

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:09:07	December 9, 2021	LD6 as drawn violates the VRA	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	<p>Including Flagstaff in a Native American Voting Rights Act legislative district reduces the opportunity for Native Americans to elect Native American candidates. This is a VRA violation. Before 2011, Flagstaff was in a legislative district with the Navajo Nation. In 2004, Ann Kirkpatrick, a white candidate from Flagstaff, ran in the Democratic Primary for state representative against two Navajo candidates. You can vote for two state representatives. Ann Kirkpatrick received 4,428 votes from the majority White voters in Coconino County; the Navajo candidates each received less than 2,000 votes. Votes totals were the opposite in Native American areas, but the vote from Flagstaff gave Kirkpatrick her win. The Native American VRA legislative district should be drawn to give Native Americans the opportunity to elect Native Americans.</p>
12/9/2021 9:10:14	December 9, 2021	Map drafting	Lauren Snyder	85226	Maricopa County Libertarian Party	<p>Proposition 106 states it's purpose as "ENDING THE PRACTICE OF GERRYMANDERING AND IMPROVING VOTER AND CANDIDATE PARTICIPATION IN ELECTIONS BY CREATING AN INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF BALANCED APPOINTMENTS TO OVERSEE THE MAPPING OF FAIR AND COMPETITIVE CONGRESSIONAL AND LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTS."</p> <p>The IRC must do what it can to ensure the most competitive districts possible. Eliminating bias in the process is the value of having an Independent Commission instead of Legislature redistricting.</p> <p>When 4 out of 5 Commissioners are appointed from the two big parties and only one independent is thrown in the mix, that is hardly a fair, balanced or competitive representation of constituents who don't have a say in the process.</p> <p>Having the Vote Spread outside of a competitive range is what creates gerrymandered districts. By IRC definition, a "competitive district" is one below a 7% Vote Spread. The 2021 map, which likely makes only 6 of 30 legislative districts competitive, mirrors the IRC's composition in leaving predictable Dem or Rep incumbents in place in 24 of 30 LDs and half the CDs. Communities of interest are blatantly prioritized over competitive districts.</p> <p>"Other" affiliation gained more voter registrations in the last year than any ballot-status parties and now makes up 32.9% of AZ voters. Libertarians, third parties and independent voters are directly affected by the harm that results when politicians still get to select which constituents they want to represent instead of vice versa.</p> <p>Regardless of what you call it, the outcome is still self-serving, it's still gerrymandering and it is still unfair to all voters in AZ.</p> <p>The Libertarian Party recognizes the value in competition not only in the economic marketplace but the marketplace of ideas, as well.</p> <p>Districting could be done based on voter registration numbers instead of active voters. The IRC could include representatives from every ballot-status party. Commissioners could be voted on by constituents instead of appointed by lawyers.</p> <p>How can we solve this issue? There's no easy answer.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:12:04	December 9, 2021	maps	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	Can Commissioner Mehl really not distinguish between a sitting legislator lobbying to save his seat and the Latino Coalition?
12/9/2021 9:13:13	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Kimberly Lovato	85119		Keep Apache Junction as a community of Interest, keep the White Mountains as a community of interest in LD7 and not in with the Navajo Nation and to put Sedona and Flagstaff up in LD6 with a Navajo Nation as a community of Interest.
12/9/2021 9:14:02	December 9, 2021	Mapping	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	<p>•Draft Legislative Map District Six as currently drawn violates the Voting Rights Act LD 6 was drawn by the IRC as a Voting Rights Act District to empower the Native American voters in the district to elect candidates of their choosing. There are a sufficient number of Native American voters in the northern Arizona area to constitute a majority in a properly drawn legislative district. The Native American vote is politically cohesive in support of Native American candidates. Indeed, Dr. Lisa Handley found evidence of polarized voting in both Navajo and Apache Counties in her initial report. The inclusion of the City of Flagstaff in draft map district six renders it ineffective as a Native American Voting Rights Act district. The City of Flagstaff becomes a major population center of the district which will encourage non-native American candidates to run for election to the state legislature. White candidates in particular are likely to be able to defeat Native American candidates in a Democratic primary. This has happened before when the City of Flagstaff was included with the Navajo Nation in a Native American Voting Rights Act district after the 2000 census. In 2004 a white female candidate, Ann Kirkpatrick, defeated the Native American candidate (Beverly Becenti-Pigman) in a primary race for state legislature. Although a Native American candidate was one of two nominees in 2004 and was elected to the legislature for two terms (Albert Tom), he was defeated in the Democratic primary in 2010 by a white male candidate (Tom Chabin). The conclusion is very clear. If the City of Flagstaff is made a part of a majority Native American legislative district, the Native American community will not be assured of electing Native American representatives to the legislature because they will not survive a contested primary against white candidates from Flagstaff. This violates the Voting Rights Act.</p> <p>•The maps of LD 6 proposed by the Navajo Nation and Coconino County solve this problem by removing all of the City of Flagstaff from the district If the IRC wishes to avoid attracting a claim under section two of the Voting Rights Act, it should adjust LD 6 to remove the City of Flagstaff. One means of doing that is to follow the map proposed by the Navajo Nation. Alternatively, the IRC could follow the map submitted by the Coconino County Board of Supervisors which also eliminates the City of Flagstaff from LD 6. Indeed, all of the major stakeholders—the Tribes, the City of Flagstaff, the Coconino County Board of Supervisors—agree with this principle: the Native American Legislative District should not include the City of Flagstaff.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:14:22	December 9, 2021	Legislative Map Drawing	Ryan Lee	85301	City of Glendale	The city of Glendale applauds the process for redrawing the congressional and legislative district maps. We feel strongly that the adopted legislative draft map provides clean and distinct lines representing Glendale and the West Valley. Our concern is that any efforts to change the maps will negatively impact the city of Glendale. Particularly, we are concerned with the impact that these maps have for Luke Air Force Base. Luke Air Force Base resides within these boundaries and, with an economic impact of more than \$2.5 billion annually, is a significant asset to our community. A recent study conducted by the Maricopa Association of Governments estimates that the base-related population will total over 23,000 by 2026. These service members, and their families, reside throughout the entire west valley. Because of this, the 13 west valley cities and Maricopa County have worked together for several decades to protect the installation from base closures and support the installation to make sure that the service members and their families have the community support and resources they need. This is why Glendale was enthusiastic when we saw Legislative District 25 which includes the cities of Glendale, Litchfield Park, Avondale, Goodyear and Buckeye. If the Commission feels the need to adjust the legislative map to address the concerns of Yuma, we ask that Luke Air Force Base remain in a legislative district included with the surrounding west valley cities. If the Commission needs to shift the LD 25 map east to add population to the proposed Yuma map, the City of Glendale suggests moving the eastern boundary of LD 25 east along 75th Ave. Any changes that would place Luke Air Force Base in a rural district along the western portion of the state will cause a disconnect between the base and the surrounding communities.
