

Submitted Time	Full Name	Subject	Message
01/16/2022 - 12:22	Cindy Wagner	Fair Maps	I am very disappointed at the outcome of the lopsided committee's proposed final maps. Please review each CD and LD for compliance with the criteria in Constitution and Voting Rights Act for competitiveness, communities of interest, compactness and contiguosness, and respect to geographic boundaries. The current maps have too many safe districts. Thank you.
01/16/2022 - 21:14	Julie Pindzola	IRC adoption of Final Maps	Hello As the IRC prepares for the 1/18/22 meeting to entertain adoption of the final Final Maps, I make this request. Please go through the mapped districts again, one by one, and identify if and how they meet the six constitutional criteria - more documentation than a blanket "it meets the COI." I believe it was stated some meetings ago that this would be done. This would give the citizens and the record a chance to hear one last time how these districts meet your standards and the Arizona's standards for FAIR and COMPETITIVE district maps. I continue to hope that reason prevails, and blatant gerrymandering is corrected. Moving lines to benefit incumbents should not stand. Creating packed and safe districts where competitive districts were available should not stand.
01/17/2022 - 12:56	Stephanie Voss	Redistricting as gerrymandering	I, like many independent thinkers in Arizona, am deeply disturbed and embarrassed by the results that the IRC is about to finalize. The new maps do not meet the criterion of creating truly competitive districts. Where I live, in Prescott, Yavapai County, we have been grouped in Legislative District One with the Verde Valley -- violating both the instruction to group communities of interest and natural boundaries. This seems to have done deliberately and specifically to weaken any liberal/progressive interests shared by Flagstaff with the northern Yavapai County area, which includes part of Sedona. Please reconsider. The eyes of the history and democracy are upon you. I was so proud of Arizona for having an IRC and not a partisan hatchet committee. It would be a shame to have been wrong.
01/17/2022 - 15:32	Diane Boman	General	I think it would behoove all of us if the commission could set up a checklist for each legislative and congressional district with the 6 constitutional criteria and whether or not they have met each one of these requirements. This would spur debate on arguments for and against changing the maps to meet these requirements can be noted. It would also be helpful to note which commissioners were for or against changing the maps. Making this available to the public would provide a level of transparency and organization that would be much appreciated.
01/18/2022 - 08:29	Gary Johnson	Split Precincts along LD8/LD12 Boundary	There are four voting precincts in Tempe that are split by the LD8/LD12 boundary, which is currently US60. Since LD8 is 5700 over population, and LD12 is only 500 over population, I suggest moving the boundary to Southern Ave for those four voting precincts, Rotary Park, Hollis, etc.

01/19/2022 - 14:14	William Bowlus-Root	Postmortem Notes for the Independent Redistricting Commission	<p>I took some time to do a postmortem from my perspective as an Independent voter on what I felt went right and what could be improved about the commission's work during the past year.</p> <p>What went right:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The experts who were brought in to analyze the polarization data and to provide discussions of other topics like measuring competitiveness were all very good. 2.Executive Assistant Valerie Neumann provided excellent and (usually) timely help responding to ad hoc requests from the public. 3.The IRC stuck to its schedule. <p>What could be improved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The IRC stuck to its schedule, whether or not that was <u>enough</u> time to spend on their task and get it right is a different question. 2.The method for selecting commissioners was politically manipulated by the governor, so the process as designed was subverted from the start. 3.The commissioners failed to see their role as representing <u>all</u> Arizonans and instead frequently stated that they represented their political party and/or the people of their county or the place of residence. That immediately set up an adversarial relationship among the commissioners and injected political partisanship into every discussion. There was never an opportunity for impartiality. 4.The mission of the commission was never clearly stated and agreed upon. That meant the process had no clear guidance. From the outcome, it's clear that, for the majority of commissioners, creating (as stated in Proposition 106) "fair and competitive" districts was NOT their mission or even <u>a</u> goal, when it should have been driving the entire process. 5.The commissioners failed to comprehend the opposing forces that were intentionally set up by Proposition 106. It pits the tendency to want to be in homogeneous districts with the need to be in diverse districts. It's the job of the commission to balance those forces to find their equilibrium when drawing the boundaries. That process was meant to be difficult, and the only way to achieve it is by having a healthy debate of the issues that arise because of it. That was the mechanism Proposition 106 set up with the aim of bolstering democracy, and it was disregarded by the commission at every step. 6.The commission failed to define the six criteria and the importance of each one to the overall outcome was never made clear. That allowed commissioner Neuberg to elevate the Communities of Interest criteria to the level of an 'organizing force' over the rest. Even where the commissioners did agree on measurements and criteria, they did not decide in advance how they would be applied. 7.Because the first Listening Tour focused on getting people to talk about their Communities of Interest, it set the stage for people to believe that they could have districts that would reflect those communities – and only those communities – that their voices, and only their voices, would be heard. That was unrealistic, but the commission did nothing to set expectations otherwise. That also set the tone and direction for all future discussions and considerations, even after the point where the communities that arose from those tours were no longer referred to or used as discussion points. 8.The commission never tried to resolve the points of difference between the various Communities of Interest, or even made clear where the points of contention lay. 9.The acceptance of the idea that the commission had to build everything from scratch worked against it from the start. It was unable to hit the ground running in ways that could easily have been avoided (e.g., assembling the IT team and resources and getting an effective website up and running, understanding its obligations under the Open Meetings law, establishing a team and process for handling Public Records Requests, and it never really established a coherent strategy for outreach or the gathering of public input much less outbound messaging) by using experienced and highly-qualified personnel and consultants. It also resulted in it making a bad choice for Executive Director and delayed selection of an Outreach Coordinator to the point of making that position meaningless. 10.The public hearings were insufficient to gather testimony that reflected the general will of the people. They did not occur at the times and places that allowed members of the general public to take part in them. As such the views presented were skewed away from minorities. It was no doubt expensive to conduct these but in the end that might not have mattered much, since the testimony was disregarded in large part anyway. They served to give the commission the impression it was listening to the public and provided a talking point they could bring up to reassure themselves that they had done their best. 11.Polarization analysis should have been conducted on all districts. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.Reports (at least their executive summaries) received and reviewed. b.A summary of the legal advice provided to the commissioners. 13.Although I did not submit any myself, I have heard from more than a few people that the Public Records Requests they made were not follow-up in a timely manner, often for many months if at all. This made it difficult for the public to perform its role in the process, and is probably a violation of several statutes. Certainly it undermines the credibility of the commission and makes it harder for the public to have any confidence in the process or outcome of the IRC's work. 14.The Executive Director was not up to the level expected from someone in that role serving a commission of such crucial importance. His reports, when they weren't late or skipped entirely, were wholly inadequate and amateur. The public was never able to see any detail around the expenditures for the various consultants or other items being paid for with our tax dollars. We never did see the budget report he kept saying for months would be forthcoming. He was poorly prepared for meetings and frequently failed to follow through on requests from the commissioners or other action items. It's difficult to know whether this was due to ineptness or if it was by design, but every time the chair publicly commended him during meetings it was painful to believe she could not see how poorly he was performing and what a disservice he did to the commission and to the citizens of Arizona as well. It's further evidence of the low level of her quality standards, something we saw demonstrated too often during the year. We all deserved so much more. 15.The mapping consultants should have been tasked with delivering a version of the draft maps that optimized the criteria. This was a simple and obvious request and, given the expertise the chair so often championed, they had (or should have had) the skills and resources to carry it out. But no one on the commission asked, so they did not. <p>William Bowlus-Root A very concerned citizen</p>
--------------------	---------------------	---	---