

Submitted Time	Full Name	Subject	Message
12/03/2021 - 00:46	Richard Roati	Proposed Legislative Maps Are Gerrymandering	I am outraged that an existing member of the legislature has apparently gamed the system to obtain a safe legislative district for himself in the current redistricting plan. I am outraged that it has been proposed that my neighborhood, Broadmoor Broadway Village, should be cut off from our community of interest, which is other in town neighborhoods in Tucson, and instead Tucson is to be carved up and my neighborhood is lumped in with rural voters in western Arizona. Please rethink this gerrymandering scheme and return the map to something more similar to the current situation where my neighborhood is included with our community of interest, residents of central Tucson. Thank you!
12/03/2021 - 02:03	Kathleen Liska	Redistricting	Please do not redistrict (gerrymander) my part of Tucson into LD16. I don't live in Gila Bend. I don't live in Maricopa. Their issues are not my issues, Tucson issues. LD20, with the rest of my city, is where we belong. Thank you.
12/03/2021 - 03:57	rex witherspoon	gerrymandering	The republicans have lost the popular vote in 7 out of the last elections. They are resorting to gerrymandering to put their thumbs on the scale. We have to put a stop to this assault on our democracy!!!!
12/03/2021 - 06:20	Karen Cusano	AZ redistricting	The IRC needs to avoid partisan influence in redistricting process.  The maps should reflect equal representation in all districts.
12/03/2021 - 07:33	Cathy Koukal	Redistricting Maps	I am a resident of Sun City, currently in CD 8. The proposed maps move us to CD 9. I am opposed to this proposal for two major reasons: The proposed change is not geographically contiguous. This proposal does not take in the need to keep us as a community of interest.
12/03/2021 - 07:50	Jan Marie Perozeni Corbus	AZ Redistricting	Leave the voting districts as they are.  There is no reason to change and/or enlarge any district.  This redistricting maneuver is a ploy to weight the districts toward Republican and distill our votes into a meaningless act.  I feel very strongly that this redistricting should not be done.  The precincts should not be split. Each precinct/area has its own issues and those issues need to be represented by the specific candidate representing that district.  To enlarge and combine neighborhoods and districts destroys the uniqueness of each district/neighborhood.  For example, I live in Pinnacle Peak. Our unique area has different land use issues compared to Old Town Scottsdale. I want my candidate to understand my unique neighborhood. Combining Carefree, Cave Creek, Fountain Hills, North Phoenix with North Scottsdale makes no sense in terms of being fair to each district and each district keeping its unique quality.  Redistricting will destroy the character of the various sections of the county; essentially destroying why we live here.  Each district needs to be fair and competitive.  Thanks for reading.

12/03/2021 - 07:54	Michael Bruwer	Call for Comments. Proposed Legislative District 16. LD17	Picture Rocks and Avra Valley should remain parts of Pima County and be in Legislative District 16. They are compact, contiguous, and a community with common interests.
12/03/2021 - 08:05	Anne Emerson	Redistricting Sedona, AZ	Please make sure that you do the right thing. This means keeping elections in Arizona fair and competitive. Follow the guidelines of Prop 106 instead of the desires of special interests and extreme political groups. Don't be one of the organizations that puts another nail in the coffin of democracy. Could you live with yourself if you helped destroy the fragile democracy that has made this nation great for this long? Put aside your personal desires and do the right thing. You know what that is. Now
12/03/2021 - 08:29	Darlene Wilcox	Redistricting	I know this is not an easy task for the Commission but the guidelines are quite clear as to what needs to be accomplished. It is also hard to separate out the political leanings however the end result should and must represent as even a voter balance as possible and any gerrymandering corrected before submitting for approval. That seems like the grown-up thing to do.
12/03/2021 - 08:48	Vivian Perry	Coconino County Legislative District Map	I strongly support the LDF 50 map and the LDF 51 maps which produce more compact and competitive districts. I also support the CDF 10 map which better meets all of the 6 criterion as well as respecting the voting rights of the Indigenous peoples in Arizona. Please give these maps your strongest consideration.
12/03/2021 - 08:50	Richard Rutkowski, MD	Proposed CD1 map	My family has lived in Fountain Hills for 20 years. I'm a Family Medicine Physician. My wife is a registered nurse and the Vice-President of the Fountain Hills School District Governing Board in her second term. We work in Scottsdale. We shop in central & north Scottsdale & Fountain Hills. We go to church in Scottsdale. We have family, close friends, and social events in Scottsdale, Rio Verde, & Fountain Hills. My wife & daughter volunteer at a stable in Rio Verde. We rarely shop, work, or visit central Phoenix, the area which is now part of the proposed CD1. CD1 combines areas which don't share the common factors which identify a community of interest - Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, & Rio Verde together as a suburban/smaller town community and central Phoenix as a separate unique urban community. These different areas don't belong in the same CD.
12/03/2021 - 08:58	Judy Rutkowski	Proposed CD1 map	My family has lived in Fountain Hills for 20 years. I'm a registered nurse and the Vice-President of the Fountain Hills School District Governing Board in my second term. My husband is a Family Medicine doctor. We work in Scottsdale. We shop in central & north Scottsdale & Fountain Hills. We go to church in Scottsdale. We have family, close friends, and social events in Scottsdale, Rio Verde, & Fountain Hills. My daughter and I volunteer at a stable in Rio Verde. We rarely shop, work, or visit central Phoenix, the area which is now part of the proposed CD1. The proposed CD1 CD1 combines central Phoenix with Fountain Hills, Rio Verde & Scottsdale, areas which don't share the common factors which identify a community of interest. Scottsdale, Fountain Hills, & Rio Verde are suburban/smaller town communities and share common features. Central Phoenix is a separate unique urban community with different features and issues. These different areas should not be in the same CD.
12/03/2021 - 09:10	Anne M. Hawkins, MD	Redistricting	I respectfully request that my beautiful town of Gilbert remain a whole district as much as possible. It is an unusually cruel and unusual act for you to divide Gilbert 5 different ways. Please reconsider.
12/03/2021 - 09:11	JOHN CRESSEY	Proposed voting maps	I am writing to voice my support for the proposed redistricting maps in Scottsdale. I am a Scottsdale resident and registered voter. I believe the current proposed maps are fair and equitable and I encourage you to approve of them. Thank you for all you do!
12/03/2021 - 09:11	JOHN CRESSEY	Proposed voting maps	I am writing to voice my support for the proposed redistricting maps in Scottsdale. I am a Scottsdale resident and registered voter. I believe the current proposed maps are fair and equitable and I encourage you to approve of them. Thank you for all you do!
12/03/2021 - 09:14	Sally Calkins Wegner	Redistricting	Although Maricopa County and Pima County are both located in Arizona, each has its own and dissimilar needs. A concern of one is not necessarily a concern of the other. Community sense, general philosophy, water, utilities, transportation, housing, environmental needs: all differ due to many factors including climate and topography. It is unreasonable to assume a person in Maricopa County can truly represent the needs of Pima County. I am against the proposal for LD 16.

12/03/2021 - 09:18	kkenneth conrad	a	<p>Any infringement on access to the polls by registered voters is essentially unconstitutional and criminal. There has been no evidence of any significant voter irregularity in recent elections and the only attempted crime occurred from the supporters of a clearly defeated presidential candidate. No one who believes in democracy could possibly support the proposed gerrymandering.</p> <p>t</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:21	Janet S Twyman	Redistricting Maps	<p>Prop 106 created the Independent Redistricting Commission to make competitive maps. Competitive redistricting maps is the IRC's mandate. My strong critique of LD 7 is that it is not competitive. The current proposed legislative draft maps move the previously competitive LD 6 and replace it LD 7. Other maps better meet the criteria of compactness and contiguousness and the LDF 050 map is competitive and the LDF 051 respects the Voting Rights Act requirements.</p> <p>I respectfully ask to IRC to seriously consider the LDF 050, LDF 051, and CDF 010 maps instead of the Proposed draft maps because of their superior reflection of our voting rights of competitiveness, contiguousness and compactness.</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:27	Annarose Lilly	I wish to Speak at Maricopa Town Hall Today	<p>I have signed up to attend the virtual Maricopa County town hall today at Noon. I want to make public comment at the meeting. How can I do that?</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:34	Nancy Musgrave	Picture Rocks in LD16??????	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Thank you for your work. I know it's hard and time-consuming.</p> <p>My name is Nancy Musgrave. I live in Picture Rocks which the latest maps have in the new Legislative District 16. This is upsetting to me to say the least. I can find no reason for putting my community of Picture Rocks in a district with towns way up in Pinal and Maricopa counties and not putting us in LD17, a district with other Pima County towns, specifically Marana, our neighbor who borders us on the north and east. It's Marana, as our closest neighbor, that we have geographic and economic ties with and with whom we even share a school district. Picture Rocks is part of the Marana Unified School District. We have absolutely no ties at all to towns way up in Pinal and Maricopa counties. We do not belong in LD16. We belong in LD17 with our community of interest.</p> <p>To put Picture Rocks in LD16 means we would not be in a compact or contiguous district. And, just as bad, these maps separate us from our closest community, our real community of interest, Marana. We don't even geographically connect to the rest of the proposed district - Marana is physically in-between Picture Rocks and Pinal County, geographically separating us from the rest of LD16.</p> <p>Looking at the maps, I see Vail is put in LD17, with Marana. Again, this makes no sense since Vail is nowhere near Marana and they have nothing in common and this would not be a contiguous district either. I propose you remove Vail from LD17 and put Picture Rocks in LD17 instead. Why not?</p> <p>Again, I thank you for your time.</p>

12/03/2021 - 09:37	Ian Murray	Cities and school districts not included in committee of interest MAPs	<p>I am a fourth generation Arizonan and have lived in Mesa for the past 30 years. When I attempted to draw maps for my communities of interest I was only able to select counties and Indian reservations. City limits and the school district boundaries were not available.</p> <p>When I looked at the legislative districts for Mesa I saw that many of them extended into the Gilbert city limits, which means that neither the communities of interest of Gilbert or Mesa were respected. The legislative districts should be contained within a single city whenever possible.</p> <p>The same issue holds for the school district boundaries. The legislative districts for Mesa Public Schools were also share with Gilbert Public Schools meaning that the communities of interest of the school were also not respected.</p> <p>I respectfully request that the legislative districts in Mesa be redrawn to be completely in Mesa and Gilbert respectively.</p> <p>I also request that the legislative districts be redrawn such that the legislative districts that contain Mesa Public Schools only contain Mesa Public School and not Gilbert Public Schools.</p> <p>Competitiveness of the districts was only suppose to be take into consideration only after communities of interest were considered and the current maps do not reflect that.</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:39	Laura McCuiston	Redistricting maps!	<p>Hi I'm writing to advocate for maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 for redistricting. The reason being is they are competitive districts that are more compact and contiguous than the current proposals.</p> <p>Looking forward to your response.</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Laura McCuiston    Cottonwood, AZ 86325</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:39	Meredith Atherley	District 2 congressional map and district 7 legislative map	<p>Neither of these maps fall within the competitive range. The district 7 map peels off a segment of Sedona so that I am not voting with my community but with a large and non-contiguous segment of the state. It makes no sense other than to keep it non-competitive.</p> <p>The district 2 congressional map stretches all the way down and around the east side of Phoenix— not contiguous, not taking into account any common community interests. Again, the lack of competitiveness of this district reflects the way it is drawn.</p> <p>The commission can and must do better to ensure that voters choices are fair and competitive.</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:41	Jeffrey Meyer	Redistricting Maps	<p>Please consider the LDF 050, LDF 051 and CDF 10 maps rather than the non-competitive maps that are being considered at the present time. You are diluting the voice of the native americans and diluting (liberal) Flagstaff. As I understand it, you are required by law to create competitive districts and the presently considered maps do the opposite! Please do your job correctly!!</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:44	JO KONTZER	mapping	<p>One of your jobs is to try to form districts that are competitive. As a resident of the Yavapai county section of Sedona, I am very disappointed in the district you are proposing for my area. It is completely noncompetitive and will result in 10 years of Republican victories guaranteed. If you continue to be committed to this map you will have failed in your duty to encourage fair elections and you will have created a completely gerrymandered section of Arizona. And you will probably (hopefully) find yourselves in court defending an indefensible action. This is just so obviously the wrong way to do your job.</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:49	Barbara Moreland	redistricting	<p>The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to IRC mandates</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:50	Barbara Moreland	redistricting	<p>The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to IRC mandates</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:50	janet ranney	redistricting	<p>I would like to make my voice heard as a resident in the Catalina Foothills. The redistricting commission must ensure that they follow their own policy which prohibits partisan gerrymandering. This process must be fair and non-partisan. I would like to request that district 17 include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the foothills including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes leaving Vail, the Houghton corridor and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. The contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA and Fourth Avenue should remain in CD7 and CD7 should also include areas south of Broadway. This is so that Latino communities maintain their voting strength in their communities of interest, which is how the process is supposed to work. Free and fair elections are essential to a healthy democracy and all citizens should be able to ensure that their interests are represented. Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 09:50	Barbara Moreland	redistricting	<p>The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to IRC mandates</p>

12/03/2021 - 10:04	Kim Schweitzer	Redistricting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) criteria prohibit partisan gerrymandering.</li> <li>•I want/insist that the IRC do their jobs free of partisan influence.</li> <li>•The maps should be competitive</li> <li>•The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate.</li> <li>•I want to see maps that reflect equal representation in the districts.</li> </ul>
12/03/2021 - 10:22	Susie Morris	Independent Redistricting Commission	<p>Gerrymandering destroys the democracy of my country, the United States of America, for which many fought and died.</p> <p>It is the "enemy within" who gerrymander.</p> <p>Legislative District 7 should include the Hispanic area south of Broadway as they are part of our cultural group.</p> <p>Legislative District 17 should be competitive so that citizens debate the issues and decide who to vote for. This is democracy. It should be a district that is contiguous from Marana eastward to Tanque Verde.</p>
12/03/2021 - 10:27	Pamela Geisel	Redistricting Maps	<p>I am a fairly new resident of Arizona, having relocated to Prescott last year to care for my elderly parents, who both now have serious dementia. Since they are now in a memory care facility, I have a little more time to focus on the goings-on of my new state and county, so have tried to become politically aware. In so doing, I've learned of the redistricting in progress and was shocked to see the lack of competitiveness in the current maps being considered by the IRC. Though I am not of Native American descent, I have enormous respect and regard for the contributions of indigenous peoples and feel strongly their votes should be fairly heard. CDF010 is a map that much more accurately represents their voices and I hope the IRC will give serious attention to it. LDF 050 and 051 also appear much more competitive; in addition, they embrace contiguousness, which has great benefit to all of us who consider ourselves part of a community, and I believe are also deserving of serious attention. I will add that my parents (who are the reason I'm in Arizona) and I often disagreed politically, but we always agreed the fairness should reign supreme so I feel as though I am also speaking for them in advocating for maps that reflect competitiveness and community. Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 10:35	Karen Kelly	Re-Districting	<p>The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate and I want to see maps that reflect equal representation in the districts.</p>
12/03/2021 - 10:38	Jeanmarie Haney	Northern AZ Districts	<p>Please replace the current IDC proposed maps for northern Arizona with proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010. I ask this because I believe in competitive districts. The maps currently proposed by the AZ IDC for northern Arizona are not competitive. Also, they do not represent my community of interest, based on where I live, work, and recreate. The IDC proposed maps split up communities and split of important watersheds. The proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 are more competitive, compact and contiguous than the current proposals.</p> <p>Overwhelmingly, elected officials and tribal leaders and numerous residents in northern Arizona have, over and over again, expressed their support for proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010. I have read the pros and cons of the current IDC proposed maps and the proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010, and I have come to the conclusion that proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 will much better serve the broad concerns of northern Arizona residents.</p>
12/03/2021 - 10:49	Timothy A Tilton	Noncompetitive districts	<p>I taught political science at Indiana University for 37 years. I hold advanced degrees from Oxford and Harvard. I spent 10 years as an elected county official. I am seriously troubled by the effort to carve out non-competitive districts in the Tucson area. Our politics have become increasingly and dangerously polarized. One of the contributing factors is surely non-competitive districts. You are legally obligated to construct contiguous and competitive districts. Please reconsider the current maps in this light.</p> <p>Thank you.  Tim Tilton  ████████████████████  Tucson, AZ 85718</p>

12/03/2021 - 10:52	Marilyn Bernhardt	Fair districts for Northern AZ	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>The original proposition that Arizonans voted for to create the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission gives its purpose as, "To oversee the mapping of FAIR AND COMPETITIVE congressional and legislative districts " The six principles which guide you are merely means to that end. Current proposed maps for Northern AZ do not even come close to adhering to these two principles and should be set aside in favor of the CD map proposed by the Navaho Nation and the LD maps proposed by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors. While nothing is perfect, these maps come much closer to "fair and competitive" (as well as the other 6 guiding factors) and are widely supported by organizations and voters in this part of the state.</p> <p>We only ask that you do the job for which you were created.</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:01	Vivien Lavelly	Redistricting map concerns	<p>Hi, my name is Vivien and I live in Mesa, over in the center of the new district 10 for state legislatures. I have lived here for 3 years and I have a child of 4 years. I am a little concerned overall with how the east valley is divided up, from the weird pan handle, to cities and communities that are divided, as well as to how some of the school districts are divided. As the mother of a young child, I know how important parents being able to properly advocate for education for their children is. If school districts are divided across many legislative districts in the east valley that can be difficult. I think one way we could have less divisions is by eliminating the pan handle and making the districts more vertical. We could bring my district boundaries up a little closer to the 60 freeway to accomplish this. Thank you for your time.</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:03	John Tanzi	Yavapai County	<p>WATER! Water will be a major factor in the years to come, it is important that all the key players be under the same management. So it is important that all of Sedona and Verde Valley be in the same management area. Sedona Oak Creek is part of the Verde River watershed so it is very important that Sedona and Verde Valley be part of Yavapai County so water issues can be discussed with these areas under one management group.</p> <p>John Tanzi 20 Year resident of Yavapai County</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:08	Barry Briggs	Change from CD2 to CD6	<p>Dear Neighbors,</p> <p>I object to the proposed CD6 district. Instead, I recommend that you adopt the CDF001 map.</p> <p>I have lived in rural Cochise County for almost a decade and have affinity for the various communities in this county – Bisbee, Sierra Vista, Douglas, Willcox, and Benson. But I have no affinity with the communities in Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal Counties. In fact, over the years I've lived in Cochise County, I have only traveled through these counties on the way to another destination.</p> <p>Instead, nearly all of my travel outside of Cochise County is to Tucson. I go to Tucson for specialized medical care, food, entertainment and culture, and to visit friends. On average, I travel to Tucson for these reasons about once each week. I NEVER go to Graham, Greenlee, or Pinal Counties for any of these services.</p> <p>There is no natural affinity among the communities in proposed CD6. I encourage you to adopt CDF001 because it links natural communities of interest. It helps to address common concerns along the border with Mexico. Fort Huachuca and the retirees associated with the base have little in common with residents in Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal. The University of Arizona maintains a campus in Cochise County. The proposed CDF001 also insures a highly competitive district which will benefit all the residents of the area.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:09	Robert F Lindsay	Gerrymandering District 17	<p>I am distressed at the proposed map for District 17. As a resident of the Tanque Verde area I have little in common with the suggested change. To accept; a plan from a partisan leaning coalition is just wrong and goes against what your core mission should be. I have little in common with those up in Oro Valley much less Casa Grande!! I want to remind the IRC that districts should be relatively equal in population, be geographically compact and contiguous, and respect communities of interest. To create a district so a certain party can win it goes against what you are charged to do. I feel the independent chairperson needs to do a better job of being independent. Also to not include Casa Adobes with Oro Valley is a joke, it is one of the early communities in that area. Do the right as an American not a Republican's or Democrat but do what is right as an American. Any type of Gerrymandering is just wrong.</p> <p>Thank you...B. Lindsay [REDACTED]</p>

12/03/2021 - 11:10	Linda Tumarkin	Redistricting for LD9 to LD 17	Proposed LD 17 is not contiguous and compact to extent that it is practice. It is made up of Republican-leaning suburbs from opposite ends of Tucson which are separated by a mountain range and a very long drive. This has been drawn not to be a competitive district but to favor one party
12/03/2021 - 11:10	Fredi Olster	LD5	The map you have proposed for my district is blatantly uncompetitive and will negate my vote. You have weighted LD5 to solidly support the Republican Party. This will remove any impetus for moderate candidates to run in my district. This is gerrymandering at its worst. I sincerely hope you will reconsider your proposed splitting of Sedona/VOC and stuffing our votes in with Prescott and Payson to guarantee we have no say in our governance. The LD 050 and 051 maps solve this and make our districts competitive and fair. I implore you to remember your mandate and redraw the maps for Northern Arizona.
12/03/2021 - 11:11	Linda Tumarkin	Redistricting for LD9 to LD 17	Proposed LD 17 is not contiguous and compact to extent that it is practice. It is made up of Republican-leaning suburbs from opposite ends of Tucson which are separated by a mountain range and a very long drive. This has been drawn not to be a competitive district but to favor one party.
12/03/2021 - 11:14	Kathryn Anderson	Redistricting	To build a better democracy, all systems, including political districts, should be designed to be as fair to citizens and community members as possible. When citizens see or feel that political systems are out of balance, or leave them out of their democracy, they become jaded, cynical and non-participatory. That will hurt our democracy, allowing one party or the other to dominate and further the disenchantment and disengagement. Please keep District 23 together and design all districts to be competitive and fair. Thank you for your consideration.
12/03/2021 - 11:22	Brock Bassetti	Re-districting	Hello,  I would like to make my voice heard that I agree with the re-redistricting proposals and disagree with people opposing them. I live in an area with a tight cluster of right wing extremists and would feel more represented if the map was draw to include people of different neighborhoods of people with similar mindsets.
12/03/2021 - 11:28	Shirley A Easton	LD17 Redistricting	I do not support Draft 10 of LD 17. This draft does not support all the constitutional criteria in that the district is not compact, district boundaries do not respect communities of interest.  Please adopt Version 9 of the Draft Map for LD 17.
12/03/2021 - 11:31	Billie D Morrison	Redistricting of LD 17	The new suggested redistricting map does not follow the required criteria. Please adopt version 9 of the draft map for LD 17.
12/03/2021 - 11:31	Barbara Brandel	I object!	Wasn't the creation & purpose of the IRC to be to ensure that ALL ARIZONANS can vote for and be represented by those best suited to work for the needs of the state and the people? In one work: DEMOCRACY. I have read many of the public comments on the IRC Public Comments pages, and most of them are in disagreement with the decisions so far by the Commission and the Chair. The people object to their communities being split up and gerrymandered to Republican advantage. As a resident of Tucson in Pima County, I object to the attempt by partisans to create safe voting districts to ensure re-election for legislators despite their public contempt for the City of Tucson and the majority of the population of greater Tucson. The IRC is instructed to create competitive and compact districts; not to create rigged voting districts to ensure Republican victories where, if not gerrymandered, voters would elect those who represent them. I suggest that the IRC Chair is off-balance and tilted, at the very least manipulated. I Object!
12/03/2021 - 11:34	Joan Hall	Unfair maps	Dear Commissioners,  It is your job to develop districts that are relatively equal in population, be geographically compact and contiguous, and respect communities of interest, enabling residents with common concerns to elect legislators who'll represent those interests.  You have not done this. There are no competitive districts. There should be no partisan gerrymandering (which there currently is).  Contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue, should remain in CD7, including areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.  Do it right.  Sincerely,  Joan Hall

12/03/2021 - 11:41	John Boyer	Approved Final Draft Map 10.0	<p>Hello my name is John Boyer. I am a 74-year resident of Arizona and I have lived in Mesa, Arizona for 41 years.</p> <p>I have two main points that concern me after viewing the approved draft maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* I want to see districts that are representative of Arizona's diverse population.</li> <li>* I want to see competitive districts in Arizona. A competitive district is will encourage better representation for the residents of that district.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, please minimize splitting of cities. The city of Mesa is split into five districts. Three would be a better number. Map LD0061 shows how this can be done.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to testify.</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:41	Lynn Bultman	Maps	<p>Be truly independent and draw competitive districts to assure a healthy democracy.</p> <p>LD 17 map is particularly problematic in being drawn for Republican advantage.</p> <p>LD 17 is also not compact and contiguous.</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:51	NORMAN R EPSTEIN	redistricting map	<p>District 17 should not include Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde. These should be left in the Eastern legislative districts. To include these in CD 17 would violate the Constitutional requirement that the districts should be compact and contiguous. Downtown Tucson, UA, and 4th Ave should remain in CD7 which should also include areas South of Broadway to meet the requirement that districts should contain groups that are similar in interest. Using gerrymandering in partisan ways that tilt the election towards one party or another rather than being competitive only undermines our confidence in government. This IRC must show that they are not tilting the scales to favor an outcome; this was the whole purpose of an IRC!</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:56	Lina F. Hatch	where is my link to Dec 3 virtual hearing?	<p>I have registered for the Dec 3 virtual hearing for Maricopa County, but where is my link &amp; permission to join?</p>
12/03/2021 - 11:56	Judith Marshall Owens	gerrymandering	<p>The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate.</p> <p>I want to see maps that reflect equal representation in the districts</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:02	Henry/Rick Guzman	proposed congressional district maps	<p>Upon reviewing the proposed maps for northern Arizona, I have the following comments. First, the IRC is charged with creating COMPETITIVE districts. LD-6 was competitive district, the proposed LD-7 separates Flagstaff and Sedona and creates 3 NON-COMPETTITIVE districts in northern Arizona. Exactly the OPPOSITE of what the IRC is supposed to be doing. In addition, the commission needs to consider LDF-050 and LDF-051 for competitiveness and the contiguousness that these districts would provide. Finally, the proposed CD-2 map dilutes the native american vote. The Navajo nation's proposed CDF-010 would create the most competitive district in the state. Please consider it.</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:02	Deborah A Melton	LD of southern Arizona	<p>I have lived in Green Valley for 4 years. I shop, and participate in community activities, go to the doctor and dentist in Green Valley and Sahuarita. This is my community.</p> <p>I want to complement the commission on work drawing maps for Congressional Districts. But I am very concerned about any LD map that would split Green Valley. The I-19 corridor is what unites our community. It is not a boundary. All of Green Valley and Sahuarita need to be kept together in one LD. Draft map 10.0 splits Green Valley and my address would be put in with Sierra Vista and Globe. I have never been to either or those places and my community has little in common with them.</p> <p>The Arizona constitution states that districts must be compact and contiguous. Splitting Green Valley and putting part of it in with rural areas to the east does not accomplish that goal.</p> <p>I am also deeply concerned by the recent revelations that draft map 10.0 was created to split populations in order to give one party a distinct advantage. This violates one of the criteria that the a bipartisan commission is charged with fulfilling and the reason Arizona voters approved. Arizona is a growing state with people moving in from all over the country effectively turning Arizona purple. Therefore, it is more important than ever to keep all districts competitive, making elected officials more responsive to the needs of all citizens, not just those with extreme partisan views. Draft map 10.0 does not do that. It splits Green Valley giving advantage to Republicans. Green Valley needs to be together in LD21.</p> <p>Therefore, I urge the commission to support Draft Map 0055 which keeps Green Valley community of interest together and provides for more competitive elections. Thank you.</p>

12/03/2021 - 12:11	Bonnie Gordon	Testimony	My name is Bonnie Gordon and I live in North Scottsdale. I appreciate the opportunity to voice my point of view and am grateful for your public service. It is important to allow the district to remain competitive, anything other than that is not keeping with the makeup of this county Specifically, Sunny Slope should be kept in (4) districts and Gilbert should not be split in (5) districts These fundamental changes simply do not represent the composition of these areas. Il also feel that Maricopa should not be split beyond (2) districts. These very fundamental changes to redistricting does not represent the constituents of these politically diverse populations. The continuity of a competitive voter landscape is essential to the fairness and proper outcomes of our electoral process. I urge you not to change these district boundaries and hope that you will make the right decisions for all of us in Maricopa county. We are counting on you!
12/03/2021 - 12:13	Peggy Simpson	Redistricting maps	I am advocating for the adoption of the map CDF010 proposed by the Navajo Nations Human Rights Commission. This is a competitive, contiguous map in keeping with the Voting Rights Act and representation of indigenous peoples. I am advocating also the consideration and adoption of the competitive and contiguous districts delineated in maps LDF 050 which supports the goals of both the Flagstaff and Sedona city councils and those of Clarkdale and Jerome and LDF 051 which better respect the requirements of the voting rights act and northern AZ's tourism economy.
12/03/2021 - 12:14	Nancy Martin	Congressional Districts	For far too long the Congressional Districts in Arizona have not been competitive! I have reviewed the various maps and proposals and I favor the maps for LDF 050 and 051, and CDF 010. These maps are more competitive, and these proposed Districts do not gerrymander all over the state. I urge you to accept the above noted proposed Congressional District maps.  Thank you for your service. I understand that in today's political climate serving in this manner can be challenging to say the least. I do appreciate your time, effort, and patience to help Arizona have competitive Districts. Thank you again. Sincerely, Nancy Martin
12/03/2021 - 12:15	Douglass Ebstyn	Redistricting - Scottsdale Community	Community of interest is the overarching criteria for redistricting. However, the Commissioners have allowed their political self-interest to take control of this important constitutional task. This, to me, is criminal. I can't make excuses for people who say one thing and do another. If you have any honor, you will keep Scottsdale intact as much as possible. We have no tie or interest to the I-17 corridor or Desert Ridge. Nor is there a scintilla of connection between central Phoenix and our community. Make the western boundary of our district coincide with the western boundary of Scottsdale. If it is necessary to draw a line, let the area south of Camelback move into District 8. Stop gerrymandering. Arizona has been a state for 109 years, it has formed natural communities over generations. The notion that a politically biased panel can whimsically draw an arbitrary line that will be right for Arizona is insane. You have heard over and over again from "we the people," keep our communities intact. We want to vote for the people who are in government where we send our kids to school, where we worship, where we buy goods and services, where we recreate. Our communities are balanced by virtue of generations living in these localities. STOP GERRYMANDERING!!!!

12/03/2021 - 12:22	Jane Rhodes	new LD3 and entire IRC approach	<p>My husband and I have lived in Cave Creek for 17 years. I have to say that we are STUNNED by the results of your work on both a micro and macro scale.</p> <p>First the micro:  You separated the Cave Creek /Carefree area from Yavapai County which is great but then you put us in a new LD 3 which is actually far worse.</p> <p>In fact, I see this new district as a FAILURE on 4 of your 6 criteria:  1.It pretty much whizzes on our community of interest which identifies with the greater Phoenix metropolitan community – and NOT in any way with the vast rugged wilderness to our East.  2.It is compact and contiguous only if you know nothing about the area this covers.  3.It presents huge geographical barriers between us and the rest of the LD, including significant mountain ranges and virtually no roads between us and anywhere else in this district.  4.LD3 is wholly uncompetitive. I mean there's a 20% spread between the number of Republican and Democratic voters.</p> <p>But now to my macro concern:  You have made 24 out of the 30 districts "safe", meaning noncompetitive. Your mission says that one person, one vote dictates districts roughly equal in population. But really, "one person, one vote" dictates more than that. It means making as many districts as possible competitive – the opposite of creating a collection of "safe" districts. The practical effect of your current approach is to take away from every single minority voter the right to a meaningful vote. This makes a mockery of "one person, one vote." And the net result is an outright bias in favor of one party.</p> <p>In closing, I have two asks:  1.Please respect our collective LD map recommendation which is being submitted tomorrow, and  2.Go back to the drawing board! REPLACE YOUR 24 "SAFE" DISTRICTS WITH 24 DISTRICTS THAT MEET OR APPROACH YOUR OWN STATED GOAL OF A 4-7% SPREAD. It's the only way you can claim to be an independent commission producing a fair and balanced map.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:28	Melissa Forbes	Redistricting	<p>My name is Melissa, and I've lived in Arizona for five years. I'm a small business owner and active member of my central Phoenix community.</p> <p>I am also a longtime volunteer/mentor to a group home of teens in state care near downtown Phoenix.</p> <p>I've seen first hand the power of competitive districts. Whenever I submit comment to my reps on issues of importance to me and my neighbors, I receive a fast and clear response - sometimes even a call.</p> <p>My community is changing and I want to ensure all communities - especially those with histories of under representation like many of the girls I mentor - have an equal chance to select the representatives that reflect their needs.</p> <p>In addition, I believe that competition is critical to a functional democracy. If our districts are drawn in a partisan manner, reps lose the incentive to focus on majority input. More importantly, they skew to the extremes of a fractured two party system.</p> <p>I urge you to redraw the maps with more balance and competition in mind.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work and your time on this important effort.</p> <p>Melissa Forbes</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:38	Judith Yescalis	Redistricting.	<p>What has happened in other states is nothing short of criminal and unconstitutional. Drawing boundaries to assure one party domination in perpetuity is not democracy.. it is autocracy.  Please make certain this does NOT happen in Arizona!  Judy Yescalis  Sedona, Az</p>

12/03/2021 - 12:43

Lynda Lu McEvoy

legislative and congressional maps

12/3/21

Dear Redistricting Commissioners,

I am a resident of Sedona and I attended the meeting in Cottonwood. As a fairly involved citizen and a person who is concerned about what is happening in America, I see the divisiveness and anger that is building upon itself as a huge threat to our democracy. Lies abound and misinformation and partisanship are breaking us into warring factions. Because of this reality, it is even more important to keep districts as competitive as can be arranged. If we are to pull off a recovery of the principles that once held us together, this can only be done by listening to one another and by compromise... which will never be achieved without truly competitive districts. Please, therefore, reconsider the draft maps and listen to the people who want fairness and competitiveness in the districts, which will support working for common ground for all points of view.

I live here and I know most of the people want to:

1. Keep Sedona together
2. Keep Sedona, Verde Valley, and Flagstaff in the same Legislative district.
3. Use maps LDF050 and LDF051 to keep us together and competitive.

Districts that are competitive often yield candidates that can speak to the "middle" and may better represent the majority of the district's voters.

Placing citizens with common concerns, not shopping or entertainment concerns but actual issues, in the same voting district serves multiple purposes. It focuses their attention where it should be... on problem-solving and solutions; it amplifies their voices in Congress and at the Arizona Legislature; increases their chances of getting needed resources for their districts.

-Competitive districts protect against extremism and focus elected representatives on the need to solve the problems of voters in the district. Put differently, to be successful in a fair district, a representative must actually govern, not just posture.

-Competitive districts encourage bipartisan cooperation.

-Competitive districts result in elected representatives who are more responsive to their diverse constituency.

-Competitive districts result in higher quality candidates because candidate quality will matter more in races where the outcome is not predetermined.

- Competitive districts encourage higher levels of civic engagement and voter participation because races are not a foregone conclusion.

When we the voters passed Prop 106 in 2000 and created the IRC, we canonized in our state constitution specific priorities to achieve fair, competitive and equitable maps. Maps must favor competitive districts to encourage high participation in elections, and guard against extremism.

We must also respect the voice of Independent Voters and not diminish their voting rights. We must minimize excessively partisan districts where the election outcome is decided in the primary. Independents already have an extra step in primary elections by having to request a ballot of a political party in order to cast a vote. Many Independents don't realize they can vote in primary elections and fail to participate.

None of our three Northern AZ LD's, 5, 6, 7 are competitive in the proposed draft maps. We have an opportunity to create one competitive district, LD7 submitted to the IRC as LDF050. LDF050 includes Flagstaff, Verde Valley, Sedona, parts of Gila and Pinal Counties. Both of these maps better meet the criteria of compactness and contiguousness and the LDF050 map is competitive and the LDF 051 respects the Voting Rights Act requirements.

We would add population from Mohave County to LD5 thereby making up for the removal of the Verde Valley and Sedona.

Please redraw LD 7 to include the 3 points I mentioned. For those of us who live here, this is hugely important. Thank you.

=====

Our proposed Congressional district is CD2. The draft map has taken a highly competitive district and made it solidly Republican by adding all of Yavapai County.

There is an alternative to draft map CD2. CDF010 has been proposed by the Navajo Nation and I want to support it. The Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission proposed the map. It is more compact and contiguous than the current proposed map.

