

Submitted Time	Completed Time	Full Name	Subject	Message
08/13/2021 - 04:27	08/13/2021 - 04:27	Eric M	Comments about my district	I've been living in LD 16 and at first I didn't have many comments about the district, but after careful review of the demographics I noticed something extremely odd. More than half of our population (60%) >65 years of age and it looks like a lot of trailer retirement communities. Then the other half is married couples with kids. You have 2 complete opposite ends of the spectrum populations that are not of a similar mindset. I didn't review other legislative districts, but something tells me other districts are likely not representative of the population. A more rectangular district that spreads into leisure world with some of these trailer park resort/retirement communities would be more representative of that population. Not saying separate all elderly, but it is grossly skewed.
08/13/2021 - 16:13	08/13/2021 - 16:13	Nancy Meister	Competitiveness	Thank you for your very thorough discussion about the various measures for competitiveness. I do feel that because I live in a competitive district, my legislators are very available and responsive to the public.

08/15/2021 - 19:51	08/15/2021 - 19:51	Lynne Hudson	IRC Process going forward	<p>Thank you for being accessible to voters wishing to share their views about redistricting. I consider myself a Tucsonan, although I live north of the city limits and adjacent to the Catalina Foothills. I attended both Tucson sessions via Zoom. On Saturday, several speakers who reside in exurban communities like Oro Valley and Marana spoke passionately that they wanted to be in districts with "like-minded" voters. Addressing their communities of interest, they described what they valued about their geographical areas --good schools, safe neighborhoods, access to quality health care, air and water, recreational venues, and more. Interestingly, these are things Tucsonans value as well, though the similarities were overlooked by the folks from Oro Valley and Marana. Their common theme was "We don't want to be in the same district as them because we have absolutely nothing in common." Their focus was not on what unites us. They seemed to want to build silos, not bridges.</p> <p>So let's state the obvious here. Tucson is more diverse, racially, ethnically, and economically. Tucson has its share of wealthy people, but it has a larger percentage of poorer folks as well. Residents of both geographical areas want safe neighborhoods, but crime rates are higher in poorer areas where residents have a harder time meeting their basic needs. The desire of folks from affluent areas to preserve what they have is understandable and should be respected. Less privileged citizens should be understood and respected as well, but many need more than that. They need government assistance to promote their general welfare, something guaranteed under the Constitution. I continue to believe the majority of Arizonans support that. And I suspect that when citizens from different socioeconomic backgrounds sit down together to discuss the problems faced by poor folks (whether that be in urban, rural or tribal areas), they can find solutions that benefit everyone. For example, they might reach consensus that all Arizonans would be better off if a larger share of the AZ corrections budget (reportedly \$1.3 billion last year) was spent in local communities on diversion and drug treatment programs and on reducing the caseloads of probation officers so they could provide more support to help their clients stay out of prison.</p> <p>Here's one more example. All Arizona residents want good schools, but schools in poorer areas are not as well funded as those in affluent areas because poorer communities lack the means to supplement State school funding with local tax dollars. As a result, children with the greatest needs have the fewest resources. In most states, lawmakers acknowledge this and allocate additional funding for low-income students. Arizona does not. Arizona also has trouble attracting and retaining good teachers because our teacher salaries are not competitive. The governor talks often about the progress we have made in this area, but the fact is that recent hikes in teacher salaries have barely moved the needle. Studies document that Arizona now ranks 48th rather than 49th place among the 50 states.</p> <p>The most troubling thing to say about Arizona education funding is that the disparities are by design, planned and enacted on a party line vote by our Arizona Legislature. The most encouraging thing to say about Arizona's current education policies is that they are not endorsed by the majority of Arizona voters. The majority know good schools benefit all of us, producing employable graduates who pay taxes, raise families, and stay out of trouble. The majority know good schools and a reliable workforce grow the economy by attracting new businesses to Arizona.</p> <p>The most promising thing to say regarding educational inequities in Arizona is that the majority of voters were so fed up with the Legislature's failure to draft and pass educational reform that they took matters into their own hands. They drafted their own bill, Prop 208, that addressed the problems and passed the measure on a bipartisan basis in 2020. This is reminiscent, of course, of Prop 106, the citizen's ballot initiative that created the Independent Redistricting Commission in 2000. The success of both initiatives demonstrates the majority of Arizonans want fairness and can and will work together to pass legislation that benefits all of us.</p> <p>The success of these citizen initiatives also begs the question: Why was the Arizona Legislature not responsive to this voting majority? One possible answer is that our legislators are not hearing the voices of enough Arizonans when they visit their districts. The task before us is to be sure they hear our voices going forward so we don't have to do their work for them.</p> <p>A key takeaway from the success of Propositions 106 and 208 is that the collaboration necessary to pass legislation that benefits all Arizonans does not occur in silos inhabited only by "like-minded" folks. It happens when people with different ideas and perspectives meet, when their paths cross, when they must explain and justify their positions to each other. One way to make paths cross is to create voting districts that have somewhat equal representation. (Arizonans who want to see this kind of collaboration at work need only watch public meetings of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.) An added benefit of drawing more inclusive voting districts is that potential candidates (and eventual winners) will be more aware of and accountable to their constituents' diverse views.</p> <p>In closing, let me address the concern parliamentarians from both political parties are likely to raise, i.e., competitive districts will cause party control to flip more often. This might well happen, but if and when it does, it is likely to be because voters considered many ideas and many candidates and the best prevailed. I believe good solutions should always take priority over party control. Arizona is fairly evenly divided among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. It is time we unite to support good ideas.</p>
--------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------------------	--

