

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:14:06	December 16, 2021	test	test	test		test
12/16/2021 9:14:48	December 16, 2021	District 17	Sherri Johnson	85704	Self	<p>I live in District 17 in Pima County. I believe I should in a district that is competitive so I can have a voice, as I am not aligned with either the Republican or the Democratic party. Map 10.0 is said to give a 10-point advantage to Republican candidates.</p> <p>If there are districts safe for Republicans and another for Democrats, extremists can gain or retain power. The map proposed is said to make Pima County evenly divided by the major parties. Why? What about the rest of Arizona that is primarily Republican? What about those of us, reported to be one-third of voters, who do not belong to either of the two parties?</p> <p>We also believe that districts should include a variety of people with different incomes and interests. District 17 should stay contiguous and competitive. To have us in a district that includes the Houghton/Tanque Verde/Vail areas is ridiculous. Looking at a map, this is gerrymandering in extreme and certainly is not contiguous.</p> <p>Other areas that should be contiguous are those in CD7. To isolate the University and the Latinos is certainly not conducive to democratic engagement.</p> <p>The IRC was established to prohibit or at least diminish partisan gerrymandering. We voters (and we do vote) are counting on you. How districts are defined is critical to preserving our democracy.</p> <p>Please give those of us who are not aligned a voice.</p> <p>Sharon Johnson</p>
12/16/2021 9:15:52	December 16, 2021	IRC's Mandate	Claire Cordon	85739	SaddleBrooke, Pinal County	You have a mandate to draw fair maps. Do your jobs and stop playing politics. Stop the obvious gerrymandered maps.
12/16/2021 9:16:29	December 16, 2021	6	Judith Simons	85224	Self	<p>* I am concerned that Draft Map LD 12.0.1 is not shown on the Dashboard this morning.*</p> <p>I have lived in Chandler for over 25 years. Please use Draft Map LD 12.0.1 going forward. It meets the Constitutional requirements of being compact and contiguous, with roughly equal population. It has reasonable geographic boundaries that keep most of the city within one district. City issues, businesses, and schools are my main communities of interest, and having one set of legislators to interact with matters a lot. It respects the Latino community of interest by keeping the northern and downtown neighborhoods together. It enables the schools of CUSD to rely on consistent representation without having to navigate multiple districts. It maintains the competitiveness of the district, which is important for both candidate and voter participation that yields more effective government. I appreciate your effort and thank you for your consideration of mine.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.16.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:17:33	December 16, 2021	IRC Public comments	John Stryker	85623	My interest government fairness and compliance with the law	<p>Comment on LD 17, version 12.1. Unfavorable changes in my District 17:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The plan does not meet the compact and continuous requirement. It stretches from SaddleBrooke to Vail, crosses geographic boundaries to include two mountain ranges.2. It does not meet the communities of interest requirement. There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks or recreation in common.3. It does not meet the competitive requirement. With Arizona voters equally divided among Republicans, Democrats and Independents the deviation should not exceed 3 to 4 points, This dissect is at 8.9%. This map gives a big advantage for Republicans virtually eliminating any chance for others from holding office.4. Map 12.1 represents the kind of blatant gerrymandering the commission was created to prevent.
12/16/2021 9:18:00	December 16, 2021	discussion of map alternatives	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	<p>Thank you for providing a mechanism by which both the Democratic and Republican appointees can clearly describe their recommendations for district boundaries – the two versions of each map being considered today as the basis for final refinements. We all realize that there are necessarily going to be tradeoffs among the six criteria – and the process of getting these alternate versions prepared has given each commissioner (including Chair Neuberger) a chance to describe how they view the criteria and the tradeoffs, and how they prioritize concerns and criteria. These are extremely difficult decisions and it is greatly appreciated when you each speak fully about your decision-making process. I'd like to request that as you further assess these contrasting maps, you continue to articulate explicitly the kinds of considerations that Chair Neuberger is speaking about right now in her response to public comments. I do think that there have been many occasions when commissioners have not described what they prioritize, or have not described what significant detriment they see from making a specific district more competitive. I know that Chair Neuberger is clear about not prioritizing competitiveness, but it should be at least recognized explicitly as one of the six criteria. (That is, don't say that a district meets the six criteria despite being very non-competitive – it meets at most FIVE of the criteria in that case.)</p>
12/16/2021 9:18:16	December 16, 2021	VI	Paula Feely	85286	Self	<p>I much prefer the LD12.0.1 map to the alternative. I like that it keeps our currently competitive LD about as competitive as it has been, and I like that it keeps the northern part of Chandler with the rest of the city and keeps our school district mostly within the LD. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:19:02	December 16, 2021	Chair's new Rationale for LD 17 is false	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	<p>As Roseann Roseannadanna said, "You know, it's always something; if it's not one thing, it's another."</p> <p>The character usually said this in response to one of the Saturday Night Live weekend update anchors interrupting her and trying to get her back on track. The IRC has gone well off track with draft LD 17 in proposed draft map 12.1.1.</p> <p>In the latest mapping discussions, Commission Mehl has doubled down on his proposed gerrymandered legislative district 17. His original justification for the district was based on a supposed "community of interest" which was based on nothing more than partisan affiliation; this rationale fell apart during the 30 day comment period when it became evident through investigative reporting that the district was drawn for purely partisan purposes despite his insistence that there was a community of interest between two parts of Pima County that are separated by the Catalina Mountains.