

 Public Meeting Comments 12.17.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 10:11:39	December 17, 2021	Mapping	Virginia Dotson	85902	Self	Dear Commissioners, It is the nature of human society that young people coexist with older ones. I think your concern about combining Flagstaff with Sedona and the Verde Valley is misplaced. Communities of Interest go far beyond narrow age-related issues to include those that affect everyone in the community and can be solved by legislative or congressional actions--health care, water protection, internet access and education opportunities. In any case, age-matching is not included as one of the redistricting criteria in the Arizona constitution. Attempting to give weight to age criteria will needlessly complicate your task. So I ask you to listen to all the people--60% of the in-person speakers!--who urged you to recognize the united community of interest among Flagstaff, Sedona and the Verde Valley. Thank you.
12/17/2021 10:14:01	December 17, 2021	Constitutional Criteria	Ann Heitland	86004	self	This Commission exists because voters wanted "fair and competitive maps" and amended the Constitution to accomplish that goal. A 17-3 legislative map, in favor of Republicans, is not a map that reflects Arizona in 2021 and is not a "fair" map.
12/17/2021 10:27:24	December 17, 2021	Commissioner Lerner is not abiding by the US Constitution. Please Approve Map 13.0, reject map 13.1	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	Commissioner Lerner is going outside the bounds of the US Constitution. Competitiveness shall not be a priority. You cannot and should not prioritize a district map on the basis of it being competitive. She continues to push unconstitutional actions in the Commission. Please proceed with Map 13.0, decline 13.1
12/17/2021 10:32:24	December 17, 2021	Latino Coalition does not run our State.	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	RESPECTFULLY, I am a Black man. I do not believe that Latinos or African American interests should be considered over drawing maps for the rest of the population. Competitiveness is not a higher priority than all other requirements and should not be considered above all other requirements. Approve 13.0.
12/17/2021 10:38:54	December 17, 2021	DO NOT add Any more Blue precincts to District 2	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	District 2 is in Trump districts. Do not add Blue Biden districts to take the district away from the citizens. Give the democrats their district 1 but do not move district 2 south. If you move district 2 it should go west.
12/17/2021 10:47:44	December 17, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	Map 13.1 fits the priorities established by the City of Buckeye City Council. 1) Including Festival in District 25 is appropriate under the incorporation of visible geographic features, including city boundaries; and 2) An eastern boundary of Dysart Road for District 23 keeps Buckeye with other cities that have similar communities of interest.



Public Meeting
Comments 12.17.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 10:58:16	December 17, 2021	Arizona Constitutional Requirements	David Higuera	85701	Future generations, who depend on a functioning Legislature and Congress	<p>Dear Commissioners, Thank you, first of all, for the immense amount of energy and time you've devoted to this process. Thank you as well to the mapping consultants who have done the hard work of putting your ideas on paper and showing the public the data in real time.</p> <p>Listening to yesterday's and today's meetings, I fear you are missing the forest for the trees. You can still course correct.</p> <p>All this talk of "Communities of Interest" -- a poorly defined term in the law -- has obscured the "very reason" the voters of Arizona passed Prop 106 in 2000 by an overwhelming margin to create the IRC in the first place -- competitiveness. To quote from the Official Title of this ballot proposition that amended Arizona's Constitution -- in other words, the exact words most voters read to understand what they were voting on -- "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of Arizona... relating to 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." [emphasis added.]</p> <p>There was no talk of COI in the ballot Title language; it is simply one of the six criteria laid out in the full language of the bill. Competitiveness is also one of those six equally important criteria. And even though it says, "to the extent practicable," Competitiveness is in fact THE REASON 56% of the voters passed Prop 106. It was there right in the Title on their ballot, and in all the messaging to voters about why the IRC was needed. Remember, when this passed, registered Republicans outnumbered Democrats in the state by only 4 percentage points, and yet, there was only ONE legislative district in which the party differential was within 5 points. The voters rejected the whole idea of SAFE districts wherein they didn't have a voice. They wanted -- and we still want and need -- more competitiveness. As the proponents of this proposition stated at the time, "Our voices cannot be heard in a system that distorts our representation."</p> <p>We cannot tackle the big issues we face effectively if our elected representatives have to only appeal to the base of their own party to win election.