

ARIZONA <small>INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION</small>	Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21					
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 8:43:32	October 15, 2021	We can not hear you!	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	I am trying to listen to the meeting. My volume is turned up as high as it goes. I can hear that people are speaking but I can not understand what they are saying. Please fix the audio issues. Do you have someone who can log in like the public is logging in and can hear that we can not hear you. Thank you.
10/15/2021 8:43:43	October 15, 2021	I.	Ann Heitland	86004	self	I've tried 3 different audio connections and you are all inaudible.
10/15/2021 8:44:48	October 15, 2021	3	Braden Biggs	85120	Self	As a resident of Apache Junction and a City Council Member I want to express my concern over the Congressional District you have us in. While I only speak for myself, I am not pleased to see a part of the new CD5 in Maricopa County. Lumping Rural Arizona in with Maricopa County is not an advantage. We are not like minded and smaller communities than Apache Junction end up being very under represented. Apache Junction and Avondale are not similar in anyway shape or form. Pinal County should be its own district or as close to that as possible while lumping in cities that are bordering Pinal County like Queen Creek. I would also suggest Payson as an alternative.
10/15/2021 8:44:54	October 15, 2021	Audio	Julie pindzola	86301	Myself	Your audio is not working well. Please correct this. The volume levels are not sufficient. There was white noise when Mehl speaks. Can barely hear Mark F at all. This is not good
10/15/2021 8:45:12	October 15, 2021	Webex	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	The meeting volume today is quite a bit lower/softer than previous meetings.
10/15/2021 8:45:30	October 15, 2021	redistricting	Judith Reisman	85737	home owner/voter	Please remember that Oro Valley is in Pima County... and belongs there as the new maps are drawn. We are a suburban community with strong ties to the city of Tucson, just to the south of us. Any other option seems to me to be an attempt to prevent appropriate representation and "water down" our influence in fair election practice.
10/15/2021 8:46:14	October 15, 2021	3	Jennifer Cook	85120	East Valley	Please do not include districts that combine Mesa and Gilbert with Pinal County. These do not make a good community of interest, as Pinal County residents are more semi-rural and rural, and do not resemble the Maricopa county mindset of urban, suburban lifestyle. The earlier maps, both Congressional and Legislative that were just Pinal were better.
10/15/2021 8:46:17	October 15, 2021	Opportunity for Public Comments	Thomas Broderick	86004	none	Legislative District (LD) including Flagstaff The LD that includes Flagstaff should run from the South Rim, through Flagstaff, including its surrounding dense rural areas that are commuter areas to Flagstaff, mostly to the east and northeast toward Sunset Crater, and then south to Sedona and Verde Valley communities in eastern Yavapai County (east of Mingus Mountain). These communities share commercial, environmental, healthcare, and water management concerns and institutions. For example, there are commuters between Sedona and Flagstaff. The Mingus Mountain geographic feature already divides Yavapai County, and that physical divide is mirrored by a commercial and water management divide. The relevant submitted map is LD023, and the focus map is LDF008. These are the maps I favor.
10/15/2021 8:46:44	October 15, 2021	III	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Compliance with the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act is the only one of the six redistricting criteria that is strictly required without the modifier "to the extent practicable." Therefore, the Commission should start by defining Voting Rights districts: 2 LDs for Native Americans and at least 8 for our Latino communities.
10/15/2021 8:47:14	October 15, 2021	Public comment/Polarization data/AZ Const	M. E. Dunn	86303		Good morning. It is interesting that Chair Neuberg mentioned the process - "we are not going through any particular order" regarding how they are tackling the maps (specific geographic areas). I would like to ask that the Commissioners consider the VRAs as a starting point. Once those are as locked in as possible, then everything else can flow from that. As you well know, any time you change one line, there is a trickle effect and everything else has to be adjusted. So, why not start with the ones that are a must, a given, let's say, and go from there. And, as a result of the census reported population growth, the addition of a VRA (at least in an LD) may be in order. Thank you for your consideration.
10/15/2021 8:47:44	October 15, 2021	Opportunity for Public Comments	Thomas Broderick	86004	none	Congressional District (CD2) including Flagstaff The versions of this CD do not allow the northern tribes to elect their Representative of their choice, and therefore violate the VRA. CD2 should not include any areas adjacent to the Mexico border. There are two CDs that include nearly all of the Mexico border and border areas should be consolidated with those two. Prescott should not be included with CD2. I favor the map CD0025. It more fully provides for two mostly rural districts better than version 2 test maps.
10/15/2021 8:48:55	October 15, 2021	III. Public Comments	Steve Kridler	85120	Self	I think that the projected district lines for Congressional District 5 should be reconsidered. Reason being is the district area wise is predominately rural/semi-rural Pinal County, but the highest density of population is in the suburban Maricopa County cities of Gilbert and Chandler. The needs and desires of the suburban industry or tech populations can be vastly different than the needs and desires of the populations of the more rural or agricultural areas. A suggestion would be to swap Gilbert and Chandler areas with areas in southern Pinal county.
10/15/2021 8:49:33	October 15, 2021	Meeting address?	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	Watching the meeting in WebEx the meeting appears to be taking place in public. However the 'Draft Maps Decision Meetings' page with WebEx entry instructions does not list any address. Please list addresses with the WebEx info if the meeting are actually public.
10/15/2021 8:50:36	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	All versions of CD 2... violate the Voting Rights Act by preventing the northern tribes from electing a Congressional Representative of their choice. Prescott must be moved out of D2 on the Congressional map. CD0025 is a fair Congressional Map. The size deviation is justified by accomplishing compliance with the Voting Rights Act. This map also does a better job of keeping two mostly rural districts than the version 2 test maps do.
10/15/2021 8:50:53	October 15, 2021	VI. Potential report from staff and mapping consultants regarding public outreach, utilization of mapping software, and report on public map submissions.	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	The Commission publicly discussed and voted on the basic criteria for competitiveness (use of a simple average of statewide elections in 2016,2018,2020 with a few elections excepted; the two ranges to be considered competitive). What we have not seen is an explanation from Timmons on precisely how the averages are determined for a district (presumably interpolated to census blocks from precinct numbers). I'm also assuming that the "CompDemVotes" is providing the Democratic result side of the computed average, but it would be good to specify that clearly. I hope that my interpretation is correct. Please ask the Timmons folk to do this. Thank you.
