ARIZONA	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 8:45:23	December 13, 2021	Redistricting	Richard Freeze	85901	Myself	Dear IRC Commission: You ask for comments on COI and we provide logical reasons why on- and off-reservations have opposite systems and requirements, which is exactly why they need their own individual representation to be fair and equal. Earlier approved maps were much better, but your newest draft maps for LD6 and LD7 display faults that will dilute if not remove fair and legal representation to all rural residents of southern Navajo and Apache Counties. Please make your final approval using 10.2 LD7 map. Thank you. Richard Freeze [redacted] Show Low, AZ 85901
12/13/2021 8:47:38	December 13, 2021	Commissioner Lerner	Sharon Edgar	860047210	self	Commissioner Lerner, you are a class act. I deeply appreciate your service to this Commission.

ARIZONA	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 8:49:01	December 13, 2021	Communties of Interest - age?	Ann Heitland	86004	self	Last week the commissioners were talking about age as, perhaps, a characteristic of communities of interest in Northern Arizona, noting that Flagstaff's average age was quite lower than Sedona or Prescott. I took the weekend to look into some statistics because, as we all know, averages can be deceiving. Thinking about the number one issue for our Legislature – K-12 education – it occurred to me we might compare population under 18 to determine what communities would be interested in. What I found is that Flagstaff's under 18 population as a percentage of overall population is very much like the cities of the Verde Valley, with the exception of Sedona according to the 2020 Census. 24% of Camp Verde's population is under 18. 20.5 % of Prescott Valley's population is under 18. Flagstaff is next in order with 17.9% of its population under 18. 16.3% of Cottonwood's population is under 18. Flagstaff's average age is lower than all, as has been noted in the record, because of it is a university town where 20% of the population is between 18-24, much higher for that cohort than any city without a college or university. Many of those students, of course, vote elsewhere, are not permanent residents, and have no long-term interest in the community. For the purpose of electing legislative representatives, Flagstaff has much in common with the small cities of the Verde Valley in age as well other characteristics in the record - most notably, economic and public safety. Some interesting numbers turned up for Snowflake, where 39.4% of the population is under 18. Compare that to the Navajo Nation Arizona population where 33% of the population is under 18 according to the 2015 Census Community Survey data. (I couldn't find a breakdown in the 2020 Census data.) This seems to indicate that Snowflake should be with the Navajo Nation in a legislative district if age is a determining factor! When I spoke with a a friend who has been paying a bit more attention to LD 17 than I, she pointed out that Marana's median age is 39; Oro Valley is 54; and Saddlebrooke is 70.9. So, if age defines communities of interest, that district really needs work.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 9:03:41	December 13, 2021	redistricting lines	mark atchley	85939	myself	i have been watching this process for the area that used to be called district 6 and have been listening to hundreds of comments on such. The peoples of the Navajo and Apache reservations have repeatedly said they do not have the desire to be added into the non tribal lands, they do not have the same common issues that the non tribal lands have , I agree they have very different issues and needs than what the non tribal lands have. i have also heard numerous non tribal members say the very same thing going the other direction the white mountains and rim country residents have a very similar concerns and issues that the tribal members do not have. This all being said why is this commission so set on destroying the communities of the rim country and white mountains and tribal lands. you have taken a districty 6 and cut up added over and over and at one point even trying to have the district go all the way down to florence what are you guys and gals thinking we have no common interest. I understand there are population growths and some minor changes need to be done as to affect the population growth. for some reason district 6 is on your agenda to destroy and add in non like peoples interest into this new map. Please listen to the people who are being affected by this and not the political asperations that are putting pressure on you guys to make these changes. you are supposed to work for all the people and listen to them not the gerrrymandering pressures that are being put onto you guys. Please do the right thing and keep district 6 snowflake , showlow, payson, heber, pinetop, camp verde, williams, sedona all in the same district as these people have tha same interest and concerns. also keep the reservations together and apart as they have they have asked for over and over again as they too have like interest with other reservations that the other areas do not have. I get the pressures of gerryymandering for one party or another this is not what this is all about it should be about having people of like interest having representation in their state. what you have been propsing all this yesr is not doing that it is tearing it apart and not for the good of the people that live here. Please do the right thing.
