



## Legal Action Report and Minutes

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

DATE: Thursday, November 3, 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 5:35 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
Ed Hendel	Ward 3
Bobby Jaramillo	Ward 5
Mark Crum, Chair	Ward 6

<u>Absent:</u>	
Jenifer Darland	Ward 2
Alexus Kaiulani Dudoit	Ward 4

Staff Present:  
Suzanne Mesich, 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  
Randy Jones, City Clerk's Office  
Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Jennifer Stash, Principal Assistant City Attorney

**2. Approval of Minutes from October 20, 2022 and October 26, 2022**

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland Absent), to approve the Minutes from the meetings of October 20, 2022 and October 26, 2022.

**3. Public Hearing on Redistricting Proposal(s)**

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland Absent), to keep the public hearing open for continuance at a future meeting.

Information was provided by Chair Crum on the history and purpose of redistricting, the responsibilities of the committee, and the respective timeframe. He thanked the public for the submission of comments and those who were present at the meeting.

Comments were made by Debra Zelnio, Maass, Mike Weingarten, Meredith Aronson, Katherine Weasel, Kristina Scholz, Betsy Larson, John Burr, Chris Gans, David Bachman-Williams, Mary DeCamp, Martha McClements, Matthew Ostermeyer and Bonnie Poulos.

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

Information was provided on and discussion ensued on proposals 1, 2 and 3, and possible alternatives to these, taking into consideration comments received from the public and the legal requirements.

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland absent), to amend Proposal 2, with the least precinct movement possible to meet the target Maximum Population Deviation (MPD).

It was moved by Committee Member Robles, duly seconded, to create a map with a third minority-majority ward, for the Committee's review, and to help guide future conversations around redistricting.

Committee Member Hendel offered a friendly amendment to the motion, accepted by the motion-maker, that this map's MPD can exceed 10%. The motion, as amended, was carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland absent).

It was moved by Committee Member Robles, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland absent), that future meetings be live streamed.

## **5. Future Agenda Items**

The following items were identified for the next meeting agenda:

- Consideration of amended Proposal 2 redistricting map
- Review of proposed redistricting map, if available, that creates a third minority-majority Ward.
- Add Call to the Audience

## **6. Next Meeting Date/Time**

Discussion ensued about the next meeting and future meeting dates.

A consensus was reached that the next meeting of the RAC would be Thursday, November 10, 2022 at 5:30 p.m.

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0, (Committee Members Dudoit and Garland absent) to continue the public hearing to the Thursday, November 17, 2022 meeting.

An apparent consensus was reached, to schedule a meeting for Tuesday, November 29, 2022 and for staff to communicate with the members to ascertain their availability for this or a date between Monday, November 28 and Wednesday, November 30, 2022.

## **7. Adjournment**

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0, (Committee Member Dudoit and Garland absent) to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:58 p.m.

**CITY OF TUCSON**  
**REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**PUBLIC HEARING AND MEETING**

**NOVEMBER 3, 2022**

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

**PRESENT:**

**APPOINTOR:**

Patrick Robles	Ward 1
Ed Hendel	Ward 3
Bobby Jaramillo	Ward 5
Mark Crum (Chairman)	Ward 6
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor

**ABSENT:**

Jenifer Darland	Ward 2
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  
Randy Jones, City Clerk's Office  
Robert Hunter, City Clerk's Office  
Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Clerk  
Jennifer Stash, Principal Assistant City Attorney  
Peter Johnson, Information Technology  
Cait Boyer, Information Technology  
Laura Sharp, Information Technology

\*\*\*\*\*

1                   CHAIRMAN CRUM: If we may, I'd like to call this  
2 meeting to order. All right. I'd like to call the meeting to  
3 order. My name is Mark Crum. I'm the Chair of this Committee.  
4 And I'd like to make a few personal comments first of all.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 I've read through your emails, plus additional emails,  
2 telephone calls, and I'd like to thank you for your directness  
3 and your honesty; and, yes, your timeliness. If there's any  
4 responsibility or comments relating to late notice, inadequate  
5 information, bad news, surprises, and what I'd like is -- because  
6 I can relate to this -- need to contemplate -- need time to  
7 contemplate, I take full responsibility for that. But please  
8 understand that I don't go out in this world trying to be stupid  
9 on purpose. I try to have good intentions. And I think without  
10 the -- your help -- well, help of this Committee and Staff's  
11 help, I'll be able to do better. In terms of responsibility, if  
12 your dog threw up on your carpeting before you left, yep, I can -  
13 - I can take responsibility for that as well. Yeah, well, you're  
14 welcome.

15 I must admit that I really love this. It's a positive  
16 example and demonstration of freedom and democracy. And this is  
17 really very special to me in my heart and my mind, and to all of  
18 you again, thank you. So onward. Oh, yes, Ed you were wanting  
19 to make a motion? Roll call.

20 MS. MESICH: Maribel Alvarez.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: Present.

22 MS. MESICH: Patrick Robles.

23 MR. ROBLES: Present.

24 MS. MESICH: Jenifer Darland. Ed Hendel.

25 MR. HENDEL: Present.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MS. MESICH: Alexis Kaiulani Dudoit. Bobby  
2 Jaramillo.

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.

4 MS. MESICH: Mark Crum.

5 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Present.

6 MS. MESICH: Madam Clerk with five members  
7 present, a quorum of the Redistricting Advisory Committee.

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Approval of minutes.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: I make a motion to approve the  
10 minutes as is.

11 MR. ROBLES: I'll second.

12 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Is that for both meetings?  
13 Understood. All in favor? Oh, was there a second? Yes.

14 MR. ROBLES: I second it.

15 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Motion duly made and seconded.  
16 All in favor say aye?

17 (All Committee members respond affirmatively.)

18 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay. Motion to approve the  
19 minutes. All right.

20 Now, Public Hearing. I'll give an introduction on the  
21 redistricting process before we begin the actual Public Hearing.  
22 The Redistricting Advisory Committee was created by public  
23 initiative and adopted by voters in 1993.