</p> <p>Chair Neuberg appears concerned enough about this blatant partisan gerrymander that she is advancing a new rationale for the district has emerged in the recent days. The new rationale for LD 17 is that the district is necessary to effectively represent residents of the state who are not residents of cities or townships but live in "unincorporated areas" where their interests diverge from the cities and towns. The implication in this rationale is that many, if not most, of the residents of LD 17 live in unincorporated areas and they deserve special representation in the state legislature because their interests are different from the cities and towns. This premise is false and it is misleading to the public to even suggest it as a rationale for the gerrymandered district.</p> <p>Here is the truth, according to the "Splits Report" on the AZ IRC hub:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Roughly 7.5% of the residents of proposed LD 17 live in "unincorporated areas" See: Arizona IRC Splits report, Legislative District 17. Put differently, 92.5% of the proposed district lives in a city or township. •Roughly 29% of the population of the proposed district live in the City of Tucson. Id. •Roughly 42% of the population of the proposed district live in the towns of Marana and Oro Valley. Id. <p>There is no rationale for this district other than as a purely partisan power play. If LD 17 stands as currently proposed, it will turn the purpose of the Independent Redistricting Commission on its head. It is time for the IRC to stop seeking a rationale to justify a bad district; instead they should draw fair districts as the voters who backed Proposition 106 expect.</p>
12/16/2021 9:24:33	December 16, 2021	Proposed LD 17	Karen Schickedanz	85739	Myself	<p>I strongly object to the proposed boundaries of LD 17. It is a gerrymandered district that would end up giving one party--the GOP--complete and continuing dominance. It does not adhere to the requirements of the IRC to create fair and competitive districts.</p>
12/16/2021 9:24:57	December 16, 2021	Public comments	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	<p>You need to redraw legislative districts 2 and 27. It is not drawn fairly. You can clearly see that you have added major blue precincts to district 2. How can you mix Arrowhead Mall and Cardinals stadium? They are two different communities. How can you add Shea Blvd to Turf Paradise community? Neither of these communities have interests. You are relying way too much on lawyers and court decisions instead of having the State citizens decide it. You are commissioned to do this job, not lawyers from law firms.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:25:48	December 16, 2021	Redistricting	Shelburne	85939	Self	Very pleased to see the 12.1.1 proposed map. Thank you for taking our concerns and comments into consideration regarding rural communities of interest in the White Mountains. As a resident of Taylor, I support the 12.1.1 proposed map!!!!!!
12/16/2021 9:27:01	December 16, 2021	LD17 - Protecting Unincorporated Areas	Sharon Edgar	860047210	self	At the December 13th meeting, Chairwoman Neuberg she is "very concerned" about the unincorporated areas in LD17. According to the "LD12.1 Assigned District Splits" report on the Redistricting Hub, the population of that version of LD17 is 239,065. 16,523 of those residents live in unincorporated areas in Pima County. 1,322 of those residents live in Pinal County. I think you are trying all sorts of arguments to justify selectively including Republican communities on both sides of the Catalina Mountains for Commissioner Mehl. Only 17,845 people in unincorporated areas in LD17. You are giving them a disproportional amount of power.
12/16/2021 9:27:36	December 16, 2021	VI Legislative Map Drawing	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	<p>On Tuesday December 14, 2021, the City of Buckeye City Council voted unanimously for the following communities of interest, in order of priority -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water, specifically developing new water resources, • Fast growth; and • Agriculture. <p>Their unanimous vote also included the following priorities in state legislative districts that include the City of Buckeye –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use Interstate 10, State Route 85 and State Route 303 as boundaries for legislative districts that include Buckeye so that neighborhoods/communities of interest are not divided, • Out of concern for similar communities of interest the eastern boundary of Buckeye's legislative districts not extend beyond Dysart Road, • Out of concern for the incorporation of visible geographic features, including city and boundaries, the northern boundary of Buckeye's legislative district Buckeye should extend to the Patton Road alignment, • Share legislative district(s) with the cities of Goodyear and Litchfield Park, • Buckeye be in fewer legislative districts – preferably two; and • Buckeye's legislative districts connect to both the west valley and Yuma. <p>Finally, the City of Buckeye City Council voted unanimously in support of the LD0085 West Valley Unified plan, submitted by the West Valley Coalition.</p>
12/16/2021 9:29:10	December 16, 2021	legislative districts	Linda Morenz	86750	self	I just heard Chairperson Neuberg say that she feels there is a compelling interest to look at the shared vested interests of persons in the unincorporated areas in the LD-17 and keep that district as is. I live in that area and feel like "shared vested interests" your referencing don't exist and that a significant proportion of people are quite tied to Tucson (values, work, medical, shopping) and making that district competitive gives both parties a chance to elect representatives.
12/16/2021 9:30:44	December 16, 2021	VI	Katherine Doman-Sheydayi	85296	Self	I have lived in Gilbert for 20 years, and I support map draft 12.0.1.
12/16/2021 9:30:58	December 16, 2021	Public comment	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	Chair Neuberg, there is way too much preference being given to make maps competitive. That is not the purpose of redistricting. Redrawing a map because a certain race of people don't have a voice in their own community is not the purpose of redistricting.
12/16/2021 9:32:05	December 16, 2021	6	Rebecca Shook	85281		I'm writing to request that you use LD 12.0.1 as your legislative maps starting point. This map is more population balanced and compact and maintains city boundaries and communities specifically better than other maps, particularly the East Valley. As a long-time resident of Tempe, this is important to me. This is important to me Thank you for your consideration."

 Public Meeting Comments 12.16.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:35:47	December 16, 2021	LD redistricting in Southern Arizona	Linda Horowitz	85750	self	On behalf of my friends who are Independents, I would urge you to consider the importance of having competitive boundaries in your selection for the LD district lines in Southern Arizona. The reason why people choose to be an Independent is that they do not trust either party and want the opportunity to choose at the time of the election. You are taking away that choice and they will remember that on Election Day. One third of voters in Arizona are Independents. Please consider making district lines that are more competitive. Give people a choice.
