

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 9:08:13	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Sarah Fanning	85248	myself	I ask that you please use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13, in particular to the north and east and not divide the Latino precincts away from downtown Chandler. North and South Chandler should be kept together. I also ask that you please reference what public comments/concerns you are addressing with suggested changes. By allowing comments made to personal cell phones be part of the conversation, you are elevating those within a position of power to influence the conversation. Just because I don't have the personal number of any of the commissioners does not make my thoughts any less relevant or valid. This transparency and equal access to the conversation is exactly why I ask that you keep districts as competitive as possible. Our Legislators should not become complacent and comfortable to only listening to those constituents with their personal phone numbers. They should be in competitive districts that force them to go out into the public and meet their community.
12/20/2021 9:18:49	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	laura sampson	85224	self	As a resident of North Chandler, I am requesting that the IRC use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 especially in the north and east of Chandler. Separating north Chandler will divide the COI Latino community in the north of Chandler in half. It is important to keep it whole within LD13. I believe the public deserves the IRC justify proposed changes by stating which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are fulfilling. It is disturbing to hear commissioners using non public requests to make changes.(for example, Commissioners Mehl and York moving of the city of Liberty) Decisions should be made using only requests entered into the public record.
12/20/2021 9:20:47	December 20, 2021	Agenda Item VI	Leslie Cox	85701	myself	The footprint of UofAZ as shown in https://:map.arizona.edu shows that nearly all of UofAZ lies west of Campbell & does not extend eastward beyond N Wilson Ave. The east boundary of CD7 need not go further east then Country Club to include UofAZ. I prefer the map which placed downtown in CD7 and UofAZ in CD6. It seemed the most balanced and fair representation for greater Tucson.
12/20/2021 9:20:51	December 20, 2021	Legislative Map LD6/LD7	Ann Heitland	86004	self	I've been mulling Commissioner Mehl's comment yesterday about Native Americans being able to elect representatives of their choice. And, I've become increasingly horrified. I understood him to say he would only do the morally right thing if the lawyers told him he had to. I guess I should have expected no more from today's Republican Party appointee.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 9:21:43	December 20, 2021	CD6/CD7	Linda Morenz	85750	Self	<p>Re CD6/CD7: The commission should honor Mayor Romero's request that the Eastern boundary of CD7 be Campbell Ave. East of Campbell, the UA "community of interest" (COI) extends randomly into Tucson and the unincorporated areas of Pima County. For example, my husband and I are both UA employees and live in Catalina Foothills. Most of my work friends live in the Foothills or other unincorporated areas around Tucson. There is no boundary within Tucson or Pima County that effectively delineates the UA COI.</p> <p>I have heard the commission give decision-making weight to the opinions of multiple mayors all over the state, to one City Councilwoman in Phoenix, even to private citizens who happen to have a direct line to commissioners. Why not give that same weight to the comments of the Mayor of one of the largest cities in Arizona? Put the Eastern boundary of CD7 at Campbell.</p> <p>The construct of communities of interest can be very nebulous and hard to prove or define. In the case of the CD6/CD7 boundary discussion the UA COI fits that description- hard to justify any particular line. So why not follow the Mayor's request? One fears that the attempt to move the boundary further East is actually partisan and an attempt to make CD6 less competitive. The majority of citizens speaking at the Listening Sessions favored competitive districts.</p>
12/20/2021 9:21:58	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Krista McKinney	85249	Self	<p>Please keep all of Chandler within the LD13 boundaries. The Latino community in northern Chandler should not be divided. Chandler unified school district is also an important group and should be contained in the same district. I would like to see more transparency in this process. Could the commissioners please relate their changes back to the constitutional requirements for the independent redistricting? I would like these comments to be entered in the public record so citizens like myself can read and understand them.</p>
