APPENDIX XIII

Written Public Testimony and Letters
"This is an official elections map. It supercedes any previously dated map of the same description. Canyon County makes no warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of this map. Canyon County assumes no liability for direct, indirect, special, or consequential damages resulting from the use or misuse of this map or any of the information contained herein."
November 2, 2021

Idaho Legislative Redistricting Commission

Dear Co-Chairs,

Upon review of proposed map L-02, the Bannock County Board of Commissioners has some concerns. Specifically, the division of the Highland Hill and exclusion of the Monte Vista and upper Center Street area from Legislative District 29 and inclusion of the Indian Hills area would give pause to the legitimacy of the map under Idaho law. We are concerned that the proposed map does not preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest, and may have been divided to protect a particular political party. If these apparent issues are not addressed, the Bannock County Board of Commissioners may seek legal action if the Board determines it is appropriate.
This map was submitted under the title “Treasure Valley by City 2 3” on 9/15/21.

This map creates 14 districts (districts 10 thru 23) out of the three southwest counties of Idaho (Canyon, Ada, & Owyhee). These three counties are within the Treasure Valley and share Cities, School Districts, Civic Organizations, etc. It is my testimony that these three counties could be and should be grouped together when dividing the districts evenly. Additionally, the city boundaries of Star, Nampa, Kuna, and Melba all split the county line between Canyon and Ada Counties. It is my testimony that currently these cities split their representation base on a county line. It should be acceptable for the legislative voting districts to be reapportioned to cross county lines/borders to reunite these cities for the purpose of representation and voting. In the attached map, the city of Star is contained entirely in District 14 (both Canyon and Ada Counties), the cities of Kuna and Melba are also largely made whole in District 22 (both Canyon and Ada Counties) by crossing the county borders.

This map reapportion districts based on population centers (cities). Boise & Garden City are apportioned 4 districts. Meridian is apportioned 3 districts. Eagle is apportioned 1 district. Star is apportioned 1 district. Kuna & Melba are apportioned 1 district. Nampa is apportioned 2 districts, Caldwell is apportioned 1 district, and the rural cities of Canyon County and the County of Owyhee are apportioned the final district. As a point of personal privilege, I would like to note that I live at a Kuna, ID mailing address but that my kids are within the legal boundaries of the Melba School District. So, we live in Kuna but go to school play sports and go to church in Melba. We are in-between these two communities and share many social, professional, farming/dairy, and religious connections between both cities. It is my experience that these two communities are well integrated and would be well served voting together in a district (District 22 on this map).

I have seen a fair number of maps to-date reapportioning the rural and farming communities of Ada County to District 23 with Owyhee County. I am a dairyman and we dairy just south of Kuna, ID. On maps where this is suggested, my diary, the 7 neighboring dairymen, their families, and all of the neighboring farmers would no longer vote with the city of Kuna. Likewise, the new neighborhoods recently developed on the south side of Kuna would be reapportioned away from Kuna would no longer vote together with the city. It is my testimony that the entire City of Kuna and surrounding
dairies and farmers should be left intact to vote and be represented together. It is not necessary to split us by neither voting precincts nor by county lines.

My final point of testimony is regarding Congressional District maps. I have submitted a few draft maps for consideration. One map divides the state East and West while the other divides it North and South. I do not have a strong opinion on either of these maps but do note that satisfactory maps can be created without dividing counties. If the commission prefers to continue to split Ada County then it seems to me to be an easy division once the Legislative District map is finalized. In this instance, I believe districts could and should remain intact and not be split.

Entire View of Canyon, Ada, and Owyhee Counties
Zoomed In Map with City Boundaries Highlighted
Zoomed in Map without Cities Boundaries Highlighted
November 2, 2021

Bart Davis, Co-Chair  
Dan Schmidt, Co-Chair  
Tom Dayley, Commissioner  
Nels Mitchell, Commissioner  
Amber Pence, Commissioner  
Eric Redman, Commissioner  
Idaho Commission for Reapportionment  
Idaho State Capitol  
700 W. Jefferson  
Boise, ID 83702

RE: Canyon County’s Comments on Commission for Reapportionment Plan

Dear Co-Chairs and Commissioners:

On October 22, 2021, Ada County, with the support of Canyon County Elected Officials, submitted proposed plan L072 to the Idaho Commission for Reapportionment (“Reapportionment Commission”). As noted in the letter that accompanied our response to L072, the Reapportionment Commission was charged to follow specific guidelines (outlined below) found in Idaho Code. The plan was to be drafted in order to keep cities and communities of interest whole rather than reapportioning to protect incumbency or partisan designations. Canyon County is disappointed that the Reapportionment Commission declined to utilize the Ada/Canyon proposal and instead supported L02. Canyon County, like Ada County, believes that the L02 proposed plan is constitutionally and statutorily flawed. We strongly oppose using L02 and urge the Reapportionment Commission to adopt the L072 plan agreed upon by two of Idaho’s largest and fastest growing counties, Ada and Canyon.

As you are aware, there is a hierarchy of requirements that govern redistricting plans. The intent of the statute compared with the impact of L02 is as follows:

Intent:
1. I.C. 72-1506(2) states...To the maximum extent possible, districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.

Impact:
L02 disrupts our current traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest. The proposed boundary lines in L02 encroach on areas of high density and commerce...
that are clearly outside the neighboring county's jurisdiction thereby minimizing local representation.

**Intent:**

2. I.C. 72-1506(4) states...To the maximum extent possible, the plan should avoid drawing districts that are oddly shaped.

**Impact:**

The LO2 has a number of "odd" designs including LD9 which puts a portion of Middleton into Payette County;
LD15 mixes Kuna's urban area with a portion of Canyon County as well as portions of Ada and Owyhee Counties;

**Intent:**

3. I.C. 72-1506 (5) states...division of counties shall be avoided whenever possible. In the event that a county must be divided, the number of divisions, per county should be kept to a minimum.

**Impact:**

LO2 proposes mixing one of the fastest growing cities in the State, Meridian, with a slice of Canyon County's commercial buildings whose population totals 1,125 people.
Multiple counties are involved in cross-border scenarios that create significant issues for elections and remove local representation for constituents in the legislature.

Ada and Canyon Counties are two of the fastest growing counties in Idaho. LO2 proposes to divide these urban, growing communities of interest and mix them with rural, sparsely populated neighboring counties.

The Reapportionment Committee fails to maintain traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest. To forestall litigation, the Canyon County Board of Commissioners and Elected Officials, in conjunction with Ada County, urge you to reconsider adopting LO2. We recommend you adopt the Ada/County proposal, L072 or a comparable proposal that meets equal protection and county division requirements and complies with the statutory requirement of keeping neighborhoods and local communities of interest intact.

Thank you for your thoughtful reconsideration of the impacts to Canyon County.

Sincerely,

CANYON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Leslie Van Beek
Keri K. Smith
Pam White

CANYON COUNTY TREASURER

Tracie Lloyd

CANYON COUNTY ASSESSOR

Brian R. Stender
CANYON COUNTY CLERK

Chris Yamamoto

Chris Yamamoto
My name is Cindy Jesinger and for the past 36 years, I have owned a home in Blaine County. My husband, Rick, and I have been actively involved in our community for many of those years. My remarks do not consider the district lines in other regions of our state since I lack adequate knowledge to address them.

In reviewing the proposed legislative district maps through L45 as posted on the Idaho Commission for Redistricting’s website, I observed that numerous proposals include combining Blaine County with a variety of 21 of Idaho’s remaining 43 counties to create a district. Blaine’s proposed county partners include Adams, Bingham, Boise, Butte, Camas, Clark, Custer, Elmore, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lemhi, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Power, Teton, Valley and Washington counties.

Tonight, I speak in favor of maps such as L1, which create a legislative district of Blaine, Jerome, and Lincoln Counties. While several other maps (L10, L27, L30, L34, L37, L41, L42, L43, L44 and L47) combine the three counties, given my lack of knowledge of other parts of our state, I will use L1 for my remarks.

In reviewing the Legislative Redistricting Guidelines for the Idaho Commission for Redistricting, L1 meets the first six requirements, including the foremost, drawing 35 districts that are substantially equal in population, with no more that a 10% population variance between the least and most populated districts. L1, with a population variance of 9.58%, meets this standard. Perhaps there could be a configuration for the remainder of the state that would provide a smaller deviation, but a district including Blaine, Jerome and Lincoln Counties would have a population variance of a very respectable 2.07%.

A second requirement is that, to the greatest extent possible, the commission should avoid dividing a county so that one part of the county is in one district and the other part of the county is in another district. To meet the aforementioned requirement of equal population, there must be some divisions, given the population of Idaho counties. L1 has minimal splits, unlike L11, L12, L14, L15, L16, L25, L26, and L31 which unnecessarily split Minidoka, Jerome and Gooding Counties or provide for an unnecessary third split in Twin Falls County. Indeed, four maps (L32, L35, L36, L39) split Blaine County into two districts.

A third requirement is that counties combined into one district must be contiguous. L1 meets the requirement. Blaine, Jerome and Lincoln Counties are not only contiguous, but are connected by a highway that unites the major regional population center of Twin Falls with the remainder of the region.

With all major requirements addressed, one can now discuss the oft-debated definition of “community of interest”. L1 combines three counties that comprise a “community of interest”. Consider these factors:

- Education – The three counties are in Idaho Education Region IV
- Health – The three counties are in the Idaho South Central Health District
- Economy – The three counties are in the same Idaho Economic Development District “Regional IV Development”
• Employment – The three counties are in the Idaho Department of Labor’s South Central Region. Moreover, due to the cost of living in Blaine County, many travel from Lincoln, Jerome and other counties to work in Blaine County.

• Transportation – The three counties are in Region IV of the Idaho Department of Transportation.

• Soil Conservation – The three counties are in Region IV of the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation

• Youth Programs – The three counties are in Boy Scouts of America’s Snake River District and for years, Association 3 of the Girl Scouts of Silver Sage Council.

• Services – Jerome has the nearest GMC/Chevrolet dealership. They have the closest RV dealership.

• Shopping – Jerome has the closest Walmart to Blaine County.

Several maps have Blaine County united with either Custer County or Elmore County to form a district. I oppose combining Blaine County with either Custer or Elmore Counties. While the population and contiguous county requirements might be met, Blaine County and these counties have none of the associations listed above in common; instead, they are in different districts, regions, or councils. Additionally:

• Joining Blaine County with either Custer County or Elmore County will increase mileage between county seats and major population centers, thereby offering diminished legislative representation. Consider these facts:
  o Hailey (Blaine County) to Jerome (Jerome County) is 61 miles, or 1 hour & 7 minutes, with Shoshone (Lincoln County) in between
  o Hailey (Blaine County) to Mountain Home (Elmore County) is 117 miles or 2 hours & 21 minutes
  o Hailey (Blaine County) to Challis (Custer County) is 151 miles or 2 hours & 37 minutes

• While many people commute from Lincoln or Jerome to work in Blaine County, few people (if any) commute over Galena Summit from Custer County to work here. Likewise, few (if any) people drive over two hours each way from Elmore County to work in Blaine County.

• The population of Blaine County frequently drives south for shopping, services and medical care. They do not drive north to Custer County or west to Elmore County for these.

Thank you for hearing my concerns. I am very grateful for the service you are providing to our state with your important work on this commission. Good luck as this process moves forward.

Cynthia (Cindy) Cramer Jesinger
PO Box 111, Sun Valley, ID 83353
cindyjesinger@gmail.com
To: Reapportionment Commission (Co-chair Bart Davis, Co-chair Dan Schmidt, Tom Dayley, Nels Mitchell, Amber Pence, Eric Redman)
Cc: Nampa City Council
From: Mayor Debbie Kling and Rick Hogaboam (Chief of Staff; Legislative Affairs)

RE: 2021 Reapportionment for Idaho Legislative Districts

2021 Commission for Reapportionment,

Thank you for serving in this important task that affects all the citizens of Idaho and ensures that all Idahoans are equally represented in their respective legislative districts. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input as you weigh the collective input of the public in response to your initial proposed legislative map. We also want to thank you for hosting a public meeting here in Nampa at our City Hall. I wish to provide some feedback that will hopefully aid in your efforts to make a decision that best represents the concerns of Mayor Kling and various members of our Nampa City Council. The feedback will follow three main thought progressions, as follows:

- Feedback on the current map.
- Feedback on the proposed map.
- Our consensus preferences for the City of Nampa with reference to Sen. Jim Rice’s proposed map as an exhibit that accomplishes most of what we’d like to see.

First, we wish to express one major concern and source of confusion among residents with the current map (pictured in Exhibit A). The wrap-around district (District 11) covers Middleton and then wraps east around Districts 10, 12, and 13 into the southern sections of Nampa’s city limits and area of impact. It’s confusing for our city residents in the southern part of the city why they share a legislative district with Middleton while three other legislative districts separate the population center of Middleton and our south Nampa residents in a more direct line.

Second, the newly proposed map (pictured as Exhibit B) retains a wrap-around district that is similar to the existing wrap-around district mentioned in our first point. In this case,
District 10 would wrap around Districts 11, 12, and 13. While this district doesn’t wrap around to cover most of south Nampa (like the existing District 11), it does wrap around to cover southwest Nampa, an area projected to grow over the next decade. In addition to the wrap-around district taking in the southwest portion of the city, another district (District 23) is proposed to encroach into the southeast part of the city, a district that extends east almost to Twin Falls. This proposed map would add even more confusion for Nampa residents, splitting the growing southern section of our city into two legislative districts that are drastically distinct from the rest of the city.

Third, our consensus goals are similar to your goals, which is to ensure that every Idahoan is as equally represented as possible in districts that represent the contextual concerns of respective regions throughout the state.

- In the proposed map, every legislative district covering our area of impact is already at or above the average population target, and we anticipate rapid growth in our city over the next decade. This would further minimize the apportionment of our citizens relative to districts to the east in areas that are more built-out. We would prefer that any districts covering the city of Nampa be as close to equal as neighboring districts or even slightly below when considering that Nampa is one of the fastest-growing cities in the state.

- Because Nampa residents are intimately aware of concerns that are unique to our city and make up more of an urban and suburban demographic, it’s preferred that city residents aren’t pulled into legislative districts that are mostly outside the city and consist of a different demographic with distinct concerns. Nampa residents are used to voting in municipal elections, local school board districts, local highway districts, local fire districts, and Canyon County elections. Taking an informed resident focused on local needs and splicing them off into a legislative district that encompasses different counties and taxing districts that they are not a part would create challenges as far as representation. Additionally, city residents are used to having local elected officials that live in close proximity to their place of residence with the apportionment of the respective districts they live within. Placing a resident in a legislative district of around 50,000 people where the representative lives over an hour away when they’re used to voting for a mayor they live in closer proximity to in a city over 100,000 creates a disproportionate sense of representation relative to their legislative district that we would rather not see.

- We respectfully request that any final decision avoids claiming precincts in our city for districts that wrap around multiple districts or into a large rural district that extends almost to Twin Falls. Please keep our city and area of impact as intact within legislative districts as possible. This will ensure that Nampa residents are
more likely to be represented by fellow residents within the city with mutual interests and priorities.

Lastly, as a point of reference, we've included a picture of the affected areas under Sen. Jim Rice’s submitted map (Exhibit C) as an example that more fully represents the preferences articulated in this letter. While not explicitly endorsing all the specifics of the map, we are pleased with how it mitigates against the southern portion of the city being pulled into two other legislative districts that extend mostly outside of the city. This map keeps Nampa as intact as possible within Districts 12 and 13. We understand that part of Nampa might need to be apportioned into a third district, but rather than taking part of south Nampa and wrapping around to Middleton and taking another part of Nampa and extending that district east across counties, Sen. Rice’s map takes the northern section of the city and adjoins it to Middleton in a more logical, proximate district without wrap-arounds to the opposite section of the city. If Nampa is going to be connected to a neighboring community in a third district, it makes sense to be immediately adjacent to community within the same county. This map would place Nampa residents within three legislative districts, all within the same county and two of districts mostly intact within the city. The only shared district would adjoin geographic neighbors. We hope to see a similar outcome in your final recommendation as this would best serve the mutual and collective interests of the residents of Nampa and specific needs of our city as a whole. We understand that your job is difficult and that there are competing interests and logistical challenges in your task. Thanks for your service, and we look forward to seeing the final outcome of this process.
Exhibit C: Sen. Jim Rice's Proposed Map

- **10** 10% 
- **11** 56% 0.11%
- **12** 306% 0.58%
- **13** -94% -0.18%
- **14** -238% -0.45%
- **20** -14% -0.28%
- **22** 228% 0.43%
- **23** 612% 1.16%

©2021 CALIPER
"This is an official elections map. It supercedes any previously dated map of the same description. Canyon County makes no warranty, expressed or implied, with respect to the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of this map. Canyon County assumes no liability for direct, indirect, special, or consequential damages resulting from the use or misuse of this map or any of the information contained herein."
Date: 10/12/2021

To: Reapportionment Commission (Co-chair Bart Davis, Co-chair Dan Schmidt, Tom Dayley, Nels Mitchell, Amber Pence, Eric Redman)
Cc: Nampa City Council
From: Mayor Debbie Kling and Rick Hogaboam (Chief of Staff; Legislative Affairs)

RE: 2021 Reapportionment for Idaho Legislative Districts

2021 Commission for Reapportionment,

Thank you for serving in this important task that affects all the citizens of Idaho and ensures that all Idahoans are equally represented in their respective legislative districts. We appreciate the opportunity to provide input as you weigh the collective input of the public in response to your initial proposed legislative map. We also want to thank you for hosting a public meeting here in Nampa at our City Hall. I wish to provide some feedback that will hopefully aid in your efforts to make a decision that best represents the concerns of Mayor Kling and various members of our Nampa City Council. The feedback will follow three main thought progressions, as follows:

- Feedback on the current map.
- Feedback on the proposed map.
- Our consensus preferences for the City of Nampa with reference to Sen. Jim Rice’s proposed map as an exhibit that accomplishes most of what we’d like to see.

First, we wish to express one major concern and source of confusion among residents with the current map (pictured in Exhibit A). The wrap-around district (District 11) covers Middleton and then wraps east around Districts 10, 12, and 13 into the southern sections of Nampa’s city limits and area of impact. It’s confusing for our city residents in the southern part of the city why they share a legislative district with Middleton while three other legislative districts separate the population center of Middleton and our south Nampa residents in a more direct line.

Second, the newly proposed map (pictured as Exhibit B) retains a wrap-around district that is similar to the existing wrap-around district mentioned in our first point. In this case,
District 10 would wrap around Districts 11, 12, and 13. While this district doesn’t wrap around to cover most of south Nampa (like the existing District 11), it does wrap around to cover southwest Nampa, an area projected to grow over the next decade. In addition to the wrap-around district taking in the southwest portion of the city, another district (District 23) is proposed to encroach into the southeast part of the city, a district that extends east almost to Twin Falls. This proposed map would add even more confusion for Nampa residents, splitting the growing southern section of our city into two legislative districts that are drastically distinct from the rest of the city.

Third, our consensus goals are similar to your goals, which is to ensure that every Idahoan is as equally represented as possible in districts that represent the contextual concerns of respective regions throughout the state.

- In the proposed map, every legislative district covering our area of impact is already at or above the average population target, and we anticipate rapid growth in our city over the next decade. This would further minimize the apportionment of our citizens relative to districts to the east in areas that are more built-out. We would prefer that any districts covering the city of Nampa be as close to equal as neighboring districts or even slightly below when considering that Nampa is one of the fastest-growing cities in the state.

- Because Nampa residents are intimately aware of concerns that are unique to our city and make up more of an urban and suburban demographic, it’s preferred that city residents aren’t pulled into legislative districts that are mostly outside the city and consist of a different demographic with distinct concerns. Nampa residents are used to voting in municipal elections, local school board districts, local highway districts, local fire districts, and Canyon County elections. Taking an informed resident focused on local needs and splicing them off into a legislative district that encompasses different counties and taxing districts that they are not a part would create challenges as far as representation. Additionally, city residents are used to having local elected officials that live in close proximity to their place of residence with the apportionment of the respective districts they live within. Placing a resident in a legislative district of around 50,000 people where the representative lives over an hour away when they’re used to voting for a mayor they live in closer proximity to in a city over 100,000 creates a disproportionate sense of representation relative to their legislative district that we would rather not see.

- We respectfully request that any final decision avoids claiming precincts in our city for districts that wrap around multiple districts or into a large rural district that extends almost to Twin Falls. Please keep our city and area of impact as intact within legislative districts as possible. This will ensure that Nampa residents are
more likely to be represented by fellow residents within the city with mutual interests and priorities.

Lastly, as a point of reference, we’ve included a picture of the affected areas under Sen. Jim Rice’s submitted map (Exhibit C) as an example that more fully represents the preferences articulated in this letter. While not explicitly endorsing all the specifics of the map, we are pleased with how it mitigates against the southern portion of the city being pulled into two other legislative districts that extend mostly outside of the city. This map keeps Nampa as intact as possible within Districts 12 and 13. We understand that part of Nampa might need to be apportioned into a third district, but rather than taking part of south Nampa and wrapping around to Middleton and taking another part of Nampa and extending that district east across counties, Sen. Rice’s map takes the northern section of the city and adjoins it to Middleton in a more logical, proximate district without wrap-arounds to the opposite section of the city. If Nampa is going to be connected to a neighboring community in a third district, it makes sense to be immediately adjacent to community within the same county. This map would place Nampa residents within three legislative districts, all within the same county and two of districts mostly intact within the city. The only shared district would adjoin geographic neighbors. We hope to see a similar outcome in your final recommendation as this would best serve the mutual and collective interests of the residents of Nampa and specific needs of our city as a whole. We understand that your job is difficult and that there are competing interests and logistical challenges in your task. Thanks for your service, and we look forward to seeing the final outcome of this process.
Exhibit A: Existing Legislative Map
Exhibit B: Proposed Legislative Map
Exhibit C: Sen. Jim Rice’s Proposed Map
Good afternoon. My name is Samuel N. Penney, and I serve as the Chairman of the Nez Perce Tribal Executive Committee. On behalf of the Nez Perce Tribe, I would like to welcome the Commission for Reapportionment to Nez Perce Country. The Tribe appreciates the opportunity to testify about the Nez Perce’s views on redistricting in Idaho.

To begin the discussion, I would like to provide the Commission with information about the Nez Perce Tribe and the Tribe’s position in relation to the current legislative districts. The Nez Perce Reservation covers approximately 750,000 acres and five counties in Idaho. Those counties are Latah, Nez Perce, Lewis, Clearwater, and Idaho. The Nez Perce Tribe is represented by the 1st Congressional District in Congress and by Districts 5, 6, and 7 in the Idaho Legislature. The Tribe has approximately 3,500 enrolled members, most of whom reside within the boundaries of the Nez Perce Reservation.

However, due to the size and reach of the Nez Perce Tribe’s aboriginal lands, the Tribe’s interests extend north of Moscow, as far south as McCall, east into Washington and Oregon, and as far east as Montana. As such, from a tribal perspective, the Tribe’s interests and connections range beyond the current boundaries of the Nez Perce Reservation. Besides having satellite offices throughout the Reservation, the Tribe also has offices in McCall and Powell, Idaho. Clarkston, Washington, and Joseph, Oregon.

Given this background, the Commission can understand the Nez Perce Tribe’s strong connection and interest in Latah County, the city of Moscow, and the University of Idaho. This relationship continues to grow. That growth is partially attributed to the representation provided by District 5 in the State Legislature—Representation that has recognized the importance and role of the Tribe in the area.

The Tribe also has a strong relationship and connection with Nez Perce County and the city of Lewiston. The Tribe’s increased economic impact and presence as an employer in the region means there that there is a need for representation for the Tribe and its members in the State Legislature from this district. The Tribe requests that these connections to Latah and Nez Perce
counties be maintained under any new apportionment plan. In addition, the Tribe understands the limitations for redistricting presented by the small populations in large counties like Clearwater, Idaho, and Lewis.

The Nez Perce Tribe recognizes that the requirements for keeping counties intact and populations evenly distributed may prevent the Commission from placing the Reservation in a single district. Regardless of the choice, it is important that any final decision only be made after careful consideration of how the portions of the Reservation that lie within different districts are represented from a tribal perspective. The Tribe does request that any division of the Reservation that may occur only be done if those divisions respect the need for all members of the Tribe throughout the Reservation to have representation and the connections the Tribe has with surrounding areas outside of the reservation boundaries. For example, the potential for splitting Nez Perce County into two districts may harm the Tribe given the strong economic connection the Tribe has with the city of Lewiston.

With regard to the reapportionment of the Congressional Districts in Idaho, the Tribe does not have any particular recommendations although it is important to state that due to the unique trust relationship tribes have with the United States, the Nez Perce Tribe expects all members of the Idaho Congressional Delegation to represent and be mindful of tribal issues and interests regardless of which district the Tribe is in and which district an elected official represents.

I would like to thank the Commission again for allowing the Nez Perce Tribe the opportunity to provide testimony. Although the Tribe has not formulated its own redistricting plan, the Tribe would request any draft plans be consistent with the Tribe’s comments in formulating a final map.
October 15, 2021

To: 2021 Commission for Reapportionment  
     Care of: Ms. Elizabeth Bowen, Legislative Services  
     State Capitol, Room W133  
     P. O. Box 83720  
     Boise, Idaho 83720 - 0054

From: Phil Hart, Precinct Committeeman, Kellogg Precinct, Shoshone County  
      P. O. Box 540  
      Kellogg, Idaho 83837

Dear Members of the 2021 Commission for Reapportionment:

At our September 21, 2021 monthly meeting of the Shoshone County Republican Party Central Committee, we endorsed the enclosed map which proposes new legislative district boundaries for the five northern Idaho counties. Each color on the map represents a suggested legislative district.

Our committee believes that the five northern counties are a type of a “Community of Interest” with a southern limit that corresponds with the county line between Benewah County and Latah county and the county line between Shoshone County and Clearwater County.

For the last 10 years, our representatives in the Legislature have lived a four hour drive away from us in Shoshone County. To visit our legislators, we must spend most of the four hour drive on highways that are outside of our legislative district. Therefore, we are opposed to Shoshone County being in the same legislative district as either Clearwater County or Idaho County.

Respectively Submitted by: 

Phil Hart
TED ON THE LEFT ---- CITY COUNCIL DISTRICTS ON THE RIGHT
IN THE

JOINT RESOLUTION NO.______

BY ____________________________

A JOINT RESOLUTION

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 2, ARTICLE III, OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO RELATING TO MEMBERSHIP OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE; PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO SECTION 4, ARTICLE III, OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO RELATING TO THE APPORTIONMENT OF THE LEGISLATURE; PROPOSING THE REPEAL OF SECTION 5, ARTICLE III, OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO RELATING TO SENATORIAL AND REPRESENTATIVE DISTRICTS; STATING THE QUESTION TO BE SUBMITTED TO THE ELECTORATE; DIRECTING THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL TO PREPARE THE STATEMENTS REQUIRED BY LAW; AND DIRECTING THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO PUBLISH THE AMENDMENT AND ARGUMENTS AS REQUIRED BY LAW.

Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

SECTION 1. That Section 2, Article III, of the Constitution of the State of Idaho be amended to read as follows:

Section 2. MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSE AND SENATE. Following the decennial census of 2020 and in each legislature thereafter, the senate shall consist of thirty-five members from each county. The legislature may fix the number of members of the house of representatives at not more than two times as many representatives as there are senators shall consist of no less than seventy members or as many more as may be established by law. The members of the house of representatives shall be apportioned county by county based on the relation the population of each county bears to the population of the State of Idaho, provided that no member of the house of representatives may represent the citizens of more than one county and further that each county shall have at least one member in the house of representatives. The senators shall be chosen by the electors of the respective counties and the house of representatives shall be chosen by the electors of the respective counties or districts into which the state may, from time to time, be divided by law.

(2) Whenever there is reason to reapportion the legislature or to provide for new congressional district boundaries in the state, or both, because of a new federal census or because of a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, a commission for reapportionment shall be formed on order of the secretary of state. The commission shall be composed of six members. The leaders of the two largest political parties of each house of the legislature shall each designate one member and the state chairmen of the two largest political parties, determined by the vote cast for governor in the last gubernatorial election, shall each designate one member. In the event any appointing authority does not select the members

Wednesday September 22, 2021 10:45 AM
within fifteen calendar days following the secretary of state’s order to form the commission, such members shall be appointed by 

the Supreme Court. No member of the commission may be an elected or 

appointed official in the state of Idaho at the time of designation 

or selection.

(3) The legislature shall enact laws providing for the im- 
plementations of the provisions of this section, including terms 
of commission members, the method of filling vacancies on the 
commission, additional qualifications for commissioners and addi-
tional standards to govern the commission. The legislature shall 
appropriate funds to enable the commission to carry out its duties.

(4) Within ninety days after the commission has been organized 
or the necessary census data are available, whichever is later, the 
commission shall file a proposed plan for apportioning the senate 

and house of representatives of the legislature with the office of 

the secretary of state. At the same time, and with the same effect, 

the commission shall prepare and file a plan for congressional dis-

tricts. Any final action of the commission on a proposed plan shall 

be approved by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the commis-
sion. All deliberations of the commission shall be open to the pub-
lic.

(5) The legislative districts created by the commission shall 
be in effect for all elections held after the plan is filed and un-
til a new plan is required and filed, unless amended by court order. 
The Supreme Court shall have original jurisdiction over actions in-
volving challenges to legislative apportionment.

(6) A member of the commission shall be precluded from serv-
ing in either house of the legislature for five years following such mem-
ber’s service on the commission.

SECTION 2. That Section 4, Article III, of the Constitution of the 
State of Idaho be amended to read as follows:

Section 4. APPORTIONMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF 
THE LEGISLATURE. The members of the house of representatives of the 
legislature following the decennial census of 2022 election 

and each legislature decennial census thereafter shall be appor-
tioned to thirty-five legislative districts the number of members 
of the house of representatives as fixed by the legislature to the 
counties of the state of Idaho.

SECTION 3. That Section 5, Article III, of the Constitution of the 
State of Idaho, be, and the same is hereby repealed.

SECTION 4. The question to be submitted to the electors of the State of 
Idaho at the next general election shall be as follows:

"Shall Sections 2 and 4, Article III, of the Constitution of the State 
of Idaho be amended to provide that, following the 2022 election and in each 
Legislature thereafter, the Senate shall consist of one member from each 
county in the State of Idaho and the House of Representatives shall consist
of no less than seventy members or as many more as may be established by law, that the members of the House of Representatives shall be apportioned county by county based on the relationship the population of each county bears to the population of the State of Idaho, provided that no member of the House of Representatives may represent the citizens of more than one county and further that each county shall have at least one member in the House of Representatives, that provisions relating to commissions on reapportionment shall be removed, and that following the 2022 election the members of the House of Representatives shall be apportioned to the number of members of the House of Representatives as fixed by the Legislature to the counties of the State of Idaho; and shall Section 5, Article III, of the Constitution of the State of Idaho relating to senatorial and representative districts be repealed?"

SECTION 5. The Legislative Council is directed to prepare the state-
ments required by Section 67-453, Idaho Code, and file the same.

SECTION 6. The Secretary of State is hereby directed to publish this proposed constitutional amendment and arguments as required by law.
Members of the Idaho Redistricting Commission:

It is with great disappointment that the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes submit this public comment regarding the Commission’s newly proposed map (L02). We object to the boundary drawn between proposed Districts 28 and 30 because it intentionally divides the two largest population clusters on our Reservation also known as the Fort Hall Indian Reservation.

We respectfully ask that you reconsider our request to be included with the Bingham County legislative district.

Our objection to the proposed map is based on the following points:

- The Commission held a public hearing at Fort Hall on October 6th. In response to questions from Commissioners, the Tribes confirmed that its strongest relationship among the local counties is with Bingham County. This is based on relations between the Fort Hall Business Council and the County Commission, commerce, where our members live and schools attended by our children. Furthermore, the Tribes’ last public comment submission included a map showing the population clusters in Fort Hall. The largest two clusters live along the Bingham/Bannock County border. Therefore, the Tribes supported having the southern boundary of a legislative district representing Bingham County pulled south to include the Fort Hall population living in Bannock County near the border with Bingham County. Instead, the divide of the Tribe’s population was maintained.