12/16/2021 9:38:50	December 16, 2021	Support the versions developed based on direction from Commissioners Lerner and Vice-Chair Watchman: CD Plan 9.1.1 and LD Plan 12.0.1	Theodora Schiro	85137	self	<p>The assumption of Arizona citizens is that the IRC will develop fair and competitive maps for our state. It appears that the current maps are in fact skewed and do not follow the simple guidelines that are intended to frame the work of the IRC. Everybody is watching you. Please show the country that you will in fact follow the constitutional criteria as you are expected to do.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Comply with the US Constitution and the US Voting Rights Act! 2. Focus on equal population in Congressional Districts. Not vaguely, but realistically! 3. Focus on geographically compact contiguous districts, geographic features, and respect communities of interest. Don't make stuff up! 4. Create fair and competitive districts that we can all be proud of! We want to show the nation how it should be done correctly. We do not want fingers pointed at us saying look at how the IRC gerrymandered the state of Arizona!
12/16/2021 9:40:23	December 16, 2021	discussion of maps	Renee Kirkpatrick	85704	myself and the Arizona community	<p>Good morning: As a native Tucsonan, I am concerned with the current discussion of redistricting maps. Based on the United States Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act it is imperative The Independent Commission adopt a map representing ALL Arizonans reflecting compact, contiguous & competitive requirements. Please adopt the LD17 9.0 map which best represents our community.</p> <p>Arizonans are counting on you</p>
12/16/2021 9:41:06	December 16, 2021	assessment of map submissions by putatively partisan sources	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	It has been interesting to hear objections to suggestions being put forward by certain groups, on the basis of those groups being too partisan. In particular, I am speaking about the characterization of the Latino Coalition as an explicitly partisan group that is more or less "identical with the Democratic Party." This is not at all a fair or relevant statement for you to use in decision-making. First, there are plenty of data to show that Hispanics (Latinos) are not at all uniform or monolithic in their party affiliations, at either the state or the national level. So the statement is counter-factual. Second, my observations of the district boundaries and the associated public comments contributed by the Coalition suggest that there were specific community of interest and VRA (ability to elect candidates of choice) arguments put forward that were far more nuanced than simply party affiliation. Finally, from the very beginning you all (especially Chair Neuberger) stated that you were going to consider and analyze specific features of maps, and select any useful or beneficial ideas, regardless of the source or author. Please stick to that very principled approach!
12/16/2021 9:42:17	December 16, 2021	6	William Schiffer	85044	Self	None
12/16/2021 9:47:39	December 16, 2021	REDISTRICTING	Alastair Stone	85623	Resident of Oracle, AZ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) V12.1 does not meet a compact and continuous requirement. b) The Map 12.1 represents gerrymandering, which the commission should be preventing.
12/16/2021 9:48:53	December 16, 2021	Redistricting	Tristan Davis	85225	Chandler	As a community - those of us in Chandler truly prefer the 12.0.1 map as it uses the boundaries for the City of Chandler for the north and east. This map also ensures candidates can better focus on the needs of 1 city (Chandler) as opposed to 2 (Chandler and Gilbert). Please approve this map.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 9:52:41	December 16, 2021	Support LD12.01.1	Sarah Fanning	85248	NA	I support map LD12.01.1. I live in Chandler and like that downtown Chandler and south Chandler have not been separated. It also includes almost all of CUSD. The two cities are different, and I like that Chandler and Gilbert have separate LDs. Finally I like that it is as competitive as the current LD17. That's what democracy looks like!
12/16/2021 9:54:48	December 16, 2021	CD mapping	Vickey Finger	86004	myself	I strongly support CD plan 9.1.1 developed by Commissioner Lerner and Vice-Chair Watchman. These maps more closely take into consideration the points from the Navajo Nation and Latino Coalition. These are two communities considered by the Voters Rights Act and two communities important to our state. We cannot ignore their needs to have fair representation.
12/16/2021 9:55:22	December 16, 2021	Chair's Opening Statement	Robert Maier	85750	Myself	In regard to Commissioner Neuberg's opening statement, if there exists a "community of interest" defined by a distrust of Tucson in unincorporated Pima County, there must also exist a parallel "community of interest" defined by trust and cooperation with Tucson. My experience is that the latter views are more effective in developing regional solutions. I do think it is a well intentioned mistake to consider "communities of interest" so broadly, as if it were a Facebook group.
12/16/2021 10:13:14	December 16, 2021	Legislative Map 17	James Bradford	85623	Myself	I am concerned about the most recent changes to district 17. The changes planned do not meet the compact and continuous requirement. It stretches from SaddleBrooke to Vail, crosses geographic boundaries to include two mountain ranges. As a result, it does not meet the communities of interest requirement. There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks or recreation in common. The planned changes also impart a decided advantage to the Republican party in violation of the standards established.
12/16/2021 10:18:13	December 16, 2021	Support for 12.0.1	Patricia Maybee	85044		I live in Ahwatukee and support 12.0.1 as it keeps communities of interest together. We need to remain a cohesive district to represent our constituents concerns.
12/16/2021 10:19:11	December 16, 2021	linda.guarino@gmail.com	Linda Guarino	86004	Myself	Please consider these maps, which are competitive and respect communities of interest as defined by law.