12/03/2021 - 12:51	Matthew Boyd	District 19 in the Legislative Map	<p>To be sure, the task that you have volunteered for is an onerous one. Thank you for being willing to take it on. I am sure that it is exhausting at times but that is a part of any extended responsibility.</p> <p>I am submitting this comment to you to let you know that, as a 50 year resident of Arizona, I was hopeful that Proposition 106 (passed in 2000) assured us that gerrymandering was guaranteed to become a thing of the past. This "Map 10.0" has destroyed my hope. If anything "Map 10.0" ought to be held up as an example of gerrymandering, ignoring actual communities of interest in favor of creating political strongholds. Please reenergize yourself and, with a clear head, look at the 10.0 map and realize that it looks like it was drawn up by a "political hack."</p> <p>My community is Green Valley, Quail Creek, and Sahuarita and it is being broken up by this map. We ought to be considered a community of interest with deeply rooted commonalities. We all go to the same churches and shop at the same stores and we all use I-19 corridor in our daily activity. We are a politically diverse community and get along quite nicely. Why would you break us up and attach us to people east of the Santa Rita Mountains who we have nothing in common with? Map LD0055 gives our community the recognition of our well established community of interest status that we deserve. Please consider that in making correction now.</p> <p>Sincerely, Matthew Boyd</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:53	Jerold Powers	Concern about Redistricting with only 7 majority Latino districts	<p>Thank you for your work on redistricting. I would like to recommend 2 changes: Please keep cities together since those citizens often have similar concerns. Also, I would like to see the 8 districts with majority Latino voters, instead of the proposed 7.</p>
12/03/2021 - 12:57	Ronald Alan Pelech	Public Comments on the Proposed Redistricting Map for District 17	<p>I appreciate the vital and under-appreciated work members of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) do to keep our democracy healthy and relatively free of hyper-partisan gamesmanship. I hereby submit this public comment.</p> <p>I read with dismay that the IRC seems to be colluding with allies of state Senator Vince Leach to allow the very gerrymandering the IRC is supposed to prevent. The law establishing the IRC states: "Members must demonstrate a commitment to performing the IRC's charge in an honest, independent, and impartial fashion and to upholding PUBLIC CONFIDENCE (emphasis mine) in the integrity of the redistricting process." How this obligation squares with the proposal for Leach's District 17 to create a gerrymandered monster by including non-contiguous Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde is beyond me.</p> <p>I have to wonder why you are doing apparent favors for Senator Leach that seem contrary to your mandate. This lapse creates the PERCEPTION of a possible corrupt deal that damages the integrity of the IRC. This ill-advised action will also surely result in lawsuits that will delay the timely creation of district maps for the 2022 election cycle.</p> <p>So stop the toxic political games of gerrymandering District 17. Also, District 17 should not be drawn so that Picture Rocks and Avra Valley are taken out of District 17 and Pima County, where they share common and vital interests.</p> <p>Thank you for considering the comments of a concerned citizen who ALWAYS votes. It is not clear to me that this is the appropriate area of your website to submit a comment. But I do the best I can with what you provide. Sincerely, Ronald A. Pelech</p>

12/03/2021 - 12:59	Nora S Walker	comment I wanted to give at the meeting	<p>IRC Testimony 12/3/21 My name is Nora Walker. I live in Tempe, south of the 60.</p> <p>I grew up in an old-line Scottsdale family, got my degree at ASU, and married a San Diego lawyer. We moved to Scottsdale in 2000. When he died I moved to Tempe to be near my sons and their families.</p> <p>I know the places I'm talking about, Scottsdale and Tempe.</p> <p>Both your CD and LD maps would add much of Scottsdale to Tempe and that's just wrong. The law requires compact and contiguous districts. A district which runs from Chandler Boulevard in the south to Frank Lloyd Wright in the north may meet the criterion, technically. But not in spirit. (Isn't that what Gerrymander means – lizard-shaped districts?)</p> <p>Your maps of LD8 and CD4 are shaped like Lego monsters invented by a four year old.</p> <p>The incompatibility of Tempe and Scottsdale is not about money. There are elegant homes and horse farms in Tempe, too. But Tempe has one of the greatest American universities, and much of the faculty. It grew up and around ASU, with its influence spilling over into Mesa, Chandler, Gilbert and eastern Phoenix. Scottsdale has a different attitude. Everyone knows that.</p> <p>When you marry Tempe to Scottsdale, you guarantee that our representatives will be the offspring of partisan, big-dollar marketing contests largely financed by out-of-state interest. Creating districts for a decade of political warfare does no one a service, least of all those who are elected to serve the Lego monsters. The old districts were closer to cohesive. Please stay closer to that.</p> <p>Don't marry Tempe to Scottsdale!</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:10	Richard P. Broder	Opposition to Proposed New Map of LD 17 and Configuration of CD7	<p>My name is Richard Broder and I am a resident of Pima County. Because I cannot attend the public hearing on December 4, 2021, I am hereby requesting that my comments be deemed part of the official public record in this matter.</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed new map of LD 17 on the ground that it constitutes illegal partisan gerrymandering in violation of the U.S. and Arizona Constitutions. Before Republican Commissioner David Mehl proposed a new map (with input from the Southern Arizona Leadership Council), District 17 included Marana, Oro Valley, Casa Adobes and the Catalina Foothills. These are all contiguous northern suburbs with common interests and favored neither Democrats nor Republicans. In proposing a new map--which would include Marana, parts of the Catalina Foothills and Oro Valley but now excludes Casa-Adobes and adds the non-contiguous Houghton Corridor, Tanque Verde, and Vail on the east side of Tucson--Commissioner Mehl stated that this reconfiguration guaranteed another safe Republican district! Partisan purpose is not a valid criterion. Two mountain ranges separate these new additions from the northern suburbs. To interact with constituents, a District 17 legislator will have to travel 40 miles to get from Marana to Vail. This proposed new configuration which adds the eastern districts of Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde violates the requirement that districts be compact, contiguous, competitive and respectful of community interests. It is a clear example of illegal partisan gerrymandering and must be rejected.</p> <p>As for CD7, the federal map splits Southern Arizona into two congressional districts, separating downtown Tucson from the Fourth Avenue retail area and the University of Arizona, both of which are contiguous and share common interests, while at the same time diluting Latino voting strength in areas south of Broadway by separating them from downtown. Therefore, I request that the contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UofA, and Fourth Avenue remain in CD7, and that CD7 include areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.</p> <p>The whole purpose of the IRC is to prevent and prohibit partisan gerrymandering, which weakens and threatens the stability of our democracy. The attempt to do so here in connection with CD7 cannot be tolerated.</p>

12/03/2021 - 13:13	Jane L. Lassar	Thoughts from a relatively new Arizonan	<p>To the Independent Redistricting Commission,</p> <p>First I would like to say I would definitely be at the hearing on Dec. 4th in person, but COVID keeps me from attending. I am in a very high risk group and cannot attend large gatherings of this kind.</p> <p>Second I would like to say thank you for allowing me to submit my comments via this form.</p> <p>Finally, I would like to say I love living in Arizona, especially proud that our state was among the first to adopt a Redistricting Commission of independent members to draw state legislative district lines. This is certainly democracy at its best. To that end, I hope the Commission will keep in mind the advantage and beauty of having districts that are neither heavily weighted "Democrats" or heavily weighted "Republicans." Rather, I favor COMPETITIVE districts that make for lively discourse, informed politicking, and meaningful substantive discussions that help move our state forward. The beauty to having so many Independents in our state-- is that people are interested in hearing all sides of issues and what each Party has to say. And, if we can keep our conversations CIVIL and RESPECTFUL, all the better! When finalizing the maps, I hope you will do your entrusted duty to keep the redistricting process fair and that you will create legislative districts that are COMPETITIVE and not unfairly weighted "D" or "R" Think of the great things we can do together in Arizona if we leave the petty, cruel, accusatory politics behind and strive for better communications and policy-drive conversations among all people of all parties. Again, thank you for allowing me to express my thoughts.</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:16	Lisa Cole	Curr3nt Legislative Maps	<p>Has the commission adopted any other maps since the drafts published on 10/28, please?</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:18	David Blyth	CD1 - Redistricting Map	<p>My wife and I are residents of Fountain Hills, and we are both retired. I would expect to have representation in Congress that reflects the values, lifestyle, and interests of my neighbors in Fountain Hills, Scottsdale, and other suburban areas of northeast Phoenix and the surrounding area.</p> <p>I firmly believe that the most important criteria for any redistricting should be to preserve those links between similar communities such that our representative in Congress will be able to effectively and fairly represent all constituents within the same District.</p> <p>I am very concerned with the current version of the CD1 map, which does not preserve those community links, by including areas within central Phoenix that are very different from other more suburban communities within the District.</p> <p>In particular, the proposed map for CD1 currently includes neighborhoods in Central Phoenix that are extremely urban and are composed of primarily young professionals and college kids. These urban neighborhoods include the Camelback East, Alhambra, and Encanto areas of central Phoenix.</p> <p>I am specifically requesting that the current redistricting map for CD1 be modified to remove these urban areas of central Phoenix, that are very different geographically, and different from the standpoint of population density and demographics, from the rest of the more suburban communities within CD1.</p>

12/03/2021 - 13:21	Deborah Witherspoon McFatter	Redistricting maps	<p>AZ voters in 2000 voted to take redistricting out of the hands of the Legislature and into the control of an independent commission. This mapping is based on the most recent Census and is supposed to create districts of equal population that are geographically compact. The mapping is meant to respect communities of interest and geographic features and boundary lines while complying with the Voting Rights Act and striving for COMPETITIVENESS. Each of these criteria are REQUIRED by the Arizona Constitution to be fulfilled by the IRC.</p> <p>The reading I have done on this matter indicates that the Draft Maps fail to create competitive districts in 24 of Arizona's 30 Legislative Districts. Fully 80 % of the state's residents would be in non-competitive "safe" districts – discouraging participation by Republicans, Democrats, and registered Independents alike.</p> <p>Democracy was taught to me from childhood as a treasured value. How does Democracy survive if the redistricting of our state allows NO competitiveness and gives only one party rule? As a concerned, voting citizen I am opposed to the mapping that would not follow the criteria of competitiveness, natural boundary lines, and respecting communities of interest.</p> <p>Mrs. Deborah Witherspoon McFatter  ██████████  Flagstaff, AZ 86004</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:24	Kathy Keler	gerrymandering	<p>The IRC that their criteria prohibit partisan gerrymandering. Therefore I request that District 17 include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts.</p> <p>I request that the contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue, remain in CD7. I request that CD7 include areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:30	Donald E Wardd	Green Valley's new district	<p>I have a hard time seeing how the redistricting committee separated GV from our usual district partners. GV should be included with Sahuarita, Quail Creek, Tubac, and even Nogales. What do we have in common with areas west of us or on the other side of the Santa Ritas. It seems that there is some serious gerrymandering taking place with the way the committee has redrawn the lines of our LD district.</p> <p>I would have the committee reconsider the lines cutting GV off from her neighbors.</p>

12/03/2021 - 13:35	Ray Darragh	Redistricting Maps	<p>Commissioners,</p> <p>Good afternoon. I will not be able to attend the December 4th meeting in Tucson, but want my voice to be heard.</p> <p>I have lived in both Oro Valley and Marana the past 31 years. I would like to voice my support for the Southern Arizona portion of LD map 10.0, specifically LD 17, which links Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, Catalina, Eagle Crest Ranch, Marana, Oro Valley, the Tanque Verde Valley and the Houghton Corridor. This is my community of interest.</p> <p>This is where my family, co-workers, and neighbors work, where our children and 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>Just like Marana and Oro Valley, residents of the Tanque Verde Valley and Houghton Corridor enjoy a rural lifestyle and choose to NOT live in Midtown Tucson because they have almost NOTHING in common with large urban areas.</p> <p>I agree with so many others that Unincorporated Pima County and the smaller surrounding towns need a check and balance on the City of Tucson. LD 17 provides that and gives residents in Souther Arizona a voice, which is something we have not had the past 10 years.</p> <p>That is all we want—to be heard. Unfortunately, LD Map 9.0 silences the voices of thousands of Southern Arizonans, and that is why I strongly support Map 10.0 with LD 17 as drawn, and urge you to please adopt it as the final map.</p> <p>Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, the Tanque Verde Valley and the Houghton Corridor belong together.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your hard work and allowing me to voice my opinion.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Raymond Darragh</p>
12/03/2021 - 13:39	Craig Swanson	Keep Sedona Together	<p>I urge you to accept proposed maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 in place of your current maps.</p> <p>We must have competitive districts.</p> <p>You are risking hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars fighting lawsuits if you enact your current maps that are highly uncompetitive.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

12/03/2021 - 13:50	Jana Darragh	Redistributing- Map 10.0 / LD17	<p>Commissioners,</p> <p>Good afternoon. I will not be able to attend the December 4th meeting in Tucson, but want my voice to be heard.</p> <p>I have lived in both Oro Valley and Marana the past 31 years. I would like to voice my support for the Southern Arizona portion of LD map 10.0, specifically LD 17, which links Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, Catalina, Eagle Crest Ranch, Marana, Oro Valley, the Tanque Verde Valley and the Houghton Corridor. This is my community of interest.</p> <p>This is where my family, co-workers, and neighbors work, where our children and 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>Just like Marana and Oro Valley, residents of the Tanque Verde Valley and Houghton Corridor enjoy a rural lifestyle and choose to NOT live in Midtown Tucson because they have almost NOTHING in common with large urban areas.</p> <p>I agree with so many others that Unincorporated Pima County and the smaller surrounding towns need a check and balance on the City of Tucson. LD 17 provides that and gives residents in Souther Arizona a voice, which is something we have not had the past 10 years.</p> <p>That is all we want—to be heard. Unfortunately, LD Map 9.0 silences the voices of thousands of Southern Arizonans, and that is why I strongly support Map 10.0 with LD 17 as drawn, and urge you to please adopt it as the final map.</p> <p>Marana, Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke, Saddlebrooke Ranch, the Tanque Verde Valley and the Houghton Corridor belong together.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your hard work and allowing me to voice my opinion.</p> <p>Respectfully, Jana Darragh</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:03	Diane Nevill	LD Draft Map 9.0 better choice	<p>I moved to the east side of Tucson fours years ago from Phoenix.</p> <p>I love my neighborhood near Tanque Verde and Sabino Canyon Rd. I am only about 5-6 minutes west of the Bear Canyon Library, Le Buzz Cafe, my dentist, hairdresser and a hardware store that I frequent. Those places will be in the new LD17, even though I live in the new LD18. My friends who live in LD17 experience just the opposite. They often travel west on Tanque Verde to Sabino Canyon to use the City of Tucson Udall Recreation Center, eat at Eclectic Cafe, Renee's Organic Kitchen, Gusto's Italian Restaurant, Coffee Xchange and other establishments. This area of the east side of Tucson is one extended neighborhood.</p> <p>Including the eastern Tanque Verde area with Marana doesn't make for a cohesive and contiguous LD; there is a mountain range separating them. LD map 10.0 breaks up my community of interest. Please go back to draft map LD 9.0.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:04	Alan Brundage	Pima County legislative redistricting problems	<p>The current IRC map for Pima County is currently illegally and partially drawn, and should not be allowed to pass since it weakens democracy in our state.</p> <p>The map does NOT follow fairness guidelines, violates both the AZ &amp; US Constitutions, and the Voting Rights Act: districts are NOT relatively equal in population, nor geographically compact &amp; contiguous, do NOT respect communities of interest, and are NOT competitive.</p> <p>The latest map proposed by partisan commissioner Mehl favors the 29% of registered Republicans with 50% of the Pima County seats. He has gerrymandered the map for partisan advantage, which is violates the very criteria of the IRC of which he is a member. He should no longer be allowed on the commission.</p> <p>Contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, U of AZ, and 4th Avenue should remain in CD7, and also include areas south of Broadway, so Latinx voters maintain their fair voting strength.</p> <p>The IRC must not violate its very own criteria and responsibilities by approving this LD and CD map or anything like it.</p> <p>Please perform you duty with integrity.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

12/03/2021 - 14:17	Daniel E. Sherry	LD 17 draft 10	Draft 10 of LD 17 is not acceptable since the map includes locations such as Tanque Verde, Redding ton Pass and Vail. Oro Valley is suburban/urban and has nothing in common with rural areas. Please go back to Draft 9 of LD 17.
12/03/2021 - 14:20	Deborah Lynn Swartz	LD16	<p>My husband and I live in Tucson and have been registered voters here for at least 35 years, We live north of West Ironwood Hill Drive, the new southern boundary of LD 16, and have resided here for 30 years. We have many ties to Tucson. We have sent children to TUSD, we have gone to school and worked at the University of Arizona, we pay Tucson city taxes, we vote in Tucson city elections, we volunteer in Tucson, and are part of the Tucson community.</p> <p>According to the Voting Rights Act legislative districts “shall be geographically compact and contiguous; shall respect communities of interest; and shall use visible geographic features, city, town and county boundaries whenever practicable”.</p> <p>LD16 extends from West Ironwood Hill Drive in Tucson, through Casa Grande to Buckeye, over 100 miles away and much closer to Phoenix than Tucson. This district is not geographically compact, it cuts us off from Tucson, our community of interest, and ignores visible geographic features and Tucson city boundaries. We have little in common with Buckeye or Casa Grande and are strongly tied to the city of Tucson where we live. Our votes will mean nothing to where we live and what we are associated with in the new district.</p> <p>For these reasons we strongly object to the new district boundaries.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:22	Marion Elaine Pack	Redistricting Maps	<p>I am most concerned about the fact that the proposed draft maps of the northern Arizona are not competitive. This goes against the purpose of Prop 106 which is to make maps competitive. LD 6 had been a competitive. Under the propose draft map, now competitive LD 6 would be replaced by LD 7 which splits Sedona and Flagstaff up. This also flies in the face of compactness and keeping communities of interest, the two issues that are to be addressed under Prop 106. The IRC should consider the LDF 050 and LDF 051 maps instead of the current proposed draft maps. LDF 050 and LDF 051 would meet the criteria of competitiveness, compactness, keeping communities if interest together.</p> <p>I have similar concerns about the new proposed CD 2 maps which replaces the current CD 4. The proposed CD 2 splits the Navajo nation and places it with Prescott. How could that possible be keeping communities of interest together? What does Prescott and the Navajo nation have in common regarding issues that would be of concern to each? It does certainly dilute the power of the Navajo Nation and undermines their voting power. The Navajo Nation’s Human Rights Commission proposed map CDF 010. This map would meet all the criteria of complete, contiguous, and community of interest.</p> <p>Commissioners please consider these suggestions as we voters will have to live with your decisions for the next ten years!!</p>

12/03/2021 - 14:23	RODERICK MC LEOD	2021 IRC redistricting	<p>My name is Roderick McLeod; I have been a resident and registered voter in what is now Pct 148, LD9, CD2 since 1980.</p> <p>I have been active in the Democratic Party since 2003, in a then Republican-dominated LD28 to the current competitive LD... which has moved, mainly through our grassroots efforts, from a +3-4% democratic voter registration +8-9% registration advantage.</p> <p>I feel we played by the rules, did things right to encourage voter - of all parties, and no-party - registrations by walking door-to-door, calling and talking to neighbors.</p> <p>We have little in common with the communities in the LD17 proposal that are distant geographically, culturally and economically, while being tied in every way to the City of Tucson. I owned a retail business for 15 years in the City and shop, spend recreational time almost exclusively in the City of Tucson.</p> <p>The proposed changes to CD2 would cause similar problems to our community of interest, throwing us in with rural communities in Graham, Greenlee and Pinal counties. Our water and power utilities, education systems and economic interests are clearly tied to those of Tucson.</p> <p>I observe the changing nature of our suburban districts from the more rural (agricultural, mining, construction) means of earning livings to those jobs in tourism, financial, and high-tech. These are natural evolutions of our communities and should be reflected in the newly created LD and CD voting districts..</p> <p>It is un-Southern Arizonan and un-American to punish folks for playing by the rules in service to the community, and that is precisely what the proposed maps will do.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:30	Adrienne Kleiboemer	Gerrymandering in current Map 10	<p>I am deeply concerned and horrified by the obvious gerrymandering that produced the latest IRC map. Contrary to Arizona and Federal law, the Chair has allowed extreme partisan politics to influence and overtake the process. The change to Legislative District 17 was introduced only recently by Republican Commissioner Mehl.. His stated reason was to guarantee another safe Republican district, which is not a valid AZ criterion. Moreover, it completely destroys the geographic compactness and contiguity of the district and any 'community of interest', which are major valid criteria. Much of LD 17 now includes much of the far northwest portion of metro Tucson - Marana, Catalina Foothills, Oro Valley, while explicitly excluding adjacent Casa Adobes. Even worse, it now also includes the far east areas of Vail, Tanque Verde, and Houghton, which are far distant from the others. Our goal should be for competitive districts - not gerrymandered "safe Republican" districts. Another example of extreme gerrymandering is evidenced in the two CDs for southern Arizona, which separate downtown Tucson from the contiguous area south of Broadway, thus diluting Latino representation and breaking up a community of interest.</p> <p>I thus request that LD 17 include Casas Adobes and exclude Vail, Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde areas, placing them into eastern LDs.</p> <p>I also request (demand?) that the continuous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA and Fourth Ave remain in CD7 and that it also include areas south of Broadway.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:34	Barbara J. Schimpf	Redistricting	<p>I want to add my voice to advocate for the proposed LDF050; LDF051 and CDF010. These proposed maps make the most sense to the communities. Also, they are the competitive districts that the IRC is looking to draw.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:36	Bonnie Poulos	Gerrymandering instead of Redistricting	<p>The work of this so-called independent redistricting committee is just another example of partisan politics-as-usual in Arizona. I am appalled at how very disparate areas of Pima County and Maricopa County are being blended in order to eliminate competitive districts and to promote one party or another. There is no "need" to have more Republican, or Democratic, representation in either county. Districts should be drawn with regard to areas being contiguous, compact, and ensuring fair representation and equity. It should not be done, as this map has been constructed, with regard to protecting incumbents, creating new power structures and artificially mandating partisan "equality". We need to start over, preferably with a less partisan group of "independent" thinkers.</p>

12/03/2021 - 14:45	Sandra Goodwin	Redistricting	<p>My name is Sandra Goodwin, I am a resident of Sierra Vista, Cochise County. My husband, Paul, a disabled Viet Nam Veteran passed away last year. I quite literally would have been lost without the help and compassion of the veteran/military community. I have looked at the IRC's proposed CD6 map and it is not as crazy as some gerrymandered maps but it is a gerrymandered map. Keep CD2 or because of population changes adopt CD(F001) thus keeping the Fort Huachuca and Davis Monthan Air Force Base communities, which include active military, veterans, civil service employees, in the same district. Cochise County and Eastern Pima County not only share a common interest in their military population but our mutual interest in our Southern Border and the community of Federal Employees employed to support it. Another shared common interest, shared by Cochise County and Eastern Pima County, is our National Parks &amp; Employees. Sierra Vista and Tucson are further tied together by commuters who live in one and work in the other, as well as, those who travel between the two for medical care or for education.</p> <p>I have never travelled to Pinal, Graham or Greenly Counties only through them! It seems to me that the IRC's CD6 proposed map combines counties with no or very little shared interest while additionally making it much harder for our elected representative to do justice to our varied communities.</p> <p>I sincerely hope the IRC can look past partisan politics and prioritize the shared interest of communities your decision will impact.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of the sensible solution which is the CD(F001) proposed map.</p> <p>Sandra Goodwin</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:47	Candace B McNulty	Draft maps for redistricting	<p>I am very concerned about redistricting that creates non-competitive districts, and it looks to me as though the proposed maps for Legislative Districts 5, 6, and 7 do that. I urge you to consider the alternative proposed maps, LDF 050 and LDF 051. They appear to better reflect the goals of competitiveness, contiguousness, and compactness.</p> <p>Likewise regarding the map for (current) Congressional District 4, proposed to be new CD 2. I support instead the proposal of the Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission, CDF 010.</p> <p>Please let Arizona shine as a state that rejects the trend toward unbalanced, politicized drawing of legislative districts. Let's clean up our reputation!</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:51	John Sewell	Map 10 Gerrymandering	<p>I am deeply concerned by the obvious gerrymandering that produced the latest IRC map. Contrary to Arizona and Federal law, the Chair has allowed extreme partisan politics to influence and overtake the process. The change to Legislative District 17 was introduced only recently by Republican Commissioner Mehl.. His stated reason was to guarantee another safe Republican district, which is not a valid AZ criterion. Moreover, it completely destroys the geographic compactness and contiguity of the district and any 'community of interest', which are major valid criteria. LD 17 now includes much of the far northwest portion of metro Tucson - Marana, Catalina Foothills, Oro Valley, while explicitly excluding adjacent Casa Adobes. Even worse, it now also includes the far east areas of Vail, Tanque Verde, and Houghton, which are far distant from the others. Our goal should be for competitive districts - not gerrymandered "safe Republican" districts.</p> <p>Another example of extreme gerrymandering is evidenced in the two CDs for southern Arizona, which separate downtown Tucson from the contiguous area south of Broadway, thus diluting Latino representation and breaking up a community of interest.</p> <p>I thus request that LD 17 include Casas Adobes and exclude Vail, Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde areas, placing them into eastern LDs.</p> <p>I also request that the continuous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA and Fourth Ave remain in CD7 and that it also include areas south of Broadway.</p>

12/03/2021 - 14:55	Jean Meconi	Is the IRC really independent?	<p>In the adopted Legislative Map, Oro Valley would be found in LD17 and it should not be.</p> <p>It just doesn't seem that you are listening: not to the 60 people who testified against LD17 on November 6th, or to the 20 who testified on November 12th, and certainly not to the innumerable concerned citizens who have written comments against LD17 on the IRC comment sites.</p> <p>Oro Valley is currently in LD11, a safe Republican District, and has elected Republican state legislators for the last ten years. These legislators have ignored Oro Valley voices and best interests in the past. According to the Official Canvass of the November 3, 2020 General election, Oro Valley supported Proposition 208 to fully fund schools with 53% of the vote. Our representation immediately passed laws to undermine it. Oro Valley gets its clean water from multiple sources. And yet, they weakened water quality requirements and passed a law that limits the use of new data for assured water supplies for development. Recently, Oro Valley along with Tucson Electric completed a solar overhang at Naranja Park that generates enough solar energy to power 50 homes. But again, they passed a law to undermine the work of the ACC and to tried to curb renewable energy sources.</p> <p>Oro Valley is not represented in the current Republican leaning LD.</p> <p>Oro Valley's community of interest is Casas Adobes and northern Pima county, not the rural places in LD17. Oro Valley is urban-suburban with a population approaching 50,000 and a population density of 1,362 according to the last census. Oro Valley students attend Amphitheater School District along with students from Casas Adobes. We share similar demographics, economies, housing and interests as Casas Adobes and northern Pima County. We don't shop, worship or work in Tanque Verde or Vail or any of the other far flung rural areas in LD17.</p> <p>Voters in Oro Valley have been disenfranchised the past ten years in the current, uncompetitive district and LD17 would assure 10 more of the same.</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:55	James Stein	Comments regarding Preliminary IRC Maps	<p>The job of the Independent Redistricting Commission is to produce maps which are fair and competitive as much as possible. I would urge the commissioners to use their ability to use their considerable capacity with regard to staff (ie mapping specialists etc.) to produce maps with districts which are in fact fair and competitive.</p> <p>I urge the commissioners to consider CDP 010, LDF 050 and LDF 051.</p> <p>Thanks, James Stein</p>
12/03/2021 - 14:56	Kelly Taylor	Legislative District 17, Version 10	<p>From what I have witnessed, even though redistricting is a non-partisan issue, the commission is making it partisan. Deliberately putting people together based on political party is NOT a community of interest, but a violation of Proposition 106, and will inevitably end up in court. I am outraged that this process of obvious gerrymandering is being allowed to happen and I do not support Version 10. Version 9 and LD0059 are much more competitive, compact and recognize properly the communities of interest. Note I would have gone to the in person meeting on 12/4 but my health is more important. I hope you give the same consideration to my written comments as to any comments shared in person on that day. Thank you.</p>

12/03/2021 - 14:57	Lois Bravo	irc redistricting must use the suggested boundaries instead of your proposal	<p>. One community of interest is represented by Fort Huachuca in Cochise County and Davis Monthan Air Force Base on the east side of Tucson. Numbers fluctuate but there are approximately 8400 active duty military and 4400 Department of Defense civilians (Civil Service) between the two installations. Both installations are also supported by numerous large and small contracting companies who employ numerous technical and non technical employees directly supporting the various entities operating on the post and AFB. A large number of military retirees live in the surrounding communities and avail themselves of the services on the base and post. They have common concerns such as military budgets, employee and retiree benefits, and foreign policy to name a few. The draft CD6 boundaries minimize this COI. The map we're recommending includes both installations as well as a larger area in Tucson likely to house or have businesses that rely on them for their livelihood. The voices of this COI should not be minimized any more than is necessary.</p> <p>2. Tucson and eastern Pima County share border-related concerns. These concerns include issues with immigrants, the border wall and associated concerns, trade and commerce associated with local business and the ports of entry. Homeland Security has a strong presence on both Fort Huachuca and DMAFB. Customs and Immigration has a strong presence in Cochise County and Pima County. Such is not the case with Graham, Greenlee or Pinal County. Many of these officers and their families live in and around both Tucson and in Benson and Sierra Vista. Note that there are actually several COIs in this general area having in some cases opposing views but these two counties share concerns that are felt in their daily lives and affecting their livelihoods directly associated with the border. This is much less the case further north.</p> <p>3. Synergy between Sierra Vista, Benson, and other parts of Cochise County with Tucson are much stronger than any ties with Pinal, Graham or Greenlee Counties. Highway 90 carries significant traffic largely going to and from Tucson. We shop in Tucson and depend on medical facilities there; many Tucson doctors schedule regular visits to Sierra Vista. We also frequent Tucson to shop and eat, for entertainment purposes, and to visit friends. A number of individuals who work on Fort Huachuca live in Tucson and commute. And there are others who live in Sierra Vista or Benson and commute to Tucson. Some families have one breadwinner working in Tucson and one working in the Sierra Vista/Fort Huachuca area. Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal counties look northward, not towards Cochise County or Tucson.</p> <p>4. Sierra Vista is suburban in nature—not rural—and has more in common with Tucson than with Casa Grande, Eloy, Florence or other Pinal County residents. It's likely few in those communities even know where Hereford, or Naco, or McNeal, or Portal are located. Residents of Cochise County rarely go to Pinal or Graham or Greenlee County unless in route to somewhere else.</p> <p>5. The rural parts of Cochise County are not much like Graham and Greenlee Counties. Many of the residents of Safford, Morenci, Clifton, and Duncan depend on the mines in Morenci for their livelihood. There is minimal mining in Cochise County. Water issues are also different.</p> <p>6. The National Park Service and its employees and businesses dependent on the tourism they generate form another COI. Headquarters for the Saguaro National Park, a premier park, is in eastern Pima County. Chiricahua National Monument, Coronado National Monument, and Fort Bowie National Historic Site are in Cochise County. Generally allied with the parks are the San Pedro River National Conservation Area, other premier birding sites such as those at Ramsey Canyon and Portal and several Wilderness areas. Wilderness areas in Cochise and Pima County include Miller Peak, Chiricahua, Peloncillo, and Rincon. The COI includes the many businesses that rely on the tourists these areas bring in as well as the conservation community they serve. .</p> <p>7. Another COI connects educators including high school and college teachers in Cochise County and Tucson. They strongly value the connections that the Cochise College campuses and UA South have with Tucson since students often matriculate from here to there.</p> <p>8. Our recommended map would be more compact than the draft CD6. It would keep important COIs together more and would keep from splitting Pinal and Santa Cruse further. Finally, our candidates of both parties would have a much more manageable area to cover</p>
--------------------	------------	--	--

12/03/2021 - 15:04	DAVID Cook	redistricting boundaries instead of your proposal	<p>1. Tucson and eastern Pima County share border-related concerns. These concerns include issues with immigrants, the border wall and associated concerns, trade and commerce associated with local business and the ports of entry. Homeland Security has a strong presence on both Fort Huachuca and DMAFB. Customs and Immigration has a strong presence in Cochise County and Pima County. Such is not the case with Graham, Greenlee or Pinal County. Many of these officers and their families live in and around both Tucson and in Benson and Sierra Vista. Note that there are actually several COIs in this general area having in some cases opposing views but these two counties share concerns that are felt in their daily lives and affecting their livelihoods directly associated with the border. This is much less the case further north.</p> <p>2. Synergy between Sierra Vista, Benson, and other parts of Cochise County with Tucson are much stronger than any ties with Pinal, Graham or Greenlee Counties. Highway 90 carries significant traffic largely going to and from Tucson. We shop in Tucson and depend on medical facilities there; many Tucson doctors schedule regular visits to Sierra Vista. We also frequent Tucson to shop and eat, for entertainment purposes, and to visit friends. A number of individuals who work on Fort Huachuca live in Tucson and commute. And there are others who live in Sierra Vista or Benson and commute to Tucson. Some families have one breadwinner working in Tucson and one working in the Sierra Vista/Fort Huachuca area. Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal counties look northward, not towards Cochise County or Tucson.</p> <p>3. Sierra Vista is suburban in nature—not rural—and has more in common with Tucson than with Casa Grande, Eloy, Florence or other Pinal County residents. It's likely few in those communities even know where Hereford, or Naco, or McNeal, or Portal are located. Residents of Cochise County rarely go to Pinal or Graham or Greenlee County unless in route to somewhere else.</p> <p>4. The rural parts of Cochise County are not much like Graham and Greenlee Counties. Many of the residents of Safford, Morenci, Clifton, and Duncan depend on the mines in Morenci for their livelihood. There is minimal mining in Cochise County. Water issues are also different.</p> <p>5. The National Park Service and its employees and businesses dependent on the tourism they generate form another COI. Headquarters for the Saguaro National Park, a premier park, is in eastern Pima County. Chiricahua National Monument, Coronado National Monument, and Fort Bowie National Historic Site are in Cochise County. Generally allied with the parks are the San Pedro River National Conservation Area, other premier birding sites such as those at Ramsey Canyon and Portal and several Wilderness areas. Wilderness areas in Cochise and Pima County include Miller Peak, Chiricahua, Peloncillo, and Rincon. The COI includes the many businesses that rely on the tourists these areas bring in as well as the conservation community they serve.</p> <p>6. Another COI connects educators including high school and college teachers in Cochise County and Tucson. They strongly value the connections that the Cochise College campuses and UA South have with Tucson since students often matriculate from here to there.</p> <p>7. Our recommended map would be more compact than the draft CD6. It would keep important COIs together more and would keep from splitting Pinal and Santa Cruz further. Finally, our candidates of both parties would have a much more manageable area to cover</p>
12/03/2021 - 15:09	Norene Smith	Need for amendment of Current District 17 map	<p>To IRC Commissioners:</p> <p>When one has considerable political power, as this commission does, it might be tempting to create districts that favor one's own party's point of view. I implore the committee to refrain from this temptation to seek the higher goal of fair maps and fair districts that do not unduly benefit one party over another.</p> <p>Specifically, District 17, Pima County is my home district. It currently is drawn so that legislators have to travel 40 miles from Marana to Vail to meet with constituents. This configuration violates requirements that a district be "compact, contiguous, competitive and respectful of community interests." Each District Needs To Be Competitive, not a safe zone for either party.</p> <p>As you consider the work you've done, I urge you to make District 17 compact, contiguous &amp; competitive by including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts,</p> <p>Please give us voters a chance to vote in fair, competitive elections. That is not currently the case, but it can be!</p> <p>Sincerely, Norene Smith, Foothills resident</p>

12/03/2021 - 15:25	Deborah Williams	Feedback on IRC Draft Maps	<p>The proposed legislative draft maps move the previously competitive LD 6 and replace it with the new non-competitive LD 7 which splits Sedona and Flagstaff up and separates them from each other. This results in three non-competitive districts in Northern Arizona with vote spreads of 28.5% Republican and 29.8% Republican in proposed districts 5 and 7. The new LD 6 which packs the city of Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation has a 42.4% Democratic vote spread.</p> <p>Alternative legislative maps LDF 050 and LDF 051 were submitted but they have not been considered by the IRC. In these proposed maps, Flagstaff, Sedona and the Verde Valley are kept together in a triangle-shaped district that runs along the Mogollon Rim and the Navajo Nation retains Navajo and Apache County. Both of these maps better meet the criteria of compactness and contiguousness. Additionally, the LDF 050 map is competitive and the LDF 051 respects Voting Rights Act requirements.</p> <p>The proposed new CD 2 map places Prescott in a congressional district with the Navajo Nation and dilutes the power of the indigenous vote. The proposed new map is outside the boundary of competitiveness as defined by the IRC.</p> <p>The Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission proposed a map, CDF 010. This map would be competitive and is also more compact and contiguous than the current proposed map. It would be the most competitive congressional district in the state.</p>
--------------------	------------------	----------------------------	---