12/13/2021 9:20:41	December 13, 2021	legislative map drawing	Jacqui Bauer	85716	myself	Please remove Broadmoor, Arroyo Chico, and other midtown Tucson neighborhoods from LD21. These areas do not share infrastructure, development pressures, or other commonalities with the border communities south of us, and voters in these neighborhoods are being done a deep disservice by the current legislative maps. Please drop the northern border of LD21 closer to Davis Monthan, and enable us to rejoin our adjacent neighborhoods.

ARIZONA	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 10:08:48	December 13, 2021	District Maps, Including District 17	Sharon and Marshall Johnson	85704	Ourselves	My husband and I are not aligned with either the Republican or the Democratic party. We prefer to be in a district that is competitive (District 17) so we can have a voice. The IRC was established to prohibit or at least diminish partisan gerrymandering. 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 who do not belong to either of the two parties? We also believe that districts should include a variety of people with different incomes and interests. 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. Looking at a map, this is gerrymandering in extreme and certainly is not contiguous. Other areas that should be contiguous are those in CD7. To isolate the University and the Latinos is certainly not conducive to democratic engagement. We voters (and we do vote) are counting on you. How districts are defined is critical to preserving our democracy. Sharon and Marshall Johnson
12/13/2021 10:16:33	December 13, 2021	Draft Maps - COI considerations	Barb Orcutt	86004	self	I want to endorse the comments of the League of Women voters which were made to you last week: "The Independent Redistricting Commission focused it's first learning tour on communities of interest and has emphasized this criterion throughout the mapping process. However your voting district does not determine where you shop, dine, worship, or socialize. When people who reside in the same community are likely to engage in personal activities together, they are free to cross voting districts for such activities. "What does define a community of interest for redistricting purposes are the common needs and problems residents share that can be addressed by government action - things like healthcare or education facilities, public safety, water shortages, access to broadband and their economic interests such as mining, agriculture, and tourism. "Placing citizens within such common concerns in the same voting district serves multiple purposes. It focuses their attention where it should be on problem solving and solutions; it amplifies their voices in Congress and at the Arizona legislature; it increases their chances of getting needed resources for their districts. The League believes the commission should employ this more useful definition of communities of interest, combined with a concerted effort to create more districts that are highly competitive or competitive. It will enable the commission to create fair maps for Arizona."
12/13/2021 10:35:04	December 13, 2021	CD 9	Ann Heitland	86004	self	You COULD population balance D9 and respect the west valley by splitting Yavapai at Mingus Mountain.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 10:56:15	December 13, 2021	III	RICHARD HOPKINS	85326	SELF	YOUR CURRENT LD 23 & 25 MAPS INDICATE THIS WHOLE EFFORT WAS FOR NAUGHT. THEY BOTH ARE CLONES OF THE CURRELT LD 4 & 13, WITH MINOR CHANGES TO SCREW UP THE COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST THAT HAVE BEEN JOINED FOREVER. I URGE YOU TO PLEASE RECONSIDER THIS DISASTROUS APPROACH AND KEEP OUR COMMUNITIES OF INTEREST TOGETHER, AS IN DRAFT MAP LD 0011.
12/13/2021 10:59:15	December 13, 2021	State legislative districts that include the City of Buckeye	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	The following priorities were developed by a working group made up of three councilmembers. First priorities for state redistricting are - •Using Interstate 10, State Route 85 and 303 as lines for legislative districts that include Buckeye so that communities of interest are not divided. For example, the communities of Festival, Verrado, historical Buckeye, Tartesso, and Sundance cannot be divided. •Prefer to be included in legislative districts with the cities of Goodyear and Litchfield Park. Support for this preference comes from 1.Buckeye's proximity to these cities, 2.Sharing critical communities of interest and 3.Our exploring sharing construction and use of infrastructure like water treatment facilities. •Out of respect for compactness and contiguity, Buckeye's preference is for any eastern boundary of our legislative districts not extend beyond Dysart Road. Secondary priorities for redistricting are - •Prefer for Buckeye to be in fewer legislative districts. If possible, for districts to connect to both the west valley and Yuma. •Northern boundary of legislative district that includes Buckeye should extend at least to the Patton Road alignment so that the legislative district can include new developments (what are the names of these developments?). Preferred plan/map - Yuma Gold/LD0057.