</p> <p>As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote for the majority in the Supreme Court's upholding of the IRC in 2015 (Republican legislators had sued to try to wrest back control of the lines!), "The people of Arizona turned to the initiative to curb the practice of gerrymandering and, thereby, to ensure that Members of Congress [and the Legislature] would have 'an habitual recollection of their dependence on the people.' (Federalist Paper No. 57, at 350, J. Madison). In so acting, Arizona voters sought to restore 'the core principle of republican government,' namely, 'that the voters should choose their representatives, not the other way around.' (Berman, Managing Gerrymandering, 83 Texas L. Rev. 781 (2005)."</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 11:00:24	December 17, 2021	The purpose of the IRC	David Higuera	85701	myself and all voters who care about functioning government	<p>Dear Commissioners, Thank you, first of all, for the immense amount of energy and time you've devoted to this process.</p> <p>Listening to yesterday's and today's meetings, I fear you are missing the forest for the trees. You can still course correct.</p> <p>All this talk of "Communities of Interest" -- a poorly defined term in the law -- has obscured the *very reason* the voters of Arizona passed Prop 106 in 2000 by an overwhelming margin to create the IRC in the first place -- Competitiveness. To quote from the Official Title of this ballot proposition that amended Arizona's Constitution -- in other words, the exact words most voters read to understand what they were voting on -- "Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of Arizona... relating to 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." [emphasis added.]</p> <p>There was no talk of COI in the ballot Title language; it is simply one of the six criteria laid out in the full language of the bill. Competitiveness is also one of those six equally important criteria. And even though it says, "to the extent practicable," Competitiveness is in fact the REASON 56% of the voters passed Prop 106. It was there right in the Title on their ballot, and in all the messaging to voters about why the IRC was needed. Remember, when this passed, registered Republicans outnumbered Democrats in the state by only 4 percentage points, and yet, there was only ONE legislative district in which the party differential was within 5 points. The voters rejected the whole idea of SAFE districts wherein they didn't have a voice. They wanted -- and we still want and need -- more competitiveness. As the proponents of this proposition stated at the time, "Our voices cannot be heard in a system that distorts our representation."</p> <p>We cannot tackle the big issues we face effectively if our elected representatives have to only appeal to the base of their own party to win election.</p> <p>As Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg wrote for the majority in the Supreme Court's upholding of the IRC in 2015 (Republican legislators had sued to try to wrest back control of the lines!), "The people of Arizona turned to the initiative to curb the practice of gerrymandering and, thereby, to ensure that Members of Congress [and the Legislature] would have 'an habitual recollection of their dependence on the people.' (Federalist Paper No. 57, at 350, J. Madison). In so acting, Arizona voters sought to restore 'the core principle of republican government,' namely, 'that the voters should choose their representatives, not the other way around.' (Berman, Managing Gerrymandering, 83 Texas L. Rev. 781 (2005)."</p> <p>Please do the right thing and weigh competitiveness as the vital criteria it is.</p>
12/17/2021 11:09:45	December 17, 2021	Map 13.1	Ann Heitland	86004	self	<p>25 of the 30 Legislative Districts in 13.1 fail to meet the constitutional mandate for competitiveness according to your own metrics. Lots of work to explain that per AZ S. Ct requirement that you show that each district cannot be competitive without substantial detriment to other goals.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 11:12:21	December 17, 2021	Redistricting	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	Neither your 13.0 or 13.1 work for Wickenburg. Why does the commission continue to put us in LD30 and CD9 when we have nothing in common with those areas that are in La Paz or Mohave Counties? Wickenburg has nothing in common with Lake Havasu, Kingman, Salome, Parker, or any of those other areas you have as a part of LD30 and CD9. Wickenburg needs to be in LD5 and CD2 as we have more in common with the communities like Congress and other areas of Yavapai County. I'm not sure how else I need to say this. Wickenburg should've been an area of interest and our needs should be considered. Why is the IRC continuing to try to work the maps based on someone's skin color or culture? That's not what this process is supposed to be about. The IRC needs to stop catering to what the left wants and start putting together a more fair map. Wickenburg shouldn't be punished because the democrats want districts that heavily favor them. We belong in LD5 and CD2 and that's what many have tried to explain to you, but the commission doesn't seem to think it's important to hear from us apparently. Why is that?
