

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
	Correction Meeting date should read 5/25/21 for all submissions below					
5/24/2021 9:09:04	May 18, 2021	Positions for the IRC	Jannah Scott	85004	Self	Where will positions for the IRC staff be posted?
5/25/2021 7:33:36	May 18, 2021	Redistricting mapping	Dieter Knecht	86336	Self	<p>I appreciate that your work on the commission to redistrict Arizona legislative districts is difficult and often not rewarding. It is even more difficult to demonstrate to the AZ voters that what you accomplish is independent, especially in the eyes of any non-Republican voters. In this purple state with two Democrat US Senators, only one-third of the voters are registered as Republican; two-thirds of the voters are registered as Independent or Democrat.</p> <p>The rejection of Haystaq as a qualified mapping contractor appears to have been made in response to a well-orchestrated emotional opposition by a select group of Republicans, with no evidence provided of any bias in Haystaq's work. In spite of Court decision evidence that previous work by the contractor, NDC/Timmons, was biased, the Commission still chose them as the mapping consultant.</p> <p>As a result, the "Independent" part of the IRC is becoming less obvious. In addition, the hiring of an under-qualified Republican operative as Executive Director supports this conclusion. Does it mean that the "Independent" part of IRC might refer to being independent only among one-third of the voters, i.e. different Republican factions that now exist here? Arizona Republicans are already undermining our democracy and embarrassing our state with their anti-voting rights legislation, conspiracy theories, and most prominently the sham "forensic audit" of the legitimate vote of over two million voters. It would be even more tragic if the work of the IRC falls into this trap.</p> <p>It would increase the confidence of many voters if the Commission published the criteria for the selection of the mapping contractor and how each of the three candidates met or did not meet the criteria.</p> <p>I will follow the Commission's future work in proposing voting district maps and urge that this is done with truly Independent maps for Arizona.</p>
5/25/2021 8:10:00	May 18, 2021	Brian Schmitt and 3 Additional FTEs	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	<p>I was surprised to hear Executive Director Schmitt report on May 18th, he is still in a "holding pattern" because he has not gotten the approval he needs to post job openings for a Community Outreach Coordinator, IT Officer and Deputy Director/Public Records Manager. The Commission approved those positions and Mr. Schmitt said a couple of weeks ago that the Commission has the funds in this fiscal year to pay for them. In that April 27th meeting, Schmitt did not make it clear to the public who he needs to petition for the three additional positions, but he gave the impression it was not a big deal and he would take care of it. Who is holding this up?</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/25/2021 8:36:46	May 18, 2021	Public input - May 25 mtg	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	NOTE I am commenting on May 25 although this form specifies the May 18 meeting. Thanks for continuing to provide these opportunities for public observation and comment. I urge you to move quickly to figure out how to share *all* the public comment you receive – including comments emailed to you or submitted through the “Contact Us” link – with the public, in the same way that you are sharing the public comments received during your meetings. In virtually any government process requiring public comment, making all of that input available as part of the public record is a key part of the requirement, so this is a natural addition to what you are already doing. And you don’t want to have to spend any staff or legal counsel time responding to lots of FOIA or public records requests. Please, establish this mechanism soon so that you can move on to other parts of your work AND so that Arizona’s residents can feel some comfort in your transparency around public opinion. I hear what Chair Neuberg just said about the emailed comments being a different type of communication with perhaps a different expectation of privacy. But – if this is a real distinction you want to maintain, then you will want to avoid repeating the step you took during the mapping consultant evaluations – when you actually encouraged the public to use the “Contact Us” link to provide input on the decision. You can’t use that link as an explicit way of gathering input and then expect to hinder or slow the ability of the public to see that input. So I’m afraid I don’t find the Chair’s distinction very compelling or reassuring.
5/25/2021 8:41:10	May 18, 2021	May 25 comment on public meetings and listening tours	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	NOTE I am commenting on May 25 although this form says May 18. A decade ago, the prior commission invested in substantial travel around the state to assure opportunity for public input (and at least from my perspective, this was important to the eventual success of their maps functioning well and surviving legal challenge). Of course technology has evolved greatly since then, and so has the public’s expectation of being able to observe and participate. I would request that you schedule a public discussion on an upcoming agenda (soon!) to share your plans for public meetings or hearings. Because I am a resident of one of the more rural counties (and the very largest county, in terms of physical size and distance), I am especially interested in how you are going to provide access to participation for rural residents of the state. What combination of in-person and virtual participation will commissioners have? What combination of in-person and virtual participation will you provide for residents of various counties and communities? How will you publicize these sessions and recruit participation? How will you capture and share the public input you receive? Since you can’t get into the substantive work yet (due to census data delays), now is an appropriate time to invest in preparing for public participation. I appreciate your having asked the Timmons Group presenters for their feedback on timing these hearings, and look forward to your planning on this.