10/15/2021 8:51:18	October 15, 2021	8:48 Audio Problems	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	It is 8:46. We are just now hearing the speakers. Chairwoman Neuberg just spoke and I could hear her. Please repeat anything of substance that has been said since the meeting started. Mark Flahan presented something but we could not hear him. Commissioner Mehl said something but we could not hear him. Chairwoman Neuberg spoke but we could not hear her.

 Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 8:52:09	October 15, 2021	Redistricting	Former Senator LD27 Catherine Miranda	85339	LD27 community	It is highly important to keep South Phoenix and Laveen together. We have an outstanding Chamber of Commerce here that works well supporting our local businesses. Our children sitting in the classroom seats are our future business men and women. South Phoenix and Laveen have supported Education and business together for decades. It is with out a doubt both communities are an outstanding asset to the people in LD27. I humbly ask this commission to keep our communities together.
10/15/2021 8:52:59	October 15, 2021		3 Bill Monroe	85142	STV	Why are you including Gilbert and Mesa with AJ, STV, and QC? We do not want to be in their district.
10/15/2021 8:56:27	October 15, 2021	VII	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	Competitiveness deserves equal weight with the other five redistricting factors. This is required by the AZ Constitution and also leads to good government since districts which can be won by either party produce representatives who are more responsive to their constituents.
10/15/2021 8:58:26	October 15, 2021	Public Comment	Lauren Bernally		Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission	The Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission is in the process of creating a Native American Coalition for LD7 and CD1. Maps are currently under construction and will satisfy the VRA principles for redistricting. Map should be ready for upload early next week.
10/15/2021 9:00:16	October 15, 2021	Independent Redistricting Committee	Linda Smith	85737	Oro Valley	Since moving here, I have been amazed at the legislative district shape that Oro Valley is part of. Oro Valley should not be part of a Pinal county district. Our economy and location place it in Pima County and this district should be redrawn to move it to Pima County exclusively. Oro Valley has very little in common with Pinal County communities and it's shape reflects a huge gerrymandering effort.
10/15/2021 9:04:43	October 15, 2021		3 Daniel Johnson	85119	Apache Junction	It is important to keep Maricopa county and Pinal County separate. AJ, San Tan Valley, and Queen Creek are more rural than Mesa or Gilbert. Even Payson is more similar to us that suburban track homes.
10/15/2021 9:11:17	October 15, 2021	Feedback on test maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	I appreciate the extensive background you have been furnished on Voting Rights Act compliance and racially polarized voting patterns in different parts of the state. Clearly this is going to be a major component of the work you do. Given Arizona's rich diversity of people, and given what the census data show about the most recent changes and trends in demography, as well as the constitutional requirement to comply with the VRA – I would suggest that you attempt to understand and create VRA districts first. I've worked with Native American tribes and indigenous communities quite a bit in the time I've been in Arizona – and I recognize both their distinctive viewpoints and the important position many of the tribes hold with respect to key state issues. (This would include water rights, public health concerns, gambling compacts, recreation and tourism economy, and access to public education.) It seems very obvious that there are too many native people – and too many different tribal governments, each with their unique contexts and economic/social perspectives – for them to all be served adequately with a single legislative district. I would strongly urge that you consider drawing at least two legislative districts where Native Americans would have a substantial opportunity to elect their own representation. Much of Northern Arizona, including all or much of Navajo and Apache counties as a core, would be one such area, and tribes in the south affected by the US border (especially the Tohono O'odham people) could be the core of another. You ought to make some effort to incorporate other tribes into legislative districts where they share some economic and social context – eg the Colorado River Indian Tribes with the southwest part of the state, where irrigated agriculture is an economic mainstay. (Of course, hearing formally from each tribe will be critical to making these kinds of decisions.) Having the ability to select their own representation is the right thing to do for our tribal neighbors, and also I firmly believe that the tribes are a substantial component of Arizona's future (water, tourism, etc.) – so their representation in our state legislature will be critical over the next decade.
10/15/2021 9:12:25	October 15, 2021	congressional redistricting	Kat Hanners	85119	AJ ladies for President Trump	It doesn't seem like the Arizona Constitution is being followed. I am concerned about being in such a huge district and put in with Gilbert and Chandler.
10/15/2021 9:13:16	October 15, 2021	Draft maps	Evelyn Lathram	85742	myself	The draft maps of legislative districts does not respect the "communities of interest" for Oro Valley, Casas Adobes and northern Pima County. Oro Valley, Casas Adobes and northern Pima County are so tied together that without a marker you wouldn't know when you left one and entered the other. All three are dense suburban with a mixture of homes, apartments, businesses, parks and churches. They all have large shopping malls and a variety of grocers. The majority of our populations own their own homes and speak English. Even the median incomes are similar ranging from \$65-\$85,000 annually. All three have populations that reflect a balance across age groups. Oro Valley's median age is about 50, and Casas Adobes' median age is 42. Oro Valley's median age is 54 years and 65+ only make up 34% of the population. Over 10,000 of Oro Valley residents are minorities or about 25%. There exist strong community ties between all three places, all were established before the 1980's and we often shop, work, and worship across our boundaries. The school systems are all rated well above the state average. All three places share the same concerns about clean water availability, ensuring safe neighborhoods and maintaining a healthy balance between development and open spaces. Oro Valley has little in common with places in Pinal County. Our new boundaries should not be composed of small and/or homogeneous communities. Residents of Oro Valley and Casas Adobes and northern Pima County go to downtown Tucson and the University of Arizona for arts and entertainment. Tucson is our central hub. Casas Adobes and northern Pima County are contiguous areas that should be combined with Oro Valley as a community of interest. All are located in Pima County and share Oracle and I-10 as major thoroughfares. Please put Oro Valley into a legislative district with likeminded communities, i.e., Casa Adobes and northern Pima County.
10/15/2021 9:13:46	October 15, 2021		7 Aubrey Sonderegger	86004	Myself	Compliance with the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act is the only one out of the six redistricting criteria that is strictly required without the modifier "to the extent practicable." This implies that this is not just a weighted consideration, but an imperative criteria. The Commission should start by defining Voting Rights districts: 2 LDs for Native Americans and at least 8 for our Latino communities based on population.
