



**Web Comments 12.07.21**

<b>Submitted Time</b>	<b>Full Name</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Message</b>
12/07/2021 - 01:02	Carol Consalvo	Keep Scottsdale Together	I have been a resident of Scottsdale for 42 years and have seen the city grow....I have always been proud of the city and the many strides we have made in keeping the city beautiful and cohesive. Please do not break us up...we need to have a diverse voting block and fair representation of our community. I have been an active member of the community, on the boards of several different organizations over the years and care about the integrity of our community. Thank you for considering my request.
12/07/2021 - 01:03	Carol Consalvo	Keep Scottsdale Together	I have been a resident of Scottsdale for 42 years and have seen the city grow....I have always been proud of the city and the many strides we have made in keeping the city beautiful and cohesive. Please do not break us up...we need to have a diverse voting block and fair representation of our community. I have been an active member of the community, on the boards of several different organizations over the years and care about the integrity of our community. Thank you for considering my request.

12/07/2021 - 09:13	Victoria Kauzlarich	Fair and Competitive Maps	<p>The rules of the game dictate the behavior of the players. When you change the rules of the game, you change the behavior of the players.</p> <p>This deceptively simple concept is behind the wisdom of fair and competitive maps. Candidates who must compete for voters of all stripes will, by definition, run more centrist campaigns and will be more likely to govern from the middle - benefitting all Arizonans.</p> <p>Rusty Bowers would have you think otherwise. When he met with you recently, he reportedly said, "The narrow majorities that I have seen, like the one I serve in today, actually empowers the extremes of political rhetoric and action. And it makes governance very difficult."</p> <p>Narrow majorities are NOT what empowers extremism. Rather, it is the long-standing behavior of the majority in our legislature. Among other things, this behavior prevents Democrats' bills from getting a fair hearing in the legislature which ensures extremism and the absence of compromise</p> <p>How might the legislative process be different if most of the legislators came from competitive districts - where each party had a nearly equal chance of winning? When you change the rules of the game...</p> <p>There are no moderate Republicans in our legislature any longer. The last of them, Paul Boyer, has announced he will not run again.</p> <p>In my view, the beginning point of the redistricting process should be fair and competitive maps. Make as many as you can and then, swallow hard and recognize that the remaining districts will have to lean one way or another.</p> <p>The draft maps show just the opposite. Out of 30 districts, it looks like only about 5 or 6 of them are competitive. A dozen are red; ten are blue.</p> <p>Fair and competitive maps are not difficult to accomplish. Invite your map maker to create 30 competitive districts using the vote count criteria you've been using. With a few key strokes, you'll easily be able to see where this will take the state.</p> <p>Build out from there. I'm sure you'll find that the majority of districts COULD be fair and competitive with the balance leaning toward one party or the other.</p> <p>It isn't too late. You can do this if you have the will.</p> <p>Victoria Kauzlarich Scottsdale Resident</p>
12/07/2021 - 09:27	Holli Ploog	LD5, LD6 and LD7 maps	<p>Commissioners, I listened to the hearing yesterday and when you discussed Northern Arizona the focus was nearly entirely on the Navajo Nation map and whether to include Flagstaff or the White Mountains into LD6/7. I want to remind you that virtually all testimony and correspondence during public hearings and through your website requested that the City of Sedona be made whole. It is a small issue to you, but a huge issue for our city. Please don't forget about us in your deliberations! Thank you. Holli Ploog, City Councilor, City of Sedona</p>

12/07/2021 - 12:12	Suzanne Mead	Comments by Chair Neuberg	<p>During the Dec. 6 deliberations Chair Neuberg said the following: "There is no one region in the state that is entitled to a competitive district." Madam Chair, please explain how you arrived at this conclusion? It seems to suggest that the Commission has no obligation to try to draw less partisan districts despite the goal of Prop 106 and extensive public demand. I sympathize that mapping is a tough process and that perfection is not realistic. However, to say that voters in entire regions of the state are not entitled to a fair chance to elect representatives of their choice, seems prematurely defeatist and in direct opposition to your pledge to fight for democratic principles and advance through redistricting, one person, one vote.</p>