- Section 72-5206(2), Idaho Code, states “To the maximum extent possible, districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.” The Tribes clearly fit within the definition of “communities of interest”. There are several proposed maps that illustrate how a Bingham County legislative district can be drawn to include the Fort Hall population living in Bannock County along the Bingham County border. Interestingly, L82 is able to achieve this while only splitting eight counties, which is the same number of split counties in the Commission’s proposed map.

- Bannock County is already a divided county on every proposed map. Having the Bingham County legislative district include those residents of Fort Hall living near the county border but in Bannock County would not impact the number of counties that are split.
In the media, Commissioner Davis is quoted as saying, “I think (it’s) really paying attention to one-person, one-vote, and it respects communities of interest and counties in a remarkable way. And I hope our state values our commitment to that target.” While Commissioner Mitchell stated, “One of the things that Tom and I really focused on was that there were lots of comments at the public hearings on the cities. So, this draft map gives Caldwell one district, and then there are two districts that sweep up most of Nampa, and then Meridian ends up with two, almost three districts. With relatively clean lines.” (“Eye on Boise: Latest legislative district plan cuts population variations,” Idaho Press, October 30, 2021).

Based on our public comments and submitted Testimony, we disagree that this represents our community of interest and are disappointed that we did not receive equal consideration to that of municipalities.

We realize that you were not assigned an easy task. However, this is the second time we have participated in the public process of redistricting, and it is the second time our input has been ignored. Again, we ask that you reconsider our request to be included with the Bingham County legislative district.

Respectfully,

The Fort Hall Business Council of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes

Chairman Devon Boyer, Vice Chairwoman Marlene Skunkcap, Secretary Ladd Edmo, Treasurer Elma Thompson, Sgt of Arms Roland Marshall, Councilman Nathan Small, Councilman Lee Juan
November 3, 2021

Commissioner Bart Davis  
Co-chairman  
Commission of Reapportionment

Commissioner Dan Schmidt  
Co-chairman  
Commission of Reapportionment

Dear Co-chairs Davis and Schmidt:

Subject: 2021 Congressional Redistricting

This letter is an effort to express my personal opinion about the process the Commission of Reapportionment is going through at this time. Previously, the Idaho Congressional districts were based on a north and south line which divides the State into western and eastern congressional districts.

It is my understanding that the Commission is considering a map with a redistricting line dividing the State on a northern and southern axis. It is my viewpoint that the traditional division of western and eastern districts is the most appropriate to meet the Constitutional criteria and guidelines provided in the Idaho Code. Furthermore, the traditional redistricting map would maintain long-established communities of interest.

While we are all Idahoans, there are significant social and cultural differences between southern, eastern Idaho and northern Idaho. From the community standpoint, there are religious, economic, employment and many other differences that distinguish the two corners of our State. In addition, there is a distinction related to their news media feed. Eastern Idaho receives most of its news locally and from the Salt Lake City, Utah media market. On the otherhand, northern Idaho gets its news locally and from Spokane, Washington media. Therefore, these two areas would not be receiving the same news reports and education on issues that impact their daily lives.
In my opinion, significant factors justifying eastern and western districts relates to geographic and transportation limitations and distances. The proximity between southern, eastern Idaho and northern Idaho are restricted by roadless areas, wilderness and natural geological barriers.

Lastly, it is my recommendation that the Commission maintains the traditional north and south dividing line, as that would also be the least confusing to the electorate during election period. It would also be very beneficial for the citizens of Idaho to know and understand their candidates and where to vote during campaign seasons.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuck Winder
District 20 - Boise
Legislative District Options for Ada County

Presented to
Idaho Redistricting Commission

By
Stephen Bender
1235 N. Sevenoaks Place
Eagle, ID
Dear Commissioners:

I take the position that it is appropriate to draw nine complete legislative districts in Ada County, plus part of a tenth district.

This report examines the numbers, and the flexibility in each county and presents two alternatives for Canyon and Ada Counties.

Ada County

At 494,967 people, nine self-contained districts would average 54,997, which is only 176 below maximum. Ten self-contained districts would average 49,497, which is 422 below the threshold.

This means that it is impossible to put 10 districts in Ada but barely possible to put in nine districts. I attempted well over 100 different combinations of precincts and split precincts focusing on compact districts, and it was only possible by carving up multiple subdivisions. The map below is the only one that succeeded in creating nine districts, but I believe it looks gerrymandered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LD</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>54,993</td>
<td>4.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>54,828</td>
<td>4.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55,007</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>55,162</td>
<td>4.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>55,153</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>55,023</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>55,135</td>
<td>4.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>54,809</td>
<td>4.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Canyon County

At 232,986 people, four self-contained districts would average 58,247, which is 3,072 over the maximum. Five self-contained districts would average 46,597, which is 3,321 below the threshold.

This means that Canyon County MUST share a district with a neighboring county.

Given that Canyon must be split and Ada probably should be split, it makes most sense to create the split district between the two counties. They are
similar in many ways—population, traffic, economic, and general community standards are
different in these urban and suburban areas than they are in the surrounding more rural counties.
Furthermore, the city of Star straddles the county line, and is currently split into two districts.

By not only locating the split district in these counties, but locating it on the Route 44 corridor,
you would be combining the cities of Middleton, Star and Eagle along Route 44. These three
cities have a different vibe than Meridian or Boise or Garden City. There is less commercial
development, more suburban communities, and it makes for a logical place to put the district.

Finally, the numbers work.

There are two ways to do it. One puts most of the split district in Ada County, pulling in just
three precincts from Canyon. The result of this is the remaining Canyon County precincts
average a few thousand people more than the remaining Ada County precincts.

The other option shifts that district farther to the west, incorporating more of Canyon County.
This results in the remaining four Canyon County districts being more equal in size to the Ada
County districts.

Both of these plans fall within the 5 percent plus or minus margin of error, but the western plan
pulls in more rural areas of Canyon while cutting off all of Eagle east of Eagle Road. Also, both
shift a portion of Eagle into precincts to the south, but that divider is the Boise River, and
between Route 16 and Glenwood, there are only two bridges over the river at Eagle Road and
Linder Road, so it does make a logical geographic boundary.

Maps of the two as submitted are on the following pages.

My personal preference is the eastern shift, submitted as **SBender Ada Canyon 14 LDs**. The
alternative map is **SBender Ada Cnyn 2 Western Shift**.
An Analysis of
Ada County
Precinct Boundary Errors
in the Maptitude Mapping Tool

Presented to
Idaho Redistricting Commission

By
Stephen Bender
1235 N. Sevenoaks Place
Eagle, ID
Dear Commissioners:

I have been working on redistricting maps since May. Initially I was using DRA, through davesredistricting.org and, once it became available, I started using Maptitude. Because DRA is the more user-friendly tool, the maps in this report were done on DRA, but I have confirmed the boundaries are identical in both tools.

I want to advise you of several errors in both tools relating to how precinct boundaries are depicted on the map. Several different areas of the county are using outdated precinct boundaries that have been changed by Ada County since the map file was transmitted to the Census Bureau and released in tools such as DRA and Maptitude.

First, to clarify, there is nothing wrong with the numbers of people counted, and I am not addressing numbers. I am simply alerting you to the fact that the precinct boundary overlay does not put the people into the same precinct boundaries that Ada County Elections uses.

As I understand it, a map that does not split precincts is prioritized over one that does. In the case of Ada County, the tool itself violates this standard by starting with split precincts. A total of 20 precincts are affected—more than 13 percent of Ada precincts.

Furthermore, I understand that the Ada County Clerk has already received the budget to redraw Ada County from scratch and add approximately 50 additional precincts.

Therefore, I would ask that the Commission formally adopt a rule that maps splitting precincts in Ada County be given equal precedence as those that do not split precincts. I also ask that you adopt this early in the process to give notice to those who are actively drawing maps so that they can feel free to disregard current boundaries.

The specifics on the errors in the tool are as follows:

- Legislative District 14: 1402, 1403, 1404, 1406, 1413, and 1414 are improperly drawn
  1420 and 1421 are missing
  1411 has a boundary that is splitting lots
- Legislative District 15: 1516 is missing
- Legislative District 16: No differences
- Legislative District 17: No differences
- Legislative District 18: 1803, 1804, 1817 and 1818 are improperly drawn
- Legislative District 19: No differences
- Legislative District 20: 2001, 2008, and 2009 are improperly drawn
  2014 and 2015 are missing
- Legislative District 21: 2106 is improperly drawn, 2117 is missing
- Legislative District 22: No differences

A more detailed description and Ada County Elections Legislative District Maps are below.
Legislative District 14

Legislative District 14 combined two precincts into one, split another into two, and split another two into four precincts.

Precincts 1402 and 1403 were combined into a single precinct, 1403.

Precinct 1406 was split down Lindor Road to create a new 1402 west of 1406.

Precinct 1413 was split into two parts along the northern boundary with 1414. The two portions south of that line were combined with 1414 to create three districts, 1414, 1420 and 1421.

Additionally, new homes were put into the southernmost portion of 1411. Because the boundary when drawn went through riverbed land, there was no extension of Edgewood to use as a boundary. A north south line was extended to the river to form the southwest boundary of 1411. In the last two years, as subdivision was put in that shifted Edgewood into 1410, and as a result, the eight westernmost homes in this subdivision are split off into 1410, including three residential lots split down the middle. Even though census blocks do not correct this change yet, it seems reasonable to put all homes in that subdivision into 1411.

The maps follow on the next page.
The LD 14 precincts as drawn in Maptitude and by Ada County are:

In 1411, the Renovere subdivision was built in 2019 and 2020. Because the boundary was a due north south line from Hwy 44 to the river, but the subdivision crossed that line slightly, the eight homes on the western edge were assigned to 1410. There are three homes on the east side of Don Vincent that are literally cut in half by the precinct boundary, and only the southeasternmost home of those six was assigned to 1411. The other five, as well as the first three on the south side of Lone Shore Ln, were placed in 1410.

It is my understanding that these situations are to be avoided, but I am uncertain how the Commission would accommodate this issue since even the census block fails to adjust for this development.

Additional guidance to the public on how to draw along street lines when the census block doesn’t accommodate that would be appreciated.
Legislative District 15

In LD 15, the only difference is that precinct 1504 was split into two, with precinct 1504 retaining the northern half, and a new precinct 1516 being created in the southern half.

Precincts as drawn in Maptitude and by Ada County are:
Legislative District 18

In LD 18, precincts 1803 and 1804 were combined to form a new 1803. The old precinct 1818 on the east side of I-84 was renumbered 1818. Finally, the northwestern portion of 1817 was carved out to create a new 1818.

Precincts as drawn in Maptitude and by Ada County are:
Legislative District 20

In LD 20, there were two changes. First, Precinct 2001 and 2002 were both split to create a new 2014 in between them. Then Precinct 2008 and 2009 were split to create a new Precinct 2015 using the southern portion of the two old precincts. In each of these, there appears to be a discrepancy between the precinct lines as shown on the Ada County map and the lines created by selecting census blocks. The areas that are affected by these discrepancies are circled on the Ada County map below.

Precincts as drawn in Maptitude and by Ada County are:
Legislative District 21

In LD 21, Precinct 2106 was split in half to create a new Precinct 2117.

Precincts as drawn in Maptitude and by Ada County are:

![Map of Maptitude Boundaries LD 21](image1)
![Map of Current Ada County Elections Precinct Boundaries LD 21](image2)

Finally, I would like to clarify that I have not looked at precincts in any other county in Idaho. It seems prudent that the Commission would vote to adopt a similar accommodation across the state should similar errors be called to your attention, but it seems likely that this problem will be most exacerbated in Ada County.

The Commission staff has my phone and email contact information should you or staff have any additional clarifying questions.

The following pages contain the official Ada County Elections Office Legislative District maps.
Idaho Code 72-1506 (9) When a legislative district contains more than one (1) county or a portion of a county, the counties or portion of a county in the district shall be directly connected by roads and highways which are designated as part of the interstate highway system, the United States highway system or the state highway system.
Testimony of Trent L. Clark
Before the Idaho Commission for Reapportionment
Convened at Fort Hall, Idaho
Wednesday, October 06, 2021

First and Last Name: Trent Clark
Email: trentlynnclark@gmail.com
Physical and mailing address: 90 North 2nd East
Soda Springs, ID 83276
Phone number: (208) 221-2701
Organization: self

COMMISSIONERS: My name is Trent Clark. I reside in Soda Springs and am here today as a private individual and as the appointing authority for a 2001 Reapportionment Commissioner who was complicit in the unconscionable division of Fort Hall Reservation into two different districts.

This Commission serves to further the right to vote as guaranteed by the U.S. and Idaho Constitutions. According to the courts, the "right to vote" has three distinct components. They are:

(1) **The Franchise Itself**\(^1\) — who gets to vote, defined in state law, but bounded by the U.S. Constitution.

(2) **The Right to a Quantitatively Undiluted Vote**\(^2\) — "the right of suffrage can be denied by a debasement or dilution of the weight of a citizen's vote just as effectively as by wholly prohibiting the free exercise of the franchise."\(^3\)

(3) **The Right to a Qualitatively Undiluted Vote**\(^4\) — disenfranchisement can occur when states dilute "cohesive interests" by placing them into multi-member legislative districts where those interests are un- or under-represented.

To illustrate these three components of the right to vote, consider voters grouped by surname.

---

\(^1\) Claims asserting infringement on the right to cast a vote are typically brought under the Constitution. See, e.g., Harper v. Virginia Bd. of Elections, 383 U.S. 663 (1966) (holding that a poll tax prerequisite to voting in a state election violated the Equal Protection Clause). The Republican Form of Government Clause in the original Constitution implicitly protects the right to vote, U.S. CONST. art. IV, § 4, cl. 1, while constitutional amendments provide more explicit protections to vote free from discrimination on the basis of race, U.S. CONST. amend. XV, § 1; on the basis of sex, U.S. CONST. amend. XIX, § 1; by reason of poll taxes in federal elections, U.S. CONST. amend. XXIV, § 1; or on account of age for citizens who are eighteen years of age or older, U.S. CONST. amend. XXVI, § 1.


Common Surnames in Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank in Idaho</th>
<th>Surname</th>
<th>Individuals</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>% of U.S.</th>
<th>Rank in U.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>14,396</td>
<td>1:117</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>11,989</td>
<td>1:140</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>9,235</td>
<td>1:182</td>
<td>0.91%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Miller</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>1:202</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>7,887</td>
<td>1:213</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jones</td>
<td>7,778</td>
<td>1:216</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>6,755</td>
<td>1:248</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>6,605</td>
<td>1:254</td>
<td>0.47%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td>5,915</td>
<td>1:284</td>
<td>1.10%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>5,588</td>
<td>1:300</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://forebears.io/united-states/idaho/surnames](https://forebears.io/united-states/idaho/surnames)

With the Chairman's permission, could we consider #8, the surname of "Davis."

Of the 6,605 "Davises" in the State of Idaho, all of them can vote if they meet Idaho's lawful criteria:

Idaho statute § 34-104 - "QUALIFIED ELECTOR" DEFINED. "Qualified elector" means any person who is eighteen (18) years of age, is a United States citizen and who has resided in this state and in the county at least thirty (30) days next preceding the election at which he desires to vote, and who is registered as required by law.

That is "the Franchise."

Also, no Davis in Boise has a greater or lesser voice or vote than a Davis who lives in Burley or in Idaho Falls, at least not if this Reapportionment Commission does its job well.

That is a "Quantitatively Undiluted Vote."

Lastly, it is possible that Davises, as a group of people, have certain "cohesive interests." They may share similar genetics, and have unique views on medicine, aging, and public health. Culturally they may share a common ethic on education, use of libraries, or access to college or career training. And they may share other common and unique interests in religion, recreation, or aesthetics.

But the Davises live dispersed throughout Idaho. Our current geographic apportionment cannot empower a "Davis" voice, and therefore, they will have a "Qualitatively Diluted Vote." While this runs counter to a principle of the Voting Rights Act, it may not be prohibited because the "Davises," as a group, are not victims of a history of recognized discrimination.

Consider, however, if such a history did exist. What if, at some time in the past, the U.S. Government declared war on Idaho's Davises. After regrettable hostilities a treaty was signed, allowing the Davis family an extensive corner of Idaho in which to live.
But then gold was discovered on a portion of the Davis land. The U.S. Government re-declared war with the Davises, ending with a re-negotiated treaty leaving a much-reduced homeland.

When additional mineral and water values were identified, for a third time the U.S. Government declared war, extracting even more concessions. This was followed by multiple unilateral "reinterpretations" of the boundaries of the amended Treaty. As a result, today Davises live on a fraction of land roughly 32 times smaller than that guaranteed under the original Treaty.

Commissioners, the fictional Davis history I just shared tracks closely with the actual history of the Shoshone and Bannock Tribes and their experience with the Fort Bridger Treaty Council of 1868.

If Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act has any meaning at all to Idaho, it would argue against diluting the voice and vote of this community.

One reason for this would be agreement with James Madison, who said:

The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.5

Focusing on "quantitative dilution" at the expense of "qualitative dilution" is arbitrary. At no point in this nation's history have we decided that the mathematics of voting is more important than hearing the actual voices of the voters.

Noted voting rights scholar and Professor at the SMU-Dedman School of Law, Grant M. Hayden, has written:

[A] decision to apply the one person, one vote standard is no more neutral or objective than decisions made with respect to the other two types of voting rights. In addition, removing the aura of objectivity from the standard helps reveal the connection between the three different types of voting rights that we now recognize.6

In the California Law Review Hayden wrote:

In sum, it is time for the Supreme Court to back away from strict adherence to the one person, one vote principle in minority-vote-dilution cases, eliminating the dilemma of minority representation and removing the ceiling on minority political participation.7

Another legal scholar writing in the Nebraska Law Review pointed out that Idaho's one senator, two house member district format is the most likely to produce qualitative dilution:

---

5 James A. Madison, The Federalist Papers No. 47.
6 Grant M. Hayden, The False Promise of One Person, One Vote, 102 MICH. L. REV. 213 (2003). Available at: https://repository.law.umich.edu/mjr/vol102/iss2/2
The battery of vote dilution cases illustrates that many election practices can have the effect of diluting a particular group's voting strength and denying them the ability to elect candidates of their choice. By far the most popular method employed by states to achieve vote dilution, however, has been the use of multimember election districts. Because of their winner-take-all rules, multimember districts ensure that a bloc-voting majority can consistently cancel out minority votes for other candidates.8

In pursuance of a remedy to ensure that the residents of Fort Hall have a voice in Idaho governance, I respectfully submit the following recommendations:

(1) Ask the Legislature to create a single House of Representatives district to represent Fort Hall. A single representative district of 26,000 residents would retain the one person – one vote distribution while significantly increasing the voice of Fort Hall residents. However, a legal argument could be made that the Reynolds v. Sims precedent does not apply when "empowering a minority voice" and so the strict mathematical proportionality of 26,000 voters may not be necessary.

Or, a middle step short of this would be . . .

(2) Ask the Legislature to create non-voting representative positions for Idaho’s Tribes similar to those provided to the Territories of the United States in Congress.

But, at a minimum, an imperative for the 2021 Legislative Reapportionment is . . .

(3) Do not add insult to injury by splitting Idaho’s largest Native American community in half so that an already diluted minority voice is further reduced adhering to a county line (1) drawn decades after the creation of the Reservation, and (2) that, in this reapportionment, will already need to be breached to accommodate target legislative district populations.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I stand ready to answer any questions.

---

November 2, 2021

Senators Bart Davis and Dan Schmidt, Co-chairs
2021 Commission for Reapportionment
c/o Paul Boucher, Commission Secretary
Idaho State Capitol, Room W133
Boise, ID 83702

Dear Co-chairs Davis and Schmidt,

Thank you for the opportunity to continue to be engaged in the process of redistricting for Idaho’s legislative districts as you work towards a result that is fair, balanced and completed within the rules and timelines needed for effective redistricting.

While the Commission’s revised legislative map, L02 is an improvement based on the substantial feedback you have received as a body, I continue to believe that maintaining two legislative districts central to Meridian will preserve the representative needs of Meridian’s interests, and is achievable based on the parameters set for redistricting. As a community of interest, it is important for Meridian to have proper representation in new districts.

To help effect implementing at least two districts which reflect Meridian boundaries, I have attached two alternate versions of the Commission’s L02 map. One ("L02A") focuses on roadways as best-practice boundaries between districts, while affording Meridian two nearly specific districts of appropriate populations based on the State guidance and statutes. The second version ("L02B"), attempts to balance out population deviations and is split at a current precinct boundary. I hope the Commission can utilize these maps as a guiding principle as you finalize recommendations on the redistricting efforts.

Thank you for your efforts as a Commission to take on this important task for the State of Idaho, and we hope that the Commission can work to map districts that best keep communities of interest, including Meridian, wholly within districts within the required parameters of the
redistricting rules. We look forward to continuing to work with you on this process. Please reach out with any questions you may have.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert E. Simison
Mayor

Cc: Commissioners, 2021 Commission for Reapportionment
    Paul Boucher, 2021 Commission for Reapportionment Secretary
    Meridian City Council
    David Miles, Chief of Staff, City of Meridian

Encl: Draft Meridian Revised L02A.pdf
      Draft Meridian Revised L02B.pdf
November 2, 2021

Bart Davis, Co-Chair
Dan Schmidt, Co-Chair
Tom Dayley, Commissioner
Nels Mitchell, Commissioner
Amber Pence, Commissioner
Eric Redman, Commissioner
Idaho Commission for Reapportionment
Idaho State Capitol
700 W. Jefferson
Boise, ID 83702

RE: Ada County’s Comments on Commission for Reapportionment Plan

Dear Co-Chairs and Commissioners:

On October 22, 2021, Ada County submitted proposed plan L072 to the Idaho Commission for Reapportionment (“Reapportionment Commission”). As we noted in our letter that accompanied L072, the proposed reapportionment plan was drafted to keep cities and communities of interest whole rather than reapportioning to protect incumbency or partisan designations. It also limited the number of county splits. Ada County is disappointed that the Reapportionment Commission declined to utilize Ada County’s proposal and instead proposed plan L02. For the reasons listed below, Ada County believes that the proposed plan is constitutionally and statutorily flawed and urges the Reapportionment Commission to adopt the County’s proposed L072.

Ada and Canyon counties are two of the fastest growing counties in Idaho, yet L02 proposes to divide these urban, growing communities of interest with rural, sparsely populated neighboring counties. For example, L02 proposes mixing Eagle, a community of large acreage estates with Emmett in Gem County. It also proposes mixing the fast-growing city of Meridian with a slice of Canyon County’s commercial buildings (1,125 people). And it mixes Kuna, another fast-growing urban area, with a portion of Canyon County and a portion of Owyhee County.

As you are aware there is a hierarchy of requirements that govern redistricting plans. The second criteria is compliance with division of counties. It is our understanding that the Reapportionment Commission is stating they are only dividing eight (8) counties in L02. Ada County disagrees with this assessment because in addition to dividing eight (8) counties, the Reapportionment Commission is actually dividing Ada County four times and is dividing Canyon County three (3) times. Ada County believes it will be difficult for the Reapportionment Committee to reasonably determine that so many divisions of two urban counties is necessary to comply with the Constitution.
Third in the hierarchy is compliance with Idaho Code § 72-1506. Item two in the statutory hierarchy is “To the maximum extent possible, districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.” The Reapportionment Committee fails to maintain traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest. To forestall litigation, the Board urges that you reconsider and adopt Ada County’s proposal or a comparable proposal that meets equal protection and county division requirements but also complies with the statutory requirement of keeping neighborhoods and local communities of interest intact.

Thank you for reconsideration of the impacts to Ada County.

Sincerely,

ADA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

Rod Beck, Commissioner

Ryan Davidson, Commissioner

Kendra Kenyon, Commissioner

cc: Paul Boucher, Commission Secretary
Commission for Reapportionment

Run Date: November 05, 2021 - 02:39 PM

Date Range: 2021-09-01 through 2021-11-30

Written Only Testifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Cook</td>
<td>12087947255</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>2021-09-15 19:58:57</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>1164 Santa Maria Dr., House, Idaho, 83712</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is great to see the commission working hard after the census to ensure Idahoans have fair representation. I think it is important for Ada County and the Treasure Valley to be in 1 US Congressional District. The commission should do it's best not to split up major metropolitan areas. The last maps split Ada County and this seems to be unfair to residents in the county.

Unfortunately Idaho did not get another seat in Congress otherwise this would have been an easier decision.

John Segar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Segar</td>
<td>2084248461</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>boise</td>
<td>2021-09-15 22:11:51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>3109 s crossfield way, Boise, Idaho, 83706</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My primary concern is with the Congressional Districts. I have never understood why the Treasure Valley and Ada county was split into 2 districts. This is my community and I believe my neighbors in Eagle and Kuna share more of my issues than someone in East Idaho. This has always struck me as an effort to limit the influence of Ada County and the Treasure Valley. For that reason I urge you to abandon map C01 and support map C02 or other options that keep Ada County and the Treasure Valley whole,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your service,
John Segar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Segar</td>
<td>2084248461</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-15 22:11:51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Richel</td>
<td>2083052475</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>EAGLE</td>
<td>2021-09-16 08:16:12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**  
542 W CARNELIAN LN, EAGLE, Idaho, 83616  
**Mailing address** , , , ,

My name is Carol Richel. I'm a life-long Idahoan and have lived in Eagle for the past 5 years. I lived in NW Eagle for 4 of those and recently moved downtown. I'm a resident of Legislative District 14.

I'm writing in support of the public map submission by Jordan Morales.

I understand that there are reasons to keep cities in one legislative district, but Eagle is truly the tale of two cities. When I lived in the NW portion, I never felt a part of Eagle. We did all of our business in Meridian as it was much closer. I never traveled into the core of Eagle downtown.

Now that I live in downtown Eagle, I typically travel East into Boise for business purposes. Eagle Road is a natural East/West corridor and a logical district boundary. This map follows existing geographic boundaries and thoroughfares that make sense to people who live here.

Thank you,

Carol Richel
Dear Commission for Reappointment,

Would you please consider keeping neighborhoods whole fostering community by creating a map that keeps the Counties whole, and that major roads define districts.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this detail.
Lanette Guillory

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission

My name is William Applegate, I have lived in 4 different homes in District 18 since 1974. I heartily encourage the proposed map presented by Mr. Morales.

I endorse the proposed street and geographic based District boundaries. District 18 is a large district, which contains several unique communities: the Original South Boise village (where I live), Lakewood, Centennial Subdivision, Surprise Valley, Columbia Village and Harris Ranch communities. These areas share the community spirit of closeness to BSU, downtown Boise, Micron, the East end of Boise and the Boise Greenbelt. These communities share the love of SE Boise including short and easy commutes, light traffic, well-planned developments, quality housing, bikeways, recreation, and top notch schools, including Timberline High School.

District 18 is a vibrant, community of people who care for their individual communities and have chosen to remain close to Boise. Residents are active, interested and involved with the District and their respective communities. I would encourage the Commission to keep District intact and accept the proposed boundaries. Thank You.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>William Applegate</td>
<td>2088595066</td>
<td>My Family</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-16 10:34:58</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**cont.**

| Diane Schwarz            | 12089490682 | Self                        | Boise    | 2021-09-16 12:11:22   | 18        |

**Physical address**
876 East Pennsylvania Lane, Boise, Idaho, 83706

**Mailing address**
876 E Pennsylvania Lane, Boise, ID, 83706,

September 16, 2021

Dear Redistricting Commission,

My name is Diane Schwarz and I live at 876 E Pennsylvania Lane in SE Boise, part of the South Shore subdivision. I have lived in this spot in Idaho since 2006, and my husband’s family has lived here for 3 generations. In the 15+ years as a resident of Idaho I have enjoyed my community of SE Boise and have developed roots in my daily activities, from community service, to yoga, work outs, hiking, shopping, to friendships and neighborhood. I would like to keep my community whole. It makes much sense with the boundaries of major roadways like Broadway and Sunset Peak Road. For these same reasons, the other proposed Ada County legislative districts also keep their communities whole and use major roadways as boundaries and keep the flow/geography of the districts in sync with the east/west flow of the roads/Boise River.

I have started 2 non-profits, serving children and families in our community and I have personally seen the importance of community coming together and the impact we can all have in ways large and small. It is vitally important to keep these communities whole.

The attached map splits the following eight counties only: Bonner, Kootenai, Nez Perce, Canyon, Ada, Twin Falls, Bannock, and Bonneville. A central feature of this map is District 9 which includes the following counties Boise, Custer, Lemhi, Butte, Jefferson. In this particular map, this district is key to reducing the number of county splits statewide. While two districts slightly exceed 5% deviation, no two districts statewide exceed overall deviation of 10%.

I am in support of a map for legislative districts across Idaho that keeps our communities whole. Thank you for your hard work and commitment to Idaho.

Very sincerely yours,

Diane Schwarz
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane Schwarz</td>
<td>12089490682</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-16 12:11:22</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>876 E Pennsylvania Lane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boise, ID 83706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dianeschwarz@hotmail.com">dianeschwarz@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208-949-0682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian Thomson</td>
<td>209-901-1420</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-16 13:24:30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36 S Mesa Vista Dr., Boise, Idaho, 83705</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing in support of a congressional redistricting map that consolidates a single district in the Treasure Valley based on principles found in both the US Constitution and Idaho statute. Depending on which counties you include, the Treasure Valley consists of nearly 800,000 people in the last census. With a population of 1.84 million statewide, that is nearly 45% of the state’s entire population, or 85% of the approximately 920,000 people that each new congressional district would need to include. But instead of keeping that single community together, past maps have decided to split the Treasure Valley right down the middle, and in fact, have split the State’s largest city in two, politically dividing the representation of the community I live in.

I have heard in the past that splitting the Treasure Valley in two makes each congressional representative responsive to the needs of both rural and metropolitan concerns, and requires that both be answerable to diverse interests. However, in doing so, past district maps have divided a single, cohesive community of interest and effectively created not two representatives who are responsive to their own unique constituencies, but two representatives who are responsive to homogenous constituencies that have been created only by dividing the Treasure Valley. In other words, contrary to the design of the Constitution, our elected representative positions appear to be indistinguishable from our statewide Senators. The idea of a statewide Senator was precisely for them to take into consideration the needs and concerns of the entire state, as opposed to a smaller subsection of the state—which should be the purpose of our representatives.
In addition, our Idaho statute indicates that “to the maximum extent possible, districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.” (I.C. §72-1506(2).) I live near downtown Boise. It has always seemed inconsistent with the statute that folks just three miles away are in a different Congressional District, even though we work at the same place, send our kids to schools in the same district, read the same local paper, and attend the same community organization events. Our very statute requests that we remain together “to the maximum extent possible.” The Treasure Valley is a single, cohesive community—and a wonderful one. It is certainly possible to preserve it as a single political community as well. The statute has indicated what you should do, and that is to not to divide our local community of interest.

Hello,

My name is Megan Smith and I am very interested in preserving our current districts as I love my community and think it's important to keep us together. The Map I'd like to offer support for is called "idahomapguy/Congressional 2 - Congressional 2 No County Splits 418" I support this map because it is most like the current congressional district plan, but follows Idaho Code 72-1506 (5) which requires the commission to avoid dividing counties in a congressional district plan. The primary difference between this proposed map and the current congressional plan is swapping the population of Western Ada with Bonneville and its nearby counties. Under this plan CD1 would retain almost 90% of its counties, only losing West Ada and Boise counties. The overall population deviation of this proposed map is 418 people, which is less than the deviation of the 2011 congressional plan, and one-tenth of the deviation between West Virginia's congressional districts that the the Supreme Court found justifiable to achieve the state's goal of preserving county boundaries in Tennant v. Jefferson County. I support this plan because it is the best way to preserve our existing congressional district boundaries as well as possible without dividing counties as required by law. I meet with Rep Crapo at least once a year and prefer to remain in his district.

Thank you for your consideration,
Megan
Megan Smith 304-777-7363 Self Boise 2021-09-16 13:54:59 16

I am writing in support of the draft Legislative map, L023 by Jordan Morales. It meets the population equity requirement while adhering to county boundary lines.

Thank you.

Ann Carlson

Ann Carlson 12083445291 Self Boise 2021-09-16 19:19:51 18

Physical address 2847 S Law Ave, Boise, Idaho, 83706

Mailing address 2847 S Law Ave, Boise, ID, 83706,

I am writing in support of the draft Legislative map, L023 by Jordan Morales. It meets the population equity requirement while adhering to county boundary lines.

Thank you.