12/13/2021 11:01:29	December 13, 2021	Congressional districts	Linda Morenz	85750	self	Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I live in Catalina Foothills, Tucson. I work in Tucson, get medical care in Tucson and Oro Valley, shop in Tucson and Oro Valley. I consider myself part of the Tucson community I listened to the meetings last week. I was disappointed to hear the Chair, Erica Neuberg say at one point that she values communities of interest over competitive districts. The law describes both criteria as equal The work that was done last week made the districts, both legislative and congressional less competitive. There were many, many comments in the month-long public listening session requesting competitive districts. I also favor competitive districts. Competitive districts make a candidate responsive to more of the voters and to a greater range of ideas, and decreases extremism. I don't like the Eastern boundary of CD 7 being at Alvernon in Tucson. It should be at Campbell as recommended by Mayor Romero.

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 11:03:32	December 13, 2021	Congressional Draft Map 9.2	Chase Williams			The proposal to connect South Scottsdale and Tempe to Fountain Hills and other parts of the north valley is problematic. This move would split the Tempe Union High School District and do significant harm to the east valley community of interest. From Ahwatukee to Tempe is a clear community of interest - that school district has had the same congressional representation for two decades. Any attempt to split the district should be avoided.
12/13/2021 11:28:09	December 13, 2021	Public comments	Jeffrey Specter	85395	Self	The public review maps are terrible. There is very little roadway or other geographic reference information from which to pinpoint the map boundaries. SR-303, for example, is missing from some of the large-scale maps. In addition, I could not verify which map version is the final draft map(s). For example, is the final LD draft map version 11.3, 12.0, 12.1 or something else? Is the final CD draft map version 8.1 or something else? It appears that the IRC did a major about face with respect to final draft LD25 (11.3) and CD9 (8.1). Final draft LD map 11.3 seems to be entirely different from the draft LD map (10.0). The latest LD25 and CD9 maps run from Yuma to the West Valley. The previous LD map was entirely in the west valley, including much of Goodyear, Lichfield Park and Buckey. It did not include Yuma and Yuma County. The previous CD map did not include the City of Yuma. As such, the latest LD and CD maps do not respect the west valley communities of interest. Yuma is entirely different from the west valley. I have not, nor have many people in my west valley community have ever been to Yuma. In addition, the proposed LD25 11.3 map is not at all compact. The map also exceeds the ideal (evenly distributed) population by about 38%. The neighboring LD23, which includes Yuma, has a shortfall of about 33%. As such, the map violates several key redistricting criteria outlined in State law. The IRC should go back to the previous draft map for LD25. LD25 should certainly exclude the City of Yuma and Yuma County. Similarly, CD 9 should exclude the area in and around the City of Yuma. By the way, the last time I checked, the "English" Newsletter on the IRC website was in Spanish, not English. The "Spanish" newsletter was in Spanish. That is unacceptable.
12/13/2021 11:28:24	December 13, 2021	District 3	Nancy Ordowski	85268	My Self	Commissioners, There have been several changes to the maps, but District 3 has had few changes. First-please move the southwest boundary to a major street. I recommend Scottsdale Rd as the first choice, or Pima and last the 101. Currently this boundary runs up 96th street, which separates neighborhoods as 96 St is just a 2 lane street in a subdivision. This issue does not arise when a major road such as Scottsdale, Pima or the 101 are used as a boundary. Second-it is imperative to move Anthem into District 2 and Precincts Tatum and north into District 4. The traffic and community of interest are very different from those of us who live in the proposed District 3. The current map makes District 3 an excessively large district. Thank you Nancy Ordowski

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 12:35:25	December 13, 2021	III. Opportunity for Public Comments	Deborah Thalasitis	86303-5633	Self - Citizen	I am deeply concerned by the Chair and Commission's reliance on the preferences of elected officials and not the communities of interest in drawing maps. Per Prop 106 "Political party registration, voting history data and residences of incumbents and other candidates may not be used to create district maps." Relying on commentary by elected officials is illegal and does not follow the law. Certainly the IRC Chair, Erika Neuberg, has given the impression that she has been talking to elected officials about redistricting off the record. For example: In the December 6 meeting the Chair said that Yavapai Co. Supervisor Donna Michaels agreed that YC be kept "whole" because of the watershed. This is not true. Supervisor Michaels was the only supervisor to vote against a resolution by the Yavapai County Board of Supervisors to keep the county intact. Also during the December 6 meeting the Chair and others on the Commission referenced preferences of Mayor Regina Romero. In addition, there have been other meetings where the Chair has referenced a certain Mayor or political group and how they want the lines drawn. The chair is not listening to the public or considering public comment and instead attempting to placate elected officials. Why did the Commission have Community of Interest testimony if they do not listen to the public? I am again submitting my comment and preference for a map that does NOT keep all of Yavapai County in one District. The argument that we all share the same water source is ridiculous. This is not about water. And, even if that were true, it's better to have two advocates (from two different districts) than one. Yavapai is a broad and diverse County and redistricting should reflect that diversity while maintaining balance as required by law.