12/9/2021 9:16:32	December 9, 2021	review of maps	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	Commissioner Watchman is not on the camera - so disrespectful!
12/9/2021 9:17:02	December 9, 2021	Fair and competitive maps	Janet Twyman	86326		<p>We need fair and competitive elections. Arizona voters made that mandate official by enthusiastically supporting the passage of Prop 106 and the formation of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission, an independent commission tasked to draw “fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts.” For the last decade the IRC followed their “fair and competitive” mandate. Maps passed by the IRC in 2012 brought AZ acclaim as being one of the least gerrymandered states, with the IRC successfully resisting the blatant, anti-democratic gerrymandering efforts that occurred throughout the country.</p> <p>I have grave concerns about the proposed legislative draft maps (LD 7, or any non-competitive map), which moves the previously competitive LD 6 by splitting Sedona and Flagstaff and separating them from each other. This results in three NON-COMPETITIVE districts in Northern Arizona. I support the remarks made by Arizona Democratic Party Chairwoman Raquel Terán: “In the ten years since the last redistricting, Arizona has experienced massive growth in both population and diversity. The political landscape has also shifted, with Arizona Democrats gaining major electoral ground... The Arizona Democratic Party reaffirms its unequivocal support for fair, competitive maps, as required in the Arizona Constitution and demanded under the voter-approved Prop 106... In spite of the GOP’s campaign to undermine Independent Redistricting, we urge the commission to carry on in the important work following the constitutional process to draw fair and competitive districts.”</p> <p>As a voter, taxpayer, and AZ resident, I too strongly urge the commission to follow the constitutional process to draw fair and competitive districts.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:24:12	December 9, 2021	Public Comments	Ann Heitland	86004	self	<p>As I am observing your final deliberations, I revisited the Communities of Interest Report on your website. The “overlap count” puts any connection between Eastern Arizona towns (like Snowflake and Eagar) and Coconino County (Williams, Parks, Kachina Village, Bellemont) at the lowest of five ratings. There is zero community of interest justification for Legislative District 7 in the data.</p> <p>Nor can you legitimately find a Community of Interest for District 7 in the public testimony and comments. The so-called “rural voice” of Arizona that has been put forward to justify the apparent gerrymander in the Draft Map is very divided. Folks in the unincorporated areas around Flagstaff are not in a community of interest with Eagar, Show Low, or Pinetop/Lakeside. Their community of interest is Flagstaff. You divide them from their school district, their workplaces, their commercial activities, and their health center. Williams is even further afield.</p> <p>People in Snowflake claim they have had no voice in the legislature because they have been in a district with Flagstaff. They should meet their representatives who are their near neighbors. For the last 10 years they have elected Republicans of their choice in every cycle, including current Rep. Walt Blackman who lives in Snowflake and former Senator Sylvia Allen, also of Snowflake. Their other current Representative, Brenda Barton, has been elected in several cycles and is also from a small rural Navajo County town. The facts are that the “voice of rural Arizona,” as they call themselves, has defeated every candidate supported by Flagstaff voters in the last 10 years. Their plaintive cry is false.</p> <p>The current Republican Senator Wendy Rogers may claim residence in Flagstaff, but she was elected by the “conservative” White Mountain residents represented in the public comments submitted to you by Steven Slaton (owner of the Trump Store in Show Low) and in testimony by those who read talking points referring to a “non-Native District” without knowing what it meant. These voices advocating for putting Flagstaff into the “non-Native district” to protect Roger’s seat are from rural Arizona, too. They are even rural eastern Arizona voices. Putting Flagstaff into a district with these eastern Arizona towns is exactly what they have told you they want. It seems the “voice of rural Arizona” contradicts itself.</p> <p>1 of 2 submissions due to space limitations. Continued in 2d submission</p>



12.09.21 Public Meeting Comments

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:25:12	December 9, 2021	Public Comments	Ann Heitland	86004	self	<p>2/2: Refusing to put some of those eastern Arizona towns into a district with the Navajo Nation, as required to population balance, sacrifices compactness and competitiveness for a fictional community of interest that labels itself the “voice of rural Arizona” but can only define itself by what it doesn’t want – it doesn’t want to be with Native Americans, and it doesn’t want to be with Democrats.</p> <p>These negative sentiments are not constitutional communities of interest and should not be given legitimacy by the IRC. A community of interest must be defined by who people are (protected minorities) or by things they do together, not by prejudice or partisanship. The Draft Map ignores economic, educational, social, and cooperative communities of interest in all these counties (Apache, Navajo, Yavapai, Coconino). Among other things, District 7 ignores the fact that Native Americans live in eastern Arizona border towns as well as on tribal lands. It slices up areas of shared commercial interests and family ties that are in both border towns and their neighboring tribal lands. It divides the tourism corridor of Flagstaff, Sedona, Verde Valley into three districts. Those places also share conservation projects and public safety arrangements. It divides the educational and workforce community of Greater Flagstaff into two districts.</p> <p>Failure to redraw the northern Arizona Legislative Draft Map would give voice to racism and partisanship for the next 10 years while violating the constitutional criteria for compactness, communities of interest, and competitiveness. Packing northern Arizona Democrats into a district with 13 tribal nations dilutes the voice of the tribal nations without reasonable basis justified by any constitutional criteria.</p>