12/20/2021 9:29:01	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft map decision discussion	Thomas Dusbabek	85249	Self	<p>As a Chandler resident I appeal to the Commissioners to please use the Chandler city boundaries for LD 13. This would keep the Latino community in North Chandler as a whole and not fragmented. I also appeal to the Commissioners, to provide full and complete transparency, stating on the record, which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are fulfilling as they justify the proposed changes. Thank you</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 9:35:37	December 20, 2021	Fair and competitive maps	Dr. Janet S. Twyman	86326		<p>We only move forward as a community, as a state, or as a nation when everyone's voices are heard. The work of the AIRC is hard. Creating "fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts" requires factual study, deep thought, open review, and putting aside personal or political perspectives. During the last decade the AIRC did just that, with maps that brought AZ acclaim as successfully resisting blatant, anti-democratic gerrymandering efforts. Please resist those same efforts now.</p> <p>As an AZ taxpayer and voter, I remind the Commissioners that the goal of the IRC is to approve "Fair and Competitive Maps." As directed in Prop 106 "Political party registration, voting history data and residences of incumbents and other candidates may not be used to create district maps." As much as possible, all the decisions of the AIRC must be made fairly and transparently across the state for every community in every district.</p> <p>The deliberations regarding Yavapai County are an example of why we are concern about AIRC actions. Over 60% of public commentary support keeping Flagstaff, Sedona, and the Verde Valley together. However, it is known that in the December 6 meeting AIRC Chair Erika Neuberg 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 YCBoS to keep the county intact. Relying on commentary by elected officials is illegal and does not follow the law. TRANSPARENCY is essential. It is apparent that the AIRC does not keep the public informed (and even seems to fail to keep each other informed). Such behavior reduces trust and confidence in the AIRC and its work.</p> <p>It is incumbent on the AIRC transparently and consistently apply the six constitutional criteria as equitably as possible, If some criteria are weighted more heavily than others, it is also incumbent on AIRC members to hold themselves and each other to the very highest level of transparency as to why they are emphasizing one criteria in one area and then not another. Anything else makes the AIRC's work suspect.</p> <p>I have grave concerns about the proposed legislative draft maps that do not form fair, competitive districts. Every time a new line is drawn, it must be accompanied by a clear and concise rationale that reinforces the "fair and competitive" mandate. IRC participation requires professionalism, including allowing fellow commissioners to finish their statement — without interruption of statements such as "Don't try to convince me." With due respect I ask: Isn't that an IRC's commissioner's role, to be convinced with clear evidence that a map represents an area fairly and competitively?</p> <p>I strongly urge the commission to transparently and consistently follow the constitutional process to draw fair and competitive districts.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 9:38:47	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Lauren Kuby	85282	self	<p>1. I think it essential that you use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 (especially in the north and east of Chandler)</p> <p>2. Please do not split the Latino community in the north of Chandler-- keep the Latino community whole within LD13.</p> <p>3. In the interests of transparency, it is important that the Commissioners state which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are using when they advocate for a change to the districts.</p>
12/20/2021 9:44:26	December 20, 2021	CD map11.1	Eileen Hollowell	85704	myself	I live in South Oro Valley. I am concerned that I am being pushed into CD6 because as he did with LD 11 Commissioner Mehl is trying to gerrymander Southern Arizona districts into Republican sure seats. I want to live in a competitive congressional and legislative district that reflects my many ties to the City of Tucson.
12/20/2021 9:56:57	December 20, 2021	General	Katherine Updegraff	85623	Myself	This plan for LD 17, version 12.1, represents blatant gerrymandering that the commission was created to prevent. It doesn't meet the continuous requirement, the communities of interest requirement, nor the competitive requirement (which all districts should be!). Instead, it eliminates ANY chance for anyone, other than a Republican, to hold office. Can't Republicans win or stay in office any other way besides outright cheating!?
12/20/2021 10:02:54	December 20, 2021	III	Margaret Cawley	85281	Self	<p>Overall, I am looking at East Valley legislative districts. I have lived in Tempe for 26 years, zip code 85281.</p> <p>* I am concerned about Hispanics communities of interest in LD 13 and LD 12. Moving LD13 north into LD12 will help this community of interest.</p> <p>*Please respect Chandler and Gilbert's boundaries. Also, Tempe's eastern boundary should be included in LD8 and LD12.</p> <p>*Unify Scottsdale Business district by moving north boundary to Camelback.</p> <p>*Move LD9 boundary to Rio Salado Parkway for balancing population.</p>
12/20/2021 10:04:54	December 20, 2021	Map 15.0	Kelly Rael	85901	The White Mountains	Our 2 tribal state reps have passed 24 bills that only effect tribal lands. Again, ZERO representation off tribal lands. Don't do this to the white mountains please.