12/16/2021 10:19:45	December 16, 2021	I live in Ahwatukee and support map 12.0.1	Michael	85048	self	I live in Ahwatukee and support map 12.0.1
12/16/2021 10:23:13	December 16, 2021	Final redistricting maps	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	I would like to ask why the IRC is now putting Wickenburg in LD30 and CD9 when quite a number of us have testified that Wickenburg belongs in LD5 and CD2 which is in Yavapai County? Wickenburg has nothing in common with La Paz and Mohave counties and we certainly don't have anything in common with places like Lake Havasu, Kingman, Salome, Aguila, etc. We have more in common with places like Congress and other areas of Yavapai County. Why doesn't the commission consider Wickenburg an area of interest and listen to what we're telling you where we need to be? You're making the same mistakes with this redistricting process that you did 10 years ago and that split up Wickenburg into 2 different districts. Wickenburg needs to stay together but not in LD30 and CD9. LD5 and CD2 works the best for our town and our community. Heck, even your LD28 map worked better for us than the current 12.1.1 map you have put us on now.
12/16/2021 10:26:53	December 16, 2021	LD7 draft map	Jerry Hubbard	85933-0405	myself	To the members of the IRC: Thank you for listening to the input from citizens of rural eastern Arizona. I support the latest proposed draft map, version 12.1.1 for LD7 combining the rural areas and small towns of the White Mountains. Jerry Hubbard

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 10:28:17	December 16, 2021	Reaction to public commentss	Lynne Hudson	85704	self	Chairperson Neuberger: When invoking "significant detriment," when favoring COIs over competitiveness in any specific decision, it would help if you explain the detriment you see.
12/16/2021 10:29:46	December 16, 2021	LD mapping	Vickey Finger	86004	Myself	<p>I strongly support the map 12.0.1 submitted by Commissioner Lerner and Vice-Chair Watchman. I live in Flagstaff and believe this map puts the Flagstaff, Sedona and Camp Verde in the same LD. You have heard many comments from people who live in these areas that they are a well connected community of interest not just by their highways but by their economies, healthcare, education, water needs, tourism coordination, and sharing of workers. As Plnney Sheoran, incoming president of the League of Women Voters has said, these are the kinds of things that make a community of interest for redistricting considerations because they are the places where are legislature has significant effect. It has little effect on where you choose to hike or shop or pay your taxes.</p> <p>One of the criteria suggested for dividing these three communities is the young median age of Flagstaff. This has not been consistently used as a criteria for other districts and it makes little sense for this area. The young and old here have needs and problems that are very consistent in terms of our economy. The three communities often share workers and services with each other. We are all very concerned about the environment because taking care of it is what makes our communities attractive and livable. It is part of why we all live here, and provides jobs and tourism dollars. We all need healthcare and Flagstaff serves as the hub. We all drive the same highways. Our communities are inextricably linked because of the geography we live in.</p> <p>Please use map 12.0.1 for determining LD 7. Thank you</p>
12/16/2021 10:42:33	December 16, 2021	CD2	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	Chairwoman Neuberger - If you keep Yavapai County whole in CD2, Paul Gosar will be the congressman for over a dozen Tribal Nations. In the Draft Map, Prescott is the power center for CD2. I know you contributed to Mr. Gosar's campaigns in the past. Feel free to contribute to his campaign again, but please do not vote on a map that will empower him or any other like-minded racist to "represent" the interests of Native Americans. Prescott wins either way – they will be well-represented whether Yavapai County is with the eastern side of the state or with Mohave County. You do not dilute the votes of Yavapai County by putting them in a district with Mohave. You do dilute the votes of most of our Native Americans by putting them in a district with Prescott.
12/16/2021 10:58:32	December 16, 2021	Map 12.0.1	Salli Nelson	85284		I have lived in Arizona for more than 26 years and in Tampa for the last 5. I support map 12. 0. 1 because it respects school district boundaries and communities of interest better than the alternative. Thank you for respecting all who live here by ensuring fair and competitive districts in this redistricting process

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 11:10:01	December 16, 2021	Maps	Marilyn Weissman	86001		<p>http://www.redrocknews.com/2021/12/12/yavapai-college-board-member-kuknyo-fails-to-grasp-taxes-are-publics-money/</p> <p>Prescott politicians and their Republican supporters insist that the Verde Valley's interests lie with Yavapai County and the county should be kept whole as a legislative district. They act as if the geographic boundary of Mingus Mountain is irrelevant and age should be a factor in determining district boundaries. They do this to keep Flagstaff away from its community of interest with the Verde Valley while creating two non competitive districts 6 and 7.</p> <p>This editorial in the red rock News from Sedona makes it clear that at least one of Yavapai County's institutions, the Prescott dominated Yavapai Community College Board has no interest in spreading the tax dollars they collect equally around the county. They expect students in the Verde Valley to drive 90 minutes to take classes in Prescott. So Prescott folks love the Verde Valley? Not so much.</p>
12/16/2021 11:11:33	December 16, 2021	Whole agenda	Suzanne Baird	85050	Myself	With Arizona's voter split at about 1/3 Republican, 1/3 Democratic, 1/3 Independent, it's imperative that the new district maps have as many competitive districts as possible.
12/16/2021 11:17:28	December 16, 2021	VI Draft Map Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	<p>Map 12.0.1 has a eastern boundary of 59th Avenue/202 that has different communities of interest from Buckeye.</p> <p>The Buckeye City Council prefers a eastern boundary that does not extend beyond Dysart Road to maintain a consistent community of interest among those cities that are included.</p>
12/16/2021 11:20:52	December 16, 2021	Concern regarding redistricting of LD17	Dale Farland	85623	LD17	I am distressed that LD 17 is so blatantly being redrawn to favor the Republicans. The division between Democrats and Republicans should NOT EXCEED 3-4 percentage points. HOWEVER, this district is at 8.9%! How is that fair representation? It eliminates any fairness in any election. It certainly does not meet the compact and continuous requirement. It stretches from SaddleBrooke to Vail. It includes two mountain ranges. REALLY? Where are the requirements to meet communities of interest? There are no shared school districts, parks & recreations or water resources in common. All it does is SHOW OUTRAGEOUS GERRYMANDERING BY REPUBLICANS! This not democratic and is a sham to our liberties.