24 The responsibilities of the Committee are to review  
25 relevant United States Census data to determine and advise the

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 Mayor and Council whether redistricting of the City ward  
2 boundaries is necessary; it determined in fact that redistricting  
3 is necessary. And so we are here to gather citizen input, to  
4 make a written recommendation to the Mayor and Council --

5 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- no later than -- recommendation  
7 will (audio cuts out) redistricting should occur --

8 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum? I just want to be  
9 sure that the members of the public can hear your comments. I  
10 think that'd be essential. Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay. I'm sorry. Federal  
12 requirements for redistricting -- better? Thank you. The one-  
13 person-one-vote requirement of the United States Constitution  
14 requires members of an elected body to be drawn from districts,  
15 here wards, of substantially equal population. A City's  
16 redistricting plan's constitutional validity under one person,  
17 one vote, is measured by MPD. The MPD measures the total  
18 percentage spread between the city's most under-represented and  
19 most over-represented. The goal is that an MPD should be not  
20 less -- should be less than 10%, which the Supreme Court of the  
21 United States considers a minimal deviation and presumptively  
22 constitutionally valid.

23 City Charter requirements. Any City redistricting plan  
24 must comply with the Tucson City Charter. In 1993, the City's  
25 voters amended Chapter 16, Sec. 1-8 to state:

1            "No redistricting plan shall be drawn  
2            for the purpose of favoring or disfavoring  
3            any political party or person, nor for the  
4            purpose of diluting the voter strength of any  
5            racial or ethnic minority group to the extent  
6            reasonably practicable or shall be equal in  
7            population and shall be contiguous and  
8            compact."

9            Additional policy objectives to accomplish the plan are  
10          in addition to reduce the maximum population deviation. We must  
11          give preference to options that will add -- that will advance  
12          rough proportionality of minority voting power, as well as  
13          options that reduce dilution that may otherwise exist from prior  
14          packing or fragmenting, and to reduce voter confusion by  
15          realignment of precincts having populations represented by more  
16          than one ward.

17          The MPD is calculated by dividing the total population  
18          of the City of Tucson by six wards, resulting in an ideal target  
19          for each ward. The percentage of persons over or under the  
20          target population is the MPD for each ward. The goal is to  
21          create a plan -- that is to create a plan of less than 10%  
22          citywide, which the Supreme Court again considers presumptively  
23          constitutional. The current MPD citywide is 13.4%.

24          At the meeting of October 26th, the Committee voted to  
25          hold a Public Hearing on November 3rd to invite public input on



City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 the map labeled Proposal 1. And, in parallel, the City Clerk's  
2 Office was directed to generate additional proposals to create a  
3 third majority/minority ward to get below 10% MPD, with a  
4 movement of fewer precincts and to provide alternate --  
5 alternative options. The additional proposals are labeled  
6 Proposal 2 and Proposal 3.

7 With that introduction, ladies and gentlemen, this is  
8 the time and place for a Public Hearing on the redistricting  
9 proposals. To best facilitate the Public Hearing, we will listen  
10 to the speakers and hold responses or discussions until the  
11 Public Hearing -- until after the Public Hearing. Speakers are  
12 limited to five-minute presentations.

13 Please come forward when I call your name and make your  
14 presentation. State your name, whether you live in the city, the  
15 ward you are representing, and whether you are a paid speaker.  
16 So --

17 MR. HENDEL: Before we start the hearing, I'd like  
18 to make a quick motion that we keep the hearing open after today.  
19 I know a lot of people had comments, particularly on how quickly  
20 the process is moving, and not everyone was able to make it in  
21 person today. So I'd just want to make sure people have a chance  
22 to come at the continuation of the Public Hearing. We'll discuss  
23 the date at the end of the meeting today, but I just wanted to  
24 quickly make a motion that we keep it open after today.

25 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Is there a second to

1 that motion? Second. All in favor say aye.

2 (All Committee members respond affirmatively.)

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Opposed? Motion is passed  
4 unanimately. Thank you very much for doing that.

5 So, the first person, Debra Zelnio.

6 MS. ZELNIO: Hello. I am representing myself.  
7 I'm a resident of the Broadmoor Neighborhood, which is Precinct  
8 82, and we're currently split between Ward 5 and 6. And I've  
9 been a resident there for 18 years and have worked really closely  
10 with Ward 6 on a number of projects, including the Broadway  
11 Village renovation and PAD development; the Broadway widening,  
12 which even though the street is done, we're just beginning on the  
13 development of the buildings and businesses; as well as the Reid  
14 Park redevelop- -- redevelopment.

15 And so I would like not to be separated from Ward 6  
16 because we have so much activity going on that's adjacent to our  
17 neighborhood. And I also feel like our neighborhood is -- our  
18 concerns are around these spaces and if we go into Ward 5, then  
19 -- I feel like we've developed kind of a long relationship with  
20 the Staff at Ward 6 on all of these really active projects right  
21 now. So -- so I'm opposed personally to the Proposal 1 which  
22 moves us completely into 5.

23 And I also felt like Proposal 1 appears to have the  
24 most disruption, you know, moving the most pieces; whereas, 2 and  
25 3 seem to move fewer of the -- of the precincts around and

1 actually keep our neighborhood in Ward 6, which I prefer. So  
2 thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you, Debra. Next speaker,  
4 the name is Maass.

5 MS. MAASS: Hello everyone. My name is Maass.  
6 I'm a lifelong Tucsonan. I'm an unpaid speaker. And I currently  
7 live in Feldman's.

8 First, I -- I think the redistricting decisions as  
9 kind of -- we heard about the requirements -- should not be based  
10 on relationships with ward offices since those have a chance of  
11 changing every four years.

12 Looking at the proposals, they seem to reinforce  
13 Tucson's racial and ethnic segregation by continuing to  
14 gerrymander Hispanic and Latin mix voters into Ward 1 and Ward 5.  
15 While I understand that race and ethnicity aren't the only  
16 demographic characteristics that matter when it comes to  
17 representation, we know it to be a reasonable proxy for a lot of  
18 different demographic -- other demographic variables. Even if  
19 the 2020 Census determined that 44% of Tucsonans identify as  
20 Hispanic and Latin mix, and then 43% of Tucsonans identify as  
21 white, I'm concerned that these redistricting proposals do not  
22 reflect our community's demographics and will maintain the  
23 disproportionate power that white voters have in electing a  
24 majority of the Council Members despite being a majority/minority  
25 community.

1 I don't mean to imply that the City Clerk's Office has  
2 made these maps with nefarious -- nefarious intentions by any  
3 means; it really looks like it's a path of least resistance in  
4 achieving 90,000 residents per ward by shuffling around these  
5 border precincts.