12/20/2021 10:05:28	December 20, 2021	VI	Leonard Gorman	86515	Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission	Navajo Nation submitted another tweak to AIRC mapping. This time the Navajo tweak is LD6 in Version 14. This map was submitted on December 19, 2021 at 9:30 a.m. It is important to adopt LD6 with a minimum of 57% Native American Voting Age Population (18+ NH Indian). It is preferred that the LD6 achieve 60% NAVAP but AIRC does not seem to be interested in making a policy decision to allow LD6 to go below -5% deviation to achieve the 60% NAVAP. Do not add the entire City of Flagstaff to LD6 (splitting Flagstaff is supported by Navajo leadership); keep Navajo, White Mountain and San Carlos Apaches, Havasupai, Hualapai, Hopi and Kaibab Paiute together in LD6.
12/20/2021 10:08:27	December 20, 2021	Shift from CD 7 to CD 6	George Whitmill	85611	Sonoita-Elgin Community Group	Please move the Sonoita Elgin community to CD 6 to align with our community of interest.



Public Meeting Comments 12.20.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 10:09:25	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Paula Feely	85286	Self	I have lived in Chandler for over 10 years and worked for the Chandler Unified School District for 8 years. I would like to request that you respect the city boundaries of Chandler to the greatest extent possible when establishing the LD boundaries, and specifically that you keep the part of Chandler that is north of Ray Road with the rest of the city. My son went to a Chandler school that was north of Ray Road, and when I worked at Willis Junior High, many of our students lived north of Ray Road. Please extend the northern boundary of LD13 in order to keep our community as whole as possible.
12/20/2021 10:09:43	December 20, 2021	going forward	Lynne Hudson	85704	self	Once the R and D maps are tweaked, I encourage you do analyses for VRA and competitiveness before choosing one over the other.
12/20/2021 10:16:27	December 20, 2021	CD 6 and CD 8 Maps	Kathleen Crockett	85611	Self	Please move the communities of Elgin, Canelo and Sonoita into D6. Our community of interest is NOT Western Santa Cruz County. Our community of interest is aligned with Cochise County. Most people here rely on Sierra Vista for shopping, entertainment, and doctor's appointments. West SCC is focused on the Produce Industry; however, East SCC depends upon wineries and tourism for most our businesses. As such, this aligns closely with the interests of Cochise County, not Santa Cruz County. Making this move would then align our LD and our CD.
12/20/2021 10:20:53	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Rich Feely	85286	Chandler Resident	<p>I strongly encourage the commission to the use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13. Especially in the north and east of Chandler. Keeping the Chandler city boundary as much as possible for LD 13 prevents division of the Latino community near downtown Chandler while keeping Chandler united from north to south. Extensive public commentary has repeatedly advocated for this outcome within Chandler. Population balancing with a Chandler-centric LD 13 is easily achieved without impacting LD maps outside of the East Valley.</p> <p>Chandler is home for an emerging Arizona economy that moves away from shopping and tourism (like Scottsdale) to national defense, software development and semiconductor chip manufacturing. Picking districts tied to shopping malls and retail "entrepreneurs" reflects the Arizona of the past. Ensuring effective legislative representation for Chandler is not only good for Chandler residents, but for the entire state's economy.</p>
12/20/2021 10:30:50	December 20, 2021	VI Draft Map Decision Discussion	George Diaz	85326	City of Buckeye	Thank you for making the changes to District 25. We appreciate you hearing and acting on our concerns.
12/20/2021 10:35:24	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Swati Ghosh	85284	self	I am requesting the Commissioners use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 especially in the north and east of Chandler. Please do not divide the Latino community in the north of Chandler in half, keep it whole within LD13. I also request that the Commissioners justify their proposed changes to maps ON THE RECORD explaining which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are fulfilling. The changes should ONLY be made using requests entered into the PUBLIC RECORD for full transparency.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 10:43:13	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Angela Willeford	85256	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community does NOT support moving Phoenix Indian Medical Center into D3 from D1. Notably the Indian Health Service and SRPMIC are partnering on a new health facility in the SRPMIC that will work closely with the Phoenix Indian Medical Center. Therefore we believe the PIMC should remain in CD1.
