



Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21

| Timestamp        | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item  | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments   |
|------------------|----------------|--|---------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 8:18:11 | August 3, 2021 | public listening tour schedule                           | Susan Bickel        | 85718    | self         | <p>Chairwoman Neuberg stated in last Tuesday's meeting that "it's been an incredible honor and humbling, you know, to participate in the first few public hearings. They've been incredible with substantive feedback, decorum behavior. It's just clear that our public is thirsty for, you know, expressing themselves through these democratic means. And I just have to say it's really been touching and exciting."</p> <p>Thank you, Chairwoman Neuberg for your enthusiasm and interest in hearing from the public. Pima County residents have Communities of Interest and personal stories that they are eager to share with you.</p> <p>Sadly however, we in Pima County, are still waiting for an official announcement of venue for our chance to speak before the Commission this coming weekend, a short 96 hours from now.</p> <p>Please give Pima County residents the respect you have afforded every other county in Arizona. Pima County residents have known that the schedule for your visit would occur on August 7 and 8. But, we still don't know where we are going to meet.</p> <p>Please remember that we too, are volunteers. We are willing and eager to share the pride we have in our county, our cities and our neighborhoods. We support and encourage citizen participation in the governance of our cities and county. We are equally interested in the mapping process and are equally supportive of the Commission's desire to meet the legal considerations of creating fair and competitive maps that protect and reflect the complex mix of people who call Arizona home. We look forward to seeing you in Pima County. And we look forward to the long overdue official announcement of the venue.</p> |
| 8/3/2021 8:33:53 | August 3, 2021 | Item V.B, "Discussion on holding 2 or 3 listening tours" | Virginia Dotson     | 85902    | self         | <p>Thank you for holding Listening Tour meetings in Apache and Navajo counties. For the next round(s) of meetings, please do not use the Show Low location again (City Council Chambers).</p> <p>Although they started the meeting with a "socially-distanced" auditorium, they made no attempt to enforce the city's own COVID mask requirement for public buildings. And partway through the meeting they removed the tape from alternate rows of seating (many audience members cheered). At a time when COVID infections are resurging in Arizona, this is unacceptable careless.</p> <p>The White Mountain Apache Tribe has a large venue at the Hon-Dah Resort and Casino which is very close to Pinetop. The WMAT protects its people and its visitors by requiring and enforcing mask wearing. The Hon-Dah Resort has some very large meeting rooms that will allow for social distancing even with a crowd. Not only will this venue be safer, it will be fair to WMAT members who were left out of the first round of meetings.</p> <p>I also urge you to spend some of your budget and advertise these meetings! I heard nothing on the radio and saw nothing in the local newspaper. People need to know about them.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>   |



**Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21**

| Timestamp        | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments   |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 8:42:28 | August 3, 2021 | Mapping     | Suzanne Mead        | 85331    | Self         | A few questions about process for the Commission:<br>1) Why is there such an early deadline for submitting comments and maps?<br>2) How will written comments and maps be used? Will they be reflected in early releases from the mapping consultants?<br>3) Will equal weight be given to testimonials at live sessions and those submitted in writing?<br>4) How will maps submitted by the public be incorporated in the process?<br>5) To what degree will all six criteria be considered in early maps generated by the mapping consultants? While some speakers at recent live sessions proffered that competitive interests were last and least important considerations, the language in Prop 106 quite clearly calls for the end of gerrymandering, improving voter and candidate participation in elections and the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts. I sincerely hope that this remains the Commission's intent. |



Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21

| Timestamp        | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item    | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments   |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 9:01:27 | August 3, 2021 | Public Comment | Jennifer Mindock    | 85364    | self         | <p>I have a couple of requests for the tech department that might make it a little easier for the public to follow the IRC proceedings. It has been great to hear the many times the commissioners have asked the support staff about making sure we were included as much as possible but I want to suggest these four changes because they are the types of things that should be pretty easy for tech people to arrange and they could make things even more "public friendly" as you go into the busy final half of the process.</p> <p>1.The commission agreed unanimously to "time-tag" the agenda so people could easily locate where specific items were discussed on the meeting recordings. I cannot find the tags; was the idea cancelled? I have tried to use it several times but it doesn't seem to show up.</p> <p>2.Can you possibly find someone who is able enlarge the font size on the tile name tags for in the virtual meetings? On my screen, only a thin, undecipherable white line appears at the bottom left corner of the tile; presumably the name label. Additionally, including the person's title or contracted company would be very helpful courtesy as well. (For example, Simmons-mapping). It is confusing for new or infrequent viewers from the public to follow when they don't know who the virtual meetings are.</p> <p>3. Could you thicken and brighten thin blue talking indicator that appears around the perimeter of the speaker's tile? It is difficult to detect who is speaking as the legal team is often across the room, many of the speakers are looking downward, and that little pale line is very difficult to detect. When people have to search for a speaker, they are not easily able to follow the conversation.</p> <p>4. I cannot find the recordings of the listening tours on your tube or on the IRC web site. Just as with the recorded regular meetings, many people cannot adjust their schedule to watch the meetings live, but they can watch the recorded sessions later. It is a wonderful service that directly addresses the transparency issue of redistricting, allows the citizens of Arizona to understand and appreciate each other's views, and learn more about the complexities of a democratic process. In the case of the meetings of the listening tours, I have only been able to view one but it was a powerful experience for getting to know and understand my neighbors in the state; much more so than piles of data could do. Please post all the listening tours on You Tube!</p> <p>While the commissioners may have decided against hiring an IT person, these simple courtesies I mention would be basic routine in many zoom rooms. Last January, the director of the state's administrative office, Mr. Andy Tobin, told the commissioners that he and his entire department were at their disposal; they should feel free to call him any time they needed something. Please, call him and ask if you can borrow an IT person to tweak your public outreach to be just a little friendlier to your virtual participants !</p> |



**Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21**

| Timestamp        | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item  | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments  |
|------------------|----------------|--|---------------------|----------|--------------|---|
| 8/3/2021 9:04:28 | August 3, 2021 | F  | Joan McDermott      | 86403    | Myself       | I appreciate the sustained efforts of the Commission to reach out to every corner of Arizona to hear as many viewpoints as possible. With this information, I want to be sure that the resulting decisions will be made by the Commissioners themselves, NOT by the contractors you've hired (they aren't our Commissioners). Having watched the presenters at the meetings, I think it is really important to consider multiple grid maps for both of our LD and CD maps. Once you've done that, I hope that you will make sure all of us who will be affected, will have the opportunity to send you our questions and perspectives on your choices. I want to CLEARLY understand why you are making the choices you are considering.   |
| 8/3/2021 9:12:11 | August 3, 2021 | Grid maps  | Peggy Pena          | 85643    | Self         | I would like to see the mapping firm offer more than one set of grid maps for both the legislature and congressional maps. Both the commission and the public should be able to analyze different grids based on community of interest, the ability to modify for competitiveness, etc.   |
| 8/3/2021 9:17:43 | August 3, 2021 | competitiveness experts discussion                   | Julie Pindzola      | 86301    | myself       | Very interesting discussion.<br>I want to ask again that where individual AZ LD and CD districts cannot practically be made to be truly competitive, then please make sure Arizona as a whole is made to be competitive. We are a purple state.<br>Thank you  |
| 8/3/2021 9:23:48 | August 3, 2021 | listening tour                                       | Barbara Tellman     | 85705    | self         | Your survey comments appear to be limited to the "communities of interest" criterion. It is only one of several. They can only be submitted with a map. One concern that needs a lot of attention is minority representation and particularly "packing" of districts. Will there be a separate survey for other criteria?   |
| 8/3/2021 9:30:06 | August 3, 2021 | competitiveness                                      | julie Pindzola      | 86301    | myself       | Why don't you run an extra intraweek meeting if necessary to give you time to fully assess how to measure competitiveness?  |
| 8/3/2021 9:30:34 | August 3, 2021 | Presentation on "Competitiveness"                    | María-Elena Dunn    | 86303    | myself       | Rushing this process is unwise. This is one of your MOST important responsibilities. As all of you have said, it is a lot to absorb and it should be carefully reviewed and digested. There are some very good tools that have been offered (responsive mapping sounds like a great option) but to judge their merit you must take the appropriate time. That is a time you MUST give to this effort. And, if Comm Lerner was not aware that this "vote" was expected next week, I am wondering how communication is taking place among yourselves.   |
| 8/3/2021 9:33:19 | August 3, 2021 | V. Update from the mapping Consultants, Timmons/NDC. | Nelson Morgan       | 85054    | Self         | I understand the NDC request that the decision about methods for determining competitiveness needs to be done soon. However, I think it will be important for the Commissioners to be presented with one or (preferably) more possible approaches to be proposed, with clear descriptions of pros and cons. Then the IRC will need time to think about these possibilities. It needn't be stretched out for many weeks, but suddenly announcing that the vote (on what?) will happen next week clearly startled Commissioner Lerner, and me as well. Not to mention, public comment. So my concrete suggestion is that presentation of this proposal (or these proposals) be put on the agenda for next week, that discussion happen next week, and a vote be the week after, which would allow for public comment. |



**Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21**

| Timestamp         | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item  | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing                 | Comments   |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---------------------|----------|------------------------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 9:36:12  | August 3, 2021 | Listening Tours                                      | Janell Hunt         | 85143    | Myself as an Arizona Citizen | Commissioners: Thank you again for your dedicated efforts as the IRC. It has been interesting to follow your work in the regular meetings and now in the first round of the Listening Tour. In that regard, I am somewhat concerned about the various sites that were first tentatively scheduled for hearings and then withdrawn; several were places occupied by communities of color, such as Sacaton here in Pinal County. While I realize it can be challenging to hold public hearings in rural communities, having lived in remote places several times in my life, I understand the importance these types of public hearings can have on citizens who believe that "for once they're coming to listen to us..to me." I encourage you to think about adding some of those places back onto your schedule as you look at planning hearings after the first grid maps and draft maps. Thank you for your consideration, and best wishes as you continue your visits outstate this week and as you go forward toward building these important maps.<br>-Janell Hunt, San Tan Valley |
| 8/3/2021 9:36:17  | August 3, 2021 | Competitiveness                                      | Peggy Pena          | 85643    | Self                         | For something as important as competitiveness the commission should take its time. This is going to be the most reactive to the public & the commission does not be seen a rushing.  |
| 8/3/2021 9:39:19  | August 3, 2021 | V. Mapping consultant update/discussion              | Paul Weich          | 85044    | self                         | I was surprised to hear that Commissioners learned during the meeting that they will be voting next week on such a tricky subject "in the name of expediency". Competitiveness is a major key to coming up with fair districts - one that is written into the Commission's mandate! Please don't give it short shrift or rush a decision through simply because the Census data is about to hit. Today's discussion lends support to the need to do the necessary research. Thanks!  |
| 8/3/2021 9:41:04  | August 3, 2021 | V. Update from the mapping Consultants, Timmons/NDC. | Nelson Morgan       | 85054    | Self                         | Just taking an average of previous time series values for prediction is a zeroth order one. How about including at least 1st order - since trends are important? Arizona is changing. This means looking at the slope, rate of change over time. Demographics, migration from other states ... I know that with limited data the model can't get too complicated, but ignoring large scale basic changes seems like an unfortunate choice.   |
| 8/3/2021 9:48:32  | August 3, 2021 | Competitiveness presentation                         | M. E. Dunn          | 86303    | myself                       | Please do remember the difference between quantity and quality when choosing a methodology and/or measures. Options are ideal but not to the nth degree.   |
| 8/3/2021 9:55:53  | August 3, 2021 | Competitiveness                                      | María-Elena Dunn    | 86303    | myself                       | A vote next week is totally ill-advised. Obviously other commissioners were not privy to that possibility and this is uber important so please, please postpone and place further comment/consideration in next week's agenda. Being able to process the complexity of the options at the same time as you are still conducting Public Hearings is way too ambitious and will short-change a very crucial part of the process. Thank you for giving us ALL time to educate ourselves on these options.   |
| 8/3/2021 10:03:36 | August 3, 2021 | Timmons/NDC presentation on competitiveness          | Jay Simpson         | 85016    | Myself                       | Doug Johnson just committed to making his recommendations public regarding how to measure competitiveness of proposed maps by this Friday yet the commission is supposedly going to vote to adopt a measure at next Tuesday's meeting. If the proposals are made public on Friday and the Commission is going to debate them on Tuesday, how can the public effectively respond to his proposed measures in time for the IRC to take public comment into their analysis?   |
| 8/3/2021 10:07:01 | August 3, 2021 | maps   | Margaret Gallagher  | 85258    | self                         | Can the Commission please provide a couple of draft grid maps (both Legislative and Congressional) and encourage public comments in these options? Thank you.  |
| 8/3/2021 10:13:50 | August 3, 2021 | survey mapping                                       | Julie Pindzola      | 86301    | myself                       | Asking again, Will this same mapping tool be the one used during draft map public comments? This dot and line tool is great but having the capability to map by block and block groups would be very helpful. Thank you for an answer!   |



Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21

| Timestamp         | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item            | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments   |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 10:18:40 | August 3, 2021 | Public Hearing "input" | M. E. Dunn          | 86303    | myself       | <p>Not sure how you can figure out what a map looks like for people who used the paper copies handed out at the hearings? There was no room. Additionally, a question re those paper forms - the space for the explanatory comments when on paper is just over two inches which allows for perhaps a sentence or two. More importantly, how, when and who will interpret those written comments? From the mapping consultant I see a preponderance of importance being given to the on-line maps submitted and fear that those "whys" are not going to be processed or taken into account. Similarly for the abundance of oral public comments. Yes, as we understand, these sessions are being recorded (and will be posted), but are all commissioners and/or the consultants going to go back and re-listen to absorb all which was said, especially those commissioners not present at the sessions? I actually tried to turn in my spoken comments, and from the reaction by the staff it was obvious that it was not something which was anticipated and, perhaps, not something for which there was a mechanism to handle or to process. Another point, in case you have not heard this already - the online survey, heretofore, could not be submitted unless you also drew a map and that process is not easy for all. Again, giving the public the impression that only the maps count, not the comments. Anyway we can be assured that our comments are more than just a component of a PR effort?</p> <p>And, a counterpoint to something being said, at least at the Prescott event. The comment re the unconstitutionality of some of the maps created by the 2011 IRC (about the 12%) were less than truthful. Shame on them. It appears that once again (such as with the mapping consultant selection) some groups have given cut and paste info to present at the hearings. Be wary.</p> |
| 8/3/2021 10:20:55 | August 3, 2021 | V-F competitiveness    | shanna leonard      | 85719    | self         | <p>Competitiveness is important as it in the preamble for the mission given to the commission - It is incumbent upon the commission to carefully review the methods used to determine this. This vote must not be rushed. It needs careful consideration- we the public need time to comment on proposals prior to vote.</p>   |
| 8/3/2021 10:25:03 | August 3, 2021 | Listenign Tour input   | M.E. Dunn           | 86303    | myself       | <p>From the many comments and question from commissioners and others, it appears that it would be very helpful if everyone gave that COI online tool a try. It is not easy to use, it is very hard to draw the maps, it is unclear that you can submit more than one (and here the consultants seem to have given contradictory information - that you need to specify that you are submitting a second map or that this is to adjust your first submission; which is it?) and where/how to specify what it is you are doing. I know you are busy, but give it a try and understand what the public is being asked to do. And, please do not continue to peddle the paper forms at the hearings as a real option. As I mentioned in an early comment here, the spacing is not adequate. Thank you for your consideration.</p>  |



Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21

| Timestamp         | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item                   | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing                      | Comments  |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|---|
| 8/3/2021 10:30:10 | August 3, 2021 | V. Competitiveness discussion | Betty Bengtson      | 85718    | League of Women Voters of Arizona | <p>Thank you to the IRC for arranging for these presentations and discussion about competitiveness measures. The experts were articulate, to-the-point, and able to translate their research into layman's terms. It's very valuable, thought-provoking information and has raised many questions for both the Commissioners and the public to consider. The League will be referring our members and the public to this part of today's IRC meeting. Comments and questions especially by Chair Neuberg and Commissioner Lerner touched on many critical points. Competitiveness is obviously complex and difficult. Your careful attention to it is essential.</p> <p>One question not addressed in your discussion is if there are differences in the competitiveness measures that should be applied to congressional districts and to state legislative districts. Today's focus seemed to be on congressional districts. Are there additional or different measures to use for legislative districts? For example, Dr. Duchin mentioned using presidential, senatorial and gubernatorial elections. Does that apply to both congressional and legislative districts?</p> <p>Thank you to the Commissioners for your continued work on behalf of our state and its citizens.</p> |
| 8/3/2021 10:41:29 | August 3, 2021 | Listening Tour                | David Dunn          | 86303    |                                   | <p>As it is being discussed now re Pinal. At the Prescott session a number of individuals spoke to the "rural" nature of the community. Be aware that it is (was) more rural only because the current lines for CD4 and LD1 were drawn to include huge swatches of ranch land. Yet, much of that same ranch land has, in the last 10 years, been sold and been replaced by huge high density developments, particularly in the described Quad City area. This is making this COI more semi urban than rural, and thus having less in common with the Colorado River basin communities or the farm areas around Yuma - and land in between - but more in common with semi urban communities in the No Maricopa area. Please also note that the same individuals who spoke to the rural nature and conservative values that should be preserved are the same ones helping make (many who spoke represent big RE interests in our area) our community much less rural and a lot more like their dreaded Maricopa. Just saying....</p>  |
| 8/3/2021 10:49:24 | August 3, 2021 | Access to meeting             | shanna leonard      | 85719    | self                              | <p>Please note that you had the incorrect (emergency) Link listed on your web site for access by the public to today's meeting- on the page <a href="https://publicmeetings.az.gov/content/notice-and-agenda-regular-meeting-and-executive-session-21">https://publicmeetings.az.gov/content/notice-and-agenda-regular-meeting-and-executive-session-21</a> you had Members of the public may view the meeting at this link: <a href="https://youtu.be/v12CCRbINNs">https://youtu.be/v12CCRbINNs</a></p> <p>this was a non functioning backup link. the link was listed incorrectly twice on that page and only accurately within the agenda page. I'm concerned that making these kinds of mistakes creates a barrier for some members of the public to attend the meeting and make comment during the course of the meeting.</p>  |



**Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21**

| Timestamp         | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item  | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing              | Comments   |
|-------------------|----------------|--|---------------------|----------|---------------------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 10:58:51 | August 3, 2021 | Travel schedule/meetings update  | Patrick Brown       | 85041    | myself - resident of LD27 | I am troubled by the lack of community outreach to ensure wider attendance at the public hearings. The commission does not have a Community outreach officer that would be responsible for insuring a wider inclusion of the residents of Maricopa County. Further more the quantity and locations of these hearings is not sufficient for a county of this size. Maricopa County is the 5 largest county in the United States but only three hearings were scheduled with a short window of information regarding start time and specific locations. Finally, the time these meeting were scheduled does not include the largest percentage of the community. The downtown Phoenix hearing took place on a Sunday during a time when people are in church services or other events. The 8/9 hearing starts at 5pm when many members of the community are ending their work day and travel will be at it's most congested. I ask that the commission add additional hearing dates as well as extend public comment in Maricopa County. |
| 8/3/2021 11:00:24 | August 3, 2021 | Competitiveness  | Peggy Pena          | 85643    | Self                      | Other reasons that the determination of competitiveness could take more time was mentioned in the meeting especially given its importance in public debate. First once the measure is decided the calculations are very quick. Second competitiveness is used last in modifying the maps.  |
| 8/3/2021 11:08:24 | August 3, 2021 | V. Update from the mapping Consultants, Timmons/NDC.   | Nelson Morgan       | 85054    | Self                      | A point of caution: while the IRC has no choice but to rely on lessons learned from the two previous examples, it is important to note that a sample size of two is minimal. In other words, while the draft maps did not look like the grid maps, we should have very little confidence that a grid map has no relationship to the draft or final maps. That being said, you can't know how that initial choice will ultimately affect the end product, it's probably best not to overthink it.   |
| 8/3/2021 11:11:59 | August 3, 2021 | grid map pt of origin  | Julie Pindzola      | 86301    |                           | The suggestion that Commissioner York made to start at Yuma seems to set up an expectation from the beginning. Shouldn't the origin be chosen randomly like before?  |
| 8/3/2021 11:15:57 | August 3, 2021 | Grid maps  | M.E. Dunn           | 86303    |                           | To start from two areas for the grid maps is not necessarily going to cause debate, disagreement, controversy unless you make it so. It is just an opportunity to look at options objectively! Both using following parameters: miles, counties (or reservations), equal population.   |
| 8/3/2021 11:24:56 | August 3, 2021 | VIII. Executive Director's Report and discussion thereof; D. Travel schedule/meetings update | Kendra Alvarez      |          | All On The Line - Arizona | Please create a plan to communicate through radio, press, mail and via local community leaders outlining the options available for providing input when internet access is unreliable for these communities and individuals. You have mentioned some alternative methods of input today, including mailing a map in, but there are no forms or tools in multiple languages provided by the IRC to facilitate that. Further, please recognize that outlining these alternatives during a virtual meeting still renders the solutions invisible to communities or individuals that cannot participate online. Such alternatives for public input must be clearly explained through other channels, preferably through channels which communities already access. Otherwise, the communities that need these alternatives most will not have access to these options.   |
| 8/3/2021 11:28:35 | August 3, 2021 | Grid maps  | Peggy Pena          | 85643    | Self                      | The starting place and technique for the grid map should be not be arbitrarily set because some commissioners suggests it but use some technique used in the past or a random technique Even though the grid maps doesn't determine much the commissioners don't want to set themselves up for attack because someone will always view any change as political.  |
| 8/3/2021 11:53:21 | August 3, 2021 | GRID MAP   | SHARON EDGAR        | 86004    | SELF                      | I'm listening to Doug Johnson's overview of how the 2001 and 2011 Commissions drew the grid maps. Last week, he mentioned that there are new "randomizing" methods. Will he present new randomizing methods?   |





**Public Meeting Comments 8.3.21**

| Timestamp         | Meeting Date   | Agenda Item                  | First and Last Name | Zip Code | Representing | Comments   |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------|--|
| 8/3/2021 12:10:23 | August 3, 2021 | The VRA and AZ Native People | María-Elena Dunn    | 86303    |              | Vice Chair Watchman. Apologies. This is beyond shameful. As a people we have not done nearly enough to redress the sins of the past. On the contrary, now enacting more measures to limit access to the ballot box. Not sure how the redistricting process will be able to provide relief, but we must find a way.   |
| 8/3/2021 12:47:52 | August 3, 2021 | Ex Dir Report                | M. E. Dunn          | 86303    |              | It is not only Vice Chair Watchman who should be seeing the budget figures. The public too! I have not been able to keep count, tho attended all online sessions, BUT the questions of budget has been brought up innumerable times and the answer has always been, " I will have it to you soon." Not only numbers re budgetary requests, but what has been spent, what was the approved budget by the legislature for the next fiscal year, what anticipated expenses are, per month or quarter, including consultant costs/fees. That should be something that goes to the commissioners regularly and available to the public on the website. This is August and the ED was hired in Mar; we are in August! A constant postponement is not adequate. |