

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 9:07:40	April 6, 2021	Selection of attorneys	Denise van Zijll	85935	self	I believe this issue is so important that I feel you should select 2 attorney firms, one that identifies with the Republicans and one that identifies with Democrats. This will give the commission balanced feedback and will ensure input from both sides. The extra cost is justified given the importance of this commission and fair redistricting. Thank you.
4/6/2021 9:07:57	April 6, 2021	item VIII options for procuring legal counsel	Laura Huenneke	86004	self/public	Thank you for providing this opportunity for public comment and input. I know that you are in the process of choosing one or more legal firms to work with over the coming year. I write to urge you to hire two firms, not one – and to choose two firms with contrasting political and philosophical approaches. I understand that the previous Commissions hired two legal groups – one leaning Democratic in philosophy, one leaning Republican – and I strongly encourage you to follow the same strategy. Given the degree of scrutiny that your process and decisions will be receiving, you should try to incorporate the greatest possible diversity of input and expertise. Two different law firms, of differing perspective, will give you the best possible chance of foreseeing and forestalling possible legal challenges to your actions. Moreover, since your choice of an Executive Director with explicit partisan leanings has opened your decision-making to some skepticism, taking this explicit step to be as balanced as possible in choice of legal advice would be very helpful in counteracting public doubt about the integrity of your process.
4/6/2021 9:11:05	April 6, 2021	Hiring outside council for Redistricting	Brian Templet	85715	Myself	It is important to preserve public trust in the process and it is essential to hire two law firms representing both Democrats and Republicans to insure that trust. This will guard against map manipulation. Diversity of expert perspectives and opinion is warranted.
4/6/2021 9:11:25	April 6, 2021	Item #8	John Moore	85395	Self	The prior two commissions (2001 and 2011) were represented by two law firms. It was a system that helped assure public trust in the process by having legal counsel from both the Democratic and Republican points of view. I would urge the commission to continue that trend this year and select two firms, one rooted in each party. It will give you the best counsel and also go a long way toward cementing public trust.
4/6/2021 9:13:57	April 6, 2021	Attorney selection	Larry Romo	85929	Myself	In the past the redistricting commission has had 2 law firms, a Democratic firm and a Republican firm. To maintain the Independent nature of this committee it is strongly requested that there be equal representation for both Democrats and Republicans by hiring two firms in order to preserve the public trust in this process. Thank You
4/6/2021 9:14:05	April 6, 2021	kathleendubbs@gmail.com	Kathleen Dubbs	85745	Self	Respected members: Arizona's redistricting commission is a model for the nation. Let's continue the tradition by hiring law firms of two different parties. Thank you for all of your hard work.
4/6/2021 9:14:20	April 6, 2021	law firm selection	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	Regarding selection of legal counsel: I urge the Commission to NOT use either the Attorney General's office or Snell Wilmer. Each has been involved in highly partisan litigation (arguing a "zero sum game theory" in the Supreme Court regarding voting restrictions and working to undo the voters' decision to approve Prop 208, respectively) and are not credible partners for an independent process.
4/6/2021 9:15:15	April 6, 2021	VIII, IX, X	Sheryl Eaton	85929	myself	I have been a fan of the IRC since I voted for it. It made Arizona a leader in redistricting! Its best features are that it is balanced in partisanship, fair, and required to follow the laws that create fair and logical districts. In connection with those features, I urge the Commission to hire two consulting law firms, one left-leaning and the other right-leaning, as it has the past two times. That will provide balance, varied opinions on the law, and a continuation of the fairness that the Commission is known for.
4/6/2021 9:15:41	April 6, 2021	general	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	I was very concerned to hear Commissioner York's comment last week that the Commissioners are there to represent the "factions that have chosen us." I strenuously disagree; the Arizona Constitution requires that each member shall be "committed to applying the provisions of this section in an honest, independent and impartial fashion..." [emphasis mine]. I urge all five Commissioners to reaffirm that they each represent every person in Arizona.
4/6/2021 9:16:10	April 6, 2021	Hiring of PIO	Diane Boman	86303	Myself	I am concerned that the PIO candidates will not offer new and creative ways to communicate with all areas of our state. there are accessibility issues with our elderly population and our Indian nations as well as the numerous rural areas that will need to be addressed.