12/17/2021 11:16:51	December 17, 2021	Support of 13.1	Angela Willeford	85215	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community supports version 13.1 and hope the commission does not change the boundaries of LD 8. It includes the two primary principles of the SRPMIC, inclusion of saddleback mtn., and parts of Mesa.
12/17/2021 11:24:09	December 17, 2021	Draft Maps, Communities of Interest, Latino communities	David Higuera	85701	Latinos	<p>I keep hearing Commissioner Mehl use the term, "the needs of the Latino Coalition," to justify his desire to pack Latinos into fewer and more Democratically-heavy districts -- for the purpose of creating a majority of safer Republican districts, fewer competitive districts, and an overall map in which Democrats cannot conceivably win a majority in the state Legislature.</p> <p>This flies in the face of both the voters' intent in creative the IRC and taking the map-drawing power out of the hands of the Republican-controlled Legislature (has been Republican-controlled for more than four decades, with the Majority in past two decades effectively shutting the minority out of all meaningful legislative debate), and also, makes a mockery of both the letter and the spirit of the Voting Rights Act.</p> <p>What Latino communities are truly asking for is representation. What the VRA demands is that their voices not be silenced.</p> <p>As I stated when I spoke to the Commission months ago from the Tucson Convention Center satellite site -- I was the last speaker of the night -- you cannot allow yourselves to "ghetto-ize" the Latino community by packing us into fewer and more overwhelmingly Democratic districts. Doing so ensures that our diverse needs and voices will NOT be heard by any other legislators outside of those few packed districts. And furthermore, no other incumbents or candidates for office will ever need to seriously listen to our Latino communities and understand our needs -- we won't be in their districts!</p> <p>Latinos are the fastest growing "minority" in Arizona, and in fact, already represent a majority of children in Pima County, if not the state. We are a "Community of Interest," and our interest is that you don't silence us by drawing lines that mean the majority of the Legislature will never have to seriously listen to us. We've had enough of that!</p>
12/17/2021 11:30:07	December 17, 2021	LD 17, version 12.1	Tim Gallagher	85623	myself	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.This 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.

 Public Meeting Comments 12.17.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 11:45:52	December 17, 2021	Maps	Patricia Wiedhopf	85715	myself	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
12/17/2021 11:47:22	December 17, 2021	Maps	Patricia Wiedhopf	85715	myself	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>
12/17/2021 11:48:44	December 17, 2021	LD mapping	Cathy Schwanke	85086	My community Anthem-New River-Desert Hills-Phx north of Jomax	<p>Please fix our community splits on the legislative map 13.1, D28.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A very small area north of Anthem in Maricopa County is split from Anthem-New River and is shown to be in Yavapai County. Please put them back with their Anthem neighbors in Maricopa County where they are registered to vote and share the only area school district and JP and other districts. 2. D28 needs to INCLUDE a small group of houses south of Carefree Hwy and east of I-17 by extending the 28th St border SOUTH to either Jomax Rd. or down and west to the 303. These communities share DVUSD and commerce along the I-17 corridor. Please don't shoot them to be joined with Scottsdale with whom they have nothing in common. <p>Thank you- Please fix these considerations. Cathy Schwanke</p>
12/17/2021 12:04:05	December 17, 2021	Mapping LDs	Holli Ploog	86336	City of Sedona	<p>The City of Sedona sent a letter to the Chairwoman of the Commission dated October 27, 2021. We are on record as supporting remaining intact in one legislative district, remaining in a district with the Verde Valley and in the same district as Flagstaff.</p>
12/17/2021 12:10:13	December 17, 2021		3 William Regner	86324	myself	<p>Madam Chair and IRC Commissioners,</p> <p>Please consider the Verde Valley requests to keep the region whole in one legislative district and ensure that the legislative district is competitive. Currently, the Verde Valley region has one Yavapai County Supervisor District and one Community College Governing Board district that lies entirely within its normally accepted boundaries. A portion of a second district for each resides within that accepted Verde Valley boundary. That means that at best the Verde Valley has two out of five votes on issues that affect it on those two County governing bodies. While the current make-ups of those boards might be attending to the equitable distribution of resources and fair policies, that has not always been the case historically, nor does it ensure that it will be so in the future. Very little can be done to change that reality. However, your actions can prevent that potentially detrimental imbalance in a third area of governance by ensuring that the Verde Valley resides within a competitive state legislative district. Please support our desire to have some measure of control over our future that does not depend on the largesse of the same dominant region within our County. The Coconino County maps presented accomplish those goals.</p>