12/03/2021 - 15:32	Thomas W. Sonandres	Public Comment to the Redistricting Commission	<p>The five Commissioners' task, not done to date, is to SPECIFICALLY EXPLAIN FOR THE WRITTEN RECORD on all 39 CD and LD districts its reasoning for designating which of the six criteria are met and not met, and why, particularly with reference to contrary views submitted in public comment.</p> <p>This would remove the current excess wiggle-room on where commissioners stand on criteria. True, many criteria are loosely defined, but true too the commissioners can demonstrate they have in mind a consistent criteria applied to all districts. This would respond to the Princeton Project "C" rating of the IRC current LD map geographic features, compactness, county split, and opportunity for Commissioners to rate the 39 districts on compactness, and defend their exceptions or make improvements.</p> <p>Examples from the media follow:      = = =      Chair Neuberger said: "The law has shown you can decrease competitiveness and contiguousness for a good reason."</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Please specifically explain in each instance the "good reason"      = = =</p> <p>The latest drafts are the most recent ones marked "version accepted."      [AZRepublic Ray Stern, ref CD6.0, LD 8.0]</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: "Version acceptable" to justify the final maps is, as you know, unacceptable fulfilling of your duties as opposed to written specific elaboration on each of the 39 districts six criteria.      = = =</p> <p>Residents argued that the districts lumps together very different communities that should be split up.</p> <p>...they should keep "communities of interest" together when possible; they should be competitive — that is, not so loaded with members of one party that the other party's candidates can't win. [Ray Stern, AZ Republic]</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Please specifically explain the justification for such lumping, if and when in the final maps.      = = =</p> <p>When the Chair asked Commissioners at an 11/9 meeting if districts met criteria, they declined to comment.</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Please record your vote on each of the six criteria met or not met on each of the 39 districts, and your specific rationale for voting met or not met and why you approve or disapprove.      = = =</p> <p>The media has reported and I count, if current maps are finalized, 24 LDs and 5 CDs or 74% of all 39 districts are safe districts, not meeting the 6th competitiveness criteria.</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Consider if having to specifically explain your rationale to approve 29 districts (74%) provides incentive for you to considerably reduce that percentage.      = = =</p> <p>This time, draft congressional and legislative maps were approved unanimously — albeit with concerns on all sides.</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Please change this draft maps vague "Approved unanimous albeit with concerns" with a final maps report that places each of you on written record specifically categorizing the six criteria on 39 districts as met or not met and why.      = = =</p> <p>"Substantive conversation should happen" to determine some ground rules before new voting takes place, she [the Chair] said.</p> <p>To the 5 Commissioners: Please commit the results of upcoming "substantive conversation" to your written justifications for meeting or not each district's six criteria, and, in the process, addressing public contrary arguments to your positions.      = = =</p> <p>But "it might not be possible to get a consensus on the final maps," he* said. Even if they do, there's little chance of pleasing myriad interested groups and residents.</p> <p>* Scott Freeman, a Valley attorney who served as a Republican commissioner for the 2011 redistricting effort</p>
--------------------	---------------------	--	--

12/03/2021 - 15:33	Corinne Shaw	Draft maps are not competitive in Northern Arizona	The draft maps are not competitive. Prop 106 created the Independent Redistricting Commission to make competitive maps. The proposed legislative draft maps move the previously competitive LD 6 and replace it with the new non-competitive LD 7 which splits Sedona and Flagstaff up and separates them from each other. This results in three non-competitive districts in Northern Arizona with vote spreads of 28.5% Republican and 29.8% Republican in proposed districts 5 and 7. The new LD 6 which puts the city of Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation with a 42.4% Democratic vote spread.
12/03/2021 - 15:51	Beverly Kloehn	Extreme Non-Competitiveness of Final IRC Legislative District Draft Maps	I'm well aware there are multiple criteria to be followed by the IRC with COMPETIVENESS being one. On this criterion the Commission has failed miserably. Of the 30 districts in its final 10.0 draft version the commission has seen fit to create 23 (75%) that are above the voting spread of 8% the high end considered competitive. A total of 15 districts have a voting spread of 20% or more, 8 a spread of 30% or more, 6 a spread of 40% or greater and 3 a voting spread of 50% or greater.  These statistics are appalling. Throwing darts at the state map would have produced more competitiveness than 7 commissioners and highly paid consultants have produced. If this isn't gerrymandering, what is it? Arizona's voters deserve fair maps. The IRC needs to go back to work and provide them.
12/03/2021 - 15:55	James H. Lumpkin	Redistricting of Legislative District 17	As a resident of in the Tanque Verde area in Tucson, I oppose the expansion of Legislative District 17 which adds Tanque Verde along with the Houghton Corridor and Vail. This expansion was proposed for purely political purposes, but results in a legislative district that is compact, contiguous, or competitive. Tanque Verde does not share any community interests with originally included areas to the west such as Marana, Oro Valley of other locations in the western areas of the Catalina Mountains.
12/03/2021 - 15:58	HELEN BOYD	Contiguous and Compact	I'm submitting this letter to let you know that as a 50-year resident of Arizona I was so proud and hopeful when we voters passed Proposition 106 in 2000 and its provisions became part of the Arizona Constitution making gerrymandering a thing of the past. But I fear I may be wrong in seeing your behavior in embracing this Map 10.0 which splits so many communities in half for no good reason: my beloved Green Valley, Quail Creek, and Sahuarita where so many of my friends live, even Indian Reservations, clearly you are not following the implicit instructions as set out in the proposition: graphically compact and contiguous, it must respect communities of interest, and it must be competitive. This map 10.0 fails to do so. You have acted as if holding common political beliefs is enough to meet the criterion of community of interest, even if it breaks up the other obvious commonalities. This must not stand and I strongly urge you to take a look at LD0055 as a better map to work with. Otherwise you will have miscarried your duties. I have every reason to believe you wish to comply with the guidelines and do a good job, so please rethink where you are headed and set a new heading. Remember, Republicans are not a community of interest that needs protection.  Thank you for your service.

12/03/2021 - 16:01	Maria Guadalupe Hidalgo	Public Comment on Draft Maps for Dec 4, 2021 Tucson/Town Hall IRC Meeting	<p>PUBLIC COMMENTS for tomorrow's IRC December 4, 2021</p> <p>My name is Maria Hidalgo. My husband and I are retirees who relocated to Tucson 4 years ago. Our home is in the Catalina Foothills near the intersection of Kolb and Sunrise.</p> <p>I will speak about my community of interest and my deep concern this redistricting process, which should be independent has become partisan.</p> <p>My community of interest encompasses most of Tucson, from as far East to Agua Caliente Park (14 miles from our home) or as far West as Tohono Chul Gardens (10 miles from our home) and as far south to use the Tucson Airport. And we have availed ourselves of the wide range of business, restaurants, and venues in between.</p> <p>Agua Caliente Park in the Tanque Verde neighborhood Tucson and Tohono Chul Park in the Casa Adobes neighborhood of Tucson are now included in a Draft map for LD17. Lumping these Tucson neighborhoods with Saddlebrook and Marana. The Tanque Verde neighborhood is not only an hour away from Saddlebrook, but there is also an entire mountain range separating them. How is this compact, let alone contiguous?</p> <p>We have come to learn answer - Republican political influences have been unleashed to create a Republican LD in Pima County, first the clan destine map created by Pima County Republican party officer for the SALC to submit as "their map" and now the clandestine letter written by Republican state representative, Vince Leech, sent to the Mayor of Marana to be submitted as Marana's "leadership letter". This is so wrong on so many levels. The IRC was created to take political influence, which includes legislators, OUT of this process. This lust for raw power cannot prevail.</p> <p>We are exhausted by the abhorrent rhetoric and behavior of extremists, who are now in office at the Arizona state and federal level. Extremists from Districts which are not competitive.</p> <p>How will the voices of independent voters of the Tanque Verde/Casa Adobes neighborhoods of Tucson be heard?</p> <p>Competitiveness is simply GOOD GOVERNANCE, and it tamps down on extremism. Please approve the more competitive Draft LD map 9.0, which is clearly competitive and most importantly not tainted with the stench of political maleficence.</p> <p>I thank you for your time and your service.</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:04	Diane Wilson	IRC	<p>I request that District 17 include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes. Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde should be in eastern legislative districts. I request that the contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA and Fourth Avenue remain in CD7. I request that CD7 include areas south of Broadway in order that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest. The IRC includes criteria that prohibits partisan gerrymandering. These maps should be competitive.</p>

12/03/2021 - 16:18	Janet Breen	Redistricting	<p>Dear Redistricting Committee:</p> <p>I am Janet Breen and was born in Phoenix, and educated in Tucson at the University of Arizona I moved to Cochise County as a young adult where I worked and also raised our children. I have lived in Sierra Vista for 28 years and Cochise County for 38. I know this community well and because of this I am compelled to write you and ask that you use CDF001 when creating a map for CD6.</p> <p>CDF001 more accurately reflects Cochise County's concerns. The economic engine of Cochise County is Fort Huachuca, the number one employer in the county. Sierra Vista, the largest town in the county owes its existence to the military. Pima County is also heavily reliant on the military for employment with Davis Monthan the 4th largest employer in Pima County and Raytheon Missile Systems the number one private employer. Cochise County and Pima County share this strong, economic bond with the military. CDF001 recognizes this powerful link by including Davis Monthan Air Force Base and Fort Huachuca in the same legislative map.</p> <p>On the other hand, the proposed CD6 map includes all of Cochise County with Graham and Greenlee Counties. Having lived in Cochise County almost all of my adult life, I can assure you that we do not see ourselves linked to Graham and Greenlee Counties. I think it's safe to say that most Cochise County residents have no clue where Graham or Greenlee Counties even are located since they have no need or inclination to visit either locales. Other than the fact that we have very similar weather, we share very little.</p> <p>And finally, I would urge the Redistricting Committee to not only consider communities of interest, but also the competitiveness of the districts. Having lived in LD 14 for decades, I can tell you from personal experience that it is demoralizing to live in a district where elections are just a forgone conclusion. I have attended a number of candidate "debates" where the only candidates who showed up were Democrats. It is a well known fact that Republicans do not even need to campaign once the primary is over in my district. In effect, LD14 is one party rule, which is antithetical to democracy.</p> <p>In conclusion, I hope you will take into consideration the commonalities shared by Cochise and Pima Counties and that competitiveness, which our American economic system and culture is based on will be represented in the new legislative maps.</p> <p>Sincerely, Janet Breen</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:25	Linda Karl	District 17	<p>My name is Linda Karl, I live in the Sabino Canyon area. I want to thank the commission for the work that you are doing.</p> <p>I have concern that for a healthy democracy all voices need to be heard and my problem with the proposed redistricting is that it increases "safe" districts. Minority voices in those districts will not be heard by the representative elected from those districts. Therefore, I think it's important to preserve as many competitive districts as possible while following the guidelines of logical geographic boundaries, communities of interest as well as competitiveness. My concern with my region is that district 17 is not compact and the communities in the district at each end geographically are disparate. Redistricting like this fosters districts that are non-competitive and that geographically don't make sense. Please reconsider</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:25	Linda Karl	District 17	<p>My name is Linda Karl, I live in the Sabino Canyon area. I want to thank the commission for the work that you are doing.</p> <p>I have concern that for a healthy democracy all voices need to be heard and my problem with the proposed redistricting is that it increases "safe" districts. Minority voices in those districts will not be heard by the representative elected from those districts. Therefore, I think it's important to preserve as many competitive districts as possible while following the guidelines of logical geographic boundaries, communities of interest as well as competitiveness. My concern with my region is that district 17 is not compact and the communities in the district at each end geographically are disparate. Redistricting like this fosters districts that are non-competitive and that geographically don't make sense. Please reconsider</p>

12/03/2021 - 16:35	David Brill MD, MA, MPH	Stacking and Packing in LD6, 5 and 7	<p>We see the stacking and packing you've proposed.</p> <p>A packed spread of 42.4% in LD6 means - of course - that many Navajo nation votes will be WASTED - instead of placed into competition.</p> <p>Proposed vote spreads of 28.5% Republican and 29.8% Republican in proposed districts 5 and 7 means you've created THREE NON-COMPETITIVE DISTRICTS.</p> <p>Congratulations.</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:43	David Brill MD, MA, MPH	Non-Competitive Districts	<p>The Oct 2021 spread of registered voters in Arizona is below.</p> <p>With a mere 3% spread between the two major political parties - WHY can't we have more competitive districts?</p> <p>It would mean more votes heard, more centrists, fewer radicals and more collaboration.</p> <p>What's wrong with that?</p> <p>A house divided against itself can't stand, and ultimately won't.</p> <p>You're helping that - unless you create more competitive districts. Why are you creating division?</p> <p>Republican 1,504,990 34.60%  Democratic 1,372,884 31.56%  Other 1,435,129 32.99%  Libertarian 36,839 0.85%</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:51	Barry Weiss	Redistricting Commission - Proposed Maps	<p>I am a long-time resident of Pima County. I first moved here in 1971, and my wife and I have lived in our current home in the Coronado Foothills for more than 20 years. I am a professor in the College of Medicine at the University of Arizona.</p> <p>I'm writing about the proposed redistricting maps. I was initially quite pleased to hear that the maps were to be designed by an independent commission, rather than by partisan politicians.</p> <p>But, as I review the latest version of the maps, they do not appear to be independent. Rather, they appear to be heavily "gerrymandered" in a way that markedly favors Republicans. That does not at all reflect the political makeup of Pima County, which has a largely Democratic votership.</p> <p>It is reasonable and appropriate for District 17 to include contiguous areas – Marana, Oro Valley, the Foothills, and Casa Adobes. But, the proposed inclusion of a geographically and politically distinct area (Vail and the areas around Houghton and Tanque Verde) makes no sense. It would gerrymander the district in favor of Republican. Those latter areas belong in the eastern legislative district.</p> <p>And, it is also important that downtown Tucson, the University Area, and Fourth Avenue all remain in CD7. Doing otherwise is again a gerrymandering approach to help Republicans, rather than reflecting the will of the people.</p> <p>So, please make your independent redistricting commission act like an independent commission, rather than than one designed to create a Republican majority in a community that does not have a majority of Republicans.</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:51	Jacqueline Day	Independent and communities of interest	<p>How can we have communities of interest when they are so far flung their representative would have difficulty contacting them and how can there be common concerns when a district is so large it covers multiple counties? Let's get the "independent" aspect back. I was so excited that Arizona voted for this to get away from gerrymandering but it seems this commission has surrendered to pressure to make districts "safe" rather than competitive. I know it's a difficult task but please step back and listen to those of us with concerns.</p>
12/03/2021 - 16:57	Laurie Soloff	oppose proposed LD 17	<p>I strongly oppose the proposed District 17. The proposed map fails to respect Communities of Interest. Despite the personal/political preferences of Commissioner Mehl and SALC, there is nothing that ties the east Tucson/Tanque Verde region with Marana and Oro Valley. They do not share the same schools.</p> <p>In fact, there are four large school districts located geographically in between the Tanque Verde area and Oro Valley. These communities do not worship together.</p> <p>Residents of Oro Valley/Marana do not share the same regional employers as the eastern area of Tucson and it makes no sense to say that residents of east Tucson go shopping in Oro Valley or Marana.</p>

12/03/2021 - 17:01	Peggy J. Turk Boyer	LD maps	<p>I have lived in Tucson since 2001, and recently retired as director and founder of a binational not for profit environmental organization that worked to build stewardship with communities for better management of their natural resources. In this work we saw first-hand the powerful impact that having the right alignment of stakeholders with the ecosystem and socio-economic system can have on building stewardship and strengthening governance. Proposition 106 of the Arizona Constitution recognizes such principles in the criteria it has established, stating that congressional and legislative districts should: 1) be geographically compact and contiguous; 2) respect communities of interest, and 3) use visible geographic features, and existing boundaries, where possible, in addition to requirements to comply with the US voting rights act, have equal populations and be competitive.</p> <p>I am concerned because the current proposal for LD17 as seen in the SALC maps does not follow these fundamental principles; it separates stakeholders with similar ecosystem and socio-economic interests. The Catalina Mountains is a major geologic barrier that separates the east Tucson/Tanque Verde community from Marana and Oro Valley, with a long drive in between. The east Tucson/Tanque Verde Community has little in common with these communities, with 3 or 4 school districts separating them, no shared worship, economy, nor employers. No one in east Tucson shops in Oro Valley or Marana. In fact, the only time east Tucsonans would visit Marana would be driving through on the way to Phoenix. Similarly, no one in Oro Valley or Marana visits or shops in east Tucson/Tanque Verde unless they are on a day trip to Mount Lemon. The only reason for combining Marana, Oro Valley and east Tucson is to pull together Republican leaning suburbs, to create another safe Republican District, which is not necessary, as in this particular instance there is great potential to create a competitive district. The gerrymandered district 17 went from a partisan split slightly in favor of Democrats to a partisan split strongly in favor of Republicans, affecting the partisan balance in the rest of the state. Solid Democratic districts were reduced from 13 to ten; solid Republican districts were increased from 13 to 15.</p> <p>In addition, the SALC maps (LD17) split the City of Tucson into five different districts. Greater Tucson is too large to be kept in one or even two districts but there is no justification for splitting it into five districts. Many communities of interest that are functionally a part of the Tucson metropolitan were were separated from the community where they live and work, including: Tucson Estates/Avra Valley (split and separated from Tucson Metro Area) Tucson Mountains (split, with parts separate from Tucson Metro Area) University of Arizona (campus split and student housing split) Tohono O'Odham Nation (separated from Tucson Metro Area) Yaqui Tribe (separated from Tucson Metro Area) Green Valley and the Continental and Sahuarita School Districts (Separated from the from the I-19 Corridor and Sahuarita) Marana and Picture Rocks (separated into 2 districts) Saddlebrooke East and West and the Oracle School District (separated into 2 districts) Tanque Verde and Catalina Foothills (separated into 2 districts) Flagstaff, Sedona, and the Verde Valley (separated) Whiteriver and Show Low/Pinetop (separated from their commercial areas, including Apache casino) Florence and Coolidge (separated) Gila Bend (separated) Santa Cruz County (separated into 2 districts)</p> <p>When Proposition 106 was passed, ARIZONA made the commitment to follow an Independent Redistricting process. I am sure the commissioners don't need to be reminded that we depend upon your personal commitment to this process. I am concerned about input from incumbents that serve personal interests and other partisan gerrymandering efforts that seem evident. Only by fully upholding the criteria outlined in Propostion 106, can we hope to control the extremism that has infiltrated our local and national politics and wasted our tax dollars, and can we hope to restore dignity to our state.</p>
12/03/2021 - 17:05	Dianne Resseguie	Redistricting	Please make fair districts that represent our democracy! No gerrymandering!

12/03/2021 - 17:12	Beatrice Harvison	Redistricting maps	<p>My name is Beatrice Harvison, I am a resident of Cochise County in Sierra Vista, AZ. I moved to Sierra Vista after retiring and traveling the southwest. I am originally from Missouri and feel blessed to be living in southern Arizona. I am pleased to have an Independent Redistricting Commission that is committed to drawing representative Congressional Districts that recognize the communities of interest and competitiveness.</p> <p>I frequently travel to Tucson for medical care, as do many of my friends and neighbors, for entertainment, shopping or to dine out. I very much value and appreciate the diversity found in this area; from members of Ft. Huachuca to community members from our border towns to retirees from across this great nation to Native Americans. I am concerned that the current draft map you are considering for Congressional District 6 diminishes this diversity and how it is represented today. I would like to request that the Commission consider a more compact Congressional District 6 map which will more fairly represent Cochise County. From my review of the maps draft CDF001 is much more representative of our area. Most of the residents in Cochise County have very few interests in Graham and Greenlee Counties and especially as far north as Casa Grande. This kind of geographical spread will make it very difficult to get candidates running for Congress to travel such large expanses and will weaken the connection they need with Congressional District 6 as a whole. You also run the risk of weakening the candidate pool with such a far flung district. Voting rights and true representation of the people is a powerful cornerstone of our great democracy and we must always keep preserving this cornerstone in the forefront of our minds and actions, encouraging citizens to participate in democracy not providing barriers.</p> <p>I thank you for working so diligently and your commitment to Arizona's Congressional Districts.</p>
--------------------	-------------------	--------------------	--

12/03/2021 - 17:14	Amy Pedotto	Please improve competitiveness of maps	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC). The voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I appreciate that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few.</p> <p>You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. Please make every effort to create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Amy Pedotto</p>
--------------------	-------------	--	--

12/03/2021 - 17:30	Patricia Gehr	Redistricting	<p>Dear Members of the Independent Redistricting Commission, I am writing to request that you avoid gerrymandering, which weakens our democracy and reduces confidence in voting. It would be far better if we had NO voting districts for Congressional Representatives. We should instead vote statewide, just as we do for our federal Senators. This would be more fair to all Arizona residents.</p> <p>Otherwise, District 17 should include the contiguous areas of Marana to the foothills, Oro Valley and Casas Adobes. This would leave Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts, where they belong.</p> <p>Thank you for doing the right thing to avoid gerrymandering.</p>
12/03/2021 - 17:38	Ardella Foster	Keep Greater Scottsdale Together	<p>I have been a resident of greater Scottsdale for the last 25 years. I urge you NOT to split precincts in Scottsdale. Our precincts should be kept whole. To break our sense of community is unnecessary. Furthermore Haden road runs right up through the town. It SHOULD NOT divide the residents of Scottsdale.</p> <p>Your Draft Map D3 needs to be fixed. Putting Fountain Hills, North Phoenix, Cave Creek Ft McDowell, Carefree and North Scottsdale together does not make sense. If one of the purposes of redistricting is to make more competitive districts, I feel this misses that purpose. It would make representation extremely difficult with a 60/40 in favor of Republicans.</p> <p>I urge you to consider the draft FO49 proposal.</p> <p>Ardella Foster</p>
12/03/2021 - 17:54	Sandra Cosentino	Comments on proposed legislative draft maps	<p>The proposed legislative draft maps move the previously competitive LD 6 and replace it with the new non-competitive LD 7 which splits Sedona and Flagstaff up and separates them from each other and packages Flagstaff in with Navajo. The Independent Redistricting Committee should instead consider the alternative LDF 050 and LDF 051 maps instead of the Proposed draft maps because these alternative maps would be more competitive and compact.</p> <p>Map LDF 050 keeps Flagstaff together with Sedona, Cottonwood (my home) together with the whole Verde Verde Valley-- together we are a cohesive economic and geographic region.</p> <p>I also support the Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission proposed map, CDF 010. This map would be competitive and is also more compact and contiguous than the current proposed map for CD2 and more fairly represent our tribal communities.</p> <p>Your proposed maps for these areas are not following the Independent Redistricting guidelines and blatantly gerrymandered. Let's be fair to all Arizonans, not just to the party with a narrow lead in voter registration and representation in our AZ legislature.</p>
12/03/2021 - 17:54	Molly McKasson	The proposed redistricting maps	<p>Dear IRC members: I live in mid-town Tucson, and am writing to express my serious concerns about the current IRC maps that you have settled on. They do not do justice to our democratic system, which functions best when based on fair and competitive voting districts. I thank you for your service but must remind you that you are taxed with the job of operating free of partisan influence. The current maps show heavy gerrymandering which is unacceptable. It is particularly disturbing what you have done in Pima County. Out of 6 districts, you have carved out 3 that are safely Republican, even though that party makes up only 29% of our registered voters, and 3 that are safely Democrat. What about the Independents and members of other parties who make up 31% of Pima County voters? Per your work, these voters will be in districts where they get no choice, where their vote makes no difference. I thought the whole point of doing these maps was to create competitive districts, not to favor either party? And why, if you're trying to keep affinity communities together, have you separated the 4th Ave. area from downtown? Finally, I want to request, out of all fairness, that you create a more contiguous and competitive District 17 from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes. I will not be able to attend tomorrow's meeting, but I will be watching your decisions and looking for a map that increases rather than decreases our democratic process. Thank you. Molly McKasson</p>
12/03/2021 - 17:56	Lynda Gordon	Redistricting	<p>Stop the gerrymandering.</p>

12/03/2021 - 17:57	Greg Staley	Redistricting	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>My name is Greg Staley. I'm a special education at Bradshaw Mountain High School and my wife, Aimee Novak, works for the University of Arizona Cooperative Extension - Yavapai County. We are long-time Yavapai residents who are raising our son here.</p> <p>We would like to voice our concern about the current draft maps. These maps do not honor the will of the voters. Prop 106 clearly requires fair and competitive districts. Yavapai County is no longer the small population base that it once was and does not need to be kept together at the expense of fairness. Yavapai County is clearly separated into the area west of Mingus Mountain and the Verde Valley to the East. Keeping Yavapai County as a whole would unfairly reduce our representation in half.</p> <p>Please look beyond political gain and do what's right for the citizens of Yavapai County and Arizona. Continued politicization of our state will only hurt our communities and divide us further. The level of political anger has reached unparalleled heights with many of our representatives. When districts are drawn with politics as the main factor, politicians are elected that only represent their side and do not acknowledge anyone that begins to question their views.</p> <p>Please consider CDF10, CDF 50 and CDF 51 as better alternatives.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to listen to the citizens of this great state before making final decisions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Greg Staley and Aimee Novak</p>
12/03/2021 - 18:11	Alice Paul	Redistricting	<p>It has come to my attention that there is a possibility of my area being added to a district in Pinal or Maricopa counties. To me this makes no sense. We are in Marana school district and my city of residence is listed as Tucson for my mail. I think my district should be with Marana Township</p>

12/03/2021 - 18:18	Rebecca J Haynes	Redistricting mapping	<p>Please continue to accept public comments during the final mapping days, at each session and in between sessions. The need for public access and input into the process increases as the opportunity for correction and adjustments decrease.</p> <p>The northern districts created in the LD maps have not accommodated the competitiveness goal when taking into account whether greater competitiveness would cause significant detriment to the other goals. They do not meet the constitutional standard.</p> <p>The northern districts seem to have been gerrymandered out of compliance with several of the constitutional criteria, specifically, competitiveness, compactness, and communities of interest.</p> <p>All the northern districts are outside the Commission's own range of competitiveness by very wide margins. Alternative maps have been submitted which show this is not necessary. LDF050, LDF051, and LD0023 (LDF008) are examples that at least one competitive district is possible in northern Arizona.</p> <p>D7 in the Draft Map is not compact to the extent practicable. The Coconino County Supervisors' alternative to D7 performs much better under all the Commission's compactness measurements. LD0023 performs well compared with the Draft Map as well. In contrast, D7 in the Draft Map is a distorted shape stretching across five counties.</p> <p>Community of interest evidence is overwhelmingly against the Draft Map of D7. Economic, public safety, transportation, cultural, and partisan relationships tie Sedona and the Verde Valley with Flagstaff and its unincorporated communities, and separate them from the rest of Yavapai County.</p> <p>Yavapai County has recognized that the two sides of Mingus Mountain have disparate needs that cannot be served by a single community college or a single jail or sheriff's office. There are separate ones of each on both sides of Mingus Mountain. The two sides of the mountain are in separate legislative districts because that is necessary to accommodate the other constitutional criteria while Section 14(E) is honored by using the mountain divide. Yavapai is one of only four counties that is not split in the Draft Map and the other three (Cochise, Greenlee, and LaPaz) are combined with other counties rather than standing alone. Yavapai is a very large county compared to Santa Cruz, Graham, Gila, and Pinal, all of which are split in the draft maps. And larger or similar-sized counties are also split.</p> <p>Please honor the weight of community of interest testimony.</p> <p>Chair Neuberger expressed the desire to give voice to the "right of center" population in the Tucson area. Surely the "left of center" population in Northern Arizona deserves similar recognition. I suggest that the map be redrawn to closely follow the current LD6 configuration, which will create a competitive district without detriment to the other five constitutional criteria. Failing to do so has no rational basis and would be unconstitutional.</p>
12/03/2021 - 18:40	Joann Alexander	Redistricting testimony	<p>My name is Joann Alexander. I live in the Foothills and love the desert Southwest outdoor life. I became an Arizona permanent resident and voter in 2016 and I have been engaged in volunteer work and community life ever since, including helping people register to vote. I thank you for your hard work in the challenging task of drawing legislative and congressional districts. Arizonans passed a constitutional amendment in November 2000 to ensure that districts were drawn fairly. The six criteria you commission members must honor are sometimes competing. However, nowhere in the amendment are you directed to establish "safe" districts for one party or another. This is gerrymandering, exactly what Proposition 106 was meant to curtail. I see the currently mapped legislative district 17 as not competitive, not compact and not honoring communities of interest. District 17 was explicitly drawn to create a safe district for Republicans. Artificially drawn safe districts threaten the health of our democracy. Young people see no point in voting or keeping up on issues when the election outcome is a foregone conclusion. Independents wash their hands of civic engagement and vote in fewer numbers. Finally, candidates running in safe districts do not have to speak to the entire electorate. They can win primaries having appealed to a narrow field of voters. When in office, they often do not represent their wider constituencies and may not be the bipartisan problem solvers our democracy needs.</p> <p>Please reconsider the outline of legislative district 17 which stretches across a mountain range, artificially joins communities with quite disparate interests, and is not competitive. Thanks for listening to us today.</p>

12/03/2021 - 19:05	Linda A Spearman	LD0061,	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>I support the LD0061 map for several reasons: it complies with the VRA, respects city and county boundaries as much as possible and creates competitive districts, which I consider to be very important for Arizona's future. This state needs opportunities for people to come together and realize their shared interests--planned growth and opportunities for all to live healthy, productive lives. Thank you for listening.</p> <p>Linda A. Spearman          Tempe Resident for 32 years, ASU grad, Retired, Former Military Dependent</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:10	Francine Mick	LDF 050& 051; CDF 010	<p>I encourage the Commission to consider seriously proposed LDF 050 and 051, as well as CDF 010. 050, putting Flagstaff, Sedona, &amp; the Verde Valley together, is compact, contiguous, competitive, and is supported by 2 city councils and is consistent with the goals of the region. 051 puts Navajo &amp; Apache Counties together, accomplishing compactness, contiguousness, &amp; competitiveness, as well respecting the Voting Rights Act requirements. The proposed new CD 2, putting Prescott &amp; the Navajo Nation together is joining 2 very different areas with differing needs &amp; goals. A much better choice is CDF 010, which honors the Voting Rights Act for Indigenous representation and would be very competitive. Thank you for your attention.</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:14	Carolyn Brown	IRC meeting Dec 4, 2021	<p>So Senator Leach wants to keep his job so bad he's trying to influence you "independent" people on the I (Independent) RC. In order for him to keep his job, he needs to make sure his area remains in a Republican District and he's working very hard behind the scene to do that. The IRC is not suppose to listen to politicians or they might as well go back to drawing the districts I ke they do in a lot of states and used to here. We don't do too many thing right in this state, let's let this be fair and honest The Republicans have had the edge in this district for far too long. Can you please make it more even. Thanks,</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:25	SUSAN WAITES	Proposed redistricting map 9.2	<p>Map 9.2 for proposed LD 17 should be tossed out after revelations of manipulation by Rep. Vince Leach in his attempt to choose his voters instead of having voters choose who will represent them. Rep. Leach's malfeasance has contaminated map 9.2. It should no longer be up for consideration.</p> <p>I reject Commissioner Mehl's notion that Republican voters comprise a community of interest for redistricting purposes. Such a notion is completely contrary to the intent of Prop 106 which amended the Arizona Constitution. The whole point was to depoliticize the redistricting process, not insert more partisanship. Commissioner Mehl knows better and should act in good faith.</p> <p>Nowhere in the AZ Constitution as amended by Prop 106 is there mention of "safe" districts for any political party. Creation of competitive districts is actually required as long as there is no significant detriment to the first five of the six criteria which must be satisfied in redistricting. I think it is possible to actually have all districts be competitive while respecting the other criteria. We just haven't tried hard enough. Listen to the voters. They are demanding competitive districts. LD 9.2 certainly is not that.</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:26	SUSAN WAITES	Proposed redistricting map 9.2	<p>Map 9.2 for proposed LD 17 should be tossed out after revelations of manipulation by Rep. Vince Leach in his attempt to choose his voters instead of having voters choose who will represent them. Rep. Leach's malfeasance has contaminated map 9.2. It should no longer be up for consideration.</p> <p>I reject Commissioner Mehl's notion that Republican voters comprise a community of interest for redistricting purposes. Such a notion is completely contrary to the intent of Prop 106 which amended the Arizona Constitution. The whole point was to depoliticize the redistricting process, not insert more partisanship. Commissioner Mehl knows better and should act in good faith.</p> <p>Nowhere in the AZ Constitution as amended by Prop 106 is there mention of "safe" districts for any political party. Creation of competitive districts is actually required as long as there is no significant detriment to the first five of the six criteria which must be satisfied in redistricting. I think it is possible to actually have all districts be competitive while respecting the other criteria. We just haven't tried hard enough. Listen to the voters. They are demanding competitive districts. LD 9.2 certainly is not that.</p>

12/03/2021 - 19:26	Carol Schneiderman	Redistricting Map	<p>To the Commissioners,</p> <p>In the year 2000 the people of Arizona passed Proposition 106 which created an Independent Redistricting Commission to prevent gerrymandering and encourage voter and candidate participation by creating a fair and politically independent mapping process throughout the state. There are certain requirements contained in that proposition that I believe are not being respected by the current commission.</p> <p>It is quite obvious that many of the legislative districts are not compact, nor competitive, and do not respect all communities of interest .</p> <p>As a voter in Tucson and Arizona I am disheartened by the obviously gerrymandered districts. I am equally disgusted by the fact that this years' process was marred by unethical and perhaps illegal acts by elected incumbents trying to preserve their districts, one of the commissioners who facilitated this action, and an "independent" chair who allowed all of this to take place.</p> <p>Submitted respectfully, Carol Schneiderman</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:30	Dean R. Chaussee	IRC maps for southern Arizona	<p>Independent Redistricting Commission Meeting - Tucson December 4, 2021</p> <p>Good morning</p> <p>Thank you, Commissioners, for the work you are doing. I know it's a difficult task.</p> <p>My name is Dean Chaussee. My wife, Carolyn, and I have lived in Green Valley for 11 years. Green Valley is located about 20 miles south of Tucson.</p> <p>As you probably know, Interstate 19 runs right through the middle of Green Valley and our community is closely tied to Sahuarita, Quail Creek and Tucson. I consider the communities along the I-19 corridor, communities of interest because we are interdependent. We shop, dine, attend church, and seek medical assistance in Green Valley and Sahuarita and visit friends in Quail Creek. We often come to Tucson for Doctor's appointments and for shopping and dining. Our weekly activities take us up and down the I-19 corridor and I feel these communities should NOT be separated by political boundaries.</p> <p>The Santa Rita Mountain range is a natural geographic barrier to the East and should be used as a boundary.</p> <p>Therefore, I support the Legislative District LD0055 (D21) map and the Congressional District D7 map.</p> <p>Thank You.</p> <p>Dean Chaussee  ████████████████████  Green Valley, AZ 85622  ████████████████████</p>

12/03/2021 - 19:44	Robert Maier	Comment on Draft Map 10.0	<p>Ladies and Gentlemen of the Commission,</p> <p>I live in unincorporated Pima County north of Tucson, in an area called the Catalina Foothills. If I were to draw a legislative district map containing the Foothills, the boundaries would be the Rillito River on the south, the I10 corridor on the west, the Rincon mountains on the east and the Catalina mountains on the north.</p> <p>Now, that happens to correspond closely to District 17 in Map version 9.0; which should be no surprise, since a good district map ought to reflect the intuition of residents.</p> <p>So, in Map 9.0 I live in District 17, but in Map 10.0, I would live in District 18, a district less compact and less respectful of significant boundaries around Tucson. The new District 17 in Map 10.0 has also raised great concerns and I share those.</p> <p>In Map 9.0 I live in District 17, which is highly competitive. But in Map 10.0, the new Districts 18 and 17 become safe democratic and republican Districts. I don't want to live in a safe District for either party if it can be helped. Fortunately, it can be helped by returning to Map 9.0.</p> <p>Map 9.0 is superior to 10.0 in measures of compactness and number of cut boundaries, as well as competitiveness. I pray that you reconsider these facts and restore the earlier Map version 9.0.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 19:48	Marcia Tingley	Current IRC redistricting maps	<p>Competitive districts encourage voter engagement and potentially allow the make-up of the Arizona Legislature to change from election to election. In Pima County where I live, one-third of the voters are independents, who are best served with competitive districts. A broad range of voters are left out in heavily partisan districts, while non-partisan districts can so easily result in significant competitiveness.</p> <p>The proposed Legislative Map 10.0 and the Congressional Draft Map 7.1 do not promote competitiveness; on the contrary, when districts are drawn to be "safe," the result is that elected officials speak to and represent their base, ignoring the broad electorate. Extreme polarization is counterproductive and dangerous.</p> <p>Legislative District 17 should include the compact, contiguous, and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. The Arizona constitutional criteria for the IRC prohibit partisan gerrymandering. Contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue, should remain in CD7, including areas south of Broadway, so Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.</p> <p>I strongly urge the IRC to reject gerrymandering for partisan purposes – which is evident in the proposed Legislative Map 10.0 – and to not give in to pressure to do so.</p> <p>Thank you, Marcia Tingley</p>

