

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 9:17:31	December 6, 2021	Redistricting for Pima County	Sharon and Marshall Johnson	85704	Ourselves	<p>How districts are defined is critical to preserving our democracy. If there are districts safe for Republicans and another for Democrats, extremists can gain or retain power. We are independents and prefer to be in a district that is competitive, so we can have a voice. We also believe that districts should include a variety of people with different incomes and interests.</p> <p>We live in the Casas Adobes/Marana/Oro Valley/Foothills area (District 17) and very much want to stay contiguous and competitive. To have us in a district that includes the Houghton/Tanque Verde/Vail areas is ridiculous. (We used to live on Houghton Road and so are familiar with that area and it has little in common with northwest Tucson area where we now live.) 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>Please remember that the IRC was established to prohibit or at least diminish partisan gerrymandering. We voters (and we do vote) are counting on you.</p> <p>Sharon and Marshall Johnson</p>
12/6/2021 9:20:21	December 6, 2021	III. Opportunity for Public Comments.	Deydrek Scott	86045	Self	<p>In this month's coupon magazine in Prescott, AZ called "money in the mail," there was a blatant advertisement from a home remodeling company with had the disclaimer that: if they presented this ad with your Republican or Independent voter registration, CCW, NRA membership or some other form of identification to show you are not a liberal or progressive that hates America and receive up to 50% off.</p> <p>This is one of many examples of how Prescott does not see eye to eye with others in the proposed CD2.</p> <p>Please exclude Yavapai county from being included with the Native Tribes (current CD1). We are not hyper partisan in this way, and this type of hyper partisanship will polarize our state and congressional district, even more. Please do not let this happen.</p>
12/6/2021 9:20:45	December 6, 2021	Public Comment	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	<p>This deliberative mapping meeting should not begin with excuses from the Chair for failing to draw fair and competitive seats. This is not an impossible task. This sets the exact wrong tone. There are a number of proposed maps submitted by the public that demonstrate the ability to draw competitive seats. The IRC should simply balance the VRA districts which must be safe seats with rural red districts leaving the rest of the map available to turn into fair and competitive seats. It is misleading to the public to describe this as an impossible task.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 9:25:38	December 6, 2021	4	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	Please can you give us some indication at the next meeting how the "almost overwhelming" (to use Commissioner Lerner's words) number of public comments will be made available to the Commissioners for their deliberations? Have all the public town hall testimonies that were transcribed now been entered onto some sort of database or the public comments dashboard? Have all the paper sheets with district maps we were asked to complete and hand back to IRC staff at the public town halls, been entered onto some sort of database or the public comments dashboard so they can be considered alongside all other public comments? Have letters and emails also been entered into a similar system? Will the Commissioners be reading every single online public comment or will there be summary reports presented at future meetings on these? Thank you in advance for your answers.
12/6/2021 9:32:34	December 6, 2021	racially poalized votind	Deborah	Howard	self	You can not call your process fair and transparent and of the highest ethical standards when you fail to make public documents you are using to inform your decisions - actually public. Please POST the reports from Dr. Handley and the summary charts presented by Dr. Johnson NOW
12/6/2021 9:48:09	December 6, 2021	Six/Executive Session	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	The IRC cannot claim that it is conducting a transparent process when there has been no attempt to explain to the public the process through which it is attempting to comply with the VRA. Going into executive session after receiving a polarized voting report without explaining the legal significance of the report is the opposite of transparency. The public cannot follow the legal significance of the data. The IRC should explain to the public in simple, plain language, how it is drawing maps to comply with the VRA. This needs to be done in open session, not behind closed doors. The previous IRCs had to submit to DOJ for preclearance under section five of the VRA. IRC 2.0 won preclearance for its maps on the first attempt. Perhaps this IRC should use the template of IRC 2.0's submission to DOJ to explain their VRA compliance decisions to the public.
