

Submitted Time	Full Name	Subject	Message
10/27/2021 - 00:14	Carol Schloff	Tucson Communities of Interest	I would like to address my Tucson Community of Interest. Draft maps 9.1 and 9.2 do not support my Community of Interest. Precinct 21 in LD3 does not belong with LD16. We are a vibrant, densely populated precinct, with a Tucson address, that identifies wholly with the city of Tucson. District 16 is rural, and we will feel very out of place and our voices will be minimized. Our interests and concerns will not be served in this sparsely populated, rural environment. District 16 is disjointed and gerrymandered. I ask the committee to put current LD3 precinct 21 with Tucson Metro. It's where we belong.
10/27/2021 - 02:20	Connie M. Williams	Proposed changes to LD19 and LD 20	I have lived in Santa Cruz County for 30 years, and since my retirement from teaching in the public schools there, I have been active as a volunteer in multiple non-profit organizations both here and in Green Valley. I have been following the redistricting process closely and submitted a map that addressed concerns raised by the Sonoita/Elgin COI during the Nogales listening session. I am horrified by Commissioner Mehl's proposed changes to LD19 and 20. This is an unvarnished power grab by Republicans; I don't see any other way to interpret it. Both Quail Creek and Tubac have thriving Democratic Clubs that would be neutralized by moving them into LD19, and moving DM into LD20 adds a huge conservative block that has no real COI ties and would neutralize the reliably more liberal voting preferences here. Frankly, I think Commissioner Mehl should be reprimanded for such a partisan move in what is supposed to be an Independent redistricting process.
10/27/2021 - 05:33	Nancy A. Cox	Independent Redistricting Commission	We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, & Camp Verde. We do Not want to be with Pinal County
10/27/2021 - 05:36	Rosella Baroni	District division	I Ould really wish that the City of Sedona will remain together with our neighboring Verde Valley communities of interest as well as with Flagstaff. Please do not split Sedona into districts along County lines. We are one city and we deserve an intact voice in electing our representatives. We also need to be kept with the rest of the Verde Valley and Flagstaff our interests are intertwined. Those interests include: business (retail and service industries) tourism, healthcare (we are in one system), education (NAU is our four year college opportunity), transportation (I-17 corridor and public transportation), history, natural physical features, and natural resources (Oak Creek and the Verde River.) Please reconsider.
10/27/2021 - 05:44	Tom Booth	Districts Must represent communities of interest.	With the way the map is currently drawn, Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. These are separate communities of interest covering a large distance of area. The new District 3 is too vast for any representative to be effective.  The district should be split between North and South at Scottsdale Rd.
10/27/2021 - 05:57	Wynema Holmes	Gerrymandering	STOP the Republican cheating and craziness!
10/27/2021 - 05:58	Sheri L Schlozman	PLease Keep Sedona in One Voting District Along with the Verde Valley,	Hi, I am a 30 year resident of Sedona. Sedona, was incorporated late, in 1988 after county lines were established which happened back in the 1800's. Sedona, because of it's geographic features was formed as a city split over two counties. One city, two counties. Yet, our needs as a city remain the same. Over the years, I have lived in Sedona, in both Yavapai and Coconino County's, yet my daily life is as a Sedonan. It is the needs of Sedona that are first and foremost on my mind. If you split our city over two voting districts, you dilute our power to vote for the needs of our town. This is wrong. In addition to keeping Sedona in one district, you should also include Cottonwood and the Verde Valley in the same district with Sedona. We are a region. We share housing, transit, shopping, medical systems and more. I regularly spend time in Cottonwood, and Cottonwood residents regularly spend time here. We are one region, one area. Please allow us to vote together as a block and allow our voices to be heard. Please do the right thing for our community. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 06:06	Bobby Davis	Redistricting	"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 06:08	Sue Ann Brown	redistricting	Please leave Payson the same as we are now. We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 06:30	Andrew M Dougherty	Redistricting	I believe that our agricultural heritage, work ethic, and moral code would be most appropriately served in district 16. Birds of a feather and all.

10/27/2021 - 07:00	Lyle Aldridge	Objection to Draft Map 9.0	<p>I object to the legislative boundaries shown on draft map 9.0. As it would apply in Pima County, that draft is not materially different from the districting with which we have live for the past decade. It ignore the dictates of the Arizona Constitution by exalting competitiveness over representation of communities of interest. Basically it requires the suburban parts of Pima County to compete against the densely populated urban areas, and it virtually guarantees that the densely urban interests will prevail. That has been the huge problem with the current maps. As an example, there is a provision of Title 9 ARS that was clearly meant to prohibit the City of Tucson's charging higher water rates for customers outside the city limits. Minor tweaking of the language of that statute would clarify that, but contacting our state legislators about this problem is like banging one's head against a wall.</p> <p>The boundaries shown in Drafts 9.1 and 9.2 are much more consistent with the intent of our constitutional scheme. It would basically provide a chance for the suburban, unincorporated, and small town parts of the county to elect representation to advocate for and protect their interests.</p> <p>The 2011 maps were upheld by the Supreme Court ONLY because the Commission contended that it had drawn those boundaries to ensure satisfaction of Sec. 5 of the Voting Rights Act. That provision of the VRA has been invalidated by the Court, and can no longer justify establishment of boundaries that violate the one man one vote rule.</p>
10/27/2021 - 07:01	Jane Evans	redistricting	Gila County should be with the rural areas of Clarkdale, Cottonwood, Cornville and Camp Verde, which are communities of interest, not Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 07:33	Josephine Nyiri-Verdugo	Redistricting of Payson	Please keep us the same as we are. We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DO NOT want to join with Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 07:38	Gayle Christy	Redistricting	<p>As a Payson resident and voter, I request that we remain with Cornville, Camp Verde, Cottonwood and not with Pinal County. Please protect our rural communities.</p> <p>Thank you and God bless you.</p> <p>Gayle Christy</p>
10/27/2021 - 07:41	Helen Hebert	Redistricting	Please keep LD7 as it is now. Include with Payson,Clarkdale,Cottonwood,Camp Verde and Cornville.they are more like minded people than Pinal County folks. We feel very strongly that it would be in the best interest not only for the Verde Valley but for Gila county. Please, do not change our boundary lines.
10/27/2021 - 07:43	Betty Leon	Redistricting	This payson voter supports keeping payson in Id7, along with cottonwood, Clarkdale, cornvillr, and camp Verde. We do not want to be with Pinal county!g
10/27/2021 - 07:47	Marilyn Castleman	Districting	We want to remain in the same as we are now - with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale and Camp Verce. We DON'T was to be with Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 07:47	Ranney Wayne	Fairness in the Maps	The will of the people of Flagstaff has not truly had a voice in the State Legislature for a few decades now. Our population is not sufficient enough to have our own district. Thus we have been tied to much different populations in order to achieve the required number of bodies within a district. I ask the Commission to TRY and place Flagstaff within a district that does not include the eastern Mogollon Rim communities. They have "drowned out" the voice of Flagstaff in the State Legislature.
10/27/2021 - 07:51	Dayton Hickson	Redistricting LD7	Do not change our district, keep the Verde Valley in Gila county, not Yavapi. Leave Pinal County areas in there own county. Do your duty to follow the wishes of your constituents.c
10/27/2021 - 07:53	William E Mansfield	Redistricting Tyranny	I live in Gila County and your tyrannical redistricting map will be the nail in the coffin of fair elections! I am vehemently opposed to any and all changes to our patriotic district! Do this and we the people will dedicate our lives to flushing each of you off the government payrolls!
10/27/2021 - 07:58	Sheila Zepp	Payson redistricting	Please leave Payson where we are now. No REDISTRICTING!!
10/27/2021 - 08:13	Donna L. Turner	Proposed LD7 Redistricting Map	Please leave Payson the same as we are now. Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Corneille, Clarkdale and Camp Verde. We DO NOT want to be with Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 08:16	Kristine Morrissey	Version 8 LD7	<p>Dear sirs and madams,</p> <p>This recent version of the Redistricting of Arizona is rather alarming. Drawing Pinal County into the northern forested areas of the state makes no sense and just ends up looking suspiciously like it's more politically motivated. Forest fires and loss of critical water sources for the rest of the state are the higher priorities for Payson and other forested communities. I thought the concern was communities of interest after the population spread. This isn't even close. Please do not sacrifice the rural counties to satisfy Maricopa county. See us for the marked differences and needs in terms of representation.</p>

10/27/2021 - 08:16	Peter Matthew Moravcsik	Redistricting maps	Dear Sirs, I live up in Strawberry just above Payson, which mostly determines local issues. Recent redistricting maps have the Payson area thrown in with parts of Pinal county with whom we really have nothing in common. From the standpoint of keeping communities of interest together please consider keeping things more the way they are now. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 08:17	Stephen Otto	Redistricting Map	The redistricting map that includes parts Pinal County with Payson to form a legislative district looks to be gerrymandering at its worst. Payson should be included with Camp Verde, Cottonwood and similar communities to make a more cohesive Legislative District. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 08:38	Tim Joseph Hermanson	redistricting	The same as we are now, the Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Corvallis, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 08:43	Darla Carlisle	Redistricting	we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County." We should be with rural areas like us. Please consider this.
10/27/2021 - 09:01	Shannon Field	Gerrymandering	This is in regards to the gerrymandering of districts. It should be an even amount divided between both parties. This is the fair and right way to give everyone a voice to vote!!!!!!!!!!!!!!
10/27/2021 - 09:02	James M. Harkin	Reject Southern Arizona Leadership Council Partisan Proposal	The Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission (ARC) is a vital positive mechanism to stop gerrymandering to assure fair and trustworthy elections in Arizona. The proposal by the Southern Arizona Leadership Council undermines this worthy purpose. If the SALC maps are accepted, it could create a road map for partisan groups in the future to corrupt the AIRC mapping process. The game plan could be used by either side. First, organize partisans to present community of interest testimony that is made up of purely partisan talking points when there is no real community of interest, only a desire to pack a district to elect a candidate of their partisan leaning. Next, ask one of their partisan commissioners use that testimony to contend that a real community of interest exists even though groups are separated by multiple school districts and a mountain range. Finally, arrange for a non-profit affiliate to submit an unvetted, gerrymandered map late in the process with a claim that it advances the supposed communities of interest. This style of partisan gambit could effectively put an end to independent redistricting in Arizona.
10/27/2021 - 09:06	Terry Brenneman	Redistricting	Greetings, Please leave Payson voters remaining with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DO NOT want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 09:07	Jean Faye Petrie	voting districts	Keep LD7 as it is, do not change it to include Pinal Co. Continue to keep the boundaries aligned with the Verde Valley. Thank you for listening to your voters.
10/27/2021 - 09:12	William J Petrie	voting districts	I am a Payson resident and voter, please do not change the LD7 to include Pinal Co. It should remain just as it is. Thanks for listening to your voters.
10/27/2021 - 09:12	Donald L. Cline	Do not dilute our district!	"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 09:25	William E Boyd	Redistricting	Dear Commission Members, I am a registered voter residing in Tucson. The work of the Commission is difficult and exceedingly important. It is essential that the redistributing be done according to population changes. Redistricting must be free of political influences and political considerations much as is reasonably possible. Respectfully, William Boyd
10/27/2021 - 09:38	Marylyn Knoner	redistricting	Payson should not be included with Pinal County!!! We need to remain with like communities like Prescott, and their surrounding communities. Do not negate our votes by lumping us in with heavily Democrat districts.
10/27/2021 - 09:42	Roscoe Joseph Dabney III	Redistricting	I want District 7 to remain the as it is. No redistricting. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 09:48	Charles Bell	Redistricting	"The same as we are now: We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 09:53	Debra Shewey	Payson voter district.	The same as we are now. Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Clarkdale, Cornville and Camp Verde. We do not want to be moved to Pinal County.

10/27/2021 - 10:02	Ingrid E. Chpuinard	Redistricting	My husband Rich Chouinard and I vehemently opposed the redistricting of Payson, Az being lumped in with Globe, Pinal county, southern Gila county, superior, and Florence as our RURAL interests need to REMAIN AND BE PROPERLY REPRESENTED WITH THOSE MOVED FROM LD6 TO LD7, WHICH INCLUDE VERDE VALLEY, COTTONWOOD, CLARKDALE, CORNVILLE, CAMP VERDE. WE IN PAYSON, DEMAND THST YOU KEEP US IN THE LD7 DISTRICT ALONG WITH OUR RURAL NEIGHBORS AS SPECIFIED. VERY ADAMANTLY YOURS, INGA AND RICH CHOUINARD [REDACTED] PAYSON, AZ 95541
10/27/2021 - 10:08	Beatriz Topete	Redistricting Hearing in Phoenix	I live at E Western Star Blvd near Elliot in Phoenix, there was only one meeting held in Phoenix for the community to attend and comment on the grid maps. Phoenix is the most populated city in the entire state and there should be more meetings held here when it comes time for the public to comment on the draft maps. We deserve the chance to talk to the commissioners about what we think about the maps.
10/27/2021 - 10:08	Suzanne Byrd	Re district non sense	Why is it you feel changing the map will help you steal elections!? You wonder why the GOP LOST ARIZONA..... Look at your actions, not the voters! YOUR all fools trying to drag the rest of us down into the mud, grow up! Run better candidates, on real issues facing OUR state.  AGAIN, Chicken Little was NEVER this interesting. Stop playing with voters, do the work of the state, represent ALL of Arizona, not just the parts you want.
10/27/2021 - 10:17	Mary Margaret Monillas	Redistricting	I am a resident of Scottsdale, shop in Scottsdale, dine in Scottsdale and worship in Scottsdale. Fountain Hills is not Scottsdale and should not be aligned with Scottsdale as you draw a new map. Kindly do not join the two. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 10:20	María Madrid	Redistricting	I live in Phoenix and we haven't mtg in my area
10/27/2021 - 10:24	Daniel Beeaff	Redistributing plan	Your recently proposed redistricting plan is clearly designed to advantage one political party namely the Republican Party. This is a good example of Gerrymandering. Go back to your drawing board, make certain you have an equal number of partisans on your committee and redraw the boundaries in a fairer way. Tucson resident.
10/27/2021 - 10:28	Michael Carlson	redistricting	I very much oppose partisan redistricting. This is one of the oldest evil in politics. Everyone knows it. Please champion independent districting.  Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 10:29	Tommy & Jan Henry	Redistricting	The Republicans just can't seem to win without cheating. Redistricting so the GOP can get more voters in a district giving them more likelihood of electing their representatives is CHEATING! We reject this ridiculous act by the Republicans.

10/27/2021 - 10:46	Ray Darragh	Comments on LD Draft Maps 9.0, 9.1, and 9.2	<p>I want my voice to be heard and would like to share my comments and concerns about LD Draft Maps Versions 9.0, 9.1, and 9.2.</p> <p>1. LD Draft Map Version 9.0 is UNACCEPTABLE. Districts should not be drawn that provide an electoral advantage for a particular political party, yet draft map Version 9.0 provides Democrats with an overwhelming advantage. This map provides me with no representation!</p> <p>Pima County is the second largest county in the state and Republicans have only ONE representative that actually lives in Pima County! To be fair and competitive, we need Republican representation in southern Arizona.</p> <p>My family, neighbors, and friends are a diverse group of individuals that do not want to be in a district that is dominated by Tucson. We do not agree with the politics and the policies in Tucson and we get NO representation from Tucson. This lack of representation is the main reason so many people refuse to live in Tucson. The city does not speak for us and we want no part of Tucson and prefer to keep it that way!</p> <p>2. LD Draft Map Version 9.1 and 9.2 are much more fair and competitive compared to Version 9.0. My family moved to Oro Valley in 1990 and then to Marana in 2016. This entire area is my Community of Interest. This is where my family works, where our grandchildren go to school, where we meet friends and family to dine at our favorite restaurants, where we shop, worship, receive medical services, and where we enjoy outdoor recreational activities.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the IRC recognize the importance and shared benefit of keeping Oro Valley, all of Marana, and the Tanque Verde Valley together on the map. This area is shaped like a backward "C" as discussed last August. Please keep this incredible Community of Interest together and undivided in a single district. That is the best way to ensure we have representation in southern Arizona.</p> <p>I sincerely thank you for considering my comments.</p>
10/27/2021 - 10:54	Lisa Stuessel	Draft Maps LD9 versions - Feedback	<p>Of the 3 draft maps currently on the table for review, LD 9.1 map represents the areas that have the most in common with each other. Most importantly, LD 9.1 does not include the City of Tucson. My community of interests are fairly represented in LD 9.1. Tanque Verde Valley is a small municipality like Oro Valley and Marana and should be included together. These communities have nothing in common with the City of Tucson.</p> <p>Pima County is the second largest county in AZ and deserves adequate representation at the state and federal levels. As a proponent of fair and competitive elections the final map must provide the ability for the citizens to be fairly represented. Currently, only one Republican, Mark Finchem, represents Pima County.</p> <p>LD 9.0 map would eliminate the ability to have a Republican representative and thus, is a non-starter. My community does not use Tucson City police, trash or water services. In the past 4 months I have observed several of the Tucson City Council meetings and I do not align with the council members decision making process, or management style, thus is why I do not live in the city. In addition, I do not get to vote in Tucson city elections, therefore, it makes less sense for me to be included with Tucson City.</p>
10/27/2021 - 10:56	Cindy	Arizona Redistricting	"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdate, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 11:04	LEE R TILMAN	Make new districts competitive!	Arizonans deserve to vote in fair elections based on real choices between values and policy proposals and objectives. We won't accept currently proposed packed/gerrymandered districts that rig the process for one side. My family has not been represented from LD6 in state legislature for decades.
10/27/2021 - 11:09	Emily DePugh	Proposed Redistricting	<p>To Whom it May Concern:</p> <p>The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdate, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Emily DePugh</p>

10/27/2021 - 11:13	Jana Darragh	IRC District Mapping	<p>I want my voice to be heard and would like to share my comments and concerns about LD Draft Maps Versions 9.0, 9.1, and 9.2.</p> <p>1. LD Draft Map Version 9.0 is UNACCEPTABLE. Districts should not be drawn that provide an electoral advantage for a particular political party, yet draft map Version 9.0 provides Democrats with an overwhelming advantage. This map provides me with no representation!</p> <p>Pima County is the second largest county in the state and Republicans have only ONE representative that actually lives in Pima County! To be fair and competitive, we need Republican representation in southern Arizona.</p> <p>My family, neighbors, and friends are a diverse group of individuals that do not want to be in a district that is dominated by Tucson. We do not agree with the politics and the policies in Tucson and we get NO representation from Tucson. This lack of representation is the main reason so many people refuse to live in Tucson. The city does not speak for us and we want no part of Tucson and prefer to keep it that way!</p> <p>2. LD Draft Map Version 9.1 and 9.2 are much more fair and competitive compared to Version 9.0. My family moved to Oro Valley in 1990 and then to Marana in 2016. This entire area is my Community of Interest. This is where my family works, where our grandchildren go to school, where we meet friends and family to dine at our favorite restaurants, where we shop, worship, receive medical services, and where we enjoy outdoor recreational activities.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the IRC recognize the importance and shared benefit of keeping Oro Valley, all of Marana, and the Tanque Verde Valley together on the map. This area is shaped like a backward "C" as discussed last August. Please keep this incredible Community of Interest together and undivided in a single district. That is the best way to ensure we have representation in southern Arizona.</p> <p>I sincerely thank you for considering my comments.</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:14	Richard Surowiec	ReDistricting	<p>I Live in the Oro Valley area. Our Church serves Marana and Oro Valley. We need a Representative for Congress in our area. O'Halleron did not have a office south Flagstaff until February 2021. District #1 Area is insane in size. The State pay not attention to Pima County. We should have Oro Valley , Marana and Tanque Verde Valley in one area. Thank you</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:14	Judith K Loop	Payson and surrounding cities redistricting	<p>My husband and I are registered voters in Gila County. We live in the Town of Payson. We do not want to be linked to Yavapi County. We want to remain within Gila County voting district. We want our local ranching and rural communities to remain in Gila County districting as well. Please read and adhere to our wishes.</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:23	Michele Hermanson	Redistricting	<p>I want fair, bipartisan, non-gerrymandered districts in my state.</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:43	Linda Grau	Redistricting of Payson	<p>"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County.</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:46	Nelson Morgan	LD test maps currently under consideration	<p>Looking at test maps LD 9.0/9.1/9.2 from a numeric/competitiveness point of view (both from the Timmons/NDC output and considerations using planscore, not gone into here for space considerations), it appears that 9.1 and 9.2 are both extremely close to LD8.0, which itself was very close to the citizen submitted map that was at one point called 6.3. Using the Timmons table, for instance, 8.0, 9.1, and 9.2 all have the same competitive districts, and district 17 leans Republican via vote spread (and strongly so in terms of a 9 to 0 on R wins). LD9.0, however, has an additional competitive district in LD17. Other districts are not strongly effected.</p> <p>My point here is that as far as competitiveness is concerned, the suggested maps of 9.1 and 9.2 are pretty much a return to 8.0. Map 9.0 does incorporate both Marana and Oro Valley into the same district, which I understood to be the primary concern raised, while improving competitiveness over the other maps.</p> <p>I defer specific COI comments about maps 9.0/9.1/9.2 to others more knowledgeable about the principal regions affected by the current choice, which are in south AZ; I live in north Phoenix.</p> <p>Thank you for your efforts.</p>
10/27/2021 - 11:50	Leiann Anderson	Green Valley Voice	<p>Hello, We do not want TUCSON to be included in our Green Valley legislative or congressional areas. Pima County is 9800 square miles of diverse communities of interest. Map 9.1 or 9.2 currently reflect our sphere of representation. We are suited to be with law enforcement and military families who live in Sahuarita, Vail and Sierra Vista. Thank you!</p>

10/27/2021 - 11:56	Merle L Shewey	Redistricting	Payson needs to remain in our same district. Do not change our district. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 11:57	Debra J Shewey	Redistricting	Do not change our district. We want to remain the same as we are now.
10/27/2021 - 12:00	Michael D Bellah	proposed map 8.0	I object to map 8.0 and I object to any attempt to redistricting I feel that it is working the way it is, and is fair to all voters  Michael D Bellah
10/27/2021 - 12:07	Bruce Bracker	Santa Cruz County	Chairwoman Neuberg and Commissioners, Thank you for your service on the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. It has come to my attention that during the discussion of legislative districts at the October 26th meeting a proposal was made for consideration. This proposal split the Northern and Eastern portions of Santa Cruz County away from the rest of Santa Cruz County and had this portion combined with Cochise County. During your listening session at the meeting you held in Nogales my comments were to do everything you could to keep Santa Cruz County whole. At the time I was referring to Federal Congressional Districts, but this also applies to State Legislative Districts as well. The communities of interest, State issues we face, the Economic base, and the Culture of this area is aligned with the rest of Santa Cruz County Southern Pima County. As such I would respectfully request that you not deviate from the draft maps 6.0, 6.1 or 6.2 that are available for public review. Sincerely, Bruce Bracker Santa Cruz County Supervisor District #3 Mobil [REDACTED] Office [REDACTED]
10/27/2021 - 12:07	Sheri Gladden	Legislative district changes	I am a resident of the small farming community of Palo Verde. We are a rural conservative community. Most of our population is now in District 4, some may be in District 13. As you consider redrawing the legislative lines I strongly urge you to align our community with district 16. Our area shares common interests with the communities of Maricopa, Casa Grande, and Stanfield. We are not a good fit for a district that adds us to the Goodyear and Avondale areas. We do not share common interests, lifestyles, and backgrounds with these communities. Please keep in mind the interests of all Arizonians, even those of us in your rural areas!
10/27/2021 - 12:21	Dion Heimink Sr.	redistricting maps	Independent Redistricting Commissioners, I am a concerned citizen, voter and tax payer and I live in Oro Valley. Pima County is the 44th largest County in the United States. I do not want to be included in any redistricting map that would include the city of Tucson. I chose to live in Oro Valley because of the quality of life and the safety it provides me and my family away from the City of Tucson. I believe the rural areas should be kept out of any redistricting maps as we have little in common with the people and voters within the Tucson City limits. I believe Marana, Oro Valley and the Tanque Verde Valley should be kept outside of those boundaries. I believe we need fair and competitive maps that will allow Republicans like myself the opportunity to have fair representation. Something I believe we don't have currently. Republican voters are at a severe disadvantage in Pima County due to the population density of the City of Tucson and many of the Democrat voters that live there. The current District Maps put Republicans voters at a disadvantage and that MUST be corrected !!! You have the ability to correct this disparity and I respectfully ask you to do so when these new boundary maps are drawn and considered. With out Fair and Competitive new maps those of us with conservative values who live in Pima County will have no appreciable voice in how we are governed. I thank you all for your time and hard work as I know this has not been an easy task. But your work is vital to all fair minded individuals. That is all I am asking for, FAIRNESS. Best Regards Dion Heimink Sr.
10/27/2021 - 12:28	greg dalder	Maintaining Commission Independence	As a registered voter in Pima County, I understand there may be intervention underway by Republican members of the legislature to undermine the independence of the commission with the goal of tipping the redistricting process to unfairly favor their party. I strongly oppose any and all efforts to influence the process in this way whether they are made by either party. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 12:36	Barbara Parks	redistricting in Pima County	Pima County redistricting. I think map 9.1 or 9.2 are the best option. Any other would dilute the voting strength of the other parties. If I wanted that party to address my needs as a voter, I would have moved to the downtown area of Tucson. I live on the east-side. Our community is of multi-nationalities. If you map out any other way, many many of us will have NO voice. Vote yes on 9.1, this would include everyone!!! Thank you

