ARIZONA	Web Comments 12.14.21		
Submitted Time	**Full Name**	**Subject**	**Message**
12/14/2021 - 04:39	Troy Wanstreet	Follow the constitution for Redistricting	The constitution lays out the parameters for redistricting. Please follow the constitution and not maps submitted by one-sided political parties. Thank you
12/14/2021 - 06:28	M'chelle Ebel	Redistricting	Please listen and follow the constitutional criteria and thousands of comments received from the general public and don't listen only to the one partisan Democratic "Latino Coalition" map. We here in the Verde Valley are dominantly more connected with Prescott with our age groups and find it much more convenient to drive to Prescott for our needs than Flagstaff, especially in winter months when the winter weather sets in. Thank you so much for considering this in your decision making process, The Weatherfords
12/14/2021 - 09:01	Thea L Chalow	LD17 maps	As it currently stands, LD17 map 10.0 is a prime example of the kind of blatant gerrymandering the IRC was created to prevent. The attempt by State Senator Vince Leach to use the Mayor of Marana as his "straw buyer/letter writer" is contemptible. I urge you to use LD17 map 9.0 which meets the requirements of being "compact and contiguous," provides for "communities of interest," and would be nominally "competitive." meet these IRC requirements.
12/14/2021 - 09:55	Jean Ann Ferguson	Redistricting of all districts	Dear Chairwoman and Members of the Independent Redistricting Commission: It is my understanding that a group called the Latino Coalition has submitted maps to the Commission. This group is highly partisan and its suggestions SHOULD NOT be taken into consideration. The members of the IRC should consider the constitutional criteria under which it is working and listen to all of the citizens who have called in and submitted maps from the general public. Thank you. Jean Ferguson, Flagstaff, Arizona
12/14/2021 - 10:02	Helen Hebert	10.2 map redistricting	Please do not include Flagstaff in district 7. There is no community interest by including Flagstaff ,a urban area into a rural area. I am strongly disappointed that the commission is not even considering all of the public comments at the Payson Dec 1st. meeting. Most all of the opinions approved of your original map ,please DO NOT include Flagstaff or push district 7 onto the reservation, there are no "common interest" in either of those choices. Stay focused on the big picture.7QZBS
12/14/2021 - 10:10	Dayton Hickson	Redistricting	I am strongly disappointed on your latest District 7 map. There is absolutely no" common interest" by including Flagstaff or pushing district 7 onto the reservation. It seems I ke the commission did not even consider the overwhelming comments of the public at the Payson Dec 1st meeting pleading with commission to Not include Flagstaff or pushing district 7 onto the reservation. Your original map seemed to be well balanced and you need to restore the original 10.2 Map.
12/14/2021 - 10:15	Dr. Lauren Pruett	REDISTRICTING notes	Please listen and follow the constitutional criteria and thousands of comments received from the general public and not listen to the one partisan Democratic "Latino Coalition" map
12/14/2021 - 10:51	Cathy Rutherford	Using age to determine COI	Commissioner Neuberg's use of age in determining the Community of Interest for the Verde Valley and Sedona is blatantly ageist. Age should not be the a component of determining the districts in Arizona as it ignores the importance of creating viable districts which work towards an integrated system of supports for all of the residents. The fact that there is an older population in Sedona and the Verde Valley actually more closely connects us with Flagstaff. Flagstaff is where we go for healthcare. With an older population there is admittedly higher needs for more healthcare and due to the fact that Flagstaff is our closest city and has the University connection, the best healthcare for us can be provided there. My husband and I and many of the residents of the Verde Valley and Sedona who we know also go to Flagstaff for other services that are available because they are supported by the student population of NAU. Our needs and their needs overlap in many, many areas. We all want safe roads, good health care, safe forests, and the protection of our precious water system. Neuberg seems to be grasping at straws to explain the illogical "keeping Yavapai County" whole reasoning by using age as a parameter. Again this is ageism, which is no more acceptable than sexism or racism.