6 I will echo the concerns about the minimal public input  
7 that was given on -- through this process and kind of surprised  
8 two maps that came out -- I think yesterday. That said, I really  
9 encourage to go forward with Proposal 3 if this is -- these are  
10 the only options available to us, as it impacts the fewest number  
11 of people. Plus, as noted, Tucson is -- you know, being a  
12 majority/minority community, it makes sense that major economic  
13 hubs, like downtown and Fourth Avenue, are under the jurisdiction  
14 of one of the two majority Hispanic and Latin-mix wards and is --  
15 and -- and many of the precincts that are affected and -- with  
16 these switches in the downtown region -- they have historic  
17 Mexican-American -- the historical Mexican-American neighborhoods  
18 that were destroyed through racist urban renewal practices that  
19 gutted the barrios to accommodate white economic interests.

20 Somehow Proposal 3 seems like a really tiny symbolic  
21 gesture to acknowledge that history and can hopefully send us  
22 down a path to repair the harm that the City has inflicted on our  
23 Hispanic and Latin-mix neighbors. Thank you for your time.

24 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you for your comments. Next  
25 speaker, Mike Weingarten.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. WEINGARTEN: Is this one live?

2 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

3 MR. WEINGARTEN: Good. My name's Mike Weingarten.  
4 I live in the Broadmoor-Broadway Village Neighborhood, so a City  
5 resident. I am here representing myself but also the  
6 Neighborhood Association for Broadmoor-Broadway Village. And I  
7 am not a paid speaker.

8 We're basically speaking in pretty strong opposition to  
9 the proposal that would move the Broadmoor-Broadway Village  
10 Neighborhood into Ward 5 from Ward 6. This was recommended in  
11 2016, and we had a pretty good showing at that point of neighbors  
12 that were opposed, and it was decided to them in -- leave us in  
13 Ward 6 at that point. And not much has changed in terms of why  
14 we feel that it's important to stay in Ward 6.

15 I understand that -- I understand about needing to  
16 rebalance the numbers between wards; that is clearly a need. I  
17 also understand that we are in Precinct 82, and 82 is split --  
18 it's one of those precincts that are split between Wards 5 and 6.  
19 And it's clear that the City has an interest in trying to unify  
20 precincts under a common ward, all else equal, because that  
21 brings administrative simplicity. But, in our case, we really  
22 feel that all else is not equal. The -- our -- our neighborhood  
23 shares common interests and needs and identity with the other  
24 neighborhoods in Ward 6, and it greatly benefits from the fact  
25 that there is a common ward representation of all those

1 neighborhoods, including us, on those issues with City Council.

2 I think about issues and interests regarding the  
3 Broadway widening project, the Sunshine Mile. I think about our  
4 recent achievement as having historic district status and the  
5 special needs associated with that. I think about our  
6 neighborhoods' many connections to the University of Arizona. I  
7 think about where most of our residents shop, work, attend  
8 schools, play and worship; those areas are basically within areas  
9 that are in Ward 6.

10 Ward 5 neighborhoods have their own very real, very --  
11 very legitimate interests and needs that are just different from  
12 what those needs are in terms of ward -- Broadmoor-Broadway  
13 Village's needs. And I would fully expect that if that move were  
14 to take place, Mr. Fimbres, or whoever is in that seat, would do  
15 their very best to represent us. But the issue I think is -- is  
16 that the coherence of the representation would be very, very  
17 different from the way it is right now. That having us within  
18 the umbrella of other Ward 6 neighborhoods that are having  
19 similar interests, it is greatly beneficial to all of us, all of  
20 those neighborhoods. And I -- I worry that such a move would  
21 really negatively impact the level of -- of representation we  
22 would have in years to come.

23 So our request is understand the numbers, but please  
24 don't let just the exercise of numbers or the -- the effort in  
25 trying to get administrative simplicity outweigh the quality of

1 the -- the representation that these areas are getting. I think  
2 those are more important.

3 Lastly, I will just say that there are a number of  
4 people from our neighborhood that's here. I guess I'll ask them  
5 to stand, give you a feel for the people who have come in support  
6 of this. I'm also told that we have -- thank you -- had about 40  
7 responses so far -- with very short notice I understand, about 40  
8 responses, all unanimously opposed to the -- the idea of moving  
9 our neighborhood into Ward 5, so there's quite a bit of interest  
10 within the neighborhood on this. And I believe that's it. Thank  
11 you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Meredith Aronson.

13 MS. ARONSON: Thank you. Hello. Thank you for  
14 allowing me an opportunity to have an opinion in this matter.  
15 I'm Meredith Aronson. I live in the City of Tucson. I'm not a  
16 paid speaker. I'm missing something in that. There's one more  
17 question. There's something else I'm supposed to say before I  
18 talk. No help? Okay. We're moving along.

19 I -- I don't want to reiterate the comments of my -- my  
20 fellow neighbors, but I do want to add in the Broadmoor-Broadway  
21 Village context. There are a few things -- a few observations  
22 I'd like to add to the record with regards to why it might make  
23 sense in particular now for our interests in staying aligned with  
24 Ward 6, and that would be Proposals 2 and 3.

25 We've -- we have, over the last couple of years,

1 engaged in a couple of topical conversations; one to do with the  
2 Reid Park Zoo, Reid Park; and, of course, Sunshine Mile. These  
3 -- these topics and these concerns have activated the  
4 neighborhood in really interesting ways that most topics don't  
5 get people out to build conversation. And so when you think  
6 about what are those contexts, the neighborhood worked together  
7 with other neighborhood associations along Sunshine Mile in the  
8 first phase of this project, right? Because now the work  
9 continues. What's going to get built out along Sunshine Mile is  
10 of particular importance to midtown, and in many ways much less  
11 important to Ward 5.

12           The Reid Park Zoo and the interactions on the northern  
13 end around the Reid Park Zoo, and revisiting the public process  
14 on Reid Park Zoo, we're again activating multiple neighborhood  
15 associations and the neighbor- -- neighborhoods around us  
16 together on topics of interest. To separate our neighborhood  
17 into -- Precinct 82 into Ward 5 dilutes our ability to join with  
18 -- with topics of critical local and daily interest to the people  
19 who live in our neighborhood. People walk in Reid Park, right?  
20 People visit and use the businesses along Broadway. These are --  
21 these are far more intentional and interesting and important to  
22 people's day-to-day lives necessarily than development to the  
23 airport, for example. Development along 22nd will certainly  
24 impact us, but not as much as Sunshine Mile.

