



Public Meeting Comments 12.19.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 13:12:53	December 19, 2021	Maps	Kelly Rael	85901	Myself	Please include Pinetop into LD6, please add Show Low and Snowflake into LD7
12/19/2021 13:14:20	December 19, 2021	Redistricting	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	The 14.0 map doesn't work for Wickenburg. We need to be in LD5 and CD2. Why does the commission continue to now insist on putting us in LD30 and CD9 when we have no common interests with any of the communities in it? We share nothing in common with the cities and towns in La Paz and Mohave Counties. We share more in common with locations in Yavapai County. How many times does this have to be stated before the commission until they'll listen to us?
12/19/2021 13:16:30	December 19, 2021	Map 12.0	Frank Rael	85901	Myself	White Mountain communities support Map 12.0. Please do not break our community up.
12/19/2021 13:17:38	December 19, 2021	Legislative Map - Parks Community	Ann Heitland	86004	self and friends in Parks, AZ	Like the Liberty neighborhood, the Parks neighborhood is relatively small. Please make that adjustment, putting it in either LD6 or LD7. The neighborhood coincides with the current precinct boundaries for the Parks precinct in Coconino County.
12/19/2021 13:19:46	December 19, 2021	New Map	Kelly Rael	85901	Myself	Please add pinetop lakeside to LD6 and put Show Low and Snowflake in LD7
12/19/2021 13:23:53	December 19, 2021	12	Kelly Rael	85901	The White Mountains	Please don't screw us over. We waited 10 years. Please don't place us in LD6!!!!!!
12/19/2021 13:24:01	December 19, 2021	VI: Draft map decision discussion	Virginia Dotson	85902	Self	Dear Commissioners, The 13.1 maps for LD6 and LD7 are looking better! Uniting White Mountains rural areas with LD6 is a good idea. Please continue in this direction toward more competitiveness. CD2 in 10.1.2 still needs better balance--0 for 9 is not competitive. Thank you.
12/19/2021 13:25:31	December 19, 2021	Public Comments	Dee Maitland	85658	Self	When I first saw the Report on Communities of Interest I was impressed and assumed that reports like this would be released based on the public listening sessions and the public submitted maps. Why is this not done? I am particularly concerned about LD17. I have lived in this area under LD11 for 10 years and have had no voice. Finchem and Leach will not even meet with constituents nor attend League of Women Voters legislator forums. I listened to the December 4th meeting in Tucson and took a count of those for an against Map 10.0. 23 people supported the map while 28 requested 9.0. Another 31 favored other maps so it was 59 to 23 against 10.0. The 31 included LD0061, CD0073 Latino Coalition, Navajo, LD0055, CD0072, LD0025, LD0059, LD0065, CD7, LD0029, CD0007, LD0073, CD0063, CD0063, LD0051 and LD0056. Why are none of these maps considered? Also taking Vail out does not do anything to improve compactness, the mountain barrier or competitiveness. Add back Casa Adobes which shares school district with Oro Valley. Taking out Vail really makes the map look gerrymandered and will be the proof the chair is not an independent.
12/19/2021 13:39:21	December 19, 2021	VI	Margaret Cawley	85281	myself	Why is there such emphasis to make other cities in one district but not Tempe and Chandler? Seems unfair to Tempeans for sure.
12/19/2021 13:46:32	December 19, 2021	Redistricting	Jamie Shelburne	85939	self	You can't be serious- map 14.0 is horrible! To carve Snowflake and Taylor out is not compact!!!! We do not belong in the Native Nation district!!!!!!!!!! We will have absolutely no representation if this map is approved!!!!!! Please do the right thing and approve map 12.1.1
12/19/2021 14:04:42	December 19, 2021	discussion of legislative district maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	Following your discussions today with great interest. I am still concerned that the communities of interest criterion (along with population balance) is receiving disproportionate consideration - especially relative to competitiveness. Please do not neglect to assess and reflect on the competitiveness of the districts you are adjusting - yes, it is only one criterion, and can't SUBSTANTIALLY affect the other criteria negatively, but there should be at least some discussion of that criterion.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 14:21:36	December 19, 2021	discussion of legislative district maps	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	I appreciated the further explanation of Chair Neuberg's view of "shopping districts" as elements of communities of interest - I agree that it is the economic and policy aspects, not the affiliation of people who shop in an area, that are most useful for district purposes. I hope you will use some of the same reasoning when you return to discussion of Flagstaff's position in one or more districts and the possibility of splitting Flagstaff. The overwhelming economic drivers of the tourism and hospitality industry (and specifically eco-tourism type activities) certainly argue for linking Flagstaff and Sedona (and other communities, as has been suggested, but at the very least these two). And if Flagstaff really cannot be kept whole, for various population balancing reasons, then it makes far more sense to "split" the city/metropolitan planning area at the railroad, rather than at Interstate 40. There is very little of Flagstaff's economic activity (that is, hotels, retail catering to visitors, etc.) south of the interstate, but a very good portion of it is south of the railroad. So if you are seeking to make sense of where the southern part of Flagstaff ends up, by linking it to the economic and social milieu of Sedona and Oak Creek, it would be best to have that southern part of Flagstaff be bounded by the railroad.