12/14/2021 - 11:51	Arlene Rheinfelder	LD 12.0.1 and LD 12.1.1	It is disheartening to once again see Yavapai County divided on LD 12.0.1. There are many reasons why this is a bad map which have been discussed over and over again. Yet here we are again looking at the same division. Flagstaff has a much younger population than the Verde Valley. The Verde Valley Watershed arises in the Chino Basin and shares water issues with Western Yavapai County, not Flagstaff or Payson. The vast majority of the Verde Valley more closely aligns with the rest of Yavapai County due to shared resources such as Yavapai College, the Yavapai County Free Library Network, sheriff's office resources, etc. Please once and for all reject this division proposed in 12.0.1 and adopt LD 12.1.1 which respects communities of interest as the starting place going forward.
12/14/2021 - 11:52	Dennis Dunphy	Commissioner Neuberg's Recent Comments	Ms. Newberg: Your recent comment suggesting age differences as a good basis for divisions of Community of Interests is both naively superficial and polarizing. For example, young folks paying FICA/Medicare taxes need to understand both the current and long term advantages these provide them: directly and, no less importantly, indirectly. Older citizens need to appreciate the burdens imposed on workers and employers by these taxes. Having one age group shouting their own perceived interests through “their” representative while another age group does l kewise through “their” representative is a recipe for deadlock. Having these groups share a representative in a common district requires that representative to hear and respond to both, and helps the groups recognize their shared interests. Your approach simply encourages polarization, Don’t we have enough of that already? Think harder.
12/14/2021 - 13:51	Steven H. Slaton	Future district 7	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 fo ks 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, Ho brook, 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 Mar juana growing facilities in the state, as well as large wind Farms, and Helium development from Ho brook 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. Thank you for your time Sincerely Steven Slaton
12/14/2021 - 13:55	Carolyn A Witcher	Redistricting	Please listen and follow the constitutional criteria and thousands of comments received from the general public and not listen to the one partisan Democratic "Latino Coalition" map.
12/14/2021 - 14:32	Lois Fruhwirth	Please support 12.1.1	As MANY people across all parts of Yavapai County have testified, PLEASE keep our county all together as shown in 12.1.1. Our interests with a single watershed that feeds the verde River and spans Mingus Mountain, plus our interests in keeping our communities rural and focused on outdoor activities and a great quality of life, with all communities of common average ages 50’s-60’s, where we really care about taxes, health care, quality of roads and ambulance services, etc. Do not split us up and then require both sides of the mountain to have to pick up populations in Maricopa and Coconino. That is Not what we want! Thank you Commissioner Neuberg for hearing us and not allowing partisan spin.

12/14/2021 - 14:59	Thomas W. Sonandres	Public Comment - COI and Competitiveness LD Table Proposal	To address competitiveness when COI is met, I submit for the Commission's consideration a Table of 10.0 LD D-R splits arranged by columns of competitiveness and safe columns. COI, while still under discussion, has been extensively addressed. I have three asks: 1. Currently there are two <4% Very Competitive LDs (2, 4) of 30 LDs, or an extremely low 6.7%. ONE Commissioner, asking the mapper for a What If Map moving the four 4-7% Competitive LDs (9, 13, 16, 23) to Very Competitive, would increase Very Competitive LDs to six or to a more substantial 20%. 2. If ONE Commissioner would also ask the mapper to move the three LDs in the non-competitive 7-10% category (12, 17, 25) to Competitive, this would increase the combined Competitive and Competitive, from 10.0's total of six or 20% to nine or 30%. 