4/6/2021 9:16:29	April 6, 2021	VIII	Hugo Polanco	85004	Living United for Change in Arizona	Good morning esteemed members of the Independent Redistricting Commission: We are writing to give our stance on the "Section VIII: Discussion and Possible Action on options for securing legal counsel." We are most concerned about consideration of Snell & Wilmer, the very same firm that defended the nationally disgraceful law SB 1070 in court. Putting such a partisan organization in the position to defend the treasure of the Independent Redistricting Commission would fly in the face of the very moniker of an "Independent" Redistricting Commission. It would once again remind the nation of Arizona's contentious past, and challenge the credibility of the next 10 years of political future. Furthermore, even if this does not present a clear conflict, it does show the tenor with which this independent commission is taking their responsibility. SB 1070 represented years of anguish, hurt and loss for communities of color, and still brings significant anxiety for LUCHA's membership. That is why we are asking that the IRC remove Snell & Wilmer from contention as legal counsel. It would bring demonstrable harm not just on Arizona, but on the Redistricting process and Commission itself. So, before you make such an important decision, please listen to the community and LUCHA, since we certainly listen to their counsel. We strongly advise against moving forward with Snell & Wilmer, and the community does as well. However, if the Commission does decide to hire a firm that would take on such contentious and divisive clients and causes, we would request a second firm be retained to give the Commission true independence and also give the Commission more choices to make during potential litigation or key legal decisions. Living United for Change in Arizona

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 9:16:32	April 6, 2021	hiring legal teams	John Franklin	85935	arizona citizen	We need TWO legal teams to represent both the Democratic and Republican viewpoint to promote public trust in this redistricting commission.
4/6/2021 9:18:24	April 6, 2021	VIII. Discussion and Possible Action on options for securing legal counsel:	Mary Keerins	85750	self	In the spirit of the Independent stance of the Commission I would encourage selection of an Independent law firm. If that is not possible the selection of two law firms with diverse political stances would be the next best option.
4/6/2021 9:19:38	April 6, 2021	VIII	Andrea Varela	85122	Self	Historically, the Commission has selected two law firms to serve as co-counsel. I support continuing that tradition in attempts for full transparency and bipartisanship. The Commission can uphold public confidence by hiring bipartisan legal counsel. Law firms need to be transparent with their political affiliation and their interests in representing the Commission. In particular, Snell & Wilmer is currently attempting to undermine Proposition 208, which was a ballot initiative approved by the voters. This demonstrates that Snell & Wilmer chooses to work against the will of the voters which is a direct conflict with the work they should do with the Commission and demonstrates that they are not truly bipartisan.
4/6/2021 9:21:59	April 6, 2021	Attorneys	Debbie López	85042	Arizona Hispanic Community Forum	I believe it would be in the best interest of the IRC to have two law firms to insure impartial and fair redistricting.
4/6/2021 9:24:49	April 6, 2021	Law Firm questioninh	Diane Boman	86303	Myself	In the past 2 law firms have served as co-counsel for the commission. I believe that this is more important today than it has ever been in the past. I live in a majority republican area but the majority of the state is democrat. The questioning of these law firms must include whether any of these firms have engaged in Partisan Challenges and they need to be transparent with their political affiliations. It would be helpful to know if they have donated to any campaigns or any specific PACS. These are hard questions ask but it must be done in order to live up to the non-partisan reputation of our redistricting commission.
4/6/2021 9:25:58	April 6, 2021	Item 8	Holli Ploog	86336	Myself	Please consider following precedence from the past two commissions and hire both a Republican and Democratic law firm to be legal advisors to the 2021 Independent Redistricting Commission. Hiring of the Executive Director has already created an appearance of partisanship. The public requires confidence the commission will represent all of the people of Arizona and not only one party.
4/6/2021 9:26:10	April 6, 2021	VIII Securing Legal Counsel	Janell Hunt	85143	Myself, an AZ Citizen	Commission Members; I encourage you to continue the precedent of hiring two law firms - one Democrat, one Republican - for balance, to work together on the essential issues you are working to achieve for a good final report and mapping for the next decade here in Arizona. Thank you.