10/27/2021 - 12:38	Maggie Comment	Southern Az Legislative Districts	<p>&gt; I am very concerned about the southern Arizona legislative map that the IRC adopted last week. As a native Tucsonan who maintains a house in Tucson, I am dismayed about both the flawed process that the IRC used to prioritize and adopt it, and legislative districts it created, which appear to violate all of the six constitutional criteria that the IRC is required to consider. While the IRC indicated this past Tuesday that it is considering some modest changes to that map before draft maps are adopted, I believe that the map remains tainted by favoritism and one sidedness.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; The Southern Arizona Leadership Council ("SALC") somehow got ahead of all of those testifying at hearings, including representatives of minority groups, and got access to one of the commissioners, Mr. Mehl, apparently contacting him during last week's meeting. The SALC was successful in advocating for a map that stretched across Pima County, from one corner to another, with constituents of proposed LD 17 separated by the Catalina Mountains. The residents of the east Tucson/Tanque Verde area share nothing with the residents of Marana and Oro Valley. This is purely a political gambit to create a Republican leaning district in Pima County; as such, it is a gerrymander, pure and simple.</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt;</p> <p>&gt; The IRC should ask itself whether, if a group of Democratic-leaning folks did the same thing, how would the commissioners (or the public) view that? Would they think that the voters of Arizona would be confident that the process they put in place to ensure that the creation of legislative and Congressional districts was fair had been followed? I think not.</p> <p>Commissioner Lerner's proposed changes incorporated in Map 9.0 are plainly an improvement but they do not go far enough to restore fairness.</p>
10/27/2021 - 12:41	Mary Lou Shively	Redistricting for Payson, AZ	"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/27/2021 - 12:42	Michael Shively	Redistricting for Payson, AZ	"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County." THIS IS IMPORTANT!!!
10/27/2021 - 12:47	STACEY SPILLERS	REDISTRICTING	I urge you to draw districts that represent the community's interests. Please do not redraw Uptown Phoenix into suburban district 1. Keep Uptown Phoenix with Midtown, Central, and South Phoenix so that the interests and needs of these communities will be best represented. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 12:59	Kathleen Kearney	Independent Redistricting	I'm a registered voter in Pima County. The gerrymandering of legislative and Congressional districts has resulted in the politicians picking the their voters instead of the voters electing their representatives. It also leads to extreme ideologies on either side. Please fir the sake of our fragile democracy draw fair and sensible districts for the citizens of Arizona.
10/27/2021 - 13:00	Roger Voelker	Tucson area redistricting	<p>I strongly urge the commission to reject Commissioner Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 and adopt Commissioner Lerner's v9.0 map for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.</li> <li>2. Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district D17 that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.</li> <li>3. Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats &amp; 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats).</li> <li>4. As described in the Oct 27 Arizona Daily Star article, Commissioner Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that goal as a legitimate redistricting goal.</li> </ol>

10/27/2021 - 13:02	Caleb Hayter	Proposed Map concerns	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I share Commissioner Lerner's concerns about the inclusion of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council Districts. Those districts were submitted to the Commission late Wednesday, and there is no information on the process that SALC - a special interest group - used to draw them.</p> <p>I echo Commissioner Lerner's question: Did they consult the southern Arizona Latino communities when drafting these districts? This is a question that must be addressed.</p> <p>The Commission must draw districts that adhere to the U.S. Voting Rights Act, which was written to ensure that the voting power of historically marginalized communities of color are protected under law.</p> <p>The voting power of Native American, Latino and other communities of color should be protected by the Independent Redistricting Commission. To dismiss the proposals from the Navajo Nation without serious consideration and analysis, and to completely reject the legislative districts submitted by the Latino Coalition with little justification, were decisions completely counter to this duty.</p> <p>The immediate embrace of a map submitted late in the process by a special interest group, and the Republican Commissioners' attempt to immediately force those district configurations into the official draft maps, was alarming and completely counter to the intent of independent redistricting.</p> <p>Voters in Pima County strongly condemn Republicans' attempts to define Arizona voting districts according to the wishes of powerful single-interest entities. As citizens of our proudly multicultural, multiethnic county, we in Pima stand firmly with our Indigenous neighbors as they assert their Constitutional right to fair representation and unfettered access to the vote.</p>
10/27/2021 - 13:03	Candi Baranski	Redistricting Tanque Verde	<p>Please do not link Tanque Verde valley with Tucson; we are rural area of the county and demand that remain so. Our values out in this area are largely out of sync with Tucson and to combine us would eliminate our representation. Thank you, Candi Baranski</p>
10/27/2021 - 13:10	Tim G Baranski	Redistricting of Tanque Verde Valley	<p>Rural should stay rural. The needs of Tanque Verde Valley are very different than Tucson the city. Such redistricting would be very unfair in representation.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Tim Baranski</p>
10/27/2021 - 13:11	Carole S. Lindly	Redistricting Mapping	<p>Dear Committee,</p> <p>As an Arizona native and resident of Pima County, I now live in the suburbs, zip code 85748 - LD 10. I've developed my own community on the eastside, along the Houghton corridor and in the Tanque Verde Valley. This is where I go to church and do most of my socializing with friends who share my interests and conservative values.</p> <p>I chose the suburbs rather than the city, because I do not share commonalities with the City of Tucson. As a concerned citizen and one who wants legislative and congressional representation, I ask that you please keep the rural and suburban areas together, rather than combining us with the urban areas. When considering the communities of interest for these areas, there is no doubt that we have far differing concerns and issues and that we've also made different lifestyle choices.</p> <p>Due to their rural aspects, interests and community alignment, Marana, Oro Valley, Tanque Verde Valley, Vail, the Houghton corridor, Sahuarita and Green Valley should be kept together. It is no accident that people chose these places to live rather than in the City of Tucson.</p> <p>For the last ten years, people like me have not had adequate representation here. As one of the largest counties in the state of AZ, don't we deserve fair and equitable representation of our interests? The 9.0 map does not have equal population or equal representation; it is simply more of the same and not close to being fair or representing communities of interest. I respectfully and strongly object to that map.</p> <p>Like democrats, I want my voice heard also, as is my right as an American citizen. Please consider the map 9.1, 9.2 or a version as close to these as possible.</p> <p>I also respectfully ask that the Constitution be precisely followed with regard to the criteria set forth so that everyone feels represented. Thank you very much for supporting this process to allow us the opportunity to provide input.</p> <p>Sincerely, Carole Lindly</p>

10/27/2021 - 13:11	Mary Preble	Map of District 16	First - the biggest commentary observed at all the meetings was that nobody wants to be partnered with the City of Tucson. The reason is because the City Charter for Tucson allows Taxation without Representation and nobody has deep enough pockets to take that to the Supreme Court. Since we exodus a system that is un-American we feel the sheep who reside in Tucson just take whatever they are given because they have no voice / vote. District 16 did not have to be drawn with Tucson residents included. The City of Tucson should have been its own swamp of sheep. We want nothing to do with those American Citizens who accept an un-American system. They just don't care. We won't even shop in Tucson so that we don't give them the 2% sales tax to continue to support their maniacal agendas. Do not include unincorporated Pima County with Tucson. They are two different animals.
10/27/2021 - 13:22	James Bartron	redistricting	I am writing to state that we are not part of Tucson and I feel that there is only one plan that meets or comes close to allowing us proper representation and that plan is 9.1. This plan takes into consideration the Tanque Verde Valley and should form a backward C.
10/27/2021 - 13:25	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0	Talking point: Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/27/2021 - 13:25	Garrett Abeln	Southern AZ LDs	Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats & 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats). Please use 9.0 because it is the more fair map!
10/27/2021 - 13:27	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0 vs. 9.1 and 9.2	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.
10/27/2021 - 13:28	Pamela Ingermanson	One change to the redistricting map	With the way the map is currently drawn, Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. These are separate communities of interest covering a large distance of area. The new District 3 is too vast for any representative to be effective.
10/27/2021 - 13:29	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0 vs. 9.1 and 9.2	Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district D17 that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.
10/27/2021 - 13:30	Steve Robinson	Mehl's map	There is simply no explanation for Commissioner Mehl's efforts to combine Tanque Verde on the east with Marana on the west, adorned with a "top hat" of Saddlebrooke in Pinal County, into a single district other than to create homogenous district of white suburban affluence. This is a repudiation of the Commission's stated aims under the law by which it was created. Commissioner Mehl's map must not stand!
10/27/2021 - 13:30	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0 vs 9.1 and 9.2	Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats & 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats).
10/27/2021 - 13:31	Brenda Payton Davies	redistricting map	I have lived in this area for 17 year and I do not feel like I have ever been represented in the US Congress. Oro Valley is a small town, and people who live here to not have the same interests as the people in Tucson. The people who drew the maps 10 years ago, decided to "punish" the republicans in Oro Valley because we did not want to be part of Tucson, so they combined us with the area in the far north east part of the state. We couldn't even connect with them in a timely manner in person. I like the maps 9.1 and 9.2 pretty well, but I would like to see more of Oro Valley in the same district. I also think that Marana and Tanque Verde Valley should be in our district. Thank you for your work.
10/27/2021 - 13:31	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0 vs 9.1 and 9.2	As described in the Oct 27 Arizona Daily Star article, Commissioner Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that goal as a legitimate redistricting goal.

10/27/2021 - 13:34	Patricia Van Tuyl	Comment on IRC discussion of legislative districts in northern Arizona	<p>The Verde Valley-Sedona-Flagstaff-Grand Canyon corridor represents the second-largest tourism economy in Arizona, with over \$2 billion in spending in 2019. Prescott is geographically separated from this area by natural barriers, and has no part in this commercial activity. It has historically been in a Congressional District with the Colorado River areas, and no legitimate basis for moving it has been presented. Moreover, moving it would reduce the opportunities for the Native American Tribes to elect Congressional representatives of their choice.</p> <p>This corridor from the South Rim of the Grand Canyon through Flagstaff and Sedona into and including the Verde Valley, share common commercial, environmental, healthcare, and public safety features which should be represented by one LD. Claims that there is no consensus among communities of interest in northern Arizona have ignored testimony and public comments demonstrating this consensus.</p>
10/27/2021 - 13:35	Alyssa Garcia	Redistricting **	I am a latino American. We are not of the same party as the Mayor of Tucson. We don't want a district that is dominated by the current politics. We have diversity all over this city. We need a voice to be competitive. Vote YES on redistricting maps 9.1 or 9.2. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 13:39	Michael Neely	REDISTRICTING MAPS	I have lived in Desert Ridge for 14 years now and have a strong ties to our community. The new proposed boundaries with Rio Verde and Fountain Hills do not align with our community and The new District 3 is too vast for any representative to be effective. The map needs to be condensed big time. This is not fair to citizens to get the representation we deserve and align with the taxes we pay!
10/27/2021 - 13:45	Lois Longobardi	Keep the backward C	Please do the right thing. I am in district 10, 22nd/Tucson Blvd. 86719 and am in the SAME district with South Tucson. No sense. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 13:48	Deborah Nuttall	Gerrymandering	Quit building up Republican districts! Please
10/27/2021 - 13:49	Annette Szalay	Redistricting Map	I am a conservative and live in Tucson. Tucson central east side used to have more conservative representation. We were strong supporters of the community and our Republic. The last redistricting debacle took all that away. Please consider the ramifications of creating more of the same in Tucson. We want our voices to be heard and be proud of our community. Dont drown out with a one size fits all. It doesn't please consider our voices and representation
10/27/2021 - 13:49	Carol Surowiec	redistricting maps	It is with the greatest concern that I am writing you regarding the redistricting maps that are being considered Your actions will have an impact on whether my vote, my voice will be heard in Washington. After we moved here I have been shocked that Pima County is one of the largest counties in the state and the nation but my voice and my beliefs have been ignored because of the way my district is configured. There is no Republican representation in my county. That doesn't make sense. I live in Oro Valley and I have little in common with Tucson city . I believe that my representation had been denied in every election due to how the current mapping for districts was drawn. I believe Oro Valley, Marana and Tanque Verde Valley need to be in my district. These are areas that have common concerns , interests and needs. Also the Needs of Rural areas need to be combined with other Rural areas for fairness and representation. I have looked at the maps and believe that 9.0 configuration would be repressive to any and all people who are Republicans . I believe that the map 9.2 would allow for better representation for me and my neighbors. I urge you not to draw legislative districts that would deny me my voice in government. Please do not allow our voices to be silenced for another ten years.
10/27/2021 - 13:51	Mary Kay Ruwette	New District 3 Redistricting Maps	I am writing to express my opinion on the new map and combining several districts, including Anthem, Desert Hill and Fountain Hills into one district. The district is too large and will not represent each community with individual needs. I lived in Anthem for 7 years and would except representation of that area which is quite different from Fountain Hills. I urge you to split this district into at least 2 different districts between the north and south.
10/27/2021 - 13:55	Kurt Neumann	Reject Map 9.0	I live in the northeast corner of the Houghton Road corridor. As a retired program director for a large defense corporation, I understand the importance of having a voice at the table with the decision-makers. I have had almost no political representation at the state or federal level for most of the last 10 years. While my community of interest centers around common sense values and concerns typical of suburban or rural areas, the extreme politics of Tucson are instead reflected by my elected representatives. While the entire southern part of Arizona may appear singularly focused on the issues engulfing Tucson, that false perception is a function of previously drawn boundary lines. Our concerns in the suburban and rural areas do not get the attention they deserve. Please reject Map 9.0 which would continue the status quo of silencing a large community in southern Arizona.
10/27/2021 - 13:55	Brenda Sparrold	D17	I spoke before the Commission in Tucson on this point. I am a long, long time resident of Tanque Verde Valley. Because of the geography of the area, notably that Sabino Canyon cuts TVValley off from the rest of the Catalina Foothills area, Tanque Verde is highly integrated with Tucson. If we buy groceries, we buy them in Tucson. If we work outside the home, the vast majority of us do so in Tucson. Our entertainment is in Tucson. Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together. I urge you to reject partisan gerrymandering and shape Arizona districts around real and lasting interests of the communities affected.

10/27/2021 - 13:56	Susan Anderson	LD map 9.0	LD Map 9.0 is the most sensible map presented thus far to the IRC. It puts Oro Valley into its wider community of interest which includes Casas Adobes and Tucson. It is compact, which will be a refreshing change of pace compared to our current LD 11. It is a competitive map which is wholly appropriate for a purple state such as Arizona.
10/27/2021 - 13:58	KENNETH R WOLFE	Political Districts	Please adopt map 9.1 as the new official district map.
10/27/2021 - 14:00	Jay Simpson	Mapping/Communities of Interest/Polarized Voting report	<p>Draft map LD 9.0 is by far the most reasonable approach to the state legislative districts in the state. It comes much closer to complying with the six constitutional criteria. Map 9.0 comes closer to compliance with the VRA; the districts are more compact; the districts respect communities of interest much better; east Tucson is kept with Tucson rather than combined with Marana and Oro Valley which are more than an hour away and separated by the Catalina Mountains. And, the LDs are more competitive. Thus, if the IRC is choosing between map 9.0 vs. the other proposals, map 9.0 is the clear choice according to the constitution.</p> <p>The staff promised to publish Dr Handley report on polarized voting on Tuesday afternoon. Executive Director Schmidt promised it would be in the "newsroom." This is not transparency to say the least. The public should receive this report as well as the other analyses the IRC is receiving on VRA compliance. This should be part of the public process rather than in executive session.</p> <p>Finally, Commissioner Lerner's suggestion to include the Sunnyslope area in CD 1 is spot on. My oldest son attends Sunnyslope High School. Even though Sunnyslope is part of the Glendale Union School district, most of the students and their families are from North Central Phoenix. The students largely attended Madison Elementary Schools and middle schools before matriculating to Sunnyslope. Families worship in Phoenix, shop in Phoenix and socialize in Phoenix, not Glendale or Sun City. Their community of interest is in North Phoenix, not Glendale or Sun City which is the focus of CD 8.</p>
10/27/2021 - 14:02	Ann Hollis	Pima County	Rural Pima County and eastern Tucson do not belong in the same districts as downtown Tucson. These are completely different demographics and different interests. The Houghton corridor from Wilmot eastward shares more of the interests as the county, which is why people live in that area: hiking, biking, volunteering at the national parks and forests, owning and riding horses. East Tanque Verde, for example, is a scenic corridor leading to Catalina Highway as well as horse property; what does it have in common with the area near the University (as currently drawn for LD 10)? In addition, a large number of Republicans live in eastern Pima County/east Tucson and have had only one Republican in 10 years represent us in the state legislature: One two-year term out of the 15 elected positions available for 10 years. Even our flooding issues are completely different than further into town and more impactful.
10/27/2021 - 14:06	Michele Stephens	Provide Public Comment at Oct 28 meeting	I would like to make a public comment on the latest draft map at the meeting tomorrow if possible. I am a Maricopa County resident. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 14:13	Gloria Saeger	LD 3	New Legislative District 3 combines three existing districts into one, will cause several communities of interest to lose their legislators. The district should be split between N and S at Sottsdale Rd . Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 14:14	Jeanne Suliere	Redistricting map decision	<p>I live in Scottsdale east of the 101 off of Shea Blvd and 92nd. I am pleading with you NOT to vote for the proposed redistricting map. Why?</p> <p>Because I do not live in Fountain Hills, I do not live in Desert Ridge area, and I do not live in North Phoenix. Each community is important to keep. This is way to large of an area and also an unfair division! I shop and play in my neighborhood. I want representation in my neighborhood, not miles and miles away from my community.</p>
10/27/2021 - 14:16	Leslie L Hunten	Stay accountable and transparent	Dear IRC, the truth has come out. Commissioner Mehl has admitted that his goal is to gerrymander the Southern Arizona districts in favor of Republicans. Have you forgotten that this is supposed to be a non-partisan process to produce fair and competitive districts? Pima County is 40% Democratic, so the district should not be gerrymandered in the opposite direction. Chair Neuberger needs to stand up to Mr. Mehl, and stop this blatant game-playing. Commissioner Lerner's submitted map is much more respectful of the communities of interest, as well as following the guideline of competitiveness. I ask that you drop Mehl's maps and focus on Lerner's.
10/27/2021 - 14:19	Barbara Reuter	Current AZ Redistricting Commission Proposals	The independent redistricting commission members are supposed to act in an unbiased and balanced manner. In following the AZ Constitution regarding IRC goals, it appears that only one option presented for the redistricting of LD 17 meets the Constitution's goals: Commissioner Lerner's proposed map, lends itself to a more contiguous district of fair competitiveness, along with being less politicized than Commissioner Mehl's map of the same LD 17. The AZ Constitution also notes that, to the extent possible, Districts should follow defined community boundaries. Oro Valley/Marana are completely separate from Tanque Verde and Vail for that matter. I should know, having lived in the Vail area since 2004. Please consider approving and utilizing Commissioner Lerner's proposed LD 17 map.
10/27/2021 - 14:19	Leslie L Hunten	Include the Latino and Navajo maps!	Dear IRC, I'm wondering if you live in the same state as I do. There are huge populations of Native Americans and Hispanics in Arizona. The Navajo Nation and Latino Coalition have submitted maps, but they have been ignored. How dare you leave them out? This goes against your charter, as well as being disrespectful and racist. I demand serious consideration of the Navajo and Hispanic maps in the redistricting process!

10/27/2021 - 14:20	Judith Alkire	Placement of Green Valley AZ on the right map	Good afternoon commissioners, I live in Green Valley AZ I have worked relentlessly for the past ten years to inform the citizens of my legislative district to vote for candidates that would carry our values to the state legislature and to the congress of the United States. Our values are conservative values. For the past ten years our candidates have been defeated! Maybe they were not the best candidates, but more importantly it was because our area was mapped heavily against our conservative values. ten years ago. Please do not let this happen again! Please consider voting YES for proposed map 9.1 or 9.2. This would place Green Valley with communities to the East and Southeast NOT STRAIGHT SOUTH TO NOGALES AND NORTH INTO SOUTH TUCSON. My community is semi-rural, retired adults, military families. We live in unincorporated Pima County, this is a very large area of the state of Arizona! The taxpayers choose to live in this area and we deserve representation. Thank you for the time you give to this commission and the citizens of Arizona. Judith Alkire
10/27/2021 - 14:25	Ken Gallardo	Redistricting	Use the 9.1 map. We here in Marana do not want to be part of Tucson!
10/27/2021 - 14:26	Linda Peet Dugan	Redistricting	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/27/2021 - 14:27	Steve Marks	V.9 is better than 9.1 or 9.2	The 9.0 map is better because it makes for less partisan districts-- the 9.1 and 9.2 maps are clearly partisan and that is against the work of the commission-- keeping asking for the same thing the SALC keeps the boundaries illogical and partisan. Please focus on community and competitive districts Keep Tanque Verde in Tucson. Make the districts fair and competitive and truly linked by shared facilities, institutions. ALSO PLEASE MAKE THE MAPS SHOW THE BOUNDARIES OF THE CITIES AND COUNTIES-- ALSO OTHER BOUNDARIES LIKE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND PARKS SO WE CAN REALLY SEE WHAT IS GOING ON. THANK YOU
10/27/2021 - 14:31	Linda Bureson	Redistricting	Dear Committee: My name is Linda Bureson, and for the last 34 years my husband I have lived in the county in an area called the Tanque Verde Valley, located in LD 10. Tanque Verde Valley is its own community where our children attended and graduated school; we attend church and socialize with friends that share our same values, interests and lifestyle. It is no accident that we chose this area...we did not want to be in the City of Tucson for a variety of reasons. That has not changed. Our current legislative and congressional districts cater to those living within the City of Tucson and do not represent us in the suburbs. The communities of Tanque Verde Valley, Marana, Oro Valley, the Houghton corridor, Vail, Sahuarita and Green Valley share numerous interests and issues, and should be kept together so that we have adequate representation, something we have NOT had for the past ten years. It is my understanding that Pima County is one of the largest counties in Arizona. It is not fair or equitable that we do not have adequate representation of Republican views and interests. The map 9.0 put forth by democrats is status quo, still not having equal representation for Republicans. It clearly does not honor the Constitution with regard to the criteria set forth therein, so that everyone feels represented. I respectfully ask that you reject this map. Please consider selecting map 9.1 or 9.2 either of which aligns more clearly with communities of interest, lifestyle and socioeconomics, as well as our Constitutional processes. Thank you for the opportunity to be part of this process. Sincerely, Linda Bureson
10/27/2021 - 14:33	Steven R Marks	Vail with Marana????	Please ---it is not according to the rules of the IRC to keep putting Vail or Tanque Verde with OV and Marana!!! SALC and Comish Mehl know this and think it OK??? Really this is partisan hyper drive PLEASE keep to the core tasks and criteria... NON PARTISAN and just so you know I have 2 emails -- mostly I use [REDACTED] for business and [REDACTED].com for other issues.... thank you
10/27/2021 - 14:35	Wendy P. Heald	Proposed Legislative Districts	The current proposed redistricting map is offensive to me as a resident of Sedona. Sedona has very little in common with Prescott. I do not go there to shop and I disagree with their taking water from the Verde River Watershed, which is on the Sedona side of Mingus Mountain. Sedona aligns much more closely with Flagstaff. We go shopping there, our doctors are there, and part of Sedona shares the same county as Flagstaff. We share Oak Creek Canyon with Flagstaff. Prescott is a city that has grown too fast. The only thing that Sedona shares with Prescott is being in the same county and I wish we did not. I would much prefer that all of Sedona belonged to Coconino County. This proposal is a clear attempt to dilute Democratic votes and it is wrong wrong wrong. Thank you for your consideration.
10/27/2021 - 14:38	Michele Stephens	Keep Scottsdale as one district	Hello. My name is Michele Stephens and I live in Scottsdale. In looking at the latest draft map, I was very concerned to see that my legislative district now includes Desert Ridge and areas all the way to the West Valley on I-17. This new area does not represent any area that I shop, work or recreate. In the past year, I have never been to Desert Ridge or the western valley. Everything I do is in South, Central or North Scottsdale. I ask that you please keep Scottsdale as one community, if not you are removing my ability to be represented and my voice to be heard. Thank you for your consideration.