3. If ONE Commissioner would also ask the mapper to move up to seven LDs in the 10% to 20.5% range (3, 8, 18, 19, 22, 27, 29), then the combined Very Competitive, Competitive, and just outside Competitive would increase from 10.0's total of nine or 30% up to sixteen or to over half of all LDS, 53.3%, a remarkable accomplishment. Such a five Commissioner review of these proposed "What If" maps -- of modified review -- would (1) go far to respond to the many (the lion's share of?) public requests for far more competitiveness, and (2) would allow the Commissioners opportunity to demonstrate an openness to such a review and to focus on maps with both substantial COI and competitiveness criteria, and then inform the public of their individual opinions.Thank you for your consideration. Table follows. If garbled in transmission and you would like a complete, all 30 LD Word 10 table by return email, email "tspica700@gmail.com," Subject Line "10.0 LD Table." 10.0 LD D-R Percent Splits Comp = Competitive Table - 10.0 LD Splits LD<4% 4-7% 7-10% 10-20%20- 30% 1 23.3 D 3 20.4 R 40.5 R 5 28.5 R 6 7 29.8 R 8 19.8 D 9 6.8 D 10 21.3 R 11 12 9.7 D 13 4.4 R 14 24.5 R 15 23.5 R 16 4.2 R 17 9.9 R 18 17.3 D 19 20.5 R 20 21 22 17.6 D 23 5.4 D 24 25 8.0 R 26 28.0 D 27 13.1 R 28 29 17.3 R 30 Evens2 D LDs0 2 1 3 1 R LDs0 2 2 2 7 Total 2 4 3 5 8

12/14/2021 - 15:30	Lynne Hudson	IRC Process going forward	Commissioner Neuberg indicated on 12/13/21 that she would not provide her own map, requesting instead that her colleagues take her concerns into account before making a case for their own preferences. I found that to be a valid and defens ble position. But she also reiterated something she has expressed multiple times in the past that, in my view, is not defensible: her belief that communities of interest are more important than competitiveness. While she is entitled to that opinion, she is obligated to follow the law, which states that the criteria are of equal importance. In fact, unless I am mistaken, a previous court ruling reaffirmed this legal language. And the law goes even further, stating that competitiveness should be FAVORED unless doing so "would create a significant detriment to other goals." The language of the law was written imprecisely on purpose, recognizing that judgment would be required to weigh all the criteria when compromise was necessary. But that judgement must be applied to a particular case. The law does not give any commissioner permission to apply personal preference for one criterion more generally.
12/14/2021 - 16:45	Catherine Hopkins	Tucson	Again, I am disappointed at the gerrymandering. Mehl was appointed by a court where his wife serves. A political operative created a district to benefit their interests. Who runs the commission? Mehl or Neuberg? It is as if PUBLIC meetings were a scam and a necessity. No one listened to what the public has said. Why can't every district be competitive? This would be the best for residents and candidates would not just know they would be elected but, oh surprise, must have ideas to be elected. It is like they can't win if they don't cheat. Gerrymandering is cheating. Shame on this commission for letting this happen.
12/14/2021 - 16:49	Julie Pindzola	"Significant Detriment" to our Fair and Competitive Districts	More disappointment. We now have the specious point of age difference as a justification for cordoning off the Verde Valley from its close neighbor and Community of Interest Flagstaff in order to pull the plug on an existing Competitive District LD6 (7). Are we to define Yavapai County now by the out of state retirees being drawn here – Sun City North? A true self-fulfilling prophesy if districts are drawn to only capture such. By refusing to allow a mix of people and persuasions in our districts, you help reinforce this homogeneity and therefore the political outcomes. This is exactly the opposite of the Prop 106 directive. It increasingly appears that this Yavapai County district was a foregone conclusion before the map work even began. Encasing it as a draft map centerpiece means it never was intended to be altered even though other commissioners and the public were reassured that this was just a draft and subject to refinement. That was a ploy to get the camel's nose in the tent. News out today that our infamous Yavapai-based Congressman is now out to make the rejected former president the Speaker of the House in 2022. All the spurious ta k of election fraud prompted new voter suppression laws in AZ and elsewhere. Now all we need is a small majority of safe R districts crafted by this Independent Redistricting Commission to make that nightmare real. This is what subjective and inconsistent application of "Community of Interest" gets us - irresponsible representators. By creating zero Competitive maps in Northern Arizona, it would seem the IRC may be courting a legal challenge. Please correct this serious problem and consider LD0070 and CD0074 as map alternatives for a better statewide Competitive and Fair balance.