25           And so when we consider which of the proposals and --



1 and consider the impact not just of redistricting, but of where  
2 our intentions as a neighborhood are in effecting change, I would  
3 say very formally within Ward 6 our intentions and where we  
4 activate as a neighborhood have been to these large projects that  
5 are right to our north.

6 So, with that, I'd like to again ask for your  
7 consideration of our ability to remain with Ward 6 as we are  
8 today in Proposals 2 and 3 or any future proposals on the table.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Next speaker,  
11 Katherine Weasel.

12 MS. WEASEL: Hello. My name is Katherine Weasel.  
13 I reside in Ward 1 district. And I have been a paying taxpayer  
14 for over 20 years. Been in the same home for over 20 years. I'm  
15 on the westside and I like the westside the way it is.

16 And, if you're going to do anything, going north is a  
17 good proposal. On Propose No. 1, I would -- I would appreciate  
18 that. I want to stay away from going downtown more because it  
19 does not fit our lifestyle on the westside. I don't know how  
20 many of you know about the westside, but we're a little  
21 different. And we do not hang with U of A. We do not hang with  
22 downtown. And, like the gentleman before me said, they have  
23 taken away a lot of our barrios. They've taken away a lot of our  
24 nuance, our natural open undeveloped spaces with a matter of a  
25 flick of a pen. And I don't like that.

1           And so I feel that this proposal needs more time, more  
2 research, more development, and let's not rush this. But, if  
3 you're going to go -- as Ward 1 representative, like I am, I will  
4 go for Proposal No. 1. Thank you.

5           CHAIRMAN CRUM: Next -- next speaker, Kristina  
6 Scholz.

7           MS. SCHOLZ: Hello. My name is Kristina Scholz.  
8 I am a resident of Tucson. I am not a paid speaker. I currently  
9 reside in Ward 3, under Precinct 43, in the newly -- well, the  
10 newly reestablished Bronx Park Neighborhood. I also stand before  
11 you as President of the neighborhood association.

12           If I knew it was easy and that you would've actually  
13 read my emails, I would've done that. I'm a little bit nervous.  
14 But I also represent a neighborhood where engagement isn't the  
15 norm. We really don't have internet access for many of our  
16 residents. And when I think about the changes that we do want to  
17 make, as we've heard before from -- from our other  
18 representatives here, what we've built with the current Ward 3  
19 office, that's something special. And we have been through -- as  
20 you know for Ward 3, this is our third Council Member since the  
21 inception of our neighborhood association.

22           So, to build on that relationship, to prioritize what  
23 little interest we do have in what we can control, we found  
24 really willing partners in Ward 3; and for that reason, I would  
25 encourage that Proposal 1 be reconsidered. And I would put my --

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 my effort behind Proposal 2 and 3 so that Precinct 43 can remain  
2 with Ward 3. Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: All right. Betsy Larson.

4 MS. LARSON: Hi, guys. All right. So I came in a  
5 little bit heated because we just got word on Proposal No. 3. I  
6 apologize. I'm going to start over. My name is Betsy Larson.  
7 I'm not a paid speaker. And I'm here on behalf of West  
8 University Neighborhood Association.

9 We are a 44 district and Proposal No. 3 has some  
10 drastic changes for us and we just got word of that last night.  
11 I was just finally able to open up the map today. I think a lot  
12 of us are kind of caught off guard by all of this. So I think  
13 here I want -- a continuance of the discussion I think is very  
14 much warranted. We do not have an opinion because we haven't had  
15 time to talk to the business owners along Fourth Avenue, along  
16 University that are going to be impacted by this, much less the  
17 residents. So I think not only do we need time, but a couple  
18 more meetings would be really beneficial. So I think that's it.  
19 Thank you, guys.

20 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. John Burr.

21 MR. BURR: Honorable Chair and Council Members,  
22 thank you for having me. My name is John Burr. I live in Armory  
23 Park in the City. I am currently the Development Chair of APNA.  
24 I've been asked to speak for us, although there are several other  
25 members here tonight.

1 I, too, was a little surprised when the flurry of  
2 emails came about yesterday notifying us of Proposal No. 3. And  
3 I looked into it. I actually listened to your meeting. I want  
4 to thank you all for having great comments and doing your best to  
5 steer a very thoughtful process. I know Mark's been on this  
6 before several times and I've kind of watched these things.

7 I want to go on record saying that Armory Park and the  
8 neighbors we have talked to in Precinct 45 are opposed to  
9 Proposition No. 3. The problem I see with it is all of the  
10 historic districts downtown, all of the HPZs, all of the IID, all  
11 of the Tucson Del Norte Corridor, all of the economic corridor,  
12 and all of the other things that affect us, that we have  
13 commonality and interests with the other historic neighborhoods  
14 downtown, would be transferred exclusively to Ward 1 -- who has  
15 publicly stated that she is antagonistic to historic preservation  
16 and thinks it's an outdated mode, so we don't feel we would have  
17 very good representation.

18 Currently, Armory Park is split between Ward 5 and Ward  
19 6. Ward 6 has actually served our interests and taken over  
20 because we rarely hear from Ward 5; and that's been the case for  
21 almost a decade. So I understand your interest in not having  
22 split districts, but I don't think any of these three maps  
23 actually work. I understand that 13.5% won't work and isn't  
24 clear and that you do need to get more proportional  
25 representation because of movement in the demographics over the

1 years, but perhaps some split wards and some merging of other  
2 proposals might be a better way forward.

3 You all said 82 was probably going to object and here  
4 they are tonight. But we need to go on the record for Barrio  
5 Viejo -- I'm not speaking for them -- but the HPZs, Barrio Viejo,  
6 West University, Armory Park and El Presidio, would all be moved.  
7 And the Ward 1 office is not set up to deal with the impacts of  
8 all downtown development or represent any of us or our voice. So  
9 we urge you to not do Proposition 3. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Next speaker, Chris Gans. Chris  
11 Gans.

12 MR. GANS: Good evening. Chris Gans. I'm a  
13 resident of Tucson. I'm not a paid speaker. I'm a resident of  
14 West University Neighborhood for 40 years.