4/6/2021 9:26:56	April 6, 2021	9	Emmie Cardella	85260	Myself	Previously, the IRC hired two law firms, one from each "side" of the political aisle. It is important that the commission continues this practice. The political climate in Arizona is extremely adversarial. Balanced legal counsel will help instill trust in the redistricting process.
4/6/2021 9:27:34	April 6, 2021	Legal Firm interviews	M.E. Dunn	86303		I am not sure why we need to know their OPINION. The Commissioners are the ones that have to be clear as to how they will weigh the 6 Constitutional elements. The legal firm should give ADVICE as to how to support the mapping effort in that context and how those final maps are drawn to comply with them.
4/6/2021 9:31:34	April 6, 2021	VIII regarding Legal Counsel	Donald Hunt, Sr.	85143	Myself	Commissioners, With so many potential legal challenges, especially in mapping, I advise you to contact with two firms (Democrat and Republican) to work with you on this important and historic project. Thank you.
4/6/2021 9:41:04	April 6, 2021	VIII	Don Hunt, Jr.	85143	Myself	Commissioners of the IRC: To maintain public trust in the work of the IRC, I suggest you hire two legal firms to ensure balance for a non-partisan outcome. Thank you for doing this important work.
4/6/2021 9:54:52	April 6, 2021	VIII securing legal counsel	John Watts	86514		Fair elections are the basis of good government, and gerrymandering is completely inconsistent with fair elections. To eliminate gerrymandering, the commission should hire two firms, an ethical democrat firm and an ethical republican firm. Both should be committed to eliminating gerrymandering. Both must also be committed to creating a system that does not discriminate against Native Americans. The firms could oversee each other to ensure they both are fair. Having two firms will also provide diverse points of view in all aspects in the mappng process.
4/6/2021 9:54:55	April 6, 2021	VIII securing legal counsel	John Watts	86514		Fair elections are the basis of good government, and gerrymandering is completely inconsistent with fair elections. To eliminate gerrymandering, the commission should hire two firms, an ethical democrat firm and an ethical republican firm. Both should be committed to eliminating gerrymandering. Both must also be committed to creating a system that does not discriminate against Native Americans. The firms could oversee each other to ensure they both are fair. Having two firms will also provide diverse points of view in all aspects in the mappng process.
4/6/2021 9:54:57	April 6, 2021	Legal council	Lisa Calderon	85225	Self	When considering council I ask that you please eliminate Snell and Wilmer as a potential Candidate. I am a very involved community member and parent of public school children. I have worked to ensure funding of public schools and this council has played a role in trying to overturn Prop208 and defended SB1070. For that reason I feel that they are not the best fit in public trust and interest. Additionally, I ask if you could please continue the model from previous years with two councils representing a bipartisanship. Thank you.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 9:55:09	April 6, 2021	Independent Redistricting Commission	Judy Nelson	85929		It is important to our country and our democracy to keep independence in the redistricting. Partisan influence will skew results in the favor of that party. We need to remain neutral for the districts so that we are represented fairly!
4/6/2021 9:56:33	April 6, 2021	Pubic Comment	Maria-Elena Dunn	86303		Wrong Opinion, Yasmin. That is not a different agenda item. It does come under Public Comments and what Com Lerner is suggesting is how to address them in the future. WOW and Chair, you have not seen any comment that rises to the level of consideration? Have we been reading the same comments? They need to be addressed more seriously. We still do not feel really heard if what you think is that they are nice to have and not much more.