12/20/2021 10:56:07	December 20, 2021	Draft map 15.0 discusson	Carol Maas	85248	myself	Live in Sun Lakes and would be a resident of the proposed LD 13. I don't understand why the proposed draft map 12.0.1 is not being used. This draft map 15.0 continues to divide Chandler into part of LD 13 and part of LD 12. It isn't addressing 1) equal populations as LD 12 is over and LD 13 is under, 2) it divides the Latino community in Chandler into LD 13 and 12, 3) it is hardly contiguous in LD 12 putting multiple cities into one, and 4) doesn't make LD 12 or 13 any more competitive. I would really like to understand what this Commission is trying to achieve with Map 15 regarding these 2 LDs. It would be appreciated to know what is being better addressed by Map 15 and is an improvement for the East Valley over Map 12.0.1. Thank you!
12/20/2021 11:32:50	December 20, 2021	Redistricting maps	Renee Kirkpatrick	85704	self and Arizona community	As a native Tucsonan, I am asking this commission to adopt test map v9.0 for district 17, as it is clearly the only map addressing competitive, compact and contiguous aspects of our community as required by Arizona legal requirements. Our state is a diverse community with a growing Latino population, and historically, Latino and Indigenous voices have been minimized or even silenced. It is time all of Arizonans have a voice in our government, and your commission is tasked with such an endeavor. Arizonans are counting on you. Thanks
12/20/2021 11:33:57	December 20, 2021	Public comments	Jeffrey Specter	85395	self	The IRC is proposing to place PebbleCreek and other parts of Goodyear into LD29 Draft 15.0. Draft Map 15 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. The OIC should adopt LD25 Draft Map 10.0. It properly includes Pebblecreek with other West Valley communities of interest including Litchfield Park and Verrado in Buckeye. These communities are all affected by overflights from Luke AFB.
12/20/2021 11:40:06	December 20, 2021	3	Tom Best	85281	self	Thank you for considering my prior comments. As a 26 year resident of Tempe I would like to keep my city as compact a district as possible. A fair compromise would be Tempe in two districts but not three. I would like to emphasize changing the LD8/LD12 border from Superstition Freeway to Southern Ave. Maybe this would help with population balance and maintain communities of interest. Thank you for your work.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 11:40:31	December 20, 2021	Map criteria	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	<p>The League of Women Voters of Arizona has been consistent in its position that the map criteria should be applied equally and consistently, with competitive districts being favored when there is no significant detriment per the Arizona Constitution. We understand that the Commissioners are struggling to balance the criteria, but you must remember that the courts have said the criteria are equally important.</p> <p>To date communities of interest (COI) has been treated as the most important criteria by Chairwoman Neuberger and other Commissioners, which we believe is contrary to the constitution. Often COI is used without clearly defining what makes a particular neighborhood a community of interest that fits with adjacent areas.</p> <p>In previous in-person and written testimony, the League discussed the definition of communities of interest for redistricting purposes.</p> <p>People who reside in the same community are likely to shop, dine, worship, and socialize together, but that's not what necessarily defines them as a Community of Interest for the purpose of drawing voting districts. Your voting district does not determine where you shop, dine, worship, or socialize. You are free to cross voting district lines for such personal activities.</p> <p>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 health care or educational facilities, public safety, water shortages, access to broadband, and their economic interests such as mining, agriculture, and tourism.</p> <p>Placing citizens with such common concerns in the same voting districts serves multiple purposes. It focuses their attention where it should be--on problem solving and solutions. It amplifies their voices in Congress and the Arizona Legislature. And it increases their chances of getting needed resources for their district.</p> <p>It does not mean that everyone in the district should have the same opinions or partisan point of view. That would be a safe district.</p> <p>It was encouraging to hear Chairwoman Neuberger remind commissioners today of the need to address constitutional requirements when making changes to balance population and to otherwise tweak the current draft maps. We remind the commissioners of their responsibility to address ALL of the map criteria as defined by Prop 106 and the Arizona Constitution.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.20.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 11:59:14	December 20, 2021	Communications directly to individual commissioners	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	<p>Frequently in the last few weeks, individual Commissioners have quoted from or referred to letters sent directly to them from groups, public officials, and others. Recommendations from those letters have been used to adjust CD or LD lines. The League is not aware that these communications have been made public or included in any of the published public comments. This is contrary to the requirement that the redistricting process should be open and public. When and where will these letters and communications be made public?