Ann Carlson

Ros Tanner 208-555-5555 self Boise 2021-09-16 19:32:27 18

Physical address 3141 S Temperance Way, Boise, Idaho, 83706

Mailing address

Dear Commission,

I am requesting you consider map L023. After reviewing all the maps, I like that this one keeps more communities together including mine because it follows the law in keeping counties together and uses geographical features as boundaries.

Thank you for this important work you are doing. I am relatively new to Boise but I am proud that Idaho has a bipartisan commission working on this issue and not a partisan one. Thank you again for your services.
My name is Jim Ruckh and we moved here six years ago from WI and now live in SE Boise to be close to our youngest son’s family and their two daughters. I really like the Jordan Morales Map L023 because it keeps the community feel we have here intact. It’s a great part of the city to live in and we like having the close access to the Boise River, Greenbelts on both sides for biking and walking, and close to Foothills Trails for hiking. Schools are very good, and Timberline and Boise are the two high schools that serve this new area. Shopping is close by and it’s easy to get to the retail choices on Parkcenter and Federal Way. I volunteer at the Idaho Botanical Garden which is only a ten-minute drive from the house.

The borders make sense because they are all major traffic thoroughfares that people are familiar with. Sunset Peak Rd on the north, I-84 on the south, Cole Rd on the west and the Ada County line on the east. Housing is almost all single-family homes but there are some duplexes and apartments but not very many.

My only comment on the Sarah Harris Congressional Maps C025, C026, & C027 is that I would much prefer that we keep Ada County as a whole county in District 2. I believe having southern and northern districts better reflect the residents than the current east/west division.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Ruckh</td>
<td>262-720-0046</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-17 20:22:10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

Overall, I support the L023 map plan because seems to keep our SE Boise community intact very much like it has been in the past.

Thank you,

Jim and Mary Ruckh
jnruckh@gmail.com
262-720-0046

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Basinger</td>
<td>12085703727</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-17 21:35:09</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address 3860 South Preamble Place, Boise, Boise, Boise, Idaho, 83706

Mailing address 3860 South Preamble Place, Boise, Boise, Boise, ID, 83706

I am supporting L023, presented by Jordan Morales for the Idaho State Districts. I just want fair and balanced districts that keep communities and natural boundaries intact. This plan appears straightforward and fair.

For our US Congressional districts, please keep counties intact. The map presented by Sarah Harris achieves this.

Thank you,

Nancy Basinger
I oppose the commission’s proposed congressional district plan on the grounds that it violates Idaho Code 72-1506 (5). I am in support of Congressional district plans C025, C026, and C027 because according to Idaho Code 72-1506 (5) that states, “Division of counties shall be avoided whenever possible.” Lower population deviation between congressional districts can be achieved in numerous congressional district plans when counties are kept whole than the deviation in the 2011 plan and the plan that the commission is now proposing. Furthermore these maps have a deviation of .02% or .03% which is acceptable and fair for residents.

I am in support of Legislative map L023. It is important in our great state to keep communities whole. You want the people you shop with, and go to church with to be in the same legislative district, because the needs of the community can then be best represented by your elected official. This map follows the natural geography of the state, following rivers, major thoroughfares, changes in terrain etc. I encourage the board to review Legislative Map L023 and adopt it.

Thank you for your service to this board and to our community.

Teegan Carter
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donald Kemper</td>
<td>2088700776</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-18 17:04:20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont. Don Kemper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Hanson</td>
<td>2083183935</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-19 10:55:07</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>877 Chardie Rd., Boise, Idaho, 83702</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong> , , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the commission to adopt the map L023 created by Jordan Morales. I like this map because my new district respects the natural boundaries including rivers and major thoroughfares and does a really good job of keeping the district sizes similar. But what I really like about it personally is that it is a good representation of my local community. I shop along State Street at places like Target at State and Eagle, go to restaurants like Westside Drivein and Cold Stone Creamery on State, my kids play soccer at Optimist soccer fields and my daughter goes to Huntington Learning Center out by State and Eagle. Thank you for taking this into consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1912 N 15th St, Boise, Idaho, 83702</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong> , , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a 67 year old man residing in north Boise for 16 years. I'm a resident of Legislative District 19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm writing in support of the L023 map.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like Mr. Morales’ map #23 on the website. It keeps my community intact and distributes the population fairly. I also think it's easy to comprehend because it uses the major east/west roadways as well as the river. In regards to the Congressional Districts, my request is simple, keep the counties intact (adjacent to each other) in order to comply with Idaho Code 72-1506 (5).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greta Dunlap</td>
<td>2088008142</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>2021-09-19 19:49:33</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address** 11003 W. Rose Lake Street, Star, Idaho, 83669

**Mailing address** 11003 W. Rose Lake Street, Star, ID, 83669,

Appreciate the efforts by the Commissioners on this difficult project. I was at a recent hearing in Eagle and heard testimony particularly on maps #23 and #34. I live in Star, and am strongly against map 23 dividing the district for Star into 3 counties. As a resident of Star, I support the local we have but go into Eagle and Meridian for other needs, never going west to Middleton or north to Emmett. I support map 34 presented by Rep. Rice and appreciate they kept the districts within Ada County.

Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ron and Cay Marquart</td>
<td>208-344-4012</td>
<td>selves</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-19 22:32:40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address** 3300 E. Red Stone Drive, Boise, Idaho, 83712

**Mailing address** , , , ,

My wife and I are part of a group who are responsible for delivering community newsletters. Keeping our community whole should be of upmost importance. The map drawn by Jordan Morales accomplishes that goal. This map follows existing geographic boundaries and thoroughfares that make sense to people who live here. Counties should remain in the same district whenever possible. This map keeps my county whole.
I've had the opportunity to review the Commission's proposed plan as it affects District 1 and believe it is a better reflection of our community as it functions in relation to commerce, education and community activities. The previous map omitted Sagle (E of the highway) including the Bottle Bay and Garfield Bay areas. The new map includes these areas, as well as the eastern part of the County south of the highway. This new map also better adheres to our school district boundaries, a fundamental delineation of community and events that bring residents together.

Thank you for your bi-partisan work on this issue.

Respectfully,
Barbara Schriber
Sandpoint, ID

My husband, Ronald Douglas, and I are writing to testify opposing the map for redistricting that moves Fernan Lake Village out of District 4, which is primarily Coeur D Alene (CDA). We can walk from or home to the CDA City Hall and all the restaurants and businesses in the city center. If there was a way to post a photo I could show the houses on Fernan Lake in the foreground and the straight walk down Sherman Avenue to downtown and CDA Lake. Please do not move Fernan Lake Village out of District 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marsha bravo</td>
<td>208-859-6284</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>garden city</td>
<td>2021-09-20 13:49:23</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address** 6237 garrett street, garden city, Idaho, 83714  
**Mailing address**  

I support legislative map #LO23 submitted by Jordan Morales. I am a forever Idaho resident and live in legislative district 16. This map satisfies my hope in that it that keeps similar neighborhood and housing types together and keeps my community together within a district.

| Susan Drumheller | 208 9460846 | self | Sagle | 2021-09-20 14:14:29 | 7 |

**Physical address** 85 Sweeney Drive, Sagle, Idaho, 83860  
**Mailing address**  

Dear Commissioners,

For the last 10 years, as a resident of Sagle, I have felt disenfranchised when it comes to the Legislature. My district is currently spread out in a way that should be illegal. My community has little in common with Whitebird or even Wallace. Sagle residents share common interests with people in Bonner County and the Sandpoint area. We should NOT be lumped in with people from Idaho or Clearwater or Shoshone counties. I look forward to having a legislator who actually knows something about my community and bothers to learn about our area and interests.

Thank you for your service,

Susan Drumheller
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judy Meyers</td>
<td>208-865-7251</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Sagle</td>
<td>2021-09-20 19:01:36</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address
375 Gold Hill Circle, Sagle, Idaho, 83860

Mailing address

Dear Commission members:

I live on Bottle Bay, just south of the Long Bridge entry into Sandpoint. Sandpoint is "my town" for shopping, recreating, volunteer work, meeting with friends, etc. I am on the board of trustees for the Sandpoint Library. I pay taxes to Bonner County.

Yet, I am in D7. While I think Senator Carl Crabtree is doing a fine job, it would make a lot more common sense for Senator Jim Woodward to represent me and my neighbors.

Thank you,

Judy Meyers
375 Gold Hill Circle
Sagle, ID 83860
208 265 7251

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bev Moss</td>
<td>208-755-0114</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>2021-09-21 09:41:39</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address
1202 E Ash Ave, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, 83814

Mailing address
1202 E Ash Ave, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, 83814,

I think it's important that the City of CDA be kept whole as a district. This is unifying for us as a community and makes perfect sense. I support Dan English's proposed redistricting to reflect this plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spencer Stucki</td>
<td>208-604-3393</td>
<td>Committee for fair elections</td>
<td>Chubbuck</td>
<td>2021-09-21 13:48:37</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td><strong>5046 Independence Ave, Chubbuck, Idaho, 83202</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Commissioners; As I look at L01 I see that Bear Lake County is included in a District that includes a large block of Bonneville County and Teton County. There is nothing to tie those counties together, no roads and no access. Butte County ties much better to Jefferson County than to Bingham County. Oneida County has no ties to Cassia County even though I-84 goes through Oneida it only passes through a very remote corner with no population. I-1,5 on the other hand, ties Oneida to Bannock County, Malad to Pocatello, and there are many other ties as well. There are some very odd shaped districts and at least for southeast Idaho, it appears the lines were drawn to keep incumbents from facing each other.

It appears that you have avoided splitting counties for the most part, except that at least three precincts in Bannock County are in whole or part included with Caribou County in District 28. I invite you to look at my submitted proposal L026 for a way to better represent Southeast Idaho.

Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kathy Holcomb</th>
<th>(208) 559-8534</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>STAR</th>
<th>2021-09-21 20:27:26</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical</strong></td>
<td><strong>198 S WILDGRASS WAY, STAR, Idaho, 83669</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I am writing in support of redistricting plan L034, submitted by Jim Rice and Scott Grow. It makes the most sense to me. I am strongly opposed to L023, which would encompass three counties by putting Star in with Emmett and Middleton. Having three counties in the same district will be problematic. The state constitution provides that counties be preserved intact where possible. L034 would keep a larger part of Ada County intact. Why not let the line be drawn at Middleton to keep our little town in Ada County?

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Kathy L. Holcomb
I am writing to encourage a redistricting process that adheres to proper guidelines that govern this important exercise. Specifically, the new redistricting map show manifest 1) communities being kept together (specifically small communities), 2) counties are not split, and major roads or rivers are used as boundaries. Accordingly, I urge the commission to seriously consider proposed maps CO25, CO26 and LO23.

Respectfully,
Paul Cooperrider

I support the maps drawn by Sarah Harris (C025, C026, C027) because they keep Ada County whole. C027 actually keeps all the counties whole and still maintains almost no deviation in population. However, having said that, it is keeping the counties whole which is more important than small variations in population between different districts. Idaho Code 72-1506 (5) states, “Division of counties shall be avoided whenever possible.” And as you can see from this map, it is TOTALLY possible. Idaho Code 72-1506 (3) requires that, “Districts shall be substantially equal in population and should seek to comply with all applicable federal standards and statutes.” Map C027 accomplishes both. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anne Wilder</td>
<td>208-448-2601</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Priest River</td>
<td>2021-09-22 11:13:18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>349 Primrose Lane, Priest River, Idaho, 83856</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please follow the Constitution and do NOT divide up the counties, especially the small counties, putting part of our county in a different district. For the last decade part of our county was in a district that stretched as far as Portland from Bonner County. Now you want to combine part of our county with Kootenai County, which already has more than one district. This is wrong. Bonner County deserves to be represented by residents of Bonner County. Please leave Bonner County intact. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Rytterager</td>
<td>2089215052</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>BOISE</td>
<td>2021-09-22 11:20:23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>2006 Gourley St., BOISE, Idaho, 83705</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My name is Linda Rytterager and I’m a retired educator who has lived in the Vista-Overland area for 26 years. I like living in this central location, close to downtown as well as the airport and main highways. I walk and bike in my neighborhood regularly, and have watched it slowly evolve as the city has grown. Traditionally, this area has been a lower-income, working-class neighborhood with many self-employed tradesmen. But it’s changed a lot recently: it’s denser and has a more diverse population.

Recent infill projects have attracted more single renters, college students, and young families with children. Foot traffic on our street has increased, and there are more pedestrians walking on our quiet shaded streets. My daily walking route takes me past a school, a park, and a daycare center. I often ride my bike to Hillcrest Library or Owyhee Park, and use the dedicated bicycle routes on Shoshone to access the bank, supermarket, and coffee shops nearby.

When I looked at the proposed maps on the website, the one I liked best was Jordan Morales’ Map #23. It’s simple to understand and keeps all of these features of our community together since it uses the main roadways and natural contours of the landscape.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan and Michael Philley</td>
<td>2083781714</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-22 15:46:00</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 8639 W Atwater Drive, Boise, Idaho, 83714

**Mailing address**: 8639 W Atwater Drive, Boise, ID, 83714,

I am a citizen in Garden City’s Congregational District 1, District 16 and want to comment:

I support LO 23 because it follows existing geographic boundaries such as rivers and main roads, and counties which I should be in the same district. We enjoy using the parks in that area and this presents a nice logical map which is easy to remember.

Thank you!

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Acuff</td>
<td>2086609229</td>
<td>City of Fernan Lake Village</td>
<td>2021-09-22 17:25:33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 112 S HAZELWOOD DR, Fernan Lake Village, Idaho, 83814

**Mailing address**: 112 S HAZELWOOD DR, 112 S. Hazelwood Dr, COEUR D ALENE, ID, 83814,

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard. Fernan is directly impacted and adjacent to the City of Coeur d'Alene. With the revitalization of East Sherman district I believe it would be beneficial to stay in the same district as Coeur d'Alene. We have diligently been working together with the City of Coeur d'Alene to have our commercial districts developed for each others benefit and redistricting us would be detrimental for all the future and previous planning. Your consideration to keep us under the same district as Coeur d'Alene is greatly appreciated. Thank you.

Kindly,

Heidi Acuff
Mayor, City of Fernan Lake Village
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Aragon</td>
<td>2084094554</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>2021-09-23 18:17:46</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Physical address  | 727 W Sedgewick, Meridian, Idaho, 83860 | Mailing address |                      |

I live in Meridian. I am a homeowner and registered voter here since April 2008. I'm a resident of Legislative District 20. I'm writing in support of the L023 map. This map includes the shops, businesses and services I frequent. The borders are sensible for Meridian city services. This map follows existing geographic boundaries and thoroughfares that make sense to people who live here.

Thank you,
Dolores Aragon

| Diane Schwarz     | 208-949-0682 | self                          | Boise     | 2021-09-24 10:27:07   | 18        |

| Physical address  | 817 E Pennsylvania Lane, Boise, Idaho, 83706 | Mailing address |                      |

Dear Redistricting Commission,
I support Map L023.
I would like to highlight that Ada County is one of the fastest growing counties in Idaho and the nation. I hope you will consider this in drawing the new legislative district boundaries. The census data is from April of 2020 and recent real estate data shows growth in Ada County from 2020 to 2021 to be 3.24% and in some areas as high as 13%. If boundaries are drawn with the deviation near or exceeding the standard (from Aril 2020) Ada County districts would be already exceeding the 10% standard now, let alone in the next 10 years.

Our Constitution guarantees the right to vote, with one person, one vote. The work of the Redistricting Commission is to ensure that all votes across Idaho count equally, so a vote in Ada County carries the same weight as a vote in Lemhi or Custer Counties. Please ensure that the population growth, even from April 2020 is considered in drawing new district boundaries, and that one person, one vote is maintained equally across the state.

I live in SE Boise, part of the South Shore subdivision. I have lived in this spot in Idaho since 2006, and my husband’s family has lived here for 3 generations. In the 15+ years as a resident of Idaho I have enjoyed my community of SE Boise and have developed roots in my daily activities, from community service, to yoga, work outs, hiking, shopping, to friendships and neighborhood. I would like...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diane Schwarz</td>
<td>208-949-0682</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-24 10:27:07</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**cont.** to keep my community whole. It makes much sense with the boundaries of major roadways like Broadway and Sunset Peak Road. For these same reasons, the other proposed Ada County legislative districts also keep their communities whole and use major roadways as boundaries and keep the flow/geography of the districts in sync with the east/west flow of the roads/Boise River.

I have started 2 non-profits, serving children and families in our community and I have personally seen the importance of community coming together and the impact we can all have in ways large and small. It is vitally important to keep these communities whole.

I am in support of Map L023 for legislative districts because it keeps our communities whole and it plans for growth. Thank you for your hard work and commitment to Idaho.

Very sincerely yours,

Diane Schwarz

| Jana Argersinger | 208-301-2955 | Self                        | Moscow | 2021-09-25 03:56:07 | 5         |

**Physical address** 1415 Pine Cone Rd., #8, Moscow, Idaho, 83843  

**Mailing address** , Princeville, HI, 96722,

I support the new district lines as drawn in the commission's first proposal--joining Latah County with the part of Nez Perze County that contains Lewiston, which has more in common with Latah than other areas under consideration.
Dear legislators,

Since Jerome county and Blaine county are closely linked in terms of workers commuting between the two counties, as well as lots of commerce occurring between the two counties, it would seem that these two counties should be linked in the same district. Jerome county provides access to stores that are not available in Blaine county.

I am writing in support of the Jordan Morales map L023. This map follows all the constitutional guidelines and keeps communities whole. My neighbors and I in NW Boise remain together.

Thank you.

Since District 26 will be approximately 6000 people short of the new district size criterion, I recommend that District 26 remove Gooding County and add Jerome County. This change will swap one contiguous county for another and bring the combined population within the range required for the district. Jerome County probably has more connectivity with the District than Gooding County has, as a large number of residents of Jerome County commute into District 26 for their livelihoods, and as a result, there is a healthy exchange of people and lifestyles. This proposed change also avoids the alternative possibility of nibbling off parts of other contiguous counties to achieve the same district population, a method which would separate neighbors into different legislative districts. It also appears that
Gooding County would be well matched with its other legislative district neighbors, making that change relatively smooth. I urge you to consider and adopt this recommendation.

Michael Burgess,  
Post Falls, LD3  
To: the independent 2021 State of Idaho Commission for Reapportionment  
(Note: this is a revision that adds the postscript of my in person testimony September 22, 2021)

Mr. Chairman,

This is the third Apportionment of Idaho by means of the "Independent Apportionment Committee". I have naively striven for two years to understand the non-political obstacles that hinder this work with the aim to find and then promote a way to smooth the path of this committees' work to avoid for the first time involvement of the Court.

The chief obstacles clouding the understanding and judgment of fellow citizens are the natural geographical boundaries and how they influenced county boundaries. A deep dive into various courts’ historical perception of “gerrymandered” lines by a 2019 Mercatus Center study (out of George Mason University) reduced the whole question to the perception of irregular lines. An ideal district as you likely know is one that is most “compact”. I presume you are all familiar with that term?

When you have to work with irregular natural lines such as pervade the midsection of Idaho it is near impossible to draw what mathematicians term a compact district. You well pointed out in the opening statement the challenge of the mountains. I submit that for the sake of general understanding you go one further. Begin with a "before" map where the federal lands on the map are erased. These maps you have over here are impressively helpful tools. Adding such a map will spare thousands of words. Citizens will understand when seeing what remains what underlies the distribution of the population, and they will see how daunting a task this is to meet well intentioned statutes.

With that as a backdrop I want to first focus on the most egregious result of past apportionments. That is the difference in "Access to Representation". The present District 7 and District 8 comprise one third of the land mass of the state (when counting the federal lands in them). Representatives tell me they travel as much as 250 miles one way in district 7. Imagine how many Town Halls
that necessitates for live person access. In contrast you can cover all of districts 10 through 22 on an 8" x 10" map with your thumb. You can walk a few blocks from some of these districts to the next. One Town hall meeting might suffice. The "Access to Representation" there is obviously easy. On top of this existing disparity we have to add the surge of new residents. Anything within statute you can do to alleviate this disparity of "Access to Representation", you must do.

Before complimenting aspects of your first effort in Legislative Plan 1, I want to remind everyone that the population numbers you are working with are based on where people lived on April 1st of 2020. According to Sheriff department numbers Kootenai County was receiving an influx of 5000 new residents each month for several months afterward. As you try to keep districts well within a couple percent of the mean, I encourage you leave room to anticipate a percentage or two more in areas where the growth is expected. One such area is Rathdrum Prairie between Post Falls and Rathdrum. I am involved in a land search for a proposed Charter school in that area. If the prognosticating planners are to be believed Post Falls will overshadow Coeur d'Alene in 15 years. I commend you in plan 1 for honoring the lines of the Communities of Interest established between Post Falls, Rathdrum, Hayden and Coeur D'Alene.

This brings me to also compliment the first plan offering, for already anticipating a fraction of that growth. I have a caveat to the compliment. Since hierarchically the second no-no by statute is "external splitting" of part of a county, to share a district with another county or more, and a distant third is not having a contiguous highway in the district, how will you be able to have the Northeast portion of the new district 3, the portion north of Athol pass muster according to statute? They will have to drive through the Athol area of the neighboring district by either one or a combination of two highways. I was informed shortly before this meeting that there is a recent submitted plan by another presenter that may addresses that so I will anticipate that with you with great interest.

Now if I still have time, I have a post script I would like to add if I may? Thank you.

P.S. It is not required in your Final Report to affix and publish compactness scores for the districts. I trust you are aware some 9 or more are available with the redistricting software you use. I am asking you to raise the bar beyond what you are required to do ... in one of two ways. I think you will be heroes for succeeding decades if you publish an applicable compactness score on an addendum map in your final report (one that mathematically "Normalizes" the irregular natural boundaries may be best). Imagine several decades of scores serving as a benchmark for future apportionment.

I submit you would be superheroes if you provide contrast for those district scores by first having the compactness of the state, and of each of the 44 counties scored. Without that contrast the district scores will be hard to appreciate. You will be able to show the irregular "playing field" apportionment starts with.

The other option if budgeting will not allow that is to recommend this as an action item in your Final Report. Similar to a consumer comparing energy ratings when shopping for an appliance, citizens will be able to appreciate the difficulty and result of the work.
Michael Burgess
208-771-2307
self
Post Falls
2021-09-25 10:42:48
3

cont.
Thank you Mr. Chairman

Linda Ross
830-426-9779
self
Deary
2021-09-25 16:06:45
5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1074 Harris Rd, Deary, Idaho, 83823</td>
<td>same, , , ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I served on county redistricting committees in two counties when we lived in Texas (commissioner precincts are determined by population)) and I know how difficult it is to please everyone.

We live in rural Latah County, south of Deary. We support redistricting mapL01 because Kendrick, Juliaetta, Genessee and other southern county areas are close to Lewiston and residents of those communities shop and get medical care in Lewiston and have common interests. The rural areas in the south of Latah are closer and more aligned with Lewiston than with Moscow. The two counties share a health district and a judicial district. I am currently receiving extended health care in Lewiston. When travelling to Lewiston we go through portions of Nez Perce County that are similar in geography to southern Latah County. It seems that adding the Nez Perce reservation that is in Nez Perce County would also make sense, with common geography, farming and other interests.

Thank you for considering our ideas. Linda and Raleigh Ross, Deary
Dear Sirs:

First, thank you for your time and patience with me as I testified in Lewiston on Thursday. As I explained, it was my first time speaking, and I may not have been as explicit and exact as I'd hoped to be. Therefore, I am including a written testimony to ensure my views are as clear as possible.

I am in favor of the Legislative Map, L1, which combines northern Lewiston with Latah County, so I am saying 'Yes' to L1 for the following reasons:

First, Moscow and Lewiston share the same Health Districts, as well as the same Judicial District (District 2). Secondly, since Moscow and Lewiston are only 30 miles apart, we interact as communities, sharing shopping experiences (contrary to testimony, many of us in Lewiston shop in the unique stores in Moscow), activities, and interests. Moscow offers Lewiston a variety of restaurants and enhance our dining experiences, as well. Both Moscow and Lewiston students and families share many college opportunities and activities. Moscow and Lewiston also share an airport, and by combining the two cities under a common district, this airport could be better supported through a combined county funding.

Finally, since both Moscow and Lewiston border Washington State, they tend to share some of the same issues, such as management of ports and access-point maintenance and security. Both cities would benefit by existing together in a single political district and, thus, making them a stronger voice for Idaho's interests in any issues between the states, ic concerning commerce.

I learned much by listening at the hearing on Thursday, and am more convinced now that L1 map would be a benefit to Lewiston by giving Lewiston, essentially, two voices in government. After doing a bit more research, I also found that school districts would not necessarily be affected and so withdraw my concerns in this area.

Again, my thanks for the panels' patience with my rather weak oral presentation. I trust that this puts my position of favoring L1 in a clear light with concrete reasons for utilizing the existing L1 plan.

Sincerely,
Helen S Hawley
Lewiston, ID 83501
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christine Silvey</td>
<td>9258724054</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>2021-09-26 15:57:26</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>932 W Crescent St, Meridian, Idaho, 83646</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My name is Christine Silvey. I'm a private practice owner and a resident of Legislative District 20 the last 3 years. I'm writing in support of the C025 and C026 map.

I love that these maps are clear and easy to understand. That alone keeps communities connected. These maps follow existing geographic boundaries and thoroughfares that make sense to people who live here. Counties should remain in the same district whenever possible. This map keeps my county whole.

Thank you,
Christine Silvey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Michael Jennings</th>
<th>208-882-8528</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Moscow</th>
<th>2021-09-26 20:26:10</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>616 E 7th St., Moscow, Idaho, 83843</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the proposed district makes sense as the "Quad Cities" (Lewiston, Clarkston, Pullman, and Moscow, along with the outlying areas of Latah County are a cohesive population. However, the southwestern corner of the proposed district is poorly shaped for representing people of the general area. The shape of it should be simplified and set a bit farther to the east to include Lapwai. Many of the citizens who live in that area commute to Lewiston and Moscow for work and shared events. They are socially cohesive with people who live in the broader region to the north and west of them. In including this small modification would make for a more consistent district.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Thea</td>
<td>2087207805</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-09-26 20:59:33</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1630 Heroic Road, Hailey, Idaho, 83333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>1630 Heroic Road, Hailey, ID, 83333,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to submit testimony on redistricting, since I cannot be there in person. I appreciate the opportunity to submit this written testimony,

I live and work in Hailey, ID in fact I am president of the Hailey City Council, and I am an actively engaged citizen, i volunteer for local organizations and I have a child who went through the school system here in Blaine County. I deeply care about Blaine County and The Wood River Valley. I would like to see the following counties in the same district: Blaine, Jerome, and Lincoln Counties, these 3 counties are probably the best fit when it comes to proximity, demographics, and communities of interest and would be the best representation for us. I think an open process with community input is very important. I do not want to see counties split they should be kept whole when going through the redistricting process. This one of the most important processes we will go through so please be thoughtful, fair and open in this process.

Thank you,
Karen (Kaz) Thea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Marlow</td>
<td>2083536722</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>2021-09-27 08:08:02</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>485 S. Winslow Bay Way, Star, Idaho, 83669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support Legislative Dist. 34 proposed by Scott Grow. However, taking some population on the West side of Eagle adding it to Dist. 14 (if it’s not added already) would help lower the amount of population in Eagle. This box is Hwy 44 between Linder and Hwy 16 and North to Beacon Light Rd. This box is already so close to Star it makes sense to have it be a part of Star.

I’m not testifying by phone.

Please DO NOT include Star in 3 different counties! Keep it in Ada County.
Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Jane Marlow</td>
<td>2083536722</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Star</td>
<td>2021-09-27 08:08:02</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janette Dennis</td>
<td>208-358-2682</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>2021-09-28 11:36:24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of Fairfield, nearly all of my needs are met in the Wood River valley and sometimes the Magic Valley. I seldom have need to go to Mountain Home. During your deliberations concerning our new legislative district lines in this region, please consider where we constituents: shop, receive services, hire our workforce, travel, and recreate. Our state regional departments and agencies, education and healthcare systems all operate through the Magic Valley. Our legislators who represent this area have decades of experience, knowledge, and relationships in the Magic Valley area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carol Brown</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-09-28 17:36:00</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of Fairfield, nearly all of my needs are met in the Wood River valley and sometimes the Magic Valley. I seldom have need to go to Mountain Home. During your deliberations concerning our new legislative district lines in this region, please consider where we constituents: shop, receive services, hire our workforce, travel, and recreate. Our state regional departments and agencies, education and healthcare systems all operate through the Magic Valley. Our legislators who represent this area have decades of experience, knowledge, and relationships in the Magic Valley area.

September 28, 2021

To: Idaho Commission for Redistricting
From: Carol Brown – 830 Silver Star Drive, Hailey, Blaine County
Re: Comments on the proposed District Boundaries District 26
Dear Commission Members:

Thank-you for undertaking this important task. I have reviewed the proposed map that includes Legislative District 26 (where I live). Overall, I think you have done a great job with the Commission’s Draft L-01 map. There will never be a “perfect” map, but keeping Blaine, Lincoln, and Jerome together does make sense. We are tied together by Highway 75 / 93. We live, work, and play throughout this Legislative District as a community. It’s easy to watch the “2J” and “4L” license plates drive into the Wood River Valley every day for work (or play). I’ve ridden up the chairlift at Sun Valley ski resort with many a person from Shoshone and Jerome. And I’ve certainly shopped at Bozutts in Jerome.

If I were to support a second map, it would be that submitted by Wendy Jaquet (designated as L050.) This map combines Blaine, Camas, Gooding, and Twin Falls city. Again, Highway 75 and Highway 20 connect us. There are many vehicles with “1C” and “2G” plates driving into the Wood River Valley every day for work and often for play. A powder ski day at Soldier Mountain is fantastic - we love skiing there! I’ve spent quite a bit of money in the City of Twin Falls. (Hello, Costco!) It’s also where I got my cataract surgery done and where I see other medical professionals.

How we spend our days, in work and play, is what ties us as a community. It is why I am supporting first your draft map L-01 and second, the Wendy Jaquet L050 map.

Thank-you again for all your hard work – it is truly appreciated.

Best,
/s/ Carol P Brown
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jake Heusinkveld</td>
<td>12088634173</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-29 08:40:18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>3675 N Gramarcy Lane, Boise, Idaho, 83703</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>3675 N Gramarcy Lane, Boise, ID, 83703,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hello, My name is Jake Heusinkveld. I am a resident of Garden City, Idaho. I live in Idaho State Legislative District 16 and in the 2nd US Congressional District. I support the adoption of Congressional district Map CO27 as proposed by Sarah Harris. I also support Legislative district Map LO23 submitted by Jordan Morales. These proposed maps keep similar neighborhoods and housing types together plus keep my same community/city together within in a district. They follow existing geographic boundaries such as rivers and main roads. They keep counties whole (not being split up) and in the same district. Thank you. Jake Heusinkveld</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Patterson</td>
<td>208-309-1701</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>2021-09-29 11:45:09</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>20641 N Main St Box 75, Carey, Idaho, 83320</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>Box 75, Carey, ID, 83320,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi, I’m Randy Patterson, Mayor of Idaho’s 200th city Carey. I am in favor of proposed map L1. This proposed plan would put Jerome, Lincoln, and Blaine counties together in one district. Point #1: The City of Carey is part of a coalition of cities that was put together during the Ranjen water call. Those in the proposed Legislative District are: City of Carey City of Shoshone City of Richfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Patterson</td>
<td>208-309-1701</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Carey</td>
<td>2021-09-29 11:45:09</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dietrich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Jerome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What we accomplished together was to mitigate our water uses to make our cities immune to future water calls. We are still part of the coalition keeping our interests in water issues safe. (All cities involved are: Jerome, Burley, Rupert, Gooding, Heyburn, Wendell, Shoshone, Paul, Hazelton, Carey, Richfield, Declo, Dietrich, Bliss)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The citizens of these cities all have a common interest in water issues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point #2:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People in the proposed L1 plan that live in Jerome, Lincoln, and Blaine counties share Twin Falls as a common shopping and supplier. In Blaine County we travel through Lincoln and Jerome counties to go to Twin Falls to shop.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Point #3:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaine County has a housing shortage for people who work in the county. Many people from Jerome and Lincoln county commute to Blaine county every day to work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The economies of all three counties are tied together. Some of the other proposed plans put us with areas of the State that we have little or no social or economic ties.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, I support proposed L1 plan for redistricting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy Patterson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 75 – 20641 N Main - Carey, ID  83320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Kelly Roberts      | 602-291-3352 | Self                        | Bellevue | 2021-09-29 15:47:37 | 26        |
| **Physical address** | 240 Melrose Street, Bellevue, Idaho, 83313 |                             |          |                     |           |
| **Mailing address** |              |                             |          |                     |           |
| I support a plan such as L1, for Blaine County, combining Blaine, Lincoln, and Jerome Counties because such a district would provide adequate representation, whereas many other maps would render us a helicopter district. |
To 2021 Commission for Reapportionment, I talked with you at your Testimony event in Sandpoint. Your staff could not find the DRA (davesredistricting.org) map I was trying to cite as good in its approach to North Idaho. I have gone through all 41 "L" maps currently on your (https://legislature.idaho.gov/redistricting/2021/) site and did not find it. You can find it here: https://davesredistricting.org/maps#viewmap::8e6655d5-5860-4a96-b591-dc5a6a3c6a6d It is still listed on the davesredistricting.org site for Idaho (https://davesredistricting.org/maps#state::ID) STATE LEGISLATURE area. They note it as the "Least Splitting" version they know of. I would think that would interest you. I suggest you add it to your list as L02 where it would get the attention it deserves.

