

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 8:11:58	July 13, 2021	data gathering from the public	Misty Atkins	85737	self	Thank you for your attention to public meetings protocol. With all the information coming in, I'm wondering how you plan to organize and attend to public comments and other information and will it be available in an organized format for the public? Thanks so much for your work and especially to Commissioner Lerner for her ability to troubleshoot and clarify this entire process.
7/13/2021 8:12:44	July 13, 2021	Fair and balanced mapping.	Debbie Logan	85614	Self	I want to again reiterate how important that the mapping be done in a fair and equitable manner as well as remaining bipartisan as this is what the voters want.
7/13/2021 8:15:36	July 13, 2021	Public Comments	Beth Bremer	85224	Myself	Comments from the public are the most important piece of information you can get to inform your work on redistricting and you should do everything possible to enable getting the public's input and highly valuing it. I strongly encourage you to create a method to accept public comments about the districting goals without restriction. Limiting public comment times to during your meetings, which are often during business hours when most people are not available, is an unnecessary barrier to allowing the public, your most important stakeholder, to having their voices heard. Please also host some public listening sessions that are truly virtual and specifically meant for people who can't attend the other sessions in person. Thank you.
7/13/2021 8:29:13	July 13, 2021	VIII	Andrea Varela	85122	Self	While I want to thank the Commission for releasing the Listening Tour Schedule two weeks in advance-which was the target date they set for themselves-I also want to emphasize that no information has been released related to guidance on how to testify and best practices which was also said to be information that would delivered. I insist that the Commission include procedures on how the public can deliver testimony. I ask that the IRC release a clear format for the hearings, including speaking procedures and best practices on how the public can deliver testimony. We need to know how to participate so we can be prepared to properly advocate for our communities of interest. We also need the ability to participate in the easiest and most effective way possible. I have heard no talk of inclusion in terms of language services. Translation/Interpretation are such important services and they should most definitely be offered, especially in a state as diverse as ours. The Commission would be leaving out huge groups of people who need these services to be able to participate and advocate for their communities of interest. This would discourage many and provide for lopsided input that doesn't take into consideration language minority groups. I hope the Commission considers these things as they move forward.
7/13/2021 8:37:24	July 13, 2021	Insuring an open meeting	Brian Templet	85715	Myself	Care should be taken at all meetings to insure language accessibility, Sensible COVID precautions, and prohibiting any carrying of firearms. The safety of all participants is paramount.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 8:43:34	July 13, 2021	Redistricting	Janet Mohr	85331	Cave Creek Precinct	When the last redistricting took place, all we heard was that we were "rural" and that was why they grouped us with Yavapai County. Our community is being represented by representatives located not only 80 miles away, the 80 miles are not even developed and occupied land. They may as well be in a different state. It is not fair for us or our representatives to be such a distance. The maps were drawn so poorly last time that there are a group of about 600 voters that should be in the Cave Creek precinct but instead were made their own precinct and have Rep Gosar as their Representative, even though they have a Cave Creek mailing address. There are other precincts like that along the Tonto National Forest. I don't drive 80 miles to shop in Prescott. I do all my business in the Cave Creek, Scottsdale area. We should not be grouped into a county that is so far north with people that we never see. We want to stay united. There is a clear line dividing us. It is a large path of land that is Tonto National Forest/State land and Preservation land. It is obvious we should stay along side the developed area that we work, live, shop, and enjoy our lives in. It is so confusing for so many voters also. It makes it very hard for them to stay engaged in the community and government. Thank you for your time. Janet Mohr
7/13/2021 8:48:28	July 13, 2021	Executive session	Margaret McConnell	85016	Self	<p>I would like to offer a comment related to transparency. My concern focuses on the IRC's frequent use of lengthy executive sessions based on the statutory exemption from Arizona's Open Meeting Law for a public body to receive legal advice. The statutory exemption for obtaining legal advice is a narrow one, only allowing the public body to ask questions of its lawyer and receive responses. It does not permit the public body to engage in robust discussions with each other. As stated in the Arizona Agency Handbook published by the Arizona Attorney General's Office (<a href="https://www.azag.gov/outreach/publications/agency-handbook">https://www.azag.gov/outreach/publications/agency-handbook</a>):</p> <p>7.9.5.3 . . . . Once the public body obtains the legal advice, the public body must go back into public session unless another executive session provision applies and has been identified in the notice and motion for executive session. . . . Discussion between the members of the public body about what action should be taken is beyond the realm of legal advice, and such discussions must be held in public session. [Emphasis supplied]</p> <p>The important work of and high public interest in the IRC's work demands that the IRC conduct its work in the public eye as much as possible. Lengthy executive sessions based on the legal advice exception raise the specter that the IRC has gone beyond the parameters of what is legally allowed.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 9:05:23	July 13, 2021	V. Pro/Con Presentations on Differential Privacy	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Several points about the presentation by Thomas Bryan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The fact that data users who want to get detailed information about people can get that kind of information from consumer data analytics firms is NOT a reason for the US Census Bureau to fail in its obligation to protect the personal information they collect. It should be obvious that the consumer data firms are also consumers of Census Bureau data, which forms much of the foundation for the work they do.</li> <li>2. Data users who are trying to find out who the individuals/families are within a census block do not try to reconstruct that information based on just the records published by the Census Bureau. That would be difficult or impossible. Instead, they merge it with data from other sources (publicly and privately gathered, trustworthy or not) to hone in on the specific household they're looking for. That's the real problem. Once they have that kind of data, the possibilities for abuse become significant.</li> <li>3. Thomas is correct that trying to get information about an individual person by using the Census Data in conjunction with data from other sources will likely produce some records that are correct as well as many that are incorrect. Most of the data users who do this couldn't care less about the incorrect records. They're just trying to target the ones that are correct, most often because they want to sell them something. They just want to narrow the field of all addresses down to those that are potential customers. They'll send their advertising brochures to all the records they find - correct and incorrect - and so what if some recipients will not become customers. At least they saved on their postage by not having to send to _everybody_ in their market area. Of course advertisers are not the only users who would do this. There are other actors who have more nefarious intentions for using this kind of data. And they don't care about the incorrect records either.</li> <li>4. Thomas misstates that the choice of the epsilon value would be made by 'some statistician sitting somewhere in the Bureau'. It was a carefully considered decision that involved numerous mathematicians and statisticians and others and had to clear several committees and review panels before it was finalized. This kind of rigorous process ensures that we, as citizens, are best served by the Bureau and that the decision was made to be consistent with the legal obligations and mission of the Bureau.</li> <li>5. Thomas did not mention that Differential Privacy data will not be applied to the core redistricting data, that used for determining the apportionment of representatives and legislators and for drawing the basic maps. It will only be applied to the demographic and employment data. That point significantly undercuts his objections to the use of Differential Privacy.</li> </ol> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
7/13/2021 9:22:30	July 13, 2021	Public listening sessions for IRC	Elaine Downing	86404	self	<p>Please provide more details about the public hearings scheduled for Mohave County. Specifically I am concerned about the processes for testimony; COVID safety protocols that will be implemented and hopefully enforced; safety concerns at the in-person and satellite locations regarding the carrying of firearms, concealed or otherwise, or other weapons; safety inside and outside of the facility; and the protocols for keeping the discussions civil. No one should be bullied or feel threatened when they are voicing their concerns. After reading the transcripts from 2011, I am deeply concerned about it. Things are much worse between the parties now. Thank you.</p>