12/16/2021 11:22:34	December 16, 2021	Support LD 12.0.1	Alison Jordan	85233	Myself	<p>I SUPPORT draft map LD 12.0.1.</p> <p>I have lived in Gilbert since 2005 and Mesa for the decade before that. I follow state and local politics closely. Chandler and Gilbert are separate Communities of Interest. Gilbert should be put in LD14 and Chandler should be put in LD13. They should be kept with their respective school districts. Please do not hack our communities into pieces.</p> <p>LD 12.0.1 is the best of the remaining map options.</p>
12/16/2021 11:22:48	December 16, 2021	Redistricting and Draft Map 12.0.1	Tamara Miller	85284	City of Tempe-My Family's Interests	I have resided in Tempe, AZ for 30+ years. Currently I reside in the southern part of Tempe on the border of Chandler. I am a parent, and a retired public school teacher. I care about issues pertaining to residents' welfare and especially school-age children. I support Draft Map 12.0.1 especially its shape for LD12 because it does a better job at keeping Communities with Like-Interests, especially cities and school districts, together, more-so than the other map version.
12/16/2021 11:22:55	December 16, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	<p>Re: Map 12.1.1</p> <p>Please consider moving the northern boundary of District 25 in Map 12.1.1 to the Patton Road alignment to keep all of Buckeye together. Currently the map does not include Festival which includes one fifth of Buckeye.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 11:25:09	December 16, 2021	Draft map 12.0.1	Kathy Wagner	85248	Resident of Sun Lakes	I support draft map 12.0.1 as it is more competitive than draft map 10.0. Draft map 12.0.1 is more inline with Chandler School District boundaries which is a community of interest.
12/16/2021 11:30:18	December 16, 2021	LD 17 gerrymandering	John Farland	85623	LD17	I am a former university professor and expected my students to present fair and honest work. The blatant gerrymandering of LD17 is a disgrace to the IRC committee. All it shows is that the Republicans are truly in control of this redistricting. How can any of you in a clear heart expect anyone to think that having a district going from SaddleBrooke to Vail and having such a large variance of 8.9% points with the advantage of Republicans over Democrats as meeting the standard of being equitable and fair? This is such a slap in the face to everyone who thinks this IRC committee was acting in good faith and following the standards set forth to only be 3-4% difference and meet the requirements of being compact and continuous. I am so disappointed in the actions of this committee.
12/16/2021 11:30:30	December 16, 2021	VI	Cathy Lee	85209	Self	Thank you for all your hard work. I am listening to today's meeting and a suggestion was made for D4 as to whether or not to include all of Mesa or put part of it with QC & STV. It would be great if all of Mesa was included together & not split for East Mesa to be included with Queen Creek & SanTan Valley as we have nothing in common with those areas. If you put East & South Mesa with QC & STV you are splitting up communities of interest. East Mesa shares parks, recreation, theater, restaurants, churches, etc with each other and not with Queen Creek & SanTan Valley.
12/16/2021 11:33:12	December 16, 2021	VI	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	Please can the Commissioners refer to the hundreds and hundreds of comments online that request that LD13 and LD14 for Chandler and Gilbert use the city boundaries. Please do not leave LD13 "square". There are so many comments online supporting the shape of LD13 on map 12.0.1. Please do not cut right through the north of Chandler, that needs to remain with the rest of Chandler. Please do not divide Chandler into 3 different districts as the square shaped LD13 proposal does. You are cutting right through Chandler's Communities of Interest.
12/16/2021 11:33:53	December 16, 2021	VI	Sara Nichols	85283	Myself and my city	I live in Tempe with my family and have been here since 2006, I SUPPORT draft map 12.0.1.
12/16/2021 11:36:31	December 16, 2021	Support map 12.0.1	Krista McKinney	85249	Self	I support the new LD13 draft map 12.0.1. Keeping Chandler in one legislative district keeps an important constituency together. Keeping Chandler unified school district in one legislative district is also important. This is much better than the square LD created on other maps with a hodgepodge of cities and towns and districts.
12/16/2021 11:40:22	December 16, 2021	"Philosophical Differences" on Competitiveness	Ann Heitland	86004	self	<p>The Arizona Supreme Court has settled the law on what the 6th Constitutional Criteria when it rejected the 2000 Commission's contention that "competitiveness is less mandatory than the other goals, can be ignored, or should be relegated to a secondary role." There can be no "genuine philosophical difference" about what the law is.</p> <p>The Commission must establish a reasonable basis FOR EACH DISTRICT to be uncompetitive because making it competitive would cause a substantial detriment other goals. Making up unreal communities of interest or approving uncompact districts will not suffice.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 11:42:43	December 16, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	Chair Neuberg speaking about COIs, is saying that the Constitution says that the criterion of COIs is the most critical. There is nothing there that establishes the primacy of this criterion. It speaks to all six, and courts have supported that view. It does make sense to limit choices for greater competitiveness when those choices conflict with other criteria, but those conflicts must be carefully described. COI is particularly fungible; clearly the different commissioners have different claims of where the COIs are. But the people who came to the public hearings, while certainly not being unanimous on this, predominantly had a contrary view to what the chair is expressing as her view of community of interest. Without a crisp definition of that, overruling concerns of competitiveness seems hard to justify. Once again, COIs are not only a fuzzy concept, they are absolutely not considered primary in the Arizona Constitution.
