



## Legal Action Report and Minutes

### City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC)

DATE: Wednesday, October 26, 2022  
TIME: 5:30 p.m.  
LOCATION: City Hall  
255 W. Alameda Street  
Mayor and Council Chambers, 1<sup>st</sup> floor  
Tucson, Arizona

#### 1. Roll Call

The Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) meeting was called to order at 5:45 p.m. by Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

|                 |                   |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| <u>Present:</u> | <u>Appointor:</u> |
| Maribel Alvarez | Mayor             |
| Patrick Robles  | Ward 1            |
| Jenifer Darland | Ward 2            |
| Ed Hendel       | Ward 3            |
| Bobby Jaramillo | Ward 5            |
| Mark Crum       | Ward 6            |

|                        |        |
|------------------------|--------|
| <u>Absent:</u>         |        |
| Alexus Kaiulani Dudoit | Ward 4 |

Staff Present:  
Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk  
Yolanda Lozano, Chief Deputy City Clerk  
Maria Talamante, Assistant City Clerk  
Shawna Lee, City Clerk's Office  
Jesus Acedo, City Clerk's Office  
Randy Hammel, City Clerk's Office  
Robert Hunter, City Clerk's Office  
Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Jennifer Stash, Principal Assistant City Attorney

**2. Introduction of Members and Staff**

Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk, invited Members of the Committee to introduce themselves and introduced herself and staff in attendance from the City Clerk’s Office, and the City Attorney’s Office.

**3. Election of Officers**

Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk, provided an explanation of what the duties of the Chair entailed and invited nominations for Chair of the RAC.

Committee Member Jaramillo nominated Committee Member Crum for Chair. No other nominations were made.

The nomination was duly seconded and carried by a voice vote of 6 to 0 (Committee Member Dudoit Absent).

**4. Approval of Minutes from the October 20, 2022 Meeting**

Tabled for the next meeting.

**5. Call to the Audience**

No members of the public presented/spoke.

**6. Discussion of Potential Redistricting Proposal(s)**

The Committee discussed an initial redistricting proposal, considerations related to redistricting and community input and a schedule for a public hearing.

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0, (Committee Member Dudoit Absent) to hold a public hearing on November 3<sup>rd</sup> during the scheduled meeting of the RAC, that the public notification process be started, and that in-parallel the City Clerk’s Office will generate additional proposals to create a third majority minority ward and to get below 10% MPD with the movement of fewer precincts and to provide alternative options.

**7. Future Agenda Items**

The following items were identified for the next meeting agenda:

- Public Hearing on initial redistricting proposal
- Post-Hearing discussion on redistricting proposal and alternative proposals

**8. Next Meeting Date/Time**

A consensus was reached that the next meeting of the RAC would be Thursday November 3, 2022 at 5:30 p.m.

**9. Adjournment**

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and passed by a voice vote of 6 to 0, (Committee Member Dudoit Absent) to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:54 p.m.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

|                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| <u>Present:</u>        | <u>Appointor:</u> |
| Mark Crum, Chairperson | Ward 6            |
| Maribel Alvarez        | Mayor             |
| Patrick Robles         | Ward 1            |
| Jenifer Darland        | Ward 2            |
| Ed Hendel              | Ward 3            |
| Bobby Jaramillo        | Ward 5            |

|                        |        |
|------------------------|--------|
| <u>Absent:</u>         |        |
| Alexus Kauilani Dudoit | Ward 4 |

Staff Present:  
 Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk  
 Yolanda Lozano, Chief Deputy City Clerk  
 Maria Talamante, Assistant City Clerk  
 Shawna Lee, City Clerk's Office  
 Jesus Acedo, City Clerk's Office  
 Randy Hammel, City Clerk's Office  
 Robert Hunter, City Clerk's Office  
 Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
 Jennifer Stash, Principal Assistant City Clerk

=====

- 1 CLERK: Maribel Alvarez?
- 2 MS. ALVAREZ: Present.
- 3 CLERK: Patrick Robles?
- 4 MR. ROBLES: Present.
- 5 CLERK: Jenifer Darland?
- 6 MS. DARLAND: Present.
- 7 CLERK: Ed Hendel?
- 8 (Inaudible response.)
- 9 CLERK: Alexis Kauilani Dudoit? Absent. Bobby Jaramillo?
- 10 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.
- 11 CLERK: Mark Crum?
- 12 MR. CRUM: Present.

1 CLERK: Madam Clerk, with six members present, a quorum of  
2 the Redistricting Advisory Committee is established.

3 MS. MESICH: Thank you very much. We will start with  
4 Item 2, Introduction of Members. If you'd like to go around and  
5 introduce yourselves, then we'll introduce Staff for those of you who  
6 weren't here last week.

7 MS. DARLAND: My name is Jenifer Darland, and I am a Ward 2  
8 constituent.

9 MR. HENDEL: My name is Ed Hendel. I live in Ward 1, but  
10 I'm representing Ward 3 today.

11 MR. ROBLES: I'm Patrick Robles (inaudible) Sorry. I'm  
12 Patrick Robles, (Inaudible) President and resident of Ward 1 and the  
13 Ward 1 Appointee.

14 MS. ALVAREZ: Hello. I'm Maribel Alvarez. I live in  
15 the Richland Heights Neighborhood on Prince and Campbell, and I'm  
16 representing the Mayor.

17 MR. JARAMILLO: Robert Jaramillo, representing Ward 5, and  
18 a resident of Ward 5 as well.

19 MR. CRUM: My name is Mark Crum. I represent Ward 6, and I  
20 live in Ward 6.

21 MS. MESICH: Thank you. I'm Suzanne Mesich, I'm the City  
22 Clerk, and next to me is -

23 MS. LOZANO: Yolanda Lozano. I'm the Chief Deputy City  
24 Clerk.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Dennis Mc- -- Dennis McLaughlin with the  
2 City Attorney. Good evening, all.

3 MS. STASH: And I'm Jennifer Stash, also with the City  
4 Attorney.

5 MR. ACEDO: Jesus Acedo with the City Clerk's Office.

6 MS. TELEMANTE: Maria Talamante, City Assistant Clerk.

7 FEMALE SPEAKER: Robert Hunter would be sitting here.  
8 He stepped away to make more copies for you. He's with our office.  
9 He's -

10 MS. LEE: And I'm Shawna Lee with the City Clerk's Office.  
11 You'll be getting e-mails from both myself and Robert. We'll be  
12 providing the primary support to the committee.

13 MR. HAMMEL: I'm Randy Hammel. I'm also with the City  
14 Clerk's Office.

15 MS. MESICH: So, you can see, we have a lot of Staff here  
16 to support you. We want to help you do your jobs as easily and best  
17 as you can.