10/27/2021 - 14:50	LINZY CHRISTIE	redistricting mapping..	Please keep Marana, Oro Valley, Tanque Verde Valley all together..we are unincorporated areas and we have nothing in common with Tucson city...we need representation which we have not had for the last 10 years...our interests in education..recreation ...land use.. are very different from Tucson city..please let our diverse..unique population from this area have representation...Linzy Christie, LD9 Elected Precinct committeeman, Pima County LD 9 Elected State Committeeman..
10/27/2021 - 15:01	Stephanie Oleary	Redistributing LD 9.1	<p>Writing to you in opposing to using Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 which purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize ( by his own admission) Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area.</p> <p>That is not one of the criteria to be considered in a fair selection, in fact ad a justification it should disqualify his maps if not his participation. It is probably the most honest explanation for the jaw dropping gerrymandered Mehl maps in contrast to Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0. Those maps keep local communities together. I shop, socialize, and use community services in the Tanque Verde areas as I live on Tanque Verde. Oro Valley is on the other side of the Catalinas for heavens sake.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:01	Stephanie Oleary	Redistributing LD 9.1	<p>Writing to you in opposing to using Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 which purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize ( by his own admission) Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area.</p> <p>That is not one of the criteria to be considered in a fair selection, in fact ad a justification it should disqualify his maps if not his participation. It is probably the most honest explanation for the jaw dropping gerrymandered Mehl maps in contrast to Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0. Those maps keep local communities together. I shop, socialize, and use community services in the Tanque Verde areas as I live on Tanque Verde. Oro Valley is on the other side of the Catalinas for heavens sake.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:03	Gary Olson	Re districting	<p>Deer commission members,</p> <p>Please create district maps so that rural stays rural and is not combine with so much of the city of Tucson.</p> <p>Please consider putting Fort Lowell neighborhood area combined withThe area north of Pantano and Rillito washes these are common community interests because of the relationship we have with the washes and the trail system we have put in as well as Pima county Flood Control loop trail.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>

10/27/2021 - 15:03	Lynn Goldstein	Redistricting	<p>Congressional District Test Map Version 6.0 D1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•I feel that CD Test Map Version 6.0 D1 meets a level of competitiveness that is fair and balanced.</li> <li>•I commend the Commission on creating a fair and competitive map.</li> <li>•Thank you for including (enter your city/town here) in D1, which a fair and competitive Congressional District.</li> <li>•Thank you for keeping District 1 on Test Map Version 6.0 with Maricopa County and not including my area with Yavapai County.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Legislative District Test Map Version 8.0 Specific Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•I have lived in Carefree, Arizona for six years and have never been able to elect the candidates of my choice for the state legislature or U. S. Congress.</li> <li>•My current legislative district is non-competitive with a 26.5% disadvantage for one party.</li> <li>•I thank the Commission for separating our district from Yavapai County but urge you to understand our community of interest and to draw maps that create a better balance between D3 and D8.</li> <li>•Fairly balanced maps will benefit citizens of all parties since they will help guard against extremist ideology and require candidates and legislators to be more responsive to the interests and needs of their constituents.</li> <li>•I thank the Commission for separating our current district from Yavapai County but urge you to understand that our community of interest not only extends south from Carefree Highway but also seeks more political balance within Maricopa County.</li> <li>•One way to achieve this is by incorporating parts of the adjoining new Legislative D8 which has an uncompetitive vote spread of 64.19 D to 35.81 R into new LD 3 which has a non-competitive vote spread of 39.79 D to 60.21 R. These spreads do not compare favorably with the maximum targeted 46.5 to 53 range that the Commission initially agreed on. In particular, I suggest adding the Salt River Pima Reservation in its entirety and portions of northern Tempe into LD3 with the intent of balancing competitiveness for the two districts.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">General Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Each district should be far more competitive to the extent possible to give hope to all minority-party voters in current lopsided single-party safe districts that their candidates have a competitive chance of winning.</li> <li>•The Commissioners should ensure that each district is as competitive as possible. Competitiveness does not mean a 15R-15D legislative map for a balanced legislature. Each district should be drawn as competitive as possible, so the extremes don't dominate.</li> <li>•Please review ALL districts in all maps regarding their conformity with all six criteria. If the Commission is not going to change any non-conformity, please explain clearly and fully why not.</li> <li>•In LD Test Map 8.0, there are 11 legislative districts that favor Democrats, 14 that favor Republicans and five that fall within a competitive range. This does not fulfill the intent of fair and competitive districts as established in Prop 106. Please ensure the possibility of a fair and balanced legislature.</li> <li>•Maps were submitted to the Commission late Wednesday by SALC - a special interest group. The immediate embrace of a map submitted late in the process by a special interest group, and the Republican Commissioners' attempt to immediately force those district configurations into the official draft maps, was alarming and completely counter to the intent of independent redistricting.</li> <li>oDid SALC consult the southern Arizona Latino communities when drafting these districts?</li> <li>•The Commission must draw districts that adhere to the U.S. Voting Rights Act, which was written to ensure that the voting power of historically marginalized communities of color are protected under law.</li> <li>•The voting power of Native American, Latino, and other communities of color should be protected by the Independent Redistricting Commission. To dismiss the proposals from the Navajo Nation without serious consideration and analysis, and to completely reject the legislative districts submitted by the Latino Coalition with little justification, are decisions completely counter to this duty.</li> <li>•The independent Chair of the IRC is deferring to Republican Commissioner Mehl too much during these hearings, allowing him to direct changes to the maps as he desires. This is especially true in southern Arizona since he is the only commissioner from the area, but he is also directing changes in other parts of the state.</li> <li>•The Chair needs to be acting more independently and not giving too much weight to partisan opinions.</li> </ul>
10/27/2021 - 15:06	Crystal Bazarnic	LD test map 8.0, 9.0, 9.1, 9.2 - Anthem & I-17 north area	<p>Please keep the community of interest in the I-17 north corridor together in a district, and please do not include us with the northwest Phoenix area, and especially not with Wickenburg and Wittman. Our area is a high-growth suburb of Phoenix. We have a semiconductor plant coming to our area which will bring in a lot of new housing, shopping, and dining. We have little in common with rural areas outside of Phoenix. Also, I am asking you to please do more to make our district competitive. I realize we live in a Republican-majority area, but by pulling our district boundaries south instead of west, we can reduce the spread to increase competitiveness. Thank you.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:08	Misty Atkins	maps	<p>Please take another look at Commissioner Lerner's map. While I don't know about COI in other areas, it keeps Oro Valley with more of Tucson, enables competition and keeps us geographically compact while keeping all the districts essentially equal in population, compact and competitive.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:10	Crystal Bazarnic	CD test map 6.0 - District 1 north Maricopa County	<p>I would like to commend the Commission for successfully creating the most competitive map possible for our north Phoenix area. While we don't have much in common with the southernmost part of this created district, and there is an argument to be made for adjusting the boundaries west to make the districts below more competitive, this map makes political competition reasonable. Thank you.</p>

10/27/2021 - 15:15	Andrew Flach	LD Test Maps v9.0, v9.1 & v9.2	<p>I decided to check the Arizona Constitution after reading today's article in the Arizona Daily Star where the head of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council acknowledged that the goal behind district D17 in Commissioner Meh's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 is to create a safe Republican district in the Tucson suburbs. Unsurprisingly, creating safe Republican districts in the Tucson area is not one of the Constitutional goals of the redistricting process.</p> <p>The D17 proposed in Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 is both much more competitive and much more compact and contiguous than the D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2. Commissioner Lerner's D17 also meets Commissioner Meh's long standing and oft stated goal of keeping Oro Valley and Marana together.</p> <p>Compact, contiguous and competitive districts are redistricting goals set in the Arizona Constitution. I hope Commissioner Neuberger sides with the Arizona Constitution tomorrow, and not with Commissioner Meh's quixotic vision of a safe Republican district in suburban Tucson.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:18	richard mazur	Redistricting	<p>Redistricting does not need to be done in this County City or state there's no reason for existence is not show that many people. Redistricting should be brought up to a state vote before anything is done this would prove that it needs to be done or doesn't</p> <p>Thank you Richard</p>

10/27/2021 - 15:18	leslie j yerman	Deep concerns about the inequity of Map 8.0	<p>Dear IRC members:</p> <p>As an Arizona resident, I always felt confident that the state's redistricting would be equitable. After all, it has an Independent Redistricting Commission.</p> <p>I have been following the IRC process. Your most recent map — 8.0 — is neither independent nor equitable.</p> <p>Statewide</p> <p>Map 8.0 creates 15 firm Republican districts (up two) while reducing solid Democratic districts to 10 (down three).  **According to figures from the Arizona Secretary of State's office, the July 2021 breakdown of party affiliation was 34.72 percent Republican, 31.82 percent Democratic, and 32.60 percent independent. These figures would not justify the large shift in districts toward the Republican party.</p> <p>In addition, Map 8.0 has created 17 districts whose racial makeup are from between 57.2 percent to 80.6 percent white. According to the US Census Department (<a href="https://www.census.gov/library/stories/state-by-state/arizona-population-change-between-census-decade.html">https://www.census.gov/library/stories/state-by-state/arizona-population-change-between-census-decade.html</a>):  **Arizona's diversity index rose from 54.9 percent to 61.1 percent.  **Non-white racial makeup was: Black alone — 12.4 percent, Hispanic —18.7 percent, Asian alone — 6 percent, American Indian/Alaska Native alone — 1.1 percent, Native Hawaiian/other Pacific Islander alone — 0.2 percent, some other race alone — 8. 4 percent. Arizonans of two or more races were 10.2 percent.  **Despite those who are white alone only being 61.6 percent of the population, it is unlikely that 17 districts out of 25 would have between 57.2 percent to 80.6 percent white population — unless they were drawn to achieve that end.</p> <p>Pima County</p> <p>I am a resident of Pima County.</p> <p>Currently, the county has four legislative districts. Map 8.0 creates seven districts that are combined with six other counties: Cochise, Graham, Greenlee, Pinal, Santa Cruz, and Yuma. In addition, the map creates two safe Republican districts. Why?  **The county's registration makeup is 40.3 percent Democratic, 28.7 Republican, and 31.0 independent.</p> <p>The only conclusion that can be drawn is that these districts were created to diminish the Pima County's Democratic majority.  **Example: District 18 — This district has been drawn to dilute the Tucson Foothills, which is strongly Democratic by putting it with Republican areas. Map 8.0 puts the Foothills in a political concoction with Tucson National Estates in Oro Valley, the area south of Grant, and Rolling Hills Country Club.</p> <p>I am asking you to revisit Map 8.0 and create independent, equitable districts that provide voting power to all Arizonans — not just white and Republican voters.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>leslie j yerman</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:19	Patricia Holvenstot	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 i	<p>I do NOT supporty this redistricting plan, which is cleaqrlly about garnering Replican support and votes, rather than a plan which makes sense for those living in the district, I live over near Tanque Verde and to be grouped in across the mountains to Oro Valley is ridiculous.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:22	Donna Booth	Redistricting Guide	<p>To whom it concerns;  the new district 3 is too vast for any representative to be affective. The district should be split between north and south at Scottsdale Road</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:26	Katie Lambert	Legislative Draft Maps	<p>Legislative District 3 as currently drawn needs to be changed. Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. These are separate communities of interest covering a large distance of area. The new District 3 is too vast for any representative to be effective. The district should be split between North and South at Scottsdale Rd.</p>
10/27/2021 - 15:28	Brad Schauf	Redistricting	<p>I have reviewed the redistricting maps and as a land owner and voter in Marana prefer Maps 9.1 and 9.2. The rural areas of Pima county should be kept separate from the City of Tucson! Thank you for your consideration.</p>

10/27/2021 - 15:31	Carlos Ruiz	Tanque Verde Community of Interest IS NOT with Tucson	To whom it may concern, I moved to the Tanque Verde Valley 18 years ago because of the rural setting. I agree with a prior map that showed Tanque Verde combined with Catalina Foothills, Oro Valley, Marana, Houghton Road corridor and parts of Pinal County. These areas have rural areas and even the cities have a more rural flavor. I think it is more important to keep these communities of interest together. I have nothing in common with the urban City of Tucson and do not want to be included at all with Tucson. Tucson has made punitive policy decisions regarding the unincorporated Pima County. As long as we stay combined with Tucson at both the LD and CD level these rural and suburban areas will not have representation. Please approve the C shaped map previously proposed that keeps Tanque Verde combined with Catalina Foothills, Oro Valley, Marana, Houghton Road corridor and parts of Pinal County.
10/27/2021 - 15:32	Jean Meconi	CD and LD draft maps	I am hoping that the commission will use CD draft map version 6.0 and LD draft map version 9.0 as starting points for discussion on Thursday, October 28th. I am also hopeful that the commission will keep in mind all the constitutional requirement while adjusting these draft map versions including: * community of interest - Oro Valley's larger community of interest is Casas Adobes and Tucson. Oro Valley shouldn't be split into separate LDs. Oro Valley should be in a Pima County legislative district. * respect for natural and city/county boundaries - Oro Valley should be in a Pima County LD and shouldn't extend into Pinal County. Mountains are natural barriers and Oro Valley's LD should end at the Catalina Mountains. * compactness - Oro Valley shouldn't be in a sprawling district. It is suburban- urban. The proposed Legislative District 17 in LD draft map version 9.1 and 9.2 give outsized representation to rural places with which Oro Valley has little in common. * competitiveness - no party should be given a competitive advantage in the purple state of AZ. LD draft map version 9.1 and 9.2 give Republicans an unfair advantage due to packing Democrats into districts. * equal in population - districts should stay within the 1% variance of the target population.
10/27/2021 - 15:33	Joseph D Boogaart	Redistricting	1st... I am unable to access Maps 9.0, 9.1, 9.2, so I am only able to comment as to what is important my wife and I. We live in Marana, west of I-10. We have everything in common with those living to the east. Our doctors, hospital, recreation, dining, shopping and friends are all north of the Rillito River, up thru Oro Valley and east to Kolb Rd. We are community urban in nature, similar to Oro Valley, Vail, Sahuarita and Green Valley. We all have a high ratio of retirees to the general population and thus similar needs and interests. What I noticed attending the IRC meeting was 1) they tended to be within communities of interest, north of River Rd and south of river Rd. 2) at the the 1st meeting no one, north or south of River Rd., stated they wanted to be a part of the other side of the river, 3) At the second hearing, red shirts talked about communities of interest. and boundaries. Those others in attendance talked about competitive districts, which suggests to me that they acknowledge communities of interest, but believe being politically competitive is of greater importance, which, according to the redistricting criteria, is subordinate. 4) Political perspective and philosophy, (not politics) is most certainly an integral part of a community of interest. Changing or attempting to change that perspective most certainly changes the community. Examples abound, California vs Florida, Texas vs New York, Phoenix vs Tucson. If it did not, why would billion be spend every election cycle? Respectfully Submitted .... Joe Boogaart
10/27/2021 - 15:38	mary Lou Sampson	IRC	Thank you for all of your hard work. I live in Green Valley and I do not want to be looped in with Tucson at all. Tucson should be it's own district, in my opinion. I respect and honor our military and law enforcement and I'm really tired of being in a district when our elected officials DO NOT LIKE officers of any kind. 9.1 and 9.2 would fit our district better than anything else Thanks for your consideration.
10/27/2021 - 15:42	Sal Goetsch	Redistricting should be between North and South at Scottsdale	Redistricting should be between North and South at Scottsdale Rd.
10/27/2021 - 15:44	Barbara Novota	Redistricting	No to Scottsdale redistricting plan! It does meet the needs of Scottsdale residents!

10/27/2021 - 15:47	Lee Stanfield	LD Test Maps comparison	<p>THE ARIZONA CONSTITUTION STATES:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable"</li> </ul> <p>Yet, in Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 it is clear that in an attempt to create a non-competitive district for Republicans, D17 includes voters living in a community on the northeast side of Tucson with 2 communities on the northwest side of Tucson, which in reality are SEPARATED by the CATALINA MOUNTAIN RANGE!</p> <p>By comparison, Lerner's D17 in map LDv9.0 keeps all of the suburban residents in a compact, contiguous area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable"</li> </ul> <p>The communities of Oro Valley and Marana share almost nothing with the Tanque Verde area of residents, and in fact, Mehl's maps intentionally cut Tanque Verde off from the Tucson area where Tanque Verde residents are employed, attend school, shop, socialize, and attend religious services.</p> <p>By comparison, Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "To the extent practicable, district lines shall use visible geographic features, city, town and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts"</li> </ul> <p>Yet Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 creates a district D17 that tries to include 2 geographically areas separated by an UNPOPULATED ROADLESS portion of the Catalina MOUNTAINS! One would have to drive more than 45 minutes OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT to get from the Tanque Verde community to the Oro Valley-Marana area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• "To the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals."</li> </ul> <p>Yet Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 purposely make District 17 a NON-COMPETITIVE Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats).</p> <p>By comparison, Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a VERY COMPETITIVE district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats &amp; 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin.</p> <p>Despite the fact that the Arizona Constitution clearly states that "competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals"... Mehl and the SALC are blatantly disregarding the AZ Constitution by doing everything possible to create a "safe" Republican district in the Tucson area!</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:08	Barbara Ware	Maps for redistricting - Pima County	<p>I live in a semi-rural part of Southern Pima County. I think that the LD should keep rural with rural and not include the city of Tucson. We live outside of Tucson for a reason and do not have common interests or concerns with people who chose to live there. We have not had any representation in the past 10 years, as the last redistricting was gerrymandered in one party's favor. Please consider keeping Green Valley, Sahuarita, Corona de Tucson, Vail and Sierra Vista together in the same LD.</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:13	Murray and Harriett Johnson	Redistricting	<p>Please put us in District 16 where we are with like properties and where we belong. You are suppose to be be putting properties in "communities of like interest"</p> <p>Our farming community does not belong in District 22</p> <p>Take care and God Bless, Murray and Harriett Johnson</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:14	george waddell sennentz	district 28	<p>I live in Anthem, Az. The current rendition of our district vastly distorts the voter party of choice registration and includes areas totally unrelated to Anthem by adding the huge rural area west of Anthem. Your efforts in forming these districts are much appreciated but adding Anthem which is a suburb of Phoenix into the rural towns and desert dwellings to the west should be changed. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

10/27/2021 - 16:15	PAULINA Maria KASPRZYCKA	Redistricting	We are one of the largest counties in the state. Please be mindful of the responsibility you have for resetting these maps. We are foreign born American Citizens who are not of the current climate. Please remember, We too have a voice that needs to be heard and represented. Please select 9.1 or 9.2 for re-mapping. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 16:19	Deana Marie Puccinelli	IRC MEETING AGENDA OF THURS 10/28 VOTE ON MAPS	My community of interest in the area I have lived for over 20 years is because of the pride of HOME ownership, better performing school districts, support & relationships with like minded small business owners/buy local, my networks with church community, social groups & organizations with people of similar lifestyles & beliefs, safer crime area, better maintenance of roads, parks, common areas, less traffic, co-exist with multi cultural ethnic population that also live in the same area for the same reasons, want to be represented by elected officials of similar political beliefs & want to comply with the Voter Rights Act. I do not want to be carved into a district where the majority of the population's beliefs & opinions are 360 degrees different from mine nor do I want to live in a district where elected officials don't represent me. I RECOMMEND VOTE FOR FIRST 9.1 MAP & SECOND 9.2 MAP. I DO NOT WANT A VOTE FOR MAP 9.0 MAP.
10/27/2021 - 16:20	Shanti Devi	Redistricting	I am suggesting to not include Marana and Oro Valley in the proposed LD17 huge district. We are not rural like Pinal county or those others to the east which are also rural. We have more in common with Catalina Foothills and Casa Adobes. Please reconsider.
10/27/2021 - 16:25	David and Susan O'Daniel	Redistricting concerns	We are very concerned about communities losing their voice. In particular, the new LD 3 is far too large to receive effective representation. We believe this should be split between north and south at Scottsdale Rd. There are several distinct communities that should not be combined in order to receive fair representation.  Regarding future CD 1, central Phoenix and uptown Phoenix should be in the same district.
10/27/2021 - 16:31	Jennifer L. Hare	IRC Redistricting Map	Hello, I am a resident of Pima County residing in the far Northeast part of Tucson, north of Tanque Verde and east of Houghton road. I have owned a home here for the past 20 years. I would like to share my strong opinion of the upcoming Redistricting map selection for our political representation. I feel extremely strongly that I, my family and many, many like-minded residents of northeast, east and southeast/Vail area are not at all represented by the current political districting maps. Community concerns are not at all addressed by the extremely liberal democrat city government. Due to the way these maps have been drawn, there is almost no chance for us to get fair representation UNLESS these district boundary maps are redrawn. Please reject IRC Map 9.0 which would continue the status quo and leave so many of us without fair representation. I strongly encourage you all to vote in favor of redistricting maps such as map 9.1 or map 9.2 that would allow many of us in these outer suburban and rural areas around Tucson to have a chance at fair representation of our moderate and conservative views. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of these important issues, Jennifer Hare [REDACTED] Tucson, 85749
10/27/2021 - 16:31	Mark Flint	Draft redistricting map	The draft redistricting maps would be laughable if they weren't scary. If it's the objective of the Republican party is to win at all costs and convert this country into a dictatorship ruled by one ideologically homogenous group, well done. If Republicans succeed in this effort and their parallel attempts to ensure that only people who think like they do can vote, we can say good-bye to the government envisioned by our Founding Fathers, and hello to another oligarchy. Kruschev didn't have to bury us; the GOP is doing it for his successor.
10/27/2021 - 16:35	Kathleen wilkins	Maps	To the Arizona redistricting commission:  I encourage using map 9.1 as the most accurate and fair representation of the community of interest that I identify with. when you vote on October 28th. This is a suburban conservative area, in contrast to the democratic downtown Tucson. Sincerely, Kathleen Wilkins Tucson AZ
10/27/2021 - 16:35	Mary Nelson	Legislative districts	Thank you for your consideration to separate Maricopa County districts from Yavapai County. However, placing Anthem in District 28 with Wickenburg does not meet the requirement of compact and contiguous districts of like minded communities. Anthem is part of north Phoenix and should logically be included in that area. Please try to remain non partisan and work toward balanced districts. Thank you.