12/6/2021 10:38:44	December 6, 2021	Redistricting	Dr. Janet S. Twyman	86326		Arizona voters support an independent commission with a mandate to draw "fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts," as evidenced in 2000 with the passage of Prop 106 and the formation of the Arizona Independent Redistricting Commission. For the last decade the IRC followed their "fair and competitive" mandate. Maps passed by the IRC in 2012 brought AZ acclaim as being one of the least gerrymandered states, with the IRC successfully resisting the blatant, anti-democratic gerrymandering efforts that occurred throughout the country. I have grave concerns about the proposed legislative draft maps LD 7 (or ANY non-competitive map), which moves the previously competitive LD 6 by splitting and separating Sedona and Flagstaff from each other. This results in three NON-COMPETITIVE districts in Northern Arizona. I support the remarks made by Arizona Democratic Party Chairwoman Raquel Terán: "In the ten years since the last redistricting, Arizona has experienced massive growth in both population and diversity. The political landscape has also shifted, with Arizona Democrats gaining major electoral ground...The Arizona Democratic Party reaffirms its unequivocal support for fair, competitive maps, as required in the Arizona Constitution and demanded under the voter-approved Prop 106...In spite of the GOP's campaign to undermine Independent Redistricting, we urge the commission to carry on in the important work following the constitutional process to draw fair and competitive districts." As a voter, taxpayer, and AZ resident, I too strongly urge the commission to follow the constitutional process to draw fair and competitive districts.
12/6/2021 10:47:04	December 6, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	William Ellett	85716	Self	I would like the IRC to adopt map number 9 to ensure fairer elections in Arizona for the next ten years.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 11:31:13	December 6, 2021	Maps	Renee Kirkpatrick	85704	Self and Arizona communities	<p>In 2000, through Proposition 106, Arizona voters agreed to establish an Independent Commission to insure ALL Arizonans have an equal voice in our elections. Your established group MUST review and make final decisions based on maps reflecting the diverse and changing populations of our state. The drawing of these new districts MUST be competitive, compact and contiguous! Maps are NOT be based on a select, partisan group who have worked behind closed doors, drawing maps supporting their self serving needs.</p> <p>Arizonans are Counting on You</p>
12/6/2021 12:15:08	December 6, 2021	Share Map VRA Compliance with Public	Hope Busto-Keyes	85743	Self	<p>Dear Commissioners,</p> <p>In the spirit of transparency of the redistricting process, IRC discussions about how the maps comply with the VRA would best serve the public interest if the discussions are conducted during open meetings instead of executive sessions.</p> <p>Please explain the VRA compliance of the maps to the public.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/6/2021 12:20:16	December 6, 2021	redistricting	Barbara Parks	85710	East Tucson	<p>I want to add my input on the redistricting maps. I like 10.0 I think it makes sense. I live on the east side of Tucson for a reason. If I wanted to be represented by opposing views, I would have bought a house downtown. Please keep in mind that everyone wants to be heard when it comes to voting. 10.0 is the best choice for that. Thank you</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 13:29:54	December 6, 2021	LD17	Jean Meconi	85737	myself	<p>Oro Valley is suburban-urban & considered to be a suburb of Tucson and our town's interests are those of a suburban-urban area.</p> <p>According to the US Census Bureau, Oro Valley is part of the Tucson urban area. With a population of 47,502, it is just under 50,000 which is considered to be an entirely urban area.</p> <p>Vail has a population density of 561 per square mile compared to Oro Valley's 1,362. Tanque Verde's population density is 514 people per square mile. Vail and Tanque Verde are rural.</p> <p>Oro Valley is experiencing growing pains. Residents just came together to turn Rancho Vistoso Golf Course into a nature preserve. Oro Valley is 85% built-out with a limited supply of vacant land according to a recent study on the town's web site. Oro Valley gets its water from Tucson, reclamation and wells while the rural areas get water from groundwater sources. Tucson Electric Power provides the Electrical Service in Oro Valley. Oro Valley students attend Amphitheater School District along with students from Casas Adobes. Oro Valley had strong support for Proposition 208 to fully fund AZ public schools.