

ARIZONA						
Public Meeting Comments 11.30.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
11/30/2021 8:06:58	November 30, 2021	You Tube Link	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Neither YouTube link is broadcasting. It's 8:06
11/30/2021 8:12:28	November 30, 2021	Public access to beginning of the meeting	Sharon Edgar	860047210	self	The November 30th meeting was not live to the public until about 8:07. Will the first portion of the meeting be available to the public?
11/30/2021 8:30:15	November 30, 2021	Public access to letters submitted to IRC	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	At the November 9th IRC meeting, Executive Director Brian Schmitt said that he would work with Mark Flahan to post letters and maps submitted on paper. Have they been posted yet? If not, should we submit public records requests?
11/30/2021 8:31:57	November 30, 2021	V.B	Ann Heitland	86004	self	What does Chair Neuberg mean when she says after Doug's review of each district, "meets criteria"? Is this prejudging the final deliberative meetings? Why are the other commissioners silent?
11/30/2021 8:32:10	November 30, 2021	General Comment	Deborah Howard	85308	Self	<p>Commissioners, As you embark on these last few weeks I ask that you reset your perspective. Each of you are appointed to the commission to develop political boundaries that best serve ALL residents of Arizona . Each one of you are tasked with doing what is right by ALL Arizonans. Not just those of your party or the party of the elected official who selected you. Not the factions that support you. Not your county. And not your ethnic, racial, cultural, academic or religious community. The voters were clear when passing Prop. 106 that hey did not want partisan or special interests to drive this process.</p> <p>As a dedicated observer of your meetings, I am confident you are sincere that you read these comments. I am not at all confident that you take them to heart. To that end, I have an ask. At your hearing this evening and all public meetings going forward, I ask that you introduce yourselves w/o naming your county or your party. Instead make a statement reflecting your pride, humility, honor, privilege or thankfulness of being trusted with this civic responsibility of such great consequence and your commitment to do what is right for all Arizonans. And mean it.</p> <p>Fair maps are still possible. Please make them a reality. Thank you for your consideration.</p>
11/30/2021 8:33:50	November 30, 2021	records migration	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	I am working in conjunction with Deborah Howard on following the activity of the IRC, and she has submitted many PR requests, some dating back to June, 2021, that are still unanswered. The Commission seems to pride themselves on transparency, but the fact that these requests can languish for months makes transparency a joke.
11/30/2021 8:35:27	November 30, 2021	IV. Discussion of public comments...	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters	The YouTube livestream did not begin until about 8:06 am when Chair Neuberg was just concluding her remarks about prior public comments for Agenda item IV. These are important remarks for the public to hear. The IRC staff must make them available to the public quickly. Thank you.

ARIZONA Public Meeting Comments 11.30.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
11/30/2021 8:52:57	November 30, 2021	LD reviews	Julie Pindzola	86301	a very concerned voter	Again, nice to not split cities and towns but COI was supposed to be as much about neighborhoods as anything - not necessarily political subdivisions. Competitiveness should not be a bonus; it should be much more top of mind as you "tweak" your "Draft" Maps. Remember these Draft Maps were supposed to just be a launching point for serious improvements. PLEASE
11/30/2021 8:59:39	November 30, 2021	V.Update from Mapping Team	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Commissioner Neuberg stated that the map for LD22 would have to be adjusted because "the mayor of Gila Bend was not enamored with the way we drew it".</p> <p>I'm concerned that the views of elected officials are being afforded significantly greater consideration to influence the actions and direction of the commission than those of the rest of The Public in general. The intent of voters who passed Proposition 106 was to get politics out of the redistricting process as much as possible. The commission should be assigning the mayor's comments the same weight as any other citizen and no more. Many other people have commented on the lines around Gila Bend. Their views should be equally considered by the commission and not overshadowed by the mayor's.</p> <p>This is not the only example where commissioner Neuberg has made such comments. She has repeatedly advocated for actively bringing politicians and other elected officials into the process to get their viewpoints. That is entirely inappropriate and contrary to the intent and spirit of Proposition 106. It is also undermines the democratic process.</p> <p>If the lines in the Gila Bend area can be simplified and the resulting districts made more competitive, then the commission should do that. But those changes should NOT be driven by whether or not the mayor of Gila Bend is "happy" with them any more than other citizens are.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
11/30/2021 9:02:29	November 30, 2021	Availability of public comments	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	The Commission has done a fine job of providing the public with a great deal of information about your work and access to maps and mapping tools. However, we note that the public comments submitted during the November 9 and November 16 IRC meetings have not been posted for the public to review. The IRC must make those available as soon as possible. The League of Women Voters also has serious concerns about the multiple places where public comments are posted on the website: the mapping hub for comments about maps, the Newsroom for comments submitted via the web, and links in the public meetings schedule for comments submitted during IRC meetings. At a minimum instructions for the public about where to find all the comments should be made available. Thank you for your continued work to provide fair maps for all Arizonans.