10/15/2021 9:16:32	October 15, 2021		7 Aubrey Sonderegger	86004	Myself	I can't even see the paper maps that have been submitted from Northern Arizona. How can I comment on them in an intelligent manner? This is not a good process so late in the process!
10/15/2021 9:17:11	October 15, 2021	Draft Maps	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	As a request to the mapping team from a citizen who is drawing maps please refrain from using the individual census block vs census block group. When we in the public attempt to make modifications to your maps we are forced to do more work to get back to census block groups. If you eventually decide to go to the census block level save that for the very end. Thank you.
10/15/2021 9:18:08	October 15, 2021	Redistricting	Cathy Lee	85209	Self	Please make sure the maps remain 1) Competitive, 2) Protect Minority Groups 3) Contiguous. Also keep in mind that many Rural & Urban communities have nothing in common. The IRC should honor the will of the people. Thank you

 Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 9:19:01	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	LD Test Map 2.0 fails to recognize at least two significant communities of interest – the Grand Canyon/Flagstaff/Verde Valley corridor and the smaller Greater Flagstaff (city and surrounding rural) areas. LD0023 is a statewide map that provides close to equal population among districts and also provides for two Native American Voting Rights Districts – one in the south and one in the north. It recognizes two communities of interest for which the commission has heard a lot of testimony (1) the "Greater Flagstaff area" (not just the city limits) and (2) the Grand Canyon/Flagstaff/Verde Valley corridor. LD023 is a statewide map that was developed with a focus on LDs 6 and 7 and reflects the interests of the populations living in both areas. The focus map related to this is LDF008. I support these maps. The area around Holbrook has a significant Native American population that should be included with LD7. This is one reason why LD0023 and LDF003 are better treatments of Navajo County than the Test Map version 2.
10/15/2021 9:21:09	October 15, 2021	aubrey.sonderegger@gmail.com	Aubrey Sonderegger	86004	Myself	LD0023 is a statewide map that provides close to equal population among districts and also provides for two Native American Voting Rights Districts – one in the south and one in the north. It recognizes two communities of interest for which the commission has heard a lot of testimony (1) the "Greater Flagstaff area" (not just the city limits) and (2) the Grand Canyon/Flagstaff/Verde Valley corridor. The area around Holbrook has a significant Native American population that should be included with LD7. This is one reason why LD0023 and LDF003 are better treatments of Navajo County than the Test Map version 2. LD023 is a statewide map that was developed with a focus on LDs 6 and 7 and reflects the interests of the populations living in both areas. The focus map related to this is LDF008. I strongly support these maps.
10/15/2021 9:23:53	October 15, 2021	Public feedback on test maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	As a resident of northern Arizona for more than 15 years (and participating in education and economic development activities there), I have some experience with defining shared interests relevant to defining legislative district boundaries. As you've heard already, there are very strong and distinctive shared interests linking the Grand Canyon-focused communities (eg Tusayan and Grand Canyon Village), Flagstaff, Sedona, and the Verde Valley. These communities are hugely dominated by tourist and recreation based economic factors. Cost of housing is skyrocketing, which affects everything from workforce to local demographics. Water and forest issues (fire risk, recreation, forest products economy) are paramount; partnership with federal agencies is crucial. This "community" might extend to the north and west, to bring in recreation-based areas along the Colorado River, and tribal areas including the whole of Hualapai. It might also extend to the southeast, with vacation-based areas like Strawberry and Pine. But it definitely does not include Prescott – which is a major commercial, health, and government center that does not have anything like the same reliance on forest, water, tourism, and the like. Natural geographic boundaries – eg the higher elevation of the Flagstaff/Grand Canyon corridors and the formal watershed boundaries of the Prescott AMA – would also support separating Prescott from this environment-focused region. It seems to me it would be very difficult to justify putting Prescott together with Sedona or Flagstaff on the basis of any of the constitutional criteria.
10/15/2021 9:25:34	October 15, 2021	VII	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	I can't see the paper maps that have been submitted from Northern Arizona so I can't comment on them. That is not a good process this late in the game!
10/15/2021 9:28:00	October 15, 2021	aubrey.sonderegger@gmail.com	Aubrey Sonderegger	86004	Myself	LD Test Map 2.0 fails to recognize at least two significant communities of interest – the Grand Canyon/Flagstaff/Verde Valley corridor and the smaller Greater Flagstaff (city and surrounding rural) areas.
10/15/2021 9:29:18	October 15, 2021	Your "public comment" agenda item	Julie pindzola	86301	Myself	The mass of Yavapai County/Verde Valley comments were again overwhelming by their sheer number. Roughly 17 of 19 pages of comments wanting to put the Verde Valley in with Prescott's very R district. The organization behind this mobilization is quite something. Some however, do not seem to realize that they have been in LD and CD districts with Flagstaff for 10 years, which is interesting... This goes to the COI aspects of the Verde Valley residents relating to Flagstaff v. Prescott, which can be argued convincingly either way. If bad weather keeps you from driving to Flagstaff, it will certainly keep you from driving to Prescott, especially if you are elderly as so many uniformly point out. Frankly the commenting residents may be thinking that they will loose their representation totally if they stay with the LD and CD districts that they are in now. These existing LD6 and CD1 districts are Competitive - one being R and one being D. We in Northern AZ want a Fair and Competitive set of maps. Currently, Mohave and Yavapai Counties are drawn as easily Red. Flagstaff/Verde Valley are drawn as truly Competitive districts. The Navajo/Hopi districts are Blue as they are contributing VRA. The goal of Competitiveness gets lost in the battles of COI. If everyone were drawn purely by perceived COI, the state would be a Balkans-like series of enclaves that already contribute to extremist representatives. Please help Arizona be a more deliberative, collaborative and civil state. We need practical Competitiveness to save ourselves. Thank you.