</p> <p>A community of interest shares policy concerns and benefits from being in a single district. Oro Valley's community of interest has not been represented by its current legislators. Oro Valley has supported public education, yet just this past legislative session, LD11 state legislators voted for bills that reduce educational funding. Oro Valley uses less groundwater today than it did 20 years ago by reclaiming water and using CAP water. Yet LD11 legislators voted to limit the use of new hydrological data for assured water supplies for development and weakened water quality requirements in the last legislative session.</p> <p>In the adopted legislative map, Oro Valley would be included in LD17 with farflung rural districts that don't share the community interests of the majority of Oro Valley residents. Voters in Oro Valley have been disenfranchised in the current, uncompetitive district and therefore, should be part of a competitive district going forward.</p>
12/6/2021 13:41:20	December 6, 2021	VI	Marlene Macek	86351	Myself	<p>Please keep CD2 as drafted. It keeps the Verde Valley communities of interest together with Prescott. Respect our communities of interest and do not split us from Prescott which is the center of the Yavapai County government. I live in the Village of Oak Creek which is an unincorporated Verde Valley community of Yavapai County. Keep our county boundaries intact.</p>
12/6/2021 14:06:01	December 6, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion: Congressional Maps Drawing	Dianne Coscarelli	85718	Self	<p>Having watched many public hearings, I note:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Santa Cruz County: I concur with Commissioner Lerner's comment that there is bipartisan support for keeping Santa Cruz County whole. 2. Tucson/CD 7: Many have given comments reiterating Mayor Romero's concerns as to keeping certain parts of Tucson together in CD 7. They have NOT asked that the western boundary of CD 7 extend beyond Campbell Road. <p>Thank you Commissioners for your thoughtful and considerate discussions today.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 14:11:42	December 6, 2021	4 and 6 - comments and map discussion	Paul Weich	85044	self	I am glad that the Commission IS concerned about the public comments that have been (and will be) received. However, there seems to be some confusion and dispute about whether there is a consensus among commenters on certain subjects. I think 1 solution may be for Commissioners to REQUEST staff to comb through all of the draft map comments - written and oral - to compile a digestible report on some of the more contentious issues. Thank you--Paul Weich
12/6/2021 14:24:12	December 6, 2021	6	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	Please can the Commissioners consider the wealth of public comments online, submitted on the IRC Public Comments dashboard in their discussions. There are as many comments published online from Sun Lakes residents saying they want to be other retiree communities and not having to battle against the voices of the younger population in Chandler as were heard at the East Valley town hall. Many of the Sun Lakes residents decided to comment online, or by email, or by letter rather than come out late at night to Mesa because they believed that all commenting methods would be considered by Commissioners equally. Please show them that the Commission shows no preference on means of public commenting. Thank you.
12/6/2021 14:26:42	December 6, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion: Congressional Maps Drawing	Dianne Coscarelli	85718	Self	Having watched many of the public hearings, I note: 1. Northern Arizona CDs: I heard many say they have lived with the same districts for decades and felt a major disruption as to how their voices would be heard with the new maps. Of course redistricting laws do require a fresh look every 10 years, but maybe drastic change does not meet redistricting goals in less urban areas such as these due to geography, the lack of change in communities of interest and minimal population shifts. We should seek to improve on the goals of Prop 106, not seek to do harm. 2. Protecting votes of Native Populations. Thank you Commissioners Lerner and Watchman for cogently explaining why it is important to address the concerns of our Native voters even where they make up only 20%. We cannot count on their member of Congress looking out for them if that member does not need their votes. This would be especially true with a wider spread in competitiveness. Anything less than 4% would put them at risk of an extremist taking office. They have only been allowed to vote for less than some of our lifetimes. We owe them.
12/6/2021 14:28:51	December 6, 2021	Re-districting.	Shenikwa Novachich	85396	Verrado	What a HUGE and lopsided mistake it would be to redistrict Yavapai with Verrado. I fear it would cause this rural community to lose out to us. Both are special and should be treated as such. But our natural beauty in land and farms have much different needs than a suburban community. Someone always loses and we can't afford to lose more free and open land.