18 One of the things I think you've already picked up on is  
19 when you're speaking, if you would turn on your mic using the button  
20 on the pedestal, that will help us get a good recording, an accurate  
21 recording of the meeting.

22 So, with that, we'll go to Item 3 which is Election of  
23 Officers. We did not do this last week, hoping you are ready for that  
24 this week. And is anybody ready to nominate a Chair?

25 MR. HENDEL: What do the duties entail?

1 MS. MESICH: That'd be running the meeting, assisting with  
2 setting the agenda if people - and also, kind of curating requests for  
3 information.

4 MR. CRUM: Are there any volunteers?

5 MR. JARAMILLO: I'd like to make a nom- -- Robert  
6 Jaramillo. I'd like to make a nomination because of his prior  
7 experience. Mark Crum.

8 MS. MESICH: Do we have a second?

9 MR. ROBLES: Second.

10 MS. ALVAREZ: Second.

11 MS. MESICH: Second; Maribel. Any other nominations?

12 All those in favor of Mark Crum for Chairperson, please say "aye".

13 (Affirmative.)

14 MS. MESICH: Any opposed? Okay. Mr. Crum, you are our new  
15 Chairperson. Would you like to take over the meeting?

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. The meeting is called to  
17 order.

18 MS. MESICH: You need a copy of the agenda?

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right. Thank you.

20 MS. MESICH: While you're getting settled, I'll just tell  
21 you that Item 4 is Approval of Minutes, and we do not quite have those  
22 Minutes ready for you yet.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Moving on then to Item 5,  
24 Call to the Audience. No one's here. Item 6. Discussion of

1 Potential Redistrict- -- Redistricting Proposals. So, it appears we  
2 have one to consider at this point in time.

3 And if I may, I have a question about the splits. If we do  
4 nothing with this - I, I, and I've looked, first of all, to get the  
5 total population tabulation.

6 It appears that all persons and the target in terms of just  
7 raw numbers are really very close together for all of the wards. So,  
8 when we look at the splits, and I guess the, the reason to deal with  
9 them is to make, since they're representing two wards, is that right?  
10 Is to make it so it represents one ward.

11 MS. MESICH: That's correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, given the numbers, the raw numbers,  
13 given all the splits, what are the consequences if we do nothing, and  
14 everything remains split as they are now?

15 MS. MESICH: So, the map handed out tonight, which I think  
16 Robert is copying, is the one that indicates the splits. And your  
17 question was, what happens if you do nothing, correct?

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right. What are cons- -- what are the  
19 consequences if things remain the same?

20 MS. MESICH: So, the goal in redistricting is to get the  
21 median population deviation down below 10%. Currently, it is 11.4%  
22 overall in the city.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay.



1 MS. MESICH: So, as we mentioned last week, your first  
2 decision, or recommendation, is whether or not you need to redistrict.  
3 And after that, you can discuss how to go about it.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: And the 10% is the standard practice, or is  
6 it mandated by law?

7 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Clerk, members of the committee, it  
8 is mandated by law to the extent that if you - it's, it's an option  
9 you have. If you do that, then it's presumptively valid. And anyone  
10 trying to overturn it is gonna have, have the burden of why it should  
11 be overturned.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And, Madam Clerk, is, is it 11.4 or 13.4  
14 on the current MPD?

15 MS. MESICH: I'm sorry. The current number for the current  
16 deviation is 13.4%.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you.

19 MS. MESICH: And just for clarification, that is the base  
20 map that we handed out last week, the 13.4. This proposal map is the  
21 changes of moving these splits into what they are now. And it brings  
22 it down to a two percent deviation. So, that's what this Proposal One  
23 map is showing, the moving of those splits into one ward.

24 MALE SPEAKER: Taking it into consideration?

25 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh. Taking that into consideration.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: Madam Clerk, that means that the deviation  
2 from the current base will go from 13.4 deviation to two percent  
3 deviation if this, if this proposal was accepted?

4 MS. MESICH: That's correct.

5 MS. DARLAND: And, Madam Clerk, if, if we were to do  
6 nothing, would we have to defend allowing the deviation to remain at  
7 13%? Would we - would that be something that we would have to look at  
8 answering as well?

9 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Clerk, members of the committee,  
10 that's right. If you leave it alone, and it's at 13.4, you don't have  
11 presumptive validity. So, it's gonna depend, it's sort of hanging out  
12 there, and if someone wants to challenge it, it's gonna be a, a  
13 brouhaha a bit about which way, which way it goes in court.  
14 (Inaudible) I hope that that says it clearly.

15 Can I add one thing on - and you can chime in - on Mr.  
16 Crum's initial question which is that operationally, if we just leave  
17 the split, it's very difficult for the Clerk to administer elections  
18 in those precincts, right? Because effectively they're - some are in  
19 one ward and some are in another.

20 So, depending on the election, some, some people within the  
21 precinct are gonna vote and some aren't - yeah. Please exemplify.  
22 I'm just saying -

23 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - spe- -- you know, generally.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, this is very serious, in my  
2 opinion. So, -

3 MR. HENDEL: Chair Crum, -

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

5 MR. HENDEL: - and professional staff, do, do we have any  
6 information as to why the splits have occurred? What was the  
7 committee's purpose two years ago in making this decision?

8 MS. MESICH: So, it's kind of an interesting situation.  
9 Pima County draws the precinct lines, and when they're doing that,  
10 their concern is their supervisorial districts, Congressional  
11 districts and legislative districts, and they're much less concerned  
12 about city wards.

13 So, consequently, we have six split precincts which is -  
14 it's been that way for several years now. Sometimes the precinct  
15 changes, but we've had six splits for several years.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I'm familiar with at least one case  
17 where this committee did return to Pima County requesting that a  
18 precinct not be split. And Pima County did not respond to that  
19 request.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Chair Crum, seems to me that the splits  
21 represent an operational challenge for elections. And then as such,  
22 it should be an item that this commission should take on to fix.

23 In the weeks ahead, we have to (inaudible) I believe we  
24 will have enough time to do the analysis of whether - deciding on the

1 splits, if the proposal will have any detrimental effect on other  
2 aspects of representation in those precincts and those wards.

3 But (inaudible) contemplate the work, I think we can, we  
4 can act on the finding that we do need to do a redistricting.

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I appreciate the positiveness of that  
6 remark. I have some, based upon my prior experience, I do have a  
7 concern with Precinct 82, which is currently in Ward 6, proposed to  
8 go to Ward 5.

9 MS. MESICH: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: That was a past proposal, by the way.  
11 And when this committee met at a public hearing, as required, a number  
12 of people from that particular precinct appeared before this comm- --  
13 and, and by the way, the committee did recommend that it go to Ward 5  
14 originally.