08/16/2021 - 21:44	08/16/2021 - 21:44	Julie Pindzola	Competitiveness and "Significant Detriment"	<p>Hello, Thank you for your recent work to learn about applying Competitiveness. Very interesting conversation. This note follows up on the deliberation of Competitiveness and the methods/measures you selected. As an aside: It is reassuring to hear it stated multiple times recently that the GRID map can be substantially modified to create the draft maps designed to meet the 6 criteria. Earlier commentary by your Counsel seemed to indicate that only minor adjustments could be made to the GRID map. Glad to know there is more flexibility in upcoming map refinements.</p> <p>Since the goal is Fair and Competitive districts, we need to make sure that the map does not lose track of Competitiveness. Some wish to minimize this criteria but it goes to the heart of Prop 106. As you balance the Voting Rights Act, communities of interest, and compactness - please remember to make Arizona a fair and competitive state that can be a roll model for others.</p> <p>How you chose to define "sufficient detriment" will have a direct influence on your competitive districts. Please be prepared to think hard about these varying criteria as things play out. Maybe it is not a "Sufficient Detriment" to the other criteria when a district contributes to the state's overall competitiveness. BALANCE. Thank you for your sincere care with this project.</p>
08/17/2021 - 07:59	08/17/2021 - 07:59	William Bowlus-Root	Missing words in Agenda item for 8/17/21 meeting	<p>On the published agenda, one of the items is missing an important word.</p> <p>"V. Update, discussion, and potential concerning report from the mapping Consultants, Timmons/NDC."</p> <p>Shouldn't there be a word between "potential" and "concerning"? Perhaps "action"?</p> <p>Without it, any action or votes on items within the report from the mapping consultants may not be appropriate.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
08/17/2021 - 10:10	08/17/2021 - 10:10	Phyllis Smith	Outreach	<p>Local TV stations in New Mexico frequently cover the status of the State's redistricting process. I have seen little recent mention in Arizona. Local radio stations as well seem to have little to no coverage of the AZ IRC. Are TV and radio outlets being given news releases or will they be and at least weekly?</p> <p>It is extremely important that the public receives immediate information about the training on the ESRI mapping tool. Thank you.</p>
08/17/2021 - 15:40	08/17/2021 - 15:40	Don Goffena	Districting	<p>We reside at [REDACTED] Camp Verde 86322. This puts us within current Leg District 01, Cong District 4. The rest of our community is within Leg District 06, Cong District 1.</p> <p>While considering new district realignments, please consider placing all of the Camp Verde community within the same Legislative and Congressional districts. Although some of the community lies outside the town limits (which essentially is defined using the Verde River as a boundary on the SW extent) the reality is those living along the Salt Mine Road corridor are more a part of the CV community than any of the other communities in these districts.</p> <p>While appreciating the many factors the commission seeks to balance, and realizing that this situation is common to many towns situated near district borders, nonetheless a coherent consolidation of communities seems a worthwhile goal.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration.</p>