12/9/2021 9:25:14	December 9, 2021	Mapping Process	Barbara Hutchinson	85718	myself	<p>I appreciate this opportunity to express my concerns with the IRC mapping process. It is becoming more and more difficult to demonstrate to my children and grandchildren that democracy still works in our country. Extremism and partisanship have become so divisive that it is keeping us from working together for the greater good. The one process I could show them that was created to take out/limit politics was the establishment of the IRC by Arizona voters. Please fulfill that promise and ensure the final maps for Arizona are clearly not gerrymandered by political concerns but stay true to the requirements of compactness, competitiveness and communities of interest. Let’s have a redistricting process that is a model for other states and one all Arizona citizens can be proud of. Thank you!</p>
12/9/2021 9:39:13	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Carrie Gill	85209	Myself and everyday people	<p>Apache Junction needs to be kept a community of interest, as does the white mountains. Put Navajo Nation with Sedona and Flagstaff please. Thank you for your time.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:41:19	December 9, 2021	IV. Discussion on Public Comments received prior to today's (Dec. 9, 2021) meeting.	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Commissioner Neuberger's comment that she feels the Coalition's rationale for drawing a district, that doing so increased its Competitiveness, is invalid because it's not because of Communities of Interest is very revealing.</p> <p>She stated in her view the Communities of Interest is the central organizing factor for the process. (And in many, many other instances she has shown this to be her primary point.) This is in direct opposition to the constitutional provisions that make the criteria equal in importance. The courts have made this clear.</p> <p>Communities of Interest is NOT the primary factor to consider, it is just one. All the others are just as valid and should be acceptable reasons for drawing a map is drawn that attempts to BALANCE ALL the factors.</p> <p>Favoring Communities of Interest as the primary organizing factor throws the entire process in to question.</p> <p>Very unfortunate.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
12/9/2021 9:43:34	December 9, 2021	III. Public Comments	Stephen Kridler	85120	Self	<p>I would like to thank you for taking on a role that is certainly intense and has significant responsibility to the citizens of Arizona.</p> <p>Some of my concerns regarding the AZ Constitutional requirements for redistricting include non-compact districts per Article IV, Part 2, Section 14(C). Case in point; Districts 6 and 7. District 6 wraps around a portion of District 7 creating what looks like a "tail". This does not have the appearance of being compact. Additionally, 6 crosses the boundaries of 6 different counties and 7 includes 5. Additionally, it would seem that the White Mountains "tail" portion of 6 should be included as a community of interest encompassing the Show Low area and those nearby towns and communities. Perhaps swapping that area for the Sedona area would even out population wise, and seeing the close proximity of Sedona to Flagstaff, that makes sense for a community of interest.</p> <p>Another concern is where I actually reside, in Apache Junction. Apparently it seems appropriate to split the city of Apache Junction. This does not sit well with me and also does not take into consideration the constitutional requirement for maintaining city borders. This has a higher standing in the constitutional order than does competitiveness that Seems to be at the forefront of many conversations. The Constitution should not be taken out of the order it is presented in, nor should it be cherry-picked, ignoring some points while placing greater importance on others. Thank you.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 9:54:09	December 9, 2021	Mapping/Voting Rights Act	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	<p>When is the IRC going to explain to the public its approach to VRA compliance? Chair Neuberg is using the VRA as an excuse to not draw competitive districts but then the commission goes into executive session to discuss how they are complying with the VRA. This is not transparency. The previous IRCs had to submit to DOJ for preclearance. In doing so, they explained their VRA compliance strategy in a public document. This commission should do the same.</p> <p>In addition, the VRA districts can be balanced with rural districts and east valley districts that lean heavily republican leaving the rest of the state available for competitive districts. There are just as many republican leaning parts of the state as there are majority-minority areas of the state. Balance is possible. Communities of interest would still be respected. This is not an impossible task Chair Neuberg. Five competitive CDs and ten or more competitive LDs are very possible. You should direct the mappers to do it and see what they come back with rather than insisting to the public that it cannot be done.</p>
12/9/2021 9:56:22	December 9, 2021	Competitive Maps	Eric DY	86301	Myself	<p>The Commissioners recently agreed to redraw 2 different sets of maps for proposed CD2. One map incorporates all of Northern Arizona into one district. This would be entirely unfair for this vast area to have only one congressional representation. Furthermore, the Prescott area was one of the fastest growing areas in Arizona based on the recent census figures. So this district has potential to grow in population by vast amounts. If it is unfair now to have only one representative for this vast area, think how unfair it will be in 9 to 10 years from now. So I strongly oppose this redrawn map for CD2, as it is unfair for this vast area to have merely one representative.</p> <p>I strongly propose that the commissioners approve the set of 2 maps for Northern Arizona. The revised maps create 2 rural districts by separating Mingus Mountain from the rest of Yavapai County, with the western district including Mohave County with the Colorado River communities. While the eastern district includes the Verde Valley, Sedona, Flagstaff and tribal lands. This set of 2 redrawn maps is the map I strongly prefer. This vast area should be represented by 2 districts. It is too large and has the potential to grow in population by large amounts in the next ten years. So including this vast area of the entire Northern Arizona into one district is entirely unfair. This area deserves to have 2 congressional representatives.</p> <p>Respectfully, Eric Day</p>