10/15/2021 9:31:35	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Staff seems overly focused on population balance for LD6 and LD7. Commission should first focus on VRA requirement that Native Americans can elect representatives of their choice and COI of Greater Flagstaff area. It's possible to have population within deviation without damaging these other interests. See LD0023
10/15/2021 9:34:38	October 15, 2021	Draft maps	Priya Sundareshan	85719	self	Regarding the LD test maps 2.0, I live just south of River (between River and Grant) and I am concerned that the current lines divide Tucson along the river, which is not in fact a geographical barrier. I grew up in the Catalina Foothills and would prefer to see the area north of Grant be included in the LD that comprises north Tucson. The Catalina Foothills share so much with the city of Tucson including educational and economic opportunities. This is an important community of interest and connection to preserve. I would also like to see the Commission stop focusing on "community of interest" criteria to the exclusion of the other important criteria, such as competitiveness - at least that is what it appears to the public. Again, it is critical that the Commission be truly "Independent", as is suggested by the name, and it is very important to protect our democracy and avoid extreme partisanship. To do so, the IRC should maximize the number of competitive districts as possible.

ARIZONA <small>INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION</small>	Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21					
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 9:37:19	October 15, 2021	Paper Maps	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	I applaud Chairwoman Neuberg for encouraging members of the public to submit paper maps if they are challenged by the Redistricting System or have little/no internet connectivity. What happens to those paper maps? A couple of weeks ago, there was some promise to organize them. Please post them so that the public can see them and comment on them. Better yet, those paper maps, including the ones submitted at the Kayenta public hearing on October 7th, should be entered into the Redistricting System. If this is not done, it is not clear to the public that maps submitted on paper will be looked at and considered. For example, in the October 4th meeting, Brian Kingery referenced "a pattern" he was seeing in the publicly submitted maps, and he showed some maps that put all of northern Arizona into one congressional district. A district like that would obviously dilute votes from the Native American tribes in northern Arizona. I'm guessing those paper maps from the Kayenta public hearing also showed "a pattern," but they not mentioned by Mr. Kingery. They are obviously not getting equal attention.
10/15/2021 9:38:49	October 15, 2021	Meeting	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	We are hearing toilet noises, sink noises, hand washing and talking from someone outside of the immediate presentation
10/15/2021 9:43:46	October 15, 2021	Audio Issues	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	It is about 9:30 during the October 15th meeting. Thank you for turning up the volume so the public can hear the speakers. You have a new problem. There was some hammering noise – maybe it was opening/closing doors. I think I just heard someone flush a toilet. Now he/she is washing their hands, or doing something that involves water. It is difficult to give Mr. Johnson my full attention because of the background noise.
10/15/2021 9:54:39	October 15, 2021	Mapping	Maria-Elena Dunn	86303		I found Com Lerner's request re VRA check reasonable. As it was immediately thereafter explained, it is something which can be done quite quickly. It is not an inefficient step as by doing this check you can determine whether the maps you are approving at each step of the way are going in the right direction. I mentioned earlier here that, in fact, setting VRA districts should be your first step from which all other map draws flow. While very elucidating for the public and very well documented, the process being followed by the mappers, seems to me, a little disjointed. Having a specific focus as a starting point would be efficient and, dare I say, more logical.
10/15/2021 9:58:05	October 15, 2021	Legislative Map 2.0	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	Please consider including the City of Williams in LD5 instead of any part of Maricopa County. Williams is more aligned with Prescott than Maricopa County. Thank you.
10/15/2021 10:09:28	October 15, 2021	Public input on maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	Thanks for reviewing the discussion on a split of Flagstaff across legislative districts. I understand the concerns about needing to balance population numbers – but I do not think you've demonstrated that there's a compelling need to give up on the concept of keeping Flagstaff whole. This is the second time, in fact, that you have accepted quickly and without any particular justification or analysis that splitting Flagstaff up is an acceptable and necessary step. (The first time you had not even had your public hearing in Flagstaff yet!) There are several public submitted maps with numerical balance that show ways of keeping Flagstaff whole – sometimes with the Navajo Nation to the northeast, sometimes with other similar communities (and environments). It seems that accepting a split of Flagstaff without specifically reviewing those other solutions for good ideas would be ignoring much of the public input you've received. Splitting the City of Flagstaff away from its outlying "suburban" areas, as in the current legislative district, is one thing; but actually splitting Flagstaff up right through the heart of the city limits would be a clear violation of several of your criteria!
10/15/2021 10:14:46	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Mehl's proposal for LD6 and LD7 is a blatant attempt to "pack" Democrats into one district. Probably also disenfranchises Native Americans.
10/15/2021 10:15:57	October 15, 2021	Mapping CD	med4others@gmail.com	86303		I have no idea what public hearing comments Com Mehl has attended or read BUT there was never a vociferous clamor for the Verde to be with Prescott and not Sedona and there was a resounding voice about having parts of Flagstaff with the Nation, etc., etc.. I have heard this narrative from the commissioner and it is somewhat disturbing as I did not seem to have heard the same comments to which he frequently alludes. Yes, there were SOME individuals who proposed what he is suggesting here BUT they were nowhere near the majority.
10/15/2021 10:18:38	October 15, 2021	maps	Barbara Tellman	85705	self	I request that information be presented to the public to indicate percentage of White people in each proposed district and that it be available in both maps with graduated colors and a spreadsheet. This would indicate the degree to which the IRC is using oft repeated requests to design districts for White people.
10/15/2021 10:21:06	October 15, 2021	format	Barbara Tellman	85705	self	Very disappointing to see you return to WebEx. Please use YouTube in the future for people who cannot attend the whole meeting but wish to catch up.
10/15/2021 10:30:15	October 15, 2021	VII Draf Map discussion	Bill Wade	86001	Self	I warned against Comm. Mehl's proposal to lump Flagstaff in LD6 with the Native Tribes at a previous meeting, as being antithetical to competitiveness: it is an attempt to gerrymander as many democratic voters as possible into a single "packed" district. I predict that it will be challenged in the courts, & should lose on that account.
10/15/2021 10:32:11	October 15, 2021	LD New Starting Point Map	Cathy Schwanke	85086	Anthem-Desert Hills-New River-Phx-Cave Creek-Carefree	New Starting point LD map - This LD new starting point map again takes my Maricopa County area (Anthem, Desert Hill, New River, Tramont-Dove Valley-Sleepy Ranch Precincts) and adds us to Yavapai-Prescott, again? Is it only for population and vote ratio purposes? It makes no sense to put us in with Yavapai-Prescott. All of our business especially on a legislative level is in Maricopa County. Please help us out here :)
10/15/2021 10:34:42	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Mehl's contention that "vociferous" comments cancel each other out must be rejected. Loudness is not a Constitutional Factor. Reasoned comments about community interest as well as geography and water resources as found in the testimony put Verde Valley and Flagstaff together.