15 And we've worked closely with Ward 6 for many years to  
16 help maintain our historic status and we want to maintain that  
17 with one district, which is District 6. We've had successful  
18 engagements with Ward 6 in dealing with different issues of the  
19 neighborhood. Splitting it between Ward 6 and Ward 1 -- and  
20 we're one of the five historic districts in Tucson, eight  
21 Historic Preservation Zones -- would not be beneficial to our  
22 neighborhood. We have fought hard and long to maintain our  
23 historic district and we want to keep it that way -- and we want  
24 to keep it the way it is.

25 And so I'm asking you to toss Proposal 3 out, both for

1 No. 044 and 045, and leave it in Ward 6. I think that would be  
2 best for all of those of us that live and work in that area --  
3 and having the support of Ward 6, which has been consistent  
4 throughout issues that we've dealt with for the last -- at least  
5 with Steve K for the last 15 years. So appreciate your time.  
6 Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Next speaker, David  
8 Bachman-Williams.

9 MR. BACHMAN-WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My  
10 name is David Bachman-Williams. I'm a resident of Armory Park.  
11 I'm the President of the neighborhood association. And I am not  
12 a paid speaker.

13 I would like to, first of all, thank you all for your  
14 work. As a retired American Government teacher, I used to have  
15 my students redistrict the City of South Tucson; and, in five  
16 years, they came up with only two identical maps. So I know  
17 there's a zillion ways to redistrict any city or map, you know.  
18 If you can divide South Tucson 48 different ways, you can  
19 certainly divide Tucson by hundreds of different ways.

20 But representing Armory Park, I would like to say that  
21 we were surprised by, you know, the -- map No. 3 which showed up  
22 just yesterday afternoon -- in the late afternoon. And we were  
23 dismayed, because we have an excellent relationship with our  
24 ward. We have lots of issues very similar to some of the other  
25 ones tonight. We're in one of those precincts that inevitably

1 has lots of issues that deal with the -- with how our  
2 neighborhood is affected by this, that, and the other. So it is  
3 very important to us that we have a very good relationship with  
4 the staff at Ward 6, and we would very much like to keep it that  
5 way. Thank you very much.

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Mary DeCamp.

7 MS. DeCAMP: Hello. My name is Mary DeCamp. I am  
8 a City resident. I'm not retained by anyone. I'm in Precinct  
9 246 and I'm not even affected here. I don't have a dog in this  
10 fight.

11 And it is so nice to be back in public in a civil  
12 gathering with familiar faces who are intent on finding solutions  
13 that work for everybody. And I -- I think that that is our  
14 strength. Tucson is so marvelous. In this past month, I did  
15 Paint the Street in front of the Children's Museum. I did the  
16 downtown meeting at Maynard's Mural Tour with music. I did  
17 Cyclovia. I mean to say we have got a marvelous city here, and  
18 many of you are to thank for that. Your hard work, your  
19 dedication, your showing up is -- it gets me emotional.

20 I want to say shame on you, though, for the quickness  
21 of this process, for not inviting these voices and building on  
22 their strengths. We need more bridges. We need communication  
23 with one another in these types of arenas. And I just applaud  
24 everybody, especially the ones who aren't paid to be here  
25 tonight, which I think is -- is the majority, and for the City

1 workers who are probably underpaid and overworked and short-  
2 staffed, a special salute to you for your years of service.

3 I'd also like to put in a plug for community  
4 conservation centers, little mini civic centers that can be  
5 spread throughout the City that offer outreach that help the  
6 people who aren't here. The people who don't have homes and  
7 neighborhoods and stability, the more transient among us, to help  
8 steer them towards services that are available. Our volunteerism  
9 in Tucson is off -- off the charts. I see that with Cyclovia. I  
10 see that with -- with so many of the events. And we could  
11 leverage that. If we would develop residences across the whole  
12 City where people could go to learn what they need to do, how  
13 they can plug in, how we can catch each other's backs as  
14 volunteers, a safety net that makes us all live a little better  
15 life in community. And I would also change the artwork in the  
16 front. Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Is there anyone else  
18 here tonight that like -- would like to be heard on this item?  
19 Yes, Martha McClements.

20 MS. McCLEMENTS: Good evening. My name is Martha  
21 McClements. I live in downtown Tucson on 16th Street. I am -- I  
22 wish I were a paid speaker but I am not. And I'm representing  
23 myself mostly, but I am the Chair of the Armory Park Historic  
24 Zone Advisory Board.

25 You guys are a rock -- between a rock and a hard place



1 for sure. And I appreciate, as we have -- has been stated more  
2 than once, volunteering for the City and -- you just kind of feel  
3 like an unpaid staff person sometimes. I've been doing that for  
4 coming on eight years on this shift. Redistricting is an issue.  
5 It is a problem. As stated before, our main concern is keeping  
6 the historic districts with a known commodity that has been very  
7 supportive for all of us. The development needs in this town,  
8 the housing needs in this town, need to be carefully constructed  
9 with -- cooperation with Historic Advisory and the HPZ preserving  
10 Tucson's history. We all live in a tiny slice of that in the HPZ  
11 zones and we do our best. We don't want to see this wiped away.

12 And I have a really bad feeling about changing the  
13 district -- the ward designation at this point could open up some  
14 scary prospects. For example -- and -- and needless to say, the  
15 late call and the maps coming in within 24 hours, 48 hours,  
16 that's a crock of doodoo. And, Mark, you know better. I know  
17 you. You're very, very good about doing stuff by the book, so  
18 thank you for apologizing for that. That was an oof-dah.

19 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you.

20 MS. McCLEMENTS: Yeah, you bet. And do you want  
21 to come back on my board anytime? I'd love to have you back.  
22 He's excellent. He knows his stuff. He's one of these guys that  
23 has worked his ass off for years and years and years. And what  
24 does he get for us? Us coming and giving him grief because he  
25 made one oof-dah.

1           Anyway, I think you get the feeling tonight, at least  
2 from our neighborhood, No. 3, just please just round-can that  
3 one. Keep hard at work. Keep us informed. Let us know how you  
4 keep doing. And, unfortunately, you're not done yet. Thank you  
5 very much.

6           CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. One more speaker,  
7 Matthew Ostermeyer.

8           MR. OSTERMEYER: Good evening. My name is Matt  
9 Ostermeyer. I'm not a paid speaker. I am here representing  
10 Ironhorse Neighborhood Board. I can't say I'm representing the  
11 neighborhood because we only had a day to sort of get our  
12 thoughts together as a Board.