12/03/2021 - 20:00	Nancy Goodman	Opposition to Legislative District Map 17	<p>Thank you for reading and listening to all points of view on this matter. I have been a resident of Oro Valley for approximately 8.5 years. I do not support LD17 in the adopted Legislative Draft Map. This map does not respect the Arizona Constitution and the requirements of Proposition 208 as voted on by the citizens of the state.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This map does not respect the geographic borders of the Catalina Mountains or the transportation corridor of US 77/Oracle Road. The district is so large that it requires an hour long trip to travel from one end of the district to the other.</li> <li>2. It is neither contiguous nor compact as one must leave LD17 and travel through other LDs to travel across the district.</li> <li>3. The boundaries of towns and school districts are not respected.</li> <li>4. Oro Valley is identified by the U.S. Census Bureau as urban and part of the Tucson metro area based upon the population density, unlike Tanque Verde and Vail which are rural.</li> <li>5. Oro Valley and Casas Adobe have similar demographics and interests in terms of schools, water supply, economics, housing and business development, energy, economics, and recreation, UNLIKE SaddleBrooke, Tanque Verde, and Vail.</li> </ol> <p>LD17 creates a manipulated and solidly Republican district. It is in no way even remotely competitive as Republican registered voters far outnumber Democrats. Oro Valley reflects the 1/3Republican/1/3Democrat/1/3Independent breakdown of the state of Arizona as a whole and will be severely diluted by the current map - as LD11 has been for the past 10 years. I find it appalling that I have never, in the last 8.5 years, ever seen Mark Finchem or Bret Roberts, let alone have them ask for my vote. This partisan gerrymandering goes completely against Prop 208 and the requirements of the Arizona Constitution. I believe that if the current map of LD17 is adopted, it is so far afield of the law and the Constitution, that there is no doubt that this map will be contested in court.</p> <p>If the IRC would follow the AZ Constitution and Prop 208 voted into existence by the citizens of Arizona, and therefore create fair and balanced Legislative Districts, the legislative maps will require that candidates actually work for our votes instead of assuming the vote will automatically go one way or the other. I really do not want to see this process be decided by the courts when you have the opportunity to do the right thing and make the people of Arizona proud. The embarrassing "audit" of the General Election already subjected our state to the criticism of the rest of the country and became fodder for late night comedians. I do not want to see this happen again.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work and dedication to this process. Respectfully, Nancy L Goodman Oro Valley</p>
12/03/2021 - 20:17	Steve Marks	Dec 4 meeting	<p>Every district should be competitive to the greatest extent possible. This ensures competition for voters and policies that voters want and need. Any shenanigans by any party that reduce competitive districts is against our interests and the purpose of the IRC and will not be forgotten.</p>
12/03/2021 - 20:22	Rachel Rulmyr	Arizona Re-districting	<p>I have lived in Oro Valley for 20 years. I am a retired educator and volunteer throughout Oro Valley and Tucson. I am very much opposed to the proposed LD17 District.</p> <p>I do not believe our community of interest is being addressed. Oro Valley does not belong or associate with the far reaching area of Tanque Verde (over the Catalina Mountains). My community of interest lies with Tucson and the east of I-10.</p> <p>As currently drawn, 25 of the 30 proposed legislative districts are expected to uniformly elect candidates of only one party. This map proposed does not reflect a competitive District.</p> <p>I expect you will revisit your proposed map and make some logical changes to it based on addressing Oro Valley's COMMUNITY OF INTEREST.</p>
12/03/2021 - 20:28	John Driscoll Fitz-Gerald III	LDF-50, LDF-51 and CDF-10 proposed districts	<p>I am writing to urge you to use the above mentioned maps instead of the commission developed maps. The above maps are much more compliant with my understanding of the primary requirements for establishing districts which are competitive, contiguous, and keep the districts closely the same in population. It is not, and should not, be a goal of the IRC to draw district maps with the intent of making "safe" districts for either Democrats or Republicans. Indeed such is specifically not a stated goal for the IRC. It may be an unavoidable consequence of the proper drawing of legislative districts but it is not a goal. I submit that the current IRC maps fail in what the IRC is supposed to do.</p>

12/03/2021 - 20:46	David Genge	CD1 comment	My family and I live in north Scottsdale (Grayhawk) and our oldest daughter attends school in Scottsdale. My wife and I both work from home, shop near our home, dine near our home, gather with friends in our community. Our neighborhood is suburban, made up of families like ours. We do not go into the central Phoenix area - it's far from us and its very urban and busy. As such, central Phoenix should not be in CD1, which is made up of suburban communities and more open spaces (i.e. parks).
12/03/2021 - 20:47	Patricia KA Mongini	Reconsideration of AIRC final draft map 10.0	I would like to convey my opinion that greater emphasis be placed on creating a northern Arizona legislative district that represents an amalgam of the Verde Valley, Sedona, Oak Creek and Flagstaff areas. All the above are communities of shared interest as proximal sites of growing tourism. To subdivide both Sedona and Flagstaff into diverse legislative districts diminishes the impact that these communities can have in determining their future. Rather, placement of the four above regions into the same district will enhance their ability to speak with one voice regarding many similar concerns.
12/03/2021 - 20:53	Alan Binnie	Resident of CD11 opposed to new CD17	As a resident of CD11 residing in Catalina, AZ, I strongly object to the proposed boundaries of LD17 in the final draft version of your legislative district map. The proposed LD17 is a transparent attempt by Republicans to gerrymander a safe district that violates several of the principles your commission are supposed to be honoring. Although it looks contiguous on paper, the architects of this district have included a substantially unpopulated mountain range that is impossible to drive through to bridge the huge gap between the islands of Republican voters that live far to the Southeast of Tucson as far away as Vail and those on suburbs and unincorporated areas far, far to the Northwest of Tucson. Therefore, the proposed CD17 is not in fact contiguous, and it is very obviously not geographically compact- it snakes artificially around the core of Tucson and extends more than 70 miles! This also violates the prescription for districts that use visible geographical boundaries there is a 9000 foot mountain range in the middle of this proposed district. It is also not designed to preserve any valid community of interest. The only thing these areas have in common are party affiliation of the majority of citizens. They live in completely separate communities day to day, have different needs with respect to commuting, recreating, traffic concerns, light pollution, school districts- just about everything. Finally, and most importantly, according to those who proposed this district, it was proposed specifically to create a non-competitive district. This flies in the face of the main reason the IRC exists, and violates the principle of creating competitive districts whenever possible. I am extremely disappointed that this LD17 was accepted at the last moment by people with a clear conflict of interest. Please restore the boundaries of LD17 that were proposed in version 9.0.
12/03/2021 - 20:55	Susan C Ott	Proposed congressional and legislative district maps	<p>As a resident of Tucson, I write to you to request that you amend the proposed congressional and legislative maps as follows:</p> <p>CD7 should include downtown Tucson, the Fourth Ave. business district, the University of Arizona, and areas south of Broadway. These areas are contiguous and represent communities of interest, both criteria you are charged to respect in drawing these maps.</p> <p>LD17 should not span 40 miles from Vail to Marana and skip over other contiguous communities with common interests in an effort to create another safe Republican district. I urge you to redraw the map of this district to include the Catalina Foothills, Casas Adobes, Oro Valley, and Marana. Vail, Tanque Verde, and the Houghton corridor should be part of the legislative districts on the east side of Tucson.</p> <p>It is important to have competitive districts so that the voices of all can be heard. Competitive districts encourage voter participation, while gerrymandered, partisan, safe districts discourage it. Safe districts often result in extreme candidates who further contribute to the terrible polarization that we are experiencing in the Arizona Legislature and in Congress.</p> <p>You are charged by the citizens of Arizona to draw maps of districts that are relatively compact and contiguous, that are relatively equal in population, that respect communities of interest, and that are competitive. You are prohibited from creating partisan, gerrymandered districts. I urge you to draw these maps based on these criteria.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Susan Ott</p>

12/03/2021 - 21:00	A. Hyatt Simpson	Comments for Public Hearing on 12/4/21 in Tucson	<p>My name is Hyatt Simpson, and I have lived in Arizona for a total of 28 years, divided between Flagstaff and Tucson. My husband and I retired to Tucson in 2007, and our home is in the Tanque Verde Valley. We shop in Tucson, recreate in Tucson, eat out in Tucson, get our medical care in Tucson, and pay our water bills to Tucson. Needless to say, I am against the proposed LD map that places our neighborhood in a gerrymandered safe Republican district (17), a far cry from our current competitive district 10.</p> <p>The IRC's webpage contains this statement: "Members must demonstrate a commitment to performing the IRC's charge in an honest, independent, and impartial fashion and to upholding public confidence in the integrity of the redistricting process."</p> <p>I've been watching and commenting on this IRC's activities in the past couple of months. A number of things I've observed have caused me to question the integrity of the redistricting process in 2021. In addition to the many concerns mentioned by others here today, I am troubled by the following:</p> <p>First and most egregious, is a recent article that reveals evidence of how State Senator Vince Leech may have conspired with officials from the Town of Marana to generate support for the LD map drawn by an official of the Pima County Republican Party, which will guarantee Leech's re-election.</p> <p>I'm also concerned that the Commission seems to have confused the concept of competitive districts with the idea that each party deserves a certain number of safe districts. That confusion is demonstrated by a statement by the Chair of the IRC, concerning the proposed Tucson LD17, that she is "comfortable having a district that will ensure that right-of-center people will have some representation."</p> <p>Because of the obvious misunderstanding of the Constitutional direction to create competitive districts where practicable, this Commission has appeared to ignore competitiveness in favor of safe districts. Exhibit A is the current LD map, which contains only 6 competitive districts out of a total of 30—and NONE are in Tucson.</p> <p>I urge the Commission to take advantage of the remaining time they have to come up with a product that will better reflect the Constitutional criteria that they swore to honor. It doesn't need to be perfect, just demonstrably consistent with the Constitution!</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:09	Christiane Dow Freer-Parsons	Keep Greater Scottsdale Together	<p>My family has lived in Scottsdale since 1973. I'm a Scottsdale H.S. graduate, my mother had a business in Scottsdale, I serve on my HOP Board, and volunteered as a reading tutor at Navajo Elementary School. I care deeply about the sanctity of elections and for my city. I care about creating a fair and balanced district that keeps greater Scottsdale together. Scottsdale is one community. The new redistricting maps should keep Scottsdale compact and contiguous. The Keep Greater Scottsdale Together map (#LDF049) meets all six IRC criteria for drawing the district. Using map (#LDF049) is logical by keeping greater Scottsdale together utilizing nearly all of the city of Scottsdale's and the Salt River -Pima Maricopa Indian Community's natural boundaries and visible geographic features. The Keeping Greater Scottsdale Together map (3LDF049) creates a district that is nearly evenly split between the two major parties reducing the potential for extremism and therefore benefits the majority of voters. What I want for Scottsdale is fair and competitive maps which aid political candidates and elected politicians in focusing on public policies and issues that reflect the diversity and views of all citizens. The Keep Greater Scottsdale Together map (#LDF049) addresses the IRC criteria of drawing a district. I strongly support it and wish its adoption by the IRC. Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:12	Kathryn Baron	2021 redistricting	<p>The approved map by the commission does not fulfill the requirements set forth by the federal government. District 17 is the prime example as well as separating downtown Tucson from the University area. These districts are not contiguous. The 2011 commission did a wonderful job in assuring competitive districts and others evenly split between Republicans, Democrats and Independents. I hope this commission can do the same so ALL parties are evenly represented.</p>

12/03/2021 - 21:24	Mike Weingarten	Public Comment: LD Draft Map	<p>I live in the residential Midtown neighborhood of Broadmoor-Broadway Village. We are bordered by Broadway on the north, and by Country Club Rd. and Tucson Blvd on the east and the west. We are about a mile SE of the University of Arizona campus. I have 2 points I would like to make.</p> <p>First, I am concerned about how District 17 was created. I am greatly concerned that it was created based on partisan influence, with the express intent of creating a safe Republican District, violating the constitutional goals of compactness, contiguousness, adherence to geographic boundaries, and obviously, competitiveness. And all of this when we KNOW that a better map, LD Test Map Version 9.0, was possible, and practicable.</p> <p>Second, I believe that what was done with District 17 has created negative consequences for my neighborhood. Broadmoor-Broadway Village is a Central Tucson neighborhood. Part of Midtown. That is our Community of Interest. But in the current LD draft map, central Tucson neighborhoods are split across 3 different LDs in order to support what has been done with District 17. My neighborhood has been forced into the head of the dragon-shaped District 21. We've been separated from most of the other Midtown neighborhoods, and joined instead with the rural portions of Southern Arizona all the way down to Nogales and the Mexican border. That is not our community of interest, and that does not create a legislative environment in which I feel our interests can be fairly and vigorously represented.</p> <p>I know that you can do better. Test Map 9.0 showed us that. We can keep central Tucson neighborhoods together. And we can create districts that are more competitive, and hence more responsive to citizens of all political viewpoints. I ask you, go back to Test Map 9.0 if that is what it takes, but please, reunite our Midtown neighborhoods. Respect these neighborhoods as the Community of Interest that they are, and make the LDs in Southern Arizona more representative of the intent of our Constitutional goals.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:25	Thomas William Hollender	Congressional District 1 Redistricting	<p>My name is Tom Hollender and I live in Nutrioso, Apache County, Arizona. I have lived here and taught at Round Valley Unified School District for 34 years. My daughter graduated from Round Valley High School in Eagar and had friends and acquaintances from both the White Mountain Apache and Navajo tribes. I've seen firsthand the importance that these tribes contribute their economic, civic, and cultural support to all of the communities in east central and northeastern Arizona.</p> <p>Please support the Congressional Draft Map proposed by the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission, CDF010. This proposal will protect the voting power of communities of color, reflecting the ethnic diversity of this area of Arizona and protecting these cultural ties and historical connections.</p> <p>The current map proposals will disrupt these communities, are not compact in area, and the populations are dissimilar in their ideology. We have little in common with Prescott and Yavapai counties if they were brought into our district, which will create division and discord.</p> <p>Again, please support CDF010, the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission Proposal. Keep the lines as close to the present congressional boundaries as possible.</p>

12/03/2021 - 21:26	Thomas William Hollender	Congressional District 1 Redistricting	<p>My name is Tom Hollender and I live in Nutrioso, Apache County, Arizona. I have lived here and taught at Round Valley Unified School District for 34 years. My daughter graduated from Round Valley High School in Eagar and had friends and acquaintances from both the White Mountain Apache and Navajo tribes. I've seen firsthand the importance that these tribes contribute their economic, civic, and cultural support to all of the communities in east central and northeastern Arizona.</p> <p>Please support the Congressional Draft Map proposed by the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission, CDF010. This proposal will protect the voting power of communities of color, reflecting the ethnic diversity of this area of Arizona and protecting these cultural ties and historical connections.</p> <p>The current map proposals will disrupt these communities, are not compact in area, and the populations are dissimilar in their ideology. We have little in common with Prescott and Yavapai counties if they were brought into our district, which will create division and discord.</p> <p>Again, please support CDF010, the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission Proposal. Keep the lines as close to the present congressional boundaries as possible.</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:32	Lisa E Wolfe	IRC integrity in Pima County	<p>I urge you to maintain the integrity of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, which has been a model for other states. Do the right thing. Reject Map 10.0 for the reasons below:</p> <p>Pima County voters are 40% Democratic, 29% Republican, and 31% Independent and other parties. Under Map 9.0, Pima County districts were aligned almost proportionately (3 Democratic, 2 Republican, and 1 Competitive). Compact, contiguous districts with common priorities are sometimes naturally aligned politically. But voters in other districts can also hold common interests even though they don't hold common political beliefs. Both situations are reflected in Pima County in Map 9.0. For example, both the Democratic Tucson districts and the competitive District 17 exhibit strong support for public education. The compact, contiguous districts in the city happen to be naturally politically aligned, while complying with all IRC criteria. The areas originally included in District 17 also strongly support public education because of their demographics - Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, northern Tucson are in the Amphitheater school district; Marana's schools and the Catalina Foothills school district are also strongly supported by their communities. While the district (17) comprising these communities complies with IRC criteria, including common priorities, the voters hold different political beliefs, which makes the district competitive, encouraging voter engagement and a dynamic, rather than a stagnant, one-sided Legislature.</p> <p>But the Commission, prompted by Commissioner Mehl and Senator Leach, have gerrymandered this naturally competitive District 17 into a Republican district. Comm. Mehl said explicitly he wants a 3rd guaranteed Republican seat in Pima County even though Republicans already have their proportionate share of safe seats in Pima County (2 of 6) and even though his configuration violates all IRC criteria. Senator Leach said he wants to include SaddleBrooke, which is in Pinal County, in District 17 so that he can keep his Senate seat. Including SaddleBrooke violates all IRC criteria; it is a retirement community, geographically distant from the Northern Tucson suburbs; it does not share the suburbs' concern for public education and other interests of the family-oriented, age-diverse communities in Pima County.</p> <p>Neither partisan purpose nor a sitting Senator's intervention in order to keep his seat are on the list of IRC redistricting criteria. In fact, the stated reasons for the maps proposed by Mehl and Leach are prime examples of gerrymandering, which an Independent Commission is supposed to guard against.</p> <p>Note: I wanted to attend the Dec. 4 hearing, but am not confident that all attendees will observe Covid precautions.</p>

12/03/2021 - 21:42	Suzanne Hetts	The effects of redistricting on Sun City residents	<p>Your proposed redistricting that puts Sun City in CD 9 along with Mohave county and communities in northern AZ and splitting Sun City into 2 different legislative districts fails to follow the criteria established by state law. You clearly are ignoring the guideline of respecting communities of interest (COI) Sun City has little in common with more rural, agrarian communities that we would be lumped in with this plan. It's clear from other comments that many in those communities agree with this criticism. Sun City should remain in districts that include Maricopa county because our interests are better aligned with that county than the so called "river counties". Second, you are charged with keeping the districts competitive yet your plan will do just the opposite, giving one party a significant advantage over the other with the end result being meaning that the district's representative will be selected in one party's primary, and not the general election. And finally, the inclusion of rural counties impacts the geographical compactness of the district putting you at odds with the requirement of creating districts that geographically compact and contingent. Your charge is to serve the people you represent, not political parties. Your proposal clearly does the latter and not the former. If you pass this, you are not doing your jobs. Listen to your constituents and make decisions that best serve US not your political interests.</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:47	Abreeza Zegeer	Public Meeting 12/06/2021 Redistricting	<p>Personal Comments to the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) to be made part of the Public Record</p> <p>I have listened to part of today's (12/3/2021) public meeting and it was interesting that many folks from across Arizona have voiced similar issues with the proposed new IRC Maps. I am appalled at the partisan gerrymandering influences in the IRC, ignoring the rules of Redistricting, specifically the requirement of having geographically compact and contiguous Districts. The lack of respect for communities' interest and common concerns in the proposed Congressional District 7 redistricting divides and cuts through our viable multicultural area that includes the UA, 4th Ave, Downtown and the area south of Broadway.</p> <p>The current district northern suburbs (LD 17) include Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, and Catalina Foothills, The proposed Legislative District 17, is not contiguous, avoids (eliminates Casas Adobes) and proposes to add the Houghton Corridor, Tanque Verde and Vail. This is partisan cut and paste selection with little regard to our communities or the redistricting rules whose only goal is to reduce the voting power Democrats, Independents and other political parties who are not Republican,</p> <p>We have the right to request and demand that voting equality of our southern Arizona communities and be fully represented in our Congressional and Legislative Districts. Is it the job of the IRC to dilute the voting power of most citizens in a certain area? Or is it their job to create equity based geographically compact and contiguous districts that is representative of the folks who live there?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and hard work. Abreeza Zegeer, [REDACTED] Tucson, AZ 85713</p>
12/03/2021 - 21:57	CJ Jones	Comments on Redistricting	<p>My name is CJ Jones. I live at [REDACTED] in Tucson. ( East of 4th Avenue – CD7)</p> <p>I am a Registered Professional Civil Engineer and have worked for multiple governmental organizations in several different US states as well as in Europe. I have been seriously politically engaged during my entire career in various cities- specifically in Santa Monica CA, Mendocino County CA and for the last twenty years here in Tucson.</p> <p>I believe that competitive districts are good for democracy in that they get voters engaged in the political process. Competitive districts also lessen the chances of extremist candidates winning elected office—something I believe is particularly pertinent here in Arizona.</p> <p>With that in mind, I request that District 17 include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde in the Eastern legislative districts.</p> <p>I would also like to request that the contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, the University of Arizona, and Fourth Avenue remain in CD7. I request that CD7 include areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.</p> <p>Independent Redistricting Commission criteria legislatively require districts to be compact and prohibit "gerrymandering", a term I understand, comes from a comment made years ago that, on a map, a certain politician's district looked like a Gerrymander, a species of lizard. When I look at a map of LD17, it looks to me more like a Gerrymander than a compact district.</p> <p>I urge you to do the right thing and comply with the criteria established by law that created the Independent Redistricting Commission and prohibits partisan gerrymandering.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

12/03/2021 - 22:02	Diane Allen	Redistricting	Don't gerrymandering Green Valley. Your disgusting tactics are so transparent. 2LrRK
12/03/2021 - 22:05	Tina Whitley	Is the AIRC truly independent?	I have been following the AIRC since you first began meeting. And the questions I continue to ask myself is: Are all members of the committee taking its mission seriously? If so, how will the results of the commission's work prove that? The results will prove the commission's independence if: 1) The redrawing of the congressional and legislative districts „reflect the results of the 2020 census. 2) „The concept of one person, one vote dictates that districts should be equal in population.“ 3) „Facts to be considered are the federal Voting Rights Act, district shape, geographical features, respect for communities of interest and potential competitiveness.“ I repeat, RESPECT for communities of interest and potential competitiveness. And yet, it has come to light that an incumbent politician has abused the AIRC safeguards to influence the redistricting process and this politician is being listened to by some members of the commission. <a href="https://azdem.org/caught-emails-reveal-covert-efforts/">https://azdem.org/caught-emails-reveal-covert-efforts/</a> . I question the independence of Chair Erika Neuberg who is dismissive of input from communities of interest such as the Navajo Nation, Latino Coalition, League of Women Voters, Common Cause, Lucha AZ, Mi Familia Vota, and yet invites lobbyists to a business meeting. Arizona is already in the throws of having its election integrity attacked by a party whose only goal is to hang on to its razor thin majority by doing whatever it takes to accomplish that. The AIRC must remain faithful to its mission. Partisanship has no place in this process.
12/03/2021 - 22:18	David Williams	District 17 Draft Map	IRC Statement 12/4/2021 Hello everyone. My name is David Williams, and my family and I have lived in the Tanque Verde area of Tucson for more than 20 years. Thank you for giving me the opportunity today to address you about District 17 as it appears in your Adopted Draft Legislative Map. I am against your proposed design because of its sprawling, non-contiguous shape, but most importantly because of its lack of competitiveness. I'm sure you would agree that successful democracy is based on the energetic competition of ideas and candidates. If so, then in our Arizona system of organizing democracy into districts, if we favor one party or another with tilted boundaries, we are, in effect, undermining democracy itself. Put another way, so called "safe districts" work against democracy. Ideally, all 30 districts would be competitive, and none would be safe. That would be the fairest way for the citizens of Arizona to express themselves. In the past we've created a legacy of fiefdoms of perpetual empowerment. Of 30 districts, 24 are considered "safe". One problem with that is that winning candidates in safe districts can be more relaxed, and accordingly less responsive. How does that serve us well? It's important that our representatives be concerned about our well-being all of the time. Listening to us and solving our problems is their job. So, I am requesting that you reject the "safe district" rationale of the adopted map in favor of actual democracy by adopting Commissioner Lerner's LD Test Map v9.0. It is much more compact, contiguous, and competitive. Thank you very much. David L. Williams, [REDACTED] Tucson 85749
12/03/2021 - 22:23	Douglas Davis	Redistricting District 7	I am a resident and registered voter in Lakeside and want to voice my approval of the approved Draft map legislative District 7. This gives residents in this area the best opportunity for equal representation for all tax paying citizens that resident in this District.
12/03/2021 - 22:23	PETER BECSKEHAZY	Redistricting	No on proposed LD-17.

12/03/2021 - 22:43	Judith Torres	Request to reconsider changing from map 10.0 to map 0055	<p>December 3, 2021 Dear Independent Redistricting Commissioners: I am a resident of Green Valley, AZ and have many concerns about the current redistricting map 10.0. Please consider map 0055. I have read your mission statement and I find several areas where map10.0 does not comply.</p> <p>1.Competitiveness within each district: This has to do with one-person, one vote and be roughly equal in population. Map 10.0 does not meet this requirement for LD District 19. It is clear gerrymandering that gives Republicans a clear advantage that will outweigh any chance for Democrats to compete. 2.Geographical features: The Santa Rita Mountains form a geographical boundary. In map 10.0 you have ignored this requirement. Green Valley is on the Western side of the Santa Ritas and the majority of LD District 19 is on the Eastern side. 3.Communities of Interest: Green Valley has very little in common with communities on the Eastern side of the Santa Ritas. Map 10.0 has separated Green Valley from our closest communities of Sahuarita, Tucson and Tubac. These are the communities where we have family and friends, where we shop and where we go to church. I want to thank the commissioners for their work. Hopefully, your will consider my concerns and instead use map LD District 0055. That map appears to honor all requirements legally needed to meet the objectives of redistricting.</p> <p>Sincerely, Judith Torres [REDACTED] Green Valley, AZ 85614 [REDACTED]</p>
12/03/2021 - 22:48	Valerie Spike Peterson	Comments to present at Dec 4 meeting of IRC	<p>Comments to present at the Independent Redistricting Commission Hearing 4 December 2021</p> <p>I am V Spike Peterson, for 31 years a Tucson resident and Professor of Political Science at the University of Arizona. I first thank you for the (too often under-appreciated) time and effort you invest in your work as Commissioners. Not surprisingly, I am someone who takes very seriously the privilege and responsbility of being a citizen of the United States. I am deeply committed to and actively participate in politics, in hopes of ensuring that the democratic principles (small d) – which so many have died for – are not further undermined by partisan bias. My comments today focus on a single but absolutely crucial point: Competitive districts are a cornerstone of democracy, and the Arizona State Constitution, the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act legally establish guidelines that prohibit partisan gerrymandering. We know that heavily partisan districts undermine democratic objectives by effectively discouraging inclusive participation. The voices, priorities and votes of not only the marginalized party but the 31% of independent voters in Arizona are effectively side-lined in non-competitive districts. My specific request is that District 17 include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes. But my larger and emphatic request is that the IRC abide by legislated guidelines, which many observers argue, I believe persuasively, are violated by the proposed redistricting maps. No one can doubt that the foundations of our democracy are currently threatened by polarizing dynamics, and research shows that heavily partisan districts foster the election of extremist candidates. You have an opportunity, indeed an obligation, to weaken the probability of that outcome by ensuring competitive districts. I urge you to meet the challenge of this responsibility. Thank you.</p> <p>Professor V. Sp ke Peterson, [REDACTED] Tucson, AZ 85705</p>
12/03/2021 - 22:51	Barbara M. Cain	Proposed LD17	<p>I wish to compliment the Commissioners on dividing up Arizona into unique districts. There are guidelines to follow but I guess they were not agreeable. I might be in LD17 if that does not get changed. I want to compliment our Commissioner from Pima County for his excellent job of designing LD17. It wraps around Tucson from Vail to Casa Adobes and then bulges like a well fed snake to take in Oro Valley, Saddlebrook, and Maranna. Then it continues along the Tucson Mountains. I appears like one of the man eating snakes of the jungle wrapped around Tucson, taking away the life of the community. I doubt it will pass inspection by the Courts but it is a lovely example of gerrymandering! I am not sure that the commission realizes the distrust that is felt my many across Arizona. The Rules are quite simple but do take some effort to follow IF you want it to be in line with our Constitution.</p>

12/03/2021 - 22:58	susan dalby	redistricting	<p>I am a voting citizen of Portal, Arizona. I have lived in southern Arizona for 56 years, and my husband and I both practiced medicine in Tucson for many years. We retired to Portal because we love the borderlands.</p> <p>As I understand the redistricting process, districts are to be fair, competitive and respectful of the integrity of inter-connected communities. Thank you for your hard work, but I think the draft map does NOT meet these criteria.</p> <p>Our families, friends, teachers and doctors live in the borderlands. I don't even know anyone in Graham, Greenlee, or Pinal, in spite of my 56 years in southern Arizona</p> <p>Those of us in Portal have nothing in common culturally or commercially with the people in the counties north of us. They do not share our lifestyle or our needs.</p> <p>Our towns in the borderlands of Arizona are very closely linked. This is our home and where we have always worked, shopped, vacationed, had jury duty and medical care. And we all share concerns and familiarity with immigration that Graham and Greenlee and Pinal do not appreciate.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you redraw the draft plan to accommodate these strong community ties.</p>
12/03/2021 - 23:17	Jeannie Majzler-Amato	Redistricting	Very happy with the redistributing of District 6 & 7. Thank you so much for hearing us and making changes so that we can have a voice.
12/03/2021 - 23:17	Aaron Jared Essif	Leg District 17	<p>Good Day,</p> <p>My family and I have lived in Marana for the past 16 years. The current (Map 10.0) plan for Leg. District 17 is neither Compact, Contiguous, Competitive nor fully contains communities of interest! Map 9.0 would much better fulfill these REQUIREMENTS. Please, either use Map 9.0 or change Map 10.0. Thank you. Aaron Essif</p>
12/03/2021 - 23:38	Theresa Jacobs	Gerrymandering	I care about education, fair wages, fair taxes, combating homelessness, helping the poverty class, civil rights, equal rights for minorities, and combating climate change. Please please please Don't allow my district to be taken over by Republicans who only care about enriching further the wealthy class. I want to see gerrymandering outlawed all throughout the country as it is a form of corrupt voter suppression. I will never ever vote for a Republican again because they have no good policies to help the average American that struggles financially on a regular basis. Do what you can to prevent my district from Republican gerrymandering so that I will have a Democratic Legislator who represents my progressive values. God forbid if my vote is thrown out because it doesn't favor a Republican. I want to see big corporate money also taken out of politics. I also want a constitutional amendment to reach the federal law for clean and fair elections that does away with dark PAC money.
12/03/2021 - 23:42	JERRY HUBBARD	Northeastern Arizona Redistricting, LD7 & LD6	<p>We in rural Eastern Arizona are asking the Commission to reunite the five plus Eastern counties whose citizens live in rural areas and small towns with common interests, in order to restore our voice and our voting power in the legislature. This is shown in the currently proposed map of LD7 with some minor changes, and consists of Graham, Gila and Graham counties, the Southern portion of Navajo and Apache counties, along with the Copper Corridor of Eastern Pinal County, the Verde Valley of Southeast Yavapai County and Northern Cochise County. In the same way, we are asking that you respect the interests of the urban communities of Apache Junction, Gold Canyon and San Tan Valley. Please do not mix urban communities with rural ones.</p> <p>We are also asking that you keep Native American communities combined with Flagstaff, since they have many common interests, while keeping them separate from the five plus Eastern counties. This is shown in the currently proposed map of LD6.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>

12/03/2021 - 23:46	Steven Spain	Communities of Interest Surrounding City of Tucson	<p>The voters of the City of Tucson have identified themselves to be starkly discordant with the towns and CDPs around them. The electorate within the city limits comprise a community of interest in proximity to but _vastly different_ from surrounding areas such as Avra Valley, Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, Catalina Foothills, Tanque Verde, Vail, Corona de Tucson, Sahuarita, and Green Valley.</p> <p>While balancing total population and constraining for shape and size, these numerous compatible communities of interest that surround--but do not meander into--Tucson city limits are deserving of representation that understands their deeply-rooted similarity and how patently incongruous these communities are to the city. These various communities should all sit within a very few districts separate from the City of Tucson. Envisioning a small number of such districts as being broader districts with the enclave of the City of Tucson carved out of them is indeed the appropriate way to view mapping of the metropolitan area; that will deliver the balanced, reasonable redistricting of communities of interest with which your commission is charged.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and efforts, Steve Spain, lifelong Pima County resident</p>
12/04/2021 - 01:48	Tracy Scheinkman	Maps are not competitive enough; there is no reason for that; they can be made more competitive	<p>The current IRC proposed maps are neither fair nor competitive. But they can be made better very easily. In both Southern Arizona and Northern Arizona there are districts whose shapes are designed to pack and crack communities of color and in particular to connect people in disparate areas together. These result in what are clearly gerrymandered shapes to some districts. Arizona is split virtually 50/50 between those who tend to vote Democratic and those who tend to vote Republican. For that reason it is obvious that at least half of all districts created should be competitive. Yet we have extremely few districts that truly are competitive. The definition of highly competitive as being a 4% split is in fact non-competitive. For a district to be highly competitive it needs to be within 2% points. That a district that is between 4-9% is competitive, is laughable. If you get 6% difference that district will be effectively non-competitive. Competitiveness matters. It is the glue that forces people to compromise. Without it we have extremism. Build true competitive districts. Thank you.</p>
12/04/2021 - 04:02	Marshall Magruder	Interstate 19 Corridor (LD19/21)	<p>The proposed v10.0 map is contrary to the I-19 north-south population corridor that connects Nogales, Rio Rico with Tubac, Green Valley and Sahuarita to Tucson. This major transportation corridor connects rural communities with two cities (Nogales-Tucson) where we travel to work, for shopping, for medical treatment and is a major tourist corridor connecting Mexico with our state. It also will be the new Interstate 11 and thus fragmenting between two LDs is not wise.</p> <p>Our commercial businesses provide over \$2B in produce from the south to the rest of the country, especially during colder months. It is our lifeline.</p> <p>Splitting Tubac, Green Valley and Sahuarita into two legislative districts for reasons that are not in accordance with Prop 106 frankly does not make (common) sense.</p> <p>There are NO East-West roads as the Santa Cruz Valley mountains make a natural barrier between LD19/LD21.</p> <p>Maps 10.1 and 10.2 keep Santa Cruz County, the smallest in Arizona, whole and are considerably better than 10.0 based on what is best for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for consideration and please decide on Map 10.1 or 10.2 and reject Map 10.0.</p>
12/04/2021 - 04:55	Jenni Pagano	Ld9	<p>Please keep Ld9 compact and fair. I live in Casas Adobes and have concerns completely unlike those in Vail. Gerrymandering us into a red block is completely disenfranchising voters with real concerns for our community. I beg you to redraw the map.</p>
12/04/2021 - 05:06	Miller Madjerich	Changing the district voting for Oro valley	<p>Please don't change our own district we don't want to part of Tucson district we want to be individual from Tucson thank you</p>