10/15/2021 10:38:25	October 15, 2021	VII. Discussion of Draft Maps	Bill Wade	86001	Self	In stating, as he did, that previous Comments vociferously supported placing Prescott and the Verde Valley in the same L district, Commissioner Mehl is leaning entirely on comments that came from Prescott (most likely organized by the Yavapai GOP). The comments that should be accorded the greatest weight by the Commissioners should be those that emanate from Sedona and the Verde Valley themselves. Not Prescott.
10/15/2021 10:40:28	October 15, 2021	Redistricting Map	David Hanke	86351	VOCA	I see the map being ALL of Yavapai County together with the Coconino County portion of Sedona included to keep unincorporated areas together with their county government.
10/15/2021 10:40:36	October 15, 2021	IRC	Tamara Blanton	86351	Self	The VV area should be kept within the Yavapai County because most of us here travel to the Prescott area for services not available locally (Dr., entertainment, shopping). I believe Counties should be kept together as much as possible and since most of us here do not use Flagstaff for our needs, it doesn't make sense to include the VV with Flagstaff. I also understand you are considering breaking up the Black Canyon area into 2 different areas...this doesn't make any sense either. People there are also remote and have the same interests and needs.
10/15/2021 10:47:33	October 15, 2021	maps	Misty Atkins	85737	self	Please keep Oro Valley with Pima County. Our COI is with other Pima County residents. There are models that keep Oro Valley in our county. By just incorporating more of Marana, the numbers will be adequate. Thank you.
10/15/2021 10:48:42	October 15, 2021	Mapping CD	M. E. Dunn	86303		I was at the two public hearings held in Prescott. At the first, on COIs, there were some proposing that we basically stay as we have been but the MAJORITY of in-person comments were in support of Verde/Cottonwood and the rest of Sedona to be with Flagstaff. And, of course, the same was said up at the Flagstaff hearings. Would love for Com Mehl to show us his evidence. Don't know why this has become a concern of Com Mehl.

 Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 10:50:53	October 15, 2021	VII. Draft Map decision discussion and possible action concerning revisions to the Grid Map	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	There is no need to guess from our own memories how people from the Verde Valley spoke about their view of being in the same community with Flagstaff. There were speakers on July 27 and on July 29; we only need to check on their testimony. My own (admittedly faulty) memory was that the predominant view was to be aligned with Flagstaff, and Commissioner Mehl seems to recall more of a "both sides" phenomenon. We can check! There are "unofficial transcripts" that you have posted.
10/15/2021 11:07:53	October 15, 2021	Redistricting	Joe Fiumara	86315	Yavapai	Flagstaff should not be included with Yavapai County. It is too distinct and different from the general area Yavapai including its culture, western heritage, and demographics. I believe Yavapai residents would like to keep their distinct history and culture with Sedona. County boundaries should align with tax districts as much as possible to insure the citizen and tax payer are properly represented by their local government and legislature. By doing county issues can easily be identified and addressed as they they come up by the people who are most affected whether it's roads, water rights, and etc. Please keep YavapaiYavapai
10/15/2021 11:12:00	October 15, 2021	maps	shanna leonard	85745	self	Please start with the Voting rights districts. You will have to re-juggle everything.
10/15/2021 11:18:07	October 15, 2021	Draft Maps Decision	Javier Torres	85014	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	Latino voices and representation must be a high priority in the redistricting process. That has always been the case, but it is especially true in this cycle: all available reliable data tells us that the Latino population in Arizona has grown significantly since the last census, but the obviously flawed 2020 census did not reflect that growth, leading to a baseline Latino disenfranchisement even before the redistricting process began. Every effort must be made to prioritize Latino representation and prevent mass disenfranchisement. The Latino Coalition for Fair district is working to ensure that representation, and I stand with them.
10/15/2021 11:20:15	October 15, 2021	Draft Maps Decisions	Quinton Miranda	85003	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	I support the maps submitted by the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Districts.
10/15/2021 11:21:51	October 15, 2021	Draft Maps Decision	Erin Garci	85015	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	It looks like the 2 congressional districts in the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting map outline a true and equitable representation of the Latino communities which is supported by an equal number of votes. The maps make sense for both metropolitan areas, based upon the growth of the population along with the parallel Latino growth representation.
10/15/2021 11:23:00	October 15, 2021	Draft Maps Decisions	Chico Robinson	85006	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	I support the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Districting map. It is essential that our state represent and prioritize the Latino populace in our state
10/15/2021 11:24:11	October 15, 2021	Draft maps decisions	Maria Zavala	85051	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	I fully support AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting. I feel it is very important to prioritize the Latino populace in this state!
10/15/2021 11:25:19	October 15, 2021	Draft maps decisions	Aarón Searles	85003	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	AZ needs better representation and diversity in leadership and the map submitted by Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting helps with that.
10/15/2021 11:26:25	October 15, 2021	Draft Map Decisions	Isaiah Lopez	85027	Arizona Latino Coalition for Fair Districts	It is an imperative to support the Hispanic / Latino communities of Arizona; therefore, I am urging the commission to support maps drawn by AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Redistricting.
10/15/2021 11:27:16	October 15, 2021	Draft map decisions	Yolanda Bejarano	85008		It is extremely important to prioritize the Latino population in our state. Please consider the AZ Latino Coalition for Fair Districting maps to ensure the Latino community is taken into account. Thank you.
10/15/2021 11:32:41	October 15, 2021	VII	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	The Commission staff needs to get more familiar with the geography and population make up of the Greater Flagstaff and Verde Valley areas. The highway running northeast from Flagstaff toward sovereign lands is NOT "I-80," it is Highway 89. The population of what are effectively suburbs of Flagstaff there approaches, if not exceeds, 10,000 people – most of who are white Republicans. Placing this area with the Navajo Nation will (1) dilute Native voting power and (2) split the area from Flagstaff, which is commercially, culturally, and geographically its community of interest.