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/20/2021 12:03:38	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Rebecca Ong	85297	myself	<p>I live in Layton Lakes precinct, which is in Gilbert but our children attend Chandler public schools. The redistricting commissioners should follow the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 and keep the Latino community in north Chandler together in LD13. Our communities and the interests of our public schools deserve to have clear representation in the state legislature and not to be split to serve as token ballast for other districts.</p> <p>And in the interest of transparency, I ask that all commissioners, particularly Commissioners York and Mehl, to please cite for the public record which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are fulfilling with all their proposed changes and to point to where in the public record the proposed changes came from. It is concerning that during the week of December 13, 2021, Commissioners York and Mehl would state that their private cell phones were "inundated" by phone calls from residents of Liberty, Arizona and that these unverified comments, later revealed to be the commissioners' own personal changes, would serve as justification for the commissioners' own proposed changes. The Independent Redistricting Commission, after all, would and should want to preserve the sanctity of the public consultation period.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 12:11:36	December 20, 2021	LD17 Redistricting	Jeff Howell	85749	Tanque Verde & East Tucson	<p>FOR CHAIR NEUBERG,</p> <p>I don't see how LD17 is being allowed to move forward. It clearly goes against the communities of interest and, more importantly, continuity. I would love for Chair Neuberg to give other examples of districts being drawn where one physically has to drive through other districts to get back to their own. She's changed her mind on what COI means. In some areas she claims shopping and services is a COI. For LD17 she now claims this region disenfranchises Republican voters. (That is not a requirement to be considered in Prop 106). But then she feels Tanque Verde and East Tucson/Houghton is bound by water rights issues? She should know Houghton Corridor and most of Tanque Verde is in the city of Tucson. And how does Saddlebrook, Oro Valley or Marana have anything to do with water?</p> <p>I suspect there will be some type of lawsuit engaged over this LD17 drawn district. LD Map 9.0 was the most accurate representation. The commission should go back to that map. And if anything...Tanque Verde and east Houghton should be linked with LD19 if Mehl is dead set against it being in LD18. I live in Tanque Verde I frequent Houghton and Vail 100% of the time. I have not been to Oro Valley and Marana in nearly 7 years. And never been to Saddlebrook and I've lived here 50 years. THIS IS WRONG, chair Neuberg. You're being given misinformation from Mehl and almost all of your public comments opposed this annexation into LD17. Your one voice is will hurt our Tanque Verde community for a decade.</p> <p>Not to mention...you should have immediately withdrawn Mehl's version of the LD map (you adopted) because it was submitted by a political party. I'm just shocked at your partisanship.</p>
12/20/2021 12:21:12	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map Decision Discussion	Jennifer Palmer	85224	Self	<p>As a resident of Chandler, I am requesting that the Commissioners use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13, especially in the north and east of Chandler, and that they don't split the Latino community in the north of Chandler in half, but keep it whole within LD13.</p> <p>I also ask that the Commissioners justify their proposed changes to maps on the record, stating which of the 6 constitutional criteria they are fulfilling, and that changes should only be made using requests entered into the public record for full transparency.</p>
12/20/2021 12:24:07	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Allen Carlson	85225	self	<p>I have lived in Chandler for over 20 years. I respectfully request that the Commissioners use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD 13 especially in the north and east of Chandler. Also, don't split the Latino community - keep north and south together within LD 13. Friendly reminder - If it's not broke don't fix it.</p> <p>I also request, in the spirit of full transparency, that the Commissioners justify any proposed changes to the maps in the record as well as how the maps and / or changes fulfill the 6 constitutional requirements, and that changes only be made based on requests entered into the public record.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 12.20.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 12:32:07	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Lauren Kuby	85282	self	I live in Tempe and suggest that: 1) Please move the border between D8 and D12 North to Southern Ave at Rural Rd to keep Friendship Village in D12, which is a better fit for this retiree community with many retirees that came from Ahwatukee. 2) Please move the NW border of D9 to Rio Salado Pkwy to keep Riverview Park in D9 3) Please move the Lehi area to D10 because the Mormon community there is a community of interest with East Mesa 4) Please move Tempe out of D9 and place Tempe in D8 and D12. Tempe is used to be divided into two districts but three districts disrupts a well-defined community of interest.