5/25/2021 8:43:01	May 18, 2021	IX Mapping consultants presentation	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	The ability of the public to submit their maps to the Commission is a good thing. Training sessions for the public in how to create maps using the ESRI software will be essential. Thank you, Commissioner Lerner, for making this point.
5/25/2021 8:45:05	May 18, 2021	Mapping Presentation	M. E. Dunn	86303	Myself, an AZ tax payer	Will the links to all of these "user" participation software, training videos, etc, be found as links in the IRC website?
5/25/2021 8:45:58	May 18, 2021	Transparency and Executive Sessions	Hope Busto-Keyes	85743	Self	This comment is for May 25, 2021. This form only allows for May 18, 2021. I am concerned about the extensive use of executive sessions because it tends to undermine the confidence of the public in the commission’s decision-making regarding the redistricting process. I urge the commission to strictly adhere to the open meeting law’s requirements.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/25/2021 8:57:18	May 18, 2021	Mapping firm presentation	David Dunn	86303	myself	Will the planning get-together between Commission, Timmons/NDC, lawyers happen at a regularly scheduled IRC mtg date/time and, if so, in PUBLIC? It would seem that this is something that needs to happen ASAP as it will guide the public outreach/informational visits to areas of communities of interest.
5/25/2021 9:07:15	May 18, 2021	IV - ED's Report	María-Elena Dunn	86303	Myself, a taxpayer	Again, this report should be presented on a shared screen. His seemingly casual approach to budget is concerning. Fiduciary stewardship should be his principal concern and yet, so far, any budget presentation is oral and very indeterminate with regard to real numbers. So, a budget request has been submitted to the legislature for next fiscal year yet that is not shown to the public and maybe not even the Commissioners? And, again, there is a current budget in place which should be covering the hires that are, we are told, on hold. Never been told clearly as to why the current budget is not enough to get that started. Very worried about this seemingly lackadaisical attitude towards tax payers' money. And, now, excellent request by Vice Chair Watchman!!!! It should not be something that Commissioners have to point out and request from an ExDir. This should be something that it's in front of them every step of the way...never mind available to the public. Very disturbing.
5/25/2021 9:09:23	May 18, 2021	"Contact Us" Link	Sharon Edgar	86004	self	Chair Neuberg said that the "Contact Us" link provides a more private communication channel with the Commission and she said that those comments are part of the public record. Since we can and will submit public records requests to see those comments, why not display them on the website, like the comments that are submitted during meetings? Why not have them all available in a searchable data base? The public was told that the "Contact Us" comments are batched daily and emailed to the Commissioners. Wouldn't it be for the Commissioners to look in once place?
5/25/2021 9:20:15	May 18, 2021	IX. Presentation from Mapping Consultant, Timmons.	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	<p>First off: this form is only allowing May 18 as the meeting date, but it should have been changed to May 25.</p> <p>Secondly, my comment re the May 25 meeting is that the mapping commission response to the question re their responding to public comments more or less equated to ignoring them. I understand that it is reasonable to have some filter between the range of public comments and the work of paid consultants of the commission. That being said, the public in general simply does not have the expertise of a group like NDC; so this puts the public input at a great disadvantage. My suggestion is that the Commission take seriously any input from the public that is well-formed, and then relay a representative sample to the paid consultants so that they, the experienced group, can do the implementation of alternate maps. Otherwise it will be very difficult for anyone else to offer competitive maps.</p> <p>Given the widespread perception among the half of the public that are both paying attention and who were unhappy with the consultant choice, it is important that something like this be implemented so that the IRC is truly seen as being committed to generating fair maps that were built with full attention paid to the public response.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/25/2021 9:24:11	May 18, 2021	ED Report	David Dunn	86303	A concerned citizen	Not to belabor "I told you so." It is very obvious that ExD BrianS is not up to the task. Pitiful that the commissioners have to call him out on how to do his job. Well, other than the Chair who always seems to have an excuse for his lack of preparation. To me, a concerned and involved member of the public AND a taxpayer, it brings up a question which we should have raised as ED candidates were being considered. Is BS undergoing a Probationary Period? Any new hire in any organization is placed under such, and is given goals to meet in order to be engaged permanently. Is he? Because from an outsiders perspective, he is definitely not meeting expectations and it is costing you time. Given the Chair's frequently stated urgency in moving the process along, this lack of preparation of the ED is extremely detrimental to the timely and efficient progress of the Commission. Hiring more people is NOT the answer. It is MY money and I have serious objection to having to prop him up because of his inability to do his job. What is being done to demand better?
5/25/2021 9:38:02	May 18, 2021	XI Outreach	ME Dunn	86303	myself	Vice Chair's recommendation on a informational presentation for the general public is excellent. And, many of us, the Public Commenters, have frequently pointed out the fact that many communities have limited access, if at all, to internet, thus the outreach process has to take that into account seriously. And, his comment re many only using phones rather than computers has to be factored in when doing such planning.
