

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/18/2021 8:17:14	May 18, 2021	Public Accessibility	Deborah Howard	85308	Self	It is 8:14 and the meeting broadcast over YouTube has just gotten sound. It is a big problem that this basic access is problematic... You have all the resource you need to operate a professional operation. You have the resources of the state behind you, your own staff and professional consultants. This isn't amateur hour. Mistakes happen - basic meeting management shouldn't be one of them.
5/18/2021 8:18:58	May 18, 2021	no audio from beginning of meeting	linda chiles	85051	public	there was no audio from the beginning of the meeting
5/18/2021 8:29:19	May 18, 2021	executive sessions	linda chiles	85051	the public	It would be beneficial to the public to hear the information being provided by the legal team...not its advice but rather educating you as to the process. The public could use that education, too. I feel that you have the ability to distinguish the difference so perhaps you could determine the difference between education and advice in advance of the meeting.
5/18/2021 8:30:46	May 18, 2021	Public comment	Mary-Jeanne Fincher	85253	self	When will the public see the responses from the three mapping consultants to public comments received prior to the Commission's decision? The Chair indicated that at least one of the consultants submitted such responses to supplement its bid.
5/18/2021 8:50:11	May 18, 2021	General; no specific item	Rivko Knox	85053	Myself.	I am a very long time resident of & voter in AZ, who was actively involved in the 2011 IRC process. I appreciated Commissioner Lerner's comments this morning acknowledging public comments re Executive Sessions...followed by the IRC going into an Ex. Session. I urge the IRC/Staff to 'explain' the necessity for such (vs. just citing an ARS!!) so I, as an average citizen/non attorney, can understand the rationale for such. I also continue to urge you to: 1) open public comments AT ANY TIME vs. just during meetings; 2) ensure total transparency re: public comments, communication between IRC members/staff/legal counsel (with legal exceptions...EXPLAINED), input re public meetings/ methods to allow for such outside public meetings, outreach re accessibility (who is contacted regarding such, who provides guidance); 3) as allowed for by the law, the rationale behind each hire and the list of those interviewed/applicants. Thank you all for serving in this very critical Commission.
5/18/2021 8:56:22	May 18, 2021		4 Janell Hunt	85143	Myself as an Arizona citizen and voter	Commissioners: I want to commend each of you for reading the comments that come from us; we are watching with interest as you deliberate in your weekly meetings. It was heartening to hear from Chair Neuberger this morning that she is engaged and looking forward to learning more about the people in our state and the communities of interest we feel important to this Redistricting process. Some of us, you realize, will be here throughout, but others do not have that capability, so we do encourage you to expand capacity for public comment however you and your staff can manage, online and in person as pandemic limitations shift. While it may seem early, even targeting potential dates for public hearings in various areas of Arizona now would give us citizens the opportunity to prepare to present to you the ideas we feel relevant. Thank you again for taking on this responsibility, and continued best wishes as you work together for a successful plan for the next decade. Janell Hunt, San Tan Valley/ Pinal County
5/18/2021 9:03:37	May 18, 2021	Public comments and Transparency	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself as an AZ voter	As the Chairmanship and IRC are becoming perceived as biased toward the loudest and most vociferous voices, it is time for the "Contact Us" comments to be posted along with the meeting dates "Public Comments". It is not a transparent process when most of your weekly public comments are not routinely posted for the general public to observe. The level of conversation among commissioners is minimal during the open sessions. We see very little of what is influencing your actions. Thank you to the staff for now getting the meeting minutes posted.
