kids to school, where our medical appointments, banks, movie theaters, frequented restaurants, etc., etc. are. Nor does this expanse's board of supervisors, judges, mayors, school bonds, etc., appear on our current COI LD1 ballots.</p> <p>-- When the proposed LD3 apparently meets only 33% (2 of 6) of Criteria - Equal population and compliance with the US Constitution and VRA.</p> <p>I propose the fix for the above, for me and the rest of the Arizona public, is:</p> <p>(1) Provide the AZ public in the next ten days, well before the 30-day public review ends, a list of criteria compliance of each LD and CD district as determined by Commission, if not by 5-0 vote then by 3-2 vote. And, tell us in each district in which criteria is not in compliance and provide a brief but clear rationale why not. Do the same for the Final Maps. Possibly in a supplementary table. This would greatly enhance public understanding and Commission transparency.</p> <p>(2) Increase the competitive (i.e., under 7 0% split) LDs from 20% (6 of 30) up to 30% (9 of 30) by moving the three 7%-10% split LDs (12, 17, 25) to the competitive LDs now below 7% category. Better, in addition, move LD competitiveness up to 50+% (16 of 30) by moving the seven LDs in the 10%-20.4% range (8, 18, 19, 22, 27, 29, and our LD3 20.4% split) to the below 10% split range. True, LDs in the 7%-10% are not in the Commission's below 7% competitive range. But true too, those districts' minority parties, Dems and Republicans, would then have a Hail-Mary hope of electing their candidate which they don't now have, and for many haven't had since the first 2000 Commission, and unless things change, won't have for a 30-year span.</p> <p>A significant increase in competitive LDs would go an EXTRAORDINARY way to meet overwhelming grassroots-level bipartisan criticism of the Commission's so far inadequate response to this ask.</p> <p>Thanks to the Commission for consideration of my comment.</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 15:30 | Dana Rakinic | RC Redistricting Maps: KEEP GREATER SCOTTSDALE TOGETHER | <p>I have lived in Scottsdale fulltime for 7 years, and have been a Scottsdale homeowner for 17 years. I am committed to having Scottsdale remain a vibrant, positive and comfortable community, that fosters community involvement and takes ALL residents' concerns seriously. I am active in my local community and neighborhood, and I work with the Maricopa County court system, as a Court Appointed Special Advocate, as I care deeply about our children, and their welfare, as the future of our community. I am concerned that the current RC map is inadequate, as it unreasonably divides Scottsdale, which should remain together as a community of interest. Alternatively, Map #LDF041 does precisely this. I ask that you consider keeping greater Scottsdale together, as a political and geographically distinct district, as well as an economic community which includes urban, suburban, reservation and rural residents. A resolution by using Map #LDF041 will also achieve the competitiveness, and thus the fairness, which we prize in Scottsdale, and which has been a hallmark of our city. Thank you for your consideration to my concerns. Dana Rakinic, resident of Scottsdale</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 15:37 | Peter Bernhardt | Redistricting Map | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 11/11/2021 - 15:47 | Colleen Pope | Rotary Park Precinct in Tempe | <p>Dear IRC members and staffers,</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to speak. Our family has lived in Rotary Park for 19 years. Our faith community is here, my husband and I work from home, 2 of our children attend ASU, and one attends a nearby school. We love living in Tempe and frequent local stores, restaurants, doctor's offices, hiking trails, and sports parks. We have every intention of staying in Tempe for the long haul. As the many versions of the legislative map are shared there are several areas of persistent concern.</p> <p>It concerns me that Tempe, like many cities, has been unnecessarily broken up. Our small city is divided between 4 districts in the current version of the map. That is a lot of separation for a community of interest.</p> <p>I am happy to see the Kyrene school district held within one district.</p> <p>In keeping with the requirements from the Arizona Constitution, the pan handle section of the proposed LD12 should be reassigned to a different district and the area to the immediate south of proposed district 12 should be included so that the district is more compact. It would also benefit the large retiree population in this area to have Ahwatukee, Friendship Village, and Sun Lakes be recognized as a community of interest and held within a single district.</p> <p>Without a doubt, the most concerning issue presented by the new map is a clear advantage for Republicans. This map will give the Republican party control of our purple state for a decade. This is alarming considering how extremism, most notably from the political right, is growing and posing an existential threat to our democracy.</p> <p>Thank you for your diligent effort in working through this challenging endeavor.