12/19/2021 14:24:52	December 19, 2021	Legislative districts	Barb rosenberg	85253	Myself	I have lived in the town of paradise valley for over 30 years. I worked in the paradise valley unified school district for 29 years, including pinnacle high school which was just mentioned. So I am familiar with both areas. And by the way, the town of paradise valley is not the same as areas near the town which are sometimes referred to as paradise valley. The town of PV, Arcadia, Arcadia lite are well established areas, and are not a good fit for newer areas like desert ridge that rely on the 101. Commissioner york, you live in the town, do you really feel desert ridge is a better fit?
12/19/2021 14:24:59	December 19, 2021	Legislative District Map	Merissa Hamilton	85022	Self	As a resident of LD2 in map 14, my doctor's offices and preferred shopping centers are in the Deer Valley area. My favorite restaurants and some of my exercise facilities are also in this area. Additionally, my dog park, my church, and my favorite hiking areas are just north of me along Cave Creek road. My insurance agency and the pubs we meet with our friends at are also just north of us along Cave Creek Road. Please combine these areas into LD2 as they have nothing to do with LD3. Please keep my community of interest together and follow the Constitution's requirement for compactness. Whereas the area by the i17 and metro center mall is radically different than my community of interest. The light rail is going to be in this area and would not be properly represented by representatives in my LD2 area.
12/19/2021 14:38:07	December 19, 2021	LD 6 map 13.0 or 12.1.1	Diane Talbott-Mosier	85901	LD 6 Show Low	We support and encourage the IRC to approve 12.1.1 or 13.0 maps not 14.0. The southern part of Navajo County needs to be with communities of interest with shared commonalities, not the Native American population of Northern Navajo and Apache Counties.
12/19/2021 14:49:23	December 19, 2021	Public comments	Jeffrey Specter	85395	Myself	The IRC is proposing to place the PebbleCreek Precinct in Goodyear into LD29 Draft Map 14.0. Draft Map 14 has an irregular-shape. It is not compact as required by law. It includes PebbleCreek with distant territory far to the north along US-60. These areas are not Communities of Interest with Goodyear. Please ask the Commission to adopt LD25 Draft Map 10.0. It includes PebbleCreek and Goodyear north of I-10 with other West Valley communities of interest including Verrado in Buckeye. Verrado, like Goodyear, is affected by noise from Luke AFB. Thank you very much.



Public Meeting Comments 12.19.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 14:52:26	December 19, 2021	LD final draft	Connie Williams	85648	myself	<p>I couldn't watch the Dec. 17th meeting until today, and the comments are closed for that meeting, but this is critical information. At 4:29 on Friday, you began talking about LD 21 and 19, specifically the Latino Coalition request to add Bisbee to LD 21. To accommodate this request, you added all of northeastern Santa Cruz County, including Patagonia and the Patagonia Mountains to LD19. At the time, everyone on the Commission admitted they didn't know anything about Patagonia. Clearly, no one remembered the large number of comments from this community and others of us who are following this closely. Most of Patagonia does not want to be in LD19.</p> <p>Patagonia and the Patagonia Mountains are all part of the Santa Cruz Valley Watershed. Many of us have expressed concerned about keeping legislation in this watershed whole. Cochise County is relatively well-known for their water policy legislative preferences, which are dramatically different than those here in the Santa Cruz River Valley and surrounding mountains. The boundary division was suggested without knowing the area. Please at least move it north of Patagonia and the Patagonia Mountains. Or even better, keep Santa Cruz County whole and find another way to accommodate the Latino Coalition.</p>
12/19/2021 14:58:27	December 19, 2021	VI.Draft Map decision discussion	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>I find it interesting that the commission is suddenly focused on Communities of Interest that are composed of shopping malls and entertainment districts. Somehow it became a goal to keep them together with the people they serve, all because it would make sense to have them share legislative representation for such things as transportation corridors and other things that would facilitate their enterprises.</p> <p>While I don't disagree that they share a common interest, I do wonder who it was that submitted these areas as Communities of Interest during the time the commission set aside to gather testimony about Col's last summer. I didn't see any such submissions or discussion of these communities. So why are they suddenly becoming so important?</p> <p>Also, no one mentioned such Communities of Interest during previous mapping sessions when you were working on other parts of the state. Were Communities of Interest based on shopping and entertainment districts considered when you set the boundaries of districts in Yuma? Flagstaff? Tucson? All the other communities along borders in the Phoenix metro area? Don't those shopping malls also warrant consideration along the same lines? Or is it OK to split those areas from each other and from their neighboring residential areas, but not the ones you accommodated today?