13           But I just want to add to the other historic  
14 neighborhoods' concerns about Proposal No. 3. Our working  
15 relationship with Ward 6 on our park currently, that is just  
16 about to start being refreshed and redone. We've worked with  
17 them on a giant development at Fourth and Ninth which is going to  
18 -- right at the edge of our neighborhood which is currently  
19 ongoing as well.

20           And one thing that I didn't think of until I was  
21 sitting here, but if you look at the -- I would guess if you look  
22 at the makeup of our neighborhood, you would see a very large  
23 percentage are students at the University of Arizona, And  
24 thinking about separating their interests sort of as students  
25 from the University proper doesn't really seem to make a lot of

1 sense to me either. Just thinking about the number of students  
2 who walk over to the University, that would be in a different  
3 ward with Proposal No. 3 as well. So -- and the same concerns  
4 about just the timeline and hoping to have more time to provide  
5 more formalized input from our neighborhood more broadly as well.  
6 But thanks for your work.

7 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you. Is there anyone else?  
8 Bonnie Poulos.

9 MS. POULOS: Good evening. My name is Bonnie  
10 Poulos. I live in Precinct 57 which is not affected by the  
11 current proposals for redistricting. I'm not a paid speaker.

12 But I am someone who'd beat the drum about tonight's  
13 meeting, because many of us who are involved in the community had  
14 no clue that this meeting was happening; that progress had been  
15 made on redistricting; and I felt that the process had failed us  
16 once again. But I would like to thank all of you who have served  
17 on this Committee and are here tonight, because this is probably  
18 one of the more difficult committees to be seated on, and  
19 involves a lot of issues that go beyond the simple fact of  
20 balancing our population.

21 I think that in the future when new maps are  
22 contemplated and precincts are looked at, or neighborhoods are  
23 looked at for redistricting, that the first person who should be  
24 contacted is the ward office; so that they can notify their  
25 constituents that this is in the works and there may be a

1 possible change to who represents them politically. That hasn't  
2 been done to my knowledge, and I think several of the Council  
3 Members were as much surprised by the information that came out  
4 recently as we all were. And I think it's important because we  
5 live in very politically volatile times right now; to assume that  
6 who represents us should be discarded or not considered in this  
7 decision-making process is not realistic in today's times.

8 But I also think that, demographically, we are a  
9 community that tries to come together. If you look at how we  
10 hold our elections, we select our candidates by ward, but we all  
11 participate in the decision as to who represents us. That means  
12 that if we feel we're not being adequately represented by the  
13 individual who's seated in the office of our ward, that we have  
14 the right and the obligation to seek out the Council Members who  
15 will represent us. And I think that's very powerful in our  
16 community and I think it's done us well.

17 I also do not think that we should look at past racial  
18 injustices that most -- none of us were here making those  
19 decisions when they were made, when our charter was written, when  
20 our community was planned out. We're here today and we're trying  
21 to work together. And I'd like to emphasize that the process and  
22 the optics of how you make your decision is probably just as  
23 important as the decision that you make. Thank you very much.

24 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Thank you very much. Anyone else?  
25 Seeing none, I would like to entertain a motion to continue the

1 hearing. We've done that. Thank you very much.

2 Well, then move on to Item No. 4.

3 MR. ROBLES: Mr. Chairman? Chairman Crum?

4 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Yes?

5 MR. ROBLES: I would first like to thank everyone  
6 for coming out this evening. It's crucial that we have members  
7 of the public involved in these conversations. But I -- it's --  
8 it's clear to me that we have to go back to the drawing board. I  
9 don't believe that neighborhoods should be split in half, but I  
10 believe we're missing a key part of the conversation and that is  
11 the Hispanic and the minority populations in these dist- -- in  
12 these wards. We're a majority/minority City, yet we only have  
13 two wards that are majority/minority.

14 So I'd like to communicate with my colleagues on this  
15 day, this evening, that we speak to the members of this Council  
16 who appointed us and look at what we can do to at least have one  
17 or two more majority/minority wards.

18 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I just want to address by  
19 comment. I believe at the last meeting we passed a motion to  
20 have Staff create a proposal that would have a third  
21 majority/minority ward, which would then bring us into compliance  
22 with the rough proportionality principle. Suzanne, do you want  
23 to speak to that?

24 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, members of the Committee.  
25 We have spent some time in the Clerk's office moving precincts

1 around on a map to create a third majority/minority ward, and  
2 we've not been successful without having to move tens of  
3 thousands of people, and it's just the nature of the demographics  
4 and where people are located now. That's something that we would  
5 have to continue working on to try to achieve and would have to  
6 do so with your direction and quite a bit of your input to get  
7 there.

8 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I just wanted to thank you for  
9 putting in the time. That definitely would be a difficult  
10 project and I'm sure we'll discuss it more right now. But just  
11 wanted to thank you for putting in the work to make all these  
12 different maps on -- on very short notice. The process has been  
13 very rushed, but we appreciate the work that Staff has done.

14 DR. ALVAREZ: Thank you very much for all the  
15 comments everyone. A couple of thoughts occurred to me. And one  
16 is that the first proposal tries to accomplish administratively a  
17 metric that is offered by the Supreme Court, all the deviation,  
18 and it does that. But the Supreme Court has also spoken clearly  
19 about other metrics and other criteria that is as equally  
20 important as a rationale for having redistricting, and that is  
21 rough proportionality and border dilution.

22 So somebody said between a rock and a hard place,  
23 that's exactly right, because you have not just a triangle now,  
24 you have a square, because you have to here address the dilution  
25 -- the -- the deviation that will stand up, right? And here you

1 have to have rough proportionality for majority/minority. That's  
2 also upheld by the Supreme Court. Here you have to then consider  
3 Hispanic majority, voter dilution. And I just said it last week  
4 and say it again, if we were in New Orleans that would be a  
5 different majority and a different dilution. But here we are in  
6 Tucson, so we have to consider the Hispanic population. And  
7 then, fourth, you also put in that square the cultural  
8 significance of the districts -- of the wards as they have  
9 existed as people have talked about. So that's a really -- I  
10 mean, on paper and on principle, you would say that's an  
11 impossible job. How do you do justice to all those four  
12 principles at the same time?

13 Now, as a Commission, we have been asked -- or charged  
14 under oath to actually uphold point one, two, and three, and then  
15 consider humanely as neighbors, because we also are residents of  
16 Tucson, point four. But that really is sort of the hierarchy of  
17 our charge and that's something that we're going to have to talk  
18 about in a way that is probably not in Proposal 1, 2, or 3, in  
19 any way.