15 So, went to public hearing, as I recall. A number of  
16 persons spoke at that public hearing. They were opposed to that, of  
17 going to Ward 5. And I think there was also a petition relating to  
18 that as well.

19 The committee decided to reverse its recommendation for the  
20 precinct to go to Ward 5, as I recall. And that's why I asked about  
21 the compelling reasons. This is, this is tough stuff when you start  
22 dealing with people's feelings.

23 And so, it's a fact that past history says that this  
24 committee specifically listened to the people. They wanted it to  
25 remain in Ward 6. Further, the vast majority of the area of the

1 precinct is represented by a neighborhood association, Broadway-  
2 Broadmoor.

3           If you look back further, further, further, I think there  
4 was a recommendation by the City Clerk that that particular precinct  
5 was in Ward 5, that it should go to Ward 6. And I opposed that  
6 happening, by the way, simply because I drove around the precinct and  
7 kind of got a feeling for its composition.

8           I don't know. I don't think this is the right precinct to  
9 go after, but -

10           MR. HENDEL: (Inaudible) some clarification.

11           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - that's based upon feelings, not based  
12 upon numbers. Go ahead.

13           MR. HENDEL: Yeah. Thank you. I, I just wanted to ask  
14 like some basic questions. So, I'm wondering who designed the  
15 proposal and why there's only one. And are we allowed to make new  
16 proposals or I - just, just basic questions like that.

17           MS. MESICH: Thank you for your question. And, Chair Crum,  
18 and members of the committee, you - this proposal is not an all or  
19 nothing proposal. First of all, I wanted - I should have said that.

20           Secondly, this was just a purely administrative proposal  
21 based on our experience with splits and, and the population deviation.  
22 So, you can take these splits one at a time. You can study the map  
23 and the numbers yourselves and see where your - where you fit as part  
24 of the recommendation.

1           Now we have the software which we introduced last week that  
2 allows us to move precincts and, and you can see the immediate impact.  
3 So, if, for instance, you want us to try moving 82, or removing it and  
4 keeping it as a split, we can do that with this software, and then see  
5 how that changes the deviation.

6           MR. HANDEL: So, were the, were the goals of the current  
7 proposal to not have any split precincts and to reduce the amount of  
8 spread between the precincts? And those were - were those the only  
9 two goals, or -

10          MS. MESICH: The main goal was to reduce the population  
11 deviation as much as we could and as far below 10% as we could get.

12          MR. HANDEL: Yeah. It does a really good job of that,  
13 they're very even. And it looks like we wouldn't have anymore split  
14 precincts if we adopt this proposal. So, sounds like that would also  
15 be nice from an election administration perspective.

16          I guess one concern, or question I have is the rough  
17 proportionality principle which I read about in the, in the notes,  
18 which is basically the percent of minority population throughout the  
19 city should be roughly proportional to the number of wards in which  
20 there is a majority-minority population. And right now, we have two  
21 wards that are majority-minority before that are not.

22          But I, I'm wondering if we have like demographic  
23 information for the whole city combined, like a column - I don't see  
24 the, the, the minority column. Can we get like a total for that, for  
25 the whole city? What percent of Tucson is minority? And then that

1 would tell us what percent of the precincts should be majority-  
2 minority based on that principle.

3 I, I looked it up. I think it's roughly half, at least  
4 within rounding error to, you know, rounding to the nearest one in  
5 six, since we have six wards. So, my understanding is that we're  
6 supposed to have three wards that are majority-minority, but we only  
7 have two.

8 And so, I don't know if it's possible to redistrict in such  
9 a way that we, we have three, but we should at least consider that  
10 since that is one of the stated objectives of our committee. Yeah, I  
11 guess if we could just start with getting the, the total percentage of  
12 Tucson that is minority, that would be helpful.

13 A little bit on the census, but it's a little confusing  
14 because I guess being Hispanic is not a race, according to the census.  
15 We got this printout of this e-mail from Fred where race and Hispanic  
16 origin are completely different concepts.

17 So, there's a minority field, which you can see in the,  
18 in these maps we have, the last two columns there - Hispanic and  
19 minority. But in some columns, in Wards 1 and 5, there's fewer  
20 minorities than there are Hispanics, which means some Hispanic people  
21 are not being counted as minority, which is, is fine. I, I think it  
22 just means I don't fully understand how that minority field is being  
23 defined or calculated.

24 And since that's the field that we need to use for the  
25 rough proportionality principle, I think it might be good if we all

1 made sure we understand what that actually means. Does anyone else on  
2 the committee have thoughts or questions about that topic?

3 MS. ALVAREZ: That is, that is a topic. The, the question  
4 could be complicated, could be simple. If, if it is, given  
5 (inaudible) Hispanic percentage as, as, as an added-on beta point.  
6 But that is not aggregate or separate from the minority, you know?  
7 That's the question we need to ask, 'cause it's, it's, it's a distinct  
8 ethnic representation, not a racial representation. So, that's,  
9 that's the question we have to ask.

10 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. So, according to this e-mail from Fred,  
11 the minority field, which is the last column in our maps in the  
12 demographics table there, the minority field is calculated as total  
13 population minus white alone. It says "while alone", but I assume  
14 that's a typo. I assume it should say "white alone".

15 So, that would mean if you identify as Hispanic, but also  
16 white alone, you're not counted as, you're not counted as a minority.  
17 I'm not gonna pretend to like fully understand like everything about  
18 how this works.

19 But I, but that's how that field is calculated and I assume  
20 that minority field is the one we're supposed to use for this rough  
21 proportionality doctrine, or principle, or guideline, whatever you  
22 want to call it.

23 MS. ALVAREZ: Maybe the Staff has clarification, but from  
24 my understanding, the minority field would include Hispanics.



1 MR. HANDEL: But not all Hispanics, 'cause if you look at  
2 Wards 1 and 5, there's more Hispanics than there are minorities.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: Well, because it's, it's ov- -- it's an  
4 overlay. It's not measuring the same thing.

5 MR. HANDEL: Right. It's a different question on the  
6 census.

7 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. Exactly.

8 MR. HANDEL: Hispanic is not considered a race.

9 MS. ALVAREZ: But you would say that in District 1, for  
10 example - but I could be incorrect. I, I asked the Staff to  
11 demographics this. It's a big field. (Inaudible)

12 MR. HANDEL: I guess since -

13 MS. ALVAREZ: I'm saying that in, in District - in, in  
14 Ward 1, 62% is minority. All the groups that are on the census  
15 counted as minority. I know that minority, 68 is Hispanic.

16 MR. HANDEL: Sixty-eight?

17 MS. ALVAREZ: (Inaudible)

18 MR. HANDEL: I don't, I don't think that's - that's not my  
19 understanding. That could be true.

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Suzanne, would you answer that, please?