12/6/2021 14:37:29	December 6, 2021	Redistricting	Maureen Woods	85396	Myself and Verrado Neighbors	We moved from Scottsdale to Victory at Verrado last year because the community offered a similar suburban environment and had the potential for continued growth in that direction. Goodyear and Litchfield Park are comparable surrounding communities. I was STUNNED to learn that you are considering including our community with Yavapai and Mohave county communities. We are not rural like they are and continued growth will only magnify the differences. Verrado, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park are TRUE communities of interest. We chose Victory (55+ neighborhood) because it was part of a multi-generational community. We are NOT like Sun City Festival either, although we share the same zip code. Elected officials cannot advocate properly for two such divergent areas. I want representation for our interests, which align more closely to Goodyear and Litchfield Park!!! Thank you.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 14:42:34	December 6, 2021	CD maps	Kim Owens	85396	self	Please respect the communities of interest found in Litchfield Park, Goodyear and the communities north of I-10 in Buckeye such as Verrado, in determining the CD maps and do not intermingle these area with rural areas to balance numbers. Neither area is well served by that option. These west valley communities share school districts, employment centers, churches, civic groups, and other elected leadership, we drive the same roads and eat at the same restaurants. We are neighbors with Peoria and the Sun Cities. The Mohave and Yavapai counties have equally important, yet uniquely different interests and needs, as they are rural communities versus suburban. Rural communities need to be seen for what they are and deserve to stand on their own, as do smaller suburban communities of Maricopa such as those found in the west valley. Using small parts of any county, despite the glaring difference in communities of interest, in order to bring numbers that do not represent real communities of interest together is antithetical to the stated mission of this commission. Such would be the case if the west valley of Maricopa was considered a community of interest with Mohave and Yavapai counties. Thank you for your diligence and attention to the future of our state!
12/6/2021 15:02:47	December 6, 2021	Arizona Redistricting Commission County Merge	Kayla Poffinbarger	85396		Verrado, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park should not be included with the rural and river communities. These three areas are true communities of interest sharing employment centers, schools, churches, shopping, county leadership and general needs. They are suburban Maricopa communities, completely unlike Yavapai and Mohave county communities which have different, but equally important and unique interests.
12/6/2021 15:06:13	December 6, 2021	Redistricting	Molly Bolich	85396		I am respectfully requesting that Verrado, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park not be included with the rural and river communities. These three areas are true communities of interest sharing employment centers, schools, churches, shopping, county leadership and general needs. They are suburban Maricopa communities, completely unlike Yavapai and Mohave county communities which have different, but equally important and unique interests.
12/6/2021 15:43:24	December 6, 2021	Combining counties	Tara Norris	85396		Verrado, Goodyear, and Litchfield Park should not be included with the rural and river communities. These three areas are true communities of interest sharing employment centers, schools, churches, shopping, county leadership and general needs. They are suburban Maricopa communities, completely unlike Yavapai and Mohave county communities which have different, but equally important and unique interests.
12/6/2021 16:10:01	December 6, 2021	Don't add Yavapai and more rural communities with the west valley!	Lew Erickson	85396	Veraddo resident	I am against this. Don't add these rural communities to the west valley communities please
12/6/2021 16:12:59	December 6, 2021	6.1	Trey Terry	85395	myself	Please do NOT put Yuma with the west valley of Maricopa County. The cities of Buckeye, Goodyear, Litchfield Park, and Waddell are completely different than Yuma. On the water issues, our priorities directly conflict. In Yuma, their water issues are centered around agriculture. In the west valley, our water issues are centered around growth and development. These conflicts are not compatible for singular representation at the state level. The west valley deserves to have proper representation at the legislature. By putting us with Yuma, you cut up the west valley and disenfranchise many voters and many cities just as big, if not bigger than Yuma itself. Our transportation issues are different. Our water issues are conflicting. We are separated by hours of barren desert. The West Valley communities are suburban Maricopa county areas. We are not rural. Please don't disenfranchise us just so the Yuma Mayor gets more representation than his population actually deserves. Buckeye is bigger than Yuma. Goodyear is bigger than Yuma. Our voice should matter as well. Thank you.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/6/2021 16:42:23	December 6, 2021	Draft maps	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	Why does the commission continue to insist that Wickenburg be in CD9 and LD28 when we want to be in CD2 and LD5? It seems like the commission is doing everything they can to appease certain groups politically. Wickenburg needs to be in the same district both congressionally and legislatively. We have nothing in common with Anthem, Surprise or even with Mohave County. I don't know how many times this has to be explained. If it helps I'd be more than happy to give all of the commission members a tour of our town to explain my viewpoint. Your current maps keep splitting our town up.