5/18/2021 9:12:49	May 18, 2021	Excess executive sessions	Erica Neuberger	85284	Myself	The frequent executive sessions are impeding the public's right to know what is occurring with the AIRC. This is not acceptable for transparency, and hurts the credibility of the Commission as well as reducing trust in the impartiality of the Commission.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/18/2021 9:16:16	May 18, 2021		8 Janell Hunt	85143	Myself as an Arizona citizen/voter	Commissioners: There is a lot of concern about the Census figures for Arizona, especially in a developing area such as where I live. While several reasons could account for compromised data, can we really afford to trust these numbers when it can mean loss of revenue and potentially political representation for our state? I urge you to take whatever legal steps you can on our behalf to better understand how a rapidly growing state like ours is not reflected as such in our Census figures. Thank you. Janell Hunt, San Tan Valley/Pinal County
5/18/2021 9:20:57	May 18, 2021	IV. Discussion on Public Comments received prior to today's (May 18, 2021) meeting.	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	I appreciated Commissioner Lerner's comments. But I would further strongly encourage that the Commissioners push back on going into Executive Session. Yes, I understand that in many cases it is required. But lawyers will often recommend the strictest requirements and this perspective must be balanced by a sense of what is important for the public. To be clear, I am not proposing that any action with strong legal prohibitions be taken; but in my experience, attorneys can be reasoned with, and ultimately choices can be made that take account of both considerations.
5/18/2021 9:30:40	May 18, 2021	General	Diane Boman	86303	Myself	I am concerned about the level of knowledge of the commission and wondered if this commission was given an outline of duties for the process by previous Commissions. I know there have been comments by at least one previous commissioner offering his past experiences. I think it would be help to the commission to take advantage of this wealth of knowledge rather than slugging through this. It would also be helpful if there is no blueprint from a previous commission; that this commission create one. No one should have to recreate the wheel every 10 years. Hopefully this document would provide a timeline of hires and activities and a list of activities that should be accomplished prior to receiving the census data.
5/18/2021 9:35:33	May 18, 2021	Agenda	Nancy Meister	85364	Self	The meeting was listed as starting at 9am. Please correct your site to reflect the correct start time of meetings. Continuous Executive Sessions and now incorrect listing of the meeting start time. This does not seem to invite public participation.
5/18/2021 9:37:39	May 18, 2021	Public presentations and us of Executive Sessions	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself as an AZ voter	We need for the IRC to use a FAIR and BALANCED decision making process. With the heavy use of Executive Sessions, we have almost no window into that process. As you move into more staff hires, please consider seriously hiring the most experienced choices. The trend of selecting the lesser experienced applicants is a questionable practice and is self defeating in terms of building trust. That practice alone raises questions of politics. Last, please refrain from using acronyms in your public meetings. They are not familiar to those of us who do not work for state government. Thank you for all your efforts!
5/18/2021 9:40:05	May 18, 2021	executive session	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	I don't understand why "trainings" need to be in executive sessions. For example, a presentation on the Open Meeting Law would benefit the public as well as the Commission. If the public had such a training, we would better understand why the Commission convenes in executive session. Perhaps the training can be in public session, but then legal questions from the Commissioners can be in executive session.
5/18/2021 9:42:03	May 18, 2021	general question	Diane McQueen	86327	self	Please have the people talking who are not commissioners say their name before they start talking. The public has no idea who these people are. It's very, very frustrating.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/18/2021 9:42:06	May 18, 2021	Use of Executive Sessions	Jay Simpson	85016	Myself	Hopefully all of the members of the IRC share the goal of creating fair districts that both respect communities of interest and honor the goal of having competitive elections. To achieve these important goals, the IRC needs to win over public confidence in its process. Public confidence in the IRC's work product will only come if the IRC is completely transparent in how it goes about its work and communications. While the state's open meeting law allows the IRC to go into executive session to receive legal advice from its counsel, this is not required. As the Chair has acknowledged, at this stage the work is foundational to the work which will follow. There is no litigation pending against the IRC that would require confidential communication with counsel. Any legal advice provided to the IRC that relates to these foundational matters and it should be given in public sessions. That way the public can also be confident that the commission is receiving legal advice that is well founded and non-partisan. Moreover, the Arizona Supreme Court has held that the use of executive sessions to receive legal advice cannot be used to conceal discussions that are policy related. City of Prescott vs. Town of Chino Valley, 803 P. 2d 891 (Ariz. 1990) ("However, once members of the public body commence any discussion regarding the merits of enacting the legislation or what action to take based upon the attorney's advice, the discussion moves beyond the realm of legal advice and must be open to the public.") Frankly, I find it very difficult to believe that an executive session that takes up most of a day was limited to the mere rendering of legal advice as opposed to a discussion of the merits of policy and the discussion of the foundational matters that were under consideration by the IRC. Such discussions are required to be had in public and the IRC should want them to be public.