12/16/2021 11:44:39	December 16, 2021	Distress ove LD17 district	Linda Sentivanac	85623	SaddleBrooke Ranch LD17	I have lived in AZ my entire life and recently moved to SaddleBrooke Ranch. I am so disappointed in the actions taken by the IRC committee regarding LD 17. The members are supposed to be fair minded and try to create districts which do not exceed 3-4% points in favor of one political party over another. Well, LD17 violates that standard of being fair and equitable. At 8.9% in favor of Republicans, you have demonstrated that being fair minded is not what is wanted. The gerrymandering in favor of Republicans is simply showing that the members of the IRC (who are Republican) are railroading this redistricting through so that their candidates can win. How is this fair? Can the Republicans with a straight face and intelligence explain how this district meets the standard of being Compact and Contiguous? Can they explain how going from SaddleBrooke Ranch to Vail meets the requirement of having communities of interest? There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks and recreation in common. All this gerrymandering does is permit the Republicans to exceed the percentage points of fairness for both political parties. This is disgrace to the IRC Committee and I hope you change these boundaries to be equitable to all!
12/16/2021 11:55:59	December 16, 2021	LD 6 and LD7	Ann Heitland	86004	self and Flagstaff	The Mayor and Council of Flagstaff has submitted two letters to you saying keep us together. The unanimous testimony was to keep Flagstaff together.
12/16/2021 11:59:05	December 16, 2021	Splitting Flagstaff	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Do not split Flagstaff and certainly do not put the portion represented by a Native American Supervisor into LD7 while leaving other parts in LD6. It all belongs in D7.
12/16/2021 12:00:08	December 16, 2021	Agenda Item VI	Norma Langer	85248	LD17	I support draft map 12.0.1 especially its shape for LD13. It keeps LD13 as competitive as it currently is.
12/16/2021 12:02:07	December 16, 2021	Running the meeting	Ann Heitland	86004	self and all women	Please stop York and Mehl from interrupting and talking over Lerner
12/16/2021 12:07:22	December 16, 2021	LD17 redistricting	Jody Haagenson	85623	SaddleBrooke Ranch LD17	It is with a heavy heart that I write this comment. I am so disappointed in the IRC Committee. You are supposed to create districts that are fair and equitable for both parties. How could you let the Republicans gerrymander LD 17 such that it violates the very standards you are suppose to uphold? You have permitted them to create a district that is almost 9% points in favor of Republicans instead of the requirement of not exceeding 3-4% points. Where is the decency, professionalism and integrity of the IRC Committee? I am so outraged by these actions. Where are the requirements to be compact and contiguous when LD17 travels from SaddleBrooke Ranch to Vail and crosses TWO MOUNTAIN RANGES. I realize that there are mountain ranges in southern AZ; however, this blatant gerrymandering in order that more Republicans than Democrats being in the district is disgraceful. It is an affront to democracy! This district is supposed to be fair and equitable to both parties. It is supposed NOT TO DIVIDE between school districts and other communities of interest. Please make changes so it is fair to everyone!!!

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 12:22:26	December 16, 2021	Changes to Legislative Map 17	Randy Gelb	85623		<p>The plan does not meet the compact and continuous requirement. It stretches from SaddleBrooke to Vail, crosses geographic boundaries to include two mountain ranges.</p> <p>It does not meet the communities of interest requirement. There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks or recreation in common.</p> <p>It does not meet the competitive requirement. With Arizona voters equally divided among Republicans, Democrats and Independents the deviation should not exceed 3 to 4 points, This dissect is at 8.9%. This map gives a big advantage for Republicans virtually eliminating any chance for others from holding office.</p> <p>Map 12.1 represents the kind of blatant gerrymandering the commission was created to prevent.</p>
12/16/2021 12:27:01	December 16, 2021	Debate on Map 12.0.1 as a starting point	Robert Maier	85750	Myself.	<p>Commissioner Neuberg believes that unincorporated communities in Pima County need a greater voice. In fact, Pima County Commissioners govern in our interest and do a decent job of balancing urban and rural infrastructure needs. The complex issue of water rates is best negotiated between Pima County and Tucson because it is fundamentally a revenue-sharing issue between the two units of government. The last thing I want is the State Legislature taking sides in such matters.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.16.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 12:28:47	December 16, 2021	12.1 Final Draft Map	Angela Willeford	85215	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	<p>Now that the Commission has approved draft LD map 12.1.1 as a new starting point for consideration the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community would like the Commission to consider the two options that are consistent with its principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Following the draft maps that were published prior to Thanksgiving, the Community submitted recommendations that included TWO primary principles•ONE, to include the Saddleback Mountain area that is within the community boundary, into the legislative district. This is located along the northern edge of the Community. It is an important geographic feature within the Community that has NO population.•AS SUCH WE BELIEVE THIS IS A RELATIVELY EASY MAPPING CHANGE THAT COULD BE MADE.•SECOND, we provided a recommendation that would bring a number of MESA area schools into the Legislative District where many of Salt River students attend.•Now that the Commission is discussing map version 12.1.1, unfortunately the draft LD8 map DID NOT INCLUDE either of the recommendations.•AS SUCH, the SRPMIC would like the commission to consider TWO OPTIONS.•Option A <p>Include the Saddleback Mountain Area of the Community along with the SRPMIC into draft legislative district #9.</p> <p>a. We believe this action would keep LD9 within the necessary population tolerances.</p> <p>b. Another added benefit would be an increase in the number of Native Americans in the district.</p> <p>c. THIS proposal would achieve the two priorities of the Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Option B, A SECOND OPTION would be to: <p>Amend the draft LD 8 map to ADD the parts of mesa that we previously recommended. Second, add back the Saddleback Mountain area. AND, third, eliminate parts of Scottsdale and Phoenix that were added into LD 8, from your previous draft map.</p> <p>a. We believe this recommendation would also keep LD8 within the necessary population targets.</p> <p>b. It would also be consistent with the previous maps the Commission has constructed for LD8 that include areas of Scottsdale, along the SRPMIC border, and Tempe.</p> <p>c. THIS proposal would achieve the two priorities of the Community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Importantly, through this whole process our Community has wanted to offer constructive ideas for your consideration, THAT WE BELIEVE, that are mutually beneficial. <p>We are happy to discuss this in further depth at any time.</p>
12/16/2021 12:35:44	December 16, 2021	Racially Polarized Voting Report	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	<p>Doug Johnson presented the Racially Polarized Voting Analysis Report on the draft maps at the November 30th meeting. He said it would be publicly posted that day. I can not find it on your website. Please let the public know where they can find it. Thank you.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 12:37:46	December 16, 2021	LD6	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	Was polarized voting analysis provided for LD6? The Native American VRA district should be drawn so that Native Americans have to opportunity to elect candidates of their choice. It is a violation of the Voting Rights Act not to do so.