08/17/2021 - 21:43	08/17/2021 - 21:43	Lynne hudson	Participation	<p>Thank you for being accessible to voters wishing to share their views about redistricting. I consider myself a Tucsonan, although I live north of the city limits and adjacent to the Catalina Foothills. I attended both Tucson sessions via Zoom. On Saturday, several speakers who reside in exurban communities like Oro Valley and Marana spoke passionately that they wanted to be in districts with "like-minded" voters. Addressing their communities of interest, they described what they valued about their geographical areas --good schools, safe neighborhoods, access to quality health care, air and water, recreational venues, and more. Interestingly, these are things Tucsonans value as well, though the similarities were overlooked by the Oro Valley and Marana speakers I cited above. Their common theme was "We don't want to be in the same district as them because we have absolutely nothing in common." Their focus was not on what unites us. They seemed to want to build silos, not bridges.</p> <p>So let's state the obvious here. Tucson is more diverse, racially, ethnically, and economically. Tucson has its share of wealthy people, but it has a larger percentage of poorer folks as well. Crime rates are higher in Tucson and any poorer areas because many residents have a harder time meeting their basic needs. The desire of folks from affluent areas to preserve what they have is understandable and should be respected. Less privileged citizens should be understood and respected as well, but many may need government assistance to promote their general welfare, something guaranteed under the Constitution. I believe the majority of Arizonans understand and support that. And I suspect that when citizens from different socioeconomic backgrounds sit down together to discuss the problems faced by poor folks (whether that be in urban, rural or tribal areas), they can find solutions that benefit everyone. For example, they might reach consensus that all Arizonans would be better off if a larger share of the AZ corrections budget (reportedly \$1.3 billion last year) was spent in local communities on education, diversion and drug treatment programs, reducing the caseloads of probation officers so they could provide more support to help their clients avoid prison entirely or avoid returning to prison for violations.</p> <p>Here's one more example. All Arizona residents want good schools, but schools in poorer areas are not as well funded as those in affluent areas because poorer communities lack the means to supplement State school funding with local tax dollars. As a result, children with the greatest needs have the fewest resources. In most states, lawmakers acknowledge this and allocate additional funding for low-income students. Arizona does not. Arizona also has trouble attracting and retaining good teachers because our teacher salaries are not competitive. The governor talks often about the progress we have made in this area, but the fact is that recent hikes in teacher salaries have barely moved the needle. Studies document that Arizona now ranks 48th rather than 49th place among the 50 states.</p> <p>The most troubling thing to say about Arizona education funding is that the disparities are by design, planned and enacted on a party line vote by our Arizona Legislature. The most encouraging thing to say these inequities in education is that they are not endorsed by the majority of Arizona voters. The majority know good schools benefit all of us by producing employable graduates who pay taxes, raise families, and stay out of trouble. The majority know good schools and a reliable workforce grow the economy by attracting new businesses to Arizona.</p> <p>The most hopeful thing to say regarding educational inequities in Arizona is that the majority of voters were so fed up with the Legislature's failure to draft and pass educational reform that they took matters into their own hands. They drafted their own bill, Prop 208, that addressed the problems and passed the measure on a bipartisan basis in 2020. This is reminiscent, of course, of Prop 106, the citizen's ballot initiative that created the Independent Redistricting Commission in 2000. The success of both initiatives demonstrates the majority of Arizonans want fairness and can and will work together to pass legislation that benefits all of us.</p> <p>The success of these citizen initiatives also begs the question: Why was the Arizona Legislature not responsive to this voting majority? One possible answer is that our legislators are not hearing the voices of enough Arizonans when they visit their districts. The task before us is to be sure they hear our voices going forward so we don't have to do their work for them.</p> <p>A key takeaway from the success of Propositions 106 and 208 is that the collaboration necessary to pass legislation that benefits all Arizonans does not occur in silos inhabited only by "like-minded" folks. It happens when people with different ideas and perspectives meet, when their paths cross, when they must explain and justify their positions to each other. One way to make paths cross is to create voting districts that have somewhat equal representation. (Arizonans who want to see this kind of collaboration at work need only watch public meetings of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission.) An added benefit of drawing more inclusive voting districts is that potential candidates (and eventual winners) will be more aware of and accountable to their constituents' diverse views.</p> <p>In closing, let me address the concern parliamentarians from both political parties may raise, i.e., competitive districts will cause party control to flip more often. It may, but if and when it does, it is likely to be because voters considered many ideas and many candidates and the best prevailed. That's a good thing. The best ideas should always take priority. Arizona is fairly evenly divided among Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. It is time we unite to support good ideas.</p>
--------------------	--------------------	--------------	---------------	--

08/17/2021 - 22:05	08/17/2021 - 22:05	Angeline De Leon	Proposed Map	<p>I am submitting a proposed congressional district map for consideration because I was unable to attend the listening tour due to a scheduling conflict. Here is my proposed map: https://davesredistricting.org/join/9f69ea16-c5a9-4639-8932-a11b6662e644</p> <p>This map has three majority-minority districts that are all plurality Hispanic (≥45%). Additionally, the map minimizes splitting cities to the extent possible. Phoenix is split 3 times (the minimum possible based on population). Of other larger municipalities, only Mesa and Buckeye are split. Overall, four of the districts would probably be highly competitive. Here is the partisan breakdown of the districts based on an aggregate of statewide election results from 2016-2020:</p> <p>District 1: 48.7R-48.6D District 2: 61.1D-36.5R District 3: 49.3D-48.3R District 4: 67.7R-30.0D District 5: 54.0R-43.6D District 6: 49.9R-47.8D District 7: 70.2D-27.4R District 8: 56.7R-41.2D District 9: 49.9R-47.8D</p>
--------------------	--------------------	------------------	--------------	--