12/04/2021 - 05:29	Kimberly D Williams	Draft Map 10.0 LD3.	<p>MY COMMUNITY OF INTEREST FOR 25 YEARS HAS BEEN TO THE SOUTH OF CAREFREE AND CAVE CREEK, ALONG THE CAVE CREEK AND TATUM CORRIDORS WE ARE A SUBURB OF PHOENIX IT IS WHERE WE SHOP AND TAKE CARE OF OUR HEALTH, LIVE OUR LIVES, AND HAVE COMMON INTERESTS IN CIVIC ISSUES, NOT IN RURAL AREAS TO THE EAST.</p> <p>ALONG WITH THIS REDRAWING COMES A 20.42% COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE TO ONE PARTY OVER ANOTHER, ALMOST TRIPLE THE TOP END OF 7% SET BY THE COMMISSION FOR NEW DISTRICTS. THE 7% WAS SET FOR A GOOD REASON. COMPETITIVENESS KEEPS A REPRESENTATIVE REPUBLIC THRIVING, IT KEEPS THOSE ELECTED RESPONSIVE TO THE CONSTITUENCIES THEY REPRESENT.</p> <p>I HAVE LATELY WATCHED A NARROW, NARROW MAJORITY IN THE STATE SENATE AND HOUSE RUN ROUGHSHOD OVER THE -- BY ONE OR TWO SEATS -- MINORITY THESE PAST SEVERAL YEARS. THIS MODE OF OPERATING DOES NOT REPRESENT THE POPULATION OF ARIZONA IN 2021 WHICH IS MUCH MORE EVENLY SPLIT. THE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION HAS A RARE AND CRUCIAL OPPORTUNITY TO POSITIVELY IMPACT THE FAIRNESS OF REPRESENTATION AND THE TENOR OF POLITICS IN THIS STATE. I URGE YOU TO CONSIDER THIS POSSIBILITY AND RESPONSIBILITY IN YOUR WORK, AND PARTICULARLY IN LD3.</p>
12/04/2021 - 06:10	Jeffrey Howard King	Citizen Comments to the IRC	<p>I urge members of the Independent Redistricting Commission to adopt the map proposed by the Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission.</p> <p>As a resident of Clarkdale, and as curator of a museum focusing on the indigenous peoples of the Verde Valley, I cannot overemphasize the importance of establishing and retaining compact and contiguous voting districts for the Native American and rural communities of northeast Arizona. LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 support these communities of interest, and place the Yavapai County seat, Prescott, with the Colorado District — the community of interest which it most closely resembles.</p> <p>Thank you for the Commission's work, and your consideration of the Navajo Nation's Human Rights Commission's proposed LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010.</p> <p>Jeffrey H. King Margaret L. McQuaid</p>
12/04/2021 - 06:20	Thea Chalow	Gerrymandering is wrong	<p>The IRC should reject the surreptitious attempt of State Senator Vince Leach to create a cattywampus legislative district designed for the sole purpose of guaranteeing a Republican win in future elections. The people of Arizona took control of redistricting away from legislators 20 years ago. You are the INDEPENDENT Redistricting Commission and I urge you to reject the efforts of State Senator Leach and Marana Mayor Honea to gerrymander a "safe" Republican district.</p>
12/04/2021 - 06:51	DONNA ZIMMERLY	REDISTRICTING	<p>I am homeowner, retired and living in Fountain Hills for the past six years, a community that is east of, not a part of, Phoenix. I dine, exercise, learn, contribute, shop and entertain in my community of Fountain Hills. I sometimes shop and go to restaurants in Scottsdale but rarely Paradise Valley. Like Rio Verde, Fountain Hills is quiet and complete with retired folks and activities for us. Unlike Tempe and Phoenix, or south Scottsdale, we are not made up of young families, university students or tourists. District boundaries should be Scottsdale Road not I17, not Deer Valley airport. Thank you for your time and consideration and the opportunity to voice my opinion.</p>
12/04/2021 - 06:52	Nelda Elaine Collett	Independent Redistricting Commission	<p>I want to see maps that show equal representation in the districts. The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate. The IRC needs to do its job free of partisan influence.</p>
12/04/2021 - 07:10	Dave Wallig	Fair redistricting maps	<p>All citizens should be allowed to vote. State wide redistricting maps should be bipartisan and represent those living there</p>
12/04/2021 - 07:18	Paula E Palotay	Redistricting District 17	<p>I reside in Marana and am concerned about the redistricting of District 17 to include Vail. I understand that this question is to be decided and discussed this morning. Please consider equity and that this district should be compact, contiguous and competitive from Marana to the foothills, This includes Oro Valley and Casa Adobes.</p> <p>I respectfully submit this request for consideration.</p>

12/04/2021 - 07:24	Jody Inman	Redistricting Eastern Arizona	I lived and taught on the White Mountain Apache Reservation, where my sons graduated from high school. They are still in touch with their Apache friends. In the 34 years I've lived here, I've observed the deep connection of communities in Eastern Arizona, including the Apache and Navajo Nations, with all the bordering towns of Navajo and Apache Counties. The schools, healthcare facilities, post offices, stores and businesses are used by all of us. Our congressional and legislative maps should reflect these common interests and not disenfranchise any citizen's voice. I ask that you support the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission draft map, CDF 010, to create competitive districts where we are not represented by extremists.
12/04/2021 - 07:25	Julie Rayda	Legislative Maps Unfair	<p>The current maps you are considering are unfair and will not allow the people to speak!</p> <p>Alternative legislative maps were submitted but they have not been considered by the IRC. In these proposed maps, named LDF 050 and LDF 051, Flagstaff, Sedona and the Verde Valley are kept together in a triangle-shaped district that runs along the Mogollon Rim and the Navajo Nation retains Navajo and Apache County. Both of these maps better meet the criteria of compactness and contiguousness and the LDF 050 map is competitive and the LDF 051 respects the Voting Rights Act requirements.</p> <p>Our primary critique of the draft maps is that they are not competitive. Prop 106 created the Independent Redistricting Commission to make competitive maps.</p> <p>The proposed legislative draft maps move the previously competitive LD 6 and replace it with the new non-competitive LD 7 which splits Sedona and Flagstaff up and separates them from each other. This results in three non-competitive districts in Northern Arizona with vote spreads of 28.5% Republican and 29.8% Republican in proposed districts 5 and 7. The new LD 6 which packs the city of Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation has a 42.4% Democratic vote spread.</p>
12/04/2021 - 07:29	Lynne Oland	Districts 17 and 7	<p>I am deeply opposed to the proposed map of District 17. I fail to understand how this proposed district meets two of the critical criteria set for districts: that they be geographically compact and contiguous and that they represent communities with common interests. Vail, Houghton corridor and Tanque Verde should be in the eastern legislative district. Furthermore, it is distressingly obvious that the purpose of this proposed district is to create another safe district. This I find appalling because safe districts routinely fail to address the interests of those in the minority in those districts. To my mind, in the interest of democracy, the primary goal in forming a district should be that it be competitive.</p> <p>In addition, for the same reasons, contiguous communities of interest - UA, Fourth Ave and the adjacent parts of downtown should remain in CD7.</p> <p>Stop egregious gerrymandering!</p>
12/04/2021 - 07:30	Thomas and Jean Meconi	adopted legislative map	<p>Vince Leach, Grant Hanna, Galen Kimmick, Anna Clark. What do these people have in common? If you guessed "Republican operatives who acted behind closed doors to submit a map of their choice and promote it via the Marana mayor's office and then proceed to have the same delivered to the IRC's Chairperson without revealing the true authors of the map" you'd be right. If you were asked who pushed this map forward "to tell the IRC that the maps for south AZ provide us with the opportunity to send a Republican to the AZ Legislature"? (Hint: the map would guarantee his own reelection.) Congratulations, you're right! It's our very own Senator Vincent Leach!</p> <p>One of the primary goals of the Independent Redistricting Commission law was to remove politicians from the redistricting process, especially incumbents. Leach's interference in the system with the knowledge and cooperation of the other Republicans is the very definition of gerrymandering, the very thing the IRC was enacted to prevent. To then pretend that the map was supported by a local mayor by writing the letter of support for the Mayor's signature shows there are no limits to what they will do to retain power.</p> <p>The Constitution, common sense and fairness require that Oro Valley be placed with its actual community of interest: Casa Adobes, Marana, and northern Tucson. To allow Sen. Leach and his cronies to shape a district to their liking is gerrymandering and will assure just one thing, long, drawn out litigation.</p>
12/04/2021 - 07:31	richard treiber	IRC redistricting	Partisan gerrymandering is prohibited under the IRC criteria, what you have done is prohibited. I want to see maps that meet IRC criteria and reflect equal representation in the districts.

12/04/2021 - 07:36	Gardner Williams	Competitive Congressional District	I writing because I have ties to the great city of Sierra Vista, Arizona, and many surrounding areas I ke Bisbee, Tombstone... I have live in Sierra Vista for approximately thirty years and the changes have been slow. Except when it is time for "We the people " to vote I am a retired County employee and a retired Civil Service employee As the President of (NAACP 99 20) we have always been on the side of the voter and it still stands today with myself. I would like to ask the Independent Redistricting Commission to review and study the alternate CD6 map. It provides a close boundaries of the old CD2 map and it accounts for population that has gradually risen throughout the years. Our community has suffered enough economic disparities. Fort Huachuca and Davis Monthan are outstanding installations in our southern area. We have our borders with Mexico that we do commerce with. Our national parks. The people who live in the border town area travel to Sierra Vista to shop and the people in Sierra Vista/Fort Huachuca shop in Tucson. We have medical appointment at our wonderful VA hospital in Tucson. Southern Arizona is a community that doesn't need to be involved with another redistricting controversy. The alternate CD6 map with the changes, in my opinion should suffice. To change the Congressional map entirely is extreme and our communities seem to always slowly disappear because of decision that favors one and not all. Thank You, Gardner Williams
12/04/2021 - 08:01	Elaine Bomkamp	Redistricting	I am advocating for LDF050, LDF051 and CDF010 to make these districts contiguous, compact, and competitive. Please.  Thank you.
12/04/2021 - 08:24	Leslie L Hunten	Make redistricting fair!	Comments to the IRC Dec 4 at Sheraton Hello, and thank you to the Commission for seeking our input. My name Leslie Hunten, I'm a Tucson resident since 1970. I consider the whole of greater Tucson to be my home and community of interest. I shop, dine and attend events everywhere, and the people who live here have more in common with each other than we have differences. This city is a delightfully diverse but unified population that supports arts, culture, education, the environment, citizen rights and business. It's also highly Democratic, with 40% registered Democrats, 31% Independent, and 29% Republican. The 2011 redistricting process respected this distribution, and still produced competitive boundaries that gave candidates a fair chance. Today, the current proposed map 10.0 is a different and disturbing picture. Districts have been radically changed. LD 17 and 21 do not follow the commission's own guidelines. 17 is not compact nor a COI; 21 is not competitive, and the vote spread is 10 points, which is way beyond your allowable deviation of 5 points. The IRC is supposed to be non-partisan, but this map is clearly a political manipulation. You have even acknowledged that the purpose is to create a new, "safe" Republican district. This is partisan. I call this new version 10, gerrymandering. You have asked for community input, so I want to register my objection to the LD 17 and 21 districts. A previous map version 9.0 by Commissioner Lerner represents Tucson more accurately, and shows that districts can be truly competitive. I ask that you seriously consider returning to version 9 to fulfill your duty of fair, non-partisan redistricting. Thank you. Leslie Hunten
12/04/2021 - 08:29	Richard Freeze	Redistricting proposal	"The citizens of Rural Eastern Arizona have these several months been calling on you to respect our Communities of Interest and restore our rural voice to the Legislature. Now we join with our neighbors of Urban Apache Junction, Gold Canyon, and Santan Valley to respect their Communities of Interest, as well! Urban must be joined with Urban, and Rural joined with Rural. Do not diminish either of our votes and voices by mixing and combining us!  We respect our Reservation neighbors, but rural Eastern AZ communities are not their communities of interest. Remove our communities, incorporated and unincorporated, from their district, and keep like-minded Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation. Metro Flagstaff has the resources needed by the Indian communities, such as education, public services etc., which rural areas do NOT have.  We, the rural citizens of Eastern Arizona, urge you to adopt the 5+ Eastern Counties proposal, solely rural and undivided: Graham, Greenlee, Gila, southern Navajo and Apache, the Copper Corridor, Verde Valley, and northern Cochise. And, respect Urban communities: Apache Junction and Gold Canyon!"

12/04/2021 - 08:42	Victoria Vela	Redistricting	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Let me begin by thanking you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) I believe the voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps, and I think you have all served with that spirit of mind to this point in the process.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I am thrilled that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons I previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few.</p> <p>You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. I believe it can be done, so I ask each of you to strive for that goal and create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Victoria Vela</p>
--------------------	---------------	---------------	--

12/04/2021 - 08:43	Bruce Plenk	Concerns with Tucson districts in draft maps	<p>Dear IRC-</p> <p>I am disturbed that you have used an unfair and incorrect partisan analysis in dividing up Tucson's District 17. The northern suburbs-Oro Valley, Marana, Catalina Foothills and Casas Adobes should be kept together, not mashed with Eastside areas like Vail or Tanque Verde, which have no connection to the northern areas. Please return to the original map that put those two very distinct areas in separate districts.</p> <p>Regarding CD7, downtown Tucson, UA and 4th Avenue are all one area of common interest, even physically joined by the streetcar. These should remain together, along with areas south of Broadway.</p> <p>This Commission can act fairly or be dragged down by excessive and illegal partisan gerrymandering. Please create districts that actually are communities of interest and create competitive districts, not ones that weaken democracy by pandering to not so subtle political motives.</p> <p>Thank you for your work.</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:47	Nancy E Fintzy	Redistricting	<p>I do NOT want to be part of the gerrymandered new LD16. I definitely prefer to remain part of a contiguous area sharing common concerns as I have been in the past. This decision should NOT be so politically motivated on either side so that we voters can fairly make our wishes known, as we have done in the past.</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:47	Mike Wilson	Keep Tohono O'odham Nation in Tucson area	<p>The Tohono O'odham Nation and its citizens must remain connected to the Tucson area for purposes of the redistricting map. The O'odham village of Schukson was the cradle of the city of Tucson. The Santa Cruz River Basin has been the ancestral homeland of O'odham for at least 4,000 years. Honor our cultural and spiritual legacy by keeping the Tohono O'odham Nation and citizens within the greater Tucson area. Respectfully, Mike Wilson. Tohono O'odham and military retiree</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:48	Rebecca Shearin	Use the LAWFUL draft v. 9.0	<p>Plain and simply, the recently submitted map to the IRC (particularly LD17) blatantly violates the constitutional criteria set forth by the IRC. Arizona has been the front runner with its lawful, democratic districting this past 10 years - something we all can be proud of regardless our party affiliation. Let's not give that up now in this crucial time in the history of our wonderful state and country, and in the interest of a healthy democracy, which begins locally. Gerrymandering doesn't support a good, competitive environment which renders better politicians, efficient governance and happier constituents. (i.e. Gerrymandering doesn't support a strong democracy in action!) The latest, last minute map violates just about every criteria outlined in the IRC constitution! This is shocking and unacceptable. Please do the right thing. Revisit v.9.0 which reflects (check the data!) every attempt to follow the constitutional criteria for redistricting.</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:48	Cindy Wagner	Fair Maps	<p>Dear Commissioners: This is your opportunity to make a positive impact by creating fair maps and competitive districts, not by making safe districts as is the case with the draft maps for District 6 and 7. This results in three non-competitive districts in Northern Arizona with vote spreads of 28.5% Republican and 29.8% Republican in proposed districts 5 and 7. The new LD 6 which packs the city of Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation has a 42.4% Democratic vote spread. You are encouraged to use the maps proposed by Coconino County LDF 050 and LDF 051 because of competitiveness, contiguousness and compactness. Please do the right thing by Arizona and Prop 106</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:52	Susan Husand	Redistricting in Pima County	<p>Arizona voters deserve to have competitive districts that reflect both the diversity and common interests of our communities. It has been such a disappointment to see how party special interests have successfully derailed this redistricting process. The draft maps for Congressional District 7 and Legislative District 21 fail to meet the standard for competitive races or for representing common interests. The neighborhood I live in, just south of Broadway Blvd. in Tucson has been included with the rural communities of Santa Cruz County and southern Pima County. Their issues are not the same as those living in the center of a large urban community. How can one representative be fair and effective in representing these widely diverse communities. Almost all of the Tohono Oodham reservation is included in District 7 which further decreases their opportunities for fair representation. The cornerstone of our democratic way of governance is representation through voting, and voting that is fair and reflects the will of the citizens of their community. Please make an effort to see the future of our state and our communities, and not just the wishes of your own politics.</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:54	Jim Myers	Redistricting	<p>Please please choose LDC 050,051 and cdf 010.</p> <p>It is time to right the wrong and have competitive districts. It is NEVER good for the well-being of all citizens to have unfair advantages.</p> <p>Thank you all for you hard work. You are a special group. Protect all Arizona</p>

12/04/2021 - 08:55	Barbara Hutchinson	Redistricting Concerns	<p>My name is Barbara Hutchinson and I have lived in the Rio Cancion Townhomes in Pima County for four years, and before that for 27 years within the city of Tucson. This year I retired from the University of Arizona after 35 years in library and project management positions</p> <p>For the past few months, I have been watching the redistricting process in the hope that the current Independent Redistricting Committee would demonstrate a model of fair and unbiased redistricting for the nation. In 2000, the voters of Arizona made it clear that they wanted politics and ideology taken out of this process. However, some of the proposed maps do not fulfill that promise.</p> <p>In particular, the gerrymandered District 17 does not meet the requirements of compactness, competitiveness, and keeping communities of interest together. For example, Marana, Oro Valley and Casas Adobes have little if anything in common with the communities of Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde. The creation of "safe" districts is absolutely un-democratic and promotes extremism at the expense of healthy dialogue and equal participation. This is a disservice to the citizens of Arizona and demeans the political process.</p> <p>I am requesting and urging the IRC to abide by Arizona law and make the changes necessary to give Arizona non-partisan, competitive districts.</p> <p>Sincerely, Barbara Hutchinson [REDACTED] Tucson, AZ 85718 [REDACTED]</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:58	Lisa Wolfe	Pima County Districts 18 and 21	<p>As a result of the gerrymandering to LD 17, Map Version 10.0 distorts Districts 18 and 21 in order to fill in the gaps and take in the leftovers from LD 17. Please reconsider Map 10.0. Maintain the IRC's integrity and undo the prohibited gerrymandering.</p>
12/04/2021 - 08:59	Lawrence Peters	Proposed LD17 map	<p>I live in the Highlands at Dove Mountain (Marana bordering Oro Valley) and have serious reservation about the proposed LD17 map. LD17 doesn't meet the IRC's constitutional criteria. LD17 isn't contiguous when a mountain range sits right in the middle. The constituents residing in one part of the district are hours away from constituents living in other places. LD17 doesn't respect communities of interest. Dove Mountain/Marana has commonalities with Oro Valley, Casas Adobes and northern Pima County. They have similar demographics, economies, urbanization, and trajectories. Dove Mountain / Marana is urban-suburban, not rural. LD17 has an almost 10% vote spread which puts the legislative district in the uncompetitive range. LD 17 ignores the Catalina and Rincon Mountains. LD17 also ignores political boundaries by including Pinal County communities.</p>
12/04/2021 - 09:00	Christine A Stidley	Redistricting	<p>To the Independent Redistricting Committee: I am a resident of Pima County and live in the Tucson Mountains. My bonds are with the Tucson Mountain neighborhoods. They are not with Maricopa County. The proposed redistricting carves up the neighborhoods in the Tucson Mountains to join them with neighborhoods over 100 miles away. This action does not serve the people of Arizona. Provide a redistricting plan that works for the people of the state and not selected interests -- that's not how a democracy is supposed to work. Sincerely, Christine A Stidley</p>

12/04/2021 - 09:08	Jo Ann Caruthers	Draft CD6	<p>My name is Jo Ann Caruthers and I live in Hereford in Cochise County. I am a native Arizonan and I have worked both as an educator in Arizona's public schools (10 years) and as an engineer for various contractors on Fort Huachuca (25 years). I am now retired I am a conservationist and volunteer for several environmental organizations My Husband, now deceased, retired after over thirty years with the Arizona Air National Guard and the U.S. Air Force.</p> <p>My comments are in reference to the draft CD6. I don't feel the draft map fairly represents the varied Communities of Interest (COI) critical to Cochise County residents. I would like to see boundaries similar to the old CD 2 boundaries, which was compact, contiguous and competitive. I am supporting the map that was submitted to the AZIRC as Competitive Congressional District—Southern Arizona (CDF001). This map like the old CD2 is compact, contiguous, competitive and represents some critical COIs far better than the draft CD6 map. Some of these COIs are in opposition to each other and a competitive district gives them all more of an opportunity to have their voices heard. Even if their candidates don't win all the time, the COI members will likely have more access to the winner and be represented by a less extreme candidate. A representative in a more competitive district is likely more responsive to all points of view than a representative who feels his/her seat is safe. I have experienced this personally in our legislative district. I want the congressional district to remain more competitive and more responsive to all points of view in a varied constituency.</p> <p>One COI of which I am a member is represented by Fort Huachuca in Cochise County and Davis Monthan Air Force Base on the east side of Tucson. Numbers fluctuate but there are approximately 8400 active duty military and 4400 Department of Defense civilians (Civil Service) between the two installations. Both are supported by large and small contracting companies. These companies employ numerous technical and non-technical employees directly supporting the various entities operating on the post and AFB. A large number of military retirees live in the surrounding communities and avail themselves of the services on the base and post. They have common concerns such as military budgets, employee and retiree benefits, and foreign policy to name a few. The draft CD6 boundaries minimize this COI in the Tucson area. The map we're recommending includes both installations as well as a larger area in Tucson likely to house or have businesses that rely on them for their livelihood. The voices of this COI should not be minimized any more than is necessary.</p> <p>2. Tucson and eastern Pima County share border-related concerns. These concerns include issues with immigrants, the border wall and associated concerns, trade and commerce associated with local business and the ports of entry. Homeland Security has a strong presence on both Fort Huachuca and DMAFB. Customs and Immigration has a strong presence in Cochise County and Pima County. Such is not the case with Graham, Greenlee or Pinal County. Many of these officers and their families live in and around both Tucson and in Benson and Sierra Vista. Note that there are actually several COIs in this general area having in some cases opposing views but these two counties share concerns that are felt in their daily lives and affecting their livelihoods directly associated with the border. This is much less the case further north.</p> <p>3. Synergy between Sierra Vista, Benson, and other parts of Cochise County with Tucson are much stronger than any ties with Pinal, Graham or Greenlee Counties. Highway 90 carries significant traffic largely going to and from Tucson. We shop in Tucson and depend on medical facilities there; many Tucson doctors schedule regular visits to Sierra Vista. We also frequent Tucson to shop and eat, for entertainment purposes, and to visit friends. A number of individuals who work on Fort Huachuca live in Tucson and commute. And there are others who live in Sierra Vista or Benson and commute to Tucson. Some families have one breadwinner working in Tucson and one working in the Sierra Vista/Fort Huachuca area. Graham, Greenlee, and Pinal counties look northward, not towards Cochise County or Tucson.</p> <p>4. The rural parts of Cochise County are not much like Graham and Greenlee Counties. Many of the residents of Safford, Morenci, Clifton, and Duncan depend on the mines in Morenci for their livelihood. There is minimal mining in Cochise County. Water issues are also different.</p> <p>5. The National Park Service and its employees and businesses dependent on the tourism they generate form another COI. Headquarters for the Saguaro National Park, a premier park, is in eastern Pima County. Chiricahua National Monument, Coronado National Monument, and Fort Bowie National Historic Site are in Cochise County. Generally allied with the parks are the San Pedro River National Conservation Area, other premier birding sites such as those at Ramsey Canyon and Portal and several wilderness areas. Wilderness areas in Cochise and Pima County include Miller Peak, Chiricahua, Peloncillo, and Rincon. The COI includes the many businesses that rely on the tourists these areas bring in as well as the conservation community they serve. .</p> <p>8. Our recommended map would be more compact than the draft CD6. It would keep important COIs together more and would keep from splitting Pinal and Santa Cruz further. Finally, our candidates of both parties would have a much more manageable area to cover</p> <p>THANK YOU for your time and attention. Again, I favor Competitive Congressional District--Southern Arizona (CDF-001)</p>
--------------------	------------------	-----------	---

12/04/2021 - 09:08	Lisa Beth Isabelle	Redistricting: proposed LD17 incomprehensible	The tortuous and incomprehensible route of the proposed LD17 district has the sole purpose of creating a safe Republican district in violation of the IRC principles to be compact, contiguous and competitive. Mr. Mehl's conflict of interest in using the SALC map, since he was an original founder of the Republican group, has been pointed out by others. I live in the Tanque Verde area and resent being placed into a district with the Northwest side of town rather than the east side areas contiguous to TV. Please re-organize this TV area into a sensible district formation. Your goal as IRC members is to be principled and independent.
12/04/2021 - 09:13	Selma Carrillo	Tucson Redistricting	<p>My name is Selma Carrillo. I live in the Highland Vista Cinco Via neighborhood which is bordered on the East by Craycroft the South by Broadway, and the North by Fifth Street. I live in Legislative District 10 which elects both Republicans and Democrats to the Legislature.</p> <p>My objection to Map 10.0, the legislative map, is that we are being moved into Legislative District 21 which is nothing like the urban area in which we live. We would be much better served in an urban district rather than one that includes rural areas that have a different community profile and may conflict with our voter interests. This commission is charged with creating maps that benefit the voters and their communities, and not political parties.</p> <p>I support the adoption of Map 9.0 and request that you do not adopt the current proposed legislative map.</p>
12/04/2021 - 09:14	Nancy Scharff	Independent Redistricting Commission draft maps	In the interest of abiding by your guidelines, I urge you to replace LD draft maps 5-7-6 with LDF050 and LDF 051, which would be more competitive, contiguous, and compact than your proposed maps. Likewise, I urge you to replace your CD2 draft map with CDF010, which provides more competitiveness, compactness and contiguousness than your proposed draft maps.
12/04/2021 - 09:18	Suzanne Baird	Redistricting	Arizona, with 35% of voters registered Republican and 32% registered Democrats, needs more congressional and legislative districts that are competitive. Among the congressional districts, only two or three should be "safe" districts for parties and among the legislative districts, no more than half should be "safe" districts. The safe districts should be close to evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats. Thank you for your attention.
12/04/2021 - 09:20	Barbara Mongan	Undemocratic Gerrymandering	The IRC is expressly prohibited from partisan gerrymandering. This is NOT your job! Dividing the districts to assure that one party is re-elected for a decade is not your job. Creating artificial divides is not your job. Diluting votes is not your job. Your job is to make sure that those who have common concerns are able to vote people into office who will address those concerns. Follow your own guidelines for fairness. Stop the partisan antics and DO your job!
12/04/2021 - 09:29	Rene Rebillot	Redistributing maps	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>From what I have heard and read you are doing a good job of drawing the new districts. Thank you for your service.</p> <p>I think the most important function of this commission is to draw competitive districts. I live in a "safe" Republican district. It is so stacked for the Republican candidates that Democrats need not bother to run. This really is a travesty because it denies me a choice. I vote for the candidate; not the party. During my lifetime, I have voted for Republicans and Democrats. Gerrymandering the maps to create "safe" districts for either party is not what America is about. Quite frankly, any candidate or political party advocating for protected or safe districts is demonstrating their fear of a free and fair election. This is cowardly.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. I understand that the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. You can do better and I urge you to improve the competitiveness in final maps.</p> <p>Please strive to make every district competitive. Give Arizona citizens a real choice. Eliminate the protected and safe districts.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Rene Rebillot</p>

12/04/2021 - 09:33	Laura Perez	Redistricting Comment	Hi, I live on 16th st. and Osborn in Phoenix, near the 51 freeway. I know you all have a tough job but I wanted to state some issues with Congressional District 1. I heard one of the hearings where many folks from North Scottsdale and Fountain Hills expressed that they did not want to be a district with more urban areas such as where I live. I agree with that, and I think we can solve this by making district one cut off at 101 and include more areas along the black canyon corridor. You could then connect district 8 with some of the areas that were in district 1 but didn't want to be in an urban district. Thank you for your work.
12/04/2021 - 09:34	Ann Fener	Redistricting	We need to keep communities of like needs and wants together. Do not separate Surprise, Sun City West and Sun City. Do not move us to areas we have nothing in common with for political purposes. This will not result in anything positive for those of us living in these areas.
12/04/2021 - 09:40	GEORGE V SMITH	REDISTRICTING OF DISTRICT 6 AND 7	I LIVE IN STAR VALLEY AZ. I would first like to Thank You for what has to be a tough job. I'm hoping you will apply "communities of Interest" as a priority factor. Having said that we don't believe Fagstaff or the Navajo reservation fits that template. Thank You for your consideration.
12/04/2021 - 09:43	Dawn Brimhall	Gilbert Legislative Districts	My name is Dawn Brimhall, and I live in Old West Estates in Gilbert, Maricopa County, AZ, where I purchased my home in 1998, and have lived here continuously since. I can see the Gilbert Water Tower from my neighborhood. When I moved here 30 years ago from Boise, Idaho, I immediately settled into Gilbert as "home." I'm a homeschooling mother of 6, the oldest of whom graduated from Mesquite High School, after attending Gilbert Elementary, Neely Elementary, Mesquite Jr. High, and Mesquite High School. The second oldest was a junior at Mesquite High School when I pulled them out to homeschool. I am a creature of habit and routine, and tend to like to be close to home. I usually shop within 5 square miles of my home, where I can find multiple grocery stores, Wal-Marts, even a Barnes and Noble. If I need something a bit more, I'll expand my "bubble" a bit, and go to San Tan Mall, located in Gilbert. I feel that the current emphasis on "competitiveness" is really hurtful to the main idea of keeping communities of interest together. Communities of interest SHOULD remain whole. The current map, with the strip of north Gilbert looking out of place, and putting my neighborhood into a community with Chandler, does not do that. It makes much more sense for this area to be in LD14, with the rest of my community. I am a Gilbertonian, through and through, and rarely go into Chandler or Ahwatukee to shop or attend activities. I tend to go south and/or east when I shop, keeping on Gilbert or Cooper Roads; it takes a great need to get me further west than McQueen Rd. The idea of Gilbert being split into five LDs, when Mesa, whose population is much larger, is kept to two, is unfathomable. Keeping my community of interest intact, in a compact block should be the highest of priorities.
12/04/2021 - 09:47	Pamela E. Frame	AZ Redistricting Process	The Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) criteria prohibit partisan gerrymandering. I want/insist that the IRC do their jobs free of partisan influence. The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate. I want to see maps that reflect equal representation in the districts.

12/04/2021 - 09:55	Jessica Lorraine Ebel	Maps CDF 10, LDF 50, and LDF 51 are better options for fair and competitive districts	<p>When I gave my testimony at the Prescott Valley hearing, you heard the response from the crowd: many constituents in Yavapai County refuse to accept the 2020 election results and support the violent insurrectionists who invaded the Capitol Building on January 6</p> <p>I am writing to raise my concerns once more, and urge the IRC to adopt maps CDF10, LDF50, and LDF 51. The non-competitive districts that exist in the current draft are absolutely unacceptable and dangerous.</p> <p>Overall, the draft maps fail to create competitive districts in 24 of Arizona's 30 legislative districts. 80% of the state's residents would be in noncompetitive "safe" districts. Of these "safe" districts, 13 are Republican and 11 Democratic.</p> <p>We see right through the plan to "keep Yavapai whole" and realize how it gerrymanders our districts in Northern Arizona by packing and cracking.</p> <p>Packing: Placing Flagstaff with the tribal district (Legislative District 7) reduces the likelihood of Native Americans having three representatives serving, as they do now, given that those representatives will be competing against Flagstaff Democrats.</p> <p>In the proposed congressional map, the Redistricting Commission adds western Yavapai County to what was previously a highly competitive congressional district, transforming it into a safe Republican district and diluting the vote of 13 Native American tribes.</p> <p>Furthermore, O'Halleran's seat is absorbed into a newly drawn noncompetitive Republican congressional district while the Colorado River District expands into Maricopa County to preserve a safe Republican seat.</p> <p>Cracking: Predominantly Democratic Sedona is split between two safe Republican districts. This results in the Republicans gaining a safe district at the cost of a competitive one.</p> <p>In keeping Yavapai County whole, the draft maps take away one of the county's congressional representatives and three of its legislators, reducing its voice in Congress and the Legislature. This will solidify Republican majorities in the Legislature for the next 10 years and unseat a popular, moderate Democratic congressman</p> <p>The Redistricting Commission could easily create one competitive legislative district and one competitive congressional district in the north. Maps LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 are more compact and contiguous than the current proposals. I am once again asking you to draw competitive districts, instead of protecting extreme candidates. As I said before, "safe" maps will make our state and our democracy less safe. You have an incredible responsibility here. You need to use your power to protect Arizonans from extremism and violence. If you choose to protect certain candidates with "safe" districts, you will validate the violence and extremism that spreads through our communities. How will you be able to live with yourselves? Please choose wisely.</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:05	Cynthia Duncan	District 17	<p>Too bad that Vail is so obviously not contiguous to Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes and the Catalina Foothills. The IRC is so obviously pandering to the GOP with the Committee's proposal to include Vail in the 17th District. Just gonna waste more tax dollars on defending this move in court. I am not in favor of this redistricting.</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:13	Rick Hamilton	Democracy	<p>Democracy is a brilliant yet fragile experiment. It is in your hands at this point. Will you help to nurture it or will you start it on its path to destruction? Is it worth holding on to power if in the process you destroy the very thing we treasure? I sincerely hope you will think long and hard about the consequences of your actions as you consider the gerrymandered districts you have drawn for Northern Arizona. Fair districts nurture Democracy....gerrymandered districts destroy it.</p>

12/04/2021 - 10:15	Christine T. Mann	Redistricting	<p>My name is Christine Mann. I have lived in Tucson and Pima County for more than fifty years. I have been a resident of the Catalina Foothills for more than twenty five years. I am an artist and a retired environmental planner.</p> <p>I am concerned because it has been my understanding that the Independent Redistricting Commission was created to prevent partisan gerrymandering. I have been proud and happy to live in a district that would often switch between Democratic and Republican representatives. I understand that the proposed new districts instead aim to produce safe Republican and Democratic districts. This seems to violate the purpose of the Independent Commission.</p> <p>I understand that partisan gerrymandering is the purpose of David Mehl's proposed map because it will create a safe Republican district.</p> <p>I think it is important that districts remain competitive in order to receive better candidates and better options for voters. Safe districts create the space for extreme candidates to win elections and to ruin the community spirit and the electoral process.</p> <p>I think districts should be as compact and as contiguous as possible while allowing communities of similar interests to be together. District 17 should include the contiguous areas of Marana, Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, Foothills, Tanque Verde, Houghton Corridor, and Vail. This is a diverse area that contains many communities with similar interests. In addition, the University and downtown area should be unified with areas south of Broadway.</p> <p>Arizona has grown into a diverse state. Legislative districts must allow all voices to be fairly heard.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Christine Mann</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:22	Dale Farland	Redistricting	<p>I live in Pinal County. I would like for Tom O'Halloran, who has been our Congressman for years, to still represent us. The map for Congress 5 should be drawn west of the Catalina Mountains, not east. Also, I want the redistricting to be fair and NON-PARTISAN. I am very disappointed that members of the committee have created districts which are not fair and support republicans. THIS IS NOT DEMOCRACY. LD 16 needs to be fair and competitive based on AZ Law. It needs to be within 5%, not 8.6%. to be fair. A community of interest DOES NOT include political party. NO GERRYMANDERING to try to elect Republicans. It needs to be fair and competitive in accordance with state law. I am so frustrated with the republican members of the committee who are acting in this unethical and unprofessional manner.</p>

12/04/2021 - 10:28	Caleb Hayter	Proposed Map concerns	<p>I live in northeast Tucson and my comments are about two proposed districts: Congressional district 6 and legislative district 17.</p> <p>The Arizona constitution's guidelines for drawing district lines stipulate that:</p> <p>Districts shall be geographically compact and contiguous to the extent practicable;  District boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable;  To the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals</p> <p>LD 17 doesn't meet any of those standards. I am not part of a community of interest with Vail and Mariana. I don't shop, eat, recreate, or work in those areas.</p> <p>LD 17 connects two distant areas via an impassable mountain range, and it is impossible to get from one end of the district to the other without passing through another district.</p> <p>And LD17 is not competitive. Competitiveness doesn't mean ensuring that the overall composition of the legislature is even; for example, two districts that are both safe for different parties. Competitiveness means each district is competitive in its own merits, ignoring any other district. LD 17 is not competitive; the proposed alternative district that was part of draft map version 9, LD 18, is much more competitive, in addition to being more compact and respectful of communities of interest.</p> <p>Much the same applies to CD6; I don't have anything to do with southern Graham and Greenlee counties, and I only pass through Pinal county on my way to Phoenix. The proposed CD6 in map version 1 is much more compact and contiguous, and does not force Graham and Greenlee counties to be included with metropolitan Tucson.</p> <p>I ask the commission to change the proposed LD17 to the version proposed in version 9, and CD6 to the version proposed in version 1.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:30	Margaret DeVries	congressional district 6 map	<p>My name is Margaret DeVries. I currently reside in Patagonia AZ, Santa Cruz county but until just recently I was a home owner and worked in Sierra Vista AZ, Cochise County, before that I lived in Sonoita AZ and before that in Tucson/Pima county. I am a semi-retired Nurse Practitioner who has served these areas for my entire adult life.</p> <p>I am writing to express my dismay at the proposed redistricting map for congressional district 6. I prefer the Competitive Congressional District--Southern Arizona (CDF001). As a long time resident of Pima county and then Cochise County it does not make any sense to me to extend into counties such as Greenlee, Graham and Pinal that do not have the same interests. The CDF001 map maintains our common interest as border communities, our strong educational ties, our water issues, and support of the two large military bases.</p> <p>I have always been grateful to live in a state with an independent redistricting committee. I thank you for your work and hope that you will value my request.</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:32	Cynthia Paster	Redistricting maps	<p>I have had a chance to look at the samples of maps that have been proposed. So far none of the maps are competitive as the IRC was charged to make them, with the exception of CD.50, CED 51, and CD 10.</p> <p>It is the IRCs charge to make maps that are truly competitive.</p> <p>Please take these three maps...the only ones that are truly competitive, as the the only viable maps possible.</p> <p>Cynthia Paster</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:32	Ann Rae Heitland	Partisan Maps	<p>Chair Neuberg - -the key differences between the Leach map that became D17 and other maps that were submitted are (1) lack of disclosure, (2) the immediate and wholesale adoption of the partisan proposal into the official draft maps. When other maps are finally disclosed, for example, the (former) Senator Sylvia Allan map, will we find the same deceptiveness?</p>
12/04/2021 - 10:39	Barbara Hutchinson	Compact and Competitive	<p>I live in Pima County and am concerned that many of the proposed maps particularly LD17 does not follow the requirements of the voters from 2000. please have Arizona be a bright beacon in demonstrating fairness and civility. Let's show country how this process can be done appropriately. Thank you, Barbara Hutchinson [REDACTED]</p>

12/04/2021 - 10:41	Loretta Pena	comment on proposed map	I am a resident/voter in Show Low, and am concerned with the proposed map in that, as I see it, it would weaken voting rights for Native American voters in Arizona. The newly formed district needs to be competitive and fair for all voters in Arizona. I am in favor of CDF010 Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission Proposal Thank you for doing the important work that the commission is doing. Loretta Pena
12/04/2021 - 10:42	Raymond Mack	Polictical Map	I am concerned about the new districting map. It's obvious that intent is to advantage Republicans' and weaken democrats' and independents. We can and should do a better job of constructing a more fair and competitive district.
12/04/2021 - 10:48	Kandis Rodda	District 17	As a resident of Casas Adobes I am in favor of this district remaining a contiguous & competitive district to include the area from Mariana to the the Foothills, to include Oro valley & Casas Adobes. Vail, the Houghton Corridor & Tanque Verde belong in the Eastern legislative districts. In addition what is the point of cutting the City of Tucson in half? The UA & Fourth Avenue should remain in CD7.
12/04/2021 - 10:50	keith r kaback	Proposed maps	I live in the Tanque Verde region northeast of Tucson in what is proposed to be District 17. I would like to remind the IRC that the purpose of the IRC is to eliminate partisan gerrymandering and to create districts that are compact, contiguous, competitive, and that respectful of community interests. The proposed District 17 does not meet these criteria, and associates my community with others 30 miles away that do not share the interests of my community. The Vail, Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde areas should be part of eastern legislative districts. Regarding the proposed congressional district CD 7 - the contiguous areas with communities of interest of downtown Tucson, the U of A, and areas south of Broadway should be included in CD 7. Please serve the citizens of Arizona and create fair and competitive maps.
12/04/2021 - 10:51	Ann Rae Heitland	Public Hearing in Tucson	I'm watching and staff just announced that people must leave the room because over 200 people are waiting outside. How is it a public hearing if the public can't watch? Poor planning by the Executive Director in spite of plenty of advance notice by the public of likely overcrowding. Shameful.