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 9:39:32	July 13, 2021	V. Pro/Con Presentations on Differential Privacy	Nelson Morgan	85054	Self	I found the presentations about differential privacy very interesting. But I don't quite understand the amount of time given to this topic, given that whatever the census bureau produces will be what you and the mapping consultants will be using. There is a lot to be discussed about the details of the upcoming hearings, which seems to be much more relevant in this moment.
7/13/2021 10:00:57	July 13, 2021	VIII	Aris Correa	85194	myself	Hello IRC. I just wanted to give some basic suggestions for the upcoming public testimony events. I just would like to emphasize the importance of having clear procedures for how public testimony is to be given. If there is a clear format, then people will know how to participate and people will know how to prepare to give clear and understandable testimony. I would like to also advocate for these hearings to have translation and interpretation services provided which will help ensure more participation. Thank you.
7/13/2021 10:02:43	July 13, 2021	Differential privacy presentations	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	Thank you for arranging these presentations on differential privacy - extremely informative and helpful. I have some background in statistics and was hoping to receive more background information; these presentations did the job. I do find the analysis on the accuracy of district-level data very persuasive. I understand that census block level data will be somewhat inaccurate; but I was reassured overall about the quality of the data from the Census for your redistricting process. Given the requirement in the state Constitution, and given this reassuring presentation, I'd personally encourage you to make plans to go ahead and rely on the Census data (including the differential privacy outcomes) for your assessments, rather than expending lots of time/effort/funding on alternatives.