ARIZONA Public Meeting Comments 11.30.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
11/30/2021 9:10:13	November 30, 2021	LD Draft Map Review	Suzanne Mead	85331	Self	How can the Chair think that LD28 satisfies the six constitutional criteria when neither population nor competitiveness measures meet two of those criteria?
11/30/2021 9:10:58	November 30, 2021	Draft map discussions	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	I am compelled to speak up as you complete your reviews of the legislative districts proposed in your draft map. One after another, the districts are described and Chair Neuberger states that they meet all the criteria and that the total lack of competitiveness for so many of them is justified by keeping communities of interest together. I'm sorry - but this is not at all satisfying or justifiable as an analysis. First, you CANNOT say a district meets all six criteria if it is far from competitive - the most you can say is that it meets five criteria and the deficit in the sixth is because the others would be damaged by trying to make it more competitive. Second - this review has not presented actual evidence of the supposed detriments to the other criteria; in fact, given alternative maps (at least for northern Arizona and southern Arizona districts), many of us are quite skeptical that competitiveness would damage the other criteria. Third, Chair Neuberger repeatedly uses the concept of keeping COI's together as the major justification. But - this is just one of the six criteria, and in the Constitution I don't see that the COI is supposed to trump all other criteria. And, in fact, given how vague the definition of COI is, and how many of them there are, you could use COI to justify nearly anything - no reason this should trump all other criteria. Given the priority that the Constitution gives "fair and competitive districts" in the Commission's mandate, you have not yet reassured the public that your draft districts are anywhere close to meeting all six constitutional criteria.

ARIZONA Public Meeting Comments 11.30.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
11/30/2021 9:18:33	November 30, 2021	V.Update from Mapping Team	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Commissioner Neuberg has repeatedly indicated that she favors the criteria of keeping Communities of Interest together over the criteria for making districts as competitive as possible.</p> <p>During the review of both congressional and legislative districts, she has frequently stated that the lack of competitiveness is OK because that's due to keeping Communities of Interest together. But she does not say which Communities of Interest are being respected either by their composition or their geographic location. Nor does she say which Communities of Interest are DIS-respected by setting the boundaries so they respect others that she claims are being protecting.</p> <p>The tactic of raising Communities of Interest to explain away the lack of competitiveness in a district seems to be used in a capricious manner, a justification that's used when it's convenient or ignored when not.</p> <p>Communities of Interest is a poorly defined concept. That vagueness is being exploited to relieve the commission of its responsibility to create competitive districts. This should not be allowed to continue and should be resisted by the other commissioners.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
11/30/2021 9:46:33	November 30, 2021	A Splits Report	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	<p>Regarding which districts split cities/counties and which maps keep certain Communities of Interest intact, Doug Johnson said at the June 15, 2021 meeting that Timmons/NDC can report which maps split cities/counties. Commissioners should not have to "search" or "find" a specific town or city to see if it is split. Timmons/NDC should provide a statewide report that lists every county and place name and the corresponding districts. Please provide these reports to the public. Thank you.</p>
11/30/2021 10:06:27	November 30, 2021	LD Draft Map Reviews	Suzanne Mead	85331	Self	<p>Re LD3, LD28, LD17, among others: Please explain what communities of interest you feel are being respected in these three+ districts as they are currently mapped? A political party or racial majority is not a legitimate community of interest and does not contribute to fair and independent redistricting.</p>
11/30/2021 10:40:47	November 30, 2021	Public Disclosure of Today's Data	Hope Busto-Keyes	85743	Self	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>Please disclose the data that you are privately discussing today. Transparency is important to promote public trust and to allow public engagement in the process of redistricting which will affect the lives of every Arizona citizen for years to come.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

ARIZONA		Public Meeting Comments 11.30.21				
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
11/30/2021 11:35:38	November 30, 2021	VI Legal update concerning Arizona Constitution criteria, including the VRA, 14th Amendment of the United States Constitution, and competitiveness	Priya Sundareshan	85719	self	<p>I have grave concerns about the constitutional and VRA compliance of the LD draft map. Particularly in the Pima county area, many have already noted that LD17 is not traversable or contiguous, and LD17 receives among the lowest compactness scores across all measures. There are important communities of interest that are split up, including Marana from Oro Valley, Casas Adobes, and Catalina. I am especially worried that the Tucson area here represents a textbook example of "packing" and "cracking" in order to reduce minority voting power, simply to create safe partisan districts. The deviation from the average population in these districts shows that there are more people crammed into LD18 and LD20 than the ideal population, while LD17 is allowed fewer people than the ideal. This privileges the voting power of suburban LD17 at the expense of urban LD18 and LD20. Significantly, LD20 is a Latino VRA district, so this arrangement discriminates against the voting power of the minorities in LD20. This is the opposite of why deviations from the ideal population are generally allowed, in order to create districts that give minorities more voting power. This "packing" and "cracking" problem could easily be rectified by rebalancing the populations among LDs 17, 18, and 20. Changes in the Tucson area need to be made for many reasons, including the effective discrimination the draft map creates. Now that you are aware of this discrimination in effect, if these problems are not fixed in the final maps, it lends to a credible argument that the Commission is intentionally discriminating.</p> <p>This is fixable, and in your power to fix it in the final maps. Otherwise I fear the Commission is inviting legal challenges that will bog down your time and effort for a long time.</p>