12/07/2021 - 12:17	Steven H. Slaton	Future district 7	<p>My Name is Steven Slaton; I live in Show Low Az.  Like to thank Chairman Neuberg, and Commissioners,  My wife and I represent the White Mountain Conservatives. We represent thousands of folks who live throughout the White Mountains of Northern Arizona Mountain communities.  As for the future of Legislative District 7, By including the Northern Communities with a Southern district of Pinal County as shown in your approved Draft Map Legislative District 7, is not communities of interests or competitiveness.  With the size of these districts half of our population is bound to feel unrepresented. And they are already!  Districts should accurately represent communities of interest who live and work together. Being loop in with the Pinal County which main community of interest is mining, were we have nothing in common with mining.  A new Legislative District 7 should accurately represent communities of interest which is required by State and Federal law.  We the people of Northern Az. request you reinstate your Az. Draft Map 1.0 Legislative District 7. HOWEVER the communities of Snowflake, Taylor, Holbrook, Joseph city, and Winslow, are not part of these communities of interested of the White Mountains.  These communities are made up primarily of rock and high desert plateau, with a vast valley of ranchland, and agriculture, With 2 of the largest Marijuana growing facilities in the state, as well as large wind Farms, and Helium development from Holbrook Basin through the Navajo Reservation these differences separates the two regions, and they should be included in Legislative District 6 not Legislative District 7.  The culture and way of life is different than those communities of interest of the White Mountain Communities.  The White Mountain Community which is outlined on the Az Draft Map 1.0 with their community of interest is commitment to bringing tourism to the region, along with common interest within other White Mountain communities, which share rivers and lakes, National Forest, winter sport activities, Hunting, Fishing with ongoing Economic Development of the White Mountain.  The White Mountain communities for Legislative District 7 need to be with other White Mountain communities of the same Interests. These interests are non-partisan and are for the common good in our locales and region. These cities include Lakeside/Pinetop, Show low, Heber/Overgaard, Forest Lakes, Payson, Pine, Strawberry, Cornville, Camp Verde, Clarkdale, Cottonwood, Williams, Parks, Sedona, Suburban and Rural Flagstaff only as in Doney Park, and West Flagstaff. All of These Communities would meet communities of Interests as well population requirements for Legislative District 7 according to Federal and State Laws.</p> <p>Thank you for your time  Sincerely  Steven Slaton</p>
12/07/2021 - 12:51	Diane Uzee-Larson	Arizona Redistricting	<p>I strongly oppose the splitting up of the Greater Sedona Area.</p>

12/07/2021 - 13:39	Priyanka Sundareshan	Minority vote dilution	<p>My greatest concern with the draft maps is how minority voting power is being diluted in southern Arizona. I know the Commissioners are working hard to meet their mandates, but I worry that these maps will open you up to legitimate challenges in court over the constitutional criteria and Voting Rights Act. The fact that the urban Tucson districts of LD18, LD20 and LD21 have both high minority concentrations, AND are relatively overpopulated compared to the underpopulated LD17, provides good evidence that minority voting power is being diluted through packing minorities into these districts. Deviation from average population should only be used to protect minority voters, not disenfranchise them. The Tucson area itself is split between more than five legislative districts, again diluting our voting power relative to existing maps. This could be evidence of cracking our urban voters with higher minority concentrations. Santa Cruz county, the smallest county in our state, is split in the draft map. This does not respect their significant community of interest nor the political boundaries. Santa Cruz county is also 80% Latino, so having it split which adds to the problem that districts in southern AZ are diluting the minority vote.</p> <p>Making the draft maps have more competitive districts will promote the voting power of minority voters as intended by the VRA, rather than packing or cracking us to dilute our voting power.</p> <p>Please rebalance the southern Arizona districts by including Casas Adobes and Catalina into their similar community of interest in LD17, and adjusting other lines accordingly.</p> <p>The DOJ recently filed suit challenging the proposed Texas maps because they dilute the minority vote. According to the New York Times article of Dec. 6, 2021, they do not have to prove intent to discriminate for the maps to be found unlawful. Thus a similar action could happen here in Arizona. Protect our votes, as well as the hard work you have put in, by ensuring that the maps do not dilute the voting power of minorities.</p>