4/6/2021 10:02:27	April 6, 2021	Securing Legal Counsel for the Commission	Virginia Dotson	85902	Self	Dear Chair Neuberg, Vice-Chair Watchman, and Commissioners Mehl, Lerner, and York: I urge you to continue the honorable bipartisan tradition of selecting two law firms: one that represents Democratic principles best, and the other representing Republican viewpoints. Please do not take a short cut by hiring only one firm. Appointing a single partisan firm would be seen as a red flag to fair-minded Arizonans. Selecting two, of different political persuasions, is the only path that all Arizonans will trust. This is the best way to ensure that the process you are embarking upon will be fair, from start to finish. Thank you, Virginia Dotson
4/6/2021 10:06:34	April 6, 2021	Staff hires	M.E. Dunn	86303	myself	A little confused. So "private" discussions to conduct "due diligence" and learn about the Exec Dir candidates, the law firms, etc. are not considered covered by the Public meetings law YET this effort would? And, yes, the reason you are having this issue now is because the Eex Dir, as said by Chair, "needs guidance" and earlier Exe Directors could be given brought authority because they were qualified and competent. Less than reasoned decisions have long term consequences. Hopefully this is the extent of the complications; I fear not.
4/6/2021 10:08:51	April 6, 2021	IV. Discussion on Public Comments received prior to today's (April 6, 2021) meeting	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	I appreciate that the public comments are read by commission members, and further appreciate that you say that your decisions and thoughts are influenced by the comments. That being said, I still felt that further attention to summarizing and stating publicly significant themes within the comments is quite important. At the moment, the only such theme that I have heard discussed is the desire of the public to maximize transparency. Of course that is very important. But reading through the comments myself, there are other themes that are frequently found in the comments, and your lack of public discussion of these additional topics is disappointing. Please assume that your reading will include some thinking about ways that your could summarize ideas from the comments, and plan on commenting on them. I understand that it would not be practical to respond publicly to each and every individual comment, but being the experienced people that you all are, I'm sure that you are quite capable of compressing a range of comments into a few common themes, so that you can efficiently respond. Please do this.
4/6/2021 10:09:48	April 6, 2021	VIII	Aris Correa	85194	Myself	Hello, with regards to law firms that will be providing council for the IRC I think that the commission should keep in mind the political affiliations that these law firms may have and these law firms should be transparent about the legal partisan challenges they may have engaged in the past or more recent past. I do want to point out that Snell & Wilmer has in the past defended SB1070 which was discriminatory to Arizona's communities of color, and looks like they are currently working to dismantle Prop 208 in Arizona. Also in the past the commission has hired two law firms to provide council, to help have a two different angle approach or bipartisan approach and I think this would help the public confidence in this redistricting process. Thanks for keeping the hiring process public and transparent, I want to encourage the IRC make a final decision on who is hired for legal representation next week so the public has time to provide additional input. Thank you.
4/6/2021 10:10:32	April 6, 2021	Discussion and Possible Action on securing Mapping Consultants support	Elaine Downing	86404	myself	As a retired federal employee and military veteran of a combined 30 years, I have never seen such division in our County before. It is time to bring the County together. In every move that we make moving forward, we need to regain the trust of all the people. This process (redistricting) only comes once every 10 years and is supposed to be based on data, not politics. It is a massive undertaking and complex. In keeping with the past practice, it is imperative that two legal firms – one Democrat and one Republican, be hired. To deviate from that practice will only cause more mistrust and cause more legal challenges when all is said and done. Thank you.
4/6/2021 10:12:32	April 6, 2021	Redistricting	Priscilla Weaver	86514-1457	Priscilla	Fair elections are the basis of a democratic & good government, and gerrymandering is completely inconsistent with fair elections. To eliminate gerrymandering, the commission should hire 2 firms—an ethical democrat law firm and an ethical republican law firm. Both of them should be committed to eliminating gerrymandering. Both must also be committed to creating a system that does not discriminate against all Native Americans. The firms could oversee each other to ensure they both are fair. Having two firms will also provide diverse points of view in all aspects in the mapping process.
4/6/2021 10:16:49	April 6, 2021	Choice of applicants	Diane Boman	86303	myself	I am concerned that the new Executive Director is too partisan to be left with reviewing the applicants and choosing which ones are the best to be interviewed. I agree with Mr. Watchman that these decisions should not be passed on to a hired employee but to the commission board.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 10:18:22	April 6, 2021	selection of lawyer	Dianne Post	85006	Self	You absolutely cannot hire Statecraft. They are one of the firms that filed a nonsense case to attack the election (the green button case) and of course had absolutely no evidence to back it up. It was thrown out by the judge as it should have been. Snell and Wilmer was on that too. But Statecraft called his own business partner and failed to mention that to the judge. Statecraft has been censored by a judge before for such unlawful courtroom antics in an unpublished case: STATECRAFT PLLC, et al., Appellants, 1 v. TOWN OF SNOWFLAKE, Defendant/Appellee, COPPERSTATE FARMS LLC, Real Party in Interest/Appellee. No. 1 CA-CV 17-0691 ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE October 30, 2018. Bar charges were filed, dismissed, and are being considered again. One of the partners is an attorney for the Republican Party so has absolutely no claim to neutrality or objectivity. To select them would truly show your bias.