21 MS. MESICH: We're running some numbers over here. I can  
22 see that now. But I think it's, it's two separate tracks because it's  
23 two different questions on the census. The, the -

24 MALE SPEAKER: So, just - I guess to make a, a more clear  
25 question for you, is that minority field the one that we're supposed

1 to be using for the rough proportionality principle? And we're just  
2 kind of ignoring the Hispanic column for the sake of rough  
3 proportionality?

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes. Which one prevails in our  
5 considerations?

6 MS. MESICH: The rough proportionality ordinance refers to  
7 minority rather than the ethnicity of Hispanic.

8 MR. HENDEL: Okay. So, thank you. That's helpful. So,  
9 so, therefore, once we figure out the total percent of, of Tucson that  
10 is minority which I think they working on. But I'm guessing will be  
11 roughly 50%, 45%, something like that.

12 Then that is the percent of precinct - of wards that are  
13 supposed to majority-minority. And so, if I'm correct, that it's  
14 something like 50%, then we currently are not meeting the rough  
15 proportionality principle, even in the new proposal.

16 Now, it's, it's not a lot, we don't have to do it, I guess.  
17 But we should at least discuss it since that's part of our stated  
18 objective here.

19 MALE SPEAKER: So, just to be clear, the minority column -  
20 I want to make sure I'm understanding this correctly. The minority  
21 column is completely separate and doesn't account for Hispanics, is  
22 that, is that what I'm -

23 MR. HANDEL: My understanding is that that's correct, but a  
24 lot of Hispanic people will be counted - will be minority.

25 MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

1 MR. HENDEL: It's not like non-Hispanic. It's just that  
2 whether you're Hispanic is separate.

3 MALE SPEAKER: Okay. I, I think that in this e-mail, it  
4 says it's defined as total population minus white alone. So, I think  
5 it's just anyone who identifies as not white alone.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: That's correct. That's my understanding and  
7 that's how we use it at the University in demographics.

8 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

9 MS. ALVAREZ: So, that's, that's exactly what it means.  
10 But Hispanic person is counted as a minority, but they're counted in  
11 addition their ethnicity. It's almost -think about if we did it for  
12 the white population and then you counted how many of the white  
13 population was Polish.

14 MR. HENDEL: Correct.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: It would then show up in the same way that it  
16 shows up here. White 27%, Polish 45%, in the same ward, 'cause the  
17 majority of people who are white by race are saying that their ethnic  
18 origin would be Polish. Does that make sense? And that's what is  
19 happening here.

20 MALE SPEAKER: But I don't, I don't think the Hispanic  
21 column in here means the percent of minorities who are Hispanic. I  
22 don't think that's it. I mean, first of all, that would mean that in  
23 Ward 2, 78% of minorities are not Hispanic, which doesn't seem likely  
24 to me. But I think it's just completely separate. It's not like one  
25 is a percent of another.

1 I think it's, it's, it's saying 69.69% of Ward 1 is  
2 Hispanic, and also separately, 62.53% of Ward 1 is minority, meaning  
3 some Hispanic people are not minority because they're separate  
4 questions on the census.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: But in the - but my under- -- you could be  
6 right, but the questions on the census are stacked. So, you first are  
7 asked if you're Hispanic. And then you're asked your race.

8 MALE SPEAKER: Umm.

9 MS. ALVAREZ: And that's why it says "only white". You  
10 know, that's why it makes that distinction. It's, it's a, it's a  
11 stacked question in the census. That's why I think that that's -  
12 it could be, I don't know. But then, Ward 2 issue, you're, you're  
13 correct. It could be, -

14 MR. HENDEL: I think, -

15 MS. ALVAREZ: - but -

16 MR. HANDEL: - I think regardless of which - of what that  
17 Hispanic column is, I think we don't need - I don't think that affects  
18 this committee. I mean, it would be interesting to know. It  
19 certainly would be good for our understanding. But I think that  
20 minority column is the key because of the wording of the rough  
21 proportionality principle.

22 So, I think that Hispanic column was just added for our  
23 edification, but it's not like a number that we're trying to  
24 necessarily optimize in a certain way.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: If that is for edification and for the  
2 cultural distinct character.

3 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: If this was - if we were in New Orleans, and  
5 it would matter that those wards have this percentage of black  
6 population.

7 MR. HANDEL: Yeah.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: In Tucson, it would be that it matters that  
9 they're Hispanic, 'cause that is the distinctive sort of impacted  
10 group by ethnicity.

11 MR. HANDEL: Yeah.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, City Staff, the conclusion that Ed  
13 just stated, is that a correct conclusion?

14 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, are you asking that Hispanic  
15 category and the minority category are two separate things completely?  
16 Is that, is that what you mean?

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And the minority category is the one we  
18 pay attention to.

19 MS. MESICH: That's my understanding as well, from the  
20 rough proportionality ordinance.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you very much for the question and  
22 the clarification. Excellent work.

23 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. Thank you for that. I appreciate it.  
24 So, I guess now that we've clarified that, we just still need to get  
25 that percentage of the, the whole city of Tucson that is (inaudible)

1 we have it there, 45%, yeah. So, that means, according - if I'm  
2 understanding the rough proportionality principle correctly, 45% of  
3 our six wards should have a majority, more than 50% in that minority  
4 column. And, and the new proposal, two of the six would have that,  
5 which is the same as the current situation. So, it would not change  
6 that.

7 I think in - I think if we're rounding, it should be three  
8 of the six, not two of the six. But I don't know. I mean we're,  
9 we're pretty close. Like right now we're at 33%. It should be 45%.  
10 We can either keep it at 33 or we can move it to 50, which would then  
11 be overshooting, but it would be a little bit closer.

12 But then, that would also require like some pretty drastic  
13 changes to the proposal. And I'm not necessarily saying that we  
14 should do that. All I'm saying is that we should consider this in our  
15 discussions.

16 It might also be very difficult, or impossible, to, to do.  
17 I don't know. I mean - but I haven't, I haven't played around with  
18 the software. But anyway, I will just leave that for people to  
19 ponder.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Madam Clerk, could I interject a question  
21 here? Mr. Chair, may I interject (inaudible)

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, Dennis.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I wanted to ask the Clerk, on the Proposal  
24 One, which is the split precincts, going to the member, first  
25 question. How was it decided which ward a split precinct goes into?

1 Was it that more were in one ward than another? Was it MPD  
2 minimization so you consider various possibilities, and then pick  
3 the one that would do - sorry. Sorry to be dense.

4 MS. MESICH: No, you're right. MPD consideration was  
5 number one, and then number two was location, and kind of the  
6 geography of the split. It didn't make sense if half of the - more  
7 than half the precinct just south of Golf Links to move the whole  
8 thing north, that kind of thing if - just looking at the map itself  
9 and, and the areas for each of the splits. So, it was population  
10 deviation number one, and then geography, number two.