12/16/2021 12:41:03	December 16, 2021	VI.Draft Map decision discussion	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Since, as the chair has stated, Communities of Interest is the primary organizing criteria for determining district boundaries, then can each of the commissioners provide a justification of their boundary choices by telling us which Communities of Interest were important in their decision, what it was about those particular Communities of Interest that was compelling, and why other Communities of Interest fell short of warranting their consideration?</p> <p>Also, please explain why respecting those particular Communities of Interest was more important than the damage done to democracy in those districts if the level of competitiveness was denigrated - or in some cases effectively eliminated - for all the people who live there.</p> <p>It seems you owe the public at least that much insight into your thinking.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
12/16/2021 12:53:19	December 16, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	<p>In the discussion of preserving communities of interest in the area of Sedona, the Verde Valley, and Flagstaff, the issue of age was brought up. Commissioner Lerner's point about the more elderly people being quite interested in towns with good health support, that is an important reason why it is not necessarily in the best interest of areas with a high median age being grouped separately from areas with a lower median age. Speaking personally, I also prefer to be around younger people, and the sharing of ideas between people of different ages (and having legislators representing both) provides the best balance - as a former professor, I definitely benefit from being around students.</p> <p>But additionally, looking only at Sedona and Flagstaff provides a broader extreme in ages than looking at the range of ages throughout that region. For instance, the median age in Camp Verde is 41; in Cottonwood, it's 46. So I don't think that drawing district lines by median age, if done consistently, would end up making much sense. Please consider the actual data rather than oversimplifications provided by the extreme cases. Thank you.</p>
12/16/2021 13:17:42	December 16, 2021	District 2 shall NOT go south! NO! Lerner is wrong.	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	Do not move District 2 south. NO. NO. NO. Leave it be. Map 12.1.1 is good. District 2 shall not include blue precincts. Do not add black canyon to Trump precincts or districts.
12/16/2021 13:25:12	December 16, 2021	Support draft map 12.0.1	Nicolas Garcia	85249	Self	As a resident of Chandler I do support the boundaries of LD13 laid out in draft map 12.0.1, this map does not separate north chandler from the rest of the city and keeps the east valley competitive. This map also distinguishes LD13 and LD14 as representing Chandler and Gilbert keeping both cities separate in representation. LD 13 also follows more closely the boundaries for Chandler Unified School District. Please support draft map 12.0.1

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 13:28:41	December 16, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	Re: Map 12.1.1 - Currently District 28 has 287,031 people in it. If you remove the community of Sun City Festival from District 28 and place it in District 25 that balances the population in District 28 and gives consideration for, "Incorporation of visible geographic features, including city boundaries" in District 25.
12/16/2021 13:29:32	December 16, 2021	Redistricting Prefer Map 12.0.1	Perry Miller	85284	City of Tempe Resident	I have lived in Tempe for 30+ years. It is where I live, work, play and engage in local causes and business. I hope that the redistricting committee leans toward draft map 12.0.1, especially since it is a better fit that represents the shared needs of the encompassed school district and the residents living in the city of Tempe.
12/16/2021 13:33:35	December 16, 2021	LD Redistricting	Lee Beaudette	85028		Please adopt LD Final Draft Version 12.1.1 Thank You
12/16/2021 13:42:23	December 16, 2021	12.1.1 maps	Lisa Green	85929		I support the 12.1.1 proposed maps. Flagstaff and the Reservations are a community of interest. Please leave Show Low and the surrounding areas in the proposed LD7. Please give the Native Americans their own district in LD6 along with Flagstaff.
12/16/2021 14:11:39	December 16, 2021	V12.1	Michael Meehan	85623	Myself	1.The plan does not meet the compact and continuous requirement. 2.It does not meet the communities of interest requirement. There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks or recreation in common. Moreover, 3.It does not meet the competitive requirement.
12/16/2021 14:17:00	December 16, 2021	Maps	Patricia Wiedhopf	85715	myself	My name is Patricia Wiedhopf. I have lived in Tucson for 57 years. I have lived in northeast Tucson for the past 41 years where I shop, dine, bank, and use public library and Regional Park in my extended neighborhood. I support the LD Draft Map 9.0 proposed by Democratic Commissioner Lerner creates a much more compact, contiguous and competitive District 17. District 17 in the Adopted Draft Legislative Map is concerning. Its design disregards some of the goals of redistricting set out in the Arizona Constitution, and instead serves the goal of creating a safe Republican district in a predominantly Democratic county. That goal is not in our Arizona Constitution.
12/16/2021 14:18:36	December 16, 2021	Maps	Patricia Wiedhopf	85715	myself	My name is Patricia Wiedhopf. I have lived in Tucson for 57 years. I have lived in northeast Tucson for the past 41 years where I shop, dine, bank, and use public library and Regional Park in my extended neighborhood. I support CD0072. I am not connected with Casa Grande and people from this area rarely interact with the City of Tucson, and in fact share more in common with areas in southern Phoenix and rural, more northern areas like Verde Valley. Instead, I would enjoin you to keep Davis Monthan Air Force Base and Ft. Huachuca within this CD0072.