4/6/2021 10:21:44	April 6, 2021	Legal firm selection	Julie Pindzola	86301	individual	Given the overtly partisan leaning of the exec director selection, I believe it is tremendously important for the legal representation to be bipartisan. Private firms are more desirable than relying on the AZ Attorney General's office, which has partisan tones and history. Selecting IRC's law firms based on experience, quality and insight into the nuances of the process is critical. Using both a Republican and Democrat law firm, it will be important to use them both in a balanced way. Citizens are watching closely about how well we all are being represented in the IRC process. We want transparency and TRUST. Lastly, How does limiting the comments to today's agenda items really help influence the IRC's deliberation when viewers haven't seen all of the discussion yet? In general, the need for clear selection criteria and public scoring of candidates and issues needs to be a top priority. Thank you
4/6/2021 10:22:50	April 6, 2021	IRC LEGAL EXPERTISE	Joan McDermott	86403	Mohave County Democratic Central Committee - District 3	IRC LEGAL EXPERTISE The current political atmosphere would certainly indicate an urgent need to reassure the public that the process of redistricting is fair and transparent beyond reproach. Considering hiring only one law firm to provide the essential legal expertise the IRC requires would clearly not meet those criteria. That option would lead Arizona citizens on all sides to distrust the redistricting process from the early stages. Securing legal counsel from 2 firms, one Democrat and one Republican, as has been done in the past, would demonstrate that a balance is being established in the current very sensitive political atmosphere. It would also bring to bear more diverse perspectives as the process unfolds. Should legal controversy develop during the remapping process, having balanced representation would be even more vital to maintaining the public's perception that the IRC is scrupulously fair and balanced.
4/6/2021 10:26:53	April 6, 2021	V	linda chiles	85051		It would be nice to have Brian been seen and open his video. I always like to see the person who is speaking unless that person is not comfortable on video and that I can understand.
4/6/2021 10:31:55	April 6, 2021	Legal firm interviews	M. E. Dunn	86303		Excellent presentation by Osborn Maledon. I am a tax payer and constituent; hopefully that counts for something, and my vote goes for TWO firms and one of them should be this, OM. They are ready to hit the ground running. And, well spoken which is crucial when litigating. Hope you hear our voice and will read these comments before the follow up or call backs.
4/6/2021 10:32:52	April 6, 2021	Keep districting fair	Robert Crane	85929		We should have district boundaries that represent the people and not skewed in favor of one party/interest. The fate of our democracy rides on this fair and balanced redistricting.
4/6/2021 10:36:09	April 6, 2021	IX: Discussion and Possible Action on evaluating and scoring candidates for Outside Counsel as part of the Outside Counsel RFP/procurement process.	Constance Aglione	85614	self	I request that the Commission select two firms for legal counsel. It is important that the public can count on legal counsel that is fair, experienced, and bi-partisan. One of the firms currently under consideration, Snell and Wilmer has a history of working to defend a Conservative agenda and is a partisan firm. It would be wrong to select them as the sole counsel to the Commission. If Snell and Wilmer is chosen they should be considered a Republican firm and another, non-Republican firm should be chosen to work alongside them to form a balanced team.
4/6/2021 10:36:44	April 6, 2021	Access to the virtual meeting	Tina Whitley	85704	Self	I am unable to join the public meeting today. Did it stop after 10:00am? I would be great if information about attending the public meeting were more explicit. For example, the times the Commission goes into executive session should be posted. Go to tech help is necessary if one cannot join. Or a disclaimer - there is no public meeting today. As an interested member of the public, I expect to easy access to public meetings. Thank you for taking this into consideration for your next meeting.