This map does not split any Precincts, and it joins Clark Fork Precinct with Bay View Pct. as requested by several folks at the Sandpoint meeting. I have not examined it's redistricting of every corner of the state in detail. However I do note there are no hugely tall or wide districts (think current LD7 &amp; LD24) though its LD25 is quite wide. Anyway I think it is a great start.

Thanks for all your work.

Respectfully,
Doug Paterson

PS I will also send this via Email so links work
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company / City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Roberts</td>
<td>16022913353</td>
<td>Self, Bellevue</td>
<td>2021-09-29 17:10:22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong> 240 Melrose St, Bellevue, Idaho, 83313</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I support a plan such as L1, for Blaine County, combining Blaine, Lincoln, and Jerome Counties because such a district would provide adequate representation, whereas many other maps would render us a helicopter district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company / City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Boyne</td>
<td>9705811268</td>
<td>Self, Boise</td>
<td>2021-09-29 20:32:42</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong> 6464 S Solar Way, Boise, Idaho, 83709</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During redistricting, the Treasure Valley and Ada county should not be split for our federal districting. Urban and rural Idaho are very different constituencies and to the extent possible we should choose a plan that recognizes those differences and allows for adequate representation of both. Dividing the Boise-Meridian area specifically between two different constituencies would dilute both our votes for the US congress and dilute the rural vote as well and their ability to be represented by politicians with a better understanding of rural America.

I strongly support the map that separates SW Idaho into one district and the remaining part of Idaho into another district as I feel it would more fairly represent the diversity of Idaho geography.
My name is Molly Page, and I live in Hailey. I am a community organizer in Blaine County. I am also the Board Chair of Conservation Voters for Idaho Education Fund.

I appreciate the commission’s willingness and desire to come to Blaine County to hear our comments about the proposed maps. I am out of the state visiting my parents and brother, and I’m sorry to miss the meeting in Hailey. Please accept my written comments on the legislative and congressional maps.

Legislative District Map
I am writing today to give my support of the L1 map. It makes sense for Blaine, Lincoln and Jerome counties for two primary reasons; we have many shared communities of interest and it minimizes county splits.

Many Shared Communities of Interest
- All three counties are part of the same health district and hospital system
- We share the same highway network that is a primary connector to the Magic Valley
- We have similar industries - agriculture, construction, and servicing the tourism industry
- People from Lincoln and Jerome counties commute to work in Blaine County
- Shared commerce - Twin Falls is the hub of our regional shopping and distribution networks
- The regional offices for BLM, USFS and IDFG are within the Magic Valley
- Mountain Rides (Blaine County’s public transportation system) recently began service to Twin Falls. It makes a stop in Lincoln County on its way to Twin Falls (and on the return trip). Our communities are even more connected through this mode of transportation.

Minimizes county splits: This map keeps Blaine, Lincoln and Jerome counties whole, which is favorable and important. It also enables an adjacent district to include Gooding County to be part of rural Twin Falls county, and eliminates the need for additional county splits.

Congressional Maps
I would also like to make a general comment about the congressional maps. C25 and c26 make some sense to me - in that Blaine County should be kept with southern Idaho. We don’t share broader common interests in agriculture, water issues, commerce, and industry with North Idaho. Our issues are different than in North Idaho; we have more in common with eastern, south-central and southwest Idaho. Our agricultural industry and public land use issues are more aligned with the southern counties and parts of southeastern Idaho.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molly Page</td>
<td>208-720-4187</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-09-29 20:36:30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tangentially, my family owns and operates a large working cattle ranch in Custer and Lemhi counties. I ask that you please keep those counties in the same CD as Eastern Idaho. Most importantly - please keep Custer and Lemhi counties together. They function as ‘one’ in theory and practice. Their issues are the same and their communities are intertwined. Please don’t split Custer and Lemhi and then use Lemhi as a conduit to connect the northern and the eastern part of the state - as map C26 does. In conclusion, I believe that C25 seems to be the best map for Idaho.

Thank you again for your time and commitment to this process.

Molly Page  
416 N. 2nd Ave  
Hailey, Idaho  
Big Creek Ranch  
Patterson & May, Idaho

| Robert/Elizabeth Lonning/Jeffrey | (2080 309-1783 | Selves | Hailey  | 2021-09-30 01:18:00 | 26        |

We wish to thank the Commissioners for their efforts in this statewide redistricting process. It continues to be a monumental effort; trying to satisfy as many Idaho residents as possible.

We wish to congratulate you on the draft plan L01 Legislative map, which combines Blaine, Lincoln and Jerome Counties. This potential combination represents the “corridor” that many people use both to travel to the “Big City” (Twin Falls) as well as traveling north for employment opportunities in the Wood River Valley. That corridor is an important link that both connects and unites us here in southern Idaho.
When we recently sought an electrician to do some work on our house, in Hailey, we were thankful that even during this pandemic, we were able to find a professional in Jerome that would do the work.

We also support the congressional district map (C025) that continues to tie the Wood River Valley with Boise and the rest of southern Idaho.

As climate change continues to impact our area and the world, it is important that residents, in southern Idaho particularly, come together and work together as we attempt to prepare for an uncertain future.

I think you should add Custer County to district 26. So make it Camas county, Gooding county, Lincoln County, Blaine, County and Custer. That should get us 50,000 people. I feel Custer has always been part of the team, Let’s make it official.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hayley Noble</td>
<td>775-304-3071</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>2021-09-30 09:47:03</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>559 Deer Meadow Court, Moscow, Idaho, 83843</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| I am writing in support of redistricting North Idaho to the proposed L01 map. Connecting parts of Latah and Nez Perce counties would be very prudent given the similarities between the population centers: Moscow and Lewiston. They share a regional government in public health, 2nd Judicial District, ITD roads, and other entities. Additionally, the size of Latah County means that many of the southern communities are much closer to Lewiston than to Moscow. Many work and recreate in Lewiston so it makes sense to include half of Lewiston in the new district. Please consider my testimony in your deliberations.
| Thank you,         |             |                               |          |                       |           |
| Hayley Noble       |             |                               |          |                       |           |
| Moscow, ID         |             |                               |          |                       |           |

<p>| Diana Serpa        | 2093292577  | self                          | Hagerman | 2021-09-30 15:27:42   | 26        |
| <strong>Physical address</strong>| <strong>544 Valley Circle, Hagerman, Idaho, 83332</strong> | <strong>Mailing address</strong>           |          |                       |           |
|                     |             |                               |          |                       |           |
| Redistricting commissioner's, my name is Diana Serpa, my husband and I live in Hagerman Id, Gooding county. I would like to testify in favor of map L1, Camas, Gooding and Twin Falls rural. This is a contiguous map, there are many things that connect these counties, agriculture, healthcare, schools, economy, employment, services, shopping, social activities, transportation. I'm confident there are more here than I have connected. I believe that the task you all have before you is a difficult one, and I thank you for considering my view. My purpose is to hopefully connect you all to my view of this map, and why it is the best map for us, reason being, that all of the fore mentioned do not connect us to Elmore county, in all the years I have resided in Hagerman, none of those things that I have referred to, have not been part of my daily life in Elmore county. While there is no perfect solution, this, I believe can be the best solution for these counties and its residing residents. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dustin Engstrom</td>
<td>208-991-2443</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-10-01 13:29:38</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1433 W Idaho St, Boise, Idaho, 83702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , , , , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to urge you to avoid splitting Ada County in the new redistricting map. I've lived in the county for 20 years and it's very frustrating to feel like myself and my neighbors are not given a full voice in our government. It's also frustrating to have to switch districts just because I've moved across town. Residents of Ada County have very unique concerns compared to the rest of Idaho counties and it's unfair to ask both of our Representatives to manage those concerns along with all of the rural counties they represent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luis Lecanda</th>
<th>6262173943</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Sun Valley</th>
<th>2021-10-01 13:31:12</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1004 Atelier Condo Dr, Sun Valley, Idaho, 83353</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>PO BOX 562, SUN VALLEYi, ID, 83353,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My name is Luis Alberto Lecanda and I live at 1004 Atelier Condo Dr, Sun Valley, Idaho, Blaine County.

I am writing in support of map L1. Although I submit this public statement as an individual, there are many of my neighbors that have reached the same conclusion. Below I explain why.

I support L1 because it makes the most sense for our community. It is especially relevant for the majority of the workforce that commutes from the south of Blaine County to as far as northern Blaine County.

It is paramount to keep the boundaries of Blaine County intact. Your draft, L 1, demonstrates that you understand the ebb and flow which occurs daily from workers commuting to our County. These workers from Lincoln and Jerome Counties contribute to the economies of their home communities as well as their “work towns”.

To me, L1 synchs the most. I believe the vibrancy of communities is measured by the ability of its workers and residents to continue to be interconnected. This is one way to be connected.

I ask the redistricting committee to approve L1 in their final Idaho map.

In community spirit.
Luis Alberto Lecanda, MS  
Sun Valley, Idaho

Kathryn Goldman  
2087213108  
sel  
Bellevue  
2021-10-01 17:25:43  
26  

1267 Glen Aspen Drive, Bellevue, Idaho, 83313  
PO Box 824, Bellevue, Idaho, 83313,

I provided the testimony below in person at the September 29 meeting in Hailey. I told the commission that I would submit my comments over the website.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on redistricting in Idaho. As a resident of Blaine County in Legislative District 26, I support the new map for our district as drawn in the Legislative Districts Commission Draft Plan L01, which shows our new district 35 to include Blaine, Jerome and Lincoln counties.

Highway 75 runs through Blaine County and becomes Hwy 93 as it travels south to the Magic Valley. Blaine County residents go to the Magic Valley to shop, access higher education, and receive health care, among other services. Blaine County’s Mountain Rides now provides bus transport to the Magic Valley for health care for seniors, using Highway 75 and Highway 93 three days a week. The L01 map represents a true community of interest and uses the boundaries of all three counties.

Thank you for drawing a new map that moves us forward with a strong community of interest in a clean district that does not split counties.
FIRST TESTIMONY RE: LEGISLATIVE DISTRICT MAPS
Legislative District Map Testimony Offered in Hailey on October 30, 2021

My name is Cindy Jesinger and for the past 36 years, I have owned a home in Blaine County. My husband, Rick, and I have been actively involved in our community for many of those years. My remarks do not consider the district lines in other regions of our state since I lack adequate knowledge to address them.

In reviewing the proposed legislative district maps through L45 as posted on the Idaho Commission for Redistricting’s website, I observed that numerous proposals include combining Blaine County with a variety of 21 of Idaho’s remaining 43 counties to create a district. Blaine’s proposed county partners include Adams, Bingham, Boise, Butte, Camas, Clark, Custer, Elmore, Fremont, Gem, Gooding, Jefferson, Jerome, Lemhi, Lincoln, Madison, Minidoka, Power, Teton, Valley and Washington counties.

Tonight, I speak in favor of maps such as L1, which create a legislative district of Blaine, Jerome, and Lincoln Counties. While several other maps (L10, L27, L30, L34, L37, L38, L41, L42, L43, L44 and L47) combine the three counties, given my lack of knowledge of other parts of our state, I will use L1 for my remarks.

In reviewing the Legislative Redistricting Guidelines for the Idaho Commission for Redistricting, L1 meets the first six requirements, including the foremost, drawing 35 districts that are substantially equal in population, with no more that a 10% population variance between the least and most populated districts. L1, with a population variance of 9.58%, meets this standard. Perhaps there could be a configuration for the remainder of the state that would provide a smaller deviation, but a district including Blaine, Jerome and Lincoln Counties would have a population variance of a very respectable 2.07%.

A second requirement is that, to the greatest extent possible, the commission should avoid dividing a county so that one part of the county is in one district and the other part of the county is in another district. To meet the aforementioned requirement of equal population, there must be some divisions, given the population of Idaho counties. L1 has minimal splits, unlike L11, L12, L14, L15, L16, L25, L26, L31, and L50 which unnecessarily split Minidoka, Jerome and Gooding Counties or provide for an unnecessary third split in Twin Falls County. Indeed, four maps (L32, L35, L36, L39) split Blaine County into two districts.

A third requirement is that counties combined into one district must be contiguous. L1 meets the requirement. Blaine, Jerome and Lincoln Counties are not only contiguous, but are connected by a highway that unites the major regional population center of Twin Falls with the remainder of the region.
With all major requirements addressed, one can now discuss the oft-debated definition of “community of interest”. L1 combines three counties that comprise a “community of interest”. Consider these factors:

- Education – The three counties are in Idaho Education Region IV
- Health – The three counties are in the Idaho South Central Health District
- Economy – The three counties are in the same Idaho Economic Development District “Regional IV Development”.
- Employment – The three counties are in the Idaho Department of Labor’s South Central Region. Moreover, due to the cost of living in Blaine County, many travel from Lincoln, Jerome and other counties to work in Blaine County.
- Transportation – The three counties are in Region IV of the Idaho Department of Transportation.
- Soil Conservation – The three counties are in Region IV of the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation
- Youth Programs – The three counties are in Boy Scouts of America’s Snake River District and for years, Association 3 of the Girl Scouts of Silver Sage Council.
- Services – Jerome has the nearest GMC/Chevrolet dealership. They have the closest RV dealership.
- Shopping – Jerome has the closest Walmart to Blaine County.

Several maps have Blaine County united with either Custer County or Elmore County to form a district. I oppose combining Blaine County with either Custer or Elmore Counties. While the population and contiguous county requirements might be met, Blaine County and these counties have none of the associations listed above in common; instead, they are in different districts, regions, or councils. Additionally:

- Joining Blaine County with either Custer County or Elmore County will increase mileage between county seats and major population centers, thereby offering diminished legislative representation. Consider these facts:
  - Hailey (Blaine County) to Jerome (Jerome County) is 61 miles, or 1 hour & 7 minutes, with Shoshone (Lincoln County) in between
  - Hailey (Blaine County) to Mountain Home (Elmore County) is 117 miles or 2 hours & 21 minutes
  - Hailey (Blaine County) to Challis (Custer County) is 151 miles or 2 hours & 37 minutes
- While many people commute from Lincoln or Jerome to work in Blaine County, few people (if any) commute over Galena Summit from Custer County to work here. Likewise, few (if any) people drive over two hours each way from Elmore County to work in Blaine County.
- The population of Blaine County frequently drives south for shopping, services and medical care. They do not drive north to Custer County or west to Elmore County for these.
Thank you for hearing my concerns. I am very grateful for the service you are providing to our state with your important work on this commission. Good luck as this process moves forward.

Cynthia (Cindy) Cramer Jesinger

SECOND TESTIMONY RE: CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT MAPS
Congressional District Map Testimony Offered in Twin Falls on October 31, 2021

My name is Cindy Jesinger. Although my husband and I are residents of Blaine County, we have had frequent interaction over decades with other counties within the Magic Valley for medical care, shopping, services, education, recreation, dining, faith-based activities, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts.

I am testifying here tonight in Twin Falls to support adoption of a congressional district map like C24. This map retains the Magic Valley and Wood River Valleys within the same congressional district.

A map like C24 best meets the constitutional and statutory requirements set for this process.

The primary mandate as detailed on the Idaho Commission for Reapportionment’s website as well as on the handout we received tonight is set forth by the U.S. Constitution and must be satisfied above all other criteria. It is: “Draw two districts that are a nearly equal in population as practicable.”

C24 has an equal population, with a 0% deviation. Providing for absolutely equal populations in 2 congressional districts with a state with a population over 1,800,000 is astonishing.

An analysis of other plans provides for a broad range of population deviations – from 24,275 on map C30 down to 0 on maps C24 and C39.

With the success of equal population, the commission can move to consider other priorities, including the retention of communities of interest. Other congressional district proposals pair Boundary County with parts of the Magic Valley to form a congressional district. These plans might be considering communities of interest as items such as agriculture, forests or the economy, but consider these differences:

- Agriculture - The Magic Valley and North Idaho raise totally different crops. One has irrigated farming, the other non-irrigated farming.
While my support of C24 is population-based, there are additional factors influencing it:

1. Disregarding the beautiful, natural geography of Idaho significantly reduces adequate representation by an elected official by rendering a district not just a helicopter one, but perhaps a jet plane district (if landing strips are available). Some of these maps create a “you can’t get there from here” situation, given the limited roads over the mountains.
   - Maps C2, C10, C11, C12, C14, C15, C16, C17, C20, C21, C22, C23, C25, C26, C27, C28, C29, C30, C31, C32, C33, C34, C36, C37, C38 and C39 disregard totally or in part the mountains that naturally divide our state between Idaho, Valley & Boise Counties and Lemhi, Custer, and Elmore Counties. While travel in Idaho is not expected to be the same as in the plains of Kansas, having to leave the state to drive from one county more efficiently to another within the same congressional district should be avoided.
   - Three maps create a district that includes the four corners of Idaho – from Boundary to Owyhee, Bear Lake to Fremont Counties. Maps C2, C27, C33 & C34 provide for a district that would touch the borders of Canada, Wyoming, Montana, Washington, Oregon, Utah & Nevada. It appears to me that C33 and C34 are identical maps.
   - Maps C2, C11, C12, C14, C20, C21, C22, C27, C28, C29, C32, C33, C34 and C38 provide for districts that traverse the state of Idaho from Boundary County at the north to Bear Lake County on the southeast.

2. Additionally, Mother Nature also differentiates North Idaho from the Magic Valley:
   - Weather - Volunteer storm watchers and weather forecasters are managed by different divisions of the National Weather Service. North Idaho is part of the Northern Panhandle out of Spokane. Fremont to Bear Lake, and Clark & Custer to Lincoln, Minidoka and Cassia are handled out of Pocatello while the western Magic Valley is handled out of Boise.
   - The average annual rainfall in Coeur d’Alene is 26.6 inches; the average annual rainfall in Twin Falls is 10 inches.
   - Coeur d’Alene averages 42 inches of snow annually; Twin Falls gets 18 inches annually.
   - North Idaho and the Magic Valley have no natural connections. The counties within the Magic Valley do have natural connections and have far more in common with the counties in eastern Idaho than those in North Idaho.

C24 proposes that one county, Ada, be divided. While dividing a county is not optimal, is it not prudent for both of Idaho’s
count. congressional districts to have access to the state capitol, court, and legislature? Utah thought so. When Utah went through redistricting, they considered a “donut hole” around Salt Lake City but instead divided the state into 4 districts, each having easy access to Salt Lake City, the state’s capital. I suggest we follow their wise example.

While I recognize that dividing the counties of the Magic Valley into different districts might be appealing if the sole priority is not splitting any individual county, the primary consideration must be equal population. I would argue a proper consideration of a community of interest, Idaho’s geography, and Mother Nature would never divide the Magic Valley into different districts.

At last night’s hearing in Hailey, a compelling argument was made to retain historical ties because they enhance continued representation. Although not a factor listed for consideration, C24 properly manages the significant growth in Idaho, yet respects the history of representation.

One final note. According to the Congressional Redistricting Guidelines as set forth on the Idaho Commission for Reapportionment’s website, we are mandated to “Identify the district including the northernmost part of the state as Congressional District One.” Four maps, C12, C14, C28 and C38 have reversed this order.

In closing, I would like to commend the commission for taking on this vital, yet thankless task. The importance of your work cannot be overstated. I have one challenge and one question for you. Could you develop a map like C24, retaining the same two congressional districts as drawn, with the same 0 population deviation, but with a straighter line along the boundary in Ada County, thereby, as suggested in the redistricting guidelines, creating two less oddly shaped districts and districts that are easier for the public to know and recognize. For example, use major roads as divisions? My knowledge of Ada County is extremely limited so this might be impossible. If it is not possible, I highly recommend consideration and adoption of C24.

And now my question. A friend recently suggested I read Doesn’t Hurt to Ask by Trey Gowdy. I do not expect an immediate answer unless you are willing to provide one. Last night, during the hearing in Hailey, we heard the story of two counties – Latah and Nez Perce. In reviewing all the congressional maps, it appears to me that we have the story of two priorities – equal population and not splitting counties. On your website and handouts, the US Constitutional priority is defined as equal population, but over half of the submitted maps have prioritized not splitting counties. Which is the higher priority?

Thank you.
Cindy Jesinger
Ada Precincts, while having ballots cast in 2020, show zero 2020 population. These are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical address</th>
<th>Mailing address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6836 W. Freemont St, Boise, Idaho, 83704</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRECINCT</th>
<th>2020 POPULATION</th>
<th>BALLOTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1420</td>
<td>2,423</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1421</td>
<td>2,248</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,924</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,551</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2117</td>
<td>1,929</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>11,372</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

what happened to the populations in these 6 precincts?
I support the adoption of C24 for the following reasons:

1. Creating a district nearly equal in population with the other 34 districts is accomplished. This district would also adequately represent Blaine County whereas other maps severely diminish Blaine County's importance and influence.

2. The 3 counties in question - Blaine, Jerome, Lincoln-- have much in common and serve each other daily. Some of the more obvious are employment, health care (hospitals and clinics) recreation, shopping, services and history.

3. It is important to avoid the unnecessary division of counties, keeping counties in one district contiguous when possible. While gerrymandering is "legal," such outlandish suggestions, such as inserting different college campuses into this map are ludicrous and insulting.

4. C24 closely retains our historical congressional districts while addressing Idaho's growth.

My name is Pete Stommel. My wife Suzan and I have been residents of Blaine county for over 33 years. We are supporting the adoption of a congressional district map as the C24 map. The population numbers of the districts in C24 seem to be pretty equal and the common sense of the contiguous aspects and the geography are my major reasons for the support.

Other reasons for the support of C24 include:

1. Financial
2. in concert with the Idaho population growth
3. Retains historic districts for congressional seats
4. Counties that have common interests are always more likely to participate in issues of concern together.

Respectfully,
Pete Stommel
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pete Stommel</td>
<td>208-721-0506</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-10-04 14:34:59</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearline Yocum</td>
<td>208-544-0369</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Kimberly</td>
<td>2021-10-04 16:36:38</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**

3308 Oregon Trail Dr. E, Kimberly, Idaho, 83341

**Mailing address**

I would like it to be known that I support having a map like C24 for the following reasons.

A. It provides easy access to the State Capital, for both proposed districts.
B. C24 would keep the populations of the two districts equal without deviation.
C. If adopted it would retain our historic congressional districts, yet properly address Idaho's growth.
D. It respects the natural geography of our state.
E. Takes into consideration, and retains communities of interest.

All my best,
Pearline Yocum

| Leigh Weidman       | 2087643418   | Self                          | Fairfield | 2021-10-04 17:35:07   | 26        |

**Physical address**

14 E. 200 N., Fairfiled, Idaho, 83327

**Mailing address**

14 E 200N, Fairfield, Idaho, 83327,

In my opinion: I would like to see Camas County joined with Gooding, Elmore, and Boise counties.
September 30, 2021

Dear Redistricting Commissioners,

My name is Susan Bolton and I have lived in Gooding County my entire life. I am currently serving my 3rd year as a Gooding County Commissioner.

I would like to show my support of the L1 map for Gooding County. This map will combine our county with Camas and rural Twin Falls counties. Gooding County currently works together with these 2 Magic Valley counties in many areas. I serve on 3 economic development boards: Region IV Development, Southern Idaho Economic Development (SEID), and Rural Economic Development (REDS). These boards are a collaborative effort to development growth for our areas. We have a long standing working relationship with common goals that should carry forward with our legislative representation.

Our counties also use primarily surface water for irrigation and Elmore County water users are pumpers so our water interests do not mesh together with Elmore County.

In general, the interests of Gooding County are more in line with Camas and Twin Falls County than with Elmore County.

Thanks for hearing my concerns! Thanks for your efforts in doing your best with this difficult job for Idaho.

Sincerely,

Susan Bolton
626 Colorado Street
Gooding, ID. 83330
208-731-3482
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>62934 S Powderhorn Bay Rd, Harrison, Idaho, 83833</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>P. O. Box 50, Harrison, Idaho, 83833,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would recommend Congressional district plan C 13 and Legislative district plan LD 13. These boundaries recognize the area’s natural boundaries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best regards,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Richard Meyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Farms, Inc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Susan Bolton         | 2087313482 | Self                         | Gooding     | 2021-10-05 10:32:36     | 26       |
| <strong>Physical address</strong> | 626 Colorado Street, Gooding, Idaho, 83330 | <strong>Mailing address</strong> | 626 Colorado Street, Gooding, ID, 83330, | | |
| October 5 2021       | | | | | |
| Dear Redistricting Commissioners, | | | | | |
| My name is Susan Bolton and I have lived in Gooding County my entire life. I am currently serving my 3rd year as a Gooding County Commissioner. | | | | | |
| I would like to show my support for the C24 legislative district map. | | | | | |
| This map has an equal population in both districts. This map keeps counties together that have common interests and retains our historic congressional districts while still working with the population growth. We need to maintain our access to the Idaho capital!! | | | | | |
| Thanks for hearing my concerns! Thanks for your efforts in doing your best with this difficult job for Idaho. | | | | | |
| Sincerely,           | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bolton</td>
<td>2087313482</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Gooding</td>
<td>2021-10-05 10:32:36</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Bolton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>626 Colorado Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooding, ID. 83330</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208-731-3482</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Thompson</td>
<td>2086614880</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Rathdrum</td>
<td>2021-10-05 11:04:34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address** 7391 Macaw Lane, Rathdrum, Idaho, 83858

**Mailing address** POB 361, Rathdrum, ID, 83858,

Dear Board Members: After a careful review of the choices presented the following makes the most sense:

Congressional Map: Choice C13, this option is very close to what we have now. (which works) and it maintains the historic districts and natural boundaries the best.

Legislative District Maps: LD13 is by far the best map available. It keeps many historic boundaries and does not make so much of a mess of North Idaho Legislative Districts. It keeps the smaller towns together and the built-up areas together. Gives the little guys a voice. This is the BEST choice.
I am writing in concern for the Congressional Districts. I believe that a Map like C24 would best serve the people of Idaho for the following reasons:

1) Proposed C24 keeps those communities with common interests aligned together. We can work together for the common good of all.

2) There is a natural geography in Idaho - let's keep the integrity of our natural boundaries in tact. C24 would do just that.

3) The Constitution of the United States has mandated that the population of the two districts remain equal. C24 Map keeps the population equal.

4) Map C24 maintains our historic congressional districts even with the population growth that Idaho is experiencing.

5) Both districts need access to Idaho's Capital City. Map C24 meets that need.

6) Water is a huge issue. If Map C24 is used, that keeps two districts strong enough to confront the issues facing our state. This is critical.
Please consider maps C013 and L013.
They involve the minimum amount of change and disruption.
They meet the requirements of the law.
They maintain most of the historic districts.
They recognize the natural boundaries of Idaho's geography.
They maintain "communities of interest."

Thank you for your service on the committee!

After Plan L026, my next approach was to take a modified L01 from the commission and modify it to fit my goal for southeast Idaho. At first glance it appeared across southern Idaho to have districts with a very north south orientation and Bear Lake was still combined with Teton and a large chunk of Bonneville County. It can't even be said that the road through Bone ties Bonneville to Caribou County. That road goes to Bingham County. I did like the way that no counties were split except for Nez Perce and some difficult combinations were split up. I switched Oneida and Power Counties because it was a better fit for Oneida County which is not tied to Cassia County by I-84. I-84 barely passes through a remote underpopulated corner of Oneida County. I joined Butte and Custer Counties with Jefferson County along with the western area of Bonneville County in District 32. I joined Fremont County with Teton County and eastern Bonneville County for District 28.

Bear Lake and Caribou County were added to Franklin and the southeast area of Bannock County in district 27. The northern area of Bannock County including the reservation area was added to Bingham County and the boundary of district 29 was moved north across I-86. My final moves added the far eastern areas of Bingham County, which is tied to Bonneville by the road through Bone, to that district. Also another area in northern Bingham was added to a different Bonneville County District. Because of moving Custer County out of district 8, that district was short of people so I took a triangular piece of District 19 and added it. The bottom of the triangle was towards Boise which meant that the point was the juncture. This would be plan L044. With the original commission plan I moved Adams
County from District 7 to make up for the shortage in District 8. This my submitted plan L047. There is a triangular area of Elmore County below Ada County that needs to be added back into District 8 in this plan.

After listening to the Lewiston hearing I went back to my last proposal and made a couple of changes that eliminated an external split of a county. It hardly seems right that a county that has enough population to have more than a district, and is forced to join with another county, should count as an external split against the allowed eight. All the larger population counties have at least one complete district entirely within the county and then the balance is added to other counties. Even Ada and Canyon Counties, in L01 had external splits joining with Owyhee County in District 23. My move of Adams County to District 8 kept the district that includes Idaho County from including any county below the Salmon River. To me this plan only splits three counties Bonner, because it is forced, Nez Perce because something had to give somewhere, and Bingham because it became necessary and was actually somewhat logical. My plan L026 was referred to at this hearing as a better way by dividing Idaho County. If there was a way to modify and keep district 7, Idaho County, all north of the Salmon and district 8 south I could go for that. I have submitted two plans, one revising My L026 plan only as a regional plan concerning splitting Idaho County. The second plan revising L026 made changes for a statewide plan meeting deviation standards, they are L055 and L060. My final submission revising L047 corrected or eliminated two external county splits and makes for a much better plan than the current in place plan, remembering districts 7, 8, and 32, new plan L056.

I oppose the Redistricting Commission maps C01 and C02. I am in favor of map C36. Map C36 appears to meet redistricting guidelines. Map C36 connects counties along the Snake River plain so that common road and rail transportation, water, economy sectors dominated by agriculture are in the same district. Communities in this C36 design have common cultures and values. Map C36 appears to keep counties whole, not split up. This connection allows the elected representative to focus staff attention more effectively on common resource and infrastructure matters. Common interests can help develop improved unity and reduce divisiveness across the region.

I oppose the Redistricting Commission map L01. I am looking at the detail around district 29 where I live. Map L53 appears
LAURENCE GEBHARDT 2083802205 Self POCATELLO 2021-10-06 11:46:18 29

best to be because it equalizes population between District 29 (Pocatello) and the surrounding district 27 in Bannock and Power counties. Map L53 appears to keep Pocatello and Chubbuck together which preserves the political communities (cities) in district 29 so the elected legislators can serve this population.

Maureen Paterson 208-263-1788 self Priest River 2021-10-06 16:00:39 1

Physical address 360 Northwoods Dr, Priest River, Idaho, 83856

Dear Redistricting Committee Members:

I have been involved in non-partisan interest groups in the Edgemere Precinct such as the Hoodoo Valley Concerned Citizens group. This 700+ member community group in the Hoodoo Valley fought small subdivisions in our traditional rural neighborhood. The L01 map shown at the meeting on September 22nd at the Sandpoint Library would break Edgemere precinct up which would be detrimental to our community and our community\'s common interests.

Please keep our precincts whole and part of the majority of Bonner County.

One of the maps which I think does this best is Map L055!

Map L055 looks good regarding North Idaho. There is no precinct splitting, and Clark Fork & Lake View are together as a common community. It also does a decent job around CDA.

Since I am not familiar with the rest of the state, I did not check on other areas. I live in the Hoodoo Valley of Bonner County - Edgemere precinct.