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you Madam  
12 Clerk.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

15 MR. JARAMILLO: Based, based on the, the numbers that we  
16 have, is it pretty close to hitting the bullseye by going with this?  
17 Thirteen? (Inaudible) numbers?

18 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, members of the committee. Yes, it  
19 is very close to go from 13.4% deviation to two percent is, yeah.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay.

21 MS. MESICH: It's a good number.

22 MR. JARAMILLO: Now we're pretty close to the target and  
23 we're still - if, if and when we decide to go with whatever we decide  
24 to go with, we're still gonna have to have a public hearing on it,  
25 like you said, -

1 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

2 MR. JARAMILLO: - have - I will be - I will consider their  
3 recommendation as well, hearing them out and see what their preference  
4 would be. And maybe we could take this back to the table and have  
5 further discussion on it.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: I agree with that, I think, on principle  
7 because this is an administrative proposal. We accept it as this will  
8 solve the problem of the, of the deviation. And that would be  
9 conforming with our charge, our number goal.

10 However, if, when we have an open hearing, I hear from  
11 someone in the community that, oh, goodness, before you do that, like  
12 you, you mentioned, Chair Crum.

13 If you change that precinct, it just completely goes  
14 against the character of that neighborhood, the way we identify, the  
15 way we feel, the relationship we have. Then, at that time, we have to  
16 then say, "Well, that's when we waited." But on principle, this  
17 administrative proposal, it's a good place to start.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you, Maribel. I think that's an  
19 excellent observation. Does anyone have anything to add to that?

20 MR. HENDEL: Yes. I'm wondering if we should consider -  
21 well, okay. First thought, when will - when are we telling the  
22 districts that might be changed? I think the hearing is like mid-to-  
23 late November, right? So, how much notice are we giving them before  
24 the hearing?



1 MS. MESICH: That's something you can talk about how you  
2 would like to go about it. I was going to bring up, under future  
3 agendas, how you want us to do public outreach (inaudible)

4 MR. HENDEL: Uh-huh.

5 MS. MESICH: Newspapers need seven days before a public  
6 hearing to get it into the paper. So, we want at least a week's  
7 notice. We want to put information out on the City's website, make  
8 sure Council Members are, are aware, the Mayor and Council and anybody  
9 else that you feel are stakeholders that might be interested in the  
10 public hearing.

11 If, and I, I just might add, the sooner you hold that  
12 public hearing, probably the better because you do want to take that  
13 input into account when you're finalizing your recommendation.

14 MR. HENDEL: Thank you. I, I think it might be worth  
15 creating additional proposals that make fewer changes but still bring  
16 us within below that 10% threshold.

17 Not necessarily saying that we should, you know, endorse  
18 that proposal right away, but, for example, what if we hold the public  
19 hearing, and everyone in Ward - or Precinct 105, I just picked one  
20 randomly, is furious.

21 And we decide, "Okay, we don't want to upset everybody.  
22 We'll leave that as it is." You know, would that still bring us under  
23 10%? Like what's the least amount that we can do and still bring us  
24 into legal compliance? And maybe - I'm sure there would be multiple  
25 options that would achieve that.

1 I'm not necessarily asking you guys to make like dozens of  
2 new proposals, but at least give us a sense of what the, maybe a  
3 handful of options like what we could - what's the least that we could  
4 do to be legally compliant?

5 And then we can have those proposals in our back pocket in  
6 case a handful of precincts become upset by the Proposal No. 1 here.  
7 'Cause we do have a fairly condensed timeline, right? Like a month  
8 from now is Thanksgiving, and we're supposed to have this all done by  
9 the end of November.

10 So, we basically have like three meetings left, and  
11 preferably less than that if we're gonna have a hearing within that  
12 time for more meetings after plus the seven days to get it in the  
13 paper. So, we probably need to like put our proposal ad in the paper  
14 like two weeks from now? Pretty quickly, I would think.

15 MALE SPEAKER: First of the month.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah. Now does anyone here want to  
17 return to any of their Council Members?

18 MR. JARAMILLO: What was that?

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Does anyone here want to return to any  
20 of their Council Members before we go to the public hearing to get  
21 their feelings on this? I'm not saying we have to, I'm just saying,  
22 just - I'm just trying to cover all the potential bases. Yes?

23 MR. ROBLES: I'd like to do so and use this next one week  
24 timeline 'til we meet again to touch base with Council Member Santa  
25 Cruz.

1 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I'll be in touch with Council Member  
2 Dahl's office. But I don't think you'll have a problem with this, but  
3 it's good to at least communicate.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is it necessary to make that into a  
5 motion?

6 MALE SPEAKER: I don't think so, but I'm not sure.

7 MALE SPEAKER: Is it necessary?

8 MR. HANDEL: I think we're allowed to talk to, write the  
9 people that appointed us.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. It's (inaudible) in our options  
11 and if we want to go back to our Council Member and say, "What do you  
12 think of this?" You can report back at the next meeting and go on  
13 from there. But I appreciate the feeling for the urgency of our  
14 action because we don't have a whole lot of time.

15 MR. HENDEL: I think in terms of - I guess I'm not gonna  
16 make this motion quite yet because I want to hear the committee's  
17 thoughts.

18 But the, the idea I have for a motion would be something  
19 like, "We ask Staff to come back with additional proposals, at least  
20 one of which creates three wards that all have majority-minority to  
21 bring us into compliance with the rough proportionality principle."

22 And then a handful of others, or at least one other, that  
23 show different ways we could bring it, you know, just below that 10%,  
24 while potentially, you know, making fewer changes in case people get  
25 upset.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Suzanne, is that doable?

2 MS. MESICH: If you'd like to make that in the form of a  
3 motion, we can accept it as a motion.

4 MR. HENDEL: Well, I mean, we don't want to work you guys  
5 to death. I mean, is that, is that some- -- like, is that feasible?

6 MS. MESICH: We're, we're happy to work with that and see  
7 if we can come up with three wards that have majority-minority, a  
8 couple of other options to bring the MPD below 10%.

9 If there's any particular area of town that causes you  
10 concern, such as Precinct 82, which would be one of our first changes,  
11 would be to leave it as is, even we can leave it as a split and see  
12 how that affects the numbers, and then just go from there in our  
13 office.

14 But if any of you have any specific areas, precincts,  
15 anything that we can look at, that'll, that'll get us a good start.

16 MR. HENDEL: I think my - I, I heard that last time around,  
17 there were people in a particular precinct that were very upset. And  
18 then the committee changed it and did not move that precinct.