4/6/2021 10:46:00	April 6, 2021	Discussion and possible action on securing Mapping Consultant support	Kenneth Downing	86404	Myself	The process of redistricting is supposed to be based on data, not politics. With all the divisions already in the County/State, it is important that two consultants, one Democrat and one Republican, be hired as has been the practice in the past. It is essential to regaining public trust. The people of this State will see that no one party is able to gerrymander the maps. Two different politically associated firms are a must.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 10:56:28	April 6, 2021	VIII, IX, X	Carolyn Blackmore	86404	myself	<p>Hello,</p> <p>Thank you for all for your hard work in this very important undertaking. Your redistricting results will influence Arizona's future for years to come. It is important that the citizens of Arizona can remain assured over that time that the redistricting was performed independently, fairly and ethically. There is no doubt in my mind there will be politically motivated scrutiny and, perhaps, Machiavellian efforts to undermine the redistricting results in the future.</p> <p>Your choice of legal councils needs to reflect this reality. I do not think you should rely on just one legal firm. More than one legal perspective on issues is important. My personal opinion is the most important criteria for identifying good legal council is the ethical character of the law firm and the assigned individuals and their legal acuity and experience in the applicable areas of law. But consideration of the political landscape we live in today makes it important that the political leanings of the two law firms hired need to be "different." This will ensure that political perspectives influencing legal advice can be seen and considered appropriately by the Commissioners. It will also, I hope help maintain public trust in the independent redistricting effort and the Commission.</p> <p>Again, thank you for your efforts and I wish you the best of luck and success in this endeavor.</p>
4/6/2021 11:09:04	April 6, 2021	public notification	Barbara Tellman	85705	self	<p>This meeting was not posted on the Arizona Public Meetings site which is where I found it last time. Also, how to comment is not obvious on your YouTube meeting site. Says "comments closed". I got this link from someone else</p>
4/6/2021 11:10:50	April 6, 2021	Public Comment: Hiring of Law Firms	Hope Busto-Keyes	85743	Self	<p>The Commission has the opportunity to select firms that have experience with the challenges of redistricting and Arizona law; can give legal advise with minimal or no partisan influence, and are committed to helping the Commission draw the best possible maps.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
4/6/2021 11:11:49	April 6, 2021	law firm choice	Barbara Tellman	85705	self	<p>Experience is far more important than political leanings. Two experienced law firms would probably serve multi-partisanship best. The first two interviews were very impressive.</p>
4/6/2021 11:26:51	April 6, 2021	Public Comments	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	<p>On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Arizona I was pleased to hear the commissioners' remarks on how you are folding comments from the public into your thinking and decisions. Hearing and considering public comments will be very important throughout the redistricting process. It also was gratifying to hear that an early responsibility for the Executive Director will be to arrange for additional time and opportunity for public comments. It will provide greater equity and more time for thoughtful input. Thank you for your continued work on behalf of all Arizonans.</p>
4/6/2021 11:39:36	April 6, 2021	law firm selection	julie pindzola	86301	myself	<p>I want to ask that you reject Statecraft PLLC from your law firm selection. My research shows this firm to a hyper partisan firm. It's relationship with deep pocketed KOCH BROTHERS and presidential campaigns should be cause this firm's disqualification. Arizona does NOT need this element inserted into our bipartisan redistricting project. Again, TRUST is paramount and this law firm does not offer inherent trust by at least half of the state.</p> <p>Thanks very much!</p>
4/6/2021 11:39:51	April 6, 2021	Hiring of legal counsel	Diane McQueen	86327	self	<p>I agree that it's extremely important that we (the commission and the public) have two law firms as counsel and that one firm represents the interests of the Democrat side and the other firm represents the interests of the Republican side. This is a partisan issue no matter how you look at it. You can't get away from it no matter how times we say "bi-partisan" and "Independent". The commission owes it to the public to be as neutral as possible. Frankly a lot of people in Arizona are still upset with the hiring of an Executive Director who has such close ties to the RNC and the AZGOP. The commission needs to work hard to balance this out and gain back some of the trust that was lost by this hiring.