12/07/2021 - 13:54	LINDA MIGHDOLL	Redistricting maps	<p>According to Chair Neuberg competitive districts are unnecessary. That is the primary reason she is going through this process. She will subvert democracy with that view. She is unqualified to be on the committee. Everything she does has to be discarded.</p>
12/07/2021 - 15:18	Maryann Kenney	Draft maps for Verde Valley area	<p>I continue to urge the commission to make more districts with competition within each district, not simply balancing some number of safe districts. This leads to extremes. I also strongly favor separating Northern Arizona at the Mingus Mountain geographic feature, keeping Sedona and the Verde Valley together with Flagstaff. It supports our natural resource, tourist based economy COI and provides increased competitiveness, rather than piling all of the area into a safe district around Prescott and Prescott Valley.</p>

12/07/2021 - 15:26	Diane McQueen	CD and LD maps	<p>I would like to again express my disappointment that the majority on the commission is still recommending to "Keep Yavapai County whole" by moving the Verde Valley and the part of Sedona that is in Yavapai County into the same districts as the Quad-City area is now in. The notion of "Keeping Yavapai County whole" is a meaningless statement. As far as CD and LD boundaries go, Yavapai County has never been "whole". It's been this way for 40 years and during the past 40 years the residents, businesses and governing bodies of these areas have worked together just fine despite being in different LD and CD districts whether it be water issues, healthcare, education, transportation, infrastructure, etc. The people of the Verde Valley want to be aligned with Sedona AND Flagstaff and Sedona wants to be aligned with Flagstaff AND the Verde Valley for their district boundaries. That is their communities of interest. It's been working this way for 40 years and there is absolutely no reason to change it other than some people and groups wanting to completely control the political environment in Northern Arizona by having safe Republican districts. Keeping Yavapai County whole is just a fallacy. This is wrong and it's flat out gerrymandering. The commission has already split over 3/4 of the counties in the state and now are discussing looking at moving the portion of Sedona that is in Coconino County into the same districts as Yavapai County? This doesn't make any sense at all and only adds to the reasoning that "keeping Yavapai County whole" is meaningless. Yavapai County is no more special than Coconino County or any of the other counties that the commission is recommending to split up. Every county has it's water issues, healthcare issues, education issues, transportation issues, etc., but all the counties work together on these issues when necessary. We've been doing it this way for 40 years and the sky has not fallen and it will not fall if Yavapai County is not kept whole. The proponents of keeping Yavapai County whole have one goal in mind and that's tilting the political scale, all across Northern Arizona, in their favor. We need two rural competitive CD districts, with fair maps, in Northern Arizona, not two safe Republican districts. My voice, along with many others, deserves a chance to be heard at the ballot box. With the current proposed maps my voice will never have a chance of being heard because in non-competitive and gerrymandered districts the elected officials and candidates don't have to listen to everyone. They only listen to the people who they know will vote for them. Thank you.</p>
12/07/2021 - 16:00	Ann Rae Heitland	Flagstaff Unified School District	<p>So much weight seems to be given to keeping school districts together in other parts of Arizona, but when it comes to the Flagstaff Unified School District, I have not heard a single commissioner mention how the draft maps slice the school district apart. This is true in spite of testimony from residents of Kachina Village and Bellemont and comments from citizens of Parks (where the Maine Consolidated District goes only through 8th grade so high school students come to Flagstaff). FUSD serves the Greater Flagstaff Community of Interest consisting of the communities of Kachina Village, Mountaineer, Munds Park, Bellemont, Parks, Fort Valley, Doney Park, Timberline, Winona, and more. Please respect the Greater Flagstaff Community of Interest and combine it with Sedona and the Verde Valley.</p>
12/07/2021 - 16:21	Cheryl W Miller	Voting Precincts	<p>Thank you for creating fair and balanced map version 10.2.</p> <p>Please keep precincts all together in one district versus splitting them up into multiple districts.</p>