12/14/2021 - 18:58	Debra M Dunbar	Keep Yavapai County together	As a native resident of Yavapai County, I am asking that you please keep Yavapai County together as one whole. Please don't split.
12/14/2021 - 19:01	Robert Leist	Redistricting	Please keep Yavapai County together
12/14/2021 - 19:05	James Peterson	Keep Yavapai district as is!	We have much more in common with cottonwood and the Verde valley than flagstaff has. Our life style and interactions are supportive of each other! Keep us together as a district!
12/14/2021 - 19:08	Bette Borst	LD 1 redistributing proposal	I vote to keep LD1 in Yavapai County as
12/14/2021 - 19:14	Beatrice L Hernandez-Jensen	Redistricting Map	Dear Redistricting Commission. As a resident of the City of Prescott, inYavapai County, I would request that you choose LD Map 12.1.1, because it keeps our County communities of interest together, particularly the Verde watershed. Thank you for your consideration. Beatrice L. Hernandez-Jensen Prescott, AZ 86301 [redacted]
12/14/2021 - 19:16	Miriam Benson	Keep Yavapai county Together!!!!!!	As A voting constituent of the state of Arizona and Yavapai County I believe it is in the best interest of the this community to keep the county as a whole unit and not be divided up or redistricted. I am not clear what purpose it would serve to otherwise. Thank you for hearing me.
12/14/2021 - 19:19	Lenora Denise Kerr	Redistricting	I am a citizen of Yavapai County and live in Chino Valley. I believe that counties that have long been established and have common history should remain within the same districts. Please consider and vote for 12.1.1 to continue traditional voting districts. Thank you.
12/14/2021 - 19:33	Mark David Smith	redistricting proposed maps	Keep Yavapai County whole Use map 12.1.1 for redistricting

12/14/2021 - 19:40	Patricia Gillenwater	Please choose wisely pick Map 12.1.1 to keep Yavapai communities of interest together	A simple message DO NO HARM. Choose LD Map 12.1.1, why? Many activist of all stripes share common goals with sister communities working together to solve important problems like the Verde Watershed.t It is crucial for our diverse activists to remain together for the well being of all.
12/14/2021 - 19:40	Judith A Babcock	Redistricting the legislative districts	I live in Paulden Arizona, in Yavapai County. I would like you to keep all of Yavapai Country in one district; keeping all of the county communities of interest together, particularly the Verde watershed. Please choose LD Map 12.1.1 Thank you. Judith Babcock
12/14/2021 - 19:48	Gail West	Redistricting	Sedona and VOC should be kept together. Duh! The whole concept of redistricting is based on commonality, shared interests, usage of resources etc. I xhoose the boundary map that keeps the City of Sedona in the same district. What plaus ble argument exists to do otherwise. There are none.
12/14/2021 - 19:56	Pamela L Denney	Redistricting	Please keep Yavapai County as one district. Do not merge us with other counties.
12/14/2021 - 20:03	Robert Harley	Redistricting	I live in Yavapai County, in Cottonwood, Az. I request that LD Map 12.1.1 be chosen, because it would be better to keep our County communities together.
12/14/2021 - 20:05	Kris Fischer	Map	KEEP SEDONA WHOLE WITH YAVAPAI!
12/14/2021 - 20:09	Matthew Jewett	Phoenix and Tucson	The latest congressional maps seem to throw together communities that have not historically been together at any level (state, congressional, county). The Proposition (106) that created the Independent Redistricting Commission addressed keeping together communities of interest, and splitting the City of Phoenix - America's fifth most populous city - into many districts and diluting its power seems contrary to what the voters intended. Additionally, as an Arizona Wildcat alumnus, I do not think using Alvernon Road as a dividing line of the City of Tucson would keep together communities of interest, nor does it help create competitive districts, a key selling point when we voters passed Prop 106.
12/14/2021 - 20:09	David Hanke	Maps	The map that actually makes sense is 12.1.1
12/14/2021 - 20:11	Hanke David & Ania	Maps	The only map that makes sense is 12.1.1 as it keeps similar communities together in the county.