12/20/2021 12:34:04	December 20, 2021	Draft Map	Kelly Rael		Myself	I love love love love love the new 12.0. map! Looks Great!
12/20/2021 12:58:45	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion"	Katherine Doman Sheydayi	85296	Self	I want to use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 - especially in the north and east of Chandler. It is vital to keep the entire Latino community whole within LD13. Also, the Commissioners should justify their proposed changes to maps on the record, stating which of the six constitutional criteria they are fulfilling in their proposed changes. Changes should only be made using requests entered into the public record for full transparency. Thank you.
12/20/2021 13:01:10	December 20, 2021	Redistricting Maps	Redistricting Maps	85263	Myself	Please remove the Deer Valley airport area from LD3 and add it to LD2. Desert Ridge and Deer Valley airpark do not belong with Scottsdale or Fountain Hills CD1 should stay as is. Please do not add urban PHX but keep Cave Creek and Carefree in CD 1. Respectfully, Jim & Janis Flavin

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 13:02:54	December 20, 2021	LD Districts	Linda Morenz	85750	Self	<p>I feel strongly that LD17 is a mistake in the current map. The map 9.0 was much better, a competitive district with more logical communities of interest. I did hear that the commission won't be continuing to discuss LD17, but as long as these maps are not final I will continue to comment.</p> <p>At the initial public meetings, a large group of what could be classified as partisans, wearing colors of a political party or clothing with political slogans declared that they were a community of interest wanting to be separate from Tucson which prompted the creation of LD17 (there were also other partisan factors behind that move as was later revealed by public records requests). In a subsequent public listening session on Dec. 4, hundreds of citizens declared the opposite – that such a community of interest did not exist and they asked for the district to be drawn as in version 9.0. Why was one group said to represent a true COI and the other ignored? How do we know that a COI exists? I see partisan interests in these public comments, but not a consensus that there is a separate COI. In such a situation the best way to decide that question would be to make a competitive district so that voters on either side would have a chance to make their case. The chair of the commission states that she sees "communities of interest that have such political cohesion" and interests separate from Tucson. Again, that is a matter of opinion. A competitive district would allow these interest groups to compete with other equally valid interest groups and let the voters, not the Redistricting Commission, decide. Also, if the differences are local, such as water rates, the state legislature is not the way to solve a local issue.</p>
12/20/2021 13:20:32	December 20, 2021	LD District Comments	Jeff Howell	85749	Myself	<p>I don't appreciate Chair Neuberg consistently berating Commissioner Lerner's comments and changes. Each time, Lerner's makes CLEAR why she's changing an area and what the criteria is constitutionally. Then Neuberg criticizes her? Yet Neuberg gives no comments to Mehl WHATSOEVER when he suggests changes and he offers zero reasons for his suggestions. I find this completely unacceptable. Go back and watch the videos and you'll see this.</p>
12/20/2021 13:50:19	December 20, 2021	Legislative District	Merissa Hamilton	85022		<p>In LD2, the area south of Thunderbird and west of the i17 is metro center north. The demographics of this area are specific and more diverse than the rest of the LD2 district. This community of interest would be better served staying with the Metro Center mall area as they will soon have access to light rail. A less ideal, but alternative situation that gives them superior representation in LD27.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 13:56:35	December 20, 2021	VI	Tempest Shires	85248	Myself	<p>I urge the Commissioners to use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 especially in the north and east of Chandler.</p> <p>If the many testimonies from Gilbert residents have been honoured, this should not be to the detriment of Chandler, dividing us up for the sake of "compactness" and dividing Chandler's communities of interest.</p> <p>I disagree with Chair Neuberg that the cities of Chandler and Gilbert being well-served by the current shapes of LD13 and LD14. Gilbert was improved but to the detriment of Chandler.</p> <p>We heard multiple times in multiple town halls that Gilbert wanted to be kept as whole as possible, but recently Commissioner York decided to include a new NE corner onto LD13 that included MORE not less of Gilbert above the 202 BACK into LD13 with Chandler. Please DO NOT include Gilbert within LD13.</p> <p>Chair Neuberg says that local leaders have said they are happy with LD13, but I believe Mayor Hartke was talking about not removing Sun Lakes from being with Chandler, not that LD13 should cut straight through the older Latino areas of north Chandler. Also Councilman Matt Orlando has written to the Commission asking that Chandler be kept together. There are also over 300 comments on the IRC public commenting dashboard requesting that Chandler be kept as whole as possible and most comments include the City of Chandler boundaries.</p> <p>Please use the City of Chandler boundaries for LD13 and do not split Chandler's Latino communities in the north of Chandler from LD13.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