5/25/2021 9:41:14	May 18, 2021	Public comments	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself	The public comment form message date preload is wrong. This comment is for 5/25 not 5/18 as prefilled. I want to say that I am disappointed in your decision to not post all your received comments. Citizens will have to individually request records which seems to be more work than a routine of regularly posting this info for all to see. The IRC may like the "privacy" but the public deserves to see what it is that is going in to your thinking process.
5/25/2021 9:42:00	May 18, 2021	XI Outreach	María-Elena Dunn	86303	The people in the non large "Markets"	Did I really just hear right from Com York? Only the large MARKETS are worthy of listening tour trips? Those of us in the rural areas or in smaller communities of interest are not relevant - chump change? Very concerned.
5/25/2021 9:43:56	May 18, 2021	Listening Tours	Diane McQueen	86327	self	Re: Commissioner York's comment: Listening tours should not just be limited to the biggest growth counties. Every County in this state is going to be affected by redistricting and the size and growth rate should make rural counties no less important that the more populated and faster growing counties. Please do not leave those of us in other areas out of the picture because we are not "fast growing".
5/25/2021 9:48:45	May 18, 2021	Mapping Consultant presentation	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself	Glad to see that the mapping project is using ESRI, the GIS industry leader. Looking forward to the tutorial opportunities. Keep the active Legislators out of a formal public comment forum. It seems this elevates them to an inappropriate level in this Independent process.
5/25/2021 9:52:14	May 18, 2021	public comment	Misty Atkins	85737	self	I am commenting on May 25, not May 18 as this form states. I would like to ask the Commission to make all comments from the public available during the meeting, including the comments made in between meetings through the "contact" page on the AIRC website. The ability to participate through public comment continues to be inadequate and shouldn't feel like a hurdle. Thank you.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
5/25/2021 9:55:15	May 18, 2021	Listening Tours	Diane McQueen	86327	self	Regarding Chairperson Neuberg's comments about reaching out to other people and groups: The Commission should do this such as reaching out to Board of Supervisors, City and Town Councils, Tribal governments, Social Justice organizations that could be affected by redistricting, Latino groups, Asian Groups, NAACP, etc. I do not think it's good to reach out to Legislators as this is too partisan. And if reaching out to Democratic and Republican officials you have to also specifically reach out to Independents as they are a 1/3 of the active registered voters. The Commission should be reaching out to all "Communities of Interest" but non-legislative groups should be reached out to first.
5/25/2021 9:56:19	May 18, 2021	public meetings	Misty Atkins	85737	self	While you are planning the process of public presentations, it would be transparent to make available each commissioner's speaking schedule and to whom they are speaking.
5/25/2021 9:59:36	May 18, 2021	XI	D Dunn	86303	Myself	I would tread very LIGHTLY on this issue of inviting the legislators from both parties (what about the independents?) to "participate" in the process before you have anything for them to react to (which is what is really required by the AZ constitution). introducing what can be seen by the public, reasonably, as further partisan participation in the process should be really studied carefully. Despite what seems to be a visceral reaction by some commissioners to learn, positively, from what happened in 2011, have any of the commissioners looked into what earlier commissions did Re this issue? No need to reinvent the wheel each time...learn, adjust, adapt, move forward.
5/25/2021 10:00:53	May 18, 2021	This is about May 25. Comments to bring legislators	Nancy Meister	85364	Self	Need to bring in cities, towns, counties, tribes - all
5/25/2021 10:02:25	May 18, 2021	8	Maria Lynam	86301	Self	Re agenda item 8 on 5/25. If you have open listening tours, invite everyone. I do not think it is appropriate to invite the legislative leaders to attend a session.
5/25/2021 10:05:52	May 18, 2021	COI	Cynthia Cook-Keller	85745	self	The COI issue is critical in Arizona where we have multiple cultural/ethnic communities that are traditionally and consistently either omitted or under-represented in all public matters. I urge the IRC to take this matter seriously and to allow adequate time to hear from, at the very least, leaders/representatives in all of Arizona's diverse communities.
5/25/2021 10:10:40	May 18, 2021	On Public Hearings	Janell Hunt	85143	Myself as an Arizona citizen, voter, taxpayrr	Commissioners: You have been given the task of preparing the Arizona INDEPENDENT Redistricting Plan for the next decade. While it may be considered a gesture to offer elected officials from the Arizona Legislature an opportunity to testify before you, I must remind you that they will be there for political, partisan purposes...a role that was taken from them and given to you. If they, as Arizona citizens, choose to take part and provide public testimony along with others in their communities, that is certainly appropriate and welcomed. I would look forward to seeing them in their respective neighborhoods as you provide statewide public hearings. Thank you for your consideration, and best wishes in this important work on our behalf. Janell Hunt, San Tan Valley