12/9/2021 9:58:22	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Nina rizzo	86351	VOC	<p>https://publicmeetings.az.gov/content/notice-public-meeting-and-possible-executive-session-15</p> <p>My comments would be to keep Apache Junction as a community of Interest, keep the White Mountains as a community of interest in LD7 and not in with the Navajo Nation and to put Sedona and Flagstaff up in LD6 with a Navajo Nation as a community of Interest.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 10:05:17	December 9, 2021	Draft Maps	James Stein	86305	Self	<p>CD 0074 makes Congressional District 2 competitive. Central Yavapai and Wickenburg have been moved to Mojave County, creating a more compact D9.</p> <p>CD2 now keeps Apache and Navajo counties whole and satisfies many of the state's Native Tribes and also makes CD6 more compact.</p> <p>I urge you to consider CD 0074 as a way to provide AZ with fair and competitive maps.</p>
12/9/2021 10:06:02	December 9, 2021	IV. Discussion on Public Comments received prior to today's (Dec. 9, 2021) meeting.	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Regarding commissioner Mehl's comment that the Latino Coalition is "identical" to the Democratic party, he is plainly wrong.</p> <p>There are MANY Democrats who are not in the Coalition and that have diverse views that do not necessarily align with those of the coalition. The two organizations are certainly not identical, and by stating his belief that they are, he makes it clear he is making decisions about both Latinos and Democrats based on patently false assumptions.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are many Arizonans who are not aligned with either the Coalition or the Democrats - including Independents like me - who find themselves in favor of the Coalition's attempt to create a competitive district or to increase the competitiveness of other districts, a responsibility that the commission was sadly unable to achieve with it's drafts maps where 80% of the legislative districts were safe districts for one or the other party. This group of voters applauds their efforts because it helps us ensure we have quality candidates who listen to the people and work on our behalf rather than their party's.</p> <p>Commissioner Mehl should re-evaluate his view on equating the Latino Coalition and it's maps with the Democratic Party. Just because they may have similar aims and values does NOT mean they are the same or even virtually the same. Such broad strokes are an insult to the intelligence of the voters of this state and what's important to them.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 10:07:12	December 9, 2021	Competitive Maps	Rita Day	86301	myself	<p>Chairwoman Neuberg has recently remarked that testimony in public comments on competitiveness HAS BEEN HEARD. I truly hope that not only has it been heard, but it will be acted upon and not overlooked. Competitiveness is critically important, as without it, extremism results. I live in Prescott, current CD4. Our Congressional representative is so extreme that he appears at Proud Boy events as a speaker and has posted videos depicting an assault of a female Democratic Congresswoman and attempting to kill President Biden. He finds nothing wrong with this. Because our district is so uncompetitive, no matter how extreme & divisive the candidate is, if they are from the Republican Party, they will prevail, even over a more qualified, moderate Democrat. This is extremely dangerous for our country. So that's why I feel the factor of competitiveness is the most important factor.</p> <p>Recently the Commissioners had quite a heated discussion regarding proposed CD2, after which they agreed to draw 2 different sets of revised maps. Of these revised maps I strongly support the maps which create 2 rural districts by separating Mingus Mountain from the rest of Yavapai County. The western district would add Mohave County and the Colorado River communities. While the eastern district would include the Verde Valley, Sedona, Flagstaff & tribal lands. I strongly prefer this set of two districts over the 2nd map which combines the entire Northern Arizona region running west to east. This vast area is so large that it should be 2 districts not just one. This vast area can not be given fair representation with only one district. Furthermore, the Prescott/Yavapai County area is one of the fastest growing areas based on the last census figures. There is no reason to believe this rate of growth won't continue. If this vast area is only allowed one representative, that is very unfair. Not to mention how much this area will grow in 10 years, when the next Redistricting happens. So, I highly recommend the 2 districts redrawn maps over the redrawn map which is just one large district including the entire Northern Arizona region.</p> <p>Respectfully, Rita Day</p>
12/9/2021 10:22:30	December 9, 2021	Communities of interest	Lauren Snyder	85226	All voters in Arizona	Is there any way to adopt a legal definition of "Community of interest"? It is too vague and left up to interpretation of all individuals involved in the process which makes it extremely easy to be exploited.
12/9/2021 10:41:03	December 9, 2021	III	Marlene Macek	86351	Myself	I am a retiree living in the Village of Oak Creek, one of the unincorporated Verde Valley communities. I support the 7.1 version of CD2 and 10.0 version LD5 as drafted as it keeps our Verde Valley communities of interest together with one minor change; I request that the City of Sedona be kept together in LD5.