5/18/2021 9:43:39	May 18, 2021	VII	Maria-Elena Dunn	86303		This is fascinating....a discussion on guidance regarding PUBLIC records done in EXECUTIVE session - a long one at that. And, while on the subject - we have yet to hear how the commission is going to have a clear way forward on how to make the PUBLIC comments sent via Contact Us part of the public record and available, simply, on the website not as a records request by individuals.
5/18/2021 9:45:16	May 18, 2021	Meeting start time	Nancy Meister	85364	Self	Here is the meeting listing:Commission Meeting Tuesday, May 18, 2021 - 09:00 Commission Meeting Next week is also listed as starting at 9am. Please list the correct time.
5/18/2021 9:46:36	May 18, 2021	VIII	M A Larkin	85016	Myself	In terms of learning more about the communities of interest, I would be interested in hearing more from University resources - Morrison Institute, Center for Population Dynamics at ASU or other academic presentations from demographers, historians, political scientists at ASU, UA or NAU.
5/18/2021 9:46:41	May 18, 2021	V.1. IT	Norma Bliven	86301	Self	Curious about the choice to move from Google Docs to Microsoft Word. There are so many pros for Google Docs as far as collaboration (can be read from iOS and Android devices) and backup to Google Cloud. The backup to Google Cloud would be invaluable to retrieve any/all data for legal purposes. Also Google Docs is "free". Using Microsoft Word requires purchasing the entire Microsoft Office Suite. It seems like a poor and expensive decision. See this article: https://www.goskills.com/Microsoft-Office/Resources/Google-Docs-Microsoft-Word-comparison

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/18/2021 9:49:01	May 18, 2021	Map criteria and future agendas	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	<p>The Arizona Constitution Art. 4, Pt. 2, Sec. 1(14)(A)-(F) outlines 6 criteria the AIRC is to use in creating congressional and legislative districts. Comments by some IRC Commissioners seemed to imply that the criteria are listed in a hierarchy of importance and that the requirement to favor competitive districts is of lesser consequence. In fact, in Arizona Minority Coalition v. Arizona Independent Redistricting Coalition, the Arizona Supreme Court ruled that all six criteria must be applied in determining the final maps. One is not lesser than the other. The first two criteria, complying with the Voting Rights Act and equal population, are federal requirements that must be met. The other four—compactness and contiguity; communities of interest; use of visible geographic features, city, town and county boundaries; and competitiveness—are of equal weight and importance.</p> <p>The intent of Prop 106, which was approved by a significant majority of Arizona voters to create the AIRC, was clearly stated in its official title. It was an initiative measure to create an independent commission "... to oversee the mapping of fair and competitive congressional and legislative districts." The intent could not have been clearer.</p> <p>Given some apparent misperceptions about the criteria among the commissioners as well as likely among the public, the League of Women Voters strongly suggests that time be allotted on a future AIRC agenda to thoroughly discuss the criteria. That discussion should include a presentation about the legal history by counsel to reach a common understanding and agreement about the criteria and how they must be applied. This presentation should be in PUBLIC session so that others may also learn.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>
5/18/2021 9:49:08	May 18, 2021	All - Being ready for the task of redistricting.	Tina Whitley	85704	Myself	<p>This is my third AIRC meeting. Again, it feels like the Commission has not progressed beyond the questions: What is our job? and How do we do it? The Commission has two prior commissions' and commissioners' work available as guidelines. Have you taken advantage of that? Have you spoken to former Commissioners who can advise about what worked and what did not? Has a strategic plan been made on how to move forward on a task that is of key importance to Arizonans? My observations: The Commission has hired an inexperienced partisan mapping consultant company. The Commission has hired an inexperienced director who appears to need guidance about what he needs to do. This is a state run commission that has access to state resources, which should provide reliable technology for Zoom meetings, and staffing for research, and information gathering. I wish that the AIRC meetings would be informing the public about the purpose and importance of redistricting in Arizona, instead of the public informing the Commission about this daunting job. Finally, please make public comments to a part of public record, instead making them only "subject to public record". (See above) I learn a lot from my fellow Arizonans' perspective, and it is a transparent way to know what the Commission is hearing. Thank you for your time, and volunteering for this important work.</p>