Thank you for your time and work,
Maureen Paterson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Paterson</td>
<td>208-263-1788</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Priest River</td>
<td>2021-10-06 16:00:39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marielle Weaver</td>
<td>5034357127</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>2021-10-06 23:33:10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>2440 Ironwood Avenue, Twin Falls, Idaho, 83301</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>2440 Ironwood Avenue, Twin Falls, ID, 83301,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support a map like C24 because it addresses Idaho’s population growth and retains community interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore Pettibone</td>
<td>408-427-5641</td>
<td>GOP Precinct #33</td>
<td>Post Falls</td>
<td>2021-10-07 16:44:22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>516 South Shore Pines Road, Post Falls, Idaho, 83854</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, Post Falls, ID, , 83854,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After careful review, I am in favor of map C13 for the Congressional Districts and map LD13 for the Legislative Districts. These meet the requirements of the law as well as it maintains most of he historic districts and communities of interest. Please take this input into account as you work through the final redistricting work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you to the Commissioners for your work and for attending a rigorous schedule of meetings. I gave testimony at the Pocatello meeting on October 6. But after leaving the meeting, there were 2 points I wanted to address further.

1. The question of keeping like communities together came up several times. One member of the Commission stated that he found it hard to understand why any Idahoan would doubt their representation just because the person did not live in a similar area. Urban versus rural is probably the main issue that comes up. I believe it matters because a Senator or Representative can best understand the issues of the communities they know and understand. When faced with complex issues, whether searching for creative solutions that address all needs, or compromising to give up lower priorities in order to keep higher priorities, I would best trust a person who really knows the type of community in which I live. It is not purely a matter of their desire to do the right thing for their constituents; it is a matter of how well they can understand the impact of decisions they are making.

2. Several times a question about the district lines in Pocatello went unanswered. You asked, did the Commission make the right decision in their proposed plan "to go east across the freeway" in drawing the lines for District 29, or should you have gone north to Chubbuck? In that respect, the draft plan made the right decision. Residents in this area do not view East or West of the freeway as a relevant distinction. I never hear that mentioned as relevant to how we view or schools, our neighbors, our shopping, not even our driving patterns. It is just not a meaningful boundary. However, people do seem to view Chubbuck as a distinctly separate community. We like our Chubbuck neighbors, but they hold themselves as a distinctly different group than Pocatello residents.

Once again, thank you for your hard work on this challenging task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Klatt</td>
<td>208 263-4834</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Sagle</td>
<td>2021-10-08 07:56:43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 285 Private Drive, Sagle, Idaho, 83860

**Mailing address**: , , , ,

Having been interested in Idaho politics and our political structure for 50+ years, including running for a county office in 1974, being elected to the Sandpoint City Council in 1975 and a Bonner County Commissioner in 1994, the past 10 years of participating in elections in Legislative District 7 have been extremely frustrating and disappointing in Idaho redistricting process. I can only strongly encourage the Commission for Reapportionment to make a substantive correction to what has to be one of the most peculiar legislative districts in the history of Idaho. It is impossible for me to believe Legislative District 7 meets the criteria of "splitting as few of Idaho’s 44 counties as possible, attempting to keep cities and communities of interest whole and avoiding drawing oddly shaped districts or districts that are not connected".

I recognize the task before the Reapportionment Commissioners is not an easy one, but Legislative District 7 should be an embarrassment to the State of Idaho. Hopefully, the Commissioners recognize this and can find an improvement in redistricting based upon the census data of 2021.

Thank you - Steve Klatt

Valerie Varadi 2083082638 Self/Twin Falls County Elections Dietrich 2021-10-08 08:51:51 26

**Physical address**: 460 N Waucanza St, Dietrich, Idaho, 83324

**Mailing address**: , , , ,

I am a resident of Lincoln County and the Elections Director for Twin Falls County. I've spent some time comparing the Committee Congressional map 1 and Public Congressional map 24 (which had a lot of support at the meeting in Twin Falls) and would like to give my opinion. I know the popular positive opinion on 24 was that it had 0% variance in population. When looking at the lines in Ada County, it's kind of messy. I think for ease of precinct boundaries and election purposes, the Committee's Congressional map 1 would be a better option, even with the .52% population variance. It's a lot easier to draw boundary lines when you're using roads.

I would like to thank you all again for working on this committee and taking the urgency of the redistricting process seriously. I felt you understand how the County Clerks and Election Directors are feeling and will work to finish this process before the end of the 90 days you are given.
Susan Giannettino 2084844319 Self Hailey 2021-10-08 09:37:12 26

Physical address 1040 CD Olena, Hailey, Idaho, 83333
Mailing address Box 4914, Hailey, ID, 83333,

October 7, 2021

To: Idaho Commission for Redistricting
From: Susan Giannettino, Hailey, Blaine County
Re: Comments on the proposed District Boundaries District 26

Dear Commission Members:

Thank-you for undertaking this important task. I appreciate your service in this task that is critical to our functioning as a State. I also appreciate the structure of the Idaho redistricting process and your efforts to gain public input. I have been out of the country so I hope I am not too late weighing in, it was hard to fully grasp the process and maps on my IPhone.

I live in Legislative District 26. Certainly your redistricting effort will affect us. I have reviewed the proposed map and focused on what affects us. While this is a challenging task and there will never be a perfect map, I support the Commission’s Draft L-01 map. Blaine, Lincoln, and Jerome Counties are linked in many ways, geographically, socially and economically. We are tied together by Highway 75 / 93. Many many people from Lincoln and Jerome counties work and play in Blaine County and people from Blaine county shop in Jerome.

If I were to support a second map, it would be that submitted by Wendy Jaquet (designated as L050.) This map combines Blaine, Camas, Gooding, and Twin Falls city. In some ways this map even more realistically portrays the inter connectivity of our communities and landscapes. The highways (75 and 20) connect us. Many from Camas and Gooding counties work every day in Blaine County. Blaine County certainly shops in Twin Falls and Soldier Mountain is a fantastic resource for all. Twin Falls is so important we
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Susan Giannettino</td>
<td>2084844319</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-10-08 09:37:12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont. have bus service between our communities. The only reason I do not prioritize this option as number one is that it chops up a county. Without the existing county boundaries, the L050 map makes most sense and was drafted by a person with significant knowledge and experience in State politics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Again, I hope I am not too late. And thank you again for your work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Giannettino</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Kincannon</td>
<td>2087200864</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Hailey</td>
<td>2021-10-08 16:35:07</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont. Thank you for providing the opportunity to testify. I support the Idaho Congressional Draft Commission Plan C01. This plan has worked well, and I see no reason to change it as radically as proposed by C02, or some of the other radically different suggested maps. I support Legislative Districts Commission Draft Plan L01. The 3 counties - Jerome, Lincoln, and Blaine - that would comprise this new district 35 are linked in both physical and economic ways. Physically, the area's main highway 75, then 93, links the 3 counties, The Wood River intersects 2 of the counties, then flows into the Snake flowing through Jerome county, and water issues and solutions can be shared among all 3 and facilitated by our legislators. People in the northern end shop along that connecting highway and in northern Twin Falls. People from along the highway travel to the resort towns in the northern end for work. The economic exchanges are connected, important and widespread, They can be assisted by representation by the same team of legislators, elected by a single district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>820 CE Olena Dr, Hailey, Idaho, 83333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Rainey</td>
<td>2087055680</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Pocatello</td>
<td>2021-10-08 17:25:50</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>122 W Young Street, Pocatello, Idaho, 83204</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to submit additional comments in relation to my comments and those of the interests from Oneida, Franklin, and Bear Lake Counties that were presented at the Pocatello public meeting. I have submitted a plan as of 5:00 10/8 that addresses both the southern counties' voiced desire to remain together and my concerns about Plan L1: Specifically, the extremely odd shape of District 27 and division of the Marsh Valley School district among multiple districts.

I anticipate the main concern with my plan will be external division of Bannock and Canyon. While these counties are allowable for external division, this plan does create one additional external divisions of both those counties. The Canyon County additional external division is the result of avoidance of an Ada County external split, which I think is sound justification to do so. I also think the additional external split of Bannock County is similarly justified as I haven't found a way to keep it whole without causing an additional external split of another county that doesn't already require an external split. I also want to mention consideration I made for dividing Pocatello among LEG 28, 29, and 32. I gave first consideration to minimizing population variance among the three districts. I also attempted to avoid separating Pocatello's traditional neighborhoods. I hope this plan is helpful in balancing the diverse interest that have been presented to the commission.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Anderson</td>
<td>4062534007</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Sagle</td>
<td>2021-10-08 17:52:27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>9676 bottle bay rd, Sagle, Idaho, 83860</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have lived in District 7 for 8 years. Not once have I been able to meet with my Representatives and Senator face-to-face. Of the forums I have attended, none of the three has made the trip to Sandpoint. I seriously doubt that my Representatives and Senator know the issues that impact me, as they live at least 250 miles from me. The distance also makes it close to impossible for a candidate from this area to run in a District 7 election. My health care, shopping, and transportation all center in Sandpoint (15 miles from my house). Please adopt a map that puts Gamlin, Sagle, Southside and Careywood precincts in District 1.
Steve Anderson

9676 bottle bay rd, Sagle, Idaho, 83860

I have lived in District 7 for 8 years. Not once have I been able to meet with my Representatives and Senator face-to-face. Of the forums I have attended, none of the three has made the trip to Sandpoint. I seriously doubt that my Representatives and Senator know the issues that impact me, as they live at least 250 miles from me. The distance also makes it close to impossible for a candidate from this area to run in a District 7 election. My health care, shopping, and transportation all center in Sandpoint (15 miles from my house). Please adopt a map that puts Gamlin, Sagle, Southside and Careywood precincts in District 1.

Daniel Bell

728 E Spokane Ave, Coeur D'Alene, Idaho, 83814

Hello,

Congressional Map C013 and Legislative map L013 seem to have the least amount of line changes across the state, which will prevent any gerrymandering. If there are extreme changes to the maps, then it will be assumed that you are gerrymandering to benefit 1 group over another.

Some other reasons the 2 maps above make the most sense:
They meet the requirements of the law
They maintain most of the historic districts
They recognize the natural boundaries of Idaho's geography
They MAINTAIN "communities of interest" (vs gerrymandering new communities).

Please feel free to reach out to me with any questions.

Cheers,

Dan
Dear Committee,

I support proposed map L01.

As a lifelong resident of northern Idaho, and a 5th generation descendant of the first folks to start farming, mining, and ranching north Idaho and eastern Washington, I have a deep and abiding interest in the political makeup of this area.

Historically and presently, Lewiston and the Palouse are tied together economically and socially. Since the 1880s, folks on the Palouse traveled as often to Lewiston as they did to Moscow to conduct business. My family was a few miles over the border in Colton, Wa, where they worked to bring a train to that town while also working proving up ranches and farms near Lapwai and in the Salmon River Country. These areas, while separated by county lines, as well as state lines, have always been linked by culture and economy. In fact, that's true of the inhabitants who were here before European settlement. The Palouse and the Snake River represented important trade routes since time immemorial and the folks living in the area cooperated to live in relative peace and prosperity. History suggests that kind of cooperation remains a wise practice.

Modern telecommunications and a faster road system link these areas even more closely today, making the geographic distance of little importance. Farmers on the Palouse ship grain both north to the E. Washington rails and south to the Lewiston grain terminals. The fast growing Schwietzer Engineering Labs has ignored state and county lines to expand from its birth place in Pullman, Wa, to both Lewiston and Moscow. Culturally speaking, the quad-cities area enjoys a highly educated population that earns degrees from Lewis-Clark State College in Lewiston, University of Idaho in Moscow, as well as Walla Walla Community College in Clarkston and WSU in Pullman. In truth, Lapwai should probably be part of this map as that community, where many members of the Nez Perce Tribe live, has prioritized higher education and is actively seeking to create the kind of economic progress that is born out of places with the kind of energy and innovation spurred on by higher education opportunities and future-oriented leadership.
People commute to and from Moscow to Lewiston daily. People shop in each other's communities. In fact, linking these larger population centers makes some sense as there has been a persistent antagonistic thread toward Lewiston from more rural local and legislative government elected officials over the past couple of decades who claim it is unfair for central economic hubs to build infrastructure with sales tax collected from people who live in outlying areas. In truth, until the past couple decades, small towns in the area relied on their own populations to grow or decline and never sought to be subsidized by the relative abundance of commerce centers or blame their misfortunes on government. I don't mean to digress. But the point is that Lewiston and Moscow have both been the targets of politicians from rural towns in economic decline as potential sources of welfare—whether that policy makes sense or not is not the point; rather, the existence of this tension creates another powerful socio-political similarity between these two Idaho cities.

I thank the committee for your work.

Yours truly,
Dean A. Ferguson
Lewiston, Idaho

It makes sense to join Lewiston and Moscow because of their agencies that are already the same, e.g. judicial. Also because residents from both often shop in both towns. I will be 79 (in three days) and I drive to Moscow several times a month to shop and, as the North Central coordinator, I offer AARP Safe Driving classes to residents in the Moscow area as well as classes in Lewiston area. Our colleges also draw us together so this would serve both the young and the old—as well as those who work in the town only 33 miles away.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kathleen Rae Gaines</td>
<td>208-816-3450</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>2021-10-10 12:48:51</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>2946 Spruce Street, Lewiston, Idaho, 83401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It makes sense to join Lewiston and Moscow because of their agencies that are already the same, e.g. judicial. Also because residents from both often shop in both towns. I will be 79 (in three days) and I drive to Moscow several times a month to shop and, as the AARP North Central coordinator, I offer AARP Safe Driving classes to residents in the Moscow area as well as classes in Lewiston area. Our colleges also draw us together so this would serve both the young and the old--as well as those who work in the town only 33 miles away.

Kathleen Rae Gaines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lisa Whitehead</th>
<th>30-3994-1230</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Coeur D Alene</th>
<th>2021-10-11 11:00:43</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>301 S 13th St, Coeur D Alene, Idaho, 83814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe it would be best to keep the districting as close to what currently exists as possible. In this day where politics have taken over common sense, stable districts and less change is wise. The fewer the changes that are made the lower the chances of gerrymandering can exist.

With than said I believe that C24 & LD13 are the best options.

Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Gilliam</td>
<td>2082659590</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>sagle</td>
<td>2021-10-11 11:41:56</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>111 Providence Lake Loop, sagle, Idaho, 83860</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>111 Providence Lake Loop, sagle, ID, 83860,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Whom it may Concern:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have lived in District 7 for 15 years. Not once in that time have I been able to meet with my Representatives and Senator face-to-face. Of the forums I have attended, none of the three has made the trip to Sandpoint. I question that my Representatives and Senator know the issues that impact me, as they live at least 250 miles from me. The distance also makes it close to impossible for a candidate from this area to run in a District 7 election. My health care, shopping, and transportation all center in Sandpoint (15 miles from my house). Please adopt a map that puts Gamlin, Sagle, Southside and Careywood precincts in District 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you so much,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nancy Gilliam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Brianna Remster     | 440-897-5083 | self-- social science researcher | Boise | 2021-10-11 14:18:04 | 19        |
| **Physical address**| 700 W Jefferson St, Boise, Idaho, 83702 | Mailing address | 800 Lancaster avenue, Villanova, PA, 19085, |
| Reallocating Incarcerated Individuals for Political Apportionment Idaho Commission for Reapportionment Testimony October 2021 |
| Rory Kramer, PhD |
| Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology |
| Villanova University |
| Brianna Remster, PhD |
| Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology |
| Villanova University |
| Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony on the practice of counting incarcerated people as residents of the districts |
where they are incarcerated, known as prison gerrymandering. As social scientists studying the impact of this practice across the country, we appreciate this opportunity to discuss this problem and how to address it during this redistricting cycle with you. To explain why equal representation in Idaho may hinge on reallocating incarcerated persons, we draw on our findings from Pennsylvania’s (PA) State House maps, which have been published in a leading peer reviewed journal (Remster and Kramer 2018).

We chose to study Pennsylvania because it represents an average test case. It is similar to the overall U.S. overall in its racial demographics, urbanicity and rurality, average district size (~60k), and incarceration rate. In brief, we find that prison gerrymandering affects districts across the state of Pennsylvania, it shifts representation in a racially unequal manner, it is neither partisan, nor a simple urban versus rural divide, and it is relatively easy to reallocate state prison populations without significantly delaying the Commission’s redistricting timeline.

In our research, we assessed the extent to which representation in Pennsylvania State House districts would be impacted if incarcerated persons were reallocated under the current maps. We removed individuals incarcerated in state, federal, and county facilities, and reallocated those who were in state and county facilities. We did not reallocate individuals in federal facilities since most are from out of state. We are happy to detail our methods for interested parties. Before turning to our findings, we emphasize that our analyses provide conservative estimates of the effect on incarceration on representation. Why? Because we did not have access to confidential pre-incarceration address data. If we had had access to that data, we are confident that prison gerrymandering would have an even larger impact on PA House districts. In other words, our estimates are likely underreporting the significant impacts on specific communities across the state. Fortunately for this Commission, pre-incarceration address data are available for your use in redistricting, allowing you to avoid such estimation techniques and simplify reallocation.

We found that, for Pennsylvania as a whole, if—all else equal—incarcerated people were reallocated, four districts became legally too small using the standard 5% cut-off for district size established by the courts to define equal representation. For example, District 150 lost over 5,000 individuals in our hypothetical scenario because it contains a state prison and county jail: that’s nearly 10% of its population. Without those facilities, the district is too small to be a district.

Those four districts are the few “winners” of prison gerrymandering—each contains a large prison and/or jail, which artificially inflates their size with people who are not from that area and would not be there if they were not imprisoned there on Census Day. These districts also appear more racially diverse than the reality, because Black, Indigenous, and people of color are disproportionately incarcerated. Overall, we found five PA districts where more than half of their non-white population were only there because they were incarcerated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brianna Remster</td>
<td>440-897-5083</td>
<td>self-- social science researcher</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-10-11 14:18:04</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand, we found that four districts would grow to be legally too large to qualify as of equal size using that same threshold. Together, those 4 districts contain roughly 264,000 Pennsylvanians, which means that at least 264,000 residents are legally underrepresented because of prison gerrymandering today. Of those 264,000, over 100,000 are Black and live in Philadelphia in three districts—that’s approximately 20% of Philadelphia’s Black population, who live in districts that only met the district size cut-off during redistricting because many residents were counted elsewhere at the time.

One other major takeaway was that ending prison gerrymandering did not disproportionately hurt one political party over another under PA’s current maps. Two of the four House districts we identified as too big are represented by Democrats and two by Republicans. There also wasn’t a clear urban versus rural divide in our analyses.

Although the four districts which became too big are generally located in more urban areas, they also include areas with smaller cities and towns that have high rates of incarceration. And District 150 that I mentioned a moment ago as becoming too small, is in a suburban area. In fact, overall, urban areas did not always gain population from rural districts. In fact, many rural districts without a prison gained representation from other rural districts that happened to have a prison. This is because most people, including residents of rural areas, do not live near a state prison; there are only 20 some state prisons and 203 districts.

Overall, prison gerrymandering distorts representation by strengthening the political voices of Pennsylvanians who live near a prison while simultaneously weakening the voices of residents who live near high crime areas. Counting incarcerated people where they are imprisoned affects entire communities and towns from which large numbers of people are being incarcerated. And with patterns of residential segregation, prison gerrymandering does so in a racially unequal way.

We found that the average white Pennsylvanian lives in a district that benefits from prison gerrymandering. White residents gain representation thanks to the location of prison facilities in districts that are disproportionately white and because whites are less likely to live in districts with large numbers of residents sent elsewhere via incarceration. In contrast, the average Black or Latinx Pennsylvaniaan lives in a district that has less of a voice because more than three hundred residents of their communities were counted elsewhere and because Black and Latinx residents are less likely to live in districts where incarcerated persons inflate the district’s population count. In short, prison gerrymandering dilutes Black and Latinx representation and amplifies whites.

You might be wondering why most of us only recently heard of prison gerrymandering. While the problem has always existed, how incarcerated people were counted only recently began to impact political representation for two reasons. It was not until the 1960s...
that the concept of one person, one vote was codified into our redistricting process and then the extraordinary growth of the American penal system only began in earnest in the 1980s—previously the incarcerated population was far smaller—peaking in the early or mid-2010s, depending on the state.

The Census’s administrative policy of counting people at correctional facilities (i.e., the usual residence rule) was implemented over two hundred some years ago. The U.S. population has changed a lot since then. For instance, very few people attended college or served in the military overseas during the first few censuses, relative to today, and the Census responded accordingly by changing how those populations are counted. However, the Census offers to reallocate incarcerated people for states, for a fee if states supply pre-prison addresses, which might be of interest to future commissions.

While some states’ prison population have declined somewhat in recent years, unfortunately that decline is not enough for prison gerrymandering to fix itself in most cases. Yet even if the number of incarcerated people did dramatically drop, that does not mean that prison gerrymandering no longer exists, just that it does not lead to the potential constitutional problems like those we found in PA.

As social scientists, we see no reason to delay tackling the problem. Thirteen states have either already addressed prison gerrymandering or will to do so starting with the 2020 Census and one has decided to delay until 2030, including via state redistricting commissions in Montana and Pennsylvania. California’s Commission voted itself to proceed with reallocation after the legislature encouraged it but did not require it. Though the reallocation process varies a bit by state, these states have all reallocated incarcerated people for representation purposes only (not funding).

We appreciate the tight timeline that the Commission faces, especially in 2021 due to the delay in the release of Census data to states as well as concerns about costly vendor contracts. Fortunately, the Idaho DOC has pre-incarceration addresses. This data can be used to reallocate individuals in state facilities in a short amount of time without busting the budget. We provide an overview of the reallocation process at the end of this testimony.

The DOC’s addresses are far superior to counting individuals where they are incarcerated. For some individuals, that address may be where they were paroled to before being reincarcerated for a parole violation. Those addresses are equally useable, in fact, they are more accurate than counting them where they are incarcerated. This holds even if an incarcerated person or their household has since moved elsewhere, because that is true of everybody. Were you or I to have moved after completing the 2020 Census forms, we too would be counted at our “prior address” in the exact same manner; the fundamental difference is that we made that decision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brianna Remster</td>
<td>440-897-5083</td>
<td>self-- social science researcher</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-10-11 14:18:04</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont. ourselves.

Making data adjustments to census aggregation is part of every redistricting cycle and this is no different. The actual adjustment is a straightforward task that would not risk any individual’s privacy in doing so.

We thank you for your time and are happy to answer questions and assist in any way we can.

Appendix: Reallocation Overview

The first step in reallocating incarcerated people involves determining how to address imperfections in the DOC’s addresses. Note: imperfections in some people’s previous addresses do not justify continuing to misallocate others—that’s something the state can work to improve for future redistricting cycles. This was Maryland and New York’s approach during the last redistricting cycle (2011), which the Prison Policy Initiative also recommends. Many address errors are due to simple data entry errors which can be resolved by consulting, for instance, the U.S. Postal Service zip code locator, maps of municipal boundaries and zip codes, and Census files. Each of these checks should be documented and done systematically.

For people with missing addresses, other data sources can be consulted such as pre-sentence investigation reports or other court records. Afterward, people with unusable addresses such as post-office boxes, the facility address, out of state addresses, or no address could either be (1) removed from the count where they are incarcerated and counted as state residents with no geographic affiliation (e.g., Connecticut), similar to how the Census counts military personnel stationed abroad at their home state of record, or (2) counted where they are incarcerated. Maryland and New York’s already-in-use protocols serve as valuable examples for commissions, mappers, and contractors to consider while making this series of technical decisions.

After that protocol is executed, the pre-incarceration addresses are then matched with their corresponding census blocks, by sending one line of code to a Census Application Programming Interface (API) that the Census offers free of charge and then a second line of code to merge that data with the reapportionment dataset from the Census. Before releasing that data for redistricting, the staff/contractors/consultants should then check that it worked correctly. The only part of this process that should take more than a few hours is the previous address data correction step. Even excluding that step entirely, and reallocating individuals as is, would be a significant improvement in the accuracy of the population data used for redistricting and lessen the impact of incarceration on
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brianna Remster</td>
<td>440-897-5083</td>
<td>self-- social science researcher</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-10-11 14:18:04</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... representation.

Ideally, we would reallocate individuals in county, state, and federal facilities at the same time. However, most people incarcerated in county jails are from that county; county facilities on their own were not enough to substantively affect representation in our analyses of PA. Because most people are incarcerated in state facilities, and because county facilities often do not lead to allocating incarcerated people across district lines, reallocating state facility populations would mitigate the majority of the problem and we would hope that future redistricting commissions would proactively manage the problem before any data is even collected by the Census. States have followed a variety of approaches with regard to reallocating federal and county prison populations, and we would be happy to discuss the options further.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karen Gray</td>
<td>2088820687</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>2021-10-11 17:11:16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>403 N. Adams, Moscow, Idaho, 83843</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>PO Box 8623, Moscow, Idaho, 83843,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LO1 sounds like a good mixture for District 5, Latah County and northern Nez Perce County. There is huge commerce between Lewiston and Moscow, and they have a lot in common. Benewah County seems far away and disconnected. I rarely go north, but I go to Lewiston and Clarkston often. I would think our interests are more aligned with northern Nez Perce County.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beatrice Thompson</td>
<td>2088904951</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-10-11 17:50:22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 6386 S. Mistyglen Ave, Boise, Idaho, 83709

**Mailing address**: Boise, ID, 83709,

Hello commissioners, and thank you so much for your time today.

I’m here to talk about my neighborhood, which falls in the area that you might be aware of thanks to Murgoritio Park an the City of Boise land swap debacle.

I was recently made aware by my neighbor, that my house, and the houses of a small percentage of our neighborhood, were pulled out of my current district and placed in District 23 instead. Though I am not someone that typically gets involved in redistricting, I wanted to see if there would be changes to my district. When I looked at the map, District 23 immediately stood out to me. This is a huge district, taking up much of Southern Idaho, and going past Mountain Home almost to Twin Falls. However, it doesn’t actually have any cities or even partial cities in it- it’s mostly rural. There’s lots of rural towns in Idaho that need to be represented, including around this area. It makes sense to have rural towns in rural districts.

That means, my neighborhood does not belong in this district. While we might not be officially in Boise City limits, we are a part of Boise and Meridian. We’re urban, and growing fast. I sometimes have to leave the house 30 minutes earlier than I used to just to get somewhere in the morning due to all the traffic. Our area is surrounded by construction projects in every direction. Traffic as well as property taxes, school districts, healthy green space and more will continue to be impacted by that growth. I’m worried about what it will be to have my neighbor down the street have someone representing them who lives nearby and understands the challenges that we all face. While I may have a representative that I don’t know, who lives hours away from me and does not face the same types of issues my neighborhood faces now and will face in the future.

It doesn’t seem very fair or appropriate to split our neighborhood in this way when we’re a tight knit group of people with nothing in common with District 23. If my house stays in a district with the rest of my neighborhood, it will feel much more like I am being represented by people who understand my needs as a citizen of Idaho.
Michelle Castillo 3254287091 Self Boise 2021-10-12 09:30:39 21

Physical address 7452 Muirwood Ave, Boise, Idaho, 83709
Mailing address 7452 Muirwood Ave, Boise, ID, 83709,

I want to speak in favor of keeping unincorporated Boise districted together in legislative districts, rather than what the current proposed map has, which is our small portion of the neighborhood placed into District 23, a very large rural area that stretches for miles into Eastern Idaho. Unincorporated Boise is a unique part of the state, and a community that has stood together for years. Our legislative districts have always reflected that, and we’ve always been represented by people who can understand our unique position in Idaho’s infrastructure. Having such a small portion of our neighborhoods not included in the districts that include the rest of Unincorporated Boise splinters this rapidly growing part of the state in a way that honestly, doesn’t make sense given the neighborhood and community trends. When Boise tried to swap the Murgoritio Park land, Unincorporated Boise came together, including dozens of residents from the neighborhood that is currently districted into 23, and fought for our community to get the park it was promised by the city in the 90s. This incident clearly demonstrates the solidness of our community, despite the fact that it isn’t yet a part of Boise, and why it’s important to keep it together. A representative from rural or Eastern Idaho would not understand the unique needs that someone from one of the fastest growing part of our state is facing, and I am worried that regardless of political party, we would have a hard time getting them to understand our point of view. I don’t know what the answer is as to where to draw population from instead, but I am asking you to consider keeping our small pieces of neighborhoods that are currently outliers in District 23 together with the rest of Unincorporated Boise in what I believe is District 21. Our community is best represented by the people who live near us, in areas like us, understand what the struggles of unannexed Boise can be, and are also dealing with the rapid growth that we are.

Joyce Ward 2088245591 Self Malta 2021-10-12 10:53:39 27

Physical address 1581 East Ey Road, Malta, Idaho, 83342
Mailing address , , ,

Dear Commission,

I would like to strongly suggest to the Commission that one small change be made to Congressional District #2 in order to bring in the amount of constituents needed to equalize the two Idaho Congressional Districts. The following: .. The Congressional District #2 Line comes down the Panhandle of Idaho and then makes a jog into Boise area. Make that Jog further West into Ada County to take up the \"number\" of Constituents needed and proceed on from there as usual with the same line down to Nevada as it has been for fifty years or more. I personally Campaigned the 24 Counties for Congressman Hansen for numerous years in District #2 and it is NOT an easy project traveling over ALL of the 24 Counties in the \"Fat\" part of the State! Believe me! Someone even mentioned having Ada
cont. County as a Congressional District! I cannot even think of anything so unwise, and Selfish to think that one Congressman would have to Campaign the Panhandle and then District #2 also! Because of the Mountainous areas and terrain that suggestion does not make sense and is not fair to the rural Constituents of Idaho! Please, just make a simple change! I have been over this territory many, many, many, times and it is a huge Job!!! Just make the Jog larger into Ada County and take in another 35,000 people and make this job simple!

Thank You!
Sincerely,
Joyc Ward

Ralph Mossman 208-354-2759 Self Driggs 2021-10-12 11:04:41 32

Here are my thoughts on Teton County:

Two things matter. Distance and "Community of Interest".
Putting us with Bonneville, Fremont, Lemhi or Madison County are all fine, but putting us with Caribou County is not fine because it is too far and a completely different type of community of interest. And, you can't even get there on a paved road without going out of the district, which is contrary to State law even though I understand that law is trumped by the constitution. In fact, If we have to go by the constitution instead of the State law, I would argue that "Community of interest" actually has meaning. It means where we shop, where we travel, dominant religion, how our economies work, where we get our news, etc.

Caribou, Bear Lake, Franklin, Oneida Counties and some parts of Bannock and other nearby counties share so much. Their biggest City and market is Pocatello or Logan, UT, they get their news from those two cities. Their economies are significantly industrial and the LDS Church plays a huge role in their communities. Eastern Bonneville, Teton, Fremont, Lemhi counties use Idaho Falls as our market. We get our news from Idaho Falls or Wyoming (or Montana), Tourism is a major part of our economies. LDS church is still significant, but it doesn't dominate community life like it does in the counties closer to Utah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scott Dockins</td>
<td>2088582118</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>VIOLA</td>
<td>2021-10-12 12:08:05</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>1320 W COVE RD, VIOLA, Idaho, 83872</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td><strong>1320  W Cove Rd, Viola, ID, 83872-9706,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My understanding is that Latah County has to be combined with another county to get enough population in the district. I believe that combining with Nez Perce County is a more natural fit than Benewah County. As a resident and business owner in Latah County we do our "out of town" shopping in Lewiston. That is where are car dealers are and RV dealers. Many of our crops are shipped to Lewiston and the port area.

I am a CPA and our firm has offices in both Moscow and Lewiston and our business area largely consists of the Quad-cities area. Moscow and Lewiston make up the Idaho side of that area and it is a natural fit.

Thanks for your consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ron Funk</th>
<th>(208) 226-7611</th>
<th>Power County</th>
<th>Americann Falls</th>
<th>2021-10-12 14:16:27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>543 Bannock Ave. , Americann Falls, Idaho, 83211</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After careful consideration The Power County Commissioners would like L030 by Dan Rainey as their choice to represent them. The Board has voted unanimously; Commissioner Funk, Commissioner Lasley and Commissioner Anderson.
I support Congressional Map C036 because it keeps counties whole, has a low deviation of just 204 people, and keeps the Snake River Plain whole.

I support Legislative Map L01, which combines Latah and the some northern parts of Nez Perce county. Even though I live in Moscow I was born in Lewiston, and have many relatives there.

The Lewiston Tribune and Moacow-Pullman Daily News have the same ownership and cover primarily stories of interest to folks living in Latah County south through Idaho County, not much about counties north of Latah (e.g. Benewah).