</p> <p>Given this, I recommend hiring Osborn Maledon (Democrat counsel) and either Snell & Wilmer or Ballard Spahr although I was more impressed with Ballard Spahr (Republican counsel). All three of these firms are reputable and for the most part middle-of-the-road and would definitely give the balance of having Democrat and Republican representation. I am strongly opposed to the hiring of Statecraft as their managing partner, Kory Langhofer, is the Koch attorney in Arizona. This is a way too over-the-top partisan law firm. Given the documented history of the Koch Enterprise spending millions of dollars to influence elections, the commission should not be hiring a law firm that has any connection at all to the Koch Enterprise when there are two very experienced and capable law firms who can represent the Republican side.</p>
4/6/2021 11:44:16	April 6, 2021	Interviews with law firms	Suzanne Mead	85331	myself	<p>I would suggest that when a law firm suggests that they have the "bandwidth" to handle anything that comes before the Commission, that they might want to make sure that their virtual data capabilities have enough actual bandwidth to handle visual as well as audio in an important virtual meeting. Snell Wilmer's presentation lacked both.</p>
4/6/2021 12:01:25	April 6, 2021	Legal firm interviews	María-Elena Dunn	86303		<p>Two strikes for Snell firm: That they brought a case against last IRC and LOST and now learning that their Senior Partner signed a very partisan controversial letter. If you now have information that makes this firm suspect, I hope that this time the Commission learns from the last mistake and selects a less tainted party.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 12:20:14	April 6, 2021	VIII.A. Discussion and Possible Action on options for securing legal counsel	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	<p>I understand that the question of 1 vs 2 law firms has not yet been resolved. Of the 3 I have heard so far, the 3rd one (Snell & Wilmer) was the one that most emphasized the single firm idea. However, I felt that this was a disingenuous presentation. While their firm does include lawyers with both party affiliations, their history on election-related law has been decidedly Republican, including in the recent flurry of post-election litigation. This history is not in and of itself disqualifying, since the precedent has been to include firms with partisan history, but in those cases two firms were chosen, in an attempt to achieve balance. Not presenting their redistricting (and other electoral) experience as being essentially exclusively on the Republican side of the partisan divide (as far as I know) was, again disingenuous, despite the statements from their Chair that were referred to.</p> <p>Here's a quote from Westlaw Today: "Snell & Wilmer, which has an election law practice, is separately serving as co-counsel in the Arizona Republican Party's long-running defense of a state law that prohibits absentee ballot collection by third parties and the counting of ballots cast at the wrong polling precinct." They similarly were paid significant funds by the National Republican Congressional Committee and the National Republican Senatorial Committee.</p> <p>Again, simply being on that side of things is not the issue: the issue is the use of platitudes about fairness without acknowledging the role they have played in this contentious period. Implicit bias is not confined to racial issues: it also applies for fundamental views on societal issues that inevitably come into play in legal actions. This firm should be viewed as a Republican candidate for the purposes of this commission, and not be seriously considered as a SINGLE law firm for the IRC. While I am concerned about their presentation, they could still qualify as one of two, if the other was one that was honest about their Democratic-leaning past electoral representation, as both of the first two firms were.</p>
4/6/2021 12:27:28	April 6, 2021	Selection of Commission Staff and Legal Counsel	Suzanne Mead	85331	myself	<p>It is apparently clear that at least one of the commissioners believes that he was chosen to represent one faction of the state. This is in direct conflict with the purpose of an independent commission and Chair Neuberg's oft-stated objectives of fairness, diversity and bi-partisanship. The Commission should hold to this ideal in the selection of additional support staff and more importantly, of legal representation.</p>