</p> <p>It seems the commission is being very inconsistent - perhaps to the level of capriciousness - about how it applies the Communities of Interest criteria. It's true the constitution is unclear about exactly what constitutes a Community of Interest. But because the commission has not made its interpretation clear from the start, its resulting loose and changing definition makes it impossible for the commissioners (or the public) to make a case for proposed boundary changes. And it makes it all the more difficult to defend your own decisions in court.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.19.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 15:09:15	December 19, 2021	Mapping LD 15.0	Cathy Schwanke	85086	My Anthem-New River-Desert Hills community	New map LD 15.0 puts New River and Desert Hills in with Scottsdale! It takes us away from our Anthem neighbors and our ONLY school district, DVUSD, and ignores our I-17 corridor. Our voting issues have nothing to do with Scottsdale. WE ARE UNINCORPORATED PHOENIX, even ANTHEM. This is soooo disheartening. None of our comments were heard. Scottsdale testified NOT to have us with them, not us along the I-17 corridor. BOTH Anthem-New River-Desert Hills "Democrats and Republicans" AGREE to keep our community together along I-17 and NOT with Scottsdale. Our only school district is DVUSD. Please fix this?? ~Cathy
12/19/2021 15:15:18	December 19, 2021	Legislative and Congressional Map Drawing	Pamela Villanueva	85086	myself	I thought we were on a course where both parties were being equally represented. Clearly, that is now not the case. And, why are you meeting on a Sunday? Unfortunately, the IRC has changed course and is now violating AZ Constitution in selecting partisan-driven maps. This is terrible news as it will turn Arizona DEEP BLUE and usher in elections that result in politicians that despise our freedoms, public safety, and small government. The IRC is ignoring communities of interest and abandoning compact districts. Please follow the AZ Constitution and stop gerrymandering the districts for your political gain. We the People are watching.
12/19/2021 15:19:43	December 19, 2021	White Mountains	Ann Heitland	86004	evidence	Mehl says White Mountains complain they have not been represented in the last 10 years. They have elected a Republican Senator over and over. They have elected Representatives. Snowflake is a hotbed or legislators.
12/19/2021 15:19:47	December 19, 2021	Legislative and Congressional map drawing	Scott Villanueva	85086	Myself	The congressional and legislative maps need to be drawn in line with the AZ Constitution and free of political bias. The maps need to be drawn compactly and in ways that make sense! Stop the gerrymandering and do your jobs in a non-partisan manner!
12/19/2021 15:25:27	December 19, 2021	Map LD 15.0	Cathy Schwanke	85086	Anthem New River Desert Hills unincorporated Phx area	The CD 10.1.2 PERFECTLY represents our area of COI since we are in DVUSD and do business along the I-17 corridor, whereas the LD 15.0 is a disaster, splitting us AWAY from our only one school district and our local issues and puts New River and Desert Hills in with Scottsdale. Please make the LD map represent us like the CD 10.1.2 map does. Both our Republicans AND Democrats testified to this. Sincerely, Cathy Schwanke 85086



Public Meeting Comments 12.19.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 15:53:06	December 19, 2021	LD7 LD6	Lisa Marshall	85937	Self	<p>Please do not approve the LD7 LD6 Maps! According to the constitution, redistricting should be based on commonalities, compactness and competitiveness.</p> <p>Commissioner Lerner and Watchman push to gerrymander the districts listening to inappropriate comments like "we need to remove Flagstaff so that the reservation districts can get their preferred candidate" or let's take that portion because there is a Hispanic population" I thought that segregation was over. Is your definition of commonality race??</p> <p>The white mountains should be placed in the same district as Heber and payson. This makes the map more compact and keeps commonalities together. The white mountains share industry, recreation and religious commonalities.</p> <p>Flagstaff should be placed with the reservation district. It is more compact and they have deep ties to the Navajo Nation.</p> <p>According to the Census the Navajo Nation had a loss of 40,000 citizens. It only makes sense to add Flagstaff in their district to make up that population.</p> <p>I do not think it's appropriate to gerrymander the district and take our voice so that the democrats and president Nez can have their "preferred Candidate!</p> <p>Please go back and approve the 12.1 map. We need representation in the White Mountains! Go look at the Bills that the Dems have written! They only write bills to benefit themselves on the Navajo Nation! They do not care about the rest of the White Mountains !!!</p>
12/19/2021 16:02:25	December 19, 2021	Final Draft Map	Wally Campbell	85395-8678	Goodyear and PebbleCreek	<p>Please adopt LD25 Draft Map 10.0. It includes PebbleCreek with other West Valley communities of interest including Verrado in Buckeye, which, like us, is affected by noise from Luke AFB.</p>