10/27/2021 - 16:39	Ana Sexton	Preferred Draft Map	<p>I write this message to strongly encourage the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission to choose Map 9.1 when you vote on October 28.</p> <p>I am a Naturalized Citizen of the U.S. who registered to vote as soon as I could because I wanted to be involved and have a voice in this Representative Republic. Sadly, though I live in the 44th largest county in the U.S., I currently have only one Representative in the State legislature who represents my beliefs and interests. The 9.1 version of the Draft Maps represents the community of interest that I most closely identify with and offers the fairest chance my family and I have of being represented by someone who shares our values.</p> <p>Thank you for your work to comply with the U.S. Constitution and the Arizona Constitution in creating voting districts that agree with our laws.</p> <p>Sincerely, Ana Tucson, Arizona</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:42	Alex Bendyna	Redistricting	<p>The plainly partisan redistricting of District 3 to absorb other voters and reduce their voices in the legislature are an offense to free and fair elections, and the rights of voters. You are doing bad work here and should be rebuked. You are not performing the mission you were charged with. Change them back.</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:43	Linda Nelson	Redistricting input	<p>Thank you for all of your diligence to get the redistricting of Arizona done in an equitable manner,</p> <p>As you know Pima county is a huge county with a diverse population. The diversity of the population needs to be taken into consideration in the districting of the state.</p> <p>I live East of the Houghton Corridor and North of Old Spanish Trail. I have lived in Pima County for 20 years and, through my business have had an opportunity to work for people of all walks of life and economic strata all over Tucson. I believe that the Pima county values and goals for their homes is somewhat different from the downtown. The city of Tucson should be kept together but definitely separate from Pima County. This would leave a swath of land from the I10 and Twin peaks over the along the foot of the Catalina's incorporating the Catalina Foothill region along with the Fairfield subdivision in 95750, KEEP Sabino Mountain in the district and then come along the Foot of Mt, Lemon and head South taking up all the area to Reddington pass. Keep the Tanque Verde Valley an the West Boundary Houghton Road all the way to Vail.</p> <p>This would form a huge backward C and have the effect of keeping like minded citizens together. While this is a large area the citizens share in common a more rural lifestyle and independent living. I hope you will consider my input. Sincerely, Linda Nelson</p>
10/27/2021 - 16:47	Julie Cohn	LD1 Redistricting	<p>I thank the commission for separating our current district from Yavapai County, but urge you to understand that our community of interest not only extends south from Carefree Highway but also seeks more political balance within Maricopa County.</p> <p>As a resident of Anthem, I do not feel we should be in the district with Wickenburg, Wittman, and rural Arizona. Please respect the boundaries of our current precinct and DVUSD district. Anthem residents shop, dine, and send our kids to school in neighboring communities along I-17. These areas should be kept together in one district.</p> <p>I ask you to make an impartial decision for the Anthem community, not one rooted in partisan politics, with respect for the U.S. Voting Rights Act that protects all Americans' right to vote.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>
10/27/2021 - 17:00	Nancy Wood	Anthem in Legislative Redistricting Map	<p>Dear Members of the Independent Redistricting Commission,</p> <p>I want to thank you for separating Anthem from Yavapai County. It gives me hope that those of us who live in Anthem will have a legislative district with a better balance in our communities of interest and be more politically competitive. I urge you to consider the fact that our community of interest not only extends south from Carefree Highway, but also seeks more political balance within Maricopa County.</p> <p>I am asking you to please reconsider placing Anthem in LD28. LD28 is largely rural Arizona. Its largest town, Wickenburg, is about 60 miles from metro Phoenix. On the other hand, Anthem is within the Phoenix metropolitan area. A large portion of Anthem is part of Phoenix. Phoenix is where many Anthem residents work, shop and play. Our community interests are much different than those of rural Arizona.</p> <p>I am asking the Commission to please place Anthem in a legislative district with our neighboring communities. Please make LD28 a more balanced and competitive district. To help achieve that, I would suggest that LD28 should go down I-17 to or beyond the northern Loop 101. Thank you for all of your work, including asking for and listening to community input.</p> <p>Respectfully, Nancy Wood</p>

10/27/2021 - 17:06	Maria Lopez	PIMA COUNTY - REDISTRICTING	Hello, I am a resident of rural Pima County. I live on the west side of Tucson, outside of Tucson city limits. I am writing to communicate my support for maps 9.1 and 9.2 currently being considered by the council. As a life long resident of Pima County, our representation at the state and federal level have been dominated by the City of Tucson. Pima County redistricting should be more reflective of its constituents. We currently do not have fair and competitive representation in Pima County. It is beyond frustrating that Republicans have limited representation in the largest county in Arizona! Rural areas should remain with rural areas (e.g. Tanque Verde Valley should remain with Marana). Residents of rural areas live there for a reason and they should not be lumped in with the City for partisan purposes. Keep the areas that have something in common together - NOT TUCSON. We do not want to be part of Tucson. Districts should be fair, constitutional and following the law. Thank you for your consideration.
10/27/2021 - 17:23	Kathleen Hill	AZ Latino Coalition Maps	I support the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps.
10/27/2021 - 17:24	Liz Levine	I support the Latino Coalition districts	I live in Tucson - 85716-5503 - and like the Congressional and Legislative maps by the Arizona Latino Coalition.
10/27/2021 - 17:25	Loretta Keane	Redistricting Maps	I am a retiree in Chandler and support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps.
10/27/2021 - 17:26	Dee Steele	No to new District 3	The district 3 should be split North and South from Scottsdale rd That District would be too large for a legislator to work with his constituents No on District 3 it is way too large
10/27/2021 - 17:27	Joanne Kaye	Redistricting Commission Input	My name is Joanne Kaye. I am supporting the maps by the Arizona Latino Fair Districts Coalition. I live in Carefree, 85377.
10/27/2021 - 17:28	Roberta Garza	Supporting the AZ Coalition	I am a resident of Glendale, Arizona. I ask you to support the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting Maps.
10/27/2021 - 17:29	Susan Ferkau Neumann	Redistricting Map Preference	I live in the northeast corner of the Houghton Road corridor and I am a data analyst for an aerospace manufacturing corporation. My community of interest revolves around good schools, good governance, low taxes, and limited interference from the political class. However, the 2010 IRC grouped my suburban area with the extremely liberal population of Tucson that does not share these same concerns. As a result, the elected legislators do not represent me or my community of interest. I have far more in common with the residents grouped together by the proposed Map 9.1 or 9.2, who may not share schools and shopping centers, but we sure share a common desire to avoid Tucson city politics. That's why we chose to live where we did. Therefore, I request that you vote for Map 9.1 or Map 9.2 at the next IRC meeting.
10/27/2021 - 17:30	Normando De Halle'	Expanding Latino Presence	We must keep and expand our Latino presence in representation in our state and nationally. That's why I support the maps submitted by the Arizona Latino Redistricting Coalition.
10/27/2021 - 17:32	Karyn S Ross	Proposed Redistricting Map for Pima County	Greetings:  I am writing to provide my comments on the proposed redistricting map for Pima County.  I live along Tanque Verde Loop and do not want to be included in the Tucson legislative or congressional districts. I am concerned about the redistricting of the Tanque Verde valley and would support staying with Marana. Based on this, I am asking that map 9.1 be implemented which would provide a fair representation.  Sincerely, Karyn Ross

10/27/2021 - 17:35	Julie M Pindzola	reworking LD9.0 and LD9.1 for a more rational and fair set of maps	<p>Dear IRC</p> <p>You are now being inundated with comments and citizen maps - mainly focused on only a few geographic regions. It is now time for some respectful candor as things start to get very real. I hope you meant it when the Chair said that all of the map was subject to change and refinement.</p> <p>Your (Mehl's) early drive to make Yavapai County its own LD5, ostensibly because it is a whole county, now sees lobbying by some who want to pull Sedona from Coconino County and Wickenburg from Maricopa County into this same very Red LD. By taking the Verde Valley away from its current rational alignment with Flagstaff and points east, you have gutted a competitive LD and turned it hard Red by extending it way south into Pinal County. There was no good reason to do this but to disrupt the competitiveness and representation in Northern Arizona - except perhaps to set the math in favor of unpopular moves in D17.</p> <p>PLEASE go back to earlier versions such as your own 2.0 or citizen maps LD0011 or LD0015 or LD0018. You have had options early on for decent and balanced treatments of Northern Arizona. Do not discount this work and good will. Yavapai County boundaries are not sacrosanct and should not be treated as such.</p> <p>Based on public testimony transcripts and written COI comments, the majority expressed the desire for Verde Valley to stay with the Flagstaff LD. These commenters were not part of the orchestrated campaign swarm of cut and paste comments received some time later. Last, the IRC seeking a balanced state, even a 15-15 partisan balance is certainly not a breach of the Constitution, To contend such is a silly and specious argument. Sorry.</p> <p>THANK YOU</p>
10/27/2021 - 17:47	Merry Anderson	Redistricting plans	<p>The last redistricting was not done very well with certain areas. Please keep areas that have something in common together and avoid an area like Oro Valley being tied into Navajo County. Keep Oro Valley and Marana and that surrounding area outside of Tucson together. Keep the rural areas together and keep in mind the ones that have large tribal groups. Please use map 9.1 or 9.2. I am strongly opposed to map 9.0.</p> <p>thank you MJ Anderson</p>
10/27/2021 - 17:49	Aaron Hellman	redistricting maps under consideration for 10/28 meeting	<p>I want to voice my strong opposition to Commissioner Mehl's proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 and v9.2. To combine two geographically separate suburban areas, Marana/Oro Valley and Tanque Verde to Vail, into one district violates the IRC goals as listed in the State Constitution; "districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous" and "Congressional districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable, and state legislative districts shall have equal population to the extent practicable." Mehl's map will make the district strongly favor Republicans, and it prioritizes Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area'</p>
10/27/2021 - 17:53	Susan Kay Meadows	Redistricting Draft Maps for Pima County	<p>To Members of the Independent Redistricting Commission,</p> <p>I am an Independent voter residing in the Tanque Verde area of Pima County. I chose property in this area because it is on the edge of suburban and rural living. Most of my neighbors are families looking for quiet neighborhoods, better roads and good schools. The communities and residents of the Tanque Verde area appear to have similar community life values as those living in the Marana area. These values differ with those of the Tucson District.</p> <p>REJECT the 9.0 version of redistricting that places Tanque Verde Valley into the Tucson district.</p> <p>SUPPORT and ADOPT version 9.1 for both Legislative and Congressional voting districts for Pima County. Tanque Verde Valley should stay with Marana. The 9.1 version provides a more equitable and fair distribution of voters among the districts. This is important for the residents of Pima County, the second largest county in the state!</p> <p>Susan K. Meadows</p>

10/27/2021 - 17:53	Robert Fisher	District 9	<p>Chairman Neuberg and Commissioners Watchman, Mehl, Lerner and York: I live in Lake Havasu City and submit these comments today in opposition of the proposed Congressional District 9.</p> <p>Our current congressional district primarily encompasses mostly rural geography. The proposed new district however, highly favors the populated areas of western Maricopa County.</p> <p>The proposed District 9 includes the west valley communities of Sun City West, Surprise, Luke Air Force Base, Goodyear and Buckeye, where at least 70 percent of the proposed district's population reside. This is clearly not representative of the residents of Lake Havasu City, nor the residents of greater Mohave, La Paz and Yuma Counties. In a district with these demographics, the chances of representation from and for rural communities would be unlikely.</p> <p>We should not be included in these high density populations with the potential of under-representation for choosing to live and work in rural Arizona. I urge you to reconsider the proposed alignment of Congressional District 9 in an effort that more fairly represents the rural voice of western Arizona.</p> <p>Thank you, Robert Fisher Lake Havasu City [REDACTED]</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:02	Wayne M Glembin	Redistricting	<p>I live in unincorporated Pima County in Vail. We are known for our good school district and a rural type lifestyle. We are a very fast growing region of Southeast Arizona and I fear we will continue to our point of view further eroded. Unfortunately it seems like we never really have a voice as Tucson dominates almost every decision made by the state or county. Our representation never really has a voice in most matters and the population of Tucson just overrides any of our interests.</p> <p>I do not want us to be part of any Map 9.0 and would rather see our area part of Map 9.1 or even Map 9.2</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:09	Stan Caine	Comments to Draft Maps 9, 9.1, and 9.2	<p>After evaluating the three maps presented, they are getting better as for representing my areas of interest. Pima County should have as much of an LD map as possible within its boundary due to the facts that it is the 44th largest county in the US and it is the second largest in Arizona.</p> <p>I will work to submit a suggested LD that better represents people who do not want to live within Tucson city limits.</p> <p>Respectfully, Stan Caine</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:11	Ana Henderson	Maps 90, 90.1 and 90.2	<p>Our family respectfully rejects the 3 maps as presented due to the conflict for our ability to have common representation. We purposefully choose to live outside the city limits. These maps have overlapping configurations of the taxation jurisdictions as well as the public safety jurisdictions. We deserve proper representation for our families.</p> <p>In addition, a majority of the individual districts have gross differences in the numbers of registered voters for each major political party. This does not allow for competitiveness.</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:14	Joseph Holden	Redistricting	<p>Sirs;</p> <p>I believe that the redistricting efforts should reflect with my community of interest, namely my physical address is located near the Drexel and Houghton intersection in Tucson. I seldom travel to downtown or mid-town Tucson. These areas are dominated by the Democratic Party. My ideology does not align with theirs. I am a Republican and want to see my community thrive. My friends and neighbors and folks that constitute my community are conservative professionals. We belong to a church that has strong focus on community service. I believe that the district that I live in should include Marana, the Tanque Verde Valley, the Houghton Corridor south to Sarita and then west to Green Valley and east to the entirety of Cochise County. The citizens in this area include conservative professionals, retirees, military and government service workers like Border Patrol. We need a voice. The Democratic Party dominance of local politics actually stymies the development of this community. Many conservatives have a view point and ideals that can help strengthen this community and southern Arizona and I have to believe that this is what we all want, don't you?</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Joseph Holden [REDACTED]</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:24	Nancy McGrath	Redistricting	<p>Please use map 9.1 for redistricting my area (Marana). We want to make sure representation is fair and not decided by those who have something to gain.</p>

10/27/2021 - 18:28	Onita Davis	Redistricting Maps	<p>We fought for the guidelines of redistricting 10 years ago and those guidelines are still under attack! 1. We ask for communities of interest to be kept together. We select where we live based on what we have in common with others!</p> <p>2. Rural areas should be grouped together because they have common needs and concerns; not grouped with urban areas that would minimize those needs and concerns.</p> <p>3. Tanque Verde Valley exists as a part of greater Marana and should not be ripped away!</p> <p>4. Pima County is large enough to allow a diversity of interests, needs, and values. One size does not fit all and any effort to cookie cut this county should be resisted.</p> <p>5. Therefore I support maps 9.1 or 9.2.</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:31	Sharon Briggs	Redistricting	<p>Sharon Briggs, Phoenix, 85024</p> <p>I want the Arizona Latino Coalition maps for Fair Districts for our state.</p>
10/27/2021 - 18:43	Chinnaz Sayegh	The Right Maps	I am a teacher and live in Phoenix and I believe the Latino Coalition maps are the right ones.
10/27/2021 - 18:45	Richard Anderson	Proposed LD17 Boundaries	I live in Oro Valley and do the majority of my shopping, dining, etc. in either Oro Valley or Marana. I am now retired, but when I was employed, most of my co-workers lived in Marana, Oro Valley, and Vail. This area is characterized primarily by single family suburban homes and rural, lower density housing. I feel that the populations of Marana, Oro Valley, Catalina, Saddlebrook, Catalina Foothills, and the Tanque Verde valley share similar concerns. I rarely venture south of Orange Grove Road. The LD17 boundaries shown in the version 9.1 and 9.2 fairly represent my community.
10/27/2021 - 18:49	Nola Perkins	Latest map	It does not appear to me that "communities of interest" were considered at all when viewing the latest map available showing D16
10/27/2021 - 18:54	Patti Snee	Proposed redistricting	I feel strongly that the communities should be split North to South at Scottsdale. The new proposal combined communities that are distinct into one big group. This makes little sense to me. We shop and eat and attend movies near our home in the Desert Ridge area. We wish to keep our community distinct.
10/27/2021 - 18:59	Edward Davis	Arizona Redistricting Maps	<p>When selecting a place to live, people look at the geographic location, the interests of the community, what the community says about its residents in terms of social and community goals, and economic drivers; in other words, its personality.</p> <p>Drawing maps that ignore the reasons for living where we live becomes a political exercise rather than reflecting the who, what, and where of the community. We have been experiencing the results of such an exercise for 10 years. Let communities of common interest coexist. Those communities thrive because they share common goals and aspirations! I oppose map 9.0 for that reason and support 9.1 or 9.2.</p>
10/27/2021 - 19:02	Barbra	Payson - NO 15/15 plan	We would like Payson to remain in LD7.
10/27/2021 - 19:02	Barbra	Payson - NO 15/15 plan	We would like Payson to remain in LD7.
10/27/2021 - 19:03	Janet Schwartz	Redistributing	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/27/2021 - 19:05	Janice Welchert	Re-districting	<p>I support map 9.0 which appears to comply with the requirements of fair and competitive districts and seems to balance the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly</p> <p>the IRC goals as listed in the State Constitution:</p> <p>I do not support either 9.1 or 9.2.</p> <p>9.1 &amp; v9.2 are distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. Tanque Verde residents mostly work and live in Tucson. It is to fragment them from their community. Violating the constitution's parameter "shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable"</p> <p>9.1 and 9.2 proposed maps create a district D17 that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains violating the tenants stated in the constitution, "To the extent practicable, district lines shall use visible geographic features, city, town and county boundaries, and undivided census tracts" again outside the words and spirit of the constitution's stated values.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

10/27/2021 - 19:08	Suzanne Annette Yost	Redistricting maps	I am writing to let you know that my husband and I are vehemently opposed to the 9.0 redistricting proposal. Rural communities have specific needs and Oro Valley, Marana and Tanque Verde should not be combined with the city of Tucson. Keep rural with rural and let us have our representation. We would welcome the 9.1 or 9.2 proposals. We humbly ask that you consider this request very seriously. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 19:08	Amy Gaiennie	Maps	Commissioner Mehl's District D17 (LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2) violates the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. Both map versions create a district that is actually two distinct geographic areas divided by an uninhabited and roadless portion of the Catalina Mountains. In order to get from one population center to the next, one has to leave the district and drive 45 minutes-1 hour. This map version is unacceptable as it does not meet the IRC goals as set forth in the State Constitution. Amy Gaiennie 85710
10/27/2021 - 19:09	Meredith Alexandra Aronson	10/28 redistricting meeting input	I have submitted comments in an earlier round, but I'd like to reiterate that I continue to support an independent redistricting effort, and that the draft map(s) be consistent with Commissioner Lerner's LD map, v 9.0, keeping Marana and Oro Valley connected and in the same compact suburban district.
10/27/2021 - 19:20	Karyn Riedell	Maps	As a Flagstaff resident, I hope that the Commission will take time to consider our Northern Arizona geography and Communities of Interest. One of the most distinctive characteristics of our area is the tourism in the corridor between the Grand Canyon and the Verde Valley. Please also consider that Prescott is NOT part of this tourist destination. It is also imperative that Kachina Village and Mountaineer be included because they are very closely attached to Flagstaff and this area in general. I support the maps adopted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors.
10/27/2021 - 19:29	Amy Gaiennie	Maps	Commissioner Mehl's district D17 (LD Test Maps v9.1 and v9.2) combines two geographically distinct suburban areas that have very little to do with each other and are a long drive apart. In contrast, Commissioner Lerner's D17 (LD Map v9.0) appropriately groups its suburban residents in a compact and contiguous area. Commissioner Lerner's map meets the IRC goal of "geographically compact and contiguous" districts as set forth in the State Constitution. Amy Gaiennie 85710
10/27/2021 - 19:33	Rosemari Sanders Dalton	Voting Rights	Stop
10/27/2021 - 19:38	JAMES BUSH	Redistricting	District 3 should be kept as is, having large different districts makes for difficult legislation. Keep areas smaller and more geo-politically aligned.
10/27/2021 - 19:39	Kelsey D Blakley	Legislative map revision for Northern AZ	I support the LD 6 and 7 Map Revision adopted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors at its October 27th meeting and submitted to you along with a supporting letter from our County Board Chairman Matt Ryan. Please give this revision the attention it deserves!
10/27/2021 - 19:40	Amy Gaiennie	Maps	Commissioner Mehl's district D17 (LD Test Maps v9.1 and v9.2) purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship, and socialize. This is clearly an effort to achieve Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. Commissioner Lerner's D17 (LD Test Map v9.0), on the other hand, keeps local communities together. Commissioner Lerner's map clearly adheres to the IRC goal of respecting communities of interest as set forth in the State Constitution. Amy Gaiennie 85710
10/27/2021 - 19:43	Aaron Torrance	Reject Mehl's Partisan Maps, please.	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together. Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats). As described in the Oct 27 Arizona Daily Star article, Commissioner Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that goal as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/27/2021 - 19:54	Amy Gaiennie	Maps	The article in the October 27 Arizona Daily Star made it clear that Commissioner Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council, in proposing LD Test Maps v9.1 and v9.2, desire to achieve the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. This is not a legitimate goal of the IRC as set forth in the State Constitution. Amy Gaiennie 85710

10/27/2021 - 19:56	Lucinda Marcello	Redistricting Request for Fairness for All	<p>Dear IRC, This email is to address the upcoming vote on redistricting for Pima County, AZ.</p> <p>Please consider my requests:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rural, suburban and urban areas have different needs and goals. Please group like-communities together to be fair and to service the people properly. Respect all communities and group them according to similar needs.</li> <li>2. Pima County needs fair representation from all parts of the city and county. Be fair in your redistricting to include all citizens; support Republicans as well as the historically over supported Democrats in Pima County.</li> <li>3. The areas of Marana and Tanque Verde should be coupled together as voters with like-needs and goals..</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for conscientiously considering ALL voters in Pima County for fair, transparent, trustworthy future elections.</p> <p>Sincerely, Lucinda Marcello</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:01	Richard Marcello	Pima County Redistricting Vote	<p>Dear Folks,</p> <p>I am emailing you to address the upcoming vote on redistricting for Pima County, AZ.</p> <p>These are concerns I have to improve voting for all registered voters in our county:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please group like-communities together to be fair and to service the people properly. Respect all communities and group them according to similar needs. Urban, suburban and rural areas are different and have varying needs.</li> <li>2. Pima County needs fair representation from all parts of the city and county. Be fair in your redistricting to include all citizens; support Republicans as well as the historically over supported Democrats in Pima County.</li> <li>3. The Tanque Verde and Marana areas should be grouped together since the voters have like-needs and concerns.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for supporting ALL voters in Pima County for fair, transparent, trustworthy future elections with these changes.</p> <p>Sincerely, Richard Marcello, MD</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:07	Cheryl. Dubois	Redistricting	<p>There is no earthly reason that scottsdale and north Phoenix should be one district or fountain hills and rio verde and anthem another district.because my faith in almost any government entity has diminished this year...I smell foul play with nepharious overtones.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:13	Amy Gaiennie	Maps	<p>Commissioner Lerner's District 17 (LD Test Map v9.0) achieves a goal of the IRC of favoring competitive districts. It balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly, creating 14 Democratic seats and 16 Republican seats. Commissioner Lerner's map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. Commissioner Mehl's two maps (LD Test Maps v9.1 and 9.2), on the other hand, purposely makes District 17 a safe Republican district, leaving only 6 competitive seats as per the definition. Commissioner Mehl's maps clearly support an increased partisan advantage, creating a predicted 13 Democratic and 17 Republican seats. This is clearly not a goal of the IRC as set forth in the State Constitution.</p> <p>Amy Gaiennie 85710</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:17	Christine Emery	Draft Map LD 9.1	<p>Regarding LD19. This is by far the best map that has been put forth. I like it. You have put together senior/retirement communities in rural, semi-rural and incorporated areas. Nice job. Green Valley &amp; precinct #84 has a lot in common with Sierra Vista, Corona de Tucson, and Cochise County. Good combination. LD19 will be represented well with the 9.1 map. Besides retirees, there are a lot of military personnel, veterans, border patrol, law enforcement, and ranchers that live through out this district. I feel the needs of the people in this area will be met and they will have a chance at being represented. These areas have nothing in common with Tucson and city life. We have small town &amp; rural life needs. We are very different than South Tucson &amp; Tucson. We rarely travel to Tucson and dislike being there when we have to visit. Please keep Precinct #84 (Quail Creek) in District 19, it is a good fit and will give our communities a voice in Arizona.</p>