Moscow and Lewiston are in the same public health and judicial districts, which ties them together.

Latah County is commercially more connected southward into Nez Perce County than northward or eastward. Agricultural and timber products ship from Latah through the Port of Lewiston; farm service providers in Latah County and Nez Perce county have overlapping territories, much more than with Benewah; and major manufacturers, such as Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories, has facilities in Moscow and Lewiston.

Latah County and Nez Perce County residents fly in and out of either the Moscow/Pullman or Lewiston airport, while counties to the north tend to go to Spokane much more often.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company / City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Merrick</td>
<td>208-495-2421</td>
<td>Owyhee County Bruneau</td>
<td>2021-10-12 16:04:15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**
27632 River Road, Bruneau, Idaho, 83604

**Mailing address**
PO Box 128, Murphy, ID, 83650

These comments are being submitted on behalf of the Board of Owyhee County Commissioners concerning legislative redistricting boundaries. We have carefully reviewed each of the maps submitted by the public. Rather than creating our own map, we have decided to submit comments supporting several of the maps that we are agreeable to. Our main goal is to ensure that our legislative district preserves our traditional neighborhoods and communities of like interests. The legislative map proposed by the Redistricting Commission pairs very rural Owyhee County with urban Ada and Canyon Counties rather than Payette, Elmore, Camas, or Twin Falls Counties which share many of the same issues and concerns. We do not want to be in a district with pockets of high population numbers such as Ada and Canyon Counties because we fear rural Owyhee County will be forgotten, or at best become an afterthought.

The list below is all of the publicly submitted maps that we support. We have included quite a few in case some of them have to be thrown out for some reason unknown to us.

Owyhee County aligns best with communities in Canyon County east of Green Leaf and south of Bowmont Road, Elmore County and eastern Twin Falls County.

Thank you for your consideration.

Owyhee County Commissioners
Joe Merrick
Jerry Hoagland
Kelly Aberasturi

L011
L012
L014
L016
L024
L026
L028
L029
L032
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe Merrick</td>
<td>208-495-2421</td>
<td>Owyhee County</td>
<td>Bruneau</td>
<td>2021-10-12 16:04:15</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Hults</td>
<td>208-536-2143</td>
<td>Self and Gooding Soil</td>
<td>Wendell</td>
<td>2021-10-12 17:17:14</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>1425 E 3200 S, Wendell, Idaho, 83355</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly recommend that the boundary lines for District 26 remain the same for the purpose of redistricting in 2021. Once in the past this District was split with part of Gooding County joining a Twin Falls District. At that time the residents of the area joining Twin Falls District did not receive any support or contact from those Representatives and Senators. I know because I am a Supervisor with Gooding Soil Conservation District. We stay in touch with our local Senator and Representatives and are on a first name basis with them. This goes to show the quality of people representing us. I would request that our District 26 remain as it is.

Respectively,
Kay Hults
Dear Committee:

I am writing in support of L01. My reason is that my family lives in Moscow but my son travels to Lewiston to attend nursing school at LCSC. Last spring when he learned of possible budget cuts to his program he asked me to reach out to our representatives. I was not sure if I should contact District 5 (where I live) or District 6 (the location of the school). Eventually I reached out to District 5 Senate and House reps. Because of our ties to both communities I find that a map that includes Latah and part of Nez Percy county makes the most sense. I know there are others who live in town and commute to the other; their lives and livelihoods are rooted in both counties. Having representation that reflects this reality would be invaluable.

Thank you for your time,
Michal Casberg
Moscow, ID 83843

Gretchen Wissner
509-336-0658
myself and my husband, James Miller
Moscow
2021-10-12 17:44:43
5

We support option L1 for the following reasons.

Latah and Nez Perce Counties are much more closely tied than Latah and Benewah Counties by geography, economics, commerce, transportation, medicine, and education. As residents of Latah County, we frequently travel to Lewiston to meet with friends, to shop, to fly, and for doctors’ appointments. If we travel north, we just travel through Benewah County.

For these reasons, we believe Latah and Nez Perce counties are a better fit as a community of interest for legislative districting purposes.

Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gretchen Wissner</td>
<td>509-336-0658</td>
<td>myself and my husband, James Miller</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>2021-10-12 17:44:43</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

| David Drown         | 2088821320     | Self, I am a retired Engineering Professor and have lived in Moscow for over 40 years | Moscow | 2021-10-12 18:11:19 | 5         |

Physical address: 818 Vista St, Moscow, Idaho, 83843
Mailing address: 818 Vista St, Moscow, Idaho, 83843,

The Congressional Map C036 is a good one because it keeps counties whole, has a extremely low deviation of just 204 people, and keeps the Snake River Plain whole.

The Legislative Map L1 or a future variation which combines Latah and parts of Nez Perce county would be a good idea for a number of reasons. Much better than the current combination of Lath and Benewah counties which have minimal commercial compatibilities. Latah County is commercially more connected southward into Nez Perce County than northward or eastward: agricultural and lumber products ship from Latah through the Port of Lewiston; farm service providers in Latah County are shared much more with Nez Perce County than with Benewah; and SEL, for one major example, has facilities in Moscow and Lewiston—many employees commute between Latah communities and employment in Lewiston and vice versa. Both Moscow and Lewiston are towns that have colleges and that common feature makes them a community of interest. U of Idaho and Lewis-Clark State College students, faculty and staff have close connections with both institutions. Faculty and staff at both of these institutions live in either county and commute frequently between them. Moscow and Lewiston are in the same public health district and judicial district, which also ties them together. Many medical service providers in Latah and Nez Perce counties have patients from each area.
Commissioners,

I am Alejandro (Alex) Zamora, and I was the first person to testify before you in person at the first hearing in Caldwell on September 15.

As I noted during the live testimony, I needed time to work through the maps; however, I did specifically ask to keep Farmway Village as a part of any Caldwell district. Additionally, I noted the importance of keeping Caldwell attached to Nampa, versus the areas of Middleton and Star, particularly given the cities' shared boundary often seems not existent as the communities roll into one another in a contiguous fashion clearly forming a single community of interest. This latter point is not true of Caldwell and Middleton, as there are miles of not yet developed area in between.

To this end, I would like to endorse map L067 submitted by Antonio Hernandez. In working with Mr. Hernandez on this submission, this map addresses the two key points I noted above, ensuring our Caldwell community of interest remains intact. Additionally, it relies on the Caldwell School District lines as one of the natural markers of the community. More importantly, given the charge you made to me of ensuring the population is near the target of 52,546, this map accomplishes that with only a .53% difference. Throughout the whole map, the greatest deviation is just over 5%, and each modification done follows the Commission's statutory requirements of maintaining communities of interest.

Additionally, great work was done by Mr. Hernandez to collaborate with others throughout the state to ensure the same inclusion of Caldwell was maintained throughout Idaho.

Please consider map L067.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>James Hecht</td>
<td>2082630800</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Sagle</td>
<td>2021-10-12 20:33:25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>552 Loch Haven Rd., Sagle, Idaho, 83860</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>PO Box 369, Sagle, ID, 83860,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have been a resident of District 7 since 1973. Almost all of my activities and business patronage are centered around Sandpoint. It seems reasonable and obvious that I would be represented in the district that is my zone of impact.

I recognize that distances are great in rural Idaho. However, it is possible to arrange districts so that they are rationally related and not fragmented at random or by un"natural boundaries.

Therefore I request that you amend the districting maps to put Sagle, Gamlin, Southside and Careywood precincts in District 1.

Respectfully, James Hecht

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cynthia Cooperrider</th>
<th>208-841-2150</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Garden City</th>
<th>2021-10-12 20:53:33</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>8690 West Atwater Drive, Garden City, Idaho, 83714</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am in favor of map C026. This format appears to respect county boundaries and the parameters provided by major highways and geographical separation. This will facilitate the cohesive voice of communities, allowing ease of communications and unique shared interests. Thank you for your consideration.
Hello Commissioners,

Thank you for this opportunity. My name is Antonio Hernandez and I was able to give remote testimony. However after listening to the other testimony I wanted to turn my written testimony in for the record and also add a note that may solve some issues with the southern Boise/Meridian area.

I am here both as a resident of Nampa, Idaho and as a member of the coalition Contamos Idaho. My background is in civic engagement and I currently work as the civic engagement coordinator at Conservation Voters for Idaho. Contamos Idaho’s mission is to reduce barriers for Idaho’s communities to engage in the Idaho democratic process by providing information, training, and resources – ensuring our communities are not only included but drive Idaho’s future. Contamos Idaho has provided multiple redistricting 101 training sessions for Idahoans in person and virtually in both English and Spanish. Contamos has also reached out to community members to hear where their communities of interest reside in order to preserve them.

I’d like to tell you a bit about what we heard and the legislative map we created and submitted as a result. This map was given the name L067 after being uploaded to the redistricting website. We heard from community members in the Caldwell area that there are two important communities of interest that need to be included in the Caldwell district, in this case district 12. That is the current Caldwell school district boundaries and Farmway Village. Community members have shared that these areas have specific needs such as information in both English and Spanish that the school district has been able to provide. With that trust has been built that could take years to re-establish if these communities are broken up. We believe the map we are sharing with you accomplishes this as well as feedback we received from community members to say the area around Ridgeview Highschool is not part of Caldwell’s Communities of interest and should not be included in district 12.

We also heard from members of Nampa’s communities of interest and have shaped the lines as a result. Notably, the Northside of Nampa is a community of interest that I’ve been a part of for over 18 years. It’s been our experience that the construction of two schools- East Valley Middle School and Columbia High has caused our community to split up, forcing residents in my community to go to those schools four miles away when Nampa and West Middle School are much closer and are a part of our community. It’s clear to us that with the growth in the area, Nampa and West Middle Schools cannot house all the students. That is why we believe the district lines must be drawn in such a way that excludes East Valley and Columbia High so that our district can advocate for new schools closer to the Northside of Nampa.

We heard from community members in the Twin Falls area to make sure the new Twin Falls district includes the area around
the Sugar beet factory as a key community of interest in a blossoming city.

Lastly, I heard testimony from residents of the southern Boise area located east of S Five Mile Rd. and south of W Lake Hazel Rd. I believe our map solves the issue of keeping this important community of interest in the Boise district instead of diluting the voices of those community members with the rural district 23.

In conclusion, our ask of this commission is to preserve the following communities of interest:

Farmway Village and the Caldwell School district. The Southern boundary of the Caldwell School District follows Homedale Rd. beginning at the intersection of S Montana Ave. then following east to Malt Rd. where it follows Malt Rd. north to Ustick. The boundary then travels up North Wagner RD. crossing the Boise River and circling Farmway Village that lies between the intersection of US HWY 20 and I-84. This Marks the Western boundary to the Calwell School District. Currently map L01 would exclude Caldwell High from the district. Our L067 maps boundaries include Caldwell highschool and add additional room for the district to grow for the next 10 years. It also excludes Ridgevue High School.

The Northside of Nampa’s southern boundary is established by the W Railroad St. but it's true southern boundary is located near Amity and Lake Lowell Ave. The Northside Community eastern boundary follows N Sugar St. up to 11th Ave. to Karcher Rd. The northern boundary is established by Karcher Rd. traveling west until reaching Midland Blvd. The boundary then follows Midland Blvd. south until connecting with Lake Lowell Ave. This is largely because West Middle School and Nampa High School are the closest schools to the area that has a Middle School that feeds into a High School. The Northside of Nampa needs additional schools closer to this community of interest and we are asking to be our own district to be able to advocate for them. Excluding: South Middle School, Skyview High School, Columbia High School and East Valley.

The South East Twin Falls community is generally seen as the area north of Orchard Drive E. This is also true on the Commissioners L01 map. However, as the Sugar Beet factory just outside of the L01 map is an important source of employment for this community of interest and all communities of interest in the City of Twin Falls, we believe it should be included in the Twin Falls district. This boundary could be extended to E 3600 N. Our L067 map only extends to the river located south of the factory.

Thank you for your time and consideration.
Commissioners,

I appreciate the time and effort you are putting forth perhaps as well as anyone. I’m sure that you will be able to take great pride in the work you produce.

I do have one concern that I would like to share with you. It’s obvious to me in looking at your work that you have been focused strongly on keeping the size difference between districts as small as possible. And while that is important, it should not obscure the need for sensible decision making.

The statute governing redistricting is quite clear on the subject of keeping counties intact. What it amounts to is, if it is not necessary to split a county, it is necessary not to split a county.

The result of your legislative map and one of your congressional maps is the dismemberment of Ada County. I’m not sure this has to happen.

The Congressional map is the easier to address. You have created a map that keeps Ada intact while creating two districts. I find that to be an elegant outcome. I wonder if you have explored the idea of separating Ada and Canyon, and creating what amounts to a southern district? Either of these two maps would meet the obligation to keep counties intact.

I understand (believe me, I do) the complexity involved in drawing the legislative map, and it’s not my intent to second guess some of the difficult decisions you must make. Nevertheless, the population numbers support creating whole districts entirely within Ada County. It would be a disservice to the citizens of Ada, not to mention be an affront to the language and spirit of the statute, not to provide that outcome.

You are down to the wire. I wish you the best of luck.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Darrell Bolz</td>
<td>12088808693</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>2021-10-13 13:28:34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>3412 College Ave., Caldwell, Idaho, 83605</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>3412 College Ave., Caldwell, Idaho, 83605,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commissioners: First I want to thank each of you for your willingness to serve on the Commission For Reapportionment. The task you are undertaking is not an easy one as there are many different opinions as to how the reapportionment should be done. My comments in regard to &quot;community of interest.&quot; To some a &quot;community of interest&quot; appears to be simple, but in reality a particular community may belong to more than one &quot;community of interest.&quot; I appreciate the fact that you follow natural boundaries. I also realize that population may dictate that you make exceptions to natural boundaries as well as &quot;communities of interest.&quot; My preference for both Congressional Districts is that they remain as close to possible the current districts. I feel the new reapportionment can be made with a slight revision of the western boundary of the current district. I realize that the current Legislative Districts will need some changes due to population changes. Due to the state's population centers, it is inevitable that some rural districts are going to be larger. Again, I would prefer to keep districts somewhat the same, noting that population changes make some changes necessary. I personally feel that travel within a district needs to be considered, i.e., being able to drive within the district on suitable roads and within a manageable time. Again, thank you for your time and effort, Darrell Bolz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather Dyer</td>
<td>2069158947</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Lewiston</td>
<td>2021-10-18 08:17:21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>3101 4th St, Lewiston, Idaho, 83501</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am writing in support of map L01 in the redistricting process. This feels like a long time coming as both Lewiston and Moscow share public health districts, many people commute back and forth for work and play. The 32 miles between the two are less than suburbs of many larger cities on the coast. Thank you for your time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thanks to members of the commission for your efforts in serving the residents of our state. Great work on creating two contiguous districts as shown in the L2 map. My concerns: 1) District 1 covers a much larger geographic area than does District 2. As a result, campaigning for elections, meeting with constituents, and establishing local offices will be far more expensive and time-consuming in District 1 than in District 2. This places burdens on one U.S. House of Representatives member that the other member from Idaho does not bear and may affect individual decisions to run for office. Wilderness areas make it impossible even to drive by motor vehicle from Bonners Ferry to Bear Lake without crossing through either District 2 or Montana. Travel time from Cambridge to Twin Falls, in contrast, requires five or six hours at most. 2) I am unsure whether State or federal law requires a member to reside within the district that he/she represents. This could lead to some complications, as incumbent Russ Fulcher now resides near Meridian in Ada County, which would no longer be located within District 1 as proposed. 3) Voters who identify as Democrats or moderate Republicans from Blaine and Bannock counties may be dismayed at joining northern Idaho voters in District 1, which has historically been more politically conservative than District 2 in its current form. 4) The economies and demographics of northern and southeastern Idaho vary considerably, as do their climates and time zones. Combining these two regions into District 1 is likely to create numerous challenges and competing interests. District 2 as proposed, however, is somewhat more homogenous.

Please do not split precincts in Nez Perce County.

Sincerely,
Patty Weeks
Nez Perce County Clerk
Dear Commissioners:

My understanding is that Idaho Democrats are seriously underrepresented -- according to the percentage of Democrats -- in our legislature -- thanks to unfair existing districting.

It is also my understanding that during the current redistricting process, the idea of taking away even more seats from Democrats is on the table.

When is it enough? Why do Democrats have to beg for the existing unfair status quo so as not to be further in the hole?

A more democratic (small d) process would result in legislative seats that mirror the percentage of the party. That is not the reality in Idaho and it seems to be going in the wrong direction.

I present as evidence the L shaped proposal for the West Boise district. Steve Berch has worked hard for his constituents and the gerrymandering of his district by Republicans to get him out of power is transparent.

I'm just asking for a fair game to be played.

Communities of interest must stay intact. Please make changes to this map and ensure fair representation for Boiseans. Here is an alternative map, L23 that accomplishes these goals: L23 (idaho.gov)

Thanks for listening,

Elizabeth Rodgers

To the Redistricting Commission:

I support the most recent map (L02) for the Idaho Legislature. It makes the most sense for my district in north Idaho because the areas East of Sandpoint that are being brought into District 1 have always had more association with Sandpoint and District 1 than with the current District 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ollie</td>
<td>208-871-5375</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Bonners Ferry</td>
<td>2021-10-31 14:11:58</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

Thank you for the amount of time and effort you have put into this. It makes sense and will give north Idaho a more unified voice.

Mary Ollie
Bonners Ferry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Bishop</td>
<td>2089364219</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>2021-10-31 16:54:41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address** 16630 Rose Briar Lane, Nampa, Idaho, 83687  
**Mailing address**

I appreciate the difficult task the commission has in preparing a redistricting map and am grateful they seem to have gone about it in a very non-partisan way! I live in the small chunk of proposed district 17 that is located in Canyon County. I believe it would do a disservice to me and my neighbors to group us into district 17. The vast majority of district 17 is in Ada County, while small sections of each of proposed District 16 and District 17 are located in Canyon County. In addition, for those of us that live west of Star Road, we are located in the Vallivue School District, which gives us even less of a connection with the rest of District 17. We have Nampa addresses and our communities of interest are in most cases associated with Nampa and Canyon County rather than Meridian and Ada County. I would ask the commission to reconsider the extension of Districts 16 and 17 into Canyon County, particularly the extension past Star Road, which also crosses a school district boundary. Best regards!
Hello, I wanted to give quick feedback on the new map since it was asked for in the Statesman today. I live in Meridian in the current district 21. Under the new map, I would be moved into the new 19, which is primarily Boise. I disappointed by this as I thought that the commission was going to try and keep Meridian together, and I also think there was a very clear north/south division in the prior setup. The interstate was a very logical dividing line in the old maps, as the communities below the interstate are mostly newer developments and don't have as much in common with the areas north of the interstate. L01 did a better job of this.

I appreciate the work you all are doing!

I am writing to oppose the adoption of the L02 proposed redistricting map. Although I am reading about how well this map divides up by population, this is only part of the challenge. This L02 map divides communities of interest and dilutes what is already a very unbalanced political landscape in Idaho. With a mere 18 Democrats in the legislature already, this map weakens and dilutes the communities of common interest and will further imbalance our representation.

I urge you to support the L23 map instead which does a better job leaving communities of interest intact ensuring that more voices can ultimately be part of our political and community conversations.

I feel the committee was overly focused on population numbers and lost sight of the more nuanced areas of common interest within our population areas. L23 is does a fine job keeping the population numbers within the margin of difference and preserves communities of interest as well.

I appreciate that we have a balanced committee with equal representation of both parties, but I am frankly mystified at how the committee could propose such a skewed map relative to the Democrats after all the time and work you have put into this. I urge you to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn Volk</td>
<td>208-340-5877</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 12:05:15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

Bring balance back to your task at hand and support the fairer L23 map.

Thank you for your time.

Carolyn Volk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doug Zenner</th>
<th>12083090</th>
<th>Nez Perce County</th>
<th>Lewiston</th>
<th>2021-11-01 13:09:44</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>Brammer Building 1225 Idaho Street, Lewiston, Idaho, 83501</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>Brammer Building 1225 Idaho Street, Lewiston, Idaho, 83501,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My testimony is more of questions rather than testimony. My questions are "where are the lines drawn through NPC and in particular around and within the City of Lewiston?" Secondarily how many precincts did this "proposed map" split within the City of Lewiston and Nez Perce County? I have been unable to establish how these two questions reflect the boundaries that are "mapped" in L02.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yvonne Sandmire</th>
<th>2088590560</th>
<th>self</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>2021-11-01 14:06:55</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>800 W. Ranch Rd., Boise, Idaho, 83702</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>800 W. Ranch Rd., Boise, ID, 83702,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Idaho Redistricting Committee,

Thank you for taking on the difficult task of redrawing maps for voting.

I have been an Ada County resident since 1987. I am writing to express my concerns & opposition to the legislative district map (L02) your committee recently released. It does not seem like similar communities were considered in the drawing of this map. It would be much more fair if like communities were kept together. The L02 map splits these communities & combines them with
areas that do not have similar attributes & concerns.

I am particularly concerned with the way West Boise was split up. The new Districts 19 & 20 do not make sense if you want to keep communities together. If population growth necessitates splitting West Boise, the freeway makes more sense as a boundary because I84 already splits these communities. The Garden City & State Street areas also concern me for similar reasons.

I know redistricting is a difficult task, but it looks like the former districts were not even considered in this redrawing resulting in "throwing the baby out with the bath water." Please start over, or consider L23, which does a much better job of keeping like communities together.

For Congressional maps, I believe Congressional Draft Commission Plan C02 more closely adheres to the requirement (which has been ignored in prior Congressional maps) to keep counties intact whenever possible. I never understood why, when splitting Idaho into just 2 districts, one would find it necessary to split the most populous city & county in the state (unless it was for political purposes, which is also forbidden).

Sincerely,
Yvonne “Sam” Sandmire
800 W. Ranch Rd.
Boise, ID 83702
samsandmireidaho@gmail.com
208-859-0560
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meg Fereday</td>
<td>2088919098</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 14:08:40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>1320 E Hays Way, Boise, Idaho, 83712</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>, , , ,</td>
<td>, , , ,</td>
<td>, , , ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Reapportionment Committee Members,

Thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony.

I am a life long resident of Ada County. I am concerned about redistricting and the dividing up of Ada County. I realize that there has been significant growth here in Boise and elsewhere (Eagle), and I urge you to please consider keeping our neighborhoods whole when you draw your maps.

I oppose the map you are currently displaying as it carves up Ada County too much. Please keep our district fair and balanced. We do not wish to be "gerrymandered" and this is a real concern.

I support the map known as Plan L023 and hope that you will seriously consider it.

Thank you very much for your consideration,

Meg Fereday
208-891-9098

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valerie James</th>
<th>2082973251</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Meridian</th>
<th>2021-11-01 15:05:27</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>1308 W Olds River Dr, Meridian, Idaho, 83642-4487</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>1308 W Olds River Dr, Meridian, ID, 83642-4487,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Reapportionment Commissioners, Thank you for your diligent work in creating maps. The Legislative District plan, L02, is a difficult map for me to understand. The carving up of Ada County, the joining of the Kuna Melba area with a district all the way across the Snake River Canyon, and the joining of Eagle with a District in Gem County north. plus multiple Canyon/Ada blending together doesn't make it easier for me to understand the voting district lines. For the Kuna-Melba area to be joined with Canyon and Owyhee means there is no highway road access or better for the residents, which creates an orphan community that separates citizens from their representatives if their representatives are in Owyhee or Canyon counties. This cannibalization of our Ada County serves as a stabilization for other parts of the state, but not Ada County. Ada County has the population to support a wholly contained 9 district plan,
Valerie James 2082973251 Self Meridian 2021-11-01 15:05:27 22

within the 10% deviation, as multiple publicly submitted maps demonstrate. I live in South Meridian, and while Kuna-Melba is a community of interest, my previous testimony was never meant to mean Kuna-Melba shouldn't be part of a District that contained some Meridian areas, rather that splitting Kuna with Meridian and orphaning Melba shouldn't be attempted, as it breaks up a community of interest. Meridian and Kuna are blending together into a community of interest at the N-S borders of those cities, but S. Kuna/Melba area also have a naturally shared rural identity. I think recognizing this unique area South of I-84 (or South of Victory Road) as a District, which contains South Meridian, Kuna AND Melba is important. The pipeline to the interstate is Meridian Rd (hwy55) or Linder Road from Kuna. The northern Kuna boundary of District 15 uses a line that is a road which doesn't connect, Hollilyn Dr. Kuna-Mora Road is the major road E/W, not Hollilyn. While I'm not advocating for my map, L049, the lines drawn for the district uses Pleasant Valley Road to Kuna-Mora. These are known and well-traveled roads to the community, and knowing the district borders follow known roads are very important for voters. We travel to and from these communities daily, and splitting into another district that requires a canyon leap to cross doesn't unite our area. Further issues with L02: As noted above, state highway access or better for these three counties of District 15 --there is none between Ada-Canyon, nor Ada-Owyhee. This creates an island community for Kuna-Melba. Other maps split Ada County 8 times, this map splits us 10 times. There are also 27 county splits in the entire state, while other submitted maps hover somewhere around 24. Additionally, there are "donut hole" districts, which use unusual road configurations and blocking when major geographical are available to accomplish the same population balancing. There is an additional road access issue in District 8, no state highway or better between Boise and Elmore Counties. Canyon County can be balanced with a 4 district split, L02 splits 5 times. There are also issues in the panhandle counties with road access between Clearwater-Shoshone and Nez Perce-Idaho, Districts 2 and 7, respectively. I respect the Tetris/Jenga aspect of drawing maps, and I know this has been a difficult process, but I believe this map should be rejected and another map drawn or selected. Thank you for your time and volunteering for this important function. Good day, Valerie James, Meridian.

Lisa Derig 2088678803 Headwaters Wealth Management Boise 2021-11-01 16:00:36 17

Dear Redistricting Commission,

Physical address 6900 W McMullen St, Boise, Idaho, 83709
Mailing address 6900 W McMullen St, Boise, ID, 83709,

November 1, 2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Derig</td>
<td>2088678803</td>
<td>Headwaters Wealth Management</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 16:00:36</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cont.** I support Map L023, L23 (idaho.gov).

I would like to thank you on your efforts to achieve a bi-partisan, fair approach to this effort. My observations were that you initially agreed that communities of interest should be kept together. The proposal that went out for comment seemed to achieve that and I was surprised when the Statesman published your most recent proposal. I don’t believe that it was your intent to pull communities of interest apart but that is what this latest map does.

I am a native Idahoan and have lived in Boise for over 30 years. I own a business here and have raised my children in Boise. My family is deeply rooted and involved in this City and because of this, I have a good understanding of the different communities within our community.

I live in West Boise. The proposed D19 is an odd shaped “L” rather than a square. In the legislation creating the commission, item (4) specifically instructs the commission not to create oddly shaped districts. I am asking you to redraw this district to ensure the community of interest is maintained rather than including a part of another neighborhood to achieve numerical equity or take another look at using Map L023.

In conclusion, I am in support of Map L023 for legislative districts because it keeps our communities whole. Thank you again for taking on this arduous task and for keeping it civil and fair.

Lisa Derig  
6900 W McMullen St  
Boise, Id 83709  
208.867.8803  derig5@msn.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vince Derig</td>
<td>2083757555</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 16:02:10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Physical address   | 6900 W McMullen St, Boise, Idaho, 83709 | Mailing address | 6900 W McMullen St, Boise, ID, 83709 |

November 1, 2021

Dear Redistricting Commission,

I support Map L023, L23 (idaho.gov).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vince Derig</td>
<td>2083757555</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 16:02:10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**cont.** I would like to thank you on your efforts to achieve a bi-partisan, fair approach to this effort. My observations were that you initially agreed that communities of interest should be kept together. The proposal that went out for comment seemed to achieve that and I was surprised when the Statesman published your most recent proposal. I don't believe that it was your intent to pull communities of interest apart but that is what this latest map does.

I am a native Idahoan and have lived in Boise for over 30 years. I own a business here and have raised my children in Boise. My family is deeply rooted and involved in this City and because of this, I have a good understanding of the different communities within our community.

I live in West Boise. The proposed D19 is an odd shaped “L” rather than a square. In the legislation creating the commission, item (4) specifically instructs the commission not to create oddly shaped districts. I am asking you to redraw this district to ensure the community of interest is maintained rather than including a part of another neighborhood to achieve numerical equity or take another look at using Map L023.

In conclusion, I am in support of Map L023 for legislative districts because it keeps our communities whole. Thank you again for taking on this arduous task and for keeping it civil and fair.

Vince Derig  
6900 W McMullen St  
Boise, Id 83709  
208.375.7555 vencederig@gmail.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deborah McGraw</th>
<th>4153854132</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>2021-11-01 16:33:39</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Physical address  
2972 E Parkcenter Blvd, Apt 311, Boise, Idaho, 83716  

Mailing address  
2972 E Parkcenter Blvd, Apt 311, Boise, ID, 83716,

I am writing to support L2 which is more logical and keeps the districts as they are. I also support the congressional map which keeps Boise in one district which is line with the law to provide coverage without distorting the population.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Robbins</td>
<td>9519904421</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 16:35:29</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>362 W Charlwood Ct, Boise, Idaho, 83706</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>362 W Charlwood Ct, Boise, ID, 83706,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1 Map is more consistent with Boise's current district. I oppose L2 and want to keep Boise's current districts intact. I support C36 Congressional Map. My hope is that the decisions will be based on what most represents each citizen rather than Idaho Freedom Foundation propaganda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Barbara Wood        | 208-284-9167 | Self                        | Boise    | 2021-11-01 18:59:30   | 17        |
| <strong>Physical address</strong> | <strong>161 West Willoway Dr., Boise, Idaho, 83705</strong> | <strong>Mailing address</strong> | , , , , |           |           |
| Dear Commissioners: |              |                             |          |                       |           |
| I have serious concerns with the proposed changes to the City of Boise in the recently released map (L02). A major problem is the total rewriting of current districts. These neighborhoods are established, and completely redrawing the lines is a mistake. The L02 can be found along the State Street corridor. State Street does not split communities in half. There are connections between neighborhoods and communities of interest on both the north and south sides of the street. o The entire corridor is about to receive major transportation, housing and community development changes, which will impact both sides of the street heavily. o These constituents need to be kept in the same legislative district so their lawmakers can effectively advocate for these developments, especially as the city's population grows. □Another issue is West Boise. D19 is an odd shaped “L” rather than a square. o D19 and D20 do not fully encompass all West Boise, which has long felt disenfranchised from city government. o It is its own community and should be represented as such. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Wood</td>
<td>208-284-9167</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 18:59:30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>cont.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o If it needs to be split, use the I84, which is a physical barrier and a community barrier.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communities must stay intact. Please make changes to this map so Boiseans can be represented fairly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>L23 that accomplishes these goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saradiane Mosko</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 19:37:42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1479 E. Rimrock Ct., Boise, Idaho, 83712</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I am writing to OPPOSE Map L2 and SUPPORT a map consistent with L1 for legislative districts. I grew up in the East End of Boise (above Military Reserve), attending both Boise High and North Junior High. I have always felt a strong connection to the downtown/North End communities, but I have very little contact with communities in Harris Ranch and those further east. A map like L1 would keep my community whole. To split it apart, as is proposed in Map L2, seems irrational. It would take away my ability to engage with the community that I am actually a part of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In addition, I SUPPORT Map C36 because it keeps counties whole as required by law, has very low population deviation, and keeps the Snake River Plain in a single congressional district.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Scott</td>
<td>2083440170</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 19:46:55</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>3437 E Parsnip Peak Drive, Boise, Idaho, 83716</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>3437 E Parsnip Peak Drive, Boise, ID, 83716,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am writing to the commission in opposition to the L2 map. Instead, I support a map more like L1, which would keep the existing legislative districts intact. Why would you change something that isn't broken? The current districts in Boise work very well.

I also support the congressional map C36, which keeps counties whole and has very low population deviation; it also keeps the Snake River Plain in a single congressional district.

Thank you for your consideration and your efforts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ruckh</td>
<td>2622128829</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 21:05:01</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>3396 E Dowling Mill Ct, Boise, Idaho, 83706</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>3396 E Dowling Mill Ct, Boise, ID, 83706,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good morning and thank you for taking more testimony from Idaho residents who are concerned about redistricting and who want to be part of this important process.