	Public Meeting Comments 12.17.21					
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 12:15:38	December 17, 2021	Please add 51st Avenue to District 2	Christian Lamar	85023	Myself	<p>District 2 is unbalanced. Please add 51st Avenue to district 2. You all added lots of blue precincts cutting the map off. So in good faith you need to move it to 51st Avenue and add the proper red precincts back.</p> <p>Giving more preference to blue precincts in a district Trump won is not fair.</p> <p>You need to balance this map back out again.</p> <p>DO NOT add Black canyon to district 2 or any other southern Biden Blue precinct.</p>
12/17/2021 13:02:32	December 17, 2021	Chandler/Gilbert/LD12	Paul Weich	85044	self	<p>Re: Chandler/Gilbert/LD12 - why doesn't LD13 expand to the north to take away the LD12 panhandle. (It's a wider panhandle that is NOT COMPACT/CONTIGUOUS.). It would also show better respect for Chandler CITY BOUNDARIES.</p>
12/17/2021 13:02:56	December 17, 2021	VI	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	<p>I urge the Commissioners to use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13.</p> <p>Please don't divide the the minority Latino communities of north Chandler in two using Ray Rd to divide it. They need to remain together with downtown Chandler and Sunshine Valley Mobile Home Park below the 202.</p> <p>I disagree with Commissioner York's proposal to move the eastern border from Val Vista (as it currently is on map 13.1) to Greenfield, as this is putting a part of Gilbert into LD13 - please keep Gilbert only Gilbert (in LD14) and Chandler only Chandler and Sun Lakes (in LD13).</p>
12/17/2021 13:17:33	December 17, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	<p>Re: 13.1 - Edits to District 25 & 29</p> <p>Please do not take the community of Festival out from District 25. The City of Buckeye City Council has recommended a northern boundary of Patton Road (alignment).</p>
12/17/2021 13:20:38	December 17, 2021	Redistricting maps	Renee Kirkpatrick	85704	Self and Arizona Community	<p>The Independent Redistricting Committee exists to ensure electoral maps comply with AZ Constitution, the US Voting Rights Act; and those electoral maps are to be competitive, compact, contiguous and take into consideration the voting representation communities of color.</p> <p>Test Map v9.0 makes District 17 a more competitive district and balances the statewide totals of predicted party seats relatively evenly. It creates 7 competitive seats, defined as within an 8-point vote margin.</p> <p>Having competitive electoral maps in AZ will aid significantly in addressing the extremism which is poisoning public discourse and our democracy.</p> <p>Please ensure all Arizonans have equal representation by adopting v9.0!</p> <p>Arizonans are Counting on you-thanks</p>
12/17/2021 13:30:39	December 17, 2021	VI	Cathy Lee	85209	Self	<p>Why are you not concentrating on balancing LD9, 10 & 15? It seems like the far east valley is always an afterthought.</p>
12/17/2021 13:34:17	December 17, 2021	Legislative District 6 and 7	Sandee McKinlay	85837	My Family and Community	<p>You put Snowflake, Taylor, Show Low, and Vernon, appears portions of Springerville and Greer among other towns back in LD7. Some of these towns have had zero representation for two decades! This is unacceptable combination of communities of interest. It is unacceptable to take Snowflake and Taylor out of district with Heber/Overgaard and put them with Flagstaff. There is nothing right about this map! You 100% understand what is wanted by these communities. This map does not comply with fairness in any way, shape, or form! The previous map was not great but better than this map. Respectfully request changes... we will not accept this.</p>

 Public Meeting Comments 12.17.21						
Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/17/2021 13:42:16	December 17, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion, Legislative Map Drawing	Jeffrey Carda	85756		Please attempt to keep the vail school district within a single legislative district. The draft map being reviewed today depicts the vail school district divided between LD17, LD19, and LD21.