19 And given that that happened, it might happen again. But I  
20 don't have a good way of predicting which one that would occur for, if  
21 any. And so, maybe it would be good to do the hearing like in a week  
22 and just get people's thoughts, and then we'll have enough time to  
23 actually make the changes.

24 I guess that seems like two weeks from now is probably at  
25 the latest that we should have the public hearing, 'cause that would

1 give us two weeks to make a new proposal, and then have a new public  
2 hearing before the end of November if people are upset by the first  
3 one.

4 MS. DARLAND: Just as a point of clarification. I think  
5 what would help me is when I, you know, if we're gonna go to our City  
6 Council folks who appointed us to this work, I would want to know what  
7 work am I taking for their review and, and input.

8 At this stage right now with this first proposal, if we're  
9 gonna come back next week and potentially have two other options for  
10 consideration, I'd want to factor that into the timeline as well. I  
11 don't want to go with incomplete work to review for the Councilman.

12 MR. HENDEL: Agree.

13 MS. ALVAREZ: I think Ed is on the right track in, in one,  
14 in one way. And, and that is that we want to have some back pocket  
15 information so that we don't have to wait a long time like, "Oh, okay.  
16 It will take two weeks to get it."

17 So, I - that I support. But I also feel like in this -  
18 it's gonna have to be like we have an administrative proposal. It's  
19 not weighted in any way by input yet. But administratively, our City  
20 Staff has come up with almost the perfect balance, right? Of the  
21 deviation. And that's a starting point.

22 So, if we said that and begin the process of securing input  
23 from Council Members as well as from the public immediately, as soon  
24 as possible, on the basis that this is (inaudible) for your proposal.  
25 We are not saying this is weighted yet.

1           Then, at the same time, we can have those back-pocket ones  
2 ready so if we get challenged, then we can say, "Oh, okay. We have  
3 options."

4           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: However, in the past, the City Clerk has  
5 provided us, or provided this committee with often three different  
6 proposals at the same time to consider. So, I think -

7           MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair?

8           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

9           MS. MESICH: May I make the recommendation that we spend  
10 a few days in our office coming up with a couple of additional  
11 proposals, and get them to you early next week before your meeting  
12 so that you have time to review them on your own. And then perhaps  
13 that'll help the discussion next week.

14          CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Uh-huh.

15          MS. MESICH: And also what you want to present for a public  
16 hearing.

17          MR. HENDEL: That sounds good to me. And I, I guess I  
18 would say this proposal is really good. It's like the, the two  
19 percent. That's extremely small. I think the deviation there is  
20 really quite excellent and having no split precincts is also really  
21 nice.

22                 So, I think Staff did an excellent job, and I personally  
23 would be fine with just approving this now. But given the possibility  
24 that people might be upset in ways that are hard to predict, I think  
25 we should move forward as fast as we can with - let me rephrase.

1 I don't think we're - our committee is going to like the  
2 new proposals better than this one, 'cause this one's really good.  
3 The reason we might change from this one is if people are upset at  
4 the hearing. So, we should probably try to have the hearing as soon  
5 as possible. So, I guess I would actually suggest that we -

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Wait. Would you like to put this in the  
7 form of a motion?

8 MR. HENDEL: Sure. Yeah. I move that we start the - how  
9 do I phrase this? What did, what did you call it? Seven-day process  
10 for the newspaper? I move that we notify the newspapers of this  
11 proposal and set a date for the public hearing for roughly two weeks  
12 from now to be determined by discussion from the committee. And -  
13 yeah, that's my relatively inelegantly-worded motion.

14 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

16 MR. ROBLES: Before we move forward with this, I'd like to  
17 get a deeper understanding on the outreach process to ensure that  
18 we're reaching all members of our community rather than a small few.  
19 And with that, how two years ago when this committee convened, were we  
20 able to tap into a decent amount of folks and, and gather their, their  
21 thoughts on what was being discussed before us?

22 MS. MESICH: Thank you for the question. What we would  
23 like to do is utilize our Public Information Office to get word out  
24 about the public hearing. When we have a date and time we will  
25 present that in English and Spanish on the City's website; newspapers,

1 press releases and the ways that they have some social media that our  
2 office does not currently participate in. So, they've already added  
3 their assistance to the effort.

4 So, the sooner - or I shouldn't say the sooner, but I just  
5 want to assure you that we will get as much outreach done and as much  
6 public notice of the hearing as we can, because it is such an  
7 important issue and we want to hear from all segments of the  
8 community.

9 MR. ROBLES: Thank you, Madam Clerk.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Patrick, I think that's a great - very  
11 good idea. And, of course, every ward office often has their own  
12 newsletters. And I'm certain that they will have their comments about  
13 this notifying the public of this proposal, understanding that it's  
14 contingent upon a public hearing.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: And for the record, I just want to say that a  
16 bunch of people being upset is not the only measure that will guide  
17 our decisions.

18 MR. HENDEL: Uh-huh. Very true.

19 MS. ALVAREZ: In our democratic system.

20 MR. HENDEL: We (inaudible) have any.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: People can be upset and still be wrong.

22 MR. HENDEL: So, I'm gonna withdraw my motion 'cause I'm  
23 writing it down in a more elegant wording. So, - and it hasn't been  
24 seconded, right? So, I can withdraw and make it again in a minute  
25 here.



1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Take your time.

2 MR. ROBLES: Do we want to discuss like when the hearing  
3 should be, like early November probably?

4 MR. HENDEL: Do we need to have a date in the motion? Or,  
5 I guess, Suzanne, can you tell us like how that would work in terms of  
6 who sets the date of the hearing? That's probably not us, right? Or  
7 is it us?

8 MR. ROBLES: It's us.

9 MR. HENDEL: It is us.

10 MS. MESICH: Yes. Yes. It can be (inaudible)

11 MR. HENDEL: Are there any logistical concerns with having  
12 it on a certain day of the week or anything like that?

13 MS. MESICH: The most pressing concern is it can't be  
14 November 14<sup>th</sup> because that's a Mayor and Council meeting, and most of  
15 us will have to be there. But, -

16 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

17 MS. MESICH: - other than that, Thanksgiving week is  
18 something I think for you to keep in mind about how much you're going  
19 to be able to meet that week. And since you normally meet on  
20 Thursdays, I wouldn't recommend meeting on Thanksgiving. No offense.

21 MR. HENDEL: I think we should do early November. Does  
22 anyone have suggestions or thoughts on the date?

23 MS. MESICH: And don't forget, November 8<sup>th</sup> is election day.

24 MS. DARLARND: I, I don't know -

25 MR. JARAMILLO: Like to make a motion now, or suggestion.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We have a motion on the floor.

2 MR. JARAMILLO: Suggestion for date.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

4 MR. JARAMILLO: Would it be possible to have it the first  
5 Thursday, which would be - of November?

6 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, the 3<sup>rd</sup>?