12/04/2021 - 10:58	Troy Walker	Independent Redistricting	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Let me begin by thanking you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) I believe the voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps, and I think you have all served with that spirit of mind to this point in the process.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I am thrilled that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons I previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few. You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. I believe it can be done, so I ask each of you to strive for that goal and create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Troy Walker</p>
--------------------	-------------	---------------------------	--

12/04/2021 - 11:04	Jay Simpson	Confirmation Bias/Need for Fair Districts/Draft Maps	<p data-bbox="787 139 1239 1624"><b>Public Comments Must Be Considered Carefully</b></p> <p data-bbox="787 186 1971 406">The Arizona Constitution, as amended by the passage of Prop 106 in November, 2000, requires the Independent Redistricting Commission ("IRC") to seek thirty days of public comment on its "draft maps." The IRC has scheduled public hearings to hear in person testimony from the public; it has also provided multiple avenues for the submission of written testimony. It is vitally important for the IRC to carefully consider the input it receives from the public in response to its proposed draft maps. The IRC needs to keep an open mind, not just look for evidence to support the decisions that they have already taken. The IRC should make every effort to consider the public's comments and respond thoughtfully. They should not simply reject those comments which do not support their previous decisions and credit those comments which support their prior decisions. Otherwise, the constitutionally mandated thirty-day comment period is rendered meaningless and all of the prior rhetoric from the Commissioners about these only being "draft maps" is surely hollow.</p> <p data-bbox="787 430 1971 576">Regrettably, the IRC seems intent on justifying the draft maps it has proposed rather than looking to public comments to improve them. Psychologists have identified this behavior as "confirmation bias." Confirmation bias is the tendency to process information by looking for, or interpreting, information that is consistent with one's existing beliefs. This approach to decision making is largely unintentional and often results in ignoring inconsistent information. People are especially likely to process information to support their own beliefs when the issue is highly important or self-relevant. That seems to be happening right before the public's eyes at this point.</p> <p data-bbox="787 600 1438 625"><b>The Need for Fair Districts in Order to have a Functioning Government</b></p> <p data-bbox="787 649 1971 836">Arizona voters passed Proposition 106 in November, 2000 for the purpose of ending Gerrymandering and ensuring the creation of fair districts. It was supported by a substantial majority of voters from both parties, largely because in the previous two census cycles the state legislature did such an awful job with the proposed maps failing in court. Before Prop 106 was passed the redistricting process was already subject to review by the courts for compliance with the U.S. Constitution and preclearance by the Department of Justice for compliance with the voting rights act. Prop 106 changed the entity responsible for drawing the lines from the legislature to the IRC. Arizona also became the first state in the country to include a constitutional criterion directing the IRC to draw competitive districts to the extent practicable. (Arizona is still one of only two states to require this expressly in its redistricting process.)</p> <p data-bbox="787 860 1869 909">The goal of fair and competitive districts is not a mere afterthought—it is the fundamental mission of this Independent Redistricting Commission according to the Arizona Constitution.</p> <p data-bbox="787 933 1932 982">Why did the voters of Arizona consider the creation of fair and competitive districts so important so as to change the Arizona Constitution to require them for the first time?</p> <ul data-bbox="787 1006 1971 1177" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Fair districts protect against extremism and focus the elected representatives on the need to solve the problems of voters in the district. Put differently, to be successful in a fair district, a representative must actually govern, not just posture;</li> <li>•Fair districts encourage bipartisan cooperation;</li> <li>•Fair districts result in elected reps who are more responsive to their diverse constituency;</li> <li>•Fair districts result in higher quality candidates because candidate quality will matter more in races where the outcome is not predetermined; and</li> <li>•Fair districts encourage higher levels of civic engagement and voter participation because races are not a forgone conclusion.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="787 1201 1932 1250">The draft congressional maps can be adjusted, as suggested below, to create five fair and competitive districts out the nine total seats. It can be done easily by the mappers without compromising VRA compliance or dividing communities of interest.</p> <p data-bbox="787 1274 1971 1453">The number of competitive Legislative Districts can also be significantly improved without disrupting communities of interest while maintaining compliance with the VRA. The suggestion that VRA compliance eliminates the ability to draw competitive districts is flatly wrong. It just means that the VRA districts must be balanced against rural deep red districts, leaving the remainder of the map for fair and competitive seats. This is far from an impossible task and to suggest otherwise is disingenuous at best and, at worst, misleading to the public. I will address the specific changes to the LD draft maps in a separate public comment. However, it is imperative that the IRC draw enough competitive legislative districts so that there will be sufficient elected state senators and representatives to constitute a sensible center allowing for good and responsive governance.</p> <p data-bbox="787 1477 1449 1502">Here is a game plan the IRC should adopt to improve the draft CD map:</p> <p data-bbox="787 1526 1018 1550"><b>Congressional Draft Map</b></p> <p data-bbox="787 1575 850 1599">CD 1:</p> <ul data-bbox="787 1599 1971 1624" style="list-style-type: none"> <li>●It should be obvious that there must be a central Phoenix district that gives the city and its residents proper representation in</li> </ul>
--------------------	-------------	--	---

12/04/2021 - 11:06	Nancy C. Faria	Redistricting	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Let me begin by thanking you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) I believe the voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps, and I think you have all served with that spirit of mind to this point in the process.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I am thrilled that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons I previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few.</p> <p>You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. I believe it can be done, so I ask each of you to strive for that goal and create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Nancy C. Faria</p>
--------------------	----------------	---------------	---

12/04/2021 - 11:23	Rita DePuydt	Loss of competitive district in the north	I think the redistricting commission should follow its mandate to create competitive districts in Arizona. I live in Prescott and I don't agree with the recommendation to keep Yavapai County whole in creating legislative and congressional districts. Keeping Yavapai County whole and splitting Sedona would create a loss of a competitive district in the Sedona and Verde Valley area. The argument that we have a library system and other services with the Verde Valley isn't a valid reason to draw the maps this way. Combining the Navajo Nation with the Prescott congressional district would dilute the voice of Native Americans tribes in the north. The draft maps for the north reduce competitiveness and create more Republican safe seats. A lack of competitiveness allows candidates with extreme views to continue being re-elected and likely reduces participation from Democratic and Independent voters. Please consider the alternate maps LDF 050 and LDF 051 and the Navajo Nation map CDF 010. Thank you.
12/04/2021 - 11:28	Cinda S. Combs	CDF001	Hello, My name is Cinda Combs and I'm a resident of Bisbee, Arizona. I am a retired librarian and purchased my home in 1989. The current draft district map is less desirable than the 'Competitive Congressional District - Southern Arizona CDF001'. It is a step backwards because it is significantly less competitive. I urge you to consider the importance of this fact and to select the CDF001 alternative. Thank you for your consideration.
12/04/2021 - 11:31	Deborah Bundy Sandin	LD 17 Bounderies	The IRC has criteria that prohibits partisan gerrymandering. LD 17 should only include compact, contiguous and competitive areas from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley, Saddlebrooke Ranch and Saddlebrooke communities, along with Casa Adobes. Vail, the Houghton Corridor and Tanque Verde belong in the eastern legislative districts.  Gerrymandering weakens democracy, and we depend on you to do the right thing.  Thank you for your consideration,  -Deb Sandin
12/04/2021 - 11:33	Raghunathan Srinivasan	Maps	Dear IRC Please consider re drawing the Northern Arizona Tribes without Prescott. There exists possibility to make 4 swing districts in Az congressional maps if you do that instead of 3 that you currently have.
12/04/2021 - 11:34	Raghunathan Srinivasan	Maps	Dear IRC Please consider re drawing the Northern Arizona Tribes without Prescott. There exists possibility to make 4 swing districts in Az congressional maps if you do that instead of 3 that you currently have.
12/04/2021 - 11:34	Eileen Feldgus	Redistricting maps	It's important that the maps be redrawn to be competitive. As they stand, there's a clear Republican bias. Our democracy is at stake when elections are unfair. Then people think that their vote doesn't count - and with unfair maps, they're right!
12/04/2021 - 11:39	carla meeske	D3 needs to be fixed	I am writing to implore you to reconsider district 3. I am concerned that this new district will NOT be competitive, instead it will be a red balloon, where the voters of any other inclination will not have a chance at representation.  There is already a pretty extreme nature to my neighborhood - and I dread the idea that this could become far worse by not having a balance to stop the extreme candidates. Arizona does have a share of those. Only having a strong competitive district can minimize their chance of winning. We really need to have balanced representation. Please reconsider this district to bring the balance back to 50/50.  Thank you for your consideration.
12/04/2021 - 11:44	Brandon Perlow	D3 Needs to be Fixed	Legislative District 3 in the IRC draft maps is not a competitive district. It is a massive geographic region that is 60/40 in favor of Republicans, and as such, is likely to produce extremist candidates who do not legislate from the middle. Here in current LD23, Republican legislators refuse to so much as debate their opponents in the most recent 2020 and 2018 elections, and they do that because they can get away with it. In proposed LD3, this is likely to continue. Please fix LD3 to make it more competitively balanced and independent. Thank you.
12/04/2021 - 11:49	Linda J Piurek	IRC	Please keep Sedona in the same Legislative and Congressional Districts.

12/04/2021 - 12:24	April Talley	Redistricting map	<p>Please keep Graham County all together. Don't put us in a metropolitan area or we will lose our voice. Graham County has more in common with communities of interest and family ties with the northern districts than with the southern districts. Thank you for your consideration and thank you for your time and efforts regarding this matter</p> <p>April Talley</p>
12/04/2021 - 12:32	Crystal Carrillo	Comment on Maps	<p>Hi Commission!</p> <p>My name is Crystal Carrillo and I am a resident of the Westwood/Melrose Estates Community in between Indian School and Came back and 19th Ave and the 17 freeway. Thank you for your work in considering communities of interest. I gave testimony today and would like to reiterate the importance of considering a 5th district for communities of interest in Phoenix. I noticed that districts 24 and 26 are heavily compacted when we know that there is opportunity to create an additional district. I would also like to mention the congressional district 1 includes my community along with Paradise Valley, Scottsdale, and Fountain Hills. These communities would never venture into the West Valley and I don't go there. Our issues are not the same and I would encourage usage of the Latino coalition maps. Thank you!</p>
12/04/2021 - 12:35	Yvonne Cahill	New Cd1 former CD6,	<p>Cd6 as it exists now should not include downtown Phoenix. Downtown Phoenix is Urban and Scottsdale, Rio Verde and Fountain Hills are more urban. The Scottsdale area is known as a western town and Rio Verde area has mainly ranch type of property. Including Phoenix in this area does not give us a community of interest .</p>
12/04/2021 - 12:42	Millicent Gray	AZ Redistricting	<p>Hello.</p> <p>My husband and I have lived in Parks, AZ, 86018, for 44 years. Over the years, this rural community outside, (to the west) of Flagstaff, has grown. Now I am chagrined to see your Draft Map of Legislative Districts, which splits our community. As a result, this joins some of us with tribal lands, and others within our Parks precinct 79, with rural communities hundreds of miles away, with which we have little in common.</p> <p>My ask for the Commission is to NOT divide our area by Interstate 40, but keep the community intact.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely, Millicent Gray</p>
12/04/2021 - 12:57	Chandler McElroy	Redistricting map	<p>Please do not put Greenlee and Graham counties into a metropolitan voting district. We have more in common with the northern district than the southern districts. Also we are small population districts and want to be divided into other districts. thank you for your considerations.</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:06	Ronald Eich	Split Precincts	<p>The IRC is funded by tax dollars, so in essence we're all paying for the mapping consultants, lawyers and staff. There is no reason the commission can't directly request to be presented with a map that optimizes the number of competitive districts while respecting the other criteria as well. They should possess the capability to do that. But no one has asked them to do it. Once they have such a map, they can modify it any way they want, but at least they would be starting from a map that met their primary mission – to create "fair and competitive" districts.</p> <p>In my opinion, creating split precincts creates confusion and gives unfair advantage to candidates who represent one or another party. Presently, Arizona's draft maps include over 500 split precincts across the state. As an example, draft maps have LD23 split between 3 different districts: LD3 (solidly Republican), LD4 (competitive), and LD8 (solidly Democrat). All voters have the right to elect a candidate of their choice. When district lines favor one party over the other by as much as 70/30, those in the minority are prevented from ever getting a candidate of their choice and are cut out of the representation process entirely.</p> <p>When districts are fair and competitive, extremism is reduced. Candidates who are forced to appeal to wide swaths of voters will run from the middle and govern from the middle. It is the primary mission of the commission to create "fair and competitive" districts. Splitting precincts helps to create districts that divide communities and create unfair advantages for one party or the other.</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:09	Shirley Sullivan	AZ redistricting maps	<p>The Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) criteria prohibit partisan gerrymandering. The maps should be competitive.</p>

12/04/2021 - 13:13	Shirley Hervatin	Split Precincts are Unfair	<p>The IRC is funded by tax dollars. We are all paying for the mapping consultants, lawyers and their staff. There is no reason the commission can't directly request to be presented with a map that optimizes the number of competitive districts while respecting the other criteria as well. They possess the capability to request such a map. But no one has asked them to do so. Once they have such a map, they can modify it any way they want, but at least they would be starting from a map that met their primary mission – to create "fair and competitive" districts.</p> <p>In my opinion, creating split precincts creates confusion and gives unfair advantage to candidates who represent one or another party. Presently, Arizona's draft maps include over 500 split precincts across the state. As an example, draft maps have LD23 split between 3 different districts: LD3 (solidly Republican), LD4 (competitive), and LD8 (solidly Democrat). All voters have the right to elect a candidate of their choice. When district lines favor one party over the other by as much as 70/30 margin, those in the minority are prevented from ever getting a candidate of their choice and are cut out of the representation process entirely.</p> <p>When districts are fair and competitive, extremism is reduced. Candidates who are forced to appeal to wide swaths of voters will run from the middle and govern from the middle. It is the primary mission of the commission to create "fair and competitive" districts. Splitting precincts helps to create districts that divide communities and create unfair advantages for one party or the other.</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:24	Ralph Schmitt	Santa Cruz County redistricting	<p>My name is Ralph Schmitt. I first discovered Patagonia 20 years ago on a mountain biking trip. I was attracted to the area by its natural beauty, ethnic diversity, local wines and restaurants and cultural heritage. Two years later I moved to Patagonia. I have been a board member for the Patagonia Museum, a historic and preservation organization, for the last 10 years. I have also volunteered for the Patagonia Fall Festival and the Fourth of July Parade. I do not want Santa Cruz County split into different legislative districts. The county as a whole has worked together and is joined culturally, ethnically, financially, recreationally, geographically. We are part of the Santa Cruz Valley National Heritage Area. As a border community we share the same problems and benefits. The area is part of the same watershed which joins us in protecting the scarce natural resource, water. The county should remain represented by a person who can focus on the unique characteristics and interests of common communities in the same area not cities of different counties. Thank you, Ralph Schmitt</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:38	Janet VanScoyk	Graham County	<p>I respectfully request that Gila Valley/Graham County stay in the same congressional district. There are less than 40,000 citizens in this county and it doesn't make logical sense to break us up.</p> <p>Thank You for your consideration.</p> <p>Janet VanScoyk, Graham County</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:51	Beatriz Topete	Maps	<p>My name is Beatriz. I live in Ahwatukee, in the proposed district 12. I hope that in the final maps you eliminate the part of my district that extends all the way through Chandler and Gilbert, dividing communities. I think the eastern boundary should be near the 101, and the northern border should be near the 60. I also believe that sun lakes should be moved into our district to allow retiree communities to be united into one district.</p>

12/04/2021 - 13:52	Patricia Hernandez	proposed district LD 7	<p>I am writing to express my concern about proposed district LD 7. As a resident of Oak Creek (Sedona), I do not believe that LD 7 takes into account at least two factors important to a district – respect for communities of interest and potential competitiveness</p> <p>Although all of Oak Creek and large portions of Sedona are in Yavapai County, residents here gravitate to and identify with Flagstaff much more than we do with Prescott and the rest of the county. Demographically we are more similar to the Flagstaff area, in terms of diversity of population, educational background and social interests. LD 7 would sever Sedona and Oak Creek from Flagstaff as well as each other.</p> <p>To me and many other residents of Oak Creek, Prescott Valley is an area where we might shop (Costco, Trader Joe's), but it is not the area where we attend college courses or take part in cultural events. Our voting preferences would be swamped by the overwhelmingly Republican voting pattern displayed by the rest of the county, depriving us, in essence, in any say in Arizona's political future.</p> <p>I urge you to consider the alternate proposals of LDF 050 and LDF 051 in lieu of LD 7.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this request,</p> <p>Patricia Hernandez  ██████████ Sedona 86351</p>
12/04/2021 - 13:55	Candace Greenburg	Redistricting	<p>I have lived in Picture Rocks, AZ for 25 years!  My children went to the Marana Unified School District. My husband &amp; I have volunteered in the community and we have close ties not only to our rural community but to that of neighboring communities of Marana and Oro Valley! We have no community ties to Casa Grande or Maricopa. I am in opposition of the redistricting that is being proposed and hope the committee will reconsider</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:06	Heather D Borman	I support the Competitive Congressional District – Southern Arizona map CDF-001.	<p>My name is Heather Borman and I live in the current CD-2. I have lived in Saint David Arizona for over 11 years. I am a retired safety and health consultant and I have a great interest in birds and the preservation of their habitat. The proposed CD-6 is unacceptable. I support the Competitive Congressional District –Southern Arizona map CDF-001. Proposed CDF-001- Southern Arizona keeps the new district contiguous and incorporates the communities of Interest I care about. The current Congressional District, CD-2 is competitive. Both Republicans and Democrats could get elected in CD-2 and did so. This proposed new district CD-6 incorporates very rural and extremely conservative areas of AZ into the new congressional district. We already have a severe problem with extremist House members. We do not want more of the same. District CD-6 should incorporate both military installations (Communities of Interest), Fort Huachuca and Davis-Monthan into the district. The proposed CD-6 splits these Communities of Interest off from one another. The proposed new district should also incorporate Coronado National Monument, Chiricahua National Monument, Saguaro National Park East and the San Pedro River National Conservation Area. As a nature lover, these Communities of Interest are important to me and should be grouped together. Finally, any Congressperson should be able to visit varied population areas within their district. Your proposed CD-6 would really be impossible for the Representative to cover geographically.</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:10	David Eisenberg	Creating safe partisan districts is antithetical to your mandate and your rules	<p>As a native Arizonan (born in Tucson in 1949) I have watched the increasingly dangerous extreme polarization of politics in the state. The citizens of this state voted to create the Independent Redistricting Commission to address this issue. Yet, it is clear that map 10.0 is in violation of the rules you are required to follow - partisan parties are not communities of interest. The partisan interference on the Commission that has emerged is shocking though not surprising. MAP 9.0 was superior to map 10.0 in all of the categories which are you required to include in your process. The goal of creating competitive districts is about making it possible for Independents, Democrats, and Republicans to have a fair shot at winning elections. If Republicans in Southern Arizona feel that they have not had a fair chance for political representation, the remedy must, by law, reside elsewhere than having the AIRC create safe districts for them. This is not unlike the situation that Democrats face around the state who have been gerrymandered out of power since the last redistricting process. The mandate from the citizens in creating the AIRC was not to try to rebalance partisan power in the state, it was to establish a process wherein fair boundaries could be drawn for COMPETITIVE, compact districts that respect geographical realities and communities of interest—NOT to create safe districts for either party.</p> <p>Listening to hours of testimony at your public processes reveals the challenges related to defining communities of interest - where over and over, people defined their communities by their own personal views, excluding the diversity that exists everywhere. The only way to properly address this by creating competitive districts, again, not by creating safe districts for either party.</p>

12/04/2021 - 14:18	Harry Cheely	Redistricting	<p>Dear IRC commissioners</p> <p>I live in Show Low, At and I am asking that you please consider the 5+ eastern counties proposal-Graham, Greenlee, Gila, southern Navajo, Apache, eastern Pinal, northern Cochise, and southern Yavapai counties We are a rural community with too much in common to list here , please let our voices be heard again! I believe we are the heart and soul of this great state of Arizona, we make Arizona unique, we value our land and way of life, we must not be silenced any longer, please consider NOT putting us in with Flagstaff! Please please please! Our voices must be heard once again !</p> <p>Thank You, Harry Cheely</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:23	Mari Jensen	Revise CD 2 as shown in Draft Map 7.1	<p>To: Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission</p> <p>RE: Please revise CD 2 as shown in Draft Map 7.1</p> <p>I urge you to reconsider CD 2 as drawn in CD Draft Map 7.1. In terms of "communities of interest, the Prescott, Prescott Valley and Chino Valley areas would be much better served by being in CD 9 on this map, not in CD 2. These regions have little in common with the Native American communities in the proposed CD 2.</p> <p>Adding those regions to CD 2 violates the criterion of "communities of interest" with regard to the tribal communities and tribal members in the current CD 1. Please delete those Yavapai county areas from the proposed CD 2 and add them to the proposed CD 9.</p> <p>Sincerely yours, Mari Jensen Arizona voter</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:28	Robin Low	Redistricting in Northern Arizona	<p>Please uphold the intent of Prop. 106 by creating fair and competitive maps. The benefits from fair and competitive maps are compelling: an increase in the number of candidates running for office, a better informed and more engaged citizenry, a reduction in polarization, and a strengthening of democracy. Specifically, I urge you to create a competitive legislative district, LD 7, as reflected in the map submitted to the IRC as LDF 050.</p> <p>I also urge you to protect the Native American community voting bloc by creating a competitive congressional district, CD2, as reflected in the map submitted by the Navajo Nation known as CDF 010.</p> <p>Thank you for the enormous amount of time and energy you are devoting to redistricting.</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:28	Carol W. West	IRC Maps	<p>I want the map drawn for District 17 to be returned to its original size which included Oro Valley, part of the Foothills, and Marana and Casa Adobes. This district is compact, contiguous and appears to have common interests.</p>

12/04/2021 - 14:29	Susan Bickel	draft maps	<p>These are my comments submitted to the public hearing in Tucson on Saturday, Dec. 4.</p> <p>I am a 4th generation Arizona native. My husband and I retired to the Catalina Foothills area almost 9 years ago.</p> <p>I wish to speak directly to the approved draft legislative map</p> <p>Recent revelations that a sitting Senator from LD11 influenced the adoption of this map to protect his seat in a Republican district, smacks of political intrigue and influence.</p> <p>While his actions are deplorable, even more disturbing is that he, his staff and the Pima County Republican Party pulled others into the little scheme.</p> <p>It is truly disappointing that 2 previously respected members of our community, the CEO of the SALC and the Mayor of Marana, fell victim to these political shenanigans.</p> <p>But the most concerning part of this attempted cover-up is that it appears that 3 members of this Commission may have violated the guidelines of Prop 106 by condoning these maps which now appear to have been drawn under false pretenses.</p> <p>I don't think it is beyond reason to think that the public could now perceive that the Independent Chair and the 2 Republican members of this commission have been complicit in this blatant attempt to deceive Arizona citizens.</p> <p>Indeed, Chair Neuberg has repeatedly asserted that her "right of center" friends deserve to have maps that are drawn to their advantage.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Commission to reject the current legislative draft maps. These maps should be discarded immediately to prevent any further stain on the legitimacy of this Commission.</p> <p>I stand for fair and competitive maps drawn transparently and devoid of partisan influence. This is the minimum expectation of Pima County citizens and the great State of Arizona.</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:29	Joan P. Warfield	Comments on proposed map	<p>Dear Commissioners. I have one overriding concern and three specific concerns re: LD17, and CD1 and CD7.</p> <p>My overriding concern is that the commission, which could and in some ways did serve as a model for the country, nevertheless tilts to an advantage for Republicans because the supposedly independent 5th member clearly leans Republican, leading to gerrymandering favoring Republican candidates in a state that has become fairly evenly divided between registered Independents, Democrats, and Republicans. This outcome does not reflect the intentions of Arizona voters in approving the IRC.</p> <p>My concerns regarding the proposed maps for LD17, CD1 and CD7 reflect this Republican-leaning bias and violate the three guiding principles of districts that are compact, contiguous, and preserving communities of interest.</p> <p>With 40 miles of separation and two mountain ranges between the eastern and northwest portions of LD17, it is absolutely clear that gerrymandering is the lone guiding principle for LD17.</p> <p>Likewise with CD1, putting mainly tribal lands in northeastern and north central AZ together with Yavapai County and Prescott is an egregious violation of the guiding principles. Paul Gosar's current district to represent the interests and concerns of indigenous Arizonans? Really? It is only too clear what you are thinking in proposing this gross misalignment. Haven't native people suffered enough injustice and lack of adequate representation throughout our history?</p> <p>As regards the proposed map of CD7, while your dividing lines are not as obviously gerrymandered as in the previous two examples, you are most definitely separating communities of interest in dividing downtown Tucson from the 4th Avenue District, as well as weakening the latino vote in this proposed split of districts. Again, wrong and alas not misguided from the point of view of what you are obviously seeking to achieve in proposing these divisions. Weaken and render inconsequential votes that do not favor Republican outcomes.</p> <p>I urge you for the credibility of the IRC process to get back to the drawing board and redress these glaring and partisan-motivated proposals.</p>

12/04/2021 - 14:31	Sharon and Marshall Johnson	Redistricting for Pima County	<p>How districts are defined is critical to preserving our democracy. If there are districts safe for Republicans and another for Democrats, extremists can gain or retain power. We are independents and prefer to be in a district that is competitive, so we can have a voice We also believe that districts should include a variety of people with different incomes and interests</p> <p>We live in the Casas Adobes/Marana/Oro Valley/Foothills area (District 17) and very much want to stay contiguous and competitive. To have us in a district that includes the Houghton/Tanque Verde/Vail areas is ridiculous. (We used to live on Houghton Road and so are familiar with that area and it has little in common with northwest Tucson area where we now live.) Looking at a map, this is gerrymandering in extreme and certainly is not contiguous.</p> <p>Other areas that should be contiguous are those in CD7. To isolate the University and the Latinos is certainly not conducive to democratic engagement.</p> <p>Please remember that the IRC was established to prohibit or at least diminish partisan gerrymandering. We voters (and we do vote) are counting on you.</p> <p>Sharon and Marshall Johnson</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:36	Dianne Coscarelli	Lack of Competition; Tucson area- LD17 & LD18	<p>The LDs in Pima County have been pinwheeled into six districts to create three safe districts for Republicans, even though they represent only 29% of registered Pima voters, and three safe for Democrats who represent 40%. And there are no competitive districts even though about one-third of voters are Independent. This leaves few choices for Independent and moderate voters.</p> <p>These pinwheeled districts are the ripple effect of LD17, which is not compact, contiguous or competitive, and was created for explicit partisan purposes. Recently, I was shocked to learn that a state senator maneuvered with officials in having LD17 structured in his favor. This is most disturbing.</p> <p>But LD17 can be fixed. I urge you to draw LD17 to include the compact, contiguous and competitive area as shown in LD Map 9.0..</p> <p>Failing that, I urge you to adopt citizen map LD0065 to adjust LD18 to replace the Davis-Monthan corridor with the Tanque Verde area to the east. LD18 communities have a much stronger communities of interest link with the Tanque Verde area than with the Davis-Monthan corridor.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work.</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:41	Henry Atha	Southern Az Map esp Districts 21 and 17	<p>Located at [REDACTED] near corner Alvernon and Broadway in current Leg District 10 I OBJECT STRONGLY TO YOUR RELOCATING ME INTO A DISTRICT #21 WHICH LUMPS ME, A CITIZEN LIVING IN VERY CENTER OF TUCSON INTO DISTRICT THAT GEOGRAPHICALLY IS LARGELY RURAL INCLUDING ALL OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY, WHERE ISSUES, NEEDS AND PROBLEMS ARE TOTALLY DIFFERENT FROM MY CENTRAL TUCSON INTERESTS AND NEEDS. I FURTHER OBJECT THAT PUTTING ME IN THIS DISTRICT SITUATION RESULTS FROM COMMISSIONER MEHLS PARTISAN INSISTENCE ON A GERRYMANDERED EXTENSION OF DISTRICT 17 TO INCLUDE THE TANQUE VERDE AND FAR EAST AREA. HIS CONTENTION THAT THIS COMBINES SUBURBAN AREA INTERESTS INTO ONE DISTRICT RINGS VERY HOLLOW WHEN COMPARED TO LUMPING THE VERY HEART OF CENTRAL TUCSON INTO A DISTRICT WITH RURAL PIMA AND SANTA CRUZ COUNTY. THIS IS EXTREMELY UNFAIR, OBVIOUSLY PARTISAN AND HOPEFULLY IS STRONG GROUNDS FOR APPEAL AS A VIOLATION OF AZ CONSTITUTION AND FEDERAL VOTING LAW REQUIREMENTS. PLEASE CHANGE THIS DECISION.</p>
12/04/2021 - 14:47	Cheryl Purvis	Current LD district 17 for Southern AZ must be redrawn	<p>I urge you to redraw District 17 to include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. Fulfill your charge under the Arizona Constitution to remove the drafting of legislative districts from the influence of current legislators such as Vince Leach, and create compact and competitive districts which represent true communities of interest, for example, the Navajo nation.</p>

12/04/2021 - 14:52	Lisa Wolfe	Which maps to reject	Re: Comm Chairperson, With respect to your question this afternoon, please reject maps drawn for an explicit partisan purpose. Modify the current map (drawn for a specific partisan purpose) to comply with IRC requirements Pima County is 40% Democratic; why should a district be gerrymandered to make an otherwise competitive district into a Republican one. Comm. Lerner, even though she is a Democrat, proposed a map complying with the criteria. Yes, we have had Republican dominance in the State Legislature for the last decade. That doesn't mean it should continue. Republicans, Democrats, and Independents are each about 1/3 of the registered voters. Competitive districts would allow the Legislature to change from time to time instead of being dominated by one party, to which only 1/3 of voters belong.
12/04/2021 - 14:53	Rosalie O'Donnell	Comment on Redistricting of LD 6 and CD 2	I am writing to convey my concern for the proposed new districts in Northern Arizona, LD 7 from LD 6 and CD 2 from CD 4. First I will address LD7. In Proposition 106 it clearly states in section 14-D that "district boundaries shall respect communities of interest to the extent practicable". In the proposed LD 7 the city of Sedona would be divided into 2 separate districts, both of which would become Republican leaning. This appears to be a partisan attempt to dilute the Democratic vote in LD6 and does not adhere to section 14-D, "competitive districts should be favored". The alternate proposed maps, LDF 050 and LDF 051 meet the criteria set out in Proposition 106 as mentioned above. These maps have not been considered by the Independent Redistricting Commission. In the proposed change to CD 4 the new map creates a non-competitive congressional district from a competitive district and eliminates a moderate leaning Democratic congressman. Again, this is an attempt to create a more Republican district and decrease the competitiveness of the current CD 4. CD 4 should remain as it currently stands and has stood for the last 10 years.  Thank you, Rosalie O'Donnell
12/04/2021 - 14:53	Cheryl Purvis	Redraw CD7 to maintain genuine communities of interest	The contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue should remain in CD7, as should areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest. I urge you to fulfill your constitutional responsibility, follow the goals specified by the Arizona Constitution to represent the interest of all Arizonans.
12/04/2021 - 14:53	Mary Ann Keerins	LD Draft Map 10	This map creates a "packed" LD18, and a uncompetitive LD17. This map does not stick with the rules of the commission. Please return to Draft Map 9.0
12/04/2021 - 14:59	Jo Anne Gieson-Powell	Redistricting	The current maps are rigged to create a Republican majority, contrary to the IRC mandate.
12/04/2021 - 15:04	Karen Wilkison	IRC meeting Dec.4, 2021	I presented remarks today at the above event. Do you still want me to send you the transcript of my remarks?
12/04/2021 - 15:05	Karen Wilkison	IRC meeting Dec.4, 2021	I presented remarks today at the above event. Do you still want me to send you the transcript of my remarks?
12/04/2021 - 15:05	Cheryl Purvis	keep midtown Tucson districts together	My neighborhood of Broadmoor is a midtown neighborhood having more in common w/ other midtown neighborhoods from which it is separated. In the currently proposed maps, Broadmoor is in LD21 which stretches down nearly or all the way to the Mexican border, and is separated from other midtown neighborhoods which have more similar interests, e.g., proximity to the Univ of Arizona, city transportation and development issues, and so on. These are the communities of interest for my neighborhood, therefore, Broadmoor should instead be in LD18 or LD20. I urge you to redraw the LD map for Southern Arizona to reflect the true communities of interest which exist here.
12/04/2021 - 15:05	Juanita Havill	draft map of LD19 and 21 of the IRC	What's wrong with this picture? comes to mind when I look at the draft map of redistricting for LD19 and LD21. Dividing the smallest county in the state nearly in half is what is wrong. Separating the northern section of Tubac, Tumacacori, Patagonia, Sonoita, and Elgin will give that section different state legislators than the southern portion of Nogales and Rio Rico. I am concerned that the issues of importance to county residents north and south will be diluted as these small areas are merged with other counties in new legislative districts. These issues include protection of the environment, eco-tourism, wineries, ranches, libraries, and border families. I fear that splitting the county will weaken its voice in the legislature and especially so if the priorities of the legislators for each section are in disagreement over how to address these issues. As a 21-year Santa Cruz County resident, I strongly urge the commission to keep the county together in one legislative district.
12/04/2021 - 15:15	Lori J. Sampson	IRC	Respectfully requesting every effort to avoid partisan gerrymandering in accordance with rules...Appreciatively!