12/07/2021 - 16:28	Robert J Banks	Precincts Redistricting	<p>Please keep communities of interest together. My only comment is to keep precincts together and do not split them up into multiple districts.</p>

12/07/2021 - 17:52	Dieter Knecht	CD2 map needs to create two rural districts and split Yavapai Co	<p>At the December 6, 2021, meeting, the IRC agreed to draw two different sets of newly revised maps for CD2, one set would create two rural districts by separating Mingus Mt from the rest of Yavapai County, the other would combine the entire Northern AZ region running east to west.</p> <p>I strongly support the first set that creates two rural districts and oppose the second set that combines the entire Northern AZ region. The two rural districts in the first set would make more sense because it would include in each a common community of interest while increasing the competitiveness of the eastern district to the desired goal of 4%. At this level of competitiveness, there would be more voter participation by both parties AND independents and it would not become a safe districts for one party, which in turn protects against extremism. The successful representative that is elected would be more responsive to all voters in the district, not just his or her party. A higher level of civic engagement and voter participation would result in this option because the races would not be a foregone conclusion, and a candidate for either party could win.</p> <p>Please support the option of two rural congressional districts which are separated east-west by the Mingus Mountain and not support the option of including all of Northern Arizona in one congressional district.</p>
12/07/2021 - 17:54	Susan Stumpf-Hebert	Associating the Houghton Road Corridor with Oro Valley	<p>As a resident of the northern area of the East Side of Tucson, I would the IRC to know that severing the Houghton Road "corridor" from the rest of Tucson and including it with Oro Valley, Marana, and parts north would wrong this tight, involved, interdependent community. People in the far eastern parts of the Tucson area as far East as Cochise County depend on the resources, churches, libraries, parks, and health care facilities of the East side of Tucson--even shopping as far into Tucson proper as Park Place Mall, Whole Foods on Speedway, and taking art classes and volunteering at the Desert Museum, which is over Gates Pass. We seldom see people from Marana in church on Sunday, and never from Casa Grande or Pinal County. In short, Tucson is a vibrant, involved community, sharing many cultural similarities with surrounding areas. It is more likely to meet someone at an event in Reid Park, or on Sunday at St. Phillips Church, or at the Quaker Meeting downtown, from the Houghton corridor or Cochise County than it is from Oro Valley, Marana, or northern subdivisions along the road to Oracle. We are all part of the Latino-friendly, Native American-friendly atmosphere of Tucson, and the practices we hold dear: sharing the bounty and challenges of nature; welcoming immigrants (both from Latin America and Muslim countries); sharing food, culture, and art; conserving water; and the density and need for greenery of our subdivisions. The Catalina Mountains provide a natural barrier between our communities. Please don't disturb it.</p>
12/07/2021 - 17:58	Rhonda Bannard	final decision	<p>When I think of my community being integrated with far away different communities, I know it doesn't make sense. Spending most of my life bringing people together to effect change has informed me that diverse voices and ideas make for better outcomes. When it comes to geographies, it makes sense to circle up around those you know in your coffee shop, the business leaders who build the economic ecosystem that you are a part of, and schools and neighborhoods that are connected. So I invite you to consider communities of interest as you shape the final maps for Arizona representing diverse voices through balanced districts that serve Arizonans here and in Washington.</p> <p>Thank you for your servie. -Rhonda Bannard</p>
12/07/2021 - 18:45	Vera Mitchell	Redistricting	<p>Hello redistricting board members. I am writing to express my concern about redrawing the AZ legislative districts that does not adequately reflect the voters of Arizona and more importantly of each district. At this time AZ is pretty evenly split between Democrats and Republicans and the districts should reflect where those specific voters reside. The districts should not be contorted into some strange reptilian shaped entity in order to pull votes to one side. Let us remember "We the people" and "one man one vote." I understand you have complex task, however if the board follows what is just and in the interest of citizens of Arizona the districts should remain fair as they are now. Thank you</p>