7 MR. ROBLES: That sounds -

8 MR. JARAMILLO: On the first Thur- -- last of next week.  
9 The following, the following - a day before Veteran's Day which is the  
10 10<sup>th</sup>.

11 MS. DARLAND: When we meet?

12 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes.

13 MS. DARLAND: Okay.

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Could you include that in the  
15 motion?

16 MR. HENDEL: Are we saying - which day was it?

17 MS. DARLAND: 11<sup>th</sup>?

18 MR. ROBLES: 10<sup>th</sup>.

19 MR. HENDEL: November 10<sup>th</sup>.

20 MR. ROBLES: Thursday.

21 MR. HENDEL: I guess I think we should do it sooner than  
22 that. So, let's discuss that. I'm open to that, but we have to have  
23 our recommendation out by November 30<sup>th</sup>.

24 Thanksgiving is the 24<sup>th</sup>, and so, after the hearing, we will  
25 have - if we do it on the 10<sup>th</sup>, we would only have one meeting between

1 the hearing and when we have to make our official recommendation. And  
2 if we needed to pick a different proposal, like if peo- -- if a lot of  
3 people are upset by what we propose and we need to pick a different  
4 one, we may want to consider having a second public hearing for the  
5 new proposal. So, we kind of want to leave time for that, right?

6 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum, my thought that we were  
7 gonna be meeting next Thursday, if I'm not mistaken. And it gives us  
8 time to review the new recommendation that administration's making.  
9 And, and then after that, would be whatever day you decide on just to  
10 have the public hearing.

11 MS. DARLAND: Chair Crum?

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

13 MS. DARLAND: If we're meeting next Thursday to review  
14 additional proposals, what about Monday, November 7<sup>th</sup> as the public  
15 hearing? That way, you still have November 10<sup>th</sup> to meet on what  
16 happened at the public hearing. And if we have to schedule another  
17 public hearing after that, we still have some time. The 7<sup>th</sup>, I think,  
18 might -

19 MR. HENDEL: I'm out of town that day.

20 MS. DARLAND: Oh, that's (inaudible)

21 MR. HENDEL: What do we need to discuss at next week's  
22 meeting? I think we could, we could just have the public hearing at  
23 next week's meeting during that time slot. Like is there anything  
24 else we need to discuss before we hear from the public?

1 MR. JARAMILLO: Well, I, I feel that what we should discuss  
2 is what's being recommended to us in the (inaudible) with the other  
3 proposals that are being presented to us, prior to having the public  
4 hearing.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I guess I'm thinking of those as like  
6 backup proposals that we would use if people are upset by this one.  
7 But if, if we don't - I guess I was under the impression that we all  
8 kind of like this one.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. I personally like it.

10 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. (Inaudible) So, I don't think any of  
11 the backups, like if we got a backup that said, "Here's the least we  
12 can possibly do to get below 10%."

13 But as population shifts and grows, we'll have to do this  
14 redistricting committee again in two years. I doubt any of us are  
15 gonna want to do that, right? But, so, I guess it's possible that  
16 we'll want to go with the rough proportionality option.

17 I guess we'll discuss that. Do you guys think there's a  
18 good chance that we're going to want to propose one of the backup  
19 plans, or alternate plans?

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Well, we don't know.

21 MR. HENDEL: I think that we'll -

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Sure. Why not? It's data.

23 MR. HENDEL: Right. But then we'll have a lot less time to  
24 evaluate the public opinion and make another change and have another

1 hearing if we have to. I mean I'm happy to do that. I just think  
2 it's kind of (inaudible)

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Suzanne will be providing us with some  
4 additional information relative to this discussion. And I think  
5 that's important to have.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: I think what I'm hearing is we like this  
7 proposal because it meets the minimum, it meets the charge that we've  
8 been given. And Staff did the job of presenting us optimal proposal  
9 administratively that meets the objectives.

10 As far as we know, we could approve that and just go home.  
11 But we're saying, "Let's advance that one. Let's advance this one  
12 forward for the hearing."

13 And then have backup in between so that if at the hearing  
14 something completely changes, then we don't have to start from that  
15 point on asking Staff to come up with the alternatives. I think  
16 that's what you're trying to say.

17 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I think if we wait until the 10<sup>th</sup>, then  
18 the 10<sup>th</sup> through the 24<sup>th</sup> is gonna be really hectic and crazy for us.

19 MS. ALVAREZ: Yes.

20 MR. HENDEL: And we're not going to gain very much between  
21 now and then. That's just my opinion. I open to other thoughts,  
22 though.

23 MS. DARLAND: I'm - just as a point of clarification, or  
24 just for my own understanding, or just to say it out loud. My, my one  
25 - I think that the first recommendation, as we've all stated, is, is a

1 really good first start. I think what we don't know is what the  
2 public is going to tell us. I think that we would like to think that  
3 the pushback that they would give us would be to push for more  
4 minority-majority wards.

5 I don't think that's gonna be what we're gonna hear.  
6 We're gonna hear about concerns or constraints or confusion about  
7 being absorbed into a new ward from a previous ward.

8 And with all due respect to my fellow constituents, I'm -  
9 while I find that to absolutely be an inconvenience, I'm more  
10 concerned about ensuring that we are not at that 13%.

11 So, I, I, I, I, I just want to be thoughtful about also in  
12 maybe getting some feedback from the attorneys with respect - well, I  
13 don't necessarily know attorneys, but when we create the alternative  
14 plans, it becomes part of the public work that the commission does.

15 And I just do worry that if we aren't making those publicly  
16 available, that the feedback we could get in the future would be, "Oh,  
17 you did this extra work. You had a public hearing, and yet you didn't  
18 propose, you didn't share, share with us the other backup proposals  
19 that the Staff created."

20 So, I would almost pre- -- I would almost prefer that we  
21 just go with this one, wait to hear what our fellow neighbors have to  
22 say, and then go forward from there versus creating work that could  
23 potentially create confusion and concern in the future.

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And understand that we necessarily don't  
25 have to balance all of the communities' concerns about where they may

1 be, ultimately, our suggested recommendation to the Mayor and Council.  
2 The Mayor and Council make the final decision in terms of what the map  
3 looks like.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: I, I think you've raised a really good point,  
5 and I support that as well in the sense that, let's just say that we  
6 have to have some core principles. There are two here that the Staff  
7 has brought to us.

8 One. The deviation is almost like down as much as it can  
9 be. To present is good. We agree on that. Other one is no split  
10 precincts. That's good thing. Voom (sic), right? You start there.

11 Now let's just say that we know 82, Precinct 82, is - it  
12 was controversial before and it probably will be. Let's just say  
13 hypothetically. It would be nice to know: Hey, if instead of giving  
14 it to District - to Ward 5, you gave it to Ward - what would be to  
15 Ward 6, then the standard deviation would be four percent.