12/04/2021 - 15:20	Livingston Sutro	Redistricting	<p>Dear Redistricting Committee:</p> <p>My name is Livingston Sutro, and I have called Arizona home for 47 years. For the past 35 years, I have lived in Cochise County where I worked for 25 years in Adult Probation. The last eight years of my employment, I was appointed the Chief Adult Probation Officer of Cochise County. In addition, my wife and I raised two children in Sierra Vista, AZ. I have deep ties to this community and because of this I feel it is incumbent on me to urge you to not create a legislative district which puts Cochise County together with Graham and Greenlee counties. Instead, I would urge you to use the Competitive Congressional District - Southern Arizona (CDF001) map, which better aligns with Cochise County's interests.</p> <p>Cochise County, in many respects, has become a bedroom community for Tucson. Virtually everyone I know in Sierra Vista travels to Tucson on a regular basis for shopping, doctor's appointments, airline travel, etc. I also know several people who either live in Sierra Vista and commute to Tucson for their jobs or visa-versa. Conversely, I can count on one hand the number of people whom I've known here in Sierra Vista who have ever even mentioned traveling to Graham or Greenlee Counties. The few people I know who are familiar with Graham and Greenlee, only know them as a pass through to the White Mountains. The CDF001 map, on the other hand, includes some of Tucson, Cochise County, and especially the largest city in the county, Sierra Vista shares much more with Tucson than Safford or Clifton.</p> <p>Besides the fact that the IRC's draft map does not reflect Cochise County's mutual interest with Pima County, it also guarantees a non-competitive election. Nearly the entire district is deep red and would ensure that Republicans would win any election in a landslide, without even having to campaign. Our country was founded on a two-party system. I believe that it is in our best interests, as a democracy, that candidates from each party should work for every vote. No election should be handed to a candidate on "silver platter." This is not the American Way. I hope you will scrap the proposed IRC map and use CDF001 instead. It better reflects common interests and competitiveness.</p> <p>Sincerely, Livingston Sutro</p>
12/04/2021 - 15:22	Yuri Casasola	Redistricting Maps	<p>My name is Yuri Casasola &amp; I live in Ahwatukee, in the proposed district 12. I wish that in the final maps you eliminate the part of my district that extends all the way through Chandler and Gilbert, dividing communities. I think the eastern boundary should be near the 101, and the northern border should be near the 60. I also believe that sun lakes should be moved into our district to allow retiree communities to be united into one district.</p>
12/04/2021 - 15:22	Jenise Porter	IRC public meeting December 4, 2021	<p>I attended the meeting in Tucson this morning and I am disturbed at what seems to be a dereliction of the responsibilities of the IRC: the venue for the meeting was too small and was clearly going to be too small when it was chosen; those of us who did not speak were asked to leave the room so that others could enter. We were not able to hear and see the proceedings once we left the room.</p> <p>There was no security visible at the hotel. I personally observed two instances of unmasked attendees standing within six feet of others and yelling obscenities at them. The mask rule, clearly posted at the doors of the hotel, was not enforced. Obviously Republicans who think masking interferes with their personal freedom, would refuse to comply and the IRC is not willing to confront them with the law.</p> <p>I am distressed when I hear self-identified conservatives from the proposed LD17 state that they have nothing in common with "those people" from Tucson. That is code for Black and Brown people and those of us who value democracy, respect for others and belief in the common good.</p> <p>Chair Neuberger, you have the authority to push the redistricting process to be fair and competitive. I hope you will do so.</p>

12/04/2021 - 15:23	Rose Marie Lopez	Testimony	<p>December 3, 2021</p> <p>Testimony submitted to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission</p> <p>My name is Rosie Lopez, a retired educator and the founder of the Arizona Hispanic Community Forum and I reside in Legislative District 27.</p> <p>The Arizona Hispanic Community Forum is a volunteer grassroots organization (since 1987) that advocates for equal opportunity and fairness for Latinos. We have been participating and advocating for fair representation in the redistricting process since 1991.</p> <p>We strongly support the Arizona Latino Coalition's proposed legislative and congressional maps.</p> <p>We believe that the Coalition's maps give the Latino community a better chance to elect officials that are in line with our values, views and needs.</p> <p>We fully support competitive districts because they give our communities more legislative districts where Latinos or people of color could run for office and better serve our interests. Moreover, the Latino population will be growing over ten years which gives more Latinos an opportunity to get involved in the voting process.</p> <p>Rosie Lopez (continued)2</p> <p>We do not believe that packing districts serve us well. We are not afraid of competitive districts!</p> <p>We also support the idea of having our school districts being included as communities of interest.</p> <p>The Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission has been a model for other states and well known for fairness in redistricting—let's keep it that way!</p> <p>Thank you,</p> <p>Rosie Lopez Legislative District 27</p>
12/04/2021 - 15:28	Ruben Pena	Cochise County Congressional District 6 map CDF001	<p>My name is Ruben Pena and I am a native Arizonan born in Mesa. I moved from the Phoenix area to the Dos Cabezas mountains outside of Willcox more than 20 years ago. I recently retired from the national park service having worked at Chiricahua National Monument, Fort Bowie National Monument and Coronado National Memorial in Cochise County and Saguaro National Park in Tucson. During this time my coworkers and I regularly went back and forth between the the parks in Cochise County and Saguaro. Cochise County has ties to the eastern Pima county/Tucson area not only due to the National parks, but Cochise County also has the San Pedro National Conservation Area, other birding areas such as Ramsey Canyon, Portal, and the Sulfur Springs Valley along with other recreational/tourism sites that complement the recreational areas in Eastern Pima County. People from the Tucson area and tourists use Cochise County as a addition recreation area and they work in tandem to create a robust tourist industry. The ranchers, and small residential land owners in our county are tied to Tucson in their desire for conservation.</p> <p>Cochise Counties communities of interest are not the same as the mining community of interest in Greenlee/Graham counties or the bedroom communities for the Phoenix area that Casa Grande, Coolidge, and Florence areas are. Therefore I am supporting the adoption of CDF001 congressional district 6 map. This congressional district 6 truly represents Cochise Counties communities of interest in a compact, contiguous, and competitive district.</p>

12/04/2021 - 15:31	Joette B. Treber	AZ redistricting maps	Gerrymandering is prohibited by the IRC criteria and I insist that the IRC be partisan free in their work on redistricting maps. Clearly, the current maps are heavily biased in order to give the GOP advantage. This is unfair and goes against the mandate of the IRC. It must not be allowed. Thank you.
12/04/2021 - 15:32	Richard Bookie	CD9 redistricting proposal	Seriously? Paul Gosar representing the Sun Cities. Someone has lost their connection to the people they serve if you think this is reasonable.
12/04/2021 - 15:45	Nancy Branham	IRC mapping in Northern Arizona	<p>Hello. My name is Nancy Branham. My husband, Frank Branham, and I have lived in Flagstaff for over 30 years. We have been involved citizens in the community. I have been a REALTOR for 30 years and we have owned a business here as well. When you heard our comments in July it was clear that we want Flagstaff to be "kept whole". We still want and need that. That includes the communities of Kachina, Mountaineer, Bellemont, Westwood, Forest Highlands, Flag Ranch and Munds Park. These communities the draft map are now included with Williams in a district that wraps south around Flagstaff and extends east nearly 200 miles and 3 hours travel time. The communities I have mentioned are absolutely PART of Flagstaff and NOT a part where you now have them on the draft map.</p> <p>Additionally the draft maps splits the small town of Sedona which is unnecessary and wrong. But once you keep Sedona together you MUST also include Cornville, Camp Verde, Clarkdale and Cottonwood as part of our community of interest based on the overwhelming testimony you have received from these areas. They identify much more closely with Flagstaff than Prescott.</p> <p>I am seriously concerned that the Commission has all but ignored the constitutionally mandated criteria of compactness and communities of interest.</p> <p>Please take seriously and adopt the map from the Coconino County Board of Supervisors regarding LD7 which has also been unanimously endorsed by the Flagstaff, Clarkdale and Sedona City Councils.</p> <p>As for the Congressional District draft map, I will simply say that your map has turned what has historically been a very competitive district into a strong Republican district with no good reason. This configuration will reduce competitiveness and will limit the voice of our Native American communities. The Navajo Nation has submitted map CDF010, a proposed revision to CD2, which I strongly support.</p> <p>Thank you very sincerely for your work on redistricting.</p>

12/04/2021 - 15:50	William Bowlus-Root	What maps should be rejected because they are political?	<p>At today's public hearing in Tucson, commissioner Neuberg asked a follow-up question about how the public expects the commissioners to decide which maps were 'political' and should, in the public's view, be rejected and which are worthy of their consideration. That's a fair question and one for which I hope to offer a possible answer.</p> <p>You're right that most district maps have a political component to them. However they're drawn, there will be a consequence for the political parties and their candidates. So it doesn't make sense to reject all of them out of hand for that reason.</p> <p>But they do tend to fall into two categories: 1) Maps that were drawn with the specific intent to produce districts that ensure that a particular incumbent would retain his or her office or strongly favor the candidates of one or the other party (so-called "safe" districts); and 2) maps that were drawn with the opposite intent, paying as little or no regard for the political consequences; those consequences would come under consideration but only when trying to optimize the districts for competitiveness.</p> <p>The commission should reject any and all Type 1 maps, since they clearly introduce politics into the process, contrary to mission for the IRC stated in Proposition 106.</p> <p>Maps of Type 2 are worthy of consideration by the commission and should be evaluated by applying the criteria set forth in the constitution. It's true that, when assessing their competitiveness, many of these maps will turn out to favor one or the other party and that's to be expected. But it won't be BECAUSE they were drawn specifically for that purpose. In those situations, the commission should look to how to minimize that disparity by adjusting borders to increase competitiveness within those districts (and NOT 'mitigate' it by creating other safe districts for the competing party in order to 'balance' them out) while having minimal impact on the other criteria. (You have a very capable mapping consultant that you can direct to provide you with an optimized version of any map you choose. That's what you're paying them to do.) If it's not possible to arrive at a map that eliminates those safe districts, the commission should look to another map instead.</p> <p>By doing this, the commission can deflect much of the criticism that was ignited with the adoption of the current approved legislative district map 10.0. It didn't take long for it to become apparent that it was a Type 1 map, which completely undermined the commission's credibility with the public. By significantly reducing the number of safe districts (preferably to 0) and increasing the number of competitive districts (as Proposition 106 charges is your duty), you can reverse the impression that our trust in you has been misplaced and that your work is no better than what the former legislators used to do in their smoke-filled hotel rooms to keep themselves and their party in power.</p> <p>BTW, this entire issue could have been sidestepped if the commissioners had taken the stance from the start that, although they may have been selected by partisan politicians to be on the commission, you nevertheless work for the benefit of ALL Arizonans - not JUST Democrats or Republicans (or Independents). Failing to do that - indeed repeatedly stating that you represent one of the parties - you have all opened yourselves to the charge of partisanship and your actions can be interpreted in no other way.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
12/04/2021 - 16:10	Kara Kaczmarzyk	Opposition to current draft maps	<p>Adjust the IRC maps to be representative and fair to the residents. Partisan gerrymandering is prohibited in this process; as leaders in this process you must uphold the charge and responsibility of our democracy. Adjust District 17 to include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. The contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue must remain in CD7, which should also include areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest.</p>
12/04/2021 - 16:16	Judy E Dolloff	Redistricting	<p>I have thought that the maps you all have drawn were the worst of gerrymandering, but in thinking about it, I think it is the BEST of gerrymandering. You have made the district that used to have Sedona, Flagstaff and most of the Verde Valley into a Republican fantasy! It was always going to be challenging for a Democrat to win any seat in the previous district, but now you have made it impossible. I really don't want to be represented by "Stop the Steal and QAnon theory conspiracists", but that is what we will have in your new map. You have more reasonable options, USE THEM.</p>

12/04/2021 - 16:18	Bonnie Blodgett	Redistricting	The IRC must follow their own criteria, which proh bits partisan gerrymandering. Specifically, downtown Tucson, UA and 4th Ave should remain in CD7.
12/04/2021 - 16:20	Katherine O. Bork	Redistricting maps	In making your final decision about redistricting, please give careful attention to the map LDF 050, which keeps the district competitive, and LDF 151, which respects the requirements of the Voting Rights Act.
12/04/2021 - 16:22	Darlene Carlson	redistricting	The Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) criteria prohibit partisan gerrymandering and I insist that the IRC do their jobs free of partisan influence. In a democracy, maps should reflect equal representation in the districts. Does the IRC support democracy?
12/04/2021 - 16:27	Michele M. Smith	LD 24	I have been a resident of central Phoenix for over 40 years. I am a retired teacher and taught for over 30 years in Arizona. I am writing in support of this process uplifting all voters no matter what district they live in. The maps should reflect ALL districts as communities of diversity, respecting the voting rights of people of color. I encourage that competitiveness be emphasized and that this committee will ensure that districts across the state be drawn as fair and balanced as possible. I agree with the expansion westward of LD 24, which will expand diversity in our community. Thank you for all your hard work on this committee.
12/04/2021 - 16:31	Alayna Wiley	Opposition to Legislative Redistricting for Hiawatha Hills & Teresa Terrace	I am a resident of the Hiawatha Hills and Teresa Terrace Neighborhood Association which is part of the City of Tucson. The proposed legislative redistricting would put me in a district that is completely disconnected from the city that I live in which is why I oppose the proposed redistricting. The proposed district 16 would put me into a non-competitive district that is not aligned with the majority of registered voters in the City of Tucson.
12/04/2021 - 16:31	William Edelstein	Redistricting	I urge you to review the IRC maps and make adjustments to be representative and fair to us, the residents. Partisan gerrymandering is prohibited in this process; as leaders in this process you must uphold the charge and responsibility of our democracy. Adjust District 17 to include the compact, contiguous and competitive area from Marana to the Foothills, including Oro Valley and Casas Adobes, leaving Vail, the Houghton Corridor, and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. The contiguous communities of interest in downtown Tucson, UA, and Fourth Avenue must remain in CD7, which should also include areas south of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest. The new map appears to have balanced areas as "safe" for certain political parties without regard that the local population currently supports one party over another. When maps are redrawn I ke this it is no wonder people have some of the least trust in government ever ( <a href="https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/05/17/public-trust-in-government-1958-2021/">https://www.pewresearch.org/politics/2021/05/17/public-trust-in-government-1958-2021/</a> ).
12/04/2021 - 16:33	Brett Wolgemuth	District 16	I live in the CITY LIMITS of Tucson. The draft map now has me in the same district as Casa Grande. This is not compact nor does it include people with a shared interest as I am sure people living south of Buckeye are not concerned with the ongoing of cthe City of Tucson residents
12/04/2021 - 16:34	Mary S. Melcher	LD 17	Dear Commission Members,  The proposed LD 17 is a bad idea. Trying to combine the Houghton corridor, as well as Vail, with northwestern suburbs makes no sense. The areas are 40 miles apart and people in them have different concerns. They do not produce a compact or contiguous district. Please rethink this plan.  Thank you for your work,  Mary Melcher Vail area
12/04/2021 - 16:36	Victoria Arrieta	Legislative Redistricting	I am a resident of the Hiawatha Hills and Teresa Terrace Neighborhood Association which is part of the City of Tucson. The proposed legislative redistricting would put me in a district that is completely disconnected from the city that I live in which is why I oppose the proposed redistricting. The proposed district 16 would put me into a non-competitive district that is not aligned with the majority of registered voters in the City of Tucson.
12/04/2021 - 16:50	Kathleen Dubbs	Civic engagement	At the risk of being overly dramatic, I believe the fate of democracy in Arizona is in your hands. You would not have volunteered for the commission unless you believed in civic engagement. It is the foundation of democracy. However, whiteout competitive voting districts, there is hardly any civic engagement. Safe districts have their elected officials decided in the primary, which is not open to people of the opposite party in Arizona. Thus, these folks know that no matter how they vote, their candidate will not win. As many of them say, "Why should I vote when my vote does not count?" So without more competitive districts, the democratic process will be stifled, since people will not be civically engaged. The fate of democracy in Arizona is in your hands. I ask you to preserve it.

12/04/2021 - 16:58	MaryAnn Marazzi	LD3 redistricting insanity	I live in LD3 and under the newly proposed changes would not be able to vote in the areas where I pay taxes and would have no say within the school district where I live. This is unconscionable! I do NOT support the redistricting to favor one political party's aims over another, nor do I support any action that violates AZ State Constitution or the US Constitution.
12/04/2021 - 17:10	Ari Ben Berrong-Huber	Redistricting comment	My name is Ari, I live in Phoenix on Thomas and 16th st near the Phoenix Children's Hospital. I understand this is a difficult job, but one of the parts of the map most confusing to me is proposed congressional district 1. I feel like there should be a district that is south of the 101 that includes places like Encanto and Coronado near where I live, but stretches north to include areas I ken Alhambra and the neighborhoods along the 17, as well as going to east phoenix to include places like Arcadia and Came back. I know Congressional maps are bound to be spread out more, but I feel its possible to create congressional district with the areas I spoke of so that neighborhoods like mine are not in same district as somewhere like Carefree
12/04/2021 - 17:34	Richard Feldgus	Redistricting	It's really important to redraw the redistricting maps so that they are unbiased!

12/04/2021 - 17:55	Mary Grier	Importance of Competitiveness; Keep Greater Scottsdale Together	<p>I have lived in McCormick Ranch in Scottsdale since 2007. I advocate that you adopt a map that keeps Greater Scottsdale and the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community (SRPMIC) together in one legislative district, as proposed in Map # LDF049, previously submitted by my fellow Scottsdale resident Emily Wilson. Doing so would serve all of the goals stated in Proposition 106, including the constitutional mandate to create competitive districts.</p> <p>Keeping Greater Scottsdale Together would serve the goal stated in section 14(F) of Proposition 106, which provides that "To the extent practicable, competitive districts should be favored where to do so would create no significant detriment to the other goals." The Keep Greater Scottsdale Together map would provide for a district that is competitive according to the standards set by the Commission. It does this in a way that supports, and does not undermine or interfere with, the goals set forth in sections 14(A) through (F) of Proposition 106. Map # LDF049 uses city boundaries and includes a geographic area with distinctive features, including the McDowell Mountains and preserve. It would also respect the joint economic and other community interests of Scottsdale and SRPMIC. It would enhance, rather than diminish, the impact of voters within the SRPMIC, certainly passing muster under the Voting Rights Act. It would create a compact, contiguous district of the appropriate size without splitting precincts, census tracts, or municipal boundaries. In addition, it would be a competitive district that includes voters of different demographics and political affiliations.</p> <p>In 2000, when Proposition 106 was on the ballot, Former Attorney General Grant Woods, a Republican proponent of Proposition 106, stated in his comments supporting its passage the principal purpose of the measure was to increase competition in elections. He noted that when districts are not competitive, good, qualified candidates do not run for office because they cannot win. Legislators in secure seats are less responsive to constituents. They don't stay in touch with voters because no one will challenge them.</p> <p>Developments since 2000 have made competitiveness even more important. In this era of political tribalism and unfettered personal antagonism, government no longer functions as it should because of extreme partisanship and polarization. As the political parties have become more sorted ideologically (we no longer hear of liberal Republicans or conservative Democrats) and more values-oriented than policy-oriented they have also become more antagonistic and judgmental toward members of the other party. Legislators and other elected officials no longer work together for the common good. Instead, they treat members of the other party as enemies and characterize them as evil, criminal, un-American. Unfounded conspiracy theories abound. Elected officials from safe districts express more extreme views because they are elected in the primary, which generally has lower turnout and attracts those with more extreme views. They fear "getting primaryed" more than they fear an election contest with someone of the other party, so their positions become more extreme. Cooperation with "the enemy" is offensive to their primary voters and therefore they rarely cooperate or accommodate. Some can barely speak with civility about members of the other party.</p> <p>As Nick Troiano describes it, "Our political system is caught in a "doom loop" of partisanship and polarization, as both major parties trade long-term institutional stability for short-term political gain in what they rationalize as a fight for the soul of our country." For one side to win, the other side has to be destroyed. If one side isn't winning, they're increasingly willing to tear the entire system down just to succeed. If your opponent is evil, any action is justified. It becomes the norm to harass, disrespect, even threaten death or imprisonment against those who hold an opposing political view. This year we saw partisans invade the capitol, proclaiming their belief that the action was necessary for them to "take back their country."</p> <p>The Commission should not be swayed by members of the public who claim they have "nothing in common" with people who do not share their every demographic and should therefore reside in a district where everyone is just like themselves. Voters in a region have plenty in common regardless of their political views. A working democracy does not require that people be segregated into voting districts based on their political views, their relative wealth, or any other specific characteristic. In our pluralistic society we all must learn to tolerate differences and get along with one another. Older generations must live with younger generations; people of different cultures and ethnicities must live and work with one another; people from all points on the socio-economic spectrum and the skin-tone spectrum must learn to get along despite their differences and work together for the greater good. Tolerant and cooperative behavior by voters and electeds is more likely when voting districts are competitive, and candidates are forced to appeal to a broader segment of interests and opinions, and to broker compromises and seek the middle ground.</p> <p>One final point. The fact that competitiveness is the last goal listed in Proposition 106 does not make it less important than the other goals. It does not mean that competitiveness may be disregarded. It is your job to design a map that optimizes ALL of the stated goals. Keeping greater Scottsdale together in a single district, as proposed in Map # LDF049, does just that. Splitting Scottsdale into three separate districts, one of which would extend many miles, and include several different jurisdictions, thereby creating a majority Republican district, may serve a partisan goal but does not optimize all six goals stated in Prop 106.</p> <p>Once again, I thank you for your time, service, and consideration of these comments.</p> <p>Mary Grier</p>
--------------------	------------	---	---

12/04/2021 - 17:57	Amy Cheely	Proposed redistricting maps	I support the current proposed maps adopted on 10/28/21 for LD6, LD7 and CD2. This will keep our rural 5+ counties solely rural and undivided. Thank you.
12/04/2021 - 18:28	Harry Cheely	LD6, LD7, and CD2 please !	Thank you Commissioners for your hard work ! It does not go unnoticed! As a resident of Show Low, I am asking the Commission to please consider the maps ( LD6, LD7, and CD2 ) As a rural community we haven't had our considerations heard for quite some time. We do have different needs than Flagstaff, and we would like to take pride in having a say in what happens in our communities and what the future holds for us ! Sincerely, Harry Cheely
12/04/2021 - 18:34	suan pierce	redistricting	To make competitive districts I endorse LD50 or LD51. I live in cottonwood
12/04/2021 - 18:51	Patricia Gerrodette	SE Arizona map	My name is Tricia Gerrodette and I have lived in Sierra Vista almost 26 years now. The congressional district has almost always been competitive, whereas the state legislative districts have not been. As a consequence of the competition factor, the races for Congress have been engaging, with either party having a chance at winning. The public pays attention and gets attention, all of which is good for our democracy, I think. I think the map you have created for this new district is too stretched out and looks like a classic gerrymander shape. I think map CDF001 does a better job of being compact, being competitive, and joining communities of interest. I think the inclusion of very rural counties to our north (Graham and Greenlee in particular) is not a good choice for communities of interest. Although eastern Cochise County is rural, I think it's a very different sort of rural. I believe most people in Cochise County have affinity with Tucson and with eastern Pima County much more than with Graham or Greenlee County. In my view, map CDF001 does a better job of connecting the people who truly share a community of interest and interact with each other. Thank you for your work on this very difficult, extremely important job. Your final map will determine a lot of our political futures for a decade and I hope you can keep this district as a competitive one.
12/04/2021 - 18:57	Esther Durán Lumm	Redistricting	I am Esther Durán Lumm, a resident, precinct and state committee member of the AZ Democratic party. As a member & secretary of Democracy for America, Maricopa County, member of the AZ Democratic Party Seniors Council, member of the AARA Board, Vice president of the AZ Hispanic Community Forum, and Co-Chair of Uncage & Reunite Families Coalition, redistricting and the rights and opportunities of voters are extremely important to me. As an Arizona native and lifelong activist, I have been involved in the democratic party and its processes for decades. I was recently elected to the ADP Hall of Fame. As a resident in Legislative District 27, I wish to express my feelings about the redistricting plans being considered. Fair representation in our district is crucial in order that our diverse community has a voice in the political actions that affect us. Having studied the legislative & congressional maps proposed by the Arizona Latino Coalition, I am in favor of them because I believe they give our particular community members an opportunity to run for office and a chance to be elected. The coalition's maps are in tune with our wants and needs because they are competitive, and it is not necessary to "pack" our district. Our district has several areas that are in concert with communities of interest, for example, our school districts, from Kindergarten through 12th grade and community college. We trust that the AZ Independent Redistricting Commission will maintain its reputation of being fair, and truly listen to our testimonies and implement our ideas into the final maps. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. Esther Durán Lumm Legislative District 27
12/04/2021 - 19:09	Loretta Plaa	CDF001 map	My name is Loretta Plaa . I live in Bisbee in Cochise County. I am retired and currently the President of the Bisbee Woman's Club. I am also a bird watcher and a hiker. I agree with the CDF001 map over the IRC's draft map. The CDF001 map keeps Cochise county whole, keeping the area compact and continuous. The CDF001 allows communities of interest to stay intact and to coordinate flowing districting requirements, Homeland security has a strong presence in the CDF001 area. They are more involved with Cochise and Pima counties compared to Graham, Greenlee, or Pinal counties.  Thank you. Please keep the CDF001 map.  Counties.

12/04/2021 - 19:16	Elizabeth Bernstein	Comment on proposed CD6	<p>For the record, I am reproducing below the comments I made at the virtual town hall on 12/3/2021. Thank you.</p> <p>Hi, I'm Elizabeth Bernstein. I have been a resident of Cochise County for over 30 years. I've raised my family here, taught in the public schools and at Cochise College, and most recently served on a commission which advised our County Board of Supervisors as they considered redrawing the supervisorial district lines.</p> <p>Since the redistricting 10 years ago we have been in Congressional District 2, a compact district which joins Cochise County with parts of Tucson with which we share many interests. We go there to shop and for medical care. Our TV stations are from there. Pima and Cochise Counties also have in common that each contains a major military installation, Davis-Monthan Air Force Base and Fort Huachuca, both of which are in our current congressional district.</p> <p>The proposed congressional District 6 separates us in Cochise County from much of Pima County including Davis-Monthan and other parts of Tucson. Our District would instead extend into areas with which we have far less in common, namely Graham and Greenlee Counties and in particular Casa Grande in Pinal County. It's apparent from the map itself that bringing Casa Grande into this District requires a long narrow extension. By reaching so far it not only fails to connect us in Cochise County with our communities of interest, it also fails the criterion of compactness, and unnecessarily crosses (instead of following) multiple city and county boundaries. In each of these respects the proposed District 6 falls short of accommodating the constitutionally required goals to the extent practicable. I urge the Commission to consider a congressional district which combines Cochise County with more of Pima County instead of Graham, Greenlee and Pinal Counties.</p> <p>I thank you all for you time and your hard work.</p>
12/04/2021 - 19:19	Suzanne Whitaker	Redistricting	Please adopt LD0061 map.
12/04/2021 - 19:34	Karolyn R. Bengier	IRC Redistricting	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Thank you for your time, commitment, and service to our state by serving on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC).</p> <p>The biggest problems facing Arizona --and our country-- are extremism and ideological divides. One-Party districts are decided in the Primaries -- where extremist candidates dominate. This leads to greater polarization and division among our Congressional representatives and within our state legislature. It also ensures a stifling of effective legislation in favor of airtime for some extremist statement or cause (take Representative Paul Gosar, for example). Competitive districts counter this trend by returning power back to an evenly divided constituent voting in the General election.</p> <p>I understand the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. This is concerning and worthy of reviewing the current maps.</p> <p>There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,"</p> <p>Karolyn R. Bengier</p>
12/04/2021 - 19:59	Richard william muto	Redistricting	I moved to Fountain Hills 8 years ago so I could live in a community with similar interests and values. I love the small town feel and this area of maybe a 15 mile radius is where i shop, enjoy restaurants, play golf and hike. Please don't lump us in with urban areas with which we know no one, have zero in common and rarely even visit. Thank you.

12/04/2021 - 20:10	Paul M. B. de Blank	Phoenix Congressional Districts; New LD 1	<p>My name is Paul de Blank and I am submitting this as a private citizen. I was born in Phoenix, Arizona, in 1945 and have lived in North Central Phoenix since 1977. For most of that time I have been a political Independent. My wife and I have three children, seven grandchildren and are both retired. My main hobby is to volunteer with my two therapy dogs at inner city schools in Phoenix to help grade school children not be afraid of dogs and know how to approach them.</p> <p>I currently live in Legislative District 28. According to the proposed maps, that will become Legislative District 1. This will mean a fairly big change of the neighborhoods in my district but I would like to compliment the Commission on how it is drawn. The new district is compact, seems to contain a good cross-section of communities of interest, and is likely to be fair and competitive. That last point is important. Voters are sick and tired of extreme partisanship that caters just to the extremists on both sides of the aisle. Old LD 28 was competitive and over the last decade I watched it move slowly from the Republican to the Democratic column. But precisely because it was competitive, LD 28 legislators were forced to listen to ALL voters. The result was that, whatever their party, they were among the most sensible, flexible and influential legislators to be found. For example, Kate Brophy McGee was one of the six Republican legislators who helped Gov. Jan Brewer get Obamacare across the finish line in Arizona. She was vilified for that by some in her own party but her voters in LD 28 appreciated that she voted for what she thought was right, rather than just along a straight party line. That used to be more common in the old days, and it is a shame that it now is fairly rare. But to the extent the Commission can draw districts that are truly competitive, please do so. And as for new LD 1, I say good job! Leave the draft map alone.</p> <p>However, as for the Congressional redistricting map, Phoenix is being cut up into a number of very strangely shaped districts that mix urban communities of interest with rural communities of interest, are not at all compact, and ignore existing city and town boundaries, all of which are to be important considerations when drawing district maps. The interests of urban and rural communities are inherently different and with a city as large as Phoenix in a state that is sparsely populated most everywhere else, there needs to be at least one Congressional district that represent the interests of all Phoenixians. Such a district can and should still be drawn to be competitive, but it should be compact and much more closely follow established city boundaries. I urge the Commission to revise the current map to do so.</p> <p>In closing, I would like to thank you for your time and for the many hours of selfless service you have performed on behalf of the citizens of Arizona. You represent the best of the best amongst public servants. Paul de Blank</p>
12/04/2021 - 20:24	Sue Thorne	Redistricting partisanship in Southern AZ	<p>Chairman Neuberg: It's been up to you to follow Arizona Law and federal Voters' Rights Act Law as an "Independent" Commissioner during your whole process this year. You have consistently shown your true colors as a right wing hack willing to break the law to formulate purple AZ as Red again despite thousands of comments to create fair competitive, compact, contiguous districts that keep "communities of Interest" together in the same district. Today's Meeting in Tucson which lasted from 10 am to 6 or 7 hours later was testament to the outrageous attempt you have made to split up sections of Tucson and combine them with wholly unrelated communities (witness your elephant trunk on CD6-delete that!). It is also outrageous that you would split Green Valley off from Sahuarita. Both depend on one another and need to be in CD6. I see now how you have planned to skew my very competitive CD2/6. Use the current CD 2 Map as your first model of a competitive compact and contiguous map that follows AZ and Federal Law. I, too, lived in CD2 when Republican Ko be won, Democrat and businesswoman Giffords won, next, with Republican thugs raging guns cocked threatening our Democracy as never before and carrying that threat out massacre which killed a child, a venerated Republican judge and many others. I had two friends who were wounded. Trump stooge, McSally, won next and was too afraid to come out of her office for fear of reprisals, even when her 126 vote win didn't justify voting with Trump's agenda 100% of the time. We now have Kirkpatrick, who grew up in a ranching family and respects voters in her district. Keep the smart current CD2 map or use map 9.0 for your CD 6 which is my current CD2. Remove the elephant trunk. Just as I told you in a former comment, Erica, I don't trust you to do the right thing, so I must tell you again keep CD2/6 the way it is or follow Lerner's suggested 9.0 map. As for LD 17 which I'm probably in as I live in the Catalina Foothills, scrap this illegal gerrymandered monstrosity!!! If you must, put Marana, Oro Valley and Casas Adobes together as LD 17, but do not combine disparate parts of the city, and do not assume they have the same interests!! Stop the gerrymander of LD21. Listen to those who spoke to you today about stopping LD21 gerrymander. And stop splitting up parts of midtown Tucson to aid your tribe. We expect you, Chairwoman Neuberg, to aid in legal redistricting; we do NOT want you to aid criminal behavior as displayed by Leach, Mehl, the Mayor of Marana or any other who wants to redraw Southern AZ maps with gerrymandering in mind!</p>

12/04/2021 - 21:32	Lynne Hudson	IRC Process going forward	<p>My name is Lynne Hudson, and I have followed the IRC public meetings since they began. I live in unincorporated Pima County, but my concerns are more general and relate primarily to the principles and processes guiding the redistricting process itself.</p> <p>My first concern relates to Communities of Interest. The purpose of Prop 106 was to minimize partisan gerrymandering and give all citizens a greater voice. Voting districts are governmental units, so it makes sense to group folks who have similar needs into the same governmental unit, thereby amplifying their voices and enhancing chances that their particular issues, issues like agriculture, mining, tourism, broad band access and historical preservation, will get both the attention and support from their representatives. Communities of Interest became a redistricting criterion to serve this purpose. But this is not understood by many commenters at public meetings, who continue to define their community of interest in terms of where they shop, dine, worship and play.</p> <p>I commend commissioners for fulfilling their obligation to listen to the public, but they have been less successful in fulfilling their reciprocal obligation to educate the public when necessary. I believe this is one of those times. The meaning and purpose of Communities of Interest should have been clarified in public session long ago. And I am more concerned about this lately because Chairperson Neuberger has seemed to use this less grounded conception of communities of interest herself as a rationale for discounting other criteria, notably competitiveness.</p> <p>For the record, competitiveness, not communities of interest, is given favored status in Prop 106. (This criterion includes the qualifier "to the extent practicable" as do all other criteria except one, adherence to the US Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, which is immutable.) Many other entries on this site have explained the many benefits of competitive districts. Suffice it to say they promote meaningful discussion of issues, enhance citizen participation, and decrease extremism--all outcomes I hope we can agree are beneficial.</p>
12/04/2021 - 21:34	Michael McHugh	Today in pima County	<p>I think it was abysmal that a location was chosen that only housed 300 people and you left more than half the crowd standing out in the streets. And this despite a distinct lack of advertising on something so crucial to our process.</p> <p>Please do better.</p> <p>Given who was let in and the overwhelming type that was not, I urge you to please ensure our voices and views are better heard on election days to come. Arizona is a very ethnically and culturally diverse population especially here in pima County. Please make sure our boundaries represent that diversity instead of hiding it away.</p>
12/04/2021 - 21:55	Leslie Cox	CDF010	<p>I support the Navajo map CDF010 over the AIRC Version 10.0 map. At the Dec 1st meeting, I heard testimony that in comparison to their currently competitive 2011-2020 District, the AIRC map would be a step backwards in their voting rights struggle, considered a dilution of the Indigenous voice, and a disenfranchisement of their vote for the next 10 years.</p>

12/04/2021 - 21:59	Lynne Hudson	IRC Process going forward	<p>At the risk of beating a dead horse, I am joining the ranks of citizens who object to the recent adoption of LD17 in Pima County, which proponents have acknowledged was created purposefully to create a non-competitive district. This map is in direct violation of Prop 106, which was intended to do the opposite. It also violates specific criteria in the Law, including compactness, contiguity, and respect for natural geographic boundaries.</p> <p>Commissioner Lerner made this argument during the discussion phase, but Commissioners Mehl, York and Neuberg supported the map. They constituted a majority, so Commissioners Lerner and Watchman reluctantly went along with the map but voiced their expectation that changes would be made in response to feedback from the public. They were right about the feedback--it was overwhelmingly negative and has gotten more so with recent revelations about the origins of the map. But I am concerned, however, about what kind of changes will be made. The Chairperson keeps talking about improving maps by tweaking. But no tweaks will make this map acceptable. It is fundamentally flawed on its face because is illegal, and it is further flawed by ripple effects on neighboring areas.</p> <p>Santa Cruz County is a prime example. The creation of LD 19 prompted the division of Santa Cruz County, thereby diluting the power of its residents to advocate for clearly articulated and cogent reasons for keeping that County intact. And yet public comments from Commissioner Neuberg suggested she is less persuaded by their interests and arguments than she is by the politically motivated interests of advocates supporting LD 17. I find this very concerning, and I respectfully request that she revisit her public comments and reflect on her priorities.</p> <p>Finally, given the geographical and population distribution constraints of Arizona, ALL citizens understand and expect compromises will be necessary. Having said that, all citizens will not be as understanding if those compromises violate the fundamental principles of the law that all commissioners promised to uphold.</p>
--------------------	--------------	---------------------------	--