12/19/2021 16:02:56	December 19, 2021	LD7	David Marshall	85937-0450	self	<p>The map from 12.1.1 which is the Ld7 district is the map that has the most community of interest, compactness and competitiveness. Now it appears that map 14.0 is a map that the commission is trying use to appease the Navajo Reservation. I find nowhere in the Arizona Constitution or the Voters Right Act that race is a bases for drawing maps, but this is what we are witnessing. Your new LD6 map with Snowflake and Taylor have no community of interest with the reservation. Flagstaff has more community of interest with the reservation, plus there are more Native Americans living in Flagstaff than Snowflake and Taylor. If you would follow the guidelines outlined in the Arizona Constitution and the Voters Right Act, you would know what you are attempting to perpetrate here is illegal. We will seek legal counsel if necessary, please follow the law.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 16:26:34	December 19, 2021	First and second to last	Jennifer Mindock	85364	Myself	<p>I apologize if the disappearance of my first entry on this topic before it was completed. If it means it was submitted and not erased. There was no notice it had been submitted, so I assume it wasn't.</p> <p>Are changes recommended today and the coordinating data going to be made to the general public as well as to the commissioners? It is important that we be able to view tomorrow's material from the same page the commissioners will be viewing it from. Additionally, suggestions from us will also require some of the evening to ponder the eviscerating data that goes with the maps as well. It is especially important at such a late stage of this process and our opportunity to make suggestions will be limited. Thank you,</p>
12/19/2021 16:46:14	December 19, 2021	Redistricting maps	Stacey Travers	85048	Myself	<p>Chandler's LD 13 Latino community of interest is split. LD 13 should move northward into LD 12 to accommodate this community of interest.</p> <p>The newest maps have moved LD 13 into Gilbert and there have been many public comments arguing against this. The Commission needs to respect the city boundaries of Gilbert and Chandler better for LD 13.</p> <p>Also, LD 12 is short by 8,000 voters, and due to its width (19 miles from east to west) is not very compact. It makes sense to move this district further north to Southern Avenue. Tempe's eastern edges should be included in LDs 8 and LD12 (from LD9) in order to respect city boundaries.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
12/19/2021 16:51:11	December 19, 2021	VI	Tempest Shires	85248	myself	<p>I urge the Commissioners to clarify which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are observing when making future changes or when population balancing.</p> <p>I also urge Commissioners to ONLY make changes that have clear DOCUMENTED requests such as formally submitted letters, emails or best of all using the IRC's public commenting system. The changes made to Liberty, simply on the word of Commissioner Mehl having had multiple phone calls from Liberty residents during his lunch break, went against the spirit of all the work the Commission has done in the past to ensure transparency, working out in the open and allowing the public to understand why changes are being made.</p> <p>I also urge the Commissioners to reconsider the current split through the older and Latino residential areas of north Chandler, and reuniting that with the rest of these communities within LD13 rather than LD12.</p> <p>I also urge using the City of Chandler and City of Gilbert boundaries as stated by many, many testimonies at town halls and in public comments. Keep Gilbert together and separately, keep Chandler together.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.19.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/19/2021 16:54:50	December 19, 2021	Comments on Legislative Maps	Lauren Kuby	85282	myself	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Chandler's LD 13 Latino community of interest is split. LD 13 should move northward into LD 12 to accommodate this community of interest- The newest maps have moved LD 13 into Gilbert and there have been many public comments arguing against this. The Commission needs to respect the city boundaries of Gilbert and Chandler better for LD 13.-- LD 12 is short by 8,000 voters, and due to its width (19 miles from east to west) is not very compact. It makes sense to move this district further north to Southern Avenue.- Tempe's eastern edges should be included in LDs 8 and LD12 (from LD9) in order to respect city boundaries
12/19/2021 17:02:08	December 19, 2021	going forward	Lynne Hudson	85704	self	Considerably earlier on, Lerner said one reason for preferring her maps was that population balancing would be easier. And here we are. We are now dealing with a tsunami, not ripple effects.
12/19/2021 17:19:48	December 19, 2021	Final redistricting maps	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	Why is this commission not addressing our concerns here in Wickenburg to be in LD5 and CD2? Is it safe to gather the IRC doesn't care to hear from us? You don't seem to want to listen to our needs but rather what the southern part of the state wants as well as the Native American and Latino demographic wants. Race nor culture should have a bearing on redistricting.