12/16/2021 14:19:21	December 16, 2021	VI	Cathy Lee	85209	Self	Please consider extending the southern boundary of LD10 to at least Guadalupe. I would prefer it be extended to include the rest of Mesa but I'm not sure about the population balance. Cutting it off at Baseline breaks up our COI's as most of us are connected to those communities for shopping, medical, arts, theater, etc. Putting us with Queen Creek & STV is not keeping us whole. In the 16 years I've lived here I probably have travelled into those communities approx. 5 times.
12/16/2021 14:31:51	December 16, 2021	VI	Cathy Lee	85209	self	There seems to be no sound when you returned from the break
12/16/2021 14:56:39	December 16, 2021	Flagstaff	Karyn Riedell	86001	Myself	Flagstaff should not be divided in two. If Flagstaff as a whole is not a community of interest, I don't know what is. You have stated that Flagstaff should not be with Sedona and the Verde Valley because of the lower age here. But now you want to divide Flagstaff? In addition, dividing at the train tracks is entirely arbitrary. It makes no sense.



Public Meeting Comments 12.16.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 15:25:00	December 16, 2021	VI	Rob Sweeney	86324	Town of Clarkdale	<p>TOWN OF CLARKDALE'S STATEMENT REGARDING THE INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSIONS APPROVED DRAFT MAPS November 9, 2021</p> <p>Legislative Map: The Town of Clarkdale Common Council reaffirms its previous statement to the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) to have the Verde Valley, including the city of Sedona, remain whole as a "Community of Interest" and that it desires a competitive district. The IRC's approved draft legislative map places the Town of Clarkdale in Legislative District 5, which does not include all locations identified in the Town's "Community of Interest" statement. Adding the Coconino County section of the city of Sedona to the approved draft Legislative District 5 would meet the Town's "Community of Interest" goal. The approved draft Legislative District 5 does not meet the Town's goal of competitiveness. The Community Draft map LDF050 is an example of what meets both of the Town's goals.</p> <p>Congressional Map: The Town of Clarkdale Common Council supports the Independent Redistricting Commission's (IRC) approved draft congressional map. Placing the Town of Clarkdale in Congressional District 2 meets the Town's "Community of Interest" statement by keeping the Verde Valley, including the city of Sedona, whole as well as ensuring a competitive district. The Town thanks the IRC for addressing the Town's goals.</p>
12/16/2021 16:10:42	December 16, 2021	Flagstaff	Karyn Riedell	86001	Myself	<p>Chairwoman Neuberg argued that New River and Anthem should not be divided because the two communities go back and forth all the time. Shouldn't this same argument also apply to Flagstaff? Why would you divide Flagstaff by the train track? Dividing into south of the track and north of the track makes no sense. We in Flagstaff cross that train track ALL the time!</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 16:33:58	December 16, 2021	4	Jennifer Mindock	85364	myself	<p>Introduction: I hear repeated references by commissioners to the values of "community of interest" over "competition"; as if the former justification is somehow more logical and 'official' than the latter; it is not. The Constitution lists goals 2-5 five as equally weighted values for redistricting (Legally, Goal One evidently does takes priority over the others). It is boring and offensive to hear commissioners repeatedly express their personal preference under the guise that it is the 'mandate' of the Constitution. I ask that the commissioners read the following discussion on basketball and then answer two questions in order to help them understand my perspective on these two very important values. Hopefully they can be more careful with respect to how they refer to them to avoid any misrepresentation of their own opinion for constitutionally set priorities.</p> <p>Basketball: The game of basketball began with a PE professor and a peach basket one hundred thirty years ago. Today it is played across the globe: professionally, at all school levels and in all communities. It makes a healthy contribution to our economy, and contributes positively to the entertainment, fashion, marketing, law, and spirit of our communities, and is enjoyed across all socio-economic lines. Basketball is a powerful binding force for our state and communities and was even used as an ice-breaker for the first few sessions of Arizona's IRC meetings.</p> <p>Questions: 1)Consider: If the first people that drew up the rules for the game of basketball made rule number one be that the final score had to be known before the game started, would basketball be what it is today? 2)Consider: With respect to communities of interest: Are there any that do not shop from the same box stores as all the others; do not dine at the same fast-food restaurants, do not have access to watch cable and the same TV shows; do not see the same movies, don't want the best education possible for their children; don't want decent paying jobs; don't want good roads, don't want clean air and water, don't want good health care; and don't want a bigger part of the state's groundwater and a larger share of the Colorado?</p> <p>Case made: Both of these issues are equally relevant. It is important not to arbitrarily simplify the of complexity of the balancing act the commissioners have by discounting one of the priorities. The very presence of our independent commission is evidence of the many similar values shared by the people of our state; the IRC was formed because thousands of citizens of all political persuasions were alike in wanting to have a healthy, competitive electoral process. It is not enough that we were a model for our nation for the last decade; we must continue to improve in order to grow and thrive going forward. Arizona's elections need to be competitive.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.16.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/16/2021 16:37:49	December 16, 2021	Leave the boundary between CD4 and CD5 at Elliot Road.	Alison Jordan	85233	Myself	Please leave the boundary between CD4 and CD5 at Elliot Road. I have lived in this corridor for nearly 2 decades. We work, shop, attend church, etc. north of Elliot Road. It is the dividing line between Old Town Gilbert and south Gilbert. Dividing at Guadalupe leaves a one mile strip of orphaned north Gilbert. It makes no sense for community cohesion.