12/04/2021 - 22:05	Dieter A Knecht	Re-draw the Draft Map to produce competitive voter districts	<p>I and many others have urged the Commission to create districts that are more competitive between the Republican and Democratic voters, to encourage voter participation and to limit extremists that are elected in primaries in the safe districts. However, in today's Arizona Republic, in a meeting with the Commission by the Arizona Legislative leaders including House Speaker Rusty Bowers, Representative Reginald Bolding and Senator Rebecca Rios, Rep Bowers urged the Commission to ignore calls for the districts to be more competitive, saying that in his 30 years with the Legislature, he believes governing works best when the balance of Republicans and Democrats is more lopsided.</p> <p>Taken further to the extreme, this implies that government works at the highest efficiency under a one-party rule or dictatorship. Is that the goal of the Commission?</p> <p>Is the IRC established to improve government efficiency? Prop 106 passed by the voters, creates an independent commission to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive Congressional and Legislative Districts. It did not create the Commission to increase government efficiency. In fact, Mr. Bower's ideal that unbalanced R vs D districts are more efficient goes against the goal of Prop 106 to produce fair and competitive districts.</p> <p>Rep Bowers further states that the Draft Map and the previous maps both contain the same amount of competitiveness they have had for the past 10 years, implying that this would be ok for the next ten years.</p> <p>However, the amount of competitiveness from the past 10 years should not be a goal to keep for the next ten years. For example, the lack of competitive districts in the past has produced extremists such as Congressmen Gosar and Biggs, who tried to overthrow the US government on January 6. On the state level, the lack of competitive districts has produced a small group of Arizona Senators who spent almost \$200,000 of our money and almost \$2 million private funds to support a "forensic" audit by a totally incompetent outside group, the Cyber Ninjas, of the election results to try to cast doubt on President Biden's win over Trump that was previously certified by the AZ Governor, Secretary of State and Legislature. In addition, during the audit, the mis-treatment of voter machines resulted in their de-certification, requiring the county to purchase new equipment for the next election for additional several \$Millions.</p> <p>In districts with a desired smaller voter spread of 1-7% rather than the large voter spread of 20-50% as exists now, such a situation would be less likely to have happened because the winning Senator or Representative candidates would have been selected by voters of both parties rather than by only the extreme primary voters of the majority party.</p> <p>However, the districts can be drawn to be more competitive, as shown in the proposed Northern AZ districts LDF 050 and 051 and CDF 010 that have yet to be adopted by the Commission. With more competitive districts, the voters will have an incentive to vote and will feel that they can influence an election regardless of their party affiliation or whether they are independent voters.</p> <p>A way to do this for the other districts was proposed in a recent opinion by Nelson Morgan published in the AZ Mirror:</p> <p>"...if boundaries are adjusted from the current map to reduce the gap in extreme majorities, this will spread party-favoring population into other districts and increase competitiveness. And the appearance of fairness will be matched by actual fairness.</p> <p>It's win-win!</p> <p>I respectfully urge the Commissioners to re-examine the Draft map's districts that have a very high voter disparity of greater than 7% and to adjust the boundaries to increase the competitiveness and give all voters a say in future elections.</p> <p>This would indeed result in a win-win situation for all Arizona voters and the resulting State and Congressional legislators that are elected.</p>
--------------------	-----------------	--	--

12/04/2021 - 22:10	Dieter A Knecht	Yavapai County is not a competitive district if kept whole	<p>In today's Arizona Republic, Rep Bowers and Senator Fann were reported to have asked specifically to keep Yavapai county intact and to recognize communities of interest over the desire for more competitiveness.</p> <p>Is it the IRC goal to keep community of interests together in a district at the expense of having a fair and competitive district for a given voter? Apparently Rep Bowers and many other members of the districts majority party believe this should be the case, I guess for obvious reasons, since they are in a large majority.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Commissioners not to keep Yavapai county intact in a district. For example, as a Democratic resident in the over 30% Republican majority Yavapai county, being part of a community of interest such as the hiking club or Audobon society would certainly not be more important than having my vote count in a local election because as part of the minority in the district, my vote would be overwhelmed by the 30% majority.</p>
12/05/2021 - 06:52	Joyce Anderson	redistricting	<p>I am very concerned about the changes being considered for District 17. I am strongly suggesting that District 17 include the area from Marana to the foothills including Oro Valley AND Casa Adobes, leaving Vail, Houghton corridor and Tanque Verde in the eastern legislative districts. It makes no sense to leave out Casa Adobes and add areas that are on the complete opposite side of the city! The criteria for your committee prohibits partisan gerrymandering. The current proposal of adding the eastern area to the far northwest seems to be ONLY about partisan gerrymandering!!!</p>
12/05/2021 - 08:44	Kathy Doran	The proposed LD 18, 20 & 17.	<p>As the maps are drawn, my midtown neighborhood at Fort Lowell and Alvernon is part of LD 18, which is the foothills, part of Oro Valley and some of midtown. The interests of my midtown won't be represented well as part of LD18. Have you seen Grant and Alvernon?!? The place has problems. I doubt someone who represents Oro Valley and the foothills will care about it. I'd rather be part of LD 20. In map CD0073 by the Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting please include more of downtown and midtown by moving the eastern north/south boundary east to Craycroft. I want the City of Tucson, the University and downtown to all be one district for better representation for our interests.</p>
12/05/2021 - 09:21	Judith Lee Anderson	CDF001	<p>December 5, 2021</p> <p>To the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission</p> <p>My name is Judith Anderson. I have lived in Bisbee in Cochise County since 1989. I worked for the County Planning Department for almost 20 years serving as the Director for the last three years.</p> <p>I support Competitive Congressional District--Southern Arizona (CDF001). While I appreciate your hard work, I do not support the map proposed by the Independent Redistricting Commission.</p> <p>I see no logical reason to change the current CD2 District so dramatically. CDF001 more closely reflects the existing, competitive district. It is compact and contiguous and keeps Cochise County whole.</p> <p>On the other hand, I see no logical reason to include Graham and Greenlee and Pinal Counties in the new district. It creates an odd-shaped, gerrymandered district with far-flung areas that have no reasonable connection to each other.</p> <p>Rather than belabor my position and take up a lot of your time, I will simply say that the IRC's proposed district makes no sense to me an educated person with a Master's Degree. I encourage you to support CDF001 and keep our new district competitive with logical boundaries.</p> <p>Again, thank you taking on this difficult job.</p> <p>Judy Anderson, Bisbee</p>

12/05/2021 - 09:38	Jee Nam	Keep asian communities together	<p>Hello my name is Jee Nam and I hope you will keep communities together.</p> <p>Please prevent the split of Indigenous, Latino, Black, AAPI and additional POC neighborhoods. When minority majority neighborhoods are split, voices are lost. I support Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community President Martin Harvier's recommendations to the IRC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Commission should keep the SRPMIC in a single legislative and congressional district. President Harvier stated, "As a unique Community of interest, a tribal community is located in only one census tract. I believe this should not be a problem for the commission to consider."</li> <li>2. Place the Community in an urban legislative and congressional district and not in any large rural district.</li> <li>3. Locate the SRPMIC and the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation in the same congressional district, because they share a common border and support being located in the same district.</li> <li>4. Because the Community also shares a common border with the City of Scottsdale and has similar transportation, public safety and solid-waste issues, to name a few, locate the Community in the same congressional district with Scottsdale.</li> <li>5. Locate the Community in the same district as Tempe and Mesa, again because of mutual beneficial activities that we have with each of these cities. Keep Scottsdale Strong</li> </ol> <p>Lastly, please cap the district at the Frank Lloyd Wright canal. This allows for a competitive district between parties and currently our indigenous nation neighbors are asking to maintain with Scottsdale and Mesa.</p> <p>Please consider these items in your revisions to the draft map districts. Thank you for your time.</p> <p>Your Constituent, Jee Nam</p>
12/05/2021 - 09:56	Joseph Watkins	Independent Redistricting Commission	<p>At this point in the process of creating new district line for the Arizona, I have had the opportunity to witness hours of thoughtful commentary from ordinary citizens across the state.</p> <p>Tribal communities, Hispanic communities, well established communities in the cities in Maricopa and Pima county wonder why the commissioners divide them in ways that seem completely at odds with the charge of the Independent Redistricting Commission. I have also heard many pleas from citizens whose need to have meaningful dialog with the elected representatives is dismissed because the district is so far from competitive.</p> <p>I share their frustrations. I live in midtown Tucson, disconnected by district boundaries from the neighborhood to the north, a neighborhood that itself is again divided to lie in two legislative districts. I walk through these three districts each morning. Standing at the corner of Tucson Boulevard and Speedway, I can look in all directions to see what to everyone seems like one intact community. Yet somehow, the Redistricting Commission's draft map has this intersection at the boundary of three districts. These districts continue to unfamiliar places – the Sonoran border, the Catalina Foothills and the suburbs of far east Tucson. In each case, no one legislator will have the nuanced understanding of the entire district needed to provide effective representation.</p> <p>In recent years, mathematicians have devised approaches to quantitatively score the fidelity of any given map with the legal requirements. With evidence of partisan meddling in the drawing of boundaries, I call on the commission to provide scores for all 205 submitted maps, to choose among those that have the highest scores, and to explain in transparent terms the rationale behind the final map. If this exercise is not undertaken by the Commission, then it will be by the courts.</p>

12/05/2021 - 10:20	Diane E Boman	Pubic Input for Mapping	<p>I am disappointed and upset that Competitiveness has been left behind in the 24 districts that are labeled as safe districts. Competitiveness is a full-fledged redistricting criterion with the same weight as the other five criteria of compactness, contiguity, respecting communities of interest and utilizing natural/geographic boundaries. The idea of competitiveness brings with it the goal of helping to ensure "fair and competitive" districts where both major parties have an opportunity to win an election. Out of 30 Legislative Districts we have six that are competitive. That is an extremely poor showing that does not provide the electorate with candidates that are reactive and open-minded on either side of the isle. If a candidate is a shoo-in, it is more likely that the electorate will not show up at elections because they feel their vote will not count or you will get the extreme right or left base to vote in candidates that serve their limited mindset. The remaining 24 districts must be reworked in order to meet the requirements of the Arizona Constitution.</p> <p>As far as the Congressional Districts, Yavapai County's 2 congressional districts will be reduced to one safe red district. How is this possible with all the guidelines that the IRC is required to meet? Of all the northern counties, Yavapai is growing. We have 40% more population than Coconino County and our growth rate is 1.68%. I am not opposed to splitting up counties because our population's interests do not end at an arbitrary county line. The interests of cities are of more importance than counties. Independent voters will not be served well by these current maps either. In districts where the independent vote leans with the majority of voters, independent voters will not show up to the polls. Why go through the hassle of requesting a ballot and designating which party you want to vote for. It is too much work. If you lean in the other direction, you have the same issues preventing from going to the polls. Too much work, my vote won't matter because there are not enough of us to make a difference.</p>
--------------------	---------------	-------------------------	---

12/05/2021 - 10:32	Laura Lane	Redistricting	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Let me begin by thanking you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC). I believe the voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps, and I think you have all served with that spirit of mind to this point in the process.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I am thrilled that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons I previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few.</p> <p>You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. I believe it can be done, so I ask each of you to strive for that goal and create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely,"</p> <p>Laura and Scott Lane [REDACTED] Chandler, AZ 85286</p>
--------------------	------------	---------------	--

12/05/2021 - 11:20	Robert Wallin	Proposed Districts in Pima County	<p>The proposed District 17 includes portions of Pima County that are not contiguous. A legislator would have to travel 40 miles from Marana to Vail to meet with constituents. This configuration violates the requirement that districts be compact, contiguous and competitive. In addition, contiguous communities of interest in Downtown Tucson, University of Arizona, and Fourth Avenue should remain in District 7. District 7 should include areas South of Broadway, so that Latinos maintain voting strength in their communities of interest. It is critically important for the fairness in our election process, that all districts be competitive. Gerrymandering undermines the spirit our democratic election process.</p>
12/05/2021 - 13:45	Pamela Thompson	proposed CD-6	<p>My name is Pamela Thompson and I live in the current CD-2. I have lived in Bisbee, Arizona for over 20 years. I am a retired community college teacher and an avid outdoor enthusiast. My husband Matt Fredrickson has been employed by the Department of the Interior for 20 years, with the Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife.</p> <p>We support the Competitive Congressional District – Southern Arizona map CDF-001. Proposed CDF-001- Southern Arizona keeps the new district contiguous and incorporates the communities of interest that we care about.</p> <p>The current Congressional District, CD-2, is competitive. Since we've lived in southern AZ, both Republicans and Democrats have been elected in CD 2. The proposed new district would be significantly less diverse because it would incorporate very rural and extremely conservative areas of AZ into the new congressional district, while excluding suburban and urban areas. AZ already has a problem with extremist House members (thinking of Paul Gosar here), and we don't want more of the same. We want our district to be as competitive as possible for both Republican and Democrat representation. Keeping this district competitive means that representatives will have to continue to work hard to create &amp; support legislation that benefits a variety of Arizonans, not just a narrow slice of the electorate.</p> <p>Another reason we support Competitive Congressional District – Southern Arizona map CDF-001 is the very strong connection between Cochise county and Tucson. Residents of Cochise county travel to Tucson routinely for medical appointments, shopping, education and entertainment. Many people live in Tucson but work in Cochise county, and others live here in Sierra Vista or Benson but travel daily to Tucson for work. Our nursing program at Cochise College often had students attending who were Tucson residents and traveled daily to Sierra Vista or Douglas for classes. Residents of Cochise county do not have the same ties to Pinal, Graham or Greenlee counties.</p> <p>We believe the new district should include Coronado National Monument, Chiricahua National Monument, Saguaro National Park East and the San Pedro River National Conservation Area. We are nature lovers and these areas represent a Community of Interest that is important to us, and we believe they should be grouped together. These areas, along with communities like Bisbee and Tombstone, depend heavily on tourism, rather than on the ranching, farming and mining that characterize much of Graham, Greenlee and Pinal counties. It makes sense to keep these areas with their similar economic focus within a single district. In addition, our national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges and conservation areas have water needs that differ from those of regions to our north; these needs can be addressed most effectively if they remain within one congressional district.</p> <p>Cochise county is also a border county. Our lives are enriched culturally and economically by the international border. Tucson also has significant cultural and economic ties to Mexico. Homeland security has a presence in Cochise and eastern Pima counties that is much greater than it is in counties to the north. We live with border issues on a daily basis, so it makes sense to have Cochise county and Tucson represented by the same member of Congress.</p> <p>Finally, we believe it's important that the congressional district be of a manageable size and shape because it's important for Representatives to visit their constituents and oversee their district. The proposed CD-6 would really be impossible for the Representative to cover geographically.</p> <p>Competitive Congressional District – Southern Arizona map CDF-001 establishes a district that is manageable for visitation, maintains significant communities of interest and is competitive for both Republicans and Democrats. We support Competitive Congressional District – Southern Arizona map CDF-001 and appreciate this opportunity to express our concerns and thoughts.</p>

12/05/2021 - 14:32	Scott Day Freeman	Improper Application of the "More Competitive" Redistricting Goal	<p>To avoid a possible future legal challenge, the AIRC should address, in a demonstrably sincere and substantive way, the fact its record reflects that it has unfairly and selectively applied the "competitiveness goal" in making adjustments to the maps.</p> <p>In its 2009 decision, the Arizona Supreme Court affirmed that all six redistricting "goals" are MANDATORY and that the AIRC "should favor creating MORE COMPETITIVE districts...when doing so does not cause significant detriment to the other goals."</p> <p>Each of the six criteria embodies a substantive "value" and each Arizonan is entitled to have his or her district infused with those values. The competitiveness goal is particularly important because, as its proponents have maintained, a "more competitive" district moderates the "voice" of the representative, among other rationales. Nevertheless, in crafting its maps, the AIRC has done the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The AIRC refused changes to make districts MORE COMPETITIVE because the changes would not get the targeted district within an arbitrary and narrow "competitiveness" range. But favoring MORE COMPETITIVE districts is MANDATORY. The Arizona constitution provides no such "excuse" for ignoring the goal.</li> <li>2. The AIRC refused changes making districts MORE COMPETITIVE only because those changes would take a neighboring district out of an arbitrary and narrow "competitiveness" range. But the "more competitive" goal yields only when the particular change would cause a "substantial detriment" to the "OTHER GOALS," not competitiveness goal.</li> <li>3. Outside the VRA districts, the AIRC must work to make each district MORE COMPETITIVE, not "favor" certain voters with competitiveness, affirmatively taking it away from others as a consequence. Yet, just like 10 years ago, the AIRC is selectively applying or emphasizing the "more competitive" goal, which fosters the creation of lopsided districts elsewhere on the map.</li> <li>4. Making lopsided non-VRA districts slightly less so, i.e., more competitive, is not a "lost cause" as this Commission has implied: making a lopsided district even slightly less so enhances minority party voice, candidate recruitment, fund raising, party building, &amp; opens door to single shot strategy in AZ House races. "Lost cause" is not a legitimate, constitutional excuse. The AIRC still must impart the "more competitive" value to each district.</li> <li>5. Everyone gets the "more competitive" value, wherever they live in the state, except perhaps in VRA districts where federal law overrides. The only legitimate, constitutional, excuse for not applying the "more competitive" goal is where particular map change would cause a "substantial detriment" to achievement of "other goals." The Commission would, of course, want to be consistent, even handed, and well-grounded in assessing whether the "substantial detriment" standard was implicated.</li> <li>6. The AIRC should focus on how it imparts "competitiveness" goal on each voter and district, NOT on a limited number of districts that satisfy a narrow and arbitrary "competitiveness range." Selective use of "competitiveness" goal is classic gerrymander... the AIRC's own mapping expert described it as such during one of your hearings in July.</li> <li>7. The AIRC has refused to take steps to meet first 5 redistricting goals AND make "each district" "more competitive." Instead, the AIRC's record indicates that it has selectively applied the "more competitiveness" goal, and its record further demonstrates that the Commission has a rationale for doing so: implementing the extra-constitutional "goal" of balancing lopsided districts created as a consequence of the VRA to achieve some notion of proportional partisan outcomes. None of that is in the constitution.</li> </ol> <p>Your final mapping hearings might very well be long and exhausting, but I know you will remember to enjoy this experience and privilege.</p> <p>Thank you, Scott Day Freeman</p>
--------------------	-------------------	---	--

12/05/2021 - 14:33	Millicent Gray	AZ Redistricting	<p>In 2000, the IRC was established by the voters of Arizona to create an independent redistricting commission. Its objective was/is to create FAIR AND COMPETITIVE MAPS for our state. That is, to curtail gerrymandering to a minimum.</p> <p>I am not clearly seeing this in the draft maps that have been offered. I am quite disturbed that approximately 24 of AZ's 30 legislative districts are now considered as non-competitive "safe" districts; that is, discouraging participation by voters as in "why should I vote? What is the point?"</p> <p>How did this get so skewed? Why did this get so skewed?</p> <p>A lot of people are asking this question.</p> <p>I am therefore asking the Commission: please, do the right thing. Our Democracy, which people have become used to taking for granted, is on the line; you might say getting close to "the tipping point".</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely, Millicent Gray</p>
12/05/2021 - 16:01	Victoria Khalidi	comments on proposed LDs	<p>Hello IRC members,</p> <p>First, I want to thank you for volunteering for this very challenging and extremely important role in our state. I am proud to be a resident of a state that determines LDs in a nonpartisan, fair, and open manner. We are an example of democratic principles in our country and really around the world. SO THANK YOU for your service,</p> <p>I moved to Tucson in 1975. I love this city and its diverse communities. My neighborhood is mostly composed of retired upper-class Republicans. Down the road are apartments with young couples just starting families. Only a few streets away, you find mobile homes on large desert lots that are homes to hardworking blue-color residents. This is the strength and beauty of my city. We are all neighbors that greet each other on our morning walks and trips to the grocery store. We know the names of each other's dogs. We are a community.</p> <p>I am writing to ask you to please strongly value this kind of community diversity and cohesiveness when you make your LD decisions. As our state has grown we are becoming more diverse in many ways and all our residents deserve a voice in the future of their neighborhood, city, county, state, and country.</p> <p>We do not want gerrymandered maps with long or odd districts that are designed to give power to one party at the cost of our communities. We want fair and competitive districts that motivate residents to get involved and to vote because they know that their vote matters.</p> <p>I understand that one district was proposed by a legislator of one party and has been adopted by the committee - that is unfair and against the rules of the process and our constitution. The outcome of tricks like this will be less community representation, increased partisanship, and more extremist politicians (like Paul Gosar). Arizonans deserve better. Please make it clear that cheating is not accepted in this process. Please reject and redraw this district so it is a fair and competitive.</p> <p>We are counting on the IRC to create fair and competitive LDs that support, strengthen, and represent communities and will take this state into the future with the strength of a fair and transparent process behind it.</p> <p>Thank you again. Your service is greatly appreciated.</p>
12/05/2021 - 16:27	catherine chouinard	Cochise County Redistricting	<p>I am in favor of the version 10.0 Draft LD map. It supports the Communities of Interest for the "not Tucson" voters and the more rural/suburban lifestyles.</p> <p>Also, I am in favor of a CD map known as "fair CD6 and CD7" which was submitted by Ray Ihly.</p>

12/05/2021 - 16:36	Fredri Olster	Democracy	<p>I know you have gotten hundreds and hundreds of letters about why and how to draw our maps. This letter is to remind you that at the very heart of your mandate is Democracy. It cannot exist if it is distorted by gerrymandering. Fair and free elections are what separates Democracies from other forms of government. Democracies are fragile and require constant care and nurturing. Our Democracy is in your hands at this moment in history. I hope the weight of that responsibility will lie heavy on each one of you as you complete your redistricting tasks. Your children and our children will live with the consequences of your choices.</p> <p>I thank you for caring for our Democracy.</p>
12/05/2021 - 16:40	Cindy Bitcon	Latest maps	<p>I would like to thank the IRC for the 10.2.21 draft maps. My only concern would be not to divide precincts between two legislative districts. Thank you for all your hard work.</p>
12/05/2021 - 17:00	Betty Bengtson	League of Women Voters comments to the IRC on December 4	<p>Comments to the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission December 4, 2021 Public Hearing, Tucson, AZ</p> <p>My name is Betty Bengtson and I'm here today to represent the League of Women Voters of Arizona. Early on, your mapping consultant, Doug Johnson, said that it's not the number of comments but the best maps that count. The best final maps will be those that provide an opportunity for all Arizonans to have a voice in their government. Safe districts, packed with partisan voters, do not provide that opportunity. Safe districts result in elections decided in closed primaries by voters from one party and legislators who tend to listen to only one side of an issue. Safe districts result in uncontested elections, and in discouraged, disengaged voters.</p> <p>These are the problems that led Arizonans to pass Prop 106 twenty years ago. Unfortunately, the approach taken by this Commission in the draft maps seems to be to balance the number of districts leaning Republican or Democratic rather than to make the districts themselves competitive.</p> <p>As a result, by your own data analysis, you have placed your thumb on the scales with 14 legislative districts where Republicans always win and 11 where Democrats always win, leaving only five legislative districts where it is possible for an election to swing to the other party. And three of those five swing in only one of nine elections. Only two legislative districts (less than 10%) are truly competitive.</p> <p>Vote spreads in 15 of the legislative districts are above 20%, including three where it is more than an astounding 50%. There is ample opportunity for the Commission to increase the number of competitive districts, especially in urban areas. Your Congressional districts are no better. The vote spread in four of the nine districts range from 14.7% to over 40%...which seems the very definition of packing. You can do better.</p> <p>You must fulfill both the letter and the spirit of the law. Give us districts that provide our state the opportunity to come together, not to be further divided. Give us maps that don't allow one party to dominate the legislature year after year. Give us districts that result in a legislature where the minority party can get its bills heard and voted on. Give us maps that encourage competition of ideas and debate of alternatives. Give us maps that apply the six criteria as written and that favor competitiveness as directed in our constitution.</p> <p>Finally we want to thank you for your dedication to our state. You are all volunteers, and we greatly respect your service and your diligence. We especially appreciate your extensive efforts to include the public in your process.</p>

12/05/2021 - 17:12	Salil Deshpande	Redistricting - Southern Arizona	<p>I live in Pima County. I'm originally from Texas, but I've made Tucson my home in recent years. My son was born at Banner University Medical Center. And my wife works at the University of Arizona and she grew up in the Catalina foothills. As someone originally from Texas, I feel fortunate to now live in a state that has an *Independent* Redistricting Commission. I have seen firsthand the impacts of partisan gerrymandering in my home state of Texas, and I would hate to see the negativity and toxicity of Texas politics come to Arizona.</p> <p>On that note, I would urge the Commission to reconsider the legislative draft map with respect to Southern Arizona. The legislative draft map, as it stands, originated from a partisan source with the intent to gerrymander the Tucson area. Particularly, Legislative District 17 in the current draft map does not create a fair and competitive district nor is this district geographically compact and contiguous. One end of the district is separated from the other end by the Catalina Mountains. I would ask that the Commission take another look at LD Test Map Version 9.0, which creates a more competitive District 17 that is more geographically compact &amp; contiguous and includes nearby parts of Tucson like the Casas Adobes region.</p> <p>As a resident of midtown Tucson, this impacts me because the relative distribution in my district is skewed by the weird shape of LD17 to the north. The draft legislative map splits us between multiple districts diluting our voting power and influence in the legislature. I want fairer districts for the entire region so we all benefit.</p> <p>Thank you for your time today.</p>
12/05/2021 - 19:24	John Fritz	Redistricting	<p>I am an Independent/ Democrat..not asking for any favors. Just asking to be competitive and fair. We all have to be honest and fair for this country to work right..Thank you</p>
12/05/2021 - 19:27	Betts Putnam-Hidalgo	Redistricting commission meeting	<p>I listened through the end of the hearing yesterday. I certainly hope you take the suggestions to jettison Id 17, re unite the tucson mountains, pull tucson estates back into tucson and keep the tribes with tucson as well, map 10 is so bad, such an insult to the intelligence of anyone in this process that one wonders if its being presented as a test case to see how "bought" the judicial system in arizona is...it was disconcerting at best to hear the chair deliver a monologue on the issue of partisanship 3/4 of the way through the speakers. I dont mean to demean what was called a question but quickly turned into a diatribe about "the confusion" of what is partisan! Neuberger continues to tell us that shes so "in the middle" that she cant see a problem with having dressed as a republican ( and clearly tried to take a gendered view of the audience comment on being surrounded by a sea of red AND seeing it on the so-called independant chair). From that position in the middle, she does not recognize that a map that is requested by a state legislator, then drawn by a gop party member who clearly ignored rthe criteria, then was front end loaded into the acceptance process by using a business groups ties to the republican commissioner in order to get voted on is partisan? Excuse my indelicacy chair Neuberger, but you are as confused as a snake going into a rodent hole. Batting eyelashes and claiming confusion all while facilitating a completely egregiously corruption scheme is more gendered than kyrsten sinemas curtsy as she axed chances for a 15\$ an hour minimum wage. I hope that tomorrow the games will stop and we will see the beginning of significant changes to the gerrymandered maps.</p>
12/05/2021 - 20:18	Larry Meads	LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010	<p>As good patriotic Americans and Arizonans, it is important to have the best legislative and congressional leaders possible and this is the intent of Proposition 106. Our best leaders rise when they face voters of every registration type allowed in Arizona. This happens more certainly when districts are compact, competitive and include communities of interest. As a Yavapai County resident we want responsible leaders and thus this family fully supports maps for northern Arizona proposed as LDF 050, LDF 051, and CDF 010. Look, we are drifting back to a one party state and that is exactly why proposition 106 was finally passed. We want a better state and a better country. It is time to boost the odds for real stateswomen and men. The Navajo Nation should not be split apart as it contains communities of interest that cannot be denied. While Sedona, Verde Valley and Clarkdale are in Yavapai County, their most true community of interest is to be included with the City of Flagstaff. County borders should be subservient to communities of interest.</p> <p>Recently the Yavapai County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution to keep the eastern communities in the county included as a community of interest. That best serves to maintain their super majority of votes in county government. We don't want one party government. The IRC members have been involved in a lengthy process. We appreciate the time and effort that you have put into this. Can you, will you, do the right thing for better government in this state and this country? We are watching. Thank you sincerely.</p>

12/05/2021 - 20:26	Lynne Hudson	IRC Process going forward	<p>Approved IRC draft maps 10.0 for Southern Arizona generated shock, disappointment, and anger when they were adopted over the objections of Commissioners Lerner and Watchman, and that was before investigative reporting revealed the maps were generated by Republican legislators and operatives. So the heated rhetoric heard at the IRC public meeting in Tucson on December 4th was not surprising. Most followers did not anticipate such blatant partisan plots would be attempted, yet alone be successful.</p> <p>Well, we are about to find out if Commissioners Mehl, York and Neuberg will overcome the partisan bad faith of the past few weeks, salvage their reputations, and make it possible for the IRC to right the ship. The only good news at this point is that the process is not done, so there is still time to repair the damage. But several things will have to happen, and promptly.</p> <p>The necessary first step must be an act of good faith, namely discarding the LD 17 map that blatantly violates Prop 106 on so many levels, the most egregious of which is that it was created purposely and admittedly to create a partisan district when the Constitution states specifically that the Commission's responsibility is to create as many competitive districts as possible. Please don't even think about tweaking the LD 17 map. It is fatally flawed and should be replaced with Southern Arizona map 9.0 immediately. To do otherwise will guarantee legal action, wasting everyone's time and taxpayer dollars. Make no mistake, there are no defensible arguments for the missteps already taken. A lawsuit arguing otherwise will be thrown out of court, just as other recent frivolous cases have been.</p> <p>The second step is to reexamine all other maps for potential bias and make any other necessary changes before proceeding further. But even then, no reboot will be successful unless at least these four conditions are met: (1) partisan political shenanigans must stop completely, regardless of their source; (2) every commissioner must focus on what is best for ALL Arizonans; (3) all actions taken going forward must uphold the Constitution; and (4) heated rhetoric and recriminations cannot be allowed to sap the energy needed to complete the task. And that includes not only commissioners, but IRC staff, consultants, legislators, party leaders, their staff, and citizens as well.</p> <p>My final suggestion is to ignore the calendar. You don't have a lot of time, but you have enough time. Chairperson Neuberg's earlier advice still applies: getting this right is more important than adhering to a self-imposed calendar. Please do what is right. We are counting on you.</p>
12/05/2021 - 20:49	Steven L Marlatt	Comments on the CD6 proposal	<p>My name is Steven Lee Marlatt and I live in Willcox. (I have been a resident of this area for over 30 years.) While I am currently retired, I worked as a science teacher for Middle School and High School Students during my career. I have reviewed the draft map of the proposed CD6 and I am not in favor of these boundaries. Instead, I much prefer the boundaries of the Competitive Congressional District--Southern Arizona (CDF001).</p> <p>The CCDF001 proposal is very similar to the old CD2 boundaries. This was a very competitive district, it had common concerns in border related issues, and included areas that were economically related to each other.</p> <p>In comparison, the proposed CD6 boundaries include Greenlee and parts of Graham and Pinal County. Those areas have far less in common than the CCDF001 proposal. The eastern portion of Pinal county, including the eastern part of Tucson, has much more in common with Sierra Vista, Benson, Willcox, etc. There is a lot of travel between the areas for shopping, work, etc. Lastly, as this is a much less spread-out proposal, the congressional representative from this area will have much easier time travelling to see all of the constituents vs. the extremely spread-out proposal which goes from Greenlee County to the southern part of Cochise County to the northwest part of Pinal county.</p> <p>Thank you for listening to my comments and I hope that you will support the Competitive Congressional District--Southern Arizona (CDF001).</p>

12/05/2021 - 21:05	Wendy Rosen	Arizona Redistricting	<p>"Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Let me begin by thanking you for your service on the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC). I believe the voters of Arizona had great foresight when they created the IRC in an effort to reduce the influence of gerrymandering and partisan extremism in creating our state's political maps, and I think you have all served with that spirit of mind to this point in the process.</p> <p>One of the biggest problems facing Arizona, and our nation, is the continued rise of partisan extremism and greater ideological divides. We see it in our nation's capital, and we see it in our state's capital. Continued gridlock, degradation of civil discourse, and an overall sense that our governing systems aren't functioning as they did in the past. There are many reasons for this, but one of the most significant reasons has been the rise of gerrymandered districts that are one Party dominant.</p> <p>These overwhelmingly one-Party districts tend to be decided in the Primary election since the General election is made irrelevant by the one-Party dominance of the district. And as almost everyone would agree, Primary elections are dominated by a small and much more partisan group of voters as opposed to General elections. This means that many elected officials are elected by, and only accountable to, an increasingly smaller number of hyper-partisan voters. This leads to greater polarization and division within the halls of Congress and our state legislature.</p> <p>One of the best ways to address this troubling trend is to create more competitive districts that allow for General election voters to decide the outcome. I am thrilled that the IRC has had many robust conversations about the importance of competitive districts and has made progress on that goal, but the Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded Arizona's draft maps as a "C" in terms of competitiveness. So, there is still some work to be done.</p> <p>As has been discussed by commissioners during the public hearings there are numerous ways to achieve this goal. For example, on the congressional maps District 3 is an overwhelmingly Democratic district. A slight redistribution of voters from this proposed district into Districts 2 and 4 could create a more competitive district while still complying with the Voting Rights Act. It would balance out the map and reduce partisan dominance for the overall map.</p> <p>The legislative maps can also still be improved in terms of competitiveness. This was discussed at length in the meetings where the final draft maps were adopted, so I hope constructive dialogue on competitiveness continues when you begin drawing the final maps in December. There are many ways to make the legislative maps more competitive, but perhaps the most obvious one is slightly adjusting the lines of proposed Districts 17 and 18. As was pointed out by Commissioner Lerner during the hearings, the hyper-partisan nature of the proposed District 17 doesn't really serve any identifiable purpose. If the IRC made some slight adjustments to this district, commissioners would create a much more balanced and competitive map overall.</p> <p>Ultimately, I strongly believe this should be an important goal for all of the reasons I previously mentioned. Your work can leave a legacy that ensures all Arizonans have an opportunity to truly have their voice represented in our political systems. If done correctly, we can show the rest of the nation that partisan politics and ideological extremism do not have to dominate a redistricting process. Reasonable people can, and should, work together to find solutions that serve everyone, not just a few. You've already demonstrated this can be done through portions of your work. The Princeton Gerrymandering Project graded the draft maps an "A" for partisan fairness. That's a great accomplishment, but let's not stop there. Let's shoot for an "A" on competitiveness. I believe it can be done, so I ask each of you to strive for that goal and create maps that will be the gold standard for the next decade.</p> <p>Thank you for your service and thank you for your consideration of my comments.</p> <p>Sincerely, Wendy Rosen</p>
12/05/2021 - 21:12	Laura J White	Proposed CD6	<p>I am a 4th generation resident of Cochise County and have chosen to stay here in retirement because of the unique opportunities for outdoor recreation this county offers. The economy of this county benefits greatly from visitors attracted here by our outstanding natural attractions as well as by historic places such as Bisbee and Tombstone. The San Pedro River is a national treasure that should be protected and valued, as should our finite groundwater resources. Residents of Pinal and Graham counties would not have knowledge of the value of Cochise County's natural resources and the economic and lifestyle benefits they provide. In addition, our largest urban area, Sierra Vista, is in no way similar to the towns found in Graham and Pinal Counties. The economic base in those portions of Pinal and Graham counties included in the proposed CD6 is dissimilar to that in much of Cochise County. In Sierra Vista, for example, where most of the population resides, the economic base is heavily dependent on Ft. Huachuca.</p> <p>It would be difficult for anyone to adequately represent the population of such disparate areas stuck together in the disjointed congressional district map being proposed. I support the alternate proposed congressional district map - Competitive Congressional District—Southern Arizona (CDF001). This is more compact and similar to the current CD, and obviously makes more sense than the proposed CD6 which is a clear case of gerrymandering. Please, instead, adopt the alternative CDF001.</p>

12/05/2021 - 23:39	Dorothy Ann Morris	Redistricting	<p>I support LDF 050, 051 and CDF 010 because these are competitive districts that are more compact and contiguous than any of the current proposals. The proposed a map, CDF 010 places Prescott in a congressional district with the Navajo Nation and dilutes the power of the indigenous vote. That map is outside the boundary of competitiveness as defined by the IRC.</p> <p>It isn't important to keep Yavapai County within one district because the Prescott Area differs from that of Sedona and the rest of the Verde Valley communities. Yavapai County was originally much larger and was subdivided by the legislature. The county boundaries have changed in the past. The district maps needn't adhere to the county boundaries drawn years ago by the state legislature.</p>
--------------------	--------------------	---------------	---