12/9/2021 10:50:21	December 9, 2021	Maps	Rita Day	86301	Myself	I strongly agree with Commissioner Lerner's comments regarding Yavapai and Prescott. I don't agree with Mele. I live in Prescott and I feel Commissioner Lerner is supporting what the majority of Prescott residents want.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 10:51:38	December 9, 2021	Congressional Districts 7 and 9	Frank Bergwall	85365-6623	myself	I support a compact congressional district for Yuma County. My interests will not be served by including me in South Yuma County or Southern Tucson I support draft maps CD0026 and LD0020
12/9/2021 11:03:14	December 9, 2021	LD7 vs LD15	Nola Perkins	85120	Myself	I can't seem to be able to understand the most recent maps, but I just want to plead with you to be certain that Apache Junction Legislative District remains intact. Thank you.
12/9/2021 11:03:53	December 9, 2021	Polarization data	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	The additional polarization data provided by Dr. Handley has not been posted for the public on the IRC website. The public must see the data being used by the Commissioners to draw final maps. It is essential to provide the polarization data quickly as promised by Doug Johnson during your discussion on December 6 and earlier. Thank you.
12/9/2021 11:18:29	December 9, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion; Congressional Map Drawings	Dianne Coscarelli	85718	Self	The comments of Commissioners Lerner and Watchman in favor of their CD Map 8.4 are most responsive to the public comments we heard. Thank you for listening to the people of Northern Arizona. Map 8.4 also is also most appealing from a Constitutional standpoint.
12/9/2021 11:19:24	December 9, 2021	Draft Map CD0074, submitted on 120421.	Corinne Shaw	86314	Myself	Map CD0074 as submitted on 120421. Map CD 0074 makes Congressional District 2 competitive. Central Yavapai and Wickenburg have been moved to Mojave County, creating a more compact D9. CD2 keeps Apache and Navajo counties whole and satisfies many of the state's Native Tribes and also makes CD6 more compact. This draft map merits discussion by the Committee
12/9/2021 11:21:49	December 9, 2021	Mapping	Ann Heitland	86004	self as a citizen of Coconino County	Chair Neuberger's characterization of what the Coconino Board of Supervisors has said about the reason for their north-south configuration is a distortion of the truth. Communities of interest are a major part of their reasons for that map. Nicely, it also makes a more competitive and compact district.
12/9/2021 11:25:31	December 9, 2021	III	Deborah Thalasis	86303	Self	Draft Map CD 0074 merits discussion. This proposed map makes Congressional District 2 competitive. Central Yavapai and Wickenburg have been moved to Mojave County, creating a more compact D9. CD2 now keeps Apache and Navajo counties whole and satisfies many of the state's Native Tribes and also makes CD6 more compact. While elected officials in Yavapai County have urged you to keep all of Yavapai County in one district, that is not what you as a commission are charged with doing. Nowhere in your rules does it state that counties must be kept together. Your rules do, however, require competitive districts which CD 0074 accomplishes.
12/9/2021 11:26:21	December 9, 2021	Draft Maps	Norma Bliven	86301	myself	CD 0074 makes Congressional District 2 competitive. Central Yavapai and Wickenburg have been moved to Mojave County, creating a more compact D9. CD2 now keeps Apache and Navajo counties whole and satisfies many of the state's Native Tribes and also makes CD6 more compact. This draft map merits discussion.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 11:29:11	December 9, 2021		6 Jesse Bryant	85501	5 Eastern Counties plan	<p>Please forgive me if my words seem harsh. I mean to be direct, not harsh. I wish to address this assumption that Rural AZ and Reservations have significant similarities. We do not. The similarities are superficial only. First, you have to stop viewing the issue through the lens of race rather than culture. American Indian Reservations are self-isolated cultural bubbles. The residents come into the neighboring towns for shopping and government services, but otherwise remain secluded. The residents of the neighboring towns have extremely little interaction with the Reservations, as the "Not Welcome" sign is metaphorically hanging on the front door.</p> <p>Reservations are not subject to State Laws. This is why you see smoking in the casinos and no sales tax on your purchases. Neighboring communities have for years attempted to get intergovernmental agreements with the Tribal governments for mutual aid in police and fire, never a response. Tribal governments offer no cooperation with neighboring towns and reminding us that they are a Sovereign Nation and must be approached at the federal level only. It is, therefore, rather dishonest to view them through any local community lens.</p> <p>As a federal level Sovereign Nation, the culture and government that has grown up around this is starkly different and quite foreign to the small rural towns in proximity to them. I cannot emphasize enough that this IS NOT about race or ethnicity. As a lifelong resident of a town ten miles from the boundary of the San Carlos Apache Reservation, I can tell you that in the last ten years youth are moving out of the Reservations and into the neighboring rural towns. They are doing this to seek opportunities that do not exist for them on the Reservation. They are leaving, not traditional culture, but static culture of the Reservation and embracing the local culture of the communities they have joined. Those who remain on the Reservations are steeped in a culture (static, not traditional) that is foreign to the communities in rural AZ. The static culture of the Reservations is collective, centralized, subsidized. The rural towns are the opposite. We are decentralized, market driven, private economy. The rural town has no guarantee or safety net. We are not Federal wards. If our town financially fails, it ceases to be a town. We are subject to jurisdictions of town, county, and state. The reservations have their own police agencies along with the BIA and FBI.</p> <p>It could be argued that the rural communities have more in common with the metro than the Reservation, or at least as much in common. I write this to challenge assumptions, or convenient rationalizations. Draft Map 11 is about to take a perceived victim (Reservations, which, by the numbers are not victims) and sacrifice what will be the true victim (the rural communities that have no means of defense, financially or legally) on the altar of emotionally coated half-truths. Let reason prevail over political/philosophical agendas.</p>
12/9/2021 11:42:40	December 9, 2021	Maps	Norma Bliven	86301	Myself	You HAVE to consider LDF050, LDF051 and CDF010. Yavapai County needs to be split to be competitive.