10/27/2021 - 20:20	Catharine Reeve	IRC proposed LD17 maps	<p>I'm very concerned that the INDEPENDENT Redistricting Council isn't independent at all, nor is it fulfilling the mission given to it in our Arizona State Constitution.</p> <p>I urge the Council to reject the D17 map proposed by Mehl but in fact "drawn by Anna Clark, who is second vice chair of the Pima County GOP and manages the campaign of Republican congressional candidate Walt Blackman" (as quoted from the article below, from the Arizona Daily Star).</p> <p>The proposed map from the supposedly independent Commissioner Mehl purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast, Commissioner Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.</p> <p>From Tim Steller's column in the Arizona Daily Star on 27 October 2021:          "I got an email just a little bit ago from the Southern Arizona Leadership Council, which I've alerted the chairwoman to, from Ted Maxwell who is the head of that council," Mehl said. "They have submitted a map for Southern Arizona. I would like to see if you could also bring that up."</p> <p>The key change in that map was that it included Marana and Oro Valley in the same district that swept east over the Santa Catalina Mountains and then south to include the Tanque Verde area and much of the eastern Tucson metro area.</p> <p>In short, it's an area drawn to produce a Republican advantage.</p> <p>But it turns out it wasn't actually drawn by the council, as Jeremy Duda of the Arizona Mirror revealed Wednesday. It was drawn by Anna Clark, who is second vice chair of the Pima County GOP and manages the campaign of Republican congressional candidate Walt Blackman.</p> <p>So, in effect if not in intent, the SALC laundered a partisan map into the redistricting process."</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:23	Reed Alexis	Redistricting	<p>I live in Anthem and I am concerned about the redistricting committee putting us in with Wickenburg and the western rural areas. We shop, eat and send our children to Deer Valley schools closer to north Phoenix, Tramonto, Dove Valley area. Please reconsider where you put current LD1. Thanks</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:33	Joan Thomas	map feedback	<p>I am in support of Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0, which makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats &amp; 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats)..</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:39	Dana Nicolson	Oro Valley	<p>CD version 6.0 and LD version 9.0 would be most competitive and appropriate for Oro Valley. Oro Valley's communities of interest are Casas Adobes and Tucson, more so than Marana. The town should not be split into two districts and should be included only with Pima county on the same side of the mountain barriers, and not Pinal. It is a suburban area and should be included with other suburban/urban areas that most share its interests.</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:39	Jeannine Reno	Verde Valley Sedona Flagstaff COI	<p>The residents, organizations, and elected officials from Sedona, Flagstaff &amp; Verde Valley have been CONSISTENT since the beginning of the listening tour in July that we are a community of interest. It is unfair that the commissioner has expressed that it would be too much work to keep the Verde Valley/Sedona/Flagstaff together because it would dictate to Maricopa County. The testimony has been 80% in favor of keeping this community together. Review all of the comments and videos of testimony provided from residents. We are not "split" as the commissioners claim. It is your duty to listen, remember, and reflect accurately. We are a community that has similar common interests related to economy, infrastructure such as transportation and broadband, health care systems, natural resources, economic development opportunities and eco-tourism. We are also the second largest tourist economy in Arizona, with workers, residents, and business in common. The Mingus Mountain range divides us from Prescott, we are not a community of interest with western Yavapai County.</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:40	Marrell D Livesay	Redistricting Maps 9.0, 9.1, 9.2	<p>I've looked at the maps and believe map 9.1 is the best of the three presented. Many of us live in Pima County and do NOT want to be ruled or bullied by the City of Tucson. The areas outside of the City of Tucson from Picture Rocks, Marana, Catalina foothills, Tanque Verde, Vail and Green Valley have far more in common with each other than they do with the City of Tucson. An example of this is interest in horses, you find horse property from Picture Rocks, Marana, areas north of Tucson, Tanque Verde then down to Green Valley. Horses is just one common interests of many these areas share. The City of Tucson is an aberration in Pima County and should be kept from silencing the voice of the rest of Pima County.</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:43	Joan Thomas	map feedback	<p>The changes to the boundaries of District 18 as shown in Map v9.0 make much more sense, reducing fragmentation and keeping my community where I work, play, and shop intact. I support map v9.0.</p>

10/27/2021 - 20:46	Jim Roundy	Public Comment input for Oct 28, 2021 IRC meeting for public comment	<p>Please include the following comments for the Oct 28, 2021 IRC meeting . The link provided in the agenda form for the Oct 28, 2021 meeting did not allow for the comments. Thank you.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the proposed plan to dissolve or quarter the Town of Gilbert into sections. Gilbert District has been associated with other cities in the past but never to the degree of separation as proposed by this plan. The plan to quarter and separate Gilbert appears an effort to stop representation of Gilbert by making too few voters from Gilbert to permit a unified Gilbert position or statement.</p> <p>This plan reminds me of Tupac Armaru II of Peru who lived about the time of George Washington. The Tupac Armaru rebellion was an Inca revival movement that sought to improve the rights of indigenous Peruvians suffering under the Spanish Bourbon Reforms. Tupac was eventually captured by the Spaniards.</p> <p>On May 18, 1781, Tupac and members of his family were taken to the Plaza de Armas in Cuzco to be executed one by one. The following is an extract from the official judicial death issued by the Spanish authorities which condemns Túpac Amaru II to torture and death.</p> <p>.to four horses who will then be driven at once toward the four corners of the plaza, pulling the arms and legs from his body. The torso will then be taken to the hill overlooking the city... where it will be burned in a bonfire... Tupac Amaru's head will be sent to Tinta to be displayed for three days in the place of public execution and then placed upon a pike at the principal entrance to the city. One of his arms will be sent to Tungasuca, where he was the cacique, and the other arm to the capital province of Carabaya, to be similarly displayed in those locations. His legs will be sent to Livitica and Santa Rosas ..</p> <p>— Sarah C. Chambers, Latin American Independence: An Anthology of Sources</p> <p>What you are trying to do to Gilbert in political redistricting is similar/equivalent to what the Spanish tried to do to Tupac Amaru II physically.</p> <p>Dissolving Gilbert by this proposed plan is a terrible separation approach. My recommendation is to retain a key Gilbert district to permit a strong working relationship between the Town of Gilbert and a single set of representatives to the Arizona Senate and House.</p>
10/27/2021 - 20:52	Dale	IRC Maps 9.0, 9.1 and 9.2	<p>None of these maps are perfect but 9.1 is the best. I have friends and family in Marana, Oro Valley, Tanque Verde, Vail and Green Valley. We share common interest, I think you use the word "communities of interest" with each other. We should be in the same CD. We are more rural areas, several of my friends have horses. We all have the same political and cultural enemy - the City of Tucson. Don't let them dominate the rest of us.</p>

10/27/2021 - 20:55	Thomas H. Griffith	Reallocating Populations in Districts 12, 13, and 14 to lower the overall levels of deviation to be close to 2%	<p>I support the Commission's goal of trying to keep each Legislative District in the state as near as possible to being equal in population. I reside near the corner of Lindsay Road and Riggs Road in Chandler. As of the time of this writing, this would be in the new District 13. Its population is 2.02% over the target population you aspire each district to have. The district to the west of my district, Legislative District 12, has a population deviation that is 3.55% over the target population goal. The district to the east of mine, District 14, has a population that is close to the target population, but still is 0.66% over the target population goal.</p> <p>It is the Commission's goal to have each district with a percentage of population deviation from the target population goal to be as close to zero as possible. There are no districts abutting Districts 12 which have significantly lower levels of population deviation. There is only one district that abuts District 13 that has a lower level of population deviation: District 14</p> <p>May I respectfully suggest that the three districts that comprise portions of the Town of Gilbert and the City of Chandler, south of the 202, Districts 12, 13, and 14, might be able to get to a lower level of deviation in each District if seen together as a block. What would happen if the levels of deviation from the population goal in those three districts were to be added together, and then divided by 3. That would come to an average deviation level for each District of 2.08%.</p> <p>Proposed District 13 is now very near that level of deviation. I believe that reducing some of the population in District 12, adding it to District 13, and removing a similar level of population in District 13 and adding it to District 14. Here is how I would suggest how this could be accomplished:</p> <p>Four square miles of District 12, bounded by Ray Road, Price Road, the 202 alignment, and Rural Road could be added to District 13. All of this area is part of the City of Chandler. Simultaneously, about six square miles in District 13 could be subtracted and moved to District 14. The area I am suggesting would be the one-mile wide strip between the 202 freeway, Greenfield, the County line/Hunt Highway, and Val Vista Road. All of this is in the Town of Gilbert. Almost half of it presently is rural and agricultural. Val Vista Road is a major highway, some of which is the boundary between Chandler and Gilbert. This would leave the majority of the Town of Gilbert intact in one District. I believe that those two moves would make each of the three Districts, 12, 13, and 14, each very close to the deviation from the population goal very near 2.08%.</p> <p>Thank you again for your consideration of this respectful suggestion.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:04	Anna Clark	YES! To Map 9.1	<p>Good Evening,</p> <p>I am writing to show my support for map 9.1. It is EXTREMELY important to keep Oro Valley and Marana TOGETHER and not with Tucson proper. Oro Valley and Marana are one community and belong in the same district along with Saddlebrooke and Catalina.</p> <p>Thanks! Anna Clark</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:05	L.A Soloff	LD test map v 9.0 - fair for AZ	<p>LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:06	Laurie Soloff	use LD map 9.0	<p>Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 is distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana and Oro Valley are a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, D17 as represented in LD v9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:08	Jeffrey Clark	Please Approve Map 9.1	<p>Hello. As a registered voter in Oro Valley I would like to request you approve map 9.1. Oro Valley and Marana need to remain in the same district because we are one community. We have the same interests and needs as a community.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:10	Olivia Anastasiadis	Redistricting	<p>We want to keep Gila County LD7 as is. We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County. Our interests in farming and agriculture keep our district involved in like minded activities and there is little that ties Payson to Florence and Superior.</p> <p>Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Olivia Anastasiadis</p>

10/27/2021 - 21:15	Jean Bishop	Independent Redistricting OPPOSITION District-9	<p>Chairman Neuberg and Commissioner Lerner and York:</p> <p>I am a 70-year-old, lifelong pioneer Mohave County resident. I respectfully submit my concerns today in opposition of the proposed Congressional District 9.</p> <p>The proposed boundary of District 9 is not favorable to Mohave, La Paz or Yuma County(s) as it places our rural Counties with the Maricopa metropolitan areas of which we have little in common. In fact, if this is approved, Maricopa County residents would make up about 70% of the district making our rural district, actually a west Phoenix District.</p> <p>That is concerning for a number of reasons including our water concerns regarding the transfer of Colorado River water to Maricopa and Pima Counties. We need a congressional representative that will protect our water rights so that the river communities can continue to grow.</p> <p>My friends and family do NOT want a Maricopa County takeover of our voting district. This proposed District 9 is not representative of our residents and we ask that your committee revisit this and find a way to keep Mohave County, La Paz County and Yuma County together for fair representation.</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider the proposed alignment of this Congressional District in an effort that fairly represents the rural voice of western Arizona.</p> <p>Thank you for sitting on this very important committee and for considering my valid concerns!</p> <p>Jean Bishop [REDACTED]</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:17	Betty Harris	Most recent test Maps: 9.0, 9.1, 9.2	<p>I am not qualified to comment on any area other than urban and suburban Tucson, but it seems to me that Map 9.0 is the best of these three. The Tucson districts seem pretty compact, deal with communities of interest, and are fairly competitive. Of most direct impact to me and my neighbors, District 20 keeps most of southwest Tucson in one district. I wish you could include all of us, those 3 precincts along W. Valencia, which were in LD3, but I understand the problem of trying create districts with equal populations. 9.0 creates a version of District 17 which is competitive, compact, and makes sense geographically. 9.1 and 9.2 do not do any of these things. Both smack of "gerrymandering", what the Commission was designed to avoid.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:19	Mykel Reese	Redistricting	<p>Of the three proposals I prefer number 2, it seems more competitive and marginally more fair. Thank you, for considering the opinions of our varied and diverse community.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:20	Angela Moffatt	LD 3 Redistricting Map	<p>IRC,</p> <p>The current draft of the map for LD 3 includes the areas of Rio Verde and Fountain Hills combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. Rio Verde and Fountain Hills is almost an hour's drive from Desert Ridge and Anthem. These areas are VERY SEPARATE communities of interest, covering a very large distance, and is too vast for any representative to be effective.</p> <p>It makes much more sense for the district to be split between North and South at Scottsdale Rd.</p> <p>Thank you very much,</p> <p>Angela Moffatt</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:20	Susan V Anderson	Marana and Oro Valley	<p>Commissioner Mehl deems it important to join thr cities of Marana and Oro Valley into one legislative district. That goal is achieved most effectively by adopting map 9.0 because it includes the entirety of Marana and the entirety of Oro Valley. Versions 9.1 and 9.2 only join parts of those cities together. If a court were to review 9.1 and 9.2 the judge is likely to conclude the areas were cherry picked in order to give one party a substantial advantage.</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:21	Socrates Anastasiadis	Redistricting	<p>Redistricting issue.</p> <p>We want to keep Gila County LD7 as is.</p> <p>We Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County. Our interests in farming and agriculture keep our district involved in like minded activities and there is little that ties Payson to Florence and Superior! How is that even feasible? Superior is way South &amp; Florence even further! Who comes up w/ these convoluted line redraws! No Thanks!</p>

10/27/2021 - 21:26	Virginia Kovatch	redistricting maps	To the Committee, I am opposed to Mr. Mehl's proposed D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 and v9.2. It is very fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley does not have much to do with Vail or Tanque Verde. Please consider Ms. Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 which has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area. Let's be fair and independent!! Thank you, Virginia Kovatch
10/27/2021 - 21:28	Virginia Kovatch	Redistricting Maps	Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district D17 that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another. I am opposed to Commissioner Mehl's maps. He is not being fair and independent. Virginia Kovatch
10/27/2021 - 21:29	Don Howard	Community of Interest	Dear Commissioners, I think that the current LD 6 legislative district has demonstrated it's certainly not competitive. In the past decade there has not been one Democrat elected to the legislature. My community of interest is that of the area of Public Safety. Flagstaff needs to be associated with Sedona and the Verde Valley. We have created associations that allow the agencies of these areas to work together during wildfires, flooding and winter storms. Sedona and the Verde Valley are our neighbors, not communities that are located much to the east that we don't have much in common. In order for us to deal with the legislature effectively, the areas of Flagstaff, Sedona and the Verde Valley need to be located in the same legislative district. Please consider this in you mapping. Respectfully, Don Howard Summit Fire and Medical District (Retired)
10/27/2021 - 21:29	Linda AA Chiles	mapping	I am quite concerned about what seems to be a hijacking of the process by Commissioner Mehl. I agree that economic interest groups have every right to participate in the process but certainly NOT the right to manipulate it.
10/27/2021 - 21:31	Virginia Kovatch	redistricting maps	I agree with Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 which makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats & 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. I oppose Commissioner Mehle's maps. Virginia Kovatch
10/27/2021 - 21:34	Virginia Kovatch	Redistricting maps	I am opposed to Commissioner Mehl's redistricting maps. As described in the Oct 27 Arizona Daily Star article, Commissioner Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that goal as a legitimate redistricting goal. Thank you for taking the time to read my message. Virginia Kovatch
10/27/2021 - 21:35	Sallie Kladnik	IRC Map Contractor	I fully support the proposed Legislative Districts for LD6 and LD7, presented by my Coconino County Board of Supervisors in their letter and map sent on Oct 27, 2021 by email.
10/27/2021 - 21:46	Teresa Kealoha	Payson Redistricting	We have lived in Payson since 2016, relocating from Pinal County. Payson voters want to remain as we are now; with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale and Camp Verde. We Do Not want to be with Pinal County. Respectfully, Teresa and Jeff Kealoha Payson Voters

10/27/2021 - 21:47	Barbara Karen Pape	Oppose the proposed Congressional District 9	<p>October 27, 2021</p> <p>Dear Chairman Neuberg and Commissioners Watchman, Mehl, Lerner and York:</p> <p>I live in Mohave County, Bullhead City, I respectfully submit these comments today in opposition of the proposed Congressional District 9.</p> <p>While our current congressional district isn't perfect, and includes portions of metropolitan Phoenix and Maricopa County, it primarily encompasses more rural geography. The proposed new district however, highly favors the populated areas of western Maricopa County.</p> <p>The proposed District 9 does include most of Arizona's west coast, which is appropriate; however, it dovetails into the west valley communities including Sun City West, Surprise, Luke Air Force Base, Goodyear and Buckeye, where at least 70 percent of the proposed district's population reside. This is clearly not representative of the residents of Bullhead City, nor the residents of greater Mohave, La Paz and Yuma Counties. In a district with these demographics, the chances of representation from and for rural communities would be unlikely.</p> <p>All Arizonans matter and all voices should have equal opportunities to be heard. We should not be punished with the potential of under-representation for choosing to live and work in rural Arizona. I urge you to reconsider the proposed alignment of Congressional District 9 in an effort that more fairly represents the rural voice of western Arizona.</p> <p>Thank you for your action! Barbara Pape, Bullhead City ____</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:49	Valerie Peterson	Redistricting in Tucson - Oct 28 meeting	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>I write to express my deep concerns regarding Commissioner Mehl's proposed LD maps v9.1 and 9.2. These proposals do not confirm with or advance the IRC goals as described in the Arizona state constitution: for example, geographically compact and contiguous districts; delineation per obvious geographic features; and as far as practicably, equal population. This is in stark contrast to the proposals of Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 that more appropriately reflects the IRC goals.</p> <p>I urge detailed discussion of how effectively these different proposals meet constitutional goals, given their relevance for supporting priorities and policies of democratic practice so central to the realization of democracy in the USA.</p> <p>Many Americans are fearful about current political factions and activities that threaten, rather than preserve, the democracy so hard won and so precarious at present. Please ensure that actions taken by the IRC reflect the best democratic practices and serve the best interests of all Americans.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted by a 31-year Tucson resident, worker and activist for democracy, Valerie Peterson</p>
10/27/2021 - 21:51	Mike Weingarten	Public Comment on Maps	<p>I am very concerned about LD Test maps 9.1 and 9.2. There are serious problems with the RESULTS they produce, and with the PROCESS by which they came into being.</p> <p>ISSUES WITH RESULTS:</p> <p>a) LD map versions 9.1 and 9.2 create serious fragmentation of the Tucson midtown neighborhoods, neighborhoods that exhibit commonality and connectedness between residences, shopping, schools, places of worship, etc.</p> <p>b) These maps create a district in D17 that forces a connection between disparate communities, separated from one another by the Catalina Mountains, and not even connected by roadways within the district. This district is not compact, it is not truly contiguous, and it does not represent communities that interact with one another or have common interests.</p> <p>c) These maps create a district that is a safe Republican district when it could have been made competitive, and in so doing, they tilt the statewide map further in favor of the Republicans.</p> <p>ISSUES WITH PROCESS:</p> <p>The fact that maps 9.1 and 9.2 are rooted in the preferential treatment of an 11th hour map submission by the SALC, a group connected to Commissioner Mehl, is extremely troublesome, and ethically questionable. Especially when other viable submitted maps from other communities were essentially dismissed without a serious look. The fact that the openly-admitted motivation of these maps is to create a safe Republican district flies in the face of the constitutional goal of creating competitive districts wherever possible. The process and the intent behind these maps I believe are a violation of the public trust, and would undermine that trust.</p> <p>These map versions should be discarded.</p>

10/27/2021 - 21:52	FREDERIQUE P DELHAYE	redistricting	I reviewed the maps proposed by commissioners Lerner and Mehl. I live in Tanque Verde and would be in district 18 with C Lerner map. This respects my neighborhood as a suburb of Tucson and my school District. It would also be a competitive district. In C Mehl, I would be in district 17, which separated me from Tucson and would sandwich my neighborhood between Marana and Oro Valley 45 min North and Vail 30 min South with 3 different school districts! It would also make it a safe Republican district, which would be against the recommendations.
10/27/2021 - 21:57	Mike Weingarten	Public Comment on Maps	Kudos for LD Test Map version 9.0! It resolves what had been a very concerning problem affecting my neighborhood in version 8.0, a problem that remains in versions 9.1 and 9.2. My neighborhood is the Broadmoor-Broadway Village neighborhood just east of downtown Tucson. We are a midtown residential neighborhood, with strong linkages to the other neighborhoods of midtown. In map versions 9.1 and 9.2, we are in District 21, in a very narrow slice of neighborhoods that were extracted from Midtown and combined with the southern-most part of the State, extending all the way to the Mexican border. Version 9.0 has moved the boundary of LD18 so that we, and other neighborhoods who were in a similar situation, are now in LD18. In Version 9.0, we are coherently collocated with the other midtown neighborhoods with whom we interact and identify. Thank you for LD Map Version 9.0.
10/27/2021 - 21:58	KARA NEWLAND	Congressional district maps	Thank you for including Anthem in D1, which is a far more competitive Congressional District. It is essential that all voices be heard through balanced voting districts.
10/27/2021 - 21:58	Carol Ann Lindsey	MAP	PLEASE say YES to map 9.1 or map 9.2; say NO to map 9.0
10/27/2021 - 22:00	Vicki Cool	Redistricting	I ask that you follow the constitution. You must follow the guidelines for redistricting. I do NOT want the 15/15 plan. Commissioner Lerner must abide by the constitution and should not be able to get away with her partisan agenda.
10/27/2021 - 22:02	Betts Putnam-Hidalgo	Tribal lands, district 23, and commissioner Mehl's oversized power	<p>The only comments I have heard to date from the Tohono O'odham tribal members requested quite strongly and movingly that their lands be kept together, and that they be associated with Tucson. In all of the latest maps they are being associated with Yuma which is very far away and far less of a market center or community of interest to them. I had thought, in the interest of inclusion and the Voting Rights Act, that their voices might hold some sway. Also associated with Yuma is Tucson Estates (NOT "Yuma Estates" for a reason) which should clearly remain in the Tucson area. It is quite explicitly a satellite community of Tucson and I wonder how many of its residents have even been to Yuma, with which they have nothing in common. Please bring Tucson Estates and the tribal lands back into association with Tucson, where their voices will be heard.</p> <p>In addition, I still do not understand the process through which the entire issue of the maps has become framed by some maps proposed by a clearly partisan business advocacy group that is concerned about getting its specific special interests reflected in our statehouse. Isn't it precisely that type of gerrymandering that this whole process is designed to prevent? An article that appeared recently stated that most commissioners were OK with Commissioner Mehl's maps. If that is the case, it's a sad commentary indeed, given that his (SALC's) maps are highly partisan and do not consider (quite egregiously in some cases) a single one of the criteria the Commissioners are supposed to be taking into account. I do understand that you are all volunteers, but the criteria for the maps are quite clear—and should be followed. Countless people put a great deal of energy into commenting and drawing up maps, which were all summarily ignored, it seems—and yet SALC comes in through the back door at the last minute and gets its map pushed to the head of consideration—and why? Where is the representation? Please reconsider this decision and stop allowing the future of Pima County's representation to be manipulated by one person who is not representative of the county he is trying to gerrymander. Thank you. (I am a resident of Id3 which is why I feel strongly about losing Tucson Estates and the tribal communities that have their casinos in Tucson as well as some of their offices and many many of their members!)</p>
10/27/2021 - 22:06	Kay Lloyd Cool	Redistricting	I do NOT support the 15/15 Plan. Your commission must follow the constitution and abide by the guidelines for redistricting. I have heard some disturbing information that Commissioner Lerner is conducting her role in a very partisan manner. If true, that can NOT be tolerated by the Commission. I will be watching and reading all of the commission records publicly available. Transparency is a must.
10/27/2021 - 22:33	Nancy Musgrave	Draft maps 9.0, 9.1 and 9.2	Picture Rocks in the same district as Pinal County towns?! Someone told me about this in the latest draft maps, 9.0, 9.1 and 9.2 and at first I thought it was a joke. But you are showing this with all three draft maps in the new LD16. This makes no sense. No sense at all. We residents in Picture Rocks are far away from those towns in Pinal County and have nothing in common with them except that we're all in Arizona. We don't share churches, shopping areas, school systems, community organizations, location, banking or anything else and never will. There's absolutely no common community of interest with those far away towns in Pinal County. We in Picture Rocks need to be in a Pima County-only district with Marana, which we border and do share a common community interest. As a community with no services, we all shop in neighboring Marana, belong to community organizations there, such as the library, our doctors are in Marana, our children even attend their schools. We need to be in the same district as our neighbor, Marana. Putting Picture Rocks in with those towns in Pinal County also means this proposed new district, LD16, will not be competitive. That is unfair and does not comply with the mandate to have competitive districts. There is no circumstance under which Picture Rocks belongs in the same district as Pinal County. These new draft maps are completely unacceptable. Pima and Pinal counties don't belong together under any circumstance. Be fair, as you are expected to be. Do your jobs honorably and fairly! Don't isolate us from our natural community of Marana!