12/20/2021 14:03:59	December 20, 2021	Legislative Map	Trey Terry	85395	Agua Fria Union High School District	<p>My name is Trey Terry and I serve on the Governing Board of the Agua Fria Union High School District. I just wanted to draw your attention to my district in the west valley and small neighborhoods LD map 15.0 currently splits, especially in Goodyear. The Palm Valley neighborhood is split. Portions of the Pebble Creek retirement community are split. This can be resolved by moving the southern boundary of D29 south to at least I-10. This keeps communities together and will give Goodyear a stronger voice in D29. D23, a VRA district that is currently overpopulated, needs to lose that population north of I-10. This is a simple, common-sense fix to that issue that will unite important communities in the city of Goodyear, and my school district. Thank you.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 14:08:24	December 20, 2021	Mapping	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Communities of Interest are groups with bonds that extend deeper and further than a common hobby or pastime - that means the maps should strongly consider populations that have shared public policy concerns and communities that share commonalities in regard to their language of choice or status as an ethnic minority group. Partisan affiliation is not the basis for a community of interest. •Competitiveness and communities of interest can coexist. Too often, competitiveness is being sacrificed in favor of groups that don't actually constitute communities of interest (groups that haven't substantiated public policy concerns that warrant being considered together). •The Voting Rights Act is the only criteria that does not contain a qualifier - it is not a criteria to be applied 'as practicable' - and it is concerning that discussion of application of the VRA is held in executive session. The IRC should publish to the public its strategy for VRA compliance, just as IRC 2.0 was required to do when it submitted its maps to DOJ for pre-clearance. <p>Comparing the mapping results regarding competitive districts to the results in 2011 is comparing apples to oranges. The State of Arizona has changed dramatically from a political standpoint in the last ten years. The number of independents has grown significantly as well as the percentage of latino residents. This is now a purple state and that should be reflected in the number of competitive districts which should be significantly higher than ten years ago.</p>
12/20/2021 14:19:10	December 20, 2021	LD Maps	Daniel Schwartzstein	85254		Desert Ridge should not be in proposed district 4. The majority of district 4 is more aligned and shares common interests with Arcadia/Old Town than it is with the area north of the 101.
12/20/2021 14:46:24	December 20, 2021	Legislative Districts	Kim Owens	85396	self	<p>This is no doubt a grueling task and you have been at it for months - it is appreciated - however the final decision will be ours to live with for 10 years. Time and again we have heard of the importance of keeping school districts together. Yet Litchfield Elementary District (LESD) is currently in four different LD's per map 15; 23, 23, 25, and 29 - that include four different counties. The majority of voters affecting LESD would be from outside of Maricopa County and as far away as the southern and western boundaries of our state. Please mitigate this complete disruption of this community of interest by at least moving LD29 to the southern border at I-10. That would at the least keep the majority of LESD in one district, and in Maricopa County. LD23 is overpopulated by about 4500 and this is a great location to offset some of the overage and keep LESD as a community of interest, via a contiguous and compact district.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
12/20/2021 15:01:26	December 20, 2021	Final redistricting maps	Nohl Rosen	85390	Self	One again, I'd like to ask why you won't put Wickenburg in LD5 and CD2? We need to be in those districts together. LD30 and CD9 doesn't work for us. We have no common interest with the communities you have in it. We have more in common with the nearby communities in LD5 and CD2.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 15:06:05	December 20, 2021	LD Mapping RE LD15.0 Chairman, LD1 (Maricopa County)anges today	Cathy Schwanke	85086	My Anthem-New River-Desert Hills PHOENIX community	<p>Map changes to 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 [Anthem-New River-Desert Hills] 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 or SOUTH OF CAREFREE HWY. Carefree and Cave Creek areas are fine to be included with Scottsdale. 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. Don't split away Anthem from NR/DH. I live in Desert Hills and our Post Office and Walmart are in Anthem. We are community. We are Phoenix. Please don't split us and don't put New River-Desert Hills and area south of Carefree Hwy near I-17 in D3!!</p> <p>Map CD11.1 PERFECTLY REPRESENTS our area since we are in DVUSD and do business along the I-17 corridor. WHY IS THE LD MAP THE TOTAL OPPOSITE??? Please make the LD map represent us like the CD 11.1 map does. BOTH OUR REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS AGREE AND TESTIFIED TO THIS. Sincerely, Cathy Schwanke 85086</p>
12/20/2021 15:21:12	December 20, 2021	VI	Cathy Lee	85209	self	Gilbert Unified School District goes all the way to Signal Butte & to Guadalupe running east and west which you have split up
12/20/2021 15:23:45	December 20, 2021	East Valley Legislative Districts (redistricting maps)	Scharlyn Wiliams	85248	Self	Please stop: opportunity for GERRYMANDERING: for political gains. All districts should have equal political party representation.