After looking at the new CO2 map, I continue to strongly believe that Map 036 is preferable for our state for the following reasons:

1. It creates a north/south division of the state which is a more accurate representation of the two primary Idaho regions.
2. It keeps all counties intact which is a requirement of Idaho law.
3. It has minimal total population deviations.
4. It keeps the Snake River Plain entirely in one district.

Thank you for all the efforts your group has devoted to this important governmental function and open process!

Mary Ruckh
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary Ruckh</td>
<td>2622128829</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-01 21:05:01</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*cont.*

| Rhiana Menen     | 7148125711     | Self                           | Boise    | 2021-11-01 23:00:00    | 18        |

**Physical address** 1601 Garfield St, Boise, Idaho, 83706

**Mailing address** , Boise, ID, 83706,

Dear Redistricting Commission,

I support Map L023, L23 (idaho.gov).

I am writing to OPPOSE L2 in favor of a map that would be more consistent with L1, which largely keeps Boise's existing legislative districts intact.

I also ask that you support C36 because it keeps counties whole as required by law, has very low population deviation, and keeps the Snake River Plain in a single congressional district.

Thank you for your time,

Rhiana Menen and Ryan Shackelford
1601 Garfield St
Boise, 83706
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amy Steckel</td>
<td>2085713032</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>BOISE</td>
<td>2021-11-01 23:14:11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>718 W. RANCH ROAD, BOISE, Idaho, 83702</td>
<td>Mailing address 718 W. RANCH ROAD, BOISE, ID, 83702</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Commissioners:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate that Idaho continues to have a fair, bipartisan method for reapportionment. I have lived in Boise for 27 years. I initially lived on State Street and 21st, then later purchased a home in the lower Highlands. I have always valued the strong neighborhood identities in Boise. I realize that you have a difficult job but am asking that you strive to keep neighborhoods together and not just look at the numerical balance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, I take issue with splitting up the State Street corridor and the former District 19. I am writing to support Map L01 in order to keep communities together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your consideration,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy Steckel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>718 W. Ranch Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Julie Custer        | 2088710221     | Self                           | BOISE     | 2021-11-02 05:24:57     | 18        |
| Physical address    | 1088 E FLEETWOOD CT, BOISE, Idaho, 83706 | Mailing address 1088 E FLEETWOOD CT, BOISE, ID, 83706 | | | |
|                     |                |                                |           |                          |           |
| I'm writing in support of two maps: L01 and C36. I strongly oppose Map L02 in favor of Map L01. Map L01 basically keeps the districts in the Boise intact. I believe this will minimize confusion to voters when new maps are implemented. I support Map C36 because it keeps counties whole. | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Ehlers</td>
<td>2085895280</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>2021-11-02 06:50:45</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>4731 W. Blue Creek Ct, Meridian, Idaho, 83642</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a resident of Meridian, I am not in favor of the current proposed map, LO2. Ada County is split various ways and has Legislative Districts as part of 3 different counties, including several that are part of Canyon County. This appears to violate multiple redistricting criteria about avoiding county division and when dividing a county, seeking to keep those districts wholly contained within a county. Therefore, I suggest re-doing the districts and keeping all Ada County districts within Ada County as much as possible in following the Constitutional and statutory guidance. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sally ferguson</td>
<td>2088711906</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 08:30:14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1317 e Jefferson street, Boise, Idaho, 83701</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>1317 E JEFFERSON ST, BOISE, Idaho, 83712,</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
<td>, , ,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

November 1, 2021
To: The Redistricting Commission
Subject: Reapportionment-I support Map L023 L23 (idaho.gov)

Greetings,
Thank you for working to achieve numerical balance in your reapportionment work. I am, however, concerned that you have dissolved balance in communities of interest.

I have lived in Boise’s East End, on East Jefferson Street for 31 years. My children attended North and East Junior Highs and Boise High. In your new map, I am now assigned to the Harris Ranch District which is an entirely different school system and much different alignment of interests. It is also difficult to access from my location because of increasing traffic and suburban density.

My concerns as a homeowner reflect central city issues. My office is in downtown Boise, near the Idaho Capital, BSU and St. Lukes. The near East End is an urban, downtown-facing location, not a suburban corridor, as is Harris Ranch.

I am concerned that in splitting up District 19, you are essentially taking away the vote of the constituents in East Boise—those who live and work as part of the downtown, central city neighborhoods. Residents of the near East End remain an important urban voice.

As Boise continues to grow, voter representation is ever more important, and the reason why I encourage you to reconsider. Please use Map L023 for legislative districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sally ferguson</td>
<td>2088711906</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 08:30:14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Thank you for your consideration.*

Sally Ferguson
1317 East Jefferson Street
Boise ID 83712
smferguson60@outlook.com

---

Jim Ruckh
262-720-0046 self Boise 2021-11-02 08:43:43 18

**Physical address**
3396 E. Dowling Mill Ct, Boise, Idaho, 83706

**Mailing address**

Hello and thank you for doing this good work for the citizens of Idaho. After reviewing the new map L02, I would recommend something closer to the original L01 map. Between the two I find that the L01 map better captures the distinct communities of interest within the Boise area. I think of these as SE Boise, SW Boise, North End, Garden City, Meridian-Kuna, Eagle, and the two bench communities all seem to be better identified in map L01.

Thank you for considering my testimony.

Jim Ruckh
Dear Commissioners:

Thank you for your service on the redistricting commission. I can imagine your job a very difficult one. I am writing over my concerns with the proposed L02 map. I favor a map similar to L01.

I respect that you have much public input to read so I will be brief. I have lived with my family in Boise for 16 years and have enjoyed the small-town feel and lifestyle in Idaho that our current legislative districts afford. While I understand your mandate for creating one person one vote, I have concerns that mandates will not be honored in that counties are being divided and odd-shaped districts (such as district 19) are being created. As Boise continues to grow at a astronomical rate, I believe it imperative that current neighborhoods and their legislative districts are kept intact so that our collective interests can be fairly represented.

I support Map L01 because I believe it allows you to comply with state mandates while keeping communities together and ensuring equal representation of all Boiseans.

Again, thank you for your service to Idaho.
Kim Gattiker
2515 E Parkside Drive
Boise, ID 83712
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Glenn</td>
<td>208 880-7742</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>2021-11-02 11:05:39</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Physical address    | 19141 Tucker, Greenleaf, Idaho, 83626 no | Mailing address | P.O. Box 396, Greenleaf, Idaho, 83626, |

I am currently in district 11. The newly drawn district will be 9. The new district not only splits canyon county, but now encompasses payette and Washington counties. This is not the only out of district split of my county. As your guidelines state, it is favored to keep county districts while, or districts that do not split counties up and mix in with other counties. Not only did you do this with canyon county, you did it FOUR times! Two splits into Ada county, one with Owyhee, and this clustered mess that we are a part of. Given the growth of the treasure valley, the people of payette and Washington counties will have no representation within a short period of time over the next decade.

You have very strangely taken a sliver of land jutting into Caldwell city limits. This area, where my parents live, is one of the wealthiest of Caldwell and a large area in the area of impact for future growth. It is and will be filled with retirees from outside of Idaho. These curious of the state's fifth largest city have nothing in common with the people of payette and Washington counties/midvale and Cambridge. There is no way one person can properly represent the interests of such a diverse population.

Also, the agricultural aspect mixed with high density city interests couldn’t be more different. Agricultural areas adjacent to city growth isn’t as large of a problem because of the increase in land value due to the housing growth. But, western canyon county to Weiser is pure agricultural land with little variance allowed to profit off of land sales.

Probably the most illegal move would be including the portion of Caldwell that is city limit currently and the area of impact around it. The numbers may add up correctly currently, but this plan must take into consideration the idea of “one person one vote”. Within a short period of time, there will be many new citizens in the Caldwell area that I reference will have many more people than the rural areas or of payette and Washington counties. Thus diluting their ability to have a say in their representation.

Canyon County should not have been split FOUR times to fix other problems you created, but should have been redistricted within itself First and foremost. You do not follow your own rules with what has been done, and this needs to be fixed to prevent soon to follow lawsuits.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Todd Lakey</td>
<td>208-989-4252</td>
<td>Self and State Senator</td>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>2021-11-02 11:56:24</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monica Church</td>
<td>2083402605</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 12:39:58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dena Duncan</td>
<td>208-345-4771</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 12:47:18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I reviewed the latest map from the Commission - LO2. I support that map. It better focuses the geographic representation in the districts in Canyon County. I am most familiar with Nampa and the surrounding portions of the county and this map represents well the natural divisions within that community and area. I think the map does a good job of following the guidelines. Thank you for your work - I know this is a difficult responsibility.

Idaho Legislative map: I oppose L2 in favor of a map that largely keeps Boise's existing legislative districts intact. I believe L23 is a better option.

Congressional map: I support C36 because it keeps counties whole as required by law, and has a low population deviation. Thank you!

I have viewed the various Congressional maps that have been proposed and find that the one map I find to be fair and best complies with the law on how redistricting should be done is C036 proposed by Brandon Durst. The variances between the the two proposed districts are quite low, better than some other maps, and all of the counties are kept whole, a fact I find much better than in the past. I've always found the splitting of Ada County to be disturbing, especially when talking with friends who don't live that far from
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dena Duncan</td>
<td>208-345-4771</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 12:47:18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cont. me and finding that we had nothing in common to talk about during campaign times since we were in different congressional districts with different candidates and different issues. It was also difficult to find where the division line was. With this map, no county's citizens will have to deal with this issue. Therefore, Congressional map C036 is the one I am supporting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Goettsche</td>
<td>(208)345-1189</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 13:39:11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address 3314 E Sweetwater Dr, Boise, Idaho, 83716  
Mailing address **, , Ada,**

Redistricting Commission, I favor map L1 over map L2 because it keeps Southeast Boise as a community of interest in the same district. I also favor Congressional Map C36. Southwest Idaho has more in common with Southeast Idaho than it has with North Idaho.

John Goettsche  
3314 E. Sweetwater Dr. Boise, Id

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue Reents</td>
<td>208.343-7009</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 14:19:58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address 908 N 18th St, Boise, Idaho, 83702  
Mailing address **, , ,**

Commissioners: Having reviewed Proposed Legislative District map, L-02, I submit these suggestions for your consideration. Dist. 21. Communities of interest could be better protected by:  
1) Moving eastern border further east so that Foothills East and East end of Boise remain a part of same district as North Boise. (These changes would approximate the current Dist. 19, which is a definite community oriented to downtown Boise.)  
2) Moving western border of district east so that community of Eagle isn't split between two districts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sue Reents</td>
<td>208.343-7009</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 14:19:58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Boise: Try to include this community in one district. L-02 appears to divide it between three districts - 16, 19 &amp; 20. Because it is a physical barrier, perhaps use I-84 as one of the boundaries. Thanks for your hard work on the challenge of drawing new district lines and for your consideration of these suggestions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sue Reents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kayla Dodson</td>
<td>9707875371</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 14:45:41</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705 N Bacon Dr, Boise, Idaho, 83712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>With the new censes we in Idaho have the opportunity to create the most fair maps possible for all our citizens. I am in favor of keeping Boise's existing legislative districts as intact as possible so L1 is a good option. I oppose L2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to see the Congressional map look like C36 because it keeps counties whole and there are about the same number of people in each section.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kayla Dodson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>705 N Bacon Dr, Boise, ID 83712</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Civickayla17@gmail.com">Civickayla17@gmail.com</a>, (970)787-5371</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Mitchell</td>
<td>5039912876</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 15:27:40</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>10336 Hollandale Dr, Boise, Idaho, 83709</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>10336 W Hollandale Dr, Boise, ID, 83709,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello and thank you for doing this good work for the citizens of Idaho. After reviewing the new map L02, I would recommend something closer to the original L01 map. Between the two I find that the L01 map better captures the distinct communities of interest within the Boise area. I think of these as SE Boise, SW Boise, North End, Garden City, Meridian-Kuna, Eagle, and the two bench communities all seem to be better identified in map L01.

Thank you for considering my testimony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>1664 E. Monterey Drive, Boise, Idaho, 83706</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I'm submitting my emailed written testimony in favor of redistricting map L-1 for our legislative districts. As you all know, we are best represented when our districts keep neighborhoods together and do not create spiderweb arms. If school districts can balance population for attendance purposes, then we can do so when choosing our legislative districts.

As for our Congressional district, I support C36. We must adhere to the requirement of low population variation. Again, when you keep regional populations together, you are serving the people and not special interests. I prefer keeping the people of the Snake River Plain together in the same Congressional District.

Thank you to the commission members who are serving and for your consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Altekruse</td>
<td>4086791259</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 16:00:49</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>3968 s oak Brook way, Boise, Idaho, 83706</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding the redistricting process. Upon consideration it is my opinion that the new map designated LO2 should remain closer to the LO1 which better represents the distinct communities the include SE Boise, SW Boise, Garden City, the North End, Meridian- Kuna, and our bench areas.

Again, thank you for this opportunity.

Mark Altekruse
408-679-1259
markaltekruse@mac.com

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rekow</td>
<td>208-739-8760</td>
<td>Gem County Commissioner</td>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>2021-11-02 16:22:31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>2375 UA Ave, Emmett, Idaho, 83617</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a Commissioner for Gem County I strongly recommend Legislative District Commission plan L01 that combines Gem County with Payette and Washington Counties. This is preferred as it would combine like counties with similar cultures and ideals being rural and agricultural in nature.

I am opposed to LDC plan L02 as it would combine Gem County with the City of Eagle, which is an urban area with high density residential population of an extremely higher income average than Gem County has. This would create a district with highly opposing needs and views.

Gem County has a high rate of elderly and low income citizens. I would be concerned that our citizens could lose representation being combined with such a substantial population base of a more affluent demographic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark Rekow</td>
<td>208-739-8760</td>
<td>Gem County Commissioner</td>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>2021-11-02 16:22:31</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Butticci</td>
<td>208-365-8975</td>
<td>Gem County</td>
<td>Emmett</td>
<td>2021-11-02 16:39:50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>610 East 5th Street, Emmett, Idaho, 83617</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td><strong>610 East 5th Street, Emmett, IDAHO, 83617,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Commissioners,

As a County Commissioner for Gem County I would strongly ask the commission to consider Legislative Map L01. This is more appropriate for the character and current population in Gem County as we are a very rural agricultural community with a moderate average income. To combine Gem County with the city of Eagle would be a mistake as that community is a highly densely populated urban environment with a higher average income among their residents as compared to Gem County. If you are to move forward with map L02 the people of Gem county will loose their voice in the Idaho Legislature. Please consider legislative map L01.

Bill Butticci  
Gem County Commissioner  
District 2
Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for all the work that you have done in creating maps and listening to people from all across the state. I definitely would not want your job, and I appreciate that you are balancing competing interests and the many requirements of law in the creation of new districts. I would like to provide additional testimony based on the proposals within L02. My testimony now is consistent with the testimony I provided to you in person at Meridian City Hall many weeks ago. I testified that it did not make sense to divide the community of Kuna (approximate population of 24,000) into two separate legislative districts. Both L01 and L02 divide the urbanizing, but still rural community of Kuna in two separate districts. I testified earlier that if you had to draw lines taking in other parts of Canyon County to combine them with Ada County, that it would make sense to put Kuna and Melba together as these two communities have much in common and a great deal of mutual interests including commerce, schools, industry, etc. Yet, the proposed L02 takes part of Kuna and puts it with parts of Meridian and parts of Boise (proposed district 18), thereby creating a district that does not have any cohesion and puts the other part of Kuna with Melba and all of southern Canyon County and all of Owyhee County. This seems particularly unnecessary given that the population growth not only in this part of Ada County, but Ada County as a whole, would support a whole new district altogether. This same anomaly occurs in the northern part of Ada County with the combining of Eagle with Gem County. The City of Eagle had enormous population growth and instead of keeping it whole it gets lumped in with Gem County. I would suggest that Gem County residents have very little in common with Eagle residents. It is concerning to me that the current proposal sheers off two fast growing portions of Ada County and oddly combines them with other neighboring counties. Ada County has historically had its districts all within the bounds of the County lines, and our population growth would suggest that is still possible. I would agree that it makes sense to cross the Ada/Canyon line in the Star/Middletown area, and in the Kuna/Melba area. Several maps have been submitted that may be helpful for your consideration of these areas: L31 shows a reasonable way for Kuna and Melba to be combined and also how the districts in northern Ada County could reasonably be drawn. L49 also has some very good options for keeping the Ada County districts reasonably within the County lines.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony, and I again thank you for the diligent work that you have done and undoubtedly will continue to do.

Lori Den Hartog
To the Commissioners: thank you for providing the proposed maps for redistricting Congressional and Idaho legislative districts. Please allow me to support the L01 map which appears to represent stability for the state legislative districts in the Treasure Valley region. The district boundaries are easy to understand. Most importantly, most voters will recognize their districts and probably retain their voting sites. These factors reduce confusion and encourage voter participation. In these times, any decision that increases participation in elections serves our entire community.

You are doing important work. Thank you again. Elizabeth McBride, 12923 N. Schick’s Ridge Rd., Boise 83714

I am not testifying by phone but submitting written testimony.

Dear Redistricting Commission-
Thank you, first, for your efforts and service in taking on this daunting task.

Second, I would like to voice support for map L01. This map, in my view as a North End resident, best adheres to the natural boundaries of Boise based on roadways and physical features. It also keeps communities with similar needs intact and priorities intact.

Map L02 concerns me due to the odd combining of Boise city with communities south of interstate 84. It makes little sense to create a district as drawn on the L02 map. The L01 map keeps SE Boise intact.

Additionally, L01 keeps Garden City intact as a community.

There appears to be an effort in L02 map to use State street as a dividing line. As I’m sure you know, this corridor will undergo significant changes in coming years, and communities on the north and south side of State street will have, and need to have, in common community goals as the city navigates these changes.
Again, L01 map keeps communities of similar interest intact. I urge you to select this map as the legislative district map.

Thank you for taking the time to take my input into account.

Kate Ryan
208-559-0142

---

Heather Dermott 208-340-3777 Self Boise 2021-11-02 18:52:33 18

Physical address
3690 S Holcomb Rd, Boise, Idaho, 83706

Dear Redistricting Commission,

I support Map L023, L23 (idaho.gov) and C36 (the Congressional Map).

I appreciate this committees efforts and commitment to achieve a bi-partisan approach to reapportionment. I support all efforts to keep communities of interest together while ensuring that new population areas are thoughtfully incorporated. The proposal that went out for comment seemed to achieve that end. However, the Statesman published your latest proposal which has me concerned.

I have lived in Boise, Idaho off-an-on since 1978. I was raised on the Warm Springs Mesa, and now live in SE Boise. While it appears you have strived to achieve numerical balance across districts in the latest maps, I'm concerned the latest plan doesn't preserve the interests of current established communities and neighborhoods. In the last 10+ years as a resident of SE Boise, where my husband and I are raising our children, I have developed a strong sense of community and place that is tied to my neighborhood, our children's school and my district as a diverse political collective, despite the areas monumental development and growth. I routinely attend my local town hall meeting and learn about the people in my district. I'm involved in service work in my schools, parks, trails, and community.

I have serious concerns with the proposed changes to the City of Boise in the recently released map (L02) because of my investment in communities and community building. One of the biggest issues is the total rewriting of existing districts, fragmenting
existing neighborhoods and communities. These neighborhoods are established, and completely redrawing the lines I see as a mistake. Building community is not easy. I hate to see challenges being posed to this effort by redrawing these lines.

One specific problems I see is in map L02 along the State Street corridor. In the past, I lived on the north side of State Street, but the south side of State Street was very much my community. There are connections between neighborhoods and communities of interest on both the north and south sides of the street. As the entire corridor is about to receive major transportation, housing and community development changes, which will impact both sides of the street heavily, I want these constituents to be kept in the same legislative district so their lawmakers can effectively advocate for these developments, especially as the city’s population grows.

I am in support of Map L023 for legislative districts because it keeps our communities whole, and it plans for growth. Thank you for your hard work and commitment to Idaho.

I also want to express my support of C36 (the Congressional map), because it keeps counties whole as required by law, has very low population deviation, and keeps the Snake River Plain in a single congressional district which is very important to my work on water quality work in the state.

Sincerely,
Heather Parkinson Dermott
3690 S. Holcomb Rd
Boise, ID 83706

Thank you for your work for the citizens of Idaho. Comparing map L02 to map L01, I recommend something closer to L01. I think communities of interest in the Boise area are better identified in L01. Thank you for considering my testimony.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Moberly</td>
<td>208-377-2486</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-02 20:32:24</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolores Aragon</td>
<td>2084094554</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>2021-11-02 20:33:49</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical address
727 W Sedgewick, Meridian, Idaho, 83646

Mailing address

Dear Redistricting Committee:

Thank you for taking on this complex and important work. After reviewing the revised maps, I prefer something similar to the original L01 map.

In my opinion the L01 map better captures the distinct communities of interest within the Boise and Ada County. Personally, I identify these areas as southeast Boise, southwest Boise, North End, Garden City, Meridian-Kuna, Eagle and the two bench communities. These district neighborhoods seem to be better identified in map L01.

Thank you for your consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Lanting</td>
<td>2083583220</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Twin Falls, Idaho</td>
<td>2021-11-03 03:22:16</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>354 Elm St. N. APT 1, Twin Falls, Idaho, Idaho, 83301</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td><strong>, , , ,</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear commissioners, I feel you should endeavor to place all fast growing under the # and slow growing areas above. You only do this every 10 years. Those small differences will balloon easily to 15 to 20% difference by 2030.

| Sarah Harris         | 2088699180   | Self                         | Boise                 | 2021-11-03 07:25:05      | 16        |
| **Physical address** | **7601 W. Apache Way, Boise, Idaho, 83714** |                              |                       |                          |           |
| **Mailing address**  | **, , , ,**  |                              |                       |                          |           |

Hello,

First, thank you so much for working on this commission. I am writing in support of your L01 map as it keeps our communities more whole and the lines look cleaner. I also support C36 as it keeps our counties whole and communities together. Thank you.

| Marji Bass           | 2088612633   | self                         | Garden City           | 2021-11-03 08:30:44      | 16        |
| **Physical address** | **8271 W Echo Falls Ln, Garden City, Idaho, 83714** |                              |                       |                          |           |
| **Mailing address**  | **8271 W Echo Falls Ln, Garden City, ID, 83714,** |                              |                       |                          |           |

Thank you for your diligence and hard work on our behalf with redistricting. To keep the goals of having clean, logical lines I strongly prefer the L1 map and along those lines in keeping counties and communities together I support the C36 map.
Kenneth Harris  
Phone: 2084404590  
Company/Representing Self: Reclaim Idaho  
City: Boise  
Submission Date: 2021-11-03 08:31:33  
District #: 19

I think that things should remain basically as they are in L01 rather than radically and circuitously changing things around such as clo2 alternate

Thanks

Ken

Marty Durand  
Phone: 2088638591  
Representing Self: self  
City: Boise  
Submission Date: 2021-11-03 10:24:28  
District #: 15

I live in District 15 and submit these comments in reference to map L02. I have lived at my current address for 20 years and am familiar with West Boise and the growth that has occurred. West Boise has always been defined by the the borders of Chinden, Eagle Road and the Interstate. It is within this area that I do my shopping, seek services (medical, veterinary, etc) and engage in regular recreational and community activities (enjoying the parks, walking areas, community education, etc.). I follow what is happening in this area for business and entertainment. I think this District is well served by the current boundaries that naturally define our community. I don’t think it’s in our interest to change those boundaries.

Thanks for serving on this Commission and doing this important work.

PS. Your form does not allow for the Title of Ms. I hope this is an oversight rather than intentional.
Dear redistricting commissioners,

I’m writing to share my serious concerns about the updated district map for the Treasure Valley, including Boise, where I live. It represents a drastic redrawing of the political boundaries in one of Idaho’s most populated areas. I live in Boise’s North End and these redrawn boundaries directly affect my family, my community, and me. I have been highly engaged in many ways as a volunteer in my community and the state, from sitting on a committee that developed a new 10-year master plan for the Boise Foothills to serving currently as chair of the board of Conservation Voters for Idaho.

I would like to see the commission produce a better map that keeps communities whole.

I’m also deeply troubled that the commission isn’t allowing adequate time for community members and neighborhood representatives to engage and comment on the impacts these maps will have for the next 10 years. This strikes me as destructive to a functional democracy.

The public holds the redistricting commission responsible for ensuring that communities of interest are kept intact. Your timing in releasing the latest map during a holiday weekend and election week unnecessarily creates barriers to everyday Idahoans participating in the redistricting process and puts our political boundaries at risk of the influence of politicians and their agendas.

Your responsibility is to create districts that allow Idahoans to choose who represents them, not for politicians to choose their voters.

I will outline specific concerns with the proposed changes to the City of Boise in the recently released map (L02), primarily with the complete redrawing of existing districts, affecting established neighborhoods. This is a grave mistake.

Specific problems with L02 can be found along the State Street corridor. State Street does not divide communities. There are connections between neighborhoods and communities of interest north and south of State Street. That entire corridor is on the verge of receiving major transportation, housing and community development changes, which will impact both sides of the street. You must keep these constituents in the same legislative district so their lawmakers can advocate for their needs.

Another major concern of mine regards West Boise. D19 is an odd shaped “L” when it should logically and fairly be closer to a square. D19 and D20 do not fully encompass all West Boise. It is its own community and should be represented as such. If you must
cont.

split it up, the physical barrier of I-84 makes more sense.

I ask you to understand the impacts on communities and our democratic process in Idaho and make changes to this proposed redistricting map to reflect these concerns.

Thank you for your time and public service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lanza</td>
<td>2088612064</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-03 11:51:36</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chief Allan

208-686-1544  Coeur d’Alene Tribe  Plummer  2021-11-03 12:53:06  5

Physical address  850 A Street, P.O. Box 408, Plummer, Idaho, 83851

Mailing address  850 A Street, P.O. Box 408, Plummer, Idaho, 83851,

November 3, 2021

Honorable Bart Davis
Honorable Dan Schmidt
Co-Chairs
Commission for Reapportionment

Dear Mr. Chairs:

On behalf of the Coeur d’Alene Tribe, I would like to thank you and the rest of the Commission members for your service in the difficult task of re-drawing Idaho’s legislative district boundaries. We fully understand the challenge of meeting the population parity requirements, while balancing the restrictions on splitting counties and addressing the needs of communities of interest. Back in September when you visited Plummer we discussed the interests of the Tribe and urged the Commission to adopt a district similar to what we have now, with Benewah County paired with Latah County. We understand the mathematical challenge with that task, but the L02 proposed map gives us grave cause for concern.

L01 was bad enough, in that it paired Benewah County with Clearwater and would open the possibility that constituents in
Plummer would have a representative in far away Pierce or Weippe. L02 is far worse, creating a downright embarrassing gerrymander of a district, starting in Clearwater County, picking up Shoshone and Benewah Counties and ending with a strip running entirely around the populated areas of Kootenai County to include a portion of Boundary County all the way the Washington line. L01 presented a far more sensible apportionment of North Idaho, allowing constituents in north Kootenai County far better access to their representatives than L02. I would urge the Commission to reconsider the proposal. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Chairman Chief J. Allan

As a resident of District One I am angry at the obvious partisanship of the redistricting committee.

They are not complying with their own criteria! They are ignoring roads and natural boundaries for natural splitting. They are dividing precincts for no reason. They are isolating communities!

I live in Priest River and am shocked and dismayed that my little town is being segregated because some Southern Idaho Democrat wants to move Heather Scott out of District 1.

How dare you attack our little community for your own political agenda.

Leave us alone!
Good afternoon. I would like to ask you to consider making the City of Star whole by following our comp plan boundary on the eastern side of our city with Eagle. There is a smaller portion of our city that is East of highway 16 around highway 44 that would be fragmented from the rest of the City of Star. I can send you a map of the proposed area if I can get an email address. I believe it would reduce District 10 (Eagle) deviation and increase district 11 (Star) deviate making them more equal and providing for citizens in our smaller cities to be lined up with their remaining fellow citizens.

The link to the comprehensive plan is: https://www.staridaho.org/vertical/sites/%7BBABF7977-2C81-44F3-A8BC-95C5171109E7%7D/uploads/COUNCIL_APPROVED_LAND_USE_MAP_12-8-20.pdf

Thank you for all of the work you all have put in this very important endeavor. It is truly appreciated.

Thank you

Mayor Trevor A. Chadwick, City of Star
My name is Devon Boyer and I serve as Chairman of the Fort Hall Business Council, the governing body of the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes of the Fort Hall Reservation, located here in southeastern Idaho. I appreciate the opportunity to offer questions and input for the 2021 Redistricting effort. I am glad to see the Commission reaching out to Tribal community on reservations to gain reservation resident input. We are at a disadvantage population-wise, because the 2020 Census data at the Reservation level has not yet been released.

The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes are a strong land-controlling tribe, with 98% of our reservation lands held in trust. Our Tribal goals are to retain political integrity and tribal jurisdiction as a tribal government, to advocate for pro-tribal legislation in State legislation, to influence state and local elections and to elect candidates of our choice by encouraging more Fort Hall community members to run in state or local elections to represent Tribal constituents.

Redistricting is a difficult concept for Tribes. Since Indian Reservations are not considered in the Idaho statutory laws and Guidelines, which forces the Tribes to be listed into the category of “Communities of Interest” and “Traditional Neighborhoods”. State law and Guidelines emphasizes county lines, which ignores tribal sovereignty, jurisdiction and reservation boundaries. Historically the Shoshone-Bannock Tribes and community members have been ignored and overlooked in the State of Idaho’s previous efforts to draw legislative district boundaries.

Therefore, we would like to propose a new concept of a Minority Legislative District. This would be based on the Idaho reservations, not based on population numbers, and would provide a non-voting tribal representative to the Idaho Legislature. We believe this would provide a solid, active voice for Tribes that is currently absent in Idaho representation in the policy-making body for the State.

At this point, the Fort Hall Business Council has not yet formalized a letter, but we will develop a letter, and some legislative maps to submit to the Commission, in the next week. Our leadership wanted to come to this meeting and learn more, ask questions and provide more written submissions.

We thank you for hearing our request to host a meeting in Fort Hall to listen to the tribal community. I stand for any questions.
Dear Commissioners,

I have lived in Nampa since 1970. At the time my family moved to Nampa, Idaho, the population of our city was just a little over 20,000. Over the past four decades, my little town has grown exponentially. Today, it is five times as populous as it was then. Throughout all the changes and growth I have witnessed over the course of those years, one thing has remained true about Nampa: the city has always attempted to keep the small town feel as we have attempted to bring the various communities of interest together for the benefit of the entire city. That is not always easy, especially as many times the interests seem divergent, and the speed of growth and expansion can tend to cause people to lose touch with neighbors. However, this effort of bringing us all together is something I have always supported and it has been one of the things that has kept me in Nampa.

For this reason, I am deeply troubled by your plan to break our city into four districts that would split the downtown, completely ignore the communities of interest that currently exist. Instead, it appears as if your plan chooses to focus on drawing legislative boundaries to benefit current legislative incumbents wants and or needs to retain their political power and influence. That should never be the goal of redistricting.

As I have reviewed the plan with others, it seems to be that the most logical way to draw the lines would be to shift Middleton and Star into a district with Gem County. These three communities tend to have more rural issues, and it would seem likely that Star and Middleton would have much more in common with Gem County than with the more urban area of Nampa.

I urge you to redraw boundaries so that Nampa is split into two districts--much like Meridian. It is vital that communities of interest stay intact. Please ensure that the map you create will ensure Nampa citizens are fairly represented for the next decade.

Thank you.
As a resident of Meridian City and Legislative District 14, I write to voice my support for what is presented as the L01 redistricting map, and my strong opposition to the proposed map L02. Map 01 is closer to the current legislative districts that went through a challenged process and legal battles. Map L01 provides a better balance between rural and urban communities. This balance is critical to Idaho values and to ensure a positive interface and engagement between rural and urban areas. It also recognizes community communalities to ensure robust opinions, thoughts and considerations on how best to meet Idaho's opportunities and challenges.

The proposed shifts in Districts 10-22 in map LO2 do NOT seek a balance of urban-rural areas and community communalities. The proposed District 10 smacks of gerrymandering. The proposal lumps Eagle and communities in Gem County together creating a long narrow District - narrow in balance and narrow in consideration to community communalities; both important factors in the Redistricting Commission's responsibility and work. The proposed District 14 boundaries make a hyper-urban, small area - one that does not balance urban-rural interests. Nor does the proposed District 14 facilitate a robust opportunity for varying thoughts and considerations to meet opportunities and challenges of a rapidly growing (the fastest) area of the Great State of Idaho.