10/15/2021 11:33:28	October 15, 2021	mapping	shanna leonard	85719	self	Web ex does NOT show who is speaking as maps are discussed, It continues to show "Stuart" - This makes it less of a "public" meeting
10/15/2021 11:44:41	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	I live in the suburbs of Flagstaff north along Highway 89. I've lived here 26 years and watched it grow tremendously. Separating the City of Flagstaff from its surrounding unincorporated populations is wrong. These relatively dense rural areas are essentially commuter suburbs of Flagstaff. You need to look at facts about population and ethnicity rather than just assuming this area belongs with the tribal areas. Lumping them together is likely to dilute Native voting power, especially as this area continues to grow over the next 10 years. In contrast, a place like Eager is much smaller and more likely to shrink over the next 10 years, and would not dilute the Native American vote as much as these areas around Flagstaff. The corridor from the South Rim of the Grand Canyon through Greater Flagstaff and Sedona and into and including the Verde Valley share common commercial, environmental, healthcare, and public safety features which should be represented by one LD. (Substantial public testimony from COI hearings proves this.) Likewise, the City of Winslow at the western edge of Navajo County has more in common with Coconino County than Navajo County, including a substantial commuting population. In contrast, the area around Holbrook has a significant Native American population that should be included with LD7 -- Holbrook was gerrymandered out of the tribal district in 2011.
10/15/2021 11:44:41	October 15, 2021	Oro Valley	Kay Schriener	85755	Myself	Oro Valley should be in a Pima County Legislative District. It makes no sense to move Oro Valley into a district in Pinal County. Currently about 25% of LD11 is minority. Moving OV into Pinal County will further disadvantage minority voters. Oro Valley residents shop in Pima County. We go to Tucson regularly for entertainment, cultural events, and shopping. Our demographics and history are clearly associated with Pima County. Oro Valley is similar to Cases Adobes and Mariana in housing types, density, and environmental and development concerns. Putting OroValley in a Pima County Legislative District is consistent with the goals of the redistricting process.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21					
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 11:49:57	October 15, 2021	VI. Potential report from staff and mapping consultants regarding public outreach, utilization of mapping software, and report on public map submissions.	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>During his initial presentation, Mark Flahan stepped through how to get the Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) data to show up in a map created in the Redistricting System tool by adding the ST1591_M* demographics items. He then brought up a Plan Summary PDF that contained a chart (in tabular form) that provided the data points for the various demographics and evaluated the competitiveness of the districts. It contained data that is clearly being presented to the commission for use in their evaluation of the submitted maps.</p> <p>But what was not clear from his demonstration is where he got that Plan Summary PDF and if that PDF can be downloaded from somewhere on the Redistricting Hub. I've looked all over the hub and have not come across it. Nor is it anywhere I can see in the Published Plan Viewer.</p> <p>This is an important document to summarize every map. Please make it available - or if already available at least more discoverable - on your website so that the public can have access to the same data that the commissioners do. That way we can both make our own evaluations of the maps and also have an insight into why the commissioners may have made the decisions they do. Both will go a long way toward increasing public confidence in the transparency of your process and the validity of the results.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
10/15/2021 11:52:20	October 15, 2021	Map requirements as per Prop 106	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	Would the commission as a whole please state whether they see the list of the six requirements in Prop 106 as a 'Rank Ordered List'. Thank you.
10/15/2021 11:55:10	October 15, 2021	Measurement of Community of Interest	Peggy Pena	85643	Self	The commission needs to have a more objective measurement of community of interest. Right now Commissioner Mehl is saying this is what I heard the people in this area want and even if other commissioners say that they heard differently in the meeting they are ignored. Even when commissioners say lets look at the competitive measurement which is objective they are being over ruled by Commissioner Mehl's subjective view of an areas community of interest and even where a certain demographic lives.
10/15/2021 12:10:58	October 15, 2021	general	Andrew Flach	85749	self	<p>Duda tweeted "Neuberg says they considering all 6 criteria on a regular basis, but warns against filtering everything for competitiveness up front, says they should organize things logically, ensure communities of interest are represented. They can tweak for competitiveness later, she says."</p> <p>I'd prefer that competitiveness be the first criteria considered, and tweak for other criteria later. Competitive districts encourage politicians to engage with their constituents because they can't take re-election for granted. Competitive districts also discourage politicians from taking extreme positions for the same reason. The last thing Arizona needs is a plethora of safe districts for either party.</p>
10/15/2021 12:19:32	October 15, 2021	Public input on test maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	Just one more thought about the prospect of Prescott being joined to the Verde Valley. Commissioner Mehl observed that Verde Valley residents seemed to have mixed opinions, and it will be impossible to please everyone. But I know that Chair Neuberg and the other commissioners have reiterated that it isn't just about what people "want" or about who was the most vocal or about the simple number of voices on each side. (I am sure there are plenty of field organizers out there who could turn out a lot of very emotional and loud voices for any particular proposal.) It is supposed to be about the best way of satisfying all of the constitutional criteria. And, as an interested party to the discussions about northern Arizona, it seems to me that there have been many more references to specific criteria in the proposals linking Flagstaff to the Verde Valley than Prescott. Physical geography and watersheds, political boundaries like the AMA, economic and environmental drivers like the national forests and national monuments, demographic factors like linking the Yavapai – Apache with indigenous voices in and around Flagstaff...Please be equally specific about how the constitutional criteria would be better satisfied by the proposal Commissioner Mehl made today.
10/15/2021 12:30:27	October 15, 2021	Public input on test maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	I've been reflecting on the comment by Chair Neuberg earlier today about being more interested in (and needing to prioritize) what's been heard about communities of interest than in competitiveness at this point in the process. I appreciate the sensitivity to what you've been hearing from the residents of the state – one of the most valuable parts of this unique Arizona process, for sure. But as the Timmons folks have summarized in their Communities of Interest report, there were more than 180 such communities described in the early stages of your work. You are simply not going to be able to ensure that every one of those communities has its own legislative district and strong position for electing a person of their choice! For this reason, competitiveness is your friend. In a politically competitive district, the elected officials (and candidates) have to work hard for any substantial block of votes – such as one of the documented communities of interest. Then a minority group (whether demographic, or social, or commercial) can feel represented even if they are far from a numeric majority in the district. On the other hand, in a non-competitive district, even rather large groups can easily be ignored by their elected officials and will lack any representation whatsoever. So I would strongly encourage you not to wait much longer before including at least some preliminary assessment of competitiveness as you consider which communities of interest to unite – or to separate – in districts.