12/13/2021 12:53:46	December 13, 2021	Draft Maps - Legislative - Parks AZ	Ann Heitland	86004	self and friends in Parks	Please make the community of Parks, including Garland Prairie, whole rather than dividing it at I-40.
12/13/2021 13:05:43	December 13, 2021	Discussion on Map LD6 and LD7	Sandee McKinlay	85937	My Family	Your latest maps for LD6 and LD7 are completely unacceptable for our communities. Having one lean Republican and one lean Democrat is not good argument and unfair to both parties and the residents whose lives are invested there. Our children, our lifestyles, our communities deserve equal and fair representation! 71% D and 29% R nor 35% D and 65% R is equitable, period. They are both outside of competitive range. Understand this is a big undertaking, but you accepted the challenge, and are obligated to do better.

ARIZONA	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 13:07:41	December 13, 2021	7	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	Listening to the deliberations today on agenda item 7 for the East Valley of the merits of draft maps 12.0 and 12.1 - I would like the strongly recommend LD map 12.0 especially for the East Valley. I live in Chandler zip code 85248. One of the biggest problems with LD13 as it currently stands on draft map 10.0 is though it is compact and square, it goes against the many, many testimonies given at town halls and on the online public commenting system that Gilbert and Chandler shouldn't be divided up into the more than 2 districts. It makes sense that the east border the new LD13 and LD14 follow the boundaries of the cities of Gilbert and Chandler, and draft map 12.0 does this. Map 12.1 goes against the wishes of so many testimonies given that Gilbert should be kept Gilbert only. Using the city boundaries of Gilbert and Chandler does not harm competitiveness AND honors communities of interestas expressed at town halls and online comments. Draft map 12.1 also honors the Latino communities of north Chandler by keeping them within LD13, rather than dividing a large block of them into either LD12 or LD9. Keep Chandler Chandler... and that means following its northern border as Baseline following the City of Chandler boundaries and as draft map 12.0 does.
12/13/2021 13:08:16	December 13, 2021	State legislative districts	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	In map 12.0, the community of Verrado is split between districts 28 and 25. The residents of this community have been very vocal about wanting to stay in the same state legislative district.
12/13/2021 13:48:24	December 13, 2021	3	Jessica Ebel	86303	Prescott/Yavapai County	I have watched the last three final decision meetings and appreciate your efforts to include feedback from Arizona residents. I know it is impossible to make everyone happy, and I'm glad you are taking the time to hear everyone out and compromise. In regards to Northern Arizona, I am asking that you listen to input from these communities and honor the mandate to make our districts up here as competitive as possible while respecting the need for representation of our Native communities. I urge you to: -Keep Flagstaff separate from the Navajo Nation -Keep the Verde Valley whole and honor their request to be included with Flagstaff Thank you, Jessica Ebel

ARIZONA INDEPENDENT REDISTRICTING COMMISSION	12.13.21 Public Meeting Comments					
Timestamp	**Meeting Date**	**Agenda Item**	**First and Last Name**	**Zip Code**	**Representing**	**Comments**
12/13/2021 13:57:22	December 13, 2021	Ld6 LD7	Teena Parham	85933	Myself	I have lived in Heber-Overgaard for over thirty years. My husband has been here his whole life. H-O is governed by our county board of supervisors. I have seen first hand how being in a county that has reservation included keeps the other small communities from having a voice. The reservations have their own government called the Bureau of Indian Affairs. We have no say in their matters but they control our county by having a majority on the Board of Supervisors. We have a chance here to be properly represented. Only if we are put in a district that is reservation free and connected to only the rural communities of eastern Arizona. It has been proven time and time again. Our schools struggle for funding. Our kids have to live elsewhere to get decent paying jobs. Our taxes are different our economy is different. Our culture and traditions are different. We deserve a voice. We deserve a chance at having proper representation. Please don't put us in with areas that have nothing in common with what we have to face. Teena Parham [redacted] Overgaard Az 85933