10/27/2021 - 22:42	Lisa E Wolfe	Maps 9.1 and 9.2	<p>•Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 comprises a huge geographical area with several different communities of interest packed into one district. Marana and Oro Valley are a long way from the Tanque Verde area, and all three are far from Vail. Yet in these maps, all 4 are in District 17.</p> <p>•The Arizona Daily Star points out that Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 were developed by Republicans with the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in and around Tucson, by splitting up communities of interest and adding the right-leaning parts into the proposed Republican district. This is gerrymandering, which is not a legitimate redistricting goal under the Arizona Constitution.</p>
10/27/2021 - 22:44	CJ Jones	Redistricting maps	Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area
10/27/2021 - 22:47	Lisa E Wolfe	Maps	Oro Valley and Casas Adobes are one community of interest. Oro Valley is an extension of Casas Adobes, which was, long ago, the northernmost part of the Tucson metro area. The two areas should be kept together and not be a part of Marana. Marana has for many, many years been separate from Tucson, Casas Adobes, Oro Valley, and the Foothills.
10/27/2021 - 22:48	Madra Bernard	Rediscribing	Leave the rediscribing alone
10/27/2021 - 22:48	Lisa E Wolfe	Map 9.0	•Version 9.0 respects Mehl's articulated goal of keeping Oro Valley and Marana together, and does so even more effectively than v9.1 and v9.2. Versions 9.1 and 9.2 are gerrymandered to include the most right-leaning sections of Oro Valley and Marana in order to guarantee a safe, non-competitive District 17. Version 9.0 includes all of these communities, making the district competitive, which is a redistricting goal.
10/27/2021 - 22:50	Lisa E Wolfe	Maps 9.1 and 9.2	D17 in Maps 9.1 and 9.2 completely ignores the goal of compact, contiguous districts comprising a community of interest. These maps create a district comprising two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of the Catalina Mountains. Getting from one population center to another would take more than 45 minutes driving time.
10/27/2021 - 22:50	Gail Golec	Redistricting Draft -IRC- District 3	<p>I am extremely concerned with the draft redistricting as it completely defies the reasons for districts to begin with. These are to be community structured and with equal representation of the People in the District. This is far from it.</p> <p>Please consider that you are working for the People and the People have a Constitutional Right to be treated Equally Under the Law in the 14th Amendment of the US Constitution. This draft, specifically District 3, appears to be highly Unconstitutional.</p> <p>As it relates to District 3, I would like to suggest the natural border be Scottsdale Road. That is a natural border in this area and truly there is a lifestyle difference between the East and West of that border.</p> <p>We have Constitutional Rights for a Reason. We need to stand for this Rights now or lose them, possibly forever.</p> <p>This Unconstituional draft will drastically effect the people in District 3 poorly for the next 10 years. This really can not stand.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p> <p>Gail Golec</p>
10/27/2021 - 23:22	Rafael Ihly	IRC LD draft maps 9.1 and 9.2	I generally like the Pima County 9.1 / 9.2 LD maps. Please them the way you have them. I approve of the backward "C" in proposed districts 17 and 18 that keep common communities of interest together and keep Tucson with Tucson. Keep rural areas with Rural areas. Keep the Tanque Verde Valley with Marana and Oro Valley. Thank you.
10/27/2021 - 23:40	Charlie Silver	LD series 9	The LD 9.x series of maps fail to recognize important communities of interest that have been identified to you in testimony. An example of this is the division of the tract of land to be used for the Northern Arizona Healthcare Village at the south edge of Flagstaff so that one part is in LD 6 and one in LD 7. The Flagstaff suburbs of Mounainaire and Kachina Village as well as the City of Sedona are separated from the City of Flagstaff - this makes no sense to those of us living on the ground in these communities.

10/27/2021 - 23:46	Rafael Ihly	Congressional Map 6.0	<p>I believe these districts (CD6 and CD7) are still VERY flawed and unfair as they have a line that runs right through the center of Tucson, thereby splitting a major community of interest. This is done in a way that appears to deliberately put conflicting communities of interest together in a way that under represents rural and suburban communities of interest in favor of the city of Tucson. Tucson already has way too much influence over surrounding territory with present day CD2 and CD3. Please remember Tucson is a mere 600 thousand people. Today it controls 2 CDs that represent about 1.5 million people. That is GROSSLY unfair. Tucson is entitled to only one CD. I proposed you fix this disparity by putting the city of Tucson and South Tucson as entirely as possible into District 7, with Latino and native american communities that share the need to be kept in the same district and share urban and communal values. Let CD6 expand into rural southern Pinal, to keep rural and suburban interests together as you add in population to make up for the loss of Tucson. Naturally this will require readjusting other districts around the state to make it all work. I ask that as you do so you continue to keep rural and suburban interest together as you keep urban interests together. Thank you.</p>
10/27/2021 - 23:49	Marshall Magruder	LD21 changes in Santa Cruz County and I-19 Corridor	<p>In today's meeting on 27 Oct., it was suggested that some communities along the I-19 Corridor be separated and added to Cochise County and others to the north. This includes Amado, Tubac, and Quail Creek leaving D-21 to D-19. This splits the majority of Santa Cruz County, the smallest Arizona County, into two districts that are separated by the I-19 Corridor that is what joins these communities.</p> <p>Some of northeastern Santa Cruz County, including Elgin and Sonoita close to Cochise County, don't have the same linkage as those communities along the I-19 Corridor which should stay together with Green Valley and Sahuarita, as they are presently.</p> <p>This continues similar population and environment characteristics in the Santa Cruz National Historic Area along the Santa Cruz River between Mexico to Tucson.</p>
10/27/2021 - 23:57	Charlie Silver	LD 6 & 7	<p>I write to you in support of the LD 6 and LD 7 Map Revisions adopted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors at its meeting on October 27 and submitted to you with a letter in support from our County Board Chairman Matt Ryan.</p>
10/28/2021 - 00:05	Maria Lynam	Draft Mais	<p>Please explain the procedure regarding how you will be digesting Draft Map Public Testimony and incorporating comments into the Final Maps.</p> <p>After all the testimony is complete, do you plan on having a number of public IRC meetings when you re-draw lines?</p>
10/28/2021 - 00:07	carissa sipp	Proposed draft maps: stop splitting Tucson like a bad haircut	<p>Dear Commission-</p> <p>You are failing at your objective : a fair and non-partisan view and adoption of the redistricting maps created and proposed.</p> <p>STOP acting like you want to give Tucson a bad haircut (map v9.1, v9.2) to make a specific party on the commission happy.</p> <p>Act like you have family in these districts that deserve fair representation for the community. Why are you trying to split Tucson in such a way where i work, where my children go to school and where we live would be 3 different districts? What setup and representation is this? Why are you accepting partisan hack jobs redistricting our community?</p> <p>We are doing our homework. A recently published article spilled the beans that the LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. I am sure that is not the goal of 'independent' commissions- commiserating with one party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.</p> <p>At this point the only 'fair' attempt to keep Tucson 'together' and represent the community and people evenly and fairly is v9.0.</p> <p>LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria and are clearly biased in manner of creation and dividing Tucson neighborhoods.</p> <p>Be INDEPENDENT. Do your job to respect the community and those in Tucson regardless of your personal or political leanings- this is your job and mission on the commission. v9.0 is the ONLY fair map to adopt at this time.</p> <p>Carissa Sipp</p>

10/28/2021 - 00:20	Dan Hunt	Comment on new redistricting draft maps	<p>Dear Commission:</p> <p>It seems like this redistricting effort is a failed attempt at the goal of being independent. LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. District 17 is safe for right-wing politicians and is essentially non-competitive for that party. Furthermore, this lumps very different geographical communities into the same district even though they don't have much to do with one another.</p> <p>Please take seriously the "Independent" part of your role on this commission and stop trying to manipulate the districts for political gain.</p> <p>Sincerely, Dan Hunt</p>
10/28/2021 - 01:59	Rafael Ihly	additional CD6/CD7 comment - 6.0 drafts	<p>In my previous comment on this topic I forgot to mention that in addition to adding more of southern Pinal County to CD6, you should also add in territory in southeastern Pima County south of Tucson running from Green Valley east to the Cochise County line. Thank you.</p>
10/28/2021 - 02:13	shanna s leonard	The moral basis for fair maps	<p>To quote a recent article published in "The Bulwark" by noted Conservative William Kristol and others, "democracy depends on free and fair elections, respect for the rights of others, the rule of law, [and] a commitment to truth ... All of these are now in serious danger."</p> <p>He then discusses the recent false accusations against elections in Arizona by many in the Republican Party... and other efforts "to discredit the very practice of free and fair elections."</p> <p>This is why the work that you commissioners are doing is so important. The work you do underpins the moral basis for our democracy. The principle that all men (and women) are created equal and endowed by their creator with unalienable rights.</p> <p>If the commissioners can put aside the idea that this is just another contest to be won, just another chance to move the football a little closer to your own political goalpost, and instead realize that you are architects of democracy - then you will be bolstering the future of our country.</p> <p>Your legacy will be based on how much you were able to step back from your short term goals and look at the bigger picture of what future you are creating. In your hearts, are you working from a commitment to truth, a desire to make the fairest possible maps?</p> <p>I understand that Commissioner Mehl is working with SALC to create a safe Republican district in Pima county and this will make it easier to promote Pima County business interests in the state legislature. I understand that the commission will vote on a map which incorporates districts created for this purpose. And I can see from statistical analysis of partisanship and wasted votes that this map (8.0), is not "free and fair" but favors Republicans in 80% or more scenarios. 9.1 and 9.2 are even less fair.</p> <p>In normal times, perhaps a little unfairness would not be a big deal. We all know that the choice of who would fill the Independent slot was likely to be someone more favorable to Republicans, given the fact that Ducey controlled the board who selected the candidates.</p> <p>But these are not normal times. Again as Kristol writes, speaking about ensuring that elections are fair.</p> <p>"democracy itself is in serious danger. "We need to join together to defend [It]"</p> <p>...</p> <p>Now is the time for leaders in all walks of life—for citizens of all political backgrounds and persuasions—to come to the aid of the Republic."</p> <p>A map with a 3.4 % partisan bias towards Republicans is not good enough. It is not fair. It is also not fair to adopt a map for Pima county based wholesale on suggestions from a business league, while ignoring scores of other maps submitted, including the Latino Coalition's.</p> <p>The commission has a sacred duty to our state and country to put the principle of democracy above the economic interest of a group of Pima county businesses and to do the absolute best you can to closely adhere to all of your constitutional requirements... And make the fairest least partisan map you can that respects the needs of all of Arizona. If you do this, your legacy will be that of a protector of democracy, that you came to the aid of the state of Arizona and of the country when it needed you most.</p> <p>Thank you all for the long hours and hard work you have given to this purpose.</p>

10/28/2021 - 02:51	Madeleine Beiser	in Re: Redistricting draft maps	<p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>As the process of redistricting continues to move forward, I want to reach out and emphasize that areas that have commonalities should stay together. The needs between rural communities and urban communities differ; keeping this in mind would be beneficial for AZ citizens throughout.</p> <p>Secondly, Pima County should have representation from all parties. My understanding is that it's one of the largest counties in the state, yet has no republican representation. This is not conducive to an equal representation between parties to ensure all of Tucson's voices are heard. I'm hopeful that this will be included in the upcoming redistricting map</p> <p>Lastly, from previous discussions that I've been able to learn from, it would appear that Tanque Verde Valley may be best suited to stay with Marana in the upcoming redistricting</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration in these matters as you continue in this endeavor, Madeleine Beiser</p>
10/28/2021 - 04:46	Peter Gallen	Redistricting	As described in the Arizona Daily Star article linked above, LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/28/2021 - 05:09	Linda Karl	Redistributing fairness	<p>In reading Tom Steelar's AZ DAILY STAR article today I am very disturbed about the partisan special acces to this process and it's undue influential on a proposal that skirt arizona constitutional guidelines. Please consider-</p> <p>Proposed District D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, and favoring safety over competition. In contrast, districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.</p> <p>D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.</p> <p>LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria.</p>
10/28/2021 - 05:47	Barbara Bloom	redistricting	LD Test Map v9.0 seems to make District 17 a competitive district, which balances past statewide totals of party seats somewhat evenly. And this map makes 7 competitive seats, within an 8 point vote margin, while LD Test Maps v9 1 & 9 2 result in only 6 competitive seats using that same criteria.
10/28/2021 - 06:04	Dana Deo	Proposed CD6 and CD7 Redistricting	<p>I am appalled at the proposed drafts of CD6 and CD7 redistricting. Why aren't the drafts of CD7 showing Tucson and South Tucson together? CD6 should represent those outside Tucson. These are two distinct communities of people and should be represented as such.</p> <p>Thank you, Dana Deo</p>
10/28/2021 - 06:07	Lorraine Hill Richardson	Redistricting Maps	<p>Dear Members of the Commission,</p> <p>I am opposed to the Republican effort to manipulate districts, which is basically gerrymandering. The Commission was put in place to eliminate this practice. The purpose of the Commission is to make sure that politicians do not create districts. The Arizona Republican proposed new district maps do not follow the stated guidelines as put in place by the voters. Districts should not be created to give any particular party an advantage in voting.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Lorraine H Richardson</p>

10/28/2021 - 06:41	Gloria m hardison	Redistricting rural area outside of buckeye, az	<p>I am writing to voice my opinion as a resident of Palo Verde, Az (a rural agriculture community west of buckeye). I do NOT support our area or any rural agricultural area becoming a part of district 22. Because I know that my personal beliefs and business will not be properly represented and grossly out numbered by the city-focused majority of 22. I DO support being combined with district 16 where my community and my business will be fairly and appropriately represented as we are now.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
10/28/2021 - 06:41	Shirley Lamonna	9.2 Maps	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I support this map that keeps Marana, Oro Valley &amp; the Tanque Verde Valley together as it closely represents my communities of interest. As mentioned in previous feedback, Oro Valley never wanted to be part of the City of Tucson. We are not urban. Our population remains less than 50,000.</p> <p>It's time to create fair maps &amp; keep common suburbs together.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
10/28/2021 - 06:52	Shirley Lamonna	CD maps	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I live in the current CD1. I have had NO representation in the last 10 years.</p> <p>Your proposed maps for CD6 &amp; 7 do not represent my communities of interest.</p> <p>The City of Tucson needs to be in District 7 &amp; include South Tucson to represent the Latino &amp; Native American communities of interest.</p> <p>CD6 should expand north into Pinal County. It should also include the area of Pima county south of Tucson from Green Valley east to the Cochise County line.</p> <p>These changes will keep the rural interests together &amp; the urban interests rather, rather than intermingling them. The intermingling would offer little to no representation to either group.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
10/28/2021 - 06:55	Samuel Markham	redistricting is unfair	<p>The new map is an obvious attempt at gerrymandering. Please don't let this stand They take a little of Tucson and Pima County,, then dip way down or across to Yuma, Pinal, Santa Cruz, Cochise, Graham, and Greenlee, counties. For no reason other than diluting the Democratic votes in Tucson.</p> <p>This is blatantly unfair.</p> <p>Sam Markham</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:02	Sharon Larson	Redistricting	<p>Version 9.0 keeps local communities together in contrast to 9.1 and 9.2 which separates them. District 17 is more competitive.</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:05	Judith McDaniel	Redistricting Committee maps	<p>Version 9 of the redistricting committee's maps is the only one that draws relatively competitive districts without giving one party an advantage over another. Please please do the job that we asked you to do when we, the voters, created an independent and impartial committee to redraw these maps every ten years. I am currently a voter in CD2, zip code 85711.</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:13	Laurel Nason	Please revisit CD6 and CD7 6.0 maps to represent the communities of interest	<p>Tucson should be placed with south Tucson in District 7 with Latino and Native American communities of interest instead of where it is proposed.</p> <p>CD6 to the east should expand north into rural Pinal County, and include Pima county south of Tucson from Green Valley east to the Cochise line.</p> <p>Please do not combine rural and urban interests together.</p>

10/28/2021 - 07:21	Linda Morenz	LD Map Version 8	Please reject LD Map Version 8. It can't be fixed to meet standards. It weakens the VRA districts. The Latino and Tribal coalitions should have more input. It divides Pima county into 7 mostly noncompetitive districts. Districts aren't compact. District 17 appears to have been drawn just to increase Republican influence and the executive director of SALC confirmed that in an interview, a portion of which was published in the 10/27/21 Arizona Daily Star. This is not a good map.
10/28/2021 - 07:34	Kathryn Williams	proposed CD6 and CD7 redistricting	<p>Please DO NOT give Tucson control of 2 Congressional Districts as is proposed in the map at:  <a href="https://irc-az.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=803b337509c4458aa37b08c7e66f8470&amp;layers=ab24ad1f3bb8427a8db1de19ad47eb7a">https://irc-az.maps.arcgis.com/home/webmap/viewer.html?webmap=803b337509c4458aa37b08c7e66f8470&amp;layers=ab24ad1f3bb8427a8db1de19ad47eb7a</a></p> <p>Tucson has enough population for one congressional district. Please do not disenfranchise the rural communities near Tucson; this would not be representing our communities of interest. Tucson is an urban community of interest. Tucson should be placed with South Tucson in District 7, together with Latino and Native American Minority communities of interest.</p> <p>CD6 to the east should go north to include rural Pinal County, and include Pima county south of Tucson from Green Valley east to the Cochise line. This would better represent the rural interests as opposed to tying a rural congressional district to urban Tucson.</p> <p>Thank you for including comments from the public in your consideration.</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:41	Susan Husand	Redistricting in Pima County	<p>Dear commission,</p> <p>In reviewing the most recent maps, 9.0, 9.1, and 9.2 and the charge given to the commissions, it appears that Commissioner Lerner's 9.0 map best meets the criteria set forth in the Arizona Constitution of creating competitive districts. This factor of competitiveness is what makes democracy work. We accept the premise of majority rule in our country and sometimes (frequently ) I am not in the majority, but for citizens to be engaged and participate in our democratic systems there cannot be acknowledgement that the deck is already stacked in favor of one side. I strongly urge all of you, as commissioners given this critical task, to step outside your personal views and give democracy a chance to work for the betterment of our state. Follow the constitutional guidelines and let us have real elections with candidates debating the issues and, not making back door deals. Thank you for your service.</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:42	Susan Husand	Redistricting in Pima County	<p>Dear commission,</p> <p>In reviewing the most recent maps, 9.0, 9.1, and 9.2 and the charge given to the commissions, it appears that Commissioner Lerner's 9.0 map best meets the criteria set forth in the Arizona Constitution of creating competitive districts. This factor of competitiveness is what makes democracy work. We accept the premise of majority rule in our country and sometimes (frequently ) I am not in the majority, but for citizens to be engaged and participate in our democratic systems there cannot be acknowledgement that the deck is already stacked in favor of one side. I strongly urge all of you, as commissioners given this critical task, to step outside your personal views and give democracy a chance to work for the betterment of our state. Follow the constitutional guidelines and let us have real elections with candidates debating the issues and, not making back door deals. Thank you for your service.</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:44	janice jean budak	please vote for the C shaped map	<p>2.Create the backward C that we talked about in August</p> <p>a.Keep the areas that have something in common together - NOT TUCSON. You do not want to be part of Tucson! Rural stays with Rural.</p> <p>b.Pima County is one of the largest county in the state and one of the largest counties in the state that does not have Republican representation</p> <p>c.Tanque Verde Valley should stay with Marana</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:47	Katta Mapes	New District Maps	<p>Dear IRC Committee,</p> <p>I live in Marana and believe that we are most aligned as a community of interest with Oro Valley, the Tanque Verde Region plus Picture Rocks. We are more suburban and rural, not urban like the city of Tucson.</p> <p>In order to create a district with fair and just political diversity we need to have more than one Republican representative in state and federal congresses.</p> <p>Thank you, Katta Mapes</p>
10/28/2021 - 07:50	Elisabeth Johnson	Voting	Republican
10/28/2021 - 07:58	Clifford D Bennett	Voting redistricting	I want to keep the same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County.

10/28/2021 - 08:01	Liz Levine	Proposed District 17	Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana and Oro Valley are a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, D17 as represented in LD v9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/28/2021 - 08:02	David Faria	Redistricting	Leave us alone. "The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/28/2021 - 08:03	Liz Levine	Proposed District 17	Version 9.0 respects Mehl's articulated goal of keeping Oro Valley and Marana together, and does so even more effectively than v9.1 and v9.2. Versions 9.1 and 9.2 actually only include the most right-leaning sections of Oro Valley and Marana in order to guarantee a safe, non-competitive District 17. Version 9.0 includes all of these communities.
10/28/2021 - 08:04	Liz Levine	Proposed District D17	Proposed District D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, and favoring safety over competition. In contrast, districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.
10/28/2021 - 08:05	Liz Levine	Proposed District 17	D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.
10/28/2021 - 08:06	Liz Levine	Proposed District 17	LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria.
10/28/2021 - 08:07	Liz Levine	proposed redistricting	LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/28/2021 - 08:11	Dianne Coscarelli	Test Map LD 9.0 is better choice for competition	Of the three series 9 test maps, I commend Test Map LD 9.0. In that version I reside in District 17 which is very competitive. This test Map LD 9.0 also nicely balances the statewide competitive factor as it creates seven competitive seats, defined as being within an eight-point vote margin. However, Test Maps LD 9.1 and 9.2 create only six competitive seats.
10/28/2021 - 08:14	Mariana Spier	LD Test Map v9.0	LD Test Map v9.0 is the best so far. Making District 17 a competitive one it's a good start for Southern Arizona.
10/28/2021 - 08:15	Mona Ammon	Proposed changes to LD17	Do not accept Commissioner Mehl's v9.1 and v9.2 maps. This is gerrymandering. It's intent is to create a safe suburban (white) district. Commissioner Lerner's proposal creates a more competitive district representing the diversity of Pima County.
10/28/2021 - 08:16	Audra Travelbee	District 7	Viewing the map of District 7, there is no other word to describe the confines of the district other than a gerrymander. Pinal County and the lower third of Gila County have absolutely no connection, communities of interest, geography, business interests, health or education interests similar to those of Sedona. The Verde Valley and in particular Sedona MUST be associated with the Flagstaff community for all the specific reasons mentioned above, THAT WE DO NOT SHARE WITH THE SOUTHERN PARTS OF THE DISTRICT MAP.
10/28/2021 - 08:19	Karen Sue Carlson	Support LD 17 test map v9. 0	I write in support of Com. Lerner's proposed LD17 Test Map v9. 0. Test Map v9. 0 keeps Oro Valley and Marana in A geographically compact district. It also maintains a competitive political district for all parties. These are major goals of the guidelines set out In the Arizona Constitution.  Neither Test Map v. 9.1 or 9.2 support these goals.  Karen Carlson, Tucson, AZ
10/28/2021 - 08:20	Dianne Coscarelli	Test Map LD 9.0 is better as to natural boundaries-Tucson area	Test Map LD 9.0 respects proposed District 17 as to geographic features. The other two maps, LD 9.1 and LD 9.2, are geographic nightmares as they create a district that is actually TWO geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of the Catalina Mountains. Try driving between communities at each end as you will need a good hour of traveling on indirect routes.
10/28/2021 - 08:28	Dianne Coscarelli	Map LD 9.0 better as to Tanque Verde Area	Test Map LD 9.0 is a better choice for the Tanque Verde (TV) area because it includes TV in District 17 which is connected to the eastern parts of Tucson, the area where most TV residents shop, work, socialize and worship. This keeps local communities together.
10/28/2021 - 08:35	Gerald Marleau	Redistricting	As a long time resident of lake havasu city mohave county it would be a mistake including this area with Maricopa district. We are a rural area and do not have anything in common with larger population areas. Thank you.
10/28/2021 - 08:36	Dianne Coscarelli	Map 9.0 better choice as to Oro Valley/Marana combination	Test Map LD 9.0 is the better choice, compared to LD 9.1 and LD 9.2, to achieve Commissioner Mehl's goal of combining Oro Valley and Marana. LD 9.0 keeps ALL portions of these two communities together in District 17. The other two maps make splits within these two communities, which has the effect of creating two bifurcated communities and a less competitive District 17.