12/14/2021 - 20:23	Steven G Woods	Adopt LD Map12.1.1	My name is Steve Woods, I am a citizen, resident, and business owner of Yavapai County, and a retired United States Army Colonel. I am writing you today because I am highly concerned about contemplated redistricting actions proposed in LD Map 12.0.1. The Verde Valley and Sedona are clearly part of the same community of interest with the rest of Yavapai County. My Quad-cities business routinely receives customers from the Verde Valley area because dense interstate traffic on I-17 and inclement weather in winter make the Quad-cities area a natural and preferred shopping option for Verde Valley residents over Flagstaff. We are a single community of interest. Additionally, my business profits from eco-tourism and many customers regularly are experiencing these opportunities in the Prescott, Sedona, and Verde Valley areas, further linking these communities together. I am writing because I cannot be silent anymore, the purely partisan interests that are supporting this draft map (12.0.1) are infuriating and have no place in this process. The small but vocal group calling for these districting lines to be adopted are not part of the Yavapai County community of interest yet are calling to rip us apart. Thank you for seeing how in Yavapai County the Quad Cities, Sedona, and the entire Verde watershed are a natural community of interest and I beg you to stand tall and not succumb to this loud and purely partisan effort. I emphatically urge you to keep this community of interest together as drawn in Map LD 12.1.1 for the sake of all of us who live and work in Yavapai County. Thank you and may God Bless.
12/14/2021 - 20:35	Dianne Schafer	New IRC Map	I live in Yavapai County. I ask that you keep Yavapai County all in one district. Yavapai County is a distinct Community of Interest and should not be split up. Thank you.
12/14/2021 - 20:43	Robert Fitzgerald	Redistate mapping	Keep the district LD Map 12.1.1
12/14/2021 - 20:47	Walter C. Otto	Re-districting	I am a resident of Yavapai County, AZ. I urge adoption of map 12.1.1 that keeps Yavapai County intact including the watershed of the Verde River. This includes areas of common interest and needs.

12/14/2021 - 20:50	Jill Martin	Please adopt MAP 12.1.1	Hello. I live in Prescott, AZ in Yavapai County. I have looked at both of the maps you are considering during the re-districting. Please adopt Map 12.1.1. Can you let me know when you will be voting? Thank you.
12/14/2021 - 20:51	Stephen Otto	Map 12.1.1	I am in favor of adopting Map 12.1.1, I live in Payson and this map does an excellent job of keeping rural communities of interest together.
12/14/2021 - 20:54	Mickelle Roberts	LD Map 12.1.1	I am a resident of Camp Verde and I am asking you to vote yes on LD Map 12.1.1 I think it is important to keep Yavapai County together. Thank you!
12/14/2021 - 20:57	Margaret Pavlich	Please support map LD 12.1.1	I have testified before, so will keep it short by saying that LD Map 12.1.1.is a GOOD solution and meets the needs of its communities of interest by providing deserved representation and acknowledgement of the residents who live there. It is especially important to keep Yavapai County whole and Sedona intact (not lopping it off partially or wholly). THANK YOU. Margaret Pavlich. Village of Oak Creek/Sedona
12/14/2021 - 20:59	Gary P. Morris	Legislative District 7 New Map 12.1.1	Thanks to the Commission for recognizing the true "community of interest" criteria as a prime factor in designing new legislative districts. The new district 12.1.1 for District 7 nearly perfectly addresses community of interest of "rural" communities, ranching, farming, forest lands, and the copper, and other mining interest. The maps properly assigns Flagstaff to the closely tied community of interest with the Tr be in District 7. The new 12.1.1 map properly absorbs the eastern towns into the District 7 and keeps the "copper corridor" intact within the district. I ask that the Commission officially adopt the District 7 version 12.1.1 map
12/14/2021 - 21:02	Janell Sterner	Thank you for the new 12.1.1 maps	Dear IRC, I would l ke to personal thank you for listening to the people. I'm so impressed with the new 12.1.1 map, and that I support this version of District 7. Thanks again for hearing our voices and restructuring the maps. God Bless! Janell Sterner Lakeside AZ
12/14/2021 - 21:08	Paul Pavlich	Redistricting comments	My name is Paul Pavlich and I live in Yavapai County in the Village of Oak Creek.I have spoken at several of the redistricting meetings. I would like to reiterate here that I support map 12.1.1. Please, please keep our like-needs communities together with Yavapai and do not break us off. It just makes sense and seemed to have the overwhelming support at meetings attended. Thank you all again for the hard work you are doing.