The proposed boundaries in Map L01 is much better and addresses the stated concerns. I strongly recommend that the Redistricting Commission return to the thoughts and considerations given in creating Map L01 and abandon Map L02.

Respectfully Submitted,
Todd Christensen
District 14, Meridian City, Idaho
Dear Redistricting Committee,

For the second time (I just composed a letter to your Committee which suddenly disappeared into cyberspace just before it was completed and sent, a frustrating experience). Since time is of the essence with a 4:00 PM deadline, my second try will be short.

First off, I am the club President of SPORTS, a well-known social club based primarily in District 1, comprised of retired peace officers and firefighters from all over the United States (we have some local active members too). We love District 1 and North Idaho, a great place to live and recreate. If you know anything about police and firefighters, you will instinctively know that we are conservative minded individuals primarily.

Representative Heather Scott (District 1) is loved and respected by our social club, and our greater community in District 1. She has joined us as a guest at our monthly luncheons and meetings on any number of occasions. She is a conservative minded legislator, well-suited to our primarily conservative minded group. She has sponsored and passed legislation favorable to our unique group in the past. She is particularly well-suited to her many conservative constituents in District 1. None of us want to lose a legislator ideally suited to District 1.

Before I lose this letter in cyberspace again, let me urge you on behalf of SPORTS to leave Rep. Scott intact in District 1. There is no legitimate reason to move her. Please respect and honor our request in this matter.

Respectfully yours,

Ron Adamik
President
Safety-Peace Officers Retired to Sandpoint
Marcia Woodbury

My name is Marcia Woodbury and I live at 12104 W Tidewater Dr in Boise. My subdivision is near Cloverdale and Fairview in what is now District 15. The new map (L2) extends beyond I84 taking in areas that are not generally part of the neighborhood and rarely frequented for shopping and other necessary services. Many of the places my husband and I go to for medical care, exercise, and social activities are East and North of the proposed boundaries. Crossing I84, the major expressway in our area for the new district does not make sense if you are trying to keep neighborhoods together. Please reconsider the proposed map (L2) to better reflect communities of interest.

David Borgerd

This redistricting is a blatant political “elbowing out” of duly elected Representatives. You are unashamedly committing a foul by Gerrymandering districts in your favor. You don’t seem to care about the amounts of votes you have made null and void by splitting communities in half. Are you going to negligently ignore the roads and highways that have been boundaries for years. Instead, you have finger-painted boundaries like petulant children who can’t have their way by following the rules. Cowardly.

Why was LD 1 and 2 shaped so oddly, so as to look childlike? Redrawing and affecting Heather Scott is obvious, pathetic, and blatantly politically motivated. I don’t believe the lines were drawn in keeping with proper redistricting criteria.

Come on, folks. You’re better than this “pissed off third-grader” thing. It’s below you.

CWO DAVID BORGERD
US ARMY, RETIRED
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bret Roush</td>
<td>2085974901</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Priest River</td>
<td>2021-11-03 16:41:43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>784 bear rd, Priest River, Idaho, 83856</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>Blue Lake Precinct, Priest River, ID, 83856,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your maps in LD1 show blatant gerrymandering. Split communities, counties and you have not even attempted to follow your own guidelines, or rules. Looking at the map it really isn’t hard to see who you are targeting in LD1 and moving into LD2. I hope it is worth it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mike Nielsen</th>
<th>208-946-7664</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Coolin</th>
<th>2021-11-03 16:51:59</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td><strong>895 Plumbago Point Road, Coolin, Idaho, 82831</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>P.O. Box 78, Coolin, ID, 83821,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opposition to the proposed Redistricting Map:

The current LD1 and LD2 redistricting maps do not comply with the committee’s redistricting criteria.

Precinct communities are split in half for no apparent reason.
Communities are split in half.
Precincts are split.
Roads and natural boundaries are ignored for natural splitting.
The new LD2 becomes an oddly shaped district that appears to be politically motivated.

Thank you for reconsidering these proposed maps to make sure they follow the guidelines set forth for this process.
Mike
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Engelhardt</td>
<td>2082908968</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Sagle</td>
<td>2021-11-03 17:11:40</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 303 Moore Creek Road, Sagle, Idaho, 83860

**Mailing address**: , , , ,

I am oppose to the current LD1 and LD2 redistricting maps as they do not comply with the committee's redistricting criteria.

Precinct communities are split in half for no apparent reason.
Communities are split in half.
Precincts are split.
Roads and natural boundaries are ignored for natural splitting.
The new LD2 becomes an oddly shaped district that appears to be politically motivated.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bryan lorentzen</td>
<td>2083046041</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>cocolalla</td>
<td>2021-11-03 17:18:40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Physical address**: 182 blackberry lane, cocolalla, Idaho, 83813

**Mailing address**: po box 609, cocolalla, id, 83813,

I am opposed to the redistricting maps LD1 and LD2.

I find zero reason to redistrict at all.

Communities are split down the middle with the new maps, roads and natural boundaries are ignored, there is no logical reason to the redistricting so it must be a political maneuver which no doubt does not serve the People of Idaho.

The legislature should be more concerned about stripping the Governor's fraudulent emergency powers over this virus that has not been proven to exist and disentangling us from the federal government overreach rather than messing with our State's political boundaries.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Lorentzen</td>
<td>2083046041</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Cocolalla</td>
<td>2021-11-03 17:18:40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda Jalbert</td>
<td>2088710931</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-03 17:23:29</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>90 Evergreen Drive, Boise, Idaho, 83716</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>, , , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support map L068.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The new LD2 becomes an oddly shaped district that appears to be politically motivated. Heather Scott has been faithful proponent and legislator to her constituents in Bonner and Boundary Counties. By altering the boundary’s of LD-1 and LD-2 in this fashion you are alienating many voters who over the years have come to trust their representatives to do their bidding and keep Idaho strong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I was just made aware of the purposed re districting map. There are several things I find disconcerting. Having served as a Precinct Committeewoman, I see that Precinct Communities are split in a random and irregular manner. This does not make sense. The directed way to determine the new boarders is to use natural boundaries and roads as much as possible. The purposed new boundaries for District 2 are beyond strange and give cause for questions. Please re-evaluate and adjust accordingly.

Thank you for your time serving in this capacity.

Sincerely,
Sherie Clipson
Oldtown, ID

Here is information for a letter to oppose the current LD1 and LD2 redistricting maps as they do not comply with the committee’s redistricting criteria.

Precinct communities are split in half for no apparent reason.
Communities are split in half.
Precincts are split.
Roads and natural boundaries are ignored for natural splitting.
The new LD2 becomes an oddly shaped district that appears to be politically motivated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lynnellen Bryant</td>
<td>8187205540</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Oldtown</td>
<td>2021-11-03 17:54:34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>510 E Spring Street S, Oldtown, Idaho, 83822</td>
<td>Mailing address , , , ,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was just made aware this afternoon of the proposed redistricting, splitting District 1, and placing our long-time representative, Heather Scott into a small pocket of District 2. There is no reason to take that small slice of Bonner County and lump it with Kootenai County since the communities included in that area align more closely with the rest of Bonner County than Kootenai county. The only reason I can see is that it is a deliberate political move to remove Heather Scott from her strong base of constituents.

Stop the political gerrymandering! Redraw the lines to put Blanchard and the rest of Bonner County back in District 1 and leave Heather Scott in District 1 as our representative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maureen Paterson</th>
<th>2082637188</th>
<th>Edgemere Precinct</th>
<th>Priest River</th>
<th>2021-11-03 18:06:49</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>360 Northwoods Dr., Priest River, Idaho, 83856</td>
<td>Mailing address 360 Northwoods Dr, Priest River, Idaho, 83856,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear Commission for Reapportionment – 2021:

The precinct that I represent, being the Edgemere Precinct Committee Person, is be shredded. As you know, a precinct comprises a community of citizens that have a comradery and similar goals. Why then would you split it, with half of it being in a totally different legislative district? If this passes, whomever were neighbors before, no longer have a common interest and the issues are probably different.

Please don’t do this. Some members of our precinct are large families that live close together for a reason. They may now be separated by this redistricting, facing different concerns and not able to cohesively work together.

Helping to keep communities together, should be a noble goal. For this reason, I like the map that is listed on davesredistricting.org site for Idaho (https://davesredistricting.org/maps#state::ID) STATE LEGISLATURE area. https://davesredistricting.org/maps#viewmap::8e6655d5-5860-4a96-b591-dc5a6a3c6a6d.

I appreciate the work you are doing,
Sincerely,
Maureen Paterson
Edgemere Precinct Committee Person
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maureen Paterson</td>
<td>2082637188</td>
<td>Edgemre Precinct</td>
<td>Priest River</td>
<td>2021-11-03 18:06:49</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Morse</td>
<td>2069487098</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Coolin</td>
<td>2021-11-03 18:16:12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This form is skewed to the right to enter in my last name and when I tab over to it I can enter "Morse" but when I try to move back to the left it kicks me of the site, hence, here I am submitting this after the 4:00PM deadline.

I am absolutely oppose the current LD1 and LD2 redistricting maps as they do not comply with the committee’s redistricting criteria.

Precinct communities are split in half for no apparent reason.
Communities are split in half.
Precincts are split.
Roads and natural boundaries are ignored for natural splitting.
The new LD2 becomes an oddly shaped district that appears to be politically motivated.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your L02 map. I recommend changing it to define District boundaries using the existing physical barriers, particularly in West Boise, where I live.

The change that worries me greatly is the extension of any District boundaries beyond major highways, particularly I84 and I284, and major roads, such as Eagle Road. Also, District boundaries should be set by a prominent geologic feature, the Bench, in West Boise.

The Districts are intended to represent communities and communities are made up of neighborhoods. It shouldn’t be surprising that many of our relationships are built around our neighborhoods. It’s the neighborhoods that should define the boundaries of the Districts on this map in urban areas.

Communities are formed by the gathering of its citizens such as at grocery stores, parks, walking paths, connecting sidewalks, school yards, playing fields, local churches, and a variety of local businesses. It is in places like Hyatt Hidden Lakes Nature Reserve on Maple Grove, Wincos on Fairview and Milwaukee, and the library at Cole and Ustick that I bump into friends and talk about what’s happening around our neighborhood. The library has been a great place to bring together small groups from several nearby neighborhoods. We’re more likely to meet up in Garden City than anywhere near Overland or Victory, south of the Interstate 84 or beyond the Connector.

Neighborhoods and communities do not form across the physical boundaries of elevated highways or heavily traveled roads. For that reason urban voting district boundaries shouldn’t be extended across an elevated highway, I84 and I284, or a heavily traveled road like Eagle or Chinden Avenue where it rises onto the Bench.

Thank you for your work on the Commission and for seeking public comments.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J Asche</td>
<td>2085977856</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Sandpoint</td>
<td>2021-11-03 21:56:17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>214 Tupelo Way, Sandpoint, Idaho, 83864</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>214 Tupelo Way, Sandpoint, ID, 83864,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I know this is late, but I want you to know I support your recent redistricting for my district. Thank you for your work.

| Betty Richardson    | 2082507088  | Self                          | Boise         | 2021-11-04 01:14:27   | 15       |
| Physical address    | 5796 N Dalspring Ave, Boise, Idaho, 83713-1316 | Mailing address | 5796 N Dalspring Ave, Boise, ID, 83713-1316, |

Dear Members of the Idaho Reapportionment Commission:

My name is Betty Richardson. I live at 5796 N. Dalspring Avenue. My family has resided at this address for the last 25 years. I thank the Commission for the opportunity to consider my input in regard to Legislative District map L02. I appreciate the difficulty of this task and the time and personal sacrifice required to make these difficult decisions.

I believe map L02 is problematic for one fundamental reason – it is significantly sub-optimal when it comes to creating districts based on communities of common interest. I’m particularly concerned about District 19 on this map (which is where I live). When viewed from 30,000 feet, West Boise looks like one large community of common interest. This implies that any main road or arterial would serve as a valid “bright line” for a district boundary. However, that is not the case when one views the map from ground level.

The fact is that all “bright lines” are not alike. In fact, there are three such lines that are not just roads, but rather hard, physical barriers that create distinct and different communities of common interest.

Those three lines are I84, Eagle Road and Chinden Boulevard. Each of them literally creates a wall between the communities on both sides of them to the point that people will avoid crossing over these roads when engaging in daily activities such as schools, church, shopping, recreating (parks), walking and cycling. I84 is particularly challenging since there are very few roads that actually allow people to cross over it.

For example, communities on the south side of I84 have very little interaction with those on the north side. People on the north side spend most of their time on the north side, and those on the south side stay mostly on the south side. The same can be said for
Eagle Road (one of the most dangerous roads in Idaho) and Chinden Boulevard, which has the added barrier of running along a raised bench that overlooks the Boise River Basin below it.

An additional enhancement would be to keep the west boundary of the current District 15 intact (Eagle to Ustick to Cloverdale to I84). This avoids mixing Meridian with Boise City. A better change would be to move the east boundary of the current District 15 (Maple Grove) to Cole Road. That would maintain this as a “West Boise only” district – a community of common interest much more so than one that mixes parts of Meridian with Boise.

For these reasons, I recommend that these roads: Eagle/Cloverdale, Chinden and especially I84, remain as boundaries for a district that encompasses communities of common interest east of Eagle Road.

Thank you for your consideration and for taking on this formidable challenge.

Sincerely,
/
Betty Richardson

Dear Idaho 2021 Commission for Reapportionment,

For the past few days, I have reviewed in depth map L02 prepared and provided recently by the Commission. I live in Ada County and am most familiar with Southwest Idaho and will be addressing my comments to that region (Ada, Canyon, Owyhee, Payette, and Elmore Counties).

I generally find L02 it to be an inappropriate map and most likely unconstitutional for the following reasons.
1. The Statute says, “Division of counties shall be avoided whenever possible. In the event that a county must be divided, the number of such divisions, per county, should be kept to a minimum.”

The proposed map L02 create many unnecessary county splits within the Treasure Valley. First, it groups a part of Canyon County with Payette County. This is an unnecessary split. Second, it splits Ada County by grouping Gem County and most of the City of Eagle which is also an unnecessary split. Third, it splits the southern part of Canyon County and the southern half of Ada County of to combine them with Owyhee County. Fourth, it splits off part of the city of Star from Ada County and combine it with Canyon County. Fifth, the district 17 shown on L02 unnecessarily takes in a part of Canyon County. There is no logical need or reason to add citizens of Canyon County to Ada County district 17 on this map.

The current map only has eight districts created wholly withing the borders of Ada County. Ada county has sufficient citizenry to have nine wholly contained districts. Ada county can be divided into nine districts without any splits which has been shown in multiple other maps submitted to the commission. If the commission desires to reduce the population of each district within Ada County, then a small portion of the county should be divided off (like maybe the city of Star since it crosses the county line). This would afford Ada County the minimum of nine district it is legally entitled by statute.

2. The Statute says, “To the maximum extent possible, districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.”

The proposed map L02 does not follow the commission’s own guidelines to leave intact incorporated cities. Instead of keeping the incorporated City of Boise together it takes off a portion of Boise and combines it with Kuna and Meridian by stretching the district from one side of the county to the other. Likewise, district 22 on this map excludes portions of the incorporated city of Boise that it used to include and now drops down to take in unincorporated parts of the county. Every effort should be made to keep the incorporated city of Boise together. There is no reason that district 9 on this map should reach all the way down into Caldwell and Nampa. This strips members of those communities from voting with the rest of the citizens of Caldwell and Nampa.

Lastly, it seems inappropriate to take approximately half of the land mass of Ada County (on the south side of the county) and group it with a district outside of Ada County. Ada County is entitled to have at nine full districts (almost ten districts) within its borders. Map L02 takes from Ada County almost all the Dairies and most of the farm ground and groups it with rural portions of Canyon County and all of Owyhee County. Ada County deserves to retain its dairies, farm ground, lands within it’s legally entitled 9 whole districts.
3. The Statute says, “To the maximum extent possible, the plan should avoid drawing districts that are oddly shaped.”

In this map north and south Meridian are both cut horizontally which are very different from the current district boundaries in Meridian. One of these long thin proposed stretches (district 18) unnecessarily stretches from the county line in the west where it combines east Nampa, north Kuna, and southern Meridian all the way over to south and west areas of incorporated Boise. There is not reasonable map that would combines portions of incorporated Kuna and incorporated Boise. Additionally, this map carves off large portions of Star, Nampa, Eagle, and Kuna and adds those portions of those cities to other counties and districts external to Ada County. There is no reason to make all of these cities orphans of the districts in other counties.

4. The Statute says, “Counties shall not be divided to protect a particular political party or a particular incumbent.”

This map appears to have been drawn primarily to protect all democrat incumbents within Ada County. This alone should disqualify map L02.

Summary:

Map L02 does not minimize the county divisions as required by law (Ada County is entitled to 9 districts contained within its boundaries). Map L02 does not preserve local communities and incorporated cities (Boise, Kuna, Meridian, Star, Eagle). Map L02 does not avoid oddly shaped district by creating a district that stretches from Nampa to Boise. Lastly, this Ada County portion of this map seems to have been intentionally drawn to protect Democrat incumbents while creating oddly shaped districts, orphan cities, and extreme changes in other parts of the county.

I do not believe this map meets the legal requirements of the commission. There are various other maps that that better follow the law with regards to county splits, preserving communities, avoiding oddly shaped districts, and that are politically neutral. I have reviewed all the publicly submitted maps and list a few here that do a more proper reapportioning the Treasure Valley L049, L087, L081, L084, L065, L063, L031.

I created and submitted map L031 which creates 14 whole districts between Canyon, Owyhee, and Ada counties with only 3 logical splits to keep communities together (Star, Kuna/Melba). I reiterate from my in-person testimony that it is important to keep cities, school districts, and communities together as much as possible.
My name is Jeremy Kitzhaber. I live at 11150 W. Hinsdale St., Boise, ID 83713. Thank you for this opportunity to provide my input on the districts comprising West Boise in Map L02.

My concern is that these districts do not create communities of common interest, especially when it comes to daily activities such as shopping, recreation, and other types of neighborhood interactions. The "L" shape of the proposed District 19 (where I live) is particularly troubling, especially where communities on the south side of I84 are joined with the very different communities on the north side of I84. I84 has been a "bright line" separating the north and south sides of I84 since established by the first redistricting commission.

I believe it would make more sense to have the communities north of I84 be in a separate, more square-shaped district. We should not be divided in Districts that are 7 miles long by 2 miles wide and then make a 90 degree turn in another direction. The people that live near Chinden are in no way part of the communities 3 miles south of the freeway.

Instead, an area defined by Eagle, Chinden, Milwaukee, and the freeway would be more appropriate. Doing that type of boundary groups a District together that is easier to understand and keeps District neighbors closer together. Please do all you can to make boundaries easier for us to understand and keep us close to our neighbors and neighborhoods.

Thank you for considering my input.

Jeremy Kitzhaber, USAF Ret
Service-Connected Disabled Veteran
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Kitzhaber</td>
<td>208-350-3462</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-04 07:24:45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *cont.* VFW Post 63 Legislative Chairman  
jeremy_kitzhaber@yahoo.com  
208-350-3462 |
| Judith Roesbery     | 6143271706     | Self                         | Garden City| 2021-11-04 08:01:55   | 16        |
| Physical address    | 8722 Austin, Garden City, Idaho, 83714 | Mailing address | , , , , ,     |                       |           |

Dear Redistricting Committee:

I testified at the Lincoln Auditorium earlier and was very impressed with all of you and with the process.

I would like to go on record as being in favor of Map L01. I believe it defines my own community of Garden City in the best way possible, as it does with many other Treasure Valley communities. It best follows the criteria required for restructuring legislative districts.

As for the Congressional District map, I favor C36, for the same reason; it best follows the required criteria.

Thank you all for your service in this most difficult but extremely important task.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lanette guillory</td>
<td>208 8412011</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-04 08:54:55</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>2726 North 30th, Boise, Idaho, 83703</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>2726 North 30th, Boise, Id, 83703,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dear Commission of Reappointment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please keep the existing district 16 whole. This is the community that we know and live with.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your time and attention to this detail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanette Guillory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kevin Glenn</th>
<th>208 880-7742</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Greenleaf</th>
<th>2021-11-04 09:08:26</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical address</strong></td>
<td>19141 Tucker rd, Greenleaf, Idaho, 83626</td>
<td><strong>Mailing address</strong></td>
<td>P.O.Box 396, Greenleaf, ID, 83626,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/4/21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is my amended testimony corrected from what earlier sent in.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was unable to make grammatical corrections to my written testimony from a mobile platform, so I’m redoing it and resubmitting it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am currently in district 11. The newly drawn district will be 9. The new district not only splits canyon county, but now encompasses Payette and Washington counties. This is not the only out of district split of my county. As your guidelines state, it is favored to keep county districts whole, or districts that do not split counties up and mix in with other counties. Not only did you do this with canyon county, you did it FOUR times with Canyon County!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation by the Reappointment Committee As found on your website in FAQ criteria determining how districts are drawn- item 8)c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two splits into Ada county, one with Owyhee, and this clustered mess that we are a part of. Given the growth of the treasure valley, the people of payette and Washington counties will have no representation within a short period of time over the next decade.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You have very strangely taken a sliver of land jutting into Caldwell city limits. This area, where my parents live, is one of the wealthiest of Caldwell and a large area within the area of impact for future growth. It is and will be filled with retirees from outside of Idaho.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name (First &amp; Last)</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Representing Self, Company /</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Submission Date</td>
<td>District#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Glenn</td>
<td>208 880-7742</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>2021-11-04 09:08:26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont.  
These citizens of the state’s fifth largest city have nothing in common with the people of payette and Washington counties/Midvale and Cambridge. There is no way one person can properly represent the interests of such a diverse population as stated in your rules of redistricting.

Violation of FAQ item 8)f
These citizens of the state’s fifth largest city have nothing in common with the people of payette and Washington counties/Midvale and Cambridge. There is no way one person can properly represent the interests of such a diverse population as stated in your rules of redistricting.

Violation of FAQ item 8)e
Also, the agricultural aspect mixed with high density city interests couldn’t be more different. Agricultural areas adjacent to city growth isn’t as large of a problem because of the increase in land value due to the housing growth. But, western canyon county to Weiser is pure agricultural land with little variance allowed to profit off of land sales.

Probably the most illegal move would be including the portion of Caldwell that is city limit currently and the area of impact around it. The numbers may add up correctly currently, but this plan must take into consideration the idea of “one person one vote “. Within a short period of time, there will be many new citizens in the Caldwell area that I reference, and will have many more people than the rural areas or of payette and Washington counties. Thus diluting their ability to have a say in their representation. These people in this part of Caldwell are in the wealthiest subdivisions of the city, and many are retirees, making them individuals who can have more representation due to time and money to donate politically. This is another violation of criteria from the commission, whereby districts shall preserve traditional neighborhoods and local communities of interest.

Violation As found in FAQ item 8)e
According to criteria, it is Preferred to not divide counties and split them with other counties, but when doing so, keep the divisions to a minimum....you did it FOUR times with Canyon County, you should have kept the countys districts split within the County first, but you did not! You mixed it with districts in other counties where it pits certain legislators against another.

Violation of FAQ item 8)c
Finally, as stated in YOUR directives...FAQ item 8)c,
“Counties shall not be divided to protect a particular political party or political incumbent.” I will alledge that you committed this exact violation with the lines you drew this year to remove certain incumbents by pitting many that you dislike into districts with others that you dislike so that they must compete for one seat instead of the two seats that they previously held. Why else would you have broken the rules to put Canyon County Middleton with Ada County Star. Need I draw a picture for you with names? You can put more of Canyon County with other parts of Canyon County that you split with other counties instead.

Along the same lines of my last allegations, the new district 9 with the odd little sliver into the old District 10-Caldwell city proper, without a doubt violates FAQ rule 8)f “avoid drawing districts that are oddly shaped “. And I also alledge that it was drawn to once again remove specific incumbents by using gerrymandering to purposely remove them by putting more than one in the same future district. From what I have heard, this was done in many areas across Idaho, and done so not to just redistrict, but to remove political
cont. opponents. Grounds for lawsuits.
Canyon County should not have been split FOUR times to fix other problems you created, but should have been redistricted within itself First and foremost. You do not follow your own rules with what has been done, and this needs to be fixed to prevent soon to follow lawsuits.

Thank you,
Kevin Glenn

The reapportionment map scheduled to be voted on Friday November 5, 2021 is poorly drawn and fails to meet the established criteria for this task. It is so flawed that if adopted it will inevitably be challenged in court.

Among the many flaws are the following:
By the established stands of the reapportionment process Ada County deserves 9 whole contained districts, yet the proposed map unjustifiable mismatches significant portions of the county with adjacent counties.

Communities of interest are ignored and coupled with illogical partners

The proposal fails to take into account logical borders, dividers, roadways and natural terrain features

I urge the commission to reconsider the proposals and select an appropriate and fair reapportionment plan.

Sincerely,
Ronald Pennington
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ronald Pennington</td>
<td>5303208491</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>2021-11-04 22:27:13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>5590 S Anaura Pl, Boise, Idaho, 83709</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-04 23:22:39</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Cooper</td>
<td>208-362-5344</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-05 08:57:55</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>11112 W Mohawk Dr, Boise, Idaho, 83709</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-05 08:57:55</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I live in unincorporated Ada County and I feel that maps C02 and L01 provide the most fair representation for my area of the state. Thank you.

May I say to the members of the Commission, congratulations on your hard work. I see that up to the last minute you are putting out more proposals. I know that you are trying to be thorough, but I would like to see you return to Map L01. It seems to me that L01 keeps communities together better, ones that have a lot in common. An example is my own district in Southwest Boise. Also based on what I know, it better outlines Southeast Boise, the North End, the Boise Benches, and of course cities such as Garden City, Eagle, and the super-growing Meridian/Kuna municipalities.

The current districts are outstandingly logical and compact. My own district is currently simple and straightforward, District 21. I assumed the existing map would be adjusted for population shifts but basically retained. I think L01 does that. L02, not so much.

I also write to support C36 for the Congressional map. It follows the law about counties and seems to me to have the most even distribution of population. I think the Snake River Plain should remain in a single congressional district, because its inhabitants have a lot in common.
Once again, thank you for all the hearings and reviewing all the submissions. Please put forward maps L01 and C36 to become the re-districting for Idaho.

I disagree with putting Custer County with Valley and Elmore Counties. The thought of trying to run a campaign with the physical barriers between these counties makes no sense. Lemhi and Butte Counties and even Blaine County included in our district makes more sense when looking at what communities are more closely connected here in Central Idaho. It is almost impossible to get from Challis to McCall at some points in the winter and would make it hard for a representative to stay in touch with their constituents, let alone campaign.

I support maps: L03, C36. I agree with keeping counties whole when able. Thanks for the hard work on this important project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill Reid</td>
<td>2083361536</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2021-11-05 10:51:21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>814 n Balsam st, Boise, Idaho, 83706</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I strongly urge the commission to adopt and approve map CO2. I believe that your proposal of map CO3 fails the mandate set forth by the Idaho constitution. Dividing Ada County is an egregious violation of the requirements to keep counties intact. The only reason to divide Ada is to perpetuate the Republican Party’s war against “the great state of Ada.” Ada county is a community of interest; The largest community of interest in Idaho. This makes splitting Ada county the largest possible violation of the county integrity rule. Splitting Ada County destroys the ability of 500,000 county voters to obtain effective political representation.

Furthermore, the Treasure valley is a community of common interest. The largest compact community of interest in Idaho. Splitting this community of interest, destroys the ability of 750,000 voters to obtain effective political representation. Correcting this entrenched gerrymander must be corrected now. Otherwise, in the 2030s, we will see Ada County and the Treasure Valley split into 3 pieces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet Buschert</td>
<td>2088306878</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>2021-11-05 13:24:58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical address</td>
<td>235 W Floating Feather Rd, Eagle, Idaho, 83616</td>
<td>Mailing address</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for all of the work you have put into the redistricting process. I cannot imagine how difficult it is.

Which is why I also cannot imagine why Eagle and Gem County in any way form a community of interest. If I could change this proposed district in any way it would be to be connected more with what really is a community of interest in northern Meridian. We share concerns about the future of the Chinden corridor, we share connections along Eagle Road and we share the political interests of Ada County. None of those form any bond between Eagle and Gem County. And their interests in fact match better with others around them. I would urge the Commission to rethink at least this piece of the map.

Thank you again for all of your efforts.
My name is Cindy Giesen. I live at 1363 Ash Avenue in Kuna, Idaho, and this is my testimony concerning the latest Legislative District map, identified as L03. This map which was posted around 4pm on 11/4/21, by the Idaho 2020 Census Redistricting Committee.

This L03 map, in particular District 23, which includes some of Kuna, is not satisfactory to me. I am concerned about the issue it will cause to Kuna City, our unique areas, our community, our areas of impact and our expectations for a successful district leadership and city government team. I object for these four reasons:

1. City Division: The L03 map is still cutting off the northern portion of the Kuna City Limits. It is very important to keep the entire city together in one district. I realize the committees desire is to distribute population equally, but is should never be done at the risk of dividing a city. The subcommittee may not get close to their 0% goal in every district they form, but the trade off to avoid multiple districts in one city should be of upmost importance. L91, District 18 to me is a better approach for the Kuna area.

2. Multiple Counties in a District: This L03 map has District 23 assigned to most of Kuna City but then goes on to expanding boundaries into THREE counties – Ada, Canyon, and Owyhee. Early in the map drawing process, citizen representatives from our region had requested that Melba be included with Kuna. This would require the inclusion of a small bit of Canyon County. But, going beyond these two counties introduces many complexities.

During a early sub-committee meeting, one committee member commented that he didn’t understand the connection between Melba and Kuna. I’m not sure if he received clarity, but as a Kuna resident and the wife of a man who grew up farming wheat in Montana on his families land, I can add my observations. This leads me to my third area of concern with L03:

3. We must maintain our unique ‘Communities of Interest’. The Kuna, Melba, farming, recreation and conservation concerns and our desires to maintaining unity between or urban and semi-rural environments, align. We desire the ability to protect our community, lifestyles and lands from outside threats and land grabs from the greedy and unconcerned, who together, often destroy our communities and cities. We must stay united to keep our way of life and protect our lands, while still finding ways to work together and provide jobs as we grow. We, Kuna and Melba, are unique communities because:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (First &amp; Last)</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Representing Self, Company /</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Submission Date</th>
<th>District#</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Giesen</td>
<td>2088079611</td>
<td>self</td>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>2021-11-05 14:22:20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cont.

a. Kuna’s and Melba’s agricultural and range land boarder each other. These communities have farmed together for decades and if we, as a community in Ada County, want to help encourage these farming and agricultural zone activities, as is stated in our comprehensive plans, we must preserve these relationships.

b. To this day, our long time residents and our senior citizens of Kuna routinely interact with Melba citizens. One example would be the joint trips that are coordinated between the Senior Centers. These citizens have shared interests because they have always lived near and have always helped each other.

c. Often a land owner can no longer maintain their land or make a profit for their labors. Often, like has been done with the land my husband’s family owns, a successful nearby land owner will agree to lease or buy that land, so that they can expand their operation, to make a better living and to produce more product.

d. As a result of these like-minded arrangements, our region is provided with a more manageable population, better infrastructure, more jobs, open recreational areas (BLM), and local food options. Our nation benefits from the farmer’s products and the animals and birds, especially in our nearby conservation areas - Birds of Prey, are provided with open areas to help them thrive and survive. The migratory paths of the Kuna/Melba/Birds of Prey areas are not further disturbed with the pollution from more urban and industrial/M1/M2 development in the area.

4. Lastly, I reject the District 23 region of the L03 map, which was drawn to include Owyhee County as part of the district desires. We have previously expressed in maps and again in L91, our desires to include Kuna, Melba and of course the associated BLM and Ada County areas of impact nearby, as one district. I propose that you refer to the L91 map which was submitted in response to the L03 posting, I believe. I recommend that we use the District 18 lines in the L91 district map as this strategy resolves the issues L03 introduces and provides the Kuna City section with well planned redistricting. I am aware that L91 might not resolve the population numbers for those areas above Kuna or in Owyhee county, but I faith that the experts can figure out a smart solution, without creating, major new issues.

Thank you for your consideration of my objections to L03, District 23 and for my proposal to consider the L91 District 18 proposal which resolves many of my objections.