4/6/2021 12:31:27	April 6, 2021	Choosing Legal Counsel	Deborah Howard	85308	self	<p>Several comments -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Chairwoman Neuberg you are doing a great job keeping the public informed as you move through the agenda - thank you for keeping those of us watching in mind as the AIRC 2021 conducts its business. 2) Each firm interviewed today has made reference to "showing your work" and creating a contemporaneous record of your work and decision as a way to mitigate future litigation. Speaking for myself I wholeheartedly agree and this is the primary reason I am so insistent on transparency. 3) As part of keeping a record - once you have an IT staff person perhaps they could begin to create a searchable database for the testimony you will receive from your public hearing sessions. Legal firm and mapping firm should be able to assist as they almost certainly use a similar tool in litigation or previous redistricting efforts. 4) On the subject of one firm or two - Two. Two. Two. For the reasons Mary O'Grady said (roughly) .. I see the two firm structures as an acceptance of the sensitivity of redistricting.. It is non-partisan work and we could do it all --but realize some commissioners and members of the public would not like that... She's been here before. Trust her experience. 5) One firm you are interviewing defended SB 1070 and is currently involved in litigation to overturn Prop 208. This firm also anticipates continuing to represent partisan clients and PACs during redistricting. I hope you can see the concerns this would raise and will exclude this firm from your final deliberation. And absolutely under no circumstance could they be the one firm to represent the AIRC 2021. Doing so would have a chilling effect on outreach to minority communities. <p>Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>
4/6/2021 13:19:10	April 6, 2021	Law Firm Selection	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	<p>I encourage the Commission to hire a Republican law firm and a Democrat law firm that can work together. Each "side" needs to be represented to ensure a fair process that will hold up in court and win public trust.</p>
4/6/2021 13:30:06	April 6, 2021	Discussion and Possible Action on options for securing legal counsel	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>The commissioners have been asking about whether instead of hiring just one law firm it would be a better idea to hire two, ostensibly one to ensure the Democrats have good counsel and the other to provide the Republican perspective. While that might seem like a good idea, what about the third perspective -- that of independent voters? Shouldn't that viewpoint be brought into the decision making process as well? There are a great many Arizonans who are NOT Democrats and NOT Republicans, but they rarely find advocates among the politicians. The redistricting process is intended to be balanced and is structured (in a general way) so that neither of the major parties has the upper hand. But making sure those two forces negate each other is not the same as having the views of independents represented in the mix.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
4/6/2021 13:48:26	April 6, 2021	Legal firm interviewing	María-Elena Dunn	86303		Even the firms, w/ perhaps one exception, are saying that they feel the commission should engage two. So, that should not even be a big decision. And, it would be good to know why Vice Chair Watchman does not want to make that decision today. If there is an important consideration, it would be good to hear ... publicly. Thanks
4/6/2021 13:55:06	April 6, 2021	law firm selection	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself	<p>Hello</p> <p>Further research shows that Statecraft represented Arizona in its challenge to our 2020 electoral vote. Kory Langhofer led that charge only to have to scale back the charges, and eventually lost. He was also found to have brought a frivolous case against the Town of Snowflake.</p> <p>I did not observe that Snell and Wilmer was a Democratic firm. The speaker said they were bipartisan, so they should be considered for the Republican slot along with the Statecraft team. Statecraft should not become your Republican default.</p>
4/6/2021 14:10:49	April 6, 2021	selection of law firm	Susan Bickel	85718	self	I appreciate Commissioner Watchman's interest in receiving public comments prior to making a decision. Thank you for watching out for the public.
4/6/2021 14:16:17	April 6, 2021	IX. Discussion and Possible Action on options for securing legal counsel:	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	Just briefly: Since Snell & Wilmer is the only one of the firms that did not commit to avoiding having clients that might suggest a conflict of interest while working for the IRC, I would hope that you would do your best to press them to commit to this. Otherwise, the credibility will be reduced.
4/6/2021 14:29:35	April 6, 2021	XII. Discussion and Possible Action on Budget.	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	It should be just about the first order of business to do a rough budget within your commission, the Exec Dir, etc. \$3M sounds like a lot, but what if your estimate suggests that it could cost you \$4M? Now would be the time to contact the legislature, not after you get the bills you can't pay ...
4/6/2021 14:30:32	April 6, 2021	Budget	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	I am also interested in learning how the Commission's work is officially funded in the state budget. Prop 106 requires funding of the IRC, yes?
4/6/2021 14:31:24	April 6, 2021	Possible Actions on Budget	Maria-Elena Dunn	86303		Actually it's 3.6m. I found it quickly by googling - https://azgovernor.gov/sites/default/files/summary_book_with_addendum_2-1-21_0.pdf