12/07/2021 - 21:05	Maria A Lynam	Fair and Competitive No. AZ CDs	<p>Please create two rural congressional districts by separating Mingus Mountain from the rest of Yavapai county. As proposed, the western district would add Mohave county and the Colorado River communities. The eastern district would include the Verde Valley, Sedona, Flagstaff, tribal lands, etc similar to what currently exists. The changes will insure that the tribal lands will be closer to meeting the VRA requirements.</p>
12/07/2021 - 21:18	Dieter Knecht	Keep Sedona in one legislative district and with Flagstaff and the Verde Valley	<p>Sedona is split into two districts under the current Draft map. So far the Commission hasn't resolved this issue. In public testimony, some Yavapai County Commissioners urged keeping Sedona whole and including it with LD5; i.e., Sedona was welcomed with open arms into a district with almost three times the 7% voter spread that was set as the upper limit of competitiveness by the Commission. For those politically like-minded Sedona voters this might be agreeable; however, for the other half of Sedona's voters who don't share the overly balanced majority views, this will result in a large drop in participation in elections where the voter's voice won't be heard. It will also further encourage fringe candidates to be elected in primaries by the extreme members of the ruling party and encourage more circus shenanigans rather than significant legislative actions in the legislature.</p> <p>A more desirable alternative map can be drawn that keeps Sedona in one highly competitive district with a very low voter spread of less than one percent, as shown in LDF 050. If the Commission decides to ignore this option and sacrifice competitiveness, the voters need to understand the rationale used to justify the loss of so many voters from our civic engagement that would result, when the charter of the Independent Redistricting Commission is to improve voter participation and to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive districts.</p> <p>I urge the Commission that in completing the mapping of Northern Arizona, they keep Sedona whole in one district, and only if that district is fair and competitive under the Commission's own guidelines. This can best be done by including the Verde Valley and Flagstaff in the same district as Sedona as demonstrated in CDF 050.</p>
12/07/2021 - 21:39	Jeannine Reno	CD2 Navajo Nation	<p>Please respect the Voting Rights Act and reconsider CD2 so the Navajo Nation will have a district that their voice will matter. It is currently diluted in the CD2 map. I suggest that you redraw CD2 to be like it is now as current CD1 which includes the Verde Valley, Sedona on east side of Mingus Mountain. I support the map you discussed on 12/4 which would create two rural districts by separating Mingus Mountain from the rest of Yavapai county. There have been countless testimonies in person and in writing to keep Verde Valley, Sedona, Flagstaff, and the tribal lands together. Keeping Yavapai County whole is NOT a community of interest.</p>
12/07/2021 - 21:40	Abraham James	Central and downtown Phoenix needs to have it own congressional district..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Phoenix is the largest growing city in the US, and yet the city is split in the draft Congressional maps between a number of different districts. The core of Phoenix shouldn't be split the way it is between different districts that extend so far north.</li> <li>•Green Gables neighborhood is currently in Draft Congressional District 1, which includes Carefree, Fountain Hills, Tonto Forest, and portions of Apache Junction. None of these areas is urban or connected to the central Phoenix area, meaning that our neighborhood, and other similar central Phoenix neighborhoods, are likely to be completely ignored by a representative who would be faced with a number of rural and ex-urban policy issues that have nothing to do with us.</li> <li>•Choosing to live in the central part of a city is a different choice than living in larger lots, farther away from one's neighbors on the outskirts of a metropolitan region (areas like Cave Creek, Carefree, Fountain Hills), and the issues we care about are very different. It does not seem that the IRC took that into consideration in drawing these maps.</li> <li>•Those of us in the city have different challenges when it comes to air quality and water supply, and we have specific considerations on issues of public transit options, small businesses, the arts - its a unique cultural area that should have a voice in Congress to represent these federal issues that impact us uniquely.</li> <li>•We want to see central Phoenix more efficiently represented in a district that is focused on our city, so that we have a voice at the federal level.</li> </ul>