10/28/2021 - 08:36	Nancy Branham	IRC mapping	Today you will be potentially choosing a draft map. . . SO IMPORTANT. Although all six of the criteria that you are constitutionally bound to in making your decision are critical, PLEASE remember A. . . honor voting rights act, make sure the map reflects Arizona, especially the communities of color. ALSO F. . . guarantee competitive and fair maps.
10/28/2021 - 08:36	Dianne Coscarelli	Map 9.0 better choice as to Oro Valley/Marana combination	Test Map LD 9.0 is the better choice, compared to LD 9.1 and LD 9.2, to achieve Commissioner Mehl's goal of combining Oro Valley and Marana. LD 9.0 keeps ALL portions of these two communities together in District 17. The other two maps make splits within these two communities, which has the effect of creating two bifurcated communities and a less competitive District 17.
10/28/2021 - 08:45	Dolores Testerman	map 9.2	Map 9.2 is an improvement. I like that the rural districts are separated from the metros and they seem to be more compact
10/28/2021 - 08:53	Gabriele Lochner	redistricting	I live in the Tanque Verde Valley and I am recently retired. I have far more in common with the residents grouped together by the proposed Map 9.1 or 9.2, who may not share schools and shopping centers, but I share a common desire to avoid Tucson city politics. . Therefore, I request that you vote for Map 9.1 or Map 9.2 at the next IRC meeting.
10/28/2021 - 08:55	Charlotte Ann Ovitz	Tucson Redistricting	To the IRC Thank you for reading my comments. I am asking that you place Tucson in District 7. I am asking that CD 6 be all inclusive from Green Valley East to the Cochise County line Pima County north including rural Pinal County to the Maricopa County line. Thank you for your consideration. Respectfully submitted Charlotte Ovitz LD2
10/28/2021 - 08:56	Dianne Coscarelli	Map 9.0 better for District 17 compactness and contiguity	Test Map LD 9.0 is better, as compared to LD 9.1 and LD 9.2, for proposed District 17 because it has its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area. By contrast, in LD 9.1 and LD 9.2, District 17 is unwieldy as it extends in fragmented crescent fashion from northern Marana to the far reaches of southern Vail. This makes no practical sense for those who of us who live in these densely populated suburban areas.
10/28/2021 - 08:59	Catherine Kossler	Proposed Redistricting: District 3	As a longtime resident and voter of Maricopa County, I want districts which represent communities of interest, so they may be effectively represented by their elected officials. However, as the map is currently drawn, Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. These are SEPARATE, DISTINCT communities of interest which cover a large geographic area. This new District 3 is far too immense for any elected representative to be effective. Instead, this vast area should be split into two separate districts, between north and south at Scottsdale Road. Thank you for your consideration.
10/28/2021 - 08:59	Jan Henry	Redistricting	Oh please.... really?? D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another. Please stop this craziness!!
10/28/2021 - 09:00	Patricia Hammes	Proposed Redistricting Maps	Commissioner Mehl's goal in his proposed Test Map for LD17 has a goal of a safe Republican district. That is not a legitimate redistricting goal of the Arizona Constitution.  I urge you to adopt Commissioner Lerner's map which does conform with Constitutional goals.
10/28/2021 - 09:14	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana and Oro Valley are a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, D17 as represented in LD v9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area. As such, LD v9.0 is more representative of a "community of interest."
10/28/2021 - 09:14	Nancy Wexler	In support of LD test map 9.0	Of the current LD test maps under discussion, Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 competitive and represents a projected fairly balanced statewide representation by creating 7 competitive seats. This is the most appropriate and reasonable version of the maps under the constitutional criteria, under the purpose of the IRC's mandate to create compact, contiguous, competitive districts, facilitating fair representation of its communities of interest. Th s is the only fair option in the series of these test maps as of Oct 28, 2021
10/28/2021 - 09:16	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	Version 9.0 keeps Oro Valley and Marana more effectively together than v9.1 and v9.2. Versions 9.1 and 9.2 actually only include the most right-leaning sections of Oro Valley and Marana in order to guarantee a safe, non-competitive District 17. Version 9.0 includes all of these communities and ensures the number one issue for redistricting: competitiveness.
10/28/2021 - 09:18	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	Proposed D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson. This despite Tanque Verde residents working, shopping, worshipping, and socializing, in Tucson. In contrast, D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep these local communities together.

10/28/2021 - 09:19	Georgetta Pierson	Redistricting Maps	<p>Dear Committee,</p> <p>I live in north Phoenix near Desert Ridge where I shop, eat out and seek entertainment. My primary care physician is also in this area. It makes no logical sense to me to include my community in with Fountain Hills and Rio Verde, place I never frequent. What to those communities so far from me know about my community needs. Please do not link us, leave our district as is. Thanks. GLP</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:20	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	<p>D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 fail to uphold the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:21	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	<p>LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. Competitiveness is the top priority to ensure public participation and accurate, representative election outcomes.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:22	Linda Evans	Pima County LD FINAL DRAFT MAP	<p>IRC Commissioners,</p> <p>Legislative District 9 in Pima County has consistently rejected ANY map of ANY kind which has placed us below the Rillito River. You torment us! You ask about our "communities of interest" in both Tours 1 &amp; 2. We answer with a resounding "Do NOT place us into the City of Tucson." We have created maps which follow the AZ Constitution, such as my map "Indigo."</p> <p>Again we tell you we have NOT had GOP representation for a decade. You express the beauty of 1/3 R; 1/3 D; 1/3 IND, but again we say Independents are 70% Dems. Only 9.0 gives us a chance for Representation. We reject 9.1 &amp; 9.2. Go TOWARD a Final Map more like Draft 2.0 or 6.1</p> <p>Thank you, Linda Evans Candidate State House LD9 Pima County Redistricting</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:22	Tanner Keaton Guske	Draft Map Comments	<p>As described in the Arizona Daily Star, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal and such an act undermines our democratic system for accurate representation.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:25	Nancy Wexler	Keep Southern AZ Local Communities Together	<p>Of the test maps, only 9.0 keeps communities together in its proposed LD 17 and LD 18. Maps 9.1 and 9.2 fracture Tanque Verde from the area of Tucson where families live, work, go to school, worship, and socialize. Tanque Verde area is much more integrated with Tucson and severing it according to those maps yet, joining it to the northern areas, has no justification according to the constitutional criteria and in its design, simply favors one party over another</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:28	Carol McCauley	redistricting	<p>"The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:30	Rebecca Block	redistricting version 9.0	<p>I am in favor of version 9.0 because it has some very important features: D17 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area. Additionally, version 9.0 respects Mehl's goal of keeping Oro Valley and Marana together, and does so even more effectively than v9.1 and v9.2. Version 9.0 includes all of these communities.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:31	Stephanie Czopp	Redistricting	<p>Prefer current districts to this proposed map. The huge district that combines Fountain Hills all the way to Desert Ridge is not sensible.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:33	Penny Grabowski	Draft Proposals of CD^ and CD&	<p>I am very dissatisfied and upset with the drafts of proposed CD6 and CD7. They are not representing our communities appropriately. Tucson should not control 2 districts representing 1.5 or 1.6 million people when it only has a population of 600K people. Tucson should be placed with South Tucson in District 7, together with Latino and Native American minority communities. CD6 to the east should expand north into rural Pinal County, and include Pima county south of Tucson from Green Valley east to the Cochise line. As they are currently drawn, there is a wrongfully mixed rural and urban interests together and mixed suburban interests with Native American and minority interests to intentionally under-represent.</p>

10/28/2021 - 09:38	Olga Tarro	link to you tube live stream	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I have been watching the IRC meetings using your youtube live stream vs using Webex. Today I can't find the live stream youtube link.</p> <p>Can you activate the youtube live stream for today's meeting (Oct 28) and the future meetings?</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:51	Catalina Hall	Map 8.0 and 9.0	<p>These maps are not compact nor competitive. Mayor Romero objections should not be ignored.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:53	Gene Fisher	District 17 Map	<p>I urge the AIRC to refrain from further considering the map advanced by Commissioner Mehl on behalf of the Southern Arizona Leadership Council. According to the Arizona Constitution, the AIRC is required to consider 6 criteria: (1) equal population; (2) compactness and contiguousness; (3) compliance with the U.S. Constitution and the Voting Rights Act; (4) respect communities of interest; (5) incorporation of visible geographic features; and (6) creation of competitive districts where there is no significant detriment other goals. The central role of the AIRC is create representative democracy in the state. The plan proposed by the Southern Arizona Leadership Council and advocated by Republican commissioner from Pima County is a purely political instrument designed to expand a Republican majority in the state legislature. Instead of drawing a map in District 17 that is competitive, the goal of the SALC and its founder advocate is to create a safe Republican seat. The redistricting process in Arizona is supposed to serve the public's interest, not the sole self interest of the business community.</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:57	Valerie Policastro Edie	maps	<p>Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 is distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana and Oro Valley are a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas DON'T HAVE MUCH TO DO WITH EACH OTHER!! In contrast, D17 as represented in LD v9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.</p> <p>Also, as described in the Arizona Daily Star article, LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal. DO YOUR JOB FAIRLY!</p>
10/28/2021 - 09:58	LeslieAnn Williams	Gerrymandering	<p>I reviewed the maps proposed by commissioners Lerner and Mehl. Mehl, did you pay attention to: "Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable" "District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable" I live in Tanque Verde and would be in district 18 with C Lerner's map. This appropriately designated my neighborhood as a suburb of Tucson and my school District. It would also be a competitive district. In Mehl's proposal I would be in district 17--not contiguous and compact, sandwiching my area between Marana and Oro Valley 45 min North and Vail 30 min South. Those areas are not legislatively competitive and gerrymandering has been against the law, which you do not enforce, caring only about keeping your job. I'm appalled by this blatant corruption of democracy.</p>
10/28/2021 - 10:03	Anna Admire	Redistricting CD9	<p>Chairman Neuberg and Commissioners Watchman, Mehl, Lerner and York: I live in Kingman and frequently support businesses in Bullhead and Lake Havasu City. I respectfully submit these comments today in opposition of the proposed Congressional District 9.</p> <p>While our current congressional district isn't perfect, and includes portions of metropolitan Phoenix and Maricopa County, it primarily encompasses more rural geography. The proposed new district however, highly favors the populated areas of western Maricopa County.</p> <p>The proposed District 9 does include most of Arizona's west coast, which is appropriate; however, it dovetails into the west valley communities including Sun City West, Surprise, Luke Air Force Base, Goodyear and Buckeye, where at least 70 percent of the proposed district's population reside.</p> <p>This is clearly not representative of the residents of Kingman, Bullhead and Lake Havasu City, nor the residents of greater Mohave, La Paz and Yuma Counties.</p> <p>In a district with these demographics, the chances of representation from and for rural communities would be unlikely.</p> <p>All Arizonans matter and all voices should have equal opportunities to be heard. We should not be punished with the potential of under-representation for choosing to live and work in rural Arizona. I urge you to reconsider the proposed alignment of Congressional District 9 in an effort that more fairly represents the rural voice of western Arizona.</p> <p>Thank you for your action!</p>

10/28/2021 - 10:28	Eve Shapiro	competitive districts	Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another. On the other hand, test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria.
10/28/2021 - 10:34	Robt. & Nancy Austin	cd 7 & 6	We object to Tucson being in District 7. C.D. 6 should go East to Cochise Co. line.
10/28/2021 - 10:40	Donna Calvert	Tucson & Pima County Redistricting proposals	I would respectfully request that the Commission consider adopting Lerner's LDv9.0 map for our area. This map does a much better job of keeping communities of interest together and is much geographically compact. The wrap around district 17 in the other two proposals creates a ridiculously non contiguous district with a stated partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district. This creates a district that requires that you leave the district and drive 45 minutes to get from one populated area to the other with a roadless stretch between them. This is completely unnecessary in a densely populated urban-suburban area.
10/28/2021 - 10:43	Margaret Voge	Redistricting	I have been a Pima County resident for decades and recognize the diversity of our neighborhoods while feeling that we are all a part of this wonderful area. The proposals for D17 by Commission Mehl are failing not only the provisions of Prop 106 but the citizens of our county. The idea that Tanque Verde and the Oro Valley/Marana areas could be joined together for D17 makes no sense as these communities have little in common and are geographically separated. I strongly oppose the D17 maps proposed by Commissioner Mehl. They are not good for Pima County.
10/28/2021 - 10:48	Ann Strine	LD 9.0 Map	The proposed LD v9.0 is the best of the curren proposals. It adheres to the objectives of this commission better the any of the others. Proposed District 17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana and Oro Valley are a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, D17 as represented in LD v9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/28/2021 - 10:49	Daniel Greenspan	Coconino county redistricting	I support the adoption of Coconino County's legislative district map over the IRC's. Please keep Flagstaff in one district. To do otherwise will disenfranchise voters in this city.
10/28/2021 - 10:59	Ronald Harnish	Redistricting of Arizona	Scottsdale and Paradise Valley does not belong as a part Of the Indian reservations. The Indian Reservations are a separate political entity and should not be asked to include any part of Scottsdale in their redistricting.  Ronald Harnish
10/28/2021 - 11:03	Dieter A Knecht	Keep all of Sedona in same CD with Flagstaff and Verde Valley	I am a resident of West Sedona and Verde Valley. IRC Chairwoman Neuberg has stated "there is not a consensus on keeping the Verde Valley separate from Prescott;" however, in their testimony and public comments, those advocating separation base their requests on solid commercial, environmental and geographic reasons for defining community of interests, whereas those advocating against separation don't state any reasons based on constitutional criteria or appear to be confused by thinking the IRC was redrawing the county lines.  I agree wholeheartedly with the commercial, environmental and geographic bases to define my community of interests for separating Prescott from Verde Valley and Sedona. I and my neighbors in our daily lives experience Flagstaff and all of Sedona, comprised of West, Uptown and Village of Oak Creek, and not Prescott, as defining a community of interest in our shopping, doctor and hospital visits, and attending art venues and theatrical and musical performances.  In the draft redistricting map, the proposed split of West Sedona and Village of Oak Creek into a Congressional District with Prescott, while keeping Uptown Sedona in the same CD as Flagstaff can be explained either as arbitrarily shifting voters to make up required district totals or more maliciously a gerrymandering tool to split and dilute possibly more liberal voters into two more conservative districts.  Please correct this oversight by placing Sedona and Verde Valley in the same CD as Flagstaff and not Prescott.  Sincerely, Dieter Knecht [REDACTED] Sedona

10/28/2021 - 11:19	Janice Suderman	Comment on Mapping Consultant NDC	Some of the IRC commissioners are agreeing with the land developers. They are not listening to the voices of the citizens of the Native Nations and Latinos of Southern Arizona. The SALC map violates IRC's requirements, community of interests, compactness, geography, and weakening of the VOTING RIGHTS ACT. Jan Suderman a concerned citizen
10/28/2021 - 11:20	Marilyn Weissman	I am supporting the AZ Latino Coalition maps	I live in Flagstaff.
10/28/2021 - 11:21	Jesse "Jay" Simpson	Input from the Latino Coalition	Input from the Latino Coalition is quite valuable and it should be balanced so that the IRC creates as many competitive districts as possible since we are an equally divided state. I live in Phoenix.
10/28/2021 - 11:22	Karen Harris	From Tucson	I support the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting Maps.
10/28/2021 - 11:23	Judith A Porter	Redistricting	Please DO NOT combine Anthem and Desert Ridge with Fountain Hills and Rio Verde. It is too large an area, too disparate in demographics for any representative to do it justice. Please split current proposed District 3 into two, separating North and South areas by Scottsdale road. Thanks
10/28/2021 - 11:26	Ms. Toni Beetham	Redistricting	I live in Concho, Arizona, and support the maps submitted by the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting.
10/28/2021 - 11:27	Ryan Anderson	AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting	I am supporting the Coalition maps as an individual.  Flagstaff, 86004-1707
10/28/2021 - 11:29	JUDITH BUTLER	Redistricting	To whom it may concern,  Here are my objections to the proposed redistricting of my county:  1. Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.  2. Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.  3. Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.  4. Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals further toward the Republicans.  5. As described in the Arizona Daily Star article, Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/28/2021 - 11:29	Linda AA Chiles	Maps	Please join me in supporting the Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps.
10/28/2021 - 11:35	Janice Counts	Latino maps	I am supporting the AZ Latino Coalition maps. I am a resident of Marana.
10/28/2021 - 11:36	Ann Heitland	Comment - Flagstaff	I like the maps from the Arizona Latino coalition for Fair Districts.
10/28/2021 - 11:37	Margaret Nichols	AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting	I am supporting these maps from Oro Valley.
10/28/2021 - 11:38	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	Paradise Valley	I live in Paradise Valley and support the maps of the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting.
10/28/2021 - 11:38	Melissa Gray	I-17 Corridor 101 to New River	Please keep the area of I-17 from 101 to New River together as one district. This area is one community. The people shop, eat out, go to school, church and doctors in this area and should be kept together. Breaking the areas up in this corridor does not make sense. The areas in this corridor are not part of rural Arizona and should not be broken up and put together with rural Arizona.

10/28/2021 - 11:39	Janice Suderman	Comment on Mapping Consultant NDC	At the Prescott and Sedona Community of interest hearing in July 85% were in favor of the Verde Valley for being part of what is now LD6 with Flagstaff. The Mingus mountains separate Verde Valley from the quqd cities, Chino Valley, Prescott, Prescott Valley and Mayer. If you want to go Verde Valley you have to go over the mountain. In winter this could be dangerous because of snow. The only other route is to go around the mountains. The citizens of the quade cities are a community of their own. The schools work together for the good of the students. We shop in our stores, we hike and fish in all four towns. We have medical doctors and hospitaks that take care of our citizens. Our economic base is different from Verde Valley. We relyon tourists and snall business. We are a tight community. Werely on each other. One of the strenth of the quad citirs is that we take care of each other.
10/28/2021 - 11:41	Ms. Sarah R Simmons	AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting	I support these maps. Tucson, 85718
10/28/2021 - 11:41	Catherine Wylet	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps	I live in Phoenix, 85022.
10/28/2021 - 11:42	Joseph Watkins	Independent Redistricting Commission	I read with considerable concern the SALC's statement that their goal was to have a solidly Republican district in Pima County. Their rationale is that they wanted someone to promote their agenda. This is far from the type of consideration that the Independent Redistricting Commission can do and still follow the law. Moreover, these maps show the signatures of gerrymandering with distending districts.  Under the v9.0 map, communities are much more intact. I live in a district 21 in the SALC map putting my midtown Tucson neighborhood into a district that is largely made of Santa Cruz County residents. The v9.0 map has my neighborhood in a Tucson district. This should be the minimum requirement for a neighborhood in the middle of the city.
10/28/2021 - 11:54	Karyn Riedell	I am supporting the AZ Latino Coalition maps	Flagstaff, AZ, 86001 I support the Arizona Latino Coalition maps.
10/28/2021 - 11:55	Maria Lynam	Redistricting Maps	I live in Prescott (86301) and am supporting the the AZ Latino Coalition maps.
10/28/2021 - 11:57	Franklyn J. Bergen	Redistricting	Please support the AZ Latino Coalition Maps for Fair Redistricting. Tucson - 85749
10/28/2021 - 12:01	Danny McDowell	I support the Latino Coalition districts	I live in Flagstaff and support these maps.
10/28/2021 - 12:02	Judith Robbins	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps	I would like to see these communities of interest ( Latino communities ) remain together as districts with cultural common interest. Phoenix, 85029
10/28/2021 - 12:03	Rachel Robles	Redistricting maps	Phoenix - 85051 - I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps.