12/9/2021 11:45:08	December 9, 2021	Re-districting	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	Why does the IRC keep splitting Wickenburg up into 2 districts? We should be in CD2 and LD5 not LD28 and CD9. We have nothing in common with Anthem, Surprise, Lake Havasu, etc. Wickenburg should be all in one district on the Yavapai side. Stop insisting on splitting us up.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 11:45:58	December 9, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>The commission spent a great deal of time and effort to gather input about the wide range of Communities of Interest that are found in our state - from getting input through in-person testimony at public hearings in various locales, to creating a questionnaires and forms for the public to specify the boundaries and rationale of their Col, to developing software to submit and display those maps and provide demographic data around them. Although difficult for the public to navigate, that was an admirable effort. The commission and all of us learned much about the makeup and concerns of the citizens of our state.</p> <p>If that was so important to do, then why is it that we've never seen a single one of the Col maps used to help evaluate the boundaries of the CD or LD maps? We've repeatedly heard how one or another boundary shift 'preserves' Cols or allows a Col to have its voice heard (never mind that doing so silences the voices of other Cols).</p> <p>If that's the case, then can we please see the evidence by showing the Col maps overlaid? I know it must be possible for Timmons to do that. Or is there some other reason why you don't want us to see that? Maybe that doing so would not support the assertion? Some other reason?</p> <p>I'm concerned by commissioner Neuberg's comment that the number of people who gave testimony or commented is really a small percentage of the people of the state. She seemed to be implying that that meant it wasn't large enough to take what was heard in their testimony as representative of what the larger populace feels is important. So apparently she will make her own assumptions about that, whether those assumptions agree with what the people said or the opposite.</p> <p>But that's an issue the commission should have realized would be the case well before they started taking public comment. The number of people who would be able to testify under any outreach plan would necessarily be small. And the commission, despite congratulating itself on it's efforts, seemed to do everything it could to make it more difficult for many people to offer their views. Regardless, if you were not really going to heed what the people have said and intended all along to substitute what you THINK the population must really want, then you could have saved all of us a lot of time and effort - and the false HOPE that this process would actually be a way for us to express our perspectives - if you'd just said so in the first place.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
12/9/2021 11:48:13	December 9, 2021	Keeping Yavapai County Whole	Diane McQueen	86327	self	<p>The commissioners need to stop with the "keeping Yavapai County" whole thing. This notion of keeping Yavapai County as a whole is a fallacy and seems to have become the sole rallying point by Commissioners Mehl, York and Chair Neuberg to try and shove down the public's throat some false narrative that nothing else will work if they don't keep Yavapai County whole. Start listening to the public please!</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 11:51:15	December 9, 2021	Maps	Rita DY	86301	Myself	<p>I agree with Lerner and Workman that there are historical reasons that go back over 40 years that Yavapai county be split and not kept whole for purposes of congressional district. I live in Prescott and the majority of residents in Yavapai County prefer the logical split of Yavapai county at Mingus Mountain.</p> <p>Regardless of what Mele and Neuberger want, the residents of Northern Arizona agree that Yavapai should be split at the Mingus Mountains. Yavapai is too large to be kept whole. By doing so you are giving less of a voice to Yavapai by having only one congressional district as opposed to two.</p> <p>I strongly oppose the 3-2 vote to start with map 8-1. The 3 members seem to be bullying the 2 Democratic Commissioners, who are speaking to what the residents of Yavapai and Northern Arizona want. I feel we are not being heard, even though Commissioners Lerner & Watchman are speaking up for the desires of Yavapai county residents.</p>
12/9/2021 11:54:11	December 9, 2021	Maps	Diane McQueen	86327	self	<p>Once again (as has been the case all along), Chair Neuberger, our supposedly "Independent" Chair has again voted with the Republican Commissioners on which maps to start with (8.1 vs 8.3). It's getting very tiring (and frustrating) to constantly hear the vote is 3-2 with the chair always voting with Mehl and York. Our "Independent" Chair is not an Independent at all but a Republican in Independent's clothing. It's shameful.</p>
12/9/2021 11:55:26	December 9, 2021	Communities of interest	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	<p>The Commissioners, especially Chairwoman Neuberger, continuously reference communities of interest (COIs). You even had a listening tour soliciting input from the public about their communities of interest. Yet we have never heard the Commissioners discuss or reach consensus on their definition of COI. What standards are you, the IRC, using to define COIs? Is it whatever an individual says it is? Or for redistricting purpose, are you focusing on specific kinds of communities or issues? The League has commented to the IRC that what does define a community of Interest for redistricting purposes are the common needs and problems residents share that can be addressed by government action--things like health care or educational facilities, public safety, water shortages, access to broadband, and their economic interests such as mining, agriculture, and tourism. Does the IRC agree? In some cases, it appears to be used in reference to partisan interests. The League does not believe this is how it should be used. Please do not confuse these in your discussions.</p> <p>Thank you for your continued work to ensure fair maps for Arizonans.</p>
12/9/2021 11:56:35	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	<p>Wickenburg should be a community of interest. We should be in LD5 and CD2 not LD28 and CD9.</p>