10/15/2021 12:32:40	October 15, 2021	Congressional Map Drawing	Ian Murray	85213	Republican Party of Mesa	The new CD-4 and CD-5 divide the communities of Mesa and Gilbert. East Mesa in CD-5 is put in the same district as Florence, Queen Creek, and Apache Junction and crosses both Pinal and Maricopa county. CD-4 puts west Mesa in with Tempe, Phoenix, and parts of Chandler. A majority of Mesa should be put into a single CD so should Gilbert, Tempe, and Chandler. Mesa should not be sharing any part of Pinal county. The current map is not reflecting communities of interest such as cities.
10/15/2021 12:37:10	October 15, 2021	7	Marilyn Weissman	86001	myself	I wish to see all of Flagstaff and it's surrounding rural areas, such as Doney Park, Baderville and Kachina remain in the same legislative district. We are a small community and I don't see why we should be split apart when we have so many common interests and concerns.
10/15/2021 12:37:30	October 15, 2021	VII. Draft Map d	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	It was suggested this morning that there were comments at the listening tour on both sides of the issue of whether the Verde Valley towns should be grouped with Prescott or with Flagstaff. I went back to the "unofficial transcripts" that you have for the July 27 meeting that was in Prescott and Sedona. While I completely recognize that there are many considerations beyond a live meeting implicit vote, I still think it is worth noting how that testimony actually went. Of the 49 speakers from the public (by my count, hopefully close), roughly half spoke explicitly about this issue. Of that group, there were 17 people who spoke of viewing the Verde Valley as being in a COI with Flagstaff, and there were only 8 who spoke of that Valley being in a COI with Prescott. So ... this is not really a "both sides" case. Your input, at least from the meeting in that area, was significantly on the side of grouping Verde Valley with Flagstaff.
10/15/2021 12:47:15	October 15, 2021	Mapping, contin	M. E. Dunn			Does the mapper contractor not have a way to either make the quick changes and/or overlay what is being suggested by the commissioners? That way they can see what they are discussing in real time rather than have to guess at it or wait another few days to see the ramifications of their proposed changes.
10/15/2021 12:47:40	October 15, 2021	Mapping	Mark Knecht	85718	Self	Looking at Southern Arizona, in order of population, the 4 border counties - Pima, Yuma, Cochise and Santa Cruz - as a group comprise 1,420,460 which is only slightly less than the requirements for 2 Congressional Districts. Please consider using 100% of those 4 counties and then adding the minimum population required to meet population requirements. Doing this produces 2 HIGHLY compact districts, honor Native American lands and are competitive.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT RESTRICTING COMMISSION	Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21					
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 12:48:33	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	The arguably less than compact appearance of D6 in LD0023 is justified by its success at meeting the other five constitutional criteria. Furthermore, most of the District is conveniently connected by I-17. In contrast, there are no fast routes from the eastern border of Navajo County to Flagstaff or Sedona, which defeats the initial visual impression that D6 in Test Map 2.0 is "compact."
10/15/2021 12:50:35	October 15, 2021	Mapping legisla	Shanna Leonard	85719	self	Comissioners creation of District 18 (my district) in central tucson completely disregards the input from my community of interest in Tucson. the vast majority of public comment requested that central tucson supports competitive districts because we feel our community of interest expands north to Catalina foothills, West to the tucson mountains, East to the rincon mountains and south to the santa ritas. We understand that this is large for one legislative district, and we requested that central Tucson is populous enough to be included in more than one LD. Instead you have packed us into one very non-competitive district and completely dishonored our requeest for competitiveness.
10/15/2021 12:56:16	October 15, 2021	Public Input	M. E. Dunn	86303		Although I appreciate the idea of having robust public input, in THIS part of the process, I believe it would be disruptive. If you had had more individuals there today, you would not have been able to accomplish much. The time for that input is once the draft maps are "finalized." In the meantime people can do what we have been doing - submitting maps, commenting on those presented, sending you feedback through this mechanism and through Contact Us. Later is the time. Thank you.
10/15/2021 13:01:36	October 15, 2021	Draft maps	Priya Sundareshan	85719	self	I'd like the legal team to comment on the acceptability of substituting a "majority equivalent" metric for meeting the requirement of majority minority districts. The vote shares being used to calculate this "majority equivalency" appear to be the 2018 Governor and AG races, in which there happened to be Latino candidates; however, there are more complexities involved in those races that inform why one did better than the other overall, including many individual campaign decisions and the candidates themselves. Thus I caution against relying too heavily on those races when attempting to determine whether the minority population of a proposed district has sufficient ability to elect the candidate of their choosing, and I'd like to hear from the lawyers on whether this equivalency would satisfy the VRA etc.
10/15/2021 13:08:12	October 15, 2021	VII. Draft Map d	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	The commissioners asked for more comment from people in the Yuma area about how the boundaries for the proposed legislative map should be drawn. As a resident of the community, I'd like to respond. My comments also apply to the congressional map's borders in the Yuma area as well. These congressional and legislative district borders should be very closely the same where they split the city of Yuma and the rest of the county as well. The boundaries as proposed in congressional map v2.2, which adds the entire count to the southwestern district is a non-starter as it fails to split the county (and city) as was strongly supported in the public meetings. v2.0 and v2.1 are better, although v2.1 is the better of the two. However, the boundaries suggested in the congressional map for the southwestern district that was proposed by the tribal coalition gets the borders in the Yuma region just right. They're very sensitive to the communities involved (from both parties) and split the city into more evenly-divided sections than any of the other maps. The other maps lump virtually all of the populated areas of the city into the southwestern district. The coalition map shows a more even split as was advocated during the Listening Tour meeting here. A concern was expressed that adding more of the City of Yuma to the district just north of it would cause that district to be over-populated. IF that's the case, then removing blocks along its border elsewhere should be the way to resolve that. Leaving the split as it is, leaving the city of Yuma essentially undivided, completely contradicts what the public comments have indicated is an crucial consideration for our area. William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen
10/15/2021 13:08:15	October 15, 2021	VII	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	You can't put Flagstaff, the Navajo Nation, and Prescott in the same CD without committing a VRA violation. Prescott has to come out of CD2.