20 So I -- I agree with my peer here that -- how do we do  
21 that? Something is going to have to give in that, because the  
22 way that you can move is only on the outer edges of those wards.  
23 You can't go in the middle and take someone and put them back  
24 here. It's not -- it's not trellis, right? So you have to only  
25 move clock- -- clockwise, this way, this way, this way, in order

1 to achieve it on the edges; and that method alone may not give us  
2 any of the maps that satisfy 2 -- 1, 2, or 3.

3 Now, here's a thought: 90,000 people per ward is a lot  
4 of people. I did a little bit of research and Chicago has 50,000  
5 per elderman. So maybe that's a little bit of a push of the  
6 imagination here, that part of this redistricting is a little  
7 heavy lifting of reimagining the wards altogether, which are  
8 arbitrary measures anyway, whether they're split or not split.  
9 As somebody said, you know, Ward 1 is busy with a whole bunch of  
10 this -- Ward 6 is busy.

11 So, that's something else that I think I want to throw  
12 on the record, the necessity for us to consider those four points  
13 of decision in relationship to also the self-imposed rule that we  
14 have given ourselves, that is roughly 90,000 people per ward.  
15 That doesn't have to be. We can create other wards. We could  
16 create other ways in which the map can be drawn. I don't know  
17 that we'll have time to do that in the next three weeks, but it  
18 sure is something that I'd like to put on the record as allowing  
19 our imagination, as Tucsonans, of is there a different way?  
20 Administratively difficult, City Clerk? Absolutely. But I know  
21 if we come up to that, you'll be up to the challenge.

22 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Right.

23 MR. HENDEL: If you don't mind, I would like to  
24 quickly define rough proportionality since we have a number of  
25 members in the audience who might not know exactly what the term



1 means. So, just to have it in the record, the idea is basically  
2 whatever percentage of the City that is minority, meaning non- --  
3 people who marked that they are not white only on the United  
4 States Census, that percentage should be roughly equal to the  
5 percentage of wards that are majority/minority; which, again, is  
6 defined as non-white, people who do not put white only on the  
7 Census.

8 Forty-five-percent of Tucson is minority under that  
9 definition, and so the rough proportionality principle says that  
10 roughly 45% of our wards should be a majority/minority. Right  
11 now, two of our six wards are majority/minority, which is 33%, so  
12 we're undershooting by 12%. If we added one more, we would then  
13 be at three out of six, which is 50%. We would then be  
14 overshooting by 5%, but 5% is less than 12%, so that would be  
15 closer to achieving the rough proportionality principle.

16 So just wanted to put that out there for context. Of  
17 course, if we added, you know, a seventh ward or an eighth ward,  
18 as my colleague just suggested, that would -- that would change  
19 the map and make it easier to get a little bit closer to that  
20 exactly 45% value. I share the concern that that would be  
21 difficult to do in three weeks. But just wanted to mention that  
22 so that people in the audience understand the idea behind that  
23 principle. Thank you.

24 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum, Clerk Mesich, I -- I'm  
25 grateful to my colleagues to my left who mentioned the idea -- or

1 that mentioned that we have to make a decision in three weeks.  
2 I'd like to see what we can do about extending the deadline. I'm  
3 21 years old. I'm going to be in this City for the next 40, 50,  
4 60 years. I want to see what we can do to make sure that we have  
5 equitable and sustainable wards here. I'd love to see what we  
6 could do about adding two more wards to make sure that we can --  
7 we can get creative and make sure that we have representation all  
8 across the board. So I'd like to see what -- what City Staff has  
9 to say about my idea of extending the deadline.

10 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair and members of the  
11 Committee, I think Jennifer Stash from the City Attorney's Office  
12 can address how to add wards to the City.

13 MS. STASH: In order to add an additional ward, it  
14 would actually -- it's in the Charter that there are six wards,  
15 so it would require an election. It's not something that's  
16 within the capacity of this group to be able to do so.

17 MR. ROBLES: Thank you.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum, colleagues, I would  
19 like to extend my appreciation for all of you being here this  
20 evening. I think it's crucial that we do get input from our  
21 public. And -- and I would like to thank our Chairman for a  
22 suggestion that we have -- and the rest of my colleagues, that we  
23 have a Public Hearing as soon as possible. We just got started  
24 on this about three weeks ago. And for -- and you folks are  
25 getting the information as we're getting it. So we're not trying

1 to rush it. I agree with my colleagues that we should extend it,  
2 and hopefully it's accepted that we put some thought into it, as  
3 well as hearing from the public. That is important. It affects  
4 all the hard work that you folks have done in your districts and  
5 your wards. And I think we should take that into consideration  
6 as well. So, with that, I --

7 CHAIRMAN CRUM: You know, one of my jobs is to  
8 state the facts as clearly as I can and to facilitate the  
9 conversation without telling you what you should do. So one of  
10 the things from the City Charter -- and you've already stated  
11 this -- this is the priority: To the extent reasonably  
12 practicable, wards shall be equal in population and shall be  
13 contiguous in impact; so that's -- that's our charge.

14 As to the number of wards, this has come up before.  
15 And the problem, as indicated, is do we have the time to do that?  
16 The City Charter requires that we -- that the Mayor and Council  
17 adopt the plan by December 31st, 2020 (sic). So the last meeting  
18 of the Mayor and Council before that date is the 20th of  
19 December, so -- and I'd -- I'd like to discuss this with my  
20 Council Members -- well, and whoever else. Can that be done?  
21 And I don't mean that rhetorically, I just mean that, you know,  
22 is it -- is it achievable?

23 In the alternative, there are other things we can do  
24 that -- I haven't noticed this really in any of the former  
25 documents from any other committee -- saying other

1 considerations, and we may want to say that in the strongest way  
2 that we would like the Mayor and Council to consider the addition  
3 of wards at smaller populations as was said. But to go to an  
4 election, that doesn't seem like it's -- it's doable. But let's  
5 explore ways and concepts, alternatives that are doable, and not  
6 just leave them out in the air as others have done. But that's  
7 just the consideration.

8 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I -- I agree with that. Thank  
9 you for those comments. I do think we should address some of the  
10 comments we've heard from the audience today and our large stacks  
11 of emails that we've received. I've done an unofficial tally,  
12 and we had 31 people from the Broadmoor-Broadway Village  
13 Neighborhood, as well as the 11 that joined us today that I  
14 counted. Apologies if I miscounted anything. But that was by  
15 far the largest group of people giving feedback from a given  
16 neighborhood. We also got 33 emails regarding the historic  
17 downtown area opposing Proposal No. 3; and then we got another  
18 eight or so today.