12/9/2021 12:03:19	December 9, 2021	Draft Map discussion	Ann Heitland	86004	self	<p>Chair Neuberger talks a lot about what she "heard" from various people in conversations the public does not yet have access to. It will be interesting to learn how selective her hearing is.</p>



12.09.21 Public Meeting Comments

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 12:07:41	December 9, 2021	Maps	Rita Day	86301	Myself	<p>Mehl's map is NOT competitive for Northern Arizona and he doesn't take into account the communities of interest in Northern Az. Also, Neuberger consistently downplays the Native American Tribes. As usually, Neuberger sides with the 2 Republicans. This happens almost 100%. How can she be considered an independent when she consistently sides with the Republicans????</p> <p>Mele is not flexible and willing to consider other views. This is shown by his unwillingness to start from map 8.4 and make changes to that map. Map 8.4 has Yavapai split in two at the Mingus Mountain, which the majority of residents of Yavapai have said they prefer. However, Mele will not even consider this map. He is totally inflexible and willing to compromise. Furthermore, he acts as a bully, rather than making tactful remarks describing his disagreements. On the other hand, Lerner and Watchman describe their disagreements in tactful, respectful ways.</p>
12/9/2021 12:13:11	December 9, 2021	Technical Issues	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	It is difficult to hear Commissioner York.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 12:30:12	December 9, 2021		6 Jesse Bryant	85501	the 5+ Eastern Counties plan	<p>On behalf of Rural Eastern AZ, draft map 11 is beyond egregious. The Commission by design excludes a voice to the most vulnerable population in the state. Four of five members are from Metro AZ, and one a member of the Navajo Nation, likely the most powerful reservation in Arizona, maybe even the country. Who does not have a voice? Rural AZ. We get mentioned when it suits the political/philosophical agenda of others. The rest of the time, we are politely ignored.</p> <p>Because of paradigm, you fail completely to see the miracle of what Eastern AZ accomplished. People near or below poverty level across nearly half the state spoke in agreement on a normally hotly divided issue. People who have never been to most of the other small towns, nonetheless, recognized that we are kindred communities sharing in everyday interests. The vast majority of Eastern AZ, across the 5+ Eastern Counties, did not think about race or political party. They did what most in the spotlight claim to want. You heard from a white city councilman, likely registered Republican from Snowflake, AZ, in Northeastern AZ speak in agreement with two Hispanic, likely registered Democrat mayors, from Globe and Superior in Central AZ. You recently received a letter from our black representative, Walt Blackman. We do not care about race or party!</p> <p>You have received letters, resolutions, comments, from people living in Southeast, Northeast, and Central AZ. Some were white, some Hispanic, some black, some Democrats, some Republicans, some Independent. We broke all of the norms. We have NOBODY prepared to launch a defense for us if we don't get what we want. No activist organizations fighting for Rural AZ. No lawyers threatening you with lawsuits if our voting rights are not respected. There is only one victim in this process. The deck is stacked against Rural AZ Communities. The Reservations are not victims in this process. They have millions of dollars at their disposal. An entire political party advocating for them, and countless organizations, not to mention federal law and a wide range of sympathetic courts.</p> <p>The Sub/Metro areas are not victims. The vast majority of state revenues goes to them because of their numbers. Infrastructure, school funding, staffed and equipped hospitals, as do the Reservations. The Reservations have an entire federal agency in support of their hospitals, at least San Carlos does. The Surgeon General's Office staffs personnel at the very well funded, top of the line San Carlos hospital. Who is the real victim? Rural AZ communities do not choose to be victims. We do not wear it like a virtue. We work for what we have. But, numbers don't lie. Draft map 11 utterly ignores us. We did what most just talk about. We united people across race and party lines. What is our reward? You ignore us. You only listen to the legally certified victims, even when, by the numbers, they are no victims at all. Respect the voiceless. Respect the 5 rural East Counties and Copper Corridor.</p>
12/9/2021 12:50:10	December 9, 2021	CD and LD Map Adjustments	Bert Campbell	86336	Self	<p>Chairwoman Neuberger represented that she had a conversation with Supervisor Donna Michaels wherein the Supervisor made a compelling case for keeping Yavapai County whole. She was the only dissenter in a vote by the BOS on 12/1 regarding support for LD5. At no time has the BOS taken a position on the CD. Why would Supervisor Michaels publicly vote against keeping Yavapai County whole in LD5 and then say the opposite to Chairwoman Neuberger? Does the Chairwoman have the correct supervisor? Did she misunderstand what was said? Very strange. The record needs to be corrected.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 12:58:17	December 9, 2021	CD and LD Maps	Bert Campbell	86336	Self	<p>https://destinyhosted.com/agenda_publish.cfm?id=92827&mt=ALL&get_month=12&get_year=2021&dsp=agm&seq=15328&rev=0&ag=1822&ln=32551&nseq=15326&nrev=0&pseq=15204&prev=0#ReturnTo32551</p> <p>This is the readout from the Yavapai County BOS meeting on 12/1 where Supervisor Michaels dissented from the vote supporting keeping YC whole in LD5.</p>
12/9/2021 13:14:13	December 9, 2021	CD Draft Map discussion	Barbara Orcutt	86004	self	<p>Perhaps Chair Neuberger should look at the testimony from real scientists about the water sheds and Verde River issues in Yavapai County instead of talking the Oath Keepers' word for it. Her account of conversations with individual supervisors is highly suspect in this and other instances. She's surely confused about what Council Member Pastor said to her. She has no rational basis for the decisions she is dictating about communities of interest.</p>
12/9/2021 13:30:15	December 9, 2021	District Map	Louis Corona	86303		<p>Keep district 1 as is. Prescott, Prescott Valley, Chino Valley have distinct familiar issues of water, infrastructure and values that are unique to our area..</p>