12/17/2021 14:06:15	December 17, 2021	Map	Lewis Carlassara	85937		Snowflake is a tight conservative community, it is not in our interest to be divided. Please take this in consideration when deciding on the map.
12/17/2021 14:31:24	December 17, 2021	CD Mapping	Cathy Schwanke	85086	My community	Congressional candidates have always adequately/superbly addressed needs of New River-Anthem-Desert Hills and northern Phx for the last 20 years. Chairman Norberg just commented that she "thought" that wouldn't be possible, but it actually HAS BEEN possible. We are presently in CD8 from northern Maricopa County border south to Surprise asking I-17 and it has worked fine. In fact, we are regularly contracted and visited by our congressional representative and outreach directors. Please accept these facts :)
12/17/2021 14:49:13	December 17, 2021	Please include Snowflake in map 12.1.1 we are an area of interest there. Nothing of interest with the reservation thank you for all your work on this!	Debra Vance	85933		Please leave snowflake in map 12.1.1
12/17/2021 15:17:32	December 17, 2021	Redistricting	Robert Horwitt	85623	Self	Proposed map for LD 17(V12.1) does not meet the compact and continuous requirement. Nor does it meet the communities of interest requirement. There are no shared school districts, water resources, parks or recreation in common. Nor does it meet the competitive requirement. This map provides a significant advantage to Republicans. This is clear gerrymandering the commission was created to prevent.
12/17/2021 15:19:24	December 17, 2021	COI - inconsistent rules	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Mehl says, it's ok to split Casa Grande because it's been split for "many, many years." But remember it's not ok in his mind to split Yavapai County, which has been split for 4 decades. And, by the way, let's split Flagstaff which has never been split.
12/17/2021 15:23:43	December 17, 2021	CD6 / CD7 split in Tucson	David Higuera	85701	Tucson	<p>Commissioner Mehl is being disingenuous when he objects to the current split between CD6 and CD7 in the City of Tucson. Under the current draft final map 10.1.2, the split is almost perfect, using Campbell – half the city in CD6 and half the city in CD7. This ensures that the voters of the City of Tucson, the 2nd largest city in the state, will have adequate representation in Congress.</p> <p>If you move the north-south line over to Alvernon, you are basically just ensuring that CD6 becomes more of a Safe-R seat, vs. a competitive seat. And, you are disenfranchising all those City of Tucson voters who would remain in CD6, because their needs would come second to the rest of the district.</p> <p>Commissioner Mehl says that Campbell "splits" the university community. I live near there. It does not. But if you need to move the line at all, Country Club or Tucson Blvd are both better alternatives to Alvernon.</p> <p>Thank you, David Higuera</p>
12/17/2021 15:36:10	December 17, 2021	Congressional Map Drawing	Angela Willeford	85256	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	If the Commission is considering changes to CD1 to meet population requirements the SRPMIC would support adding areas of mesa that are consistent with the area identified in the LD8 map. Specifically, if the Commission is considering spring training baseball facilities, as common interests, this recommendation could include the Diamondbacks (SRPMIC), Rockies (SRPMIC), Giants (Scottsdale), Cubs (Mesa), and Oakland A's (Mesa).