12/20/2021 15:42:38	December 20, 2021	Redistricting maps	Anastasia Travers	85048	myself	<p>I would like to respectfully request the Commissioners justify their proposed changes to maps on the record, stating which of the 6 constitutional criteria you are fulfilling.</p> <p>I would like to add that in the spirit of full transparency changes should only be made using requests entered into the public record.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>
12/20/2021 15:43:19	December 20, 2021	LD6 and 7	Sandee McKinlay	85937	WM	Not a compromise to disenfranchise any of the White Mountains! Flagstaff is better suited as community of interest. You are creating a minority without representation for another decade. They have never represented the White Mountains. Leave WM together. Include Flagstaff with the Navajo Nation. Why is no one talking about the 100's of citizens sending in comments that will receive zero support legislatively. We will seek legal counsel.
12/20/2021 15:55:22	December 20, 2021	LD6 and Ld7	Taylor Fields	85937	My community	I hear so much pandering to the Native Americans. It sounds like WM voices don't matter. Residents have suffered with Native representation or lack of! Leave WM together.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
12/20/2021 15:57:08	December 20, 2021	VI. Draft Map decision discussion	Rex Armstrong	85249	Myself	Please don't divide the Latino community in the north of Chandler and put them in half I wish you could keep it whole within LD13. I feel that this measure will weaken their vote as a district. What is the justification for these changes to the district maps? I think there are 6 constitutional criteria, which one or ones are you fulfilling?
12/20/2021 16:00:30	December 20, 2021	VI. DRAFT MAP DECISION DISCUSSION	Alison Jorda	85233	Myself	I continue to be disturbed by the square nature of legislative district that contains some, but not all, of Chandler. I am bothered by this because it does NOT follow the Chandler City limits in the north or the east. These areas contain more Latino communities. By excluding them from LD13, you are dividing and diluting the influence of the Latino community. This is contrary to the Voting Rights Act. Please remedy this.
12/20/2021 16:27:37	December 20, 2021	LD26 boundaries and CD request	Timothy Schwartz	85301	Many members and residents in current LD30	I live inside the area currently known as LD30 which will become LD26. Thank you for all the work that's been done on the maps. I see a vast improvement! There is however one area that I believe still needs attention. Several of the precincts are split in half by the I-17 freeway. That's always been a sore spot, and has not been corrected with the new maps. The Black Canyon freeway is a Natural boundary. Our new legislative District should be West of the Freeway and the small strip that's East of the freeway should be included in the district that is East of the freeway. Once again, the freeway is a natural boundary and truly divides. I believe Communities of interest have been affected by this boundary and should not be forced to ask why they are separated from the larger group which is on the West side of this boundary. Finally, CD 3 needs to include Glendale, and the areas of Alhambra and Encanto. These are central Phoenix neighborhoods and they belong in a central Phoenix district. They do not belong with North Phoenix or Scottsdale
12/20/2021 16:44:38	December 20, 2021	Draft Map Discussion	Alison Porter	85283	self	The vote against the logical statements made for map 12.0 are extremely difficult to understand. AZ voters are not being represented with that decision