10/28/2021 - 12:07	Cynthia Edwards	Redistricting Tucson	<p>5. Talking Points on Legislative District Map Series 9.0 for consideration during today's IRC meeting  Talking point: Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.</p> <p>Talking point: Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 purposefully splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, in order to prioritize Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together.</p> <p>Talking point: Commissioner Mehl's district D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another.</p> <p>Talking point: Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals further toward the Republicans.</p> <p>Talking point: As described in the Arizona Daily Star article, Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council have proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.</p> <p>6. Talking Points on Congressional District Map 6.0 for consideration during today's IRC meeting  Provide Feedback on Draft Map Test CD 6.0: (The link will take you to a form to make comments about this specific map.)  The difference between Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 and Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; 9.2 is how the Tucson area legislative districts are laid out, particularly D17.  Commissioner Mehl's v9.1 and v9.2 maps combine two geographically separate suburban areas, Marana/Oro Valley and Tanque Verde to Vail, into one safe Republican district.  In an article in today's Arizona Daily Star Mehl and the Southern Arizona Leadership Council (SALC) made plain that the goal of their proposed LD17 is to create a safe Republican district in the Tucson area.</p>
10/28/2021 - 12:10	Chelsea Acree	Tucson - 85716	I am supporting the Arizona Latino Coalition maps
10/28/2021 - 12:11	Kathleen McDaniel	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps	I live in Tucson in the zip code 85716.
10/28/2021 - 12:12	Denise Bacon	Redistricting	The same as we are now, we Payson voters want to remain with Cottonwood, Cornville, Clarkdale, and Camp Verde. We DON'T want to be with Pinal County."
10/28/2021 - 12:13	victoriabrauncampbell@gmail.com	Redistricting Maps	I endorse the Arizona Latino Coalition maps. I live in Tucson, 85704.
10/28/2021 - 12:16	Kay Lapid	concerned citizen	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps.  I am a concerned citizen from Tempe.
10/28/2021 - 12:17	William Boyd	Redistricting	Please take into account input from affected Native American communities. Also, limiting political influence and focusing on population is advisable

10/28/2021 - 12:17	Herbert Bradford Barber (Brad)	Legislative redistricting maps, 9.0, 9.1, & 9.2	I wish to comment in favor of Commissioner Lerner's Map 9.0, and in opposition to Maps 9.1 & 9.2 from Commissioner Mehl and the SALC. As indicated by a recent news article, the motivation for Maps 9.1 & 9.2 appears to be to create a "safe" Republican district in Pima county. But they do so by violating principles for the IRC as laid down in the AZ Constitution. For instance, in their LD17 (I'm from Casas Adobes and would be in this LD17), inclusion of people in the far northwest side (Marana and Oro Valley) with those on the far southeast side (Vail) makes little sense, these groups do not share a community, they don't go to the same churches, shop in the same stores, send their kids to the same school districts or have obvious common interests. Just for people from these geographically separated areas to get together in a the same place, would likely require a long road trip. Their principal commonality appears to be a tendency to vote Republican. Map 9.0 is a much better choice. It meets all the requirements of the Constitutional guidelines for the IRC, and includes Commissioner Mehl's desire to combine Marana and Oro Valley while favoring competitive districts (criterion 7). Competitive districts allow both parties to have a chance to win, if they choose good candidates, and run on issues that are of concern to everyone, Republicans, Democrats and Independents. Safe districts encourage extreme candidates from either party. Please vote for Map 9.0. Thank you, for your service to the people of Arizona.
10/28/2021 - 12:17	Mr. Dave Fronske	AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting	I support their maps. FLAGSTAFF, 86001
10/28/2021 - 12:18	Christina Baker	I am supporting the AZ Latino Coalition maps	I live in Tucson.
10/28/2021 - 12:18	Cindy Wagner, in Prescott	Redistricting Commission comment	I support the Arizona Latino Coalition maps.
10/28/2021 - 12:19	John Stuckey	Redistricting	I support the Arizona Latino Coalition maps. I am in Pinetop.
10/28/2021 - 12:20	William Sarnack	I support the Latino Coalition districts	I am in Tucson and I support these maps.
10/28/2021 - 12:21	Julie Steinepreis-Whitehead	Redistricting Maps	I support the AZ latino coalition maps. (Gilbert, 85234)
10/28/2021 - 12:22	Kelley Blakslee	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting maps	I am a Public school teacher and live in Phoenix and I support the coalition maps.
10/28/2021 - 12:23	Nancy Burton	Maps v9.1-v9.3	Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly (14 Democratic seats & 16 Republican seats). The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8-point vote margin. In contrast, Commissioner Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals even further toward the Republicans (13 Democratic seats and 17 Republican seats).
10/28/2021 - 12:24	Councilman Ernest Bustamante	I am supporting the AZ Latino Coalition maps	I am a Councilman in Mammoth, Arizona, 85618. I support these maps.
10/28/2021 - 12:28	Yvonne Cahill	Ld23	If u are looking for a community of interest then keep Scottsdale in one piece! We are not a community of interest with Fountain Hills or Rio Verde. Scottsdale has one city council. People in Scottsdale shop in Scottsdale and use the hospitals and churches in Scottsdale . If Scottsdale had to be broke. Up it should be below Osborn. Any other attempt to break up a city which has distinct borders and community of interest with sports activities like spring training and waste Management Open is obviously a political move to destabilize our city and the voters in the city.
10/28/2021 - 12:35	Rebecca Crow	Midtown Tucson Redistricting	As a long time resident of Sam Hughes Neighborhood, I was dismayed to see that the current iteration of maps actually splits our neighborhood! And if I drove through midtown Tucson I would be driving through 4 Legislative Districts. This is the antithesis of community of interest!! Many of our midtown neighborhoods have nothing in common with Nogales. I urge you to give us all fair and equitable representation. Thank you.
10/28/2021 - 12:47	Laura Klass	Redistricting voting maps	LD Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 result in only 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. As described in the Arizona Daily Star article linked above, LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 were developed by one political party for the partisan goal of creating a safe district for that party. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/28/2021 - 12:54	Dana Offerman	maps	I am very concerned about the draft maps and the work of this commission. I don't think you are following the the mission of the IRC to draw competitive districts. The draft maps are blatantly being gerrymandered. You are deliberately diluting the voices of people of color, notably Native Americans and Hispanics. And giving preferential treatment to those in power. You have politicized this process in an obvious power grab by one party, the Republican Party. I am especially critical of the chair, who was supposed to be independent. All of her decisions favor the Republican Party.

10/28/2021 - 13:25	Lorine Egans	Redistricting	Keep the areas that have something in common together - NOT TUCSON. You do not want to be part of Tucson! Rural stays with Rural. Pima County is one of the largest county in the state and one of the largest counties in the state that does not have Republican representation Tanque Verde Valley should stay with Marana
10/28/2021 - 13:28	Peggy J. Turk Boyer	LD maps	The Southern Arizona Leadership Council has proposed LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 for the partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area. The Arizona Constitution does not have that as a legitimate redistricting goal.
10/28/2021 - 13:30	Peggy J. Turk Boyer	LD maps	Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a very competitive district, and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. The map creates 7 competitive seats, defined as being within an 8 point vote margin. In contrast, Mehl's LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 purposely make District 17 a safe Republican district, and only have 6 competitive seats using the 8-point criteria. The statewide balance under Mehl's maps would tilt the state totals further toward the Republicans.
10/28/2021 - 13:34	Jerad Wages Morris	Redistricting Maps Issues	I am writing again because after further study I realize that the three Congressional districts you have laid out give virtual certain wins to current Congressmen who participated in the attempt to overthrow our government. The current map is a shameful attempt to continue to put seditionists in office. Make all districts competitive to see who the people really want!
10/28/2021 - 13:34	Peggy J. Turk Boyer	LD maps	District D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 is ridiculously distended and fragmented for a district whose voters all live in relatively densely populated suburban areas. Marana/Oro Valley is a long drive from Tanque Verde down to Vail, and these two geographically distinct suburban areas don't have much to do with each other. In contrast, Lerner's D17 in LDv9.0 has all of its suburban residents grouped together in a compact and contiguous area.
10/28/2021 - 13:56	Victoria Kauzlarich	Keep Greater Scottsdale Together	<p>The current draft maps and previous iterations have, in varying ways, split Scottsdale into two or three legislative districts. As much as is practicable, greater Scottsdale should be kept together.</p> <p>Keeping greater Scottsdale together is wholly 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 equal population.</p> <p>Keeping greater Scottsdale together achieves compactness and contiguousness. It incorporates visible geographic features. The geographic footprint of Scottsdale remains virtually in tact as does the Salt River Pima-Maricopa community. It includes all of the unique features of both: urban, suburban and rural.</p> <p>Further, it creates competitiveness that the previous draft iterations do not. It comes very close to creating parity between the two major political parties with the advantage slightly favoring Republicans. Keeping greater Scottsdale together offers the opportunity for legislative candidates to run and govern from the middle, thereby serving the majority of voters in the proposed greater Scottsdale district.</p> <p>We already know that this level of party parity works. Two examples in the city of Scottsdale are the City Council and the Scottsdale Unified School District Governing Board. Both are composed of centrist candidates from both parties and both govern as citizen-centric.</p> <p>This greater Scottsdale district also complies with the Voting Rights Act in ways that the current LD23 does not.</p> <p>The proposed greater Scottsdale district has a compelling economic community of interest that includes tourism, local business interests on the 101 corridor south of 90th Street, along with Scottsdale Community College - all of which are on tribal lands.</p> <p>Putting these two communities together also preserves their mutual interest in sustainable land use, respect for the individual character of diverse and distinct neighborhoods, a culture of citizen involvement, environmental stewardship &amp; open space preservation, along with a citizen-centric focus on planning, community building &amp; decision-making.</p> <p>Both communities - Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian community value their unique sense of place. The IRC should value that as well by keeping greater Scottsdale together.</p> <p>You are invited to refer to map #CDF009. While this map has a CD designation, it is a legislative district map that implements the forgoing. It was developed and submitted by Scottsdale resident, Emily Wilson.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration</p> <p>Victoria Kauzlarich Scottsdale Resident</p>

10/28/2021 - 13:58	Ryan Boyd	Redistricting: Draft Map Series 9	<p>Hi, I live at Grand Avenue and Taylor Street and I just wanted to highlight my support for including a legislative district centered around the light rail which connects communities from Uptown to Downtown Phoenix.</p> <p>Additionally, I am in general support of the Latino Coalition maps. While I prefer keeping Central City Village as close together as possible, there certainly is a strong connection between Central City South and South Phoenix. There are also very strong communities that are correctly grouped together in the Latino Coalition maps in the western side of Phoenix.</p> <p>When it comes to the broader maps, I do defer to the Navajo Nation's comments on those that affect tribal impacts. I think it is very important to respect communities such as the tribes and others protected by the Voting Rights Act.</p> <p>After that, I think it is possible to add as much competitiveness as possible to congressional and legislative districts. Most Arizonans are not the dedicated partisans that are so engaged in these processes. As someone who has knocked many a door and convinced folks to vote with candidates not of their own party, Arizonans care a lot more about getting pragmatic things done to help their local communities have great education, safe transportation and a strong network of jobs in their neighborhoods. We can't get there without working together and we don't work together when we don't talk to people who have different opinions from us. Packing more voters into "safe" districts prevents this. If you only have to talk to the most extremely opinionated voters to win and there is no true competition, we won't work together and we won't achieve these major goals. Maps should represent Arizonans' diverse opinions, not whether given two choices they prefer red or blue.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work and I hope you come out to more communities in Phoenix as the draft maps are approved.</p>
10/28/2021 - 14:31	Christine Sipp	Redistricting	<p>I would like the commission to consider the map V9.0 as the one to adapt or at least considered the best alternative as it seems fair for the city of Tucson. With this map, my neighborhood of midtown in poets square will now stay in the city districts and will not have been drawn into the rural areas south of Tucson. We do not have the same interest or concerns as the rural areas south of Tucson. We need fair representation</p> <p>.</p>
10/28/2021 - 14:41	Suzanne King	Objections to Mehl maps	<p>Commissioner Mehl's district D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 &amp; v9.2 splits Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize and, instead, places these residents in a district that is separated from them by unpopulated areas of the Catalina Mountains. This is being done with the purpose of prioritizing Commissioner Mehl's partisan goal of creating a safe Republican district in the Tucson area and tilts the statewide balance of seats. Mehl's district configurations ignore the constitutional requirement of using geographical boundaries as district boundaries. In contrast Lerner's districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together and create competitive districts.</p>
10/28/2021 - 14:43	Carol Engler	Finalizing Draft Maps for Congressional District 1 and LD, District 28	<p>IRC I would like to add my message to your records as a person living in the Anthem community for nineteen years. After reviewing your draft map for Congressional District 1 which includes Anthem I agree with your decision which makes it a competitive and fare Congressional District.</p> <p>Continuing as Anthem, suburb of Phoenix, we should be in a District with other nearby suburbs. The LD 28 Draft Map needs to be drawn down I-17 to or beyond northern loop 101 rather than west or east.</p>
10/28/2021 - 14:48	Arwen Gustafson	redistricting of area where I live - 56th and Bell - include Desert Ridge and do not include anything south of Shea	<p>I just looked at the proposed maps for the area where I live and feel that an understanding of how people in this area actually live is critical. I live south of 101 and interact with many businesses and people in the Desert Ridge area. That area is not in my district which seems very strange. However, the area south of Shea which is not an area where people in my area interact often is in my district. Representation south of Shea for my area and not north of 101 seems odd. Additionally, my proposed area extends beyond Scottsdale Rd and that seems like a completely different area as well.</p> <p>This is what I recommend as logical map boundaries - Shea as a south boundary, include the Desert Ridge area north to Dynamite and an eastern boundary of Scottsdale Rd with 51 being a western boundary - these boundaries make sense to anyone living in this area.</p> <p>Thank you for taking into account my suggestions based on living in the area. This is an important process that needs careful consideration.</p>

10/28/2021 - 14:59	Edward Wozniak	CD6 / CD7	If you're REALLY serious about trying to keep communities of interest together, I don't see the rationale for basically splitting an urban area like Tucson down the middle and putting half the population into CD7 and half into CD6 which is overwhelmingly rural. I would think that Tucson could be placed with South Tucson in District 7 and the eastern section of CD6 could be extended north into rural Pinal County. Seems that would be more representative of the communities of interest than the current kluge.
10/28/2021 - 15:15	Judith Liebman	Redistricting	Gerrymandering around the country is simply a way for Republicans (especially) to manipulate the vote in their favor. Don't let it happen here in AZ. The proposed new district maps are in violation of legal requirements.
10/28/2021 - 15:15	Arwen Gustafson	Congressional District boundaries	I live near 56th St and E Bell Rd in current CD6. While looking at the proposed new boundaries, I am troubled that the area does not include areas north to Cave Creek which I consider to be a part of the areas I include in my daily life. It does include areas south to Tempe which are odd since it is a completely different part of the metropolitan area. Similarly, the areas west of 51 and south of Shea should not be included in this congressional district since they are much more urban and belong to an area that is traditionally part of Phoenix. The boundaries as they are now represent very different communities - urban v suburban and college/university v suburban - Please reconsider these boundaries as they would be very difficult for anyone to represent such disparate interests of constituents.
10/28/2021 - 15:43	magdalena Acosta	redistricting public comment I live at [cross streets] and I am part of the XYZ community. We are concerned that our community ha	I live at 71St Ave and Indian School Rd and I am part of the XYZ community. We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because that will makes us stronger community. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 15:44	magdalena Acosta	redistricting public comment I live at [cross streets] and I am part of the XYZ community. We are concerned that our community ha	I live at 71St Ave and Indian School Rd and I am part of the XYZ community. We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because that will makes us stronger community. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 15:50	Kelly Taylor	Maps 9.0, 9.1 and 9.2	I am commenting on District 16. In all of these 3 maps, District 16 is NOT compact and contiguous, it does not respect county boundaries, and it is not a competitive district. Also, being in Picture Rocks, my community of interest is Marana, which is 18 minutes away and NOT Casa Grande which is over one hour away. Unfortunately, District 16 requires a complete do-over on all of these maps.
10/28/2021 - 15:52	Lisa Cole	Final Maps	When does the commission expect to adopt the final map congressional and legislative district maps, please?  Thank you.
10/28/2021 - 16:08	Judith Keagy	Redistricting in the northwest part of metro Tucson	I am a resident of Casas Adobes located adjacent to the Catalina Foothills area and immediately to the north of the Tucson City limits and south of Oro Valley. I am very upset about the highly partisan attempt to carve out my community from its natural community of interest and neighboring contiguous areas in order to create a guaranteed right leaning "safe" but gerrymandered legislative district as represented by proposed test maps 9.1 and 9.2. Casas Adobes has little in common with Tanque Verde or Vail and should not be divided from the adjacent Foothills and Oro Valley and Tucson communities of the where most of us work, shop, worship and recreat. Test map 9.0 on the other hand respects our day to day interactions with our natural communities of interest and creates a more competitive district. The Arizona Constitution does not have as a legitimate non-partisan goal the creation of "safe" districts for one party at the expense of all the other more important goals that are part of the redistricting process.
10/28/2021 - 17:20	cynthia worley	CD map	I have lived in 85016, and work through the metro Phoenix area. The high density urban Phoenix communities currently tacked onto the proposed district 1 ( West of 51, East of 51 through 85016 and 85008) are a very different community than the rest of district 1. These areas of Phoenix should not be tacked onto the Scottsdale, Paradise Valley and suburban areas deprives both areas of representation and suppresses voters.

10/28/2021 - 17:36	Joey Robert Parks	The new district maps	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I'm a member of the Coronado Historic District community. I live at 8th Street &amp; Sheridan. I'm asking the Commission to take my community into account when they're drafting the new district maps.</p> <p>I'm concerned that the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation's maps didn't seem to be taken as seriously as the Southern Arizona Leadership Council's maps. The purpose of having an independent commission and allowing the public to submit our own maps is to ensure that everyone has an equal opportunity to use their voice and participate in the process. I don't feel like this is being done as well as it could be.</p> <p>I hope that moving forward, more can be done to make the public aware of the process and be given an opportunity to engage our decision makers. If I knew about such opportunities, I'd be involved more than just writing an online "letter"</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>~ Joey Robert Parks Author &amp; Ghostwriter</p>
10/28/2021 - 18:07	Rachel Sulkes	comments on new maps	I live at Thunderbird and 35th Avenue in current legislative district 20. I want to make sure that there will be public hearings in my community for me and my neighbors to participate in as we look at the new maps. Please make sure there are ways for working people to have access and to hear from the commission why you have proposed changes to our current district, and what the impact may be.
10/28/2021 - 18:07	Katie Lavra	Comment	I live at [REDACTED]. We need help with the homeless population in my area and need public hearing for the new maps in my area
10/28/2021 - 18:08	Crystal Lopez	Redistricting	I live at [REDACTED] and I am part of the Augustus community. We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because we need to be aware of our limited resources such as water in this state. Land back means people returning back and finding their place in those systems of life. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 18:09	Ari Berrong-Huber	Redistricting	I live at 16th st. and Thomas and I am part of the community of working class Phoenicians. We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because working class people have long been underrepresented in Arizona politics. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 18:10	Tomika Brown	Redistricting and mapping	Hello I would like for you to open more public meeting in South Phoenix and allow the public to speak and these changes that could affect me and my family
10/28/2021 - 18:12	Harlie Jackson	Representation & Resources for the LGBTQ community	How are LGBTQ communities being supported and represented in our districts when the city council meetings aren't held in accessible areas? I want to see these communities have a voice and be able to say how they feel and what they need from their representatives.
10/28/2021 - 18:12	Maico Stravlin Olivares	Accessibility	There needs to be translation available and open access from so people can hop on from home if they choose and not simply at designated locations as many people may struggle with transportation
10/28/2021 - 18:12	Dominic Jasso	redistricting hearing.	We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because it is very important that we have representation in our districts. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 18:13	Joan J Mason	AIRC community meetings	I feel that the process has not tried hard enough to get feedback from diverse communities. I hope hearings will be held in densely populated areas like South, Central and West Phoenix. We need translators of many languages available. I don't think it was fair for the SALC to be able to have their map fast tracked.
10/28/2021 - 18:14	Mark Bernal	Redistricting/Public Input	We are excited to know about the lines being drawn for the maps and redistricting. I am a Mexican-American voter and want to be sure to be represented and have hearings to be able to voice and express my voice in future endeavors when it comes to our government. Please be sure to keep in mind the communities that do so much work but are yet thought of last when it comes to making these decisions. Thank you for your time and I look forward to voicing my opinions and concerns.

10/28/2021 - 18:15	Jorden Taylor	Representation	I live at Van Buren and 35th Street and I am part of the Protestant community. We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and Navajo Nation maps. It is important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because I want to see a fair redistricting and I want to see my community not decided. Please hold in-person hearings in South Phoenix and West Phoenix/Glendale and in the white mountain area at times accessible for working Arizonans.
10/28/2021 - 18:16	Donald J Ameden	Redistricting process	My name is Don Ameden I am concerned that my city of Phoenix is being underserved by this process as there are no meetings scheduled within the city limit I love in zip code 85032 and would like to see some schedules
10/28/2021 - 18:16	Yolanda Hernandez	Public Hearings	My name is Yolanda Hernandez and I live in the Maryvale district off 35 ave and Elm St. During this whole process our community has been left out with no access to public hearings and to have our voices silenced. This is unacceptable and we urge the Commission to adopt the Latino Coalition and the Navajo Nation maps. It is extremely important that our communities stay united.
10/28/2021 - 18:18	Irma Pacheco Morales	Public hearins	My name is Irma Pacheco and I live in ██████████ Phoenix az 85041 south Phoenix I'm very concerned about the lack of public hearings in my community and the Commission needs to adopt the Latino Coalition's map to keep our communities united.
10/28/2021 - 18:19	Omaima	Sudanese community	I live at 43rd Avenue and Bethany home and I am part of the Sudanese community . We are concerned that our community has real representation. We urge the commission to adopt the Navajo Nation maps. It's important that our community stays together. I care about having our voices heard during the redistricting process because we want to expand the education due to the limited resources. Please hold In person hearings in south Phoenix and west Phoenix/Glendale at times accessible fir working organizations
10/28/2021 - 18:21	Patricia Thomas	Redistricting Committee	When are you going to have meetings on the west side of Phoenix? I have heard from two different sources about the racism that has been displayed at the meeting which was held in Surprise. I don't feel that all communities are going to receive equity in this process. Phoenix is the 5th largest city in the nation, so there is no reason you should not be having meetings all over this valley.
10/28/2021 - 18:51	Linda Hill	Subject to Tucson politicians	Not interested in being subject to Tucson politicians. I am a Mesa resident in Maricopia County . Leave politics out of our Re-distribution of districts and protect our communities of interests.
10/28/2021 - 19:13	Melissa Alexander	Redistricting	I urge the commission to draw our districts in such a way that they represent communities of interest.  In the current draft, Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are combined with Desert Ridge and Anthem. These are separate communities of interest covering a large physical area. The new District 3 is too vast for any representative to be effective.  Please consider that the district should be split between North and South at Scottsdale Rd.  Thank you for your time.
10/28/2021 - 19:31	Leslie L Hunten	Make redistricting fair!	Dear Commissioner Mehl, finally, you've admitted that your true purpose is to push the Republican agenda in the Tucson area. In spite of the fact that Tucson is 40% Democrat. So, are you willing to support more Democratic representation in the Phoenix area? Fair is fair, right? Will you draw Phoenix maps that are fair and competitive for Democrats? No, you only want it "fair" in your favor.
10/28/2021 - 19:44	Leslie L Hunten	Are lawsuits the only recourse now?	Dear IRC, a gerrymandered, partisan-pushed district map is what you submitted today for Pima County. Commissioner Mehl and his real estate cabal SALC dominated and won out. The map was submitted despite Mehl's obvious business ties and profit motive. Submissions by the Navajo Nation and Latino Coalition have been completely ignored, despite Arizona being 32% Hispanic. This redistricting process has been corrupted from the beginning, with the hiring of a right-wing mapping firm and then the appointment of a Republican-leaning Chair. Democrats have been attending meetings and participating in the comment process but have been ignored. The only option left to us is to bring lawsuits against the IRC and Commissioner Neuberger herself. Sigh. I guess we'll be seeing you in court.
10/28/2021 - 20:11	Jennifer Dawson	Redistricting maps	Districts D17 and D18 in LD Test Map v9.0 keep local communities together. The previously proposed District D17 in LD Test Maps v9.1 & v9.2 purposefully split Tanque Verde from the parts of Tucson where Tanque Verde residents are most likely to work, shop, worship and socialize, favoring (partisan) safety over competition. Not acceptable. Districts D17 and D18 are a definite improvement.
10/28/2021 - 20:13	Jennifer Dawson	Redistricting maps	D17 as shown in LD Test Maps v9.1 & 9.2 makes a mockery of the constitutional goal of using geographical features as district boundaries. They create a district that is really two geographically separate areas divided by an unpopulated and roadless portion of Catalina Mountains. This may be the only district on the LD map where you would have to leave the district and drive over 45 minutes to get from one population center to another. This is unacceptable. The IRC needs to do much better.
10/28/2021 - 20:57	Brian Morgan	hello	we are watching and your redistricting it is not being done evenly, fix it or take the rigidus anger of the citizens of this great state

10/28/2021 - 22:32	Summer Baker	Current LD Map 9.2 DOES NOT Represent My Community	<p>To Whom it may concern,</p> <p>The current Legislative draft map 9.2 does not appropriately represent the community I live in. The southern most of the boundary on baseline all the way up to the Salt River Reservation are separate communities of interest covering a large distance of area. The community in which I reside and those around me are hard working class citizens. The involvement of the middle most Mesa and the Salt River Reservation DO NOT coincide with the actions and representation of those in the community. Approving such boundaries would tarnish the voice of those that actively live in lower Tempe/Chandler area. From the US 60 on Priest to McClintock and south from there into Ahwatukee is a better boarder for this district as it includes the community in which most of those people thrive and spend their time. Previous maps such as AZ Draft 2.0 Legislative District: 12 better represents the area more than any of the other drafts.</p>
10/28/2021 - 23:04	Jeffrey Howell	Uprise about LD17 in Tucson	<p>Arizona IRC,</p> <p>The communities of Tanque Verde, East Tucson (Houghton Corridor) and Vail are in an uprise over being part of the LD17 district that was approved today on 10.28.21. Not only should it be illegal as its not a "real" continuous district (you cant link us via a 10,000 foot mountain range) our communities are entirely different than Tucson's NW side of Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrook and even Red Rock. Its over an hour+ drive away. Its essentially separated by other districts. You need to figure out a way to include Tanque Verde down to Vail into D18 or D19 which we have far more in common with.</p> <p>We're also upset you've taken all of eastern Santa Cruz County including Amado, Tubac and Tumacacori and tied it into D19. This is devastating to the region. We'd rather have LD10.1 plan extending D21 to Douglas along the southern border.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>