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 10:12:57	July 13, 2021	V. Pro/Con Presentations on Differential Privacy	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Several points about the presentation of Moon Duchin:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Thanks for pointing out that reconstruction is just the first step (and easier to accomplish than has been suggested by others) for people who want to use the data for their own purposes (whether benign or malicious).</li> <li>2. Thanks for using examples that draw on Arizona data and communities. These are the kinds of issues that the commission will have to face, so it's great that you demonstrate that the Census Data will be trustworthy for the mission of the commission (and the benefit of all Arizonans).</li> <li>3. The discussion of ensuring population data will be accurate was interesting. I hope that the commissioners and public were able to follow it. It was very convincing to someone like me who did.</li> <li>4. Thanks for providing practical suggestions for how the commission can use your conclusions to proceed with its tasks (e.g., drawing districts first from the top data and fine-tuning them using the bottom level data).</li> </ol> <p>The Q&amp;A was informative and helped compare the points of agreement and the few areas of disagreement. It seems that there is every reason to trust the data that comes from the Census Bureau when drawing districts and other boundaries for lower level geographies as well.</p> <p>It was also a good to hear it acknowledged that the ACS data is supplemental data and not primary data because it is based on a survey rather than the census itself and therefore inherently incomplete. It's a bit disappointing to hear Thomas Bryan talk about using data from other sources (including the ACS) to help with the process of drawing boundaries. That's not a good idea, since the commission won't know the methodology and assumptions that go into the collection and aggregation of that data, not to mention that those criteria may be in conflict with each other or with the decennial data from the Census Bureau).</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>
7/13/2021 10:13:34	July 13, 2021	Public listening sessions	Laura Huenneke	86004	self	<p>I hope you will soon be able to tell prospective attendees much more about specific formats and conditions for your public listening sessions. Specifically, up here in Coconino County, we remain very sensitive to risks of COVID-19 transmission - given highly variable vaccination status, attitudes toward mask-wearing, prevalence of tourists from other areas and nations, etc. (And we also have tribal government ability to set local requirements.) Another issue is travel distance for people - thus they really need to know ahead of time how to plan for making comments, how they might provide input via phone or Zoom rather than in person, what length of comment they might be able to make, what opportunities will be available in the satellite sites, etc. In sum - it will be really helpful to learn as much as possible ahead of time about what attendees will need to know in order to participate fully in the listening session.</p>
7/13/2021 10:17:48	July 13, 2021	Differential Privacy presentation	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself	<p>VERY INTERESTING, thank you! My brain has been fed this morning. I think the open source Representable map drawing software uses Block Groups for drafting Communities of Interest. Will have to double check.</p>



Public Meeting Comments 7.13.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 10:31:16	July 13, 2021	Re:Public Hearings	Janell Hunt	85143	Myself, as an AZ Citizen	Commissioners; Thank you for your decision to change the Public Hearing sites for Pinal County. While I had prepared to attend at the first tentative hearing places, the new locations in Florence, Maricopa, and Superior will be much more accessible and conducive to Pinal County residents to attend. We are still awaiting more details regarding the number of people you might suggest to appear and how we might register, as well as the formal and length of statements we might provide. Thank you again for your willingness to take on this important role for our state, and I wish you well as you travel and meet with Arizonans. Stay safe and hydrated in our July weather. Janell Hunt, San Tan Valley
7/13/2021 10:32:44	July 13, 2021	V. Pro/Con Presentations on Differential Privacy	Betty Bengtson	85718	League of Women Voters of Arizona	Thank you to the Commission for arranging these presentations about differential privacy which appear to have given a balanced view of the issue. They were very informative. It is essential for the Commissioners to understanding the data and to fully explore and make public how they will be used by your consultants to produce draft maps. This will build public confidence in your work and in the final maps. The presentations also will inform questions that members of the public have and increase their understanding of the process.
7/13/2021 10:36:47	July 13, 2021	Listening Tour meeting in Prescott, AZ	Julie Pindzola	86301	myself	<p>I just spoke to Yavapai College facilities and they inform that the IRC Listening Tour public hearing on Tuesday July 27 will be held in the Community Room Building 19 Room 147. The seating capacity is about 150. The meeting is scheduled from 5-7pm.</p> <p>No social distancing seating arrangement is planned. Wear a mask if you are concerned or not yet vaccinated. No overflow space identified.</p> <p>Thanks</p>
7/13/2021 10:42:29	July 13, 2021	VI	Rita Day	86301	Myself	After the break,the YouTube connection didn't include the remainder of the IRC meeting. How do I view the reminder of the meeting? When I connect with the link, there is nothing after the break after agenda itemV.
7/13/2021 10:43:29	July 13, 2021	YouTube Connection	Nancy Meister	85364	self	Lost the feed at 2:29. Is the meeting continuing?