</p> <p>Sincerely Colleen Pope</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 15:49 | Colleen Pope | Rotary Park Precinct in Tempe | <p>Dear IRC members and staffers,</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to speak. Our family has lived in Rotary Park for 19 years. Our faith community is here, my husband and I work from home, 2 of our children attend ASU, and one attends a nearby school. We love living in Tempe and frequent local stores, restaurants, doctor's offices, hiking trails, and sports parks. We have every intention of staying in Tempe for the long haul. As the many versions of the legislative map are shared there are several areas of persistent concern.</p> <p>It concerns me that Tempe, like many cities, has been unnecessarily broken up. Our small city is divided between 4 districts in the current version of the map. That is a lot of separation for a community of interest.</p> <p>I am happy to see the Kyrene school district held within one district.</p> <p>In keeping with the requirements from the Arizona Constitution, the pan handle section of the proposed LD12 should be reassigned to a different district and the area to the immediate south of proposed district 12 should be included so that the district is more compact. It would also benefit the large retiree population in this area to have Ahwatukee, Friendship Village, and Sun Lakes be recognized as a community of interest and held within a single district.</p> <p>Without a doubt, the most concerning issue presented by the new map is a clear advantage for Republicans. This map will give the Republican party control of our purple state for a decade. This is alarming considering how extremism, most notably from the political right, is growing and posing an existential threat to our democracy.</p> <p>Thank you for your diligent effort in working through this challenging endeavor.</p> <p>Sincerely Colleen Pope</p> |
| 11/11/2021 - 16:35 | Allen Skillicorn | Map | I live in Fountain Hills, shop and work in Scottsdale. It's silly to include 117 in my legislative district. Please keep Fountain Hills, Rio Verde, and Scottsdale together. |
| 11/11/2021 - 16:37 | Louanne Giralte | Redistricting | I am a retired Flight Attendant that lives in North Scottsdale. I shop, eat, go to events in Scottsdale. I want to keep Scottsdale as one entity. Do NOT SEPARATE SCOTTSDALE!!! |
| 11/11/2021 - 17:10 | Jesus Jerez | Commenting on AZ Redistricting 2022 | I live in Santa Cruz CO, AZ and would like to sign up to comment on the Redistricting. |
| 11/11/2021 - 17:16 | Janni Smith | Re-Districting Maps | I am a resident of Sedona. The current maps seem to violate the charge of the IRC by splitting Sedona in half and placing part of our community in a district with Prescott, which is a radically different community from Sedona. The map submitted by Coconino County has the best outlines for a reasonable and competitive district. It keeps Sedona whole (which is absolutely essential). It keeps Sedona, Village of Oak Creek and the Verde Valley together, which is also absolutely essential. And it couples the Verde Valley and Sedona with Flagstaff, a community with similar interests and concerns as our communities. Please do not fracture our communities. So, by accepting the Coconino County map submission, the IRC would be adhering to its mission to create balanced, competitive districts among communities of interest. To accept the current destructive map would violate the charter of the IRC. |
| 11/11/2021 - 18:28 | Martha S O'Connor | Keep Greater Scottsdale Together | First Keep Greater Scottsdale Together. Second, the current LD maps are not fair and they're not competitive, your work is not acceptable. Keeping Greater Scottsdale together Respects the 101 as a transportation corridor between Scottsdale and Salt River. It includes virtually all of SUSD. Scottsdale and Salt River share a compelling economic community of interest that begs for legislators who thoroughly understand this relationship and who will represent it in the Legislature. |

| | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|
| 11/11/2021 - 18:34 | Janeen Bailey | LDF049 | Please keep greater Scottsdale together. Better for governing, consensus. Even somewhat better for Republicans. This arrangement works for the city of Scottsdale. Don't divide us down Hayden Road. Janeen Bailey |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:13 | Kevin Patrick Egan | Redistricting | I live in Scottsdale, AZ. I don't shop or spend time anywhere near I-17. Please keep local Government local. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:14 | charlotte perez | redistributing | I am a student and full time employee. I live in north Scottsdale. I live, shop, work, go to church, go to school, and live my life in Scottsdale. This is my community. I don't shop, work, go to school in, or visit Desert Ridge and Deer Valley airport or go near 1-17. Those areas are miles away should not be in the same district. The western boundary for the Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, Rio Verde district should be the western border of Scottsdale, which is at Scottsdale Road, not I-17! Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, and Rio Verde are western/suburban cities. North Phoenix and the 1-17 are urban. These areas are not the same. Our communities of interest are different and shouldn't be in the same district. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:14 | Jan Dubauskas | Proposed District | Hi - I am an attorney and I live with my family in DC Ranch in north Scottsdale. I live, work, play in Scottsdale The proposed map does not represent my community of interest. I do not go to Desert Ridge. And never, ever to Deer Valley Airport. It makes no sense for Phoenix to be in my district. What does make sense is to take out Phoenix, with a Scottsdale Road western boundary. And then to include more of Scottsdale. Thank you! |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:15 | Tami A. Smith | Redistricting | I am resident of Scottsdale. The large majority of my activities take place in Scottsdale. Our communities of interest should remain unchanged. Thank you for your consideration. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:15 | Charles Baird | Redistricting | I am a businessman in Scottsdale. I do not go to highway 17 for anything. This is my district. I work here. I shop here. Please do not make these changes. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:15 | TIMOTHY A STRATTON | Community of Interest | My name is Tim STRATTON. I'm running for City Council in Scottsdale and served on the Board of Zoning Adjustment. I also serve on the Arizona State Board for Charter Schools. The currently proposed maps are terrible for Scottsdale. It splits our community into different and unrelated districts and fragments us. We should be in a more compact district that preserves more of the common interests of Scottsdale. These maps split our City and will divide the community. It will disconnect our city, homes, offices, schools and common areas. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:15 | Arthur T Doglione | Redistricting | I am a business owner, I live, work, go to church, in scottsdale, your proposed redistricting would be very inconvenient for me and others like me. Please consider keeping the district borders close to where they are now. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:16 | Joyce Str | New map | The new map does not represent us. We live and work in Scottsdale. We do not have much in common with Fountain Hills and nothing with the I 17 area. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:16 | Mike FitzGibbons | Redistricting | I'm a Scottsdale business owner Keep border at Scottsdale road not I 17 I never or very seldom go to I 17 Let's be smart Common sense works Thx Mike |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:18 | Gerry Friedel | Redistricting | I am an elected official and councilman for the town of Fountain Hills. I live in Fountain Hills shop in Fountain Hills and go to church in Scottsdale. Please consider community interest when looking at and redrawing these maps. We done need to be included with the I-17 corridor or the Anthem area. Please keep us with Scottsdale and the communities of common interest. |
| 11/11/2021 - 19:24 | Carol Rogala D.O. | Redistricting LD 23 | I am a practicing physician who lives in Fountain Hills. I live and work there, shop and frequent businesses there and in Scottsdale. My husband and I never go to the Deer Valley Airport, I17, or Desert Ridge. It is of no personal or political value to us to be included in a map which would have these areas. The western border for Fountain Hills, Scottsdale, and Rio Verde should be Scottsdale road, not I17. We don't want this change and I will definitely vote against this. Carol Rogala D.O.,FACEP, FASAM |
| 11/11/2021 - 20:23 | Cherie Calbom | Redistricting | I live in Maricopa County off 136th and Shea Blvd. My community is made up of retired people, working people and families whose children attend school in this area. We also have many people who commute to work in Scottsdale. We gather to support local restaurants and arts and entertainment venues throughout Scottsdale. Our communities are primarily single family housing, apartment buildings, and some condominiums. Please keep our Scottsdale community whole in a single congressional district, which is 23. We are very unhappy that you are proposing to split us up into 3 districts. Many people we know are angry about this proposal. Splitting us up and attaching parts of our community to other areas does not represent our values or respect our priorities Focusing on competitiveness is the wrong emphasis. This is not what we need or want. You are here to serve us rather than a personal agenda of competitiveness. Please follow the Arizona Constitution when you are drawing districts |

| | | | |
|--------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 11/11/2021 - 20:43 | Fredi Olster | Redistricting Sedona/VOC | Please restore the unity of our community. Our community...Sedona/VOC...is being splintered by the proposed redistricting map. I sincerely hope this is due to an oversight on the part of the commission and not an attempt to negate the voices of the citizens of Sedona/VOC. Thank you for reconsidering our district lines. |
| 11/11/2021 - 21:32 | Sharon R Edgar | Please give the public access to letters and paper maps. | At the November 9th meeting, Executive Director Brian Schmitt said that he would work with Timmons to provide access to letters and paper maps that have been sent to the Commission or handed to staff at a public hearing. Thank you, in advance, for making this happen. |