12/9/2021 14:04:15	December 9, 2021	Review of maps for redistricting	Renee Kirkpatrick	85704	self, Arizona community	<p>Please adopt the Arizona Latino Coalition updates from congressional draft map CD0073. Based on our diverse community with a growing Latino population, decisions must be made where all deserving voices are heard. This proposed map reflects the reality of our community. Historically, Latino and Indigenous voices have been minimized or even silenced. It is up to this Independent Commission to recommend districts maps that reflect our communities. Arizonans are counting on you.</p>
12/9/2021 14:41:04	December 9, 2021	redistricting AZ	Ashley Cohen	86351	VOC	<p>I am adding to my testimonial to say that during the hearing, the only arguments I heard from anyone promoting dividing Sedona and VOC away from Verde Valley/Prescott was that 'all we did there was shop at Costco and Trader Joes which isn't a justifiable reason for redistricting'. First let me say how condescending, lacking in actual evidence of what our business is there, and weak that argument is. This is exactly the kind of mentality that distinguishes our communities. They are grasping at straws for power while I and many of my neighbors here have a rational arguments based on the actual legal requirements for drawing districts boundaries. If someone is that concerned about hospital access then the rational choice is to go live somewhere that hospitals exist already. The small town feel of Sedona and Village of Oak Creek is exactly what people moved here for. We want to keep it that way. The Verde Valley community is a natural community that has evolved out of shared interests and geographical compatibility. Please do the right thing and be aware that breaking up Yavapai County will be a deeply unpopular decision.</p>



12.09.21 Public Meeting Comments

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 15:09:07	December 9, 2021	Mapping Northern Arizona	Julie Pindzola	86301	a concerned voter	<p>The IRC seems to be going off the rails. The mapping justifications that the Commission majority puts forward are from the power centers, not from the many 100s of citizens who have commented over 9 months. John Q Public uses the public forums. The influencers get to talk with commissioners off the record. It appears that the end results were predetermined - at least in terms of Northern Arizona, which in turn drives all the map moves down to Pima County. Yavapai County, my county, is being used as the lynch pin for the entire state. Why?</p> <p>Seems our Independent Chair is not an Independent after all. Independents want good and varied candidates to choose from. That means Competitive districts such as CD2 and LD7 should be kept rather than thrown out the window!</p> <p>Arizona is supposed to be above this shady practice. Prop106 was to shield us from this, Influence is supposed to be out in the open and ideas debated. COI is being used indiscriminately as the rationale to defeat the Fair and Competitive maps that the citizens have repeatedly called for. This is WRONG. Your map decisions need to have a full analysis attached to them and not just by referencing some conversation held off the public record. We are looking for above-board decency here, not naked politics. What a pity.</p>
12/9/2021 15:33:26	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	<p>After looking at the 11.0 maps, 11.3 which pulls Wickenburg into LD30 won't work. We have nothing in common with Yuma, Lake Havasu, Kingman, Quartzite. In fact we have nothing in common with La Paz, Mohave or Yuma Counties. Wickenburg needs to be in LD5 and CD2. I don't know why the commission is catering to one specific demographic and why they aren't considering Wickenburg to be an area of interest but it needs to be looked at. I'd be happy to give the commission a tour of our town and show you why we need to be on the Yavapai County side of things.</p>
12/9/2021 15:35:35	December 9, 2021	All	Vice Mayor Brannon Hampton	85338		<p>I would like to talk about the map as it relates to Goodyear and Buckeye</p>



12.09.21 Public Meeting Comments

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/9/2021 15:39:38	December 9, 2021		4 Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	<p>For months now, in nearly every IRC meeting, and definitely at the end of every public town hall during the public consultation period, the Commissioners asked the public to use the online public commenting system. There are currently 1940 public comments on the IRC dashboard.</p> <p>Though I appreciate the Commissioners using what they heard in town halls and the views of a number of Arizona Mayors and City Council members, I am dismayed that the vast number of public comments do not appear to be considered or referenced during deliberations.</p> <p>I urge the Commissioners to use the online public comments, giving them the same consideration as meetings with Mayors, to justify their decisions instead of appearing to go with their gut feelings or own knowledge. Though staff have been asked to report on NUMBERS of maps and comments submitted, there does not appear to be any reporting to the Commissioners of what the public ARE SAYING online. For example, on a quick search of public comments, 245 mention Yuma, but in the deliberations about Yuma and the Yuma Gold map, these 245 comments have not been referred to at all.</p> <p>Please use the online comments submitted as the Commission asked us to make ourselves heard.</p> <p>Please, rather than use the Chair's deciding vote to split deadlocks on contentious issues, ask staff to present reports on what public comments have been entered on the IRC public commenting dashboard. Thank you.</p>
12/9/2021 16:04:31	December 9, 2021	LD maps	Trey Terry	85395	Agua Fria Union High School District	<p>My name is Trey Terry and I am a Governing Board Member on the Agua Fria Union High School District. I am writing to ask you to NOT put the Agua Fria Union High School district with Yuma. We are a suburban, Maricopa County community. Northern Buckeye, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park deserve to be in a west valley district. Please DO NOT put us with Yuma. Thank you.</p>
12/9/2021 16:06:13	December 9, 2021	Redistricting	Laura Bowes	85704	Pima County residents	<p>Keep Apache Junction as a community of Interest. Keep the White Mountains as a community of interest in LD7, not in with the Navajo Nation. Put Sedona and Flagstaff in LD6 with the Navajo Nation as a community of Interest.</p>