10/15/2021 13:12:05	October 15, 2021	Congressional C	Ilan Murray	85213	Self	The new District 9 should include Yuma, Kingman, and Lake Havasu which are similar communities of interest. The way that District 7 is currently drawn means that Tucson will completely overshadow the community of interests in Yuma, in the same way that the cities just west of Phoenix will overshadow Kingman and Lake Havasu. These communities of interest are entitled to their voices instead of being made subordinate to the urban areas of Phoenix and Tucson.
10/15/2021 13:13:39	October 15, 2021	Potential sched	Blair Tarman	73034		Who was included in the meetings to talk about locations? Additionally, where is the best place for the public to submit suggestions for locations by end of day today? Thank you.
10/15/2021 13:18:47	October 15, 2021	Congressional C	Ilan Murray	85213	Self	Tucson is divided into two Congressional Districts, CD 6 and CD 7. This means that the urban areas of Tucson will overshadow the communities of interests in the smaller cities such as Nogales and Yuma. A majority of Tucson should be placed in a single CD to allow the other communities of interests their voices. Please give Yuma and Nogales a voice in Congress and not just give the large cities a voice.
10/15/2021 13:22:41	October 15, 2021	legislative distric	Jean Meconi	85737	myself	Oro Valley is a distinct place in Pima County and should not be split between legislative districts. It is also most closely aligned with Marana and Casa Adobes and should be part of a predominantly Pima County LD. Throughout my over seven years of living here, I've seen tempered growth and a definite swing toward diversity. Please keep Oro Valley intact in a Pima County LD. Thank you.
10/15/2021 13:23:22	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Seems like a waste of time to discuss Congressional Maps without starting with identifying VRA districts. All versions of CD 2_ violate the Voting Rights Act by preventing the northern tribes from electing a Congressional Representative of their choice. Prescott must be moved out of D2 on the Congressional map.
10/15/2021 13:24:48	October 15, 2021	VII. Draft Map d	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	In a previous comment today I pointed out, referring to the transcripts that you have posted, that of the people in the July 27 Prescott/Sedona meeting who explicitly spoke about the Verde Valley being associated with Prescott or Flagstaff, 17 preferred Flagstaff and 8 preferred Prescott. I have just checked the transcript for the July 29 Flagstaff meeting, and of the 10 speakers who explicitly discussed this issue, 10 spoke in favor of Flagstaff being connected with the Verde Valley; 3 preferred Flagstaff to be connected to both Prescott and Verde Valley. So more or less the same story - at least in the listening tour meetings in the local areas that are relevant to this issue, the response is overwhelmingly in favor of grouping Flagstaff with the Verde Valley.
10/15/2021 13:39:17	October 15, 2021	Mapping - CDs	M. E. Dunn	86303		And, Commissioner Mehl and colleagues: Not all of the communities in Yavapai County are rural - especially the Prescott Quad City area - many are more urban and becoming more so as growth continues. We have little in common with the Colorado River basin communities and, in fact, more with the northern Maricopa and even those in Pinal.
10/15/2021 13:44:43	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Calling D2 "rural" is always going to be a relative term. Flagstaff is certainly not a rural community. Flagstaff does not share Community of Interest values with the Colorado River communities in Mohave County. (or with Prescott, for that matter)

 Public Meeting Comments 10.15.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
10/15/2021 13:47:54	October 15, 2021	Congressional	Cathy Lee	85209	Self	The way you have D5 drawn now you are not taking into account competitiveness or communities of interest at all. Please consider extending the southern part of D4 east to include D5 from the 60 south to Guadalupe & east to Signal Butte.
10/15/2021 13:51:50	October 15, 2021	CD Map	Shanna leonard	85719	self	Verde valley area in listening tour overwhelmingly favored not splitting Sedona and being in same district with Flagstaff, not prescott. I'm wondering if the commission pays more attention to volume of comments on this web form or to the folks who actually took the time to show up in person, give their address and submit maps. I'm concerned that the commission is being spammed by cut and paste campaigns. Listen to the citizens of Verde valley and respect their community of interest.
10/15/2021 14:14:18	October 15, 2021	CD test map ver	Peggy Pena	85643	Self	Please look at my IRC plan: CDF001: Competitive Congressional District-Southern Arizona.I have lived here in Cochise county for over 20 years and worked in Graham county for ten years. Graham/Greenlee Counties are totally different communities of interest than Cochise county. Graham/Greenlee counties are very much mining areas and their shopping/ entertainment hub is the Phoenix area. Cochise county shopping/entertainment hub is Tucson and is tied to southern border.
10/15/2021 14:32:36	October 15, 2021	VII	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	I am disturbed by the Chair's comment that an alternative solution is to let the outer areas of the state become more more extreme. The last thing this nation needs is more polarization. Competitive districts means representatives are more responsive to all of their constituents instead of just the extremists who elect them in the primaries.
10/15/2021 14:49:56	October 15, 2021	VII	Ann Heitland	86004	self	One more time, in response to Chair Neuberg's suggestion that extremism is an option: Competitiveness deserves equal weight with the other five redistricting factors. This is required by the AZ Constitution and also leads to good government since districts which can be won by either party produce representatives who are more responsive to their constituents.
10/15/2021 14:56:33	October 15, 2021	Draft leg maps	Evelyn Lathram	85742	myself	The draft maps (LD Test Map Version 2.0) of legislative districts do not respect the "communities of interest" for Oro Valley, Casas Adobes and northern Pima County. The northern communities of Pima County should not be in a district with Pinal County. There are no common interests between those populations in Pima County communities and the rural areas of Pinal County. Oro Valley and Marana identify with Pima County and the city of Tucson and should be in districts that include northern Pima County, like Casa Adobes and the Catalina Foothills. In the latest draft maps, Oro Valley is split between LD16 and LD17. Oro Valley must be left whole. Please move the Oro Valley portion of LD16 to LD17. The natural barrier of the Catalina Mountains is not respected. The populations to the east of the mountains is in LD16. In order to travel from the west of the mountains to the eastern part, one must travel completely around the mountains, either north or south of the mountains. It makes more sense to put the eastern portion in a continuous district directly south of it, in this case LD19; or in a continuous district directly north of it, in this case LD6. I live in Oro Valley and we have not had our community accurately represented in the Arizona Legislature for the last 10 years. The 10 years before that we were in a district containing Casa Adobes and part of the Catalina Foothills. That was a competitive district and put COIs together. Please put all of Oro Valley into a legislative district with likeminded communities, i.e., Casa Adobes and northern Pima County.