16 And then we will say, "Oh, well, that's still pretty good,"  
17 right? We're not making the neighbors mad because they're changing  
18 wards, and we're still at a low percentage, you know, the deviation.  
19 That - we may like that.

20 And in order for us to achieve that type of option, we  
21 would have to be working in tandem with the, the City Staff preparing  
22 alternatives for us, or using the map, 'cause I think (inaudible) we  
23 could that right on the spot. So, that's the thing, and at the same  
24 time, we would be advancing one forward so that we don't lose out in  
25 the public - in the timing in the sequence. That may be -

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: In my mind, what you're saying, too, is  
2 that don't underestimate the value of the public hearing because one  
3 of my original thoughts was that this is not just about balancing  
4 data. There also is a need to recognize people's feelings in that  
5 process. And a part of that - and the part of recognizing their  
6 feelings is in that public hearing.

7 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I think that's the most important piece  
8 of data that we're going to get that we don't have now. So, I guess  
9 with that, I'll go ahead and make my motion and we can amend it if we  
10 want to. But I actually have it written down now, so it will be more,  
11 more elegant.

12 Okay. I move that we hold the public hearing on November  
13 3<sup>rd</sup>, and we start the notification process with the newspapers now.  
14 In parallel, we request that Staff generate additional proposals to  
15 create a third majority-minority ward, and to get below 10% MPD with  
16 fewer precincts being moved.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: For purposes of discussion, do I hear a  
18 second?

19 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Bobby seconds it. Discussion.  
21 None? All right. Motion has been seconded. All in favor say "aye".

22 (Affirmative.)

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Motion passes. Okay. Are there any  
24 future agenda items, or did we already discuss them?



1           MR. HENDEL: I guess one other thought. Are we - how often  
2 does this committee meet? I mean not this committee, the  
3 redistricting committee. Like every - is it every two years, or is  
4 it only when it needs to meet with a minimum of every two years?

5           MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, members of the committee, the  
6 redistricting process takes place every four years, and every two  
7 years after a decennial census.

8           MR. HANDEL: Okay. So, it'll be four years from now. I,  
9 I just wonder if it's worth considering projected future population  
10 growth like my understanding is that Ward 4 is growing the fastest.  
11 Frankly, I think this is fine. I think it's so close to even the -

12           MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

13           MR. HENDEL: - in the - in four years it will be slightly  
14 imbalanced probably with Ward 4 having more than they should. But  
15 then the RAC in 2026 will take care of it, or just not take care of it  
16 because it'll probably still be well below the 10%. I'm fine with  
17 that. I just wanted to bring up the topic and see if anyone has  
18 thoughts on that.

19           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah. I don't think you should try to  
20 guess at what population is going to because I'm always really  
21 surprised about how development occurs and what that development looks  
22 like.

23           And sometimes development is people moving in equals a  
24 number of people moving out. It's, it's really difficult to, to  
25 project population and where it's going to occur or not occur.

1           MR. HENDEL: Sounds good to me. And then my other question  
2 for Staff. Did the motion that we passed give you what you needed in  
3 terms of starting the notification process with Proposal One, or do we  
4 need to make another motion to say like, "Tell the members of these  
5 wards specifically." Like do you need anything else or are we all  
6 set?

7           MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, members of the commission -  
8 committee, I don't think we need anything else because we will put the  
9 entire proposal out, do a display ad in the paper if we can get one  
10 done that quickly. And encourage our Council Members to use their  
11 mailing list to notify residents as well as doing as much advertising  
12 as we can.

13           MR. HENDEL: Great. Thank you. And the seven-day period,  
14 I guess if we tell the papers tomorrow morning - wait. So, then would  
15 they be publishing it the day of the hearing? Oh, that'd be great.  
16 Okay. Yeah, if we can publish it on Monday, that would give people a  
17 couple of days to get their schedules sorted out and show up on  
18 Thursday.

19           MS. MESICH: And that's the other question. Do you want to  
20 hold the public hearing here in this chamber?

21           MR. HENDEL: That's fine with me.

22           MS. MESICH: Okay.

23           MR. HENDEL: I think we should have a remote option in case  
24 someone wants to call in on the phone. Is that possible?

1 MS. MESICH: It's not really under Mayor and Council  
2 meeting guidelines. If people want to speak at Call to the Audience,  
3 they're encouraged to attend.

4 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Is there a place to have a comment  
5 section for people (inaudible)

6 MS. MESICH: And actually, what our public notice will  
7 include is how to e-mail or phone in or mail comments to us so that we  
8 can get as much input as, -

9 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

10 MS. MESICH: - as possible.

11 MR. HENDEL: Perfect. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And that door is the one that people  
13 come through, right? And we'll be sitting up there.

14 MR. HENDEL: Cool.

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Any other future agenda  
16 items that people would like to see?

17 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, one of the things we would like to  
18 do is if there is more data or information that you need for next  
19 week's meeting, if we could find out what that information is by  
20 Monday so that we can provide it to you in advance of the meeting.

21 We will also provide the information requested in the  
22 motion and get that to you as soon as we can. We'll work on that  
23 tomorrow.

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right. Everyone hear that? Good.  
25 Okay. That's it for additional discussion? Next meeting date, time?

1 MS. MESICH: November 3<sup>rd</sup> at 5:30 P.M.

2 MR. HENDEL: Is it - but that's the hearing, right?

3 MS. MESICH: After the public hearing, you can hold a  
4 discussion.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. So, would the hearing start at 5:30,  
6 and then our private meeting would be like right after that?

7 MS. MESICH: So, I would recommend the day of the public  
8 hearing that we approve Minutes, do any housekeeping items that need  
9 to go on the agenda. I can't think of any right off the bat. Go into  
10 the public hearing.

11 After the public hearing, you hold discussion on the input  
12 that you heard which either could make you change your recommendation,  
13 request more information, that type of thing.

14 MR. HENDEL: Yes, that sounds good to me.

15 MS. MESICH: If you're reading to vote on the proposal that  
16 night, that's fine. I mean we can agenda-size (sic) it that way, but  
17 then you'd have a good start.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I think that's a great idea. All right.  
19 Ready for adjournment? I have a motion that we adjourn.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Make a motion that we adjourn.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second? All in favor -

22 MR. ROBLES: I second.

23 (Affirmative.)

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We're adjourned. Thank you very much.

25 (Meeting was adjourned.)

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the original tape recorded conversation in the case reference on page 1 above.

Transcription Completed: 11/06/2022

/s/ Kathleen R. Krassow  
KATHLEEN R. KRASSOW - Owner  
M&M Typing Service