12/14/2021 - 21:13	CHRIS KUKNYO	REDISTRICTING	Please keep Yavapai county whole.
12/14/2021 - 21:15	Gayle Baingo	Choose LD Map 12.1.1	I am a resident of Yavapai County living in Sedona and I want you to choose LD Map 12.1.1 because it keeps our County communities of interest together, particularly the Verde watershed. Thank you.
12/14/2021 - 21:18	Sharon Chapman	Redistricting	Please keep Sedona and the Verde Valley in Yavapai County. Vote for LD 12.1.1. I am a native of Az. and longtime resident in the Village of Oak Creek. We have little in common with Coconino Country and common interest with Yavapai County, especially the Verde watershed. Thanking you for your consideration. Sharon Stanfill-Chapman
12/14/2021 - 21:18	Sharon Chapman	Redistricting	Please keep Sedona and the Verde Valley in Yavapai County. Vote for LD 12.1.1. I am a native of Az. and longtime resident in the Village of Oak Creek. We have little in common with Coconino Country and common interest with Yavapai County, especially the Verde watershed. Thanking you for your consideration. Sharon Stanfill-Chapman

12/14/2021 - 21:19	Michael Kollwitz	Keep Yavapai together with LD Map 12.1.1	I am a resident of Yavapai County residing in West Sedona and I am writing to ask you to choose LD Map 12.1.1 because it keeps our County communities of interest together, particularly the Verde watershed. Thanks in advance for for picking the RIGHT MAP- LD 12.1.1 ~MK
12/14/2021 - 21:21	deborah pernice knefel	Keep Yavapai County Together Please select LD Map 12.1.1	Please keep Yavapai County together as in LD Map 12.1.1 It keeps our county communities of interest together and especially the Verde watershed. District boundaries should be drawn so as to respect, conserve and reflect the common moral and cultural values of the District's communities, such as land and wildlife preservation, fortification of family and spiritual foundations. Thank you
12/14/2021 - 22:37	Catherine O'Brien	Redistricting	I'm a resident of Yavapai County (Sedona) and I implore you to choose LD Map 12.1.1 as it keeps our communities of interest together, in particular the Verde watershed.
12/14/2021 - 23:01	Frances Huff	Redistricting map 12.1.1	As a resident of Yavapai County, once again I am urging you to not divide Yavapai County into 2 districts Please select map 12.1.1 which keeps the county in one district. Again I state my arguments as stated in a previous correspondence: I am very concerned that any redistricting that divides Yavapai County would have disastrous results for the towns and communities that comprise this county. The current IRC draft Legislative District Map, 10.0, has Yavapai County as its own Legislative District (LD-5), which is appropriate since our population is very near the target population of approximately 238,000 for each of these legislative districts. LD Map 10.0 reflects our common communities of interest across our county including: our rural Western heritage/culture, the need to protect our scarce water resources (the Verde River in particular), and our ranching, agriculture, mining, and forestry interests. Also, the small portions of the towns of Sedona and Wickenburg, which are outside of Yavapai County, should be included in the Yavapai Legislative District so as not to split these towns into 2 separate districts. Splitting these towns into separate legislative districts is contrary to their communities' interest. Respectfully, Frances Huff
12/14/2021 - 23:57	Just A McGowan	Yavapai Redistricting Map	I live in Prescott Valley in Yavapai County. I ask that map 12.1.1 be chosen because it keeps Yavapai communities of interest together.