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 10:46:11	July 13, 2021	several	Rivko Knox	85053	myself	<p>1) I find it very difficult to both listen carefully to the meeting/s and also write comments. And the reason that is a problem is that ONLY comments submitted during the meeting are easily available for the public to see.</p> <p>2) On somewhat the same topic, as I am not watching right this minute (as I'm writing to you), I'm not sure if you have gotten to the agenda items re the presentations at public meetings and the schedule, (which is why it would make so much more sense to allow and SHOW public comments submitted after the meetings) but:</p> <p>a) re the public hearings, I continue (as I have stated in the past) to urge you to ensure that they are totally accessible, which I interpret to mean not only meeting ADA requirements but translators; plus elements such as: free babysitting; perhaps refreshments to encourage participation; meetings in venues convenient to public transit where such exists; coordinating with local community groups to provide transportation/babysitting/eldercare etc.</p> <p>b) widely publicized in all the languages and means available: social media, newspapers (to include local community papers), radio/TV (to include non English stations), asking local community groups to publicize in their emails/newsletters; and even mailings in some areas.</p> <p>c) ensure that the presentation at each meeting is clear and understandable by the general public vs. mapping specialists or census nerds!!</p> <p>d) altho I am glad to see two meetings already scheduled in Maricopa County (where I live) with one more being considered, that is NOT enof!!!!!!! Maricopa County is HUGE...and many meetings must be held all over if you truly want public input.</p> <p>2) Now back to listen/learn and not write.</p>
7/13/2021 10:51:01	July 13, 2021	VI	Rita Day	86301	myself	<p>the YouTube connection did not continue after the break taken after the 2 presenters. How is the public able to view the rest of the meeting????</p>
7/13/2021 11:02:22	July 13, 2021	Listening Tour - Round 1	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>While I appreciate that you've added the Quartzsite location to the public meeting on 8/4/21, I have to express my disappointment that you've chosen to combine it and Parker along with Yuma for the same meeting. La Paz County and Yuma County and have vastly different interest and needs and should have their own meetings so the commissioners can hear what their residents have to say about them. Yuma County is a border county, and issues around that may dominate the discussion, which would be appropriate for a Yuma County-only meeting. If La Paz County is included in the same meeting, then both of them will have only half of the time they need to air their views and concerns. And, for all their effort, the commission will not be fully informed.</p> <p>I suspect the same is true of other counties that you have combined in your schedule in an effort to cover everyone efficiently. Sometimes efficiency isn't the primary consideration.</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>



Public Meeting Comments 7.13.21

Timestamp	Meeting Date	Agenda Item	First and Last Name	Zip Code	Representing	Comments
7/13/2021 11:11:43	July 13, 2021	Listening Tour - Round 1	William Bowlus-Root	85365	Myself	<p>Thank you for publishing a schedule of dates and locations for the upcoming Listening Tour - Round 1.</p> <p>What's not apparent from the schedule is who you are interested in hearing from at each of the locations. Your first attempt at a schedule included the counties that you were targeting, but that's not clear from the new schedule on the website. It gives the impression that you're holding a meeting in these locations that anyone from anywhere in the state is welcome to attend and speak at. While it would be nice to have that kind of openness, as a practical matter people who take advantage of that at meetings that are far distant from where they reside will take slots from those who live near the meetings. For many of them, traveling to the meeting (or satellite) location may represent a significant sacrifice so it would be a shame to knock them out of a slot for someone who is wealthier who can afford to travel across state to grab one of the slots.</p> <p>If you allow this, then groups who are determined to have the most/loudest say in these meetings will work to ensure that they have as many people as possible at every meeting so they can dominate the discussion (to the exclusion of locals). It's a disappointing tactic, but one that will almost certainly be deployed unless you place a limit on the people you're willing to listen to at each meeting (for example by residents of the county its in, or ZIP Codes, or by x distance from the meeting).</p> <p>How will you avoid this problem?</p> <p>William Bowlus-Root A concerned citizen</p>