19 I also want -- as -- as the Ward 3 representative, I'd  
20 like to convey the concerns of Council Member Kevin Dahl. He  
21 does not support Proposal No. 1 because it removes some of the  
22 westside district that he's been working very closely with over  
23 the past year from his ward. In particular, there's -- he -- he  
24 sent us a letter -- I think we've all had a chance to see that --  
25 but just to reiterate some of the points in there. He -- Council

1 Member Dahl has been a member of the City Council for almost a  
2 year now, and he's spent a lot of time and money working with  
3 those precincts. I'm specifically referring to Precinct 153 and  
4 some of the ones in that -- in that area that would be  
5 transferred to Ward 1 under Proposal No. 1.

6 There's a lot of programs in the City that have funding  
7 for various things and the City Councilors work with the  
8 neighborhoods to kind of distribute that money and figure out  
9 exactly which streets it would be most useful on, including the  
10 Storm-to-Shade Program, Tucson Clean and Beautiful, ARPA, Back to  
11 Basics, and a number of others that Council Member Dahl has been  
12 working with those -- those neighborhoods on. And so he feels  
13 that moving those out of his ward right when he basically just  
14 started working with them and is -- it's still an ongoing process  
15 would be unfortunate.

16 I don't want to take too much time with this comment,  
17 but basically Ward 3 does not support Proposal 1 primarily for  
18 that reason. And Proposal 1 is also the one that the Broadway --  
19 that Broadmoor-Broadway Neighborhood opposes, and that was the  
20 largest group that spoke up about any of this. So I think we  
21 should consider just scrapping Proposal 1. That -- that one --  
22 it's also by far the most disruptive over all, if you just look  
23 at the number of wards that would -- the number of precincts that  
24 would be moved. It's by far the largest and, yet, it's  
25 essentially the same as the others in terms of getting the

1 overall MPD, which is the population discrepancy. Those are all,  
2 you know, around the 2- or 3% range, which is well below the 10%  
3 that is mandated by the federal court system, so I think Proposal  
4 1 should be scrapped. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Just as an additional  
6 consideration, we don't have to adopt any proposal in total. So,  
7 if we want to, we can modify any of the proposals we've received.  
8 And certainly, as it relates to Ward Sample 1, my Council Member  
9 feels pretty strongly about maintaining Precinct 42, which is,  
10 what, North University and one other. But that doesn't mean we  
11 cannot take other parts of that proposal -- and I noticed, for  
12 example, there we have Precincts 98, 105, and 113, for example.  
13 My Council Member is saying -- well, in the spirit of going for  
14 the low-hanging fruit first of all and keeping things simple --  
15 he's prepared to let those go.

16 And the important thing about -- what this is all  
17 about, the conversation to me, is if we're mixing and matching  
18 and trading and all of that, the City Clerk's Office can do a re-  
19 -- a calculation right now, real time, and tell us what the  
20 impact of those suggestions we may have in moving wards around,  
21 meaning -- and I say this in terms of -- I looked through a lot  
22 of what prior commissions did -- and then we're dealing with  
23 split precincts -- but depending upon what other commissions did,  
24 they're all over the map. So we're pretty much free to do what  
25 we want to do in terms of the placement of precincts in

1 particular wards as long as we don't exceed -- or meet that 10%.

2           So I say that not -- hopefully not to confuse things,  
3 but to say we can talk and we should. And it doesn't matter --  
4 we should not -- we necessarily shouldn't be driven by any  
5 proposal. And I say that -- not necessarily to say that, you  
6 know, we should adopt one of the proposals. We can. But we can  
7 do some modifying if we want to. Thank you.

8           DR. ALVAREZ: So, certainly, I'm not ready to  
9 adopt any proposal today. We have a few weeks of work together  
10 and -- but I do want to ask Madam Clerk about Proposal 1  
11 including the -- meeting the objectives of the deviation and no  
12 split precincts. Hearing the public, that didn't seem to bother  
13 people, the split precincts, as long as the wards were intact.  
14 Could you speak to that a little bit and why was that important  
15 as a criteria in Proposal 1?

16           MS. MESICH: Thank you. Mr. Chair and members of  
17 the Committee, One of the goals of redistricting is to try and  
18 eliminate splits as much as possible. When we were just coming  
19 up with Proposal 1, we found that if we got rid of all of the  
20 splits, we were -- we had a good MPD, a nice low one; however,  
21 that is certainly not the most critical factor for you to -- you  
22 to decide on redistricting. We've had split precincts for  
23 decades and we know how to manage them during an election.

24           CHAIRMAN CRUM: And if I may add, we can say add  
25 these split precincts, don't bother with them at all, or place

1 split -- split precincts elsewhere. So, at least on one  
2 commission that was dealing with split precincts and other  
3 things, their MPD was something like 7%. They actually increased  
4 that and presented that to the Mayor and Council and it was  
5 adopted. And I say that not to be argumentative but to say, wow,  
6 we have room to talk. And, although it does say eliminate split  
7 -- try to eliminate split precincts, it doesn't say how many,  
8 which ones, or if any.

9 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum, I -- I want to touch on  
10 two points; one, two, three comments ago you mentioned about the  
11 timeline that we have. I believe it's important to note that we  
12 are very rushed and next time around, I hope that it doesn't have  
13 to be that way. So, you know, with -- with all due respect to  
14 our City Staff here, I would hope that the timeline for  
15 redistricting, the next go-around, begins a lot sooner so that we  
16 can have concrete conversations without a pressing deadline,  
17 because I know we're talking about very bold and big ideas this  
18 evening.

19 And -- and then, secondly, my colleague, Mr. Hendel and  
20 Chairman Crum, we -- we looked at the maps, right, and certain  
21 precincts -- and when we're going through all these different  
22 proposals, I'm noticing that the suggested precincts -- all  
23 redistricting are on the edges of the wards. I want to remind my  
24 colleagues that we have to -- I -- I -- I don't want to go with  
25 the status quo. A lot of these wards are going back and forth



1 every two years. I don't believe that's sustainable, nor is it  
2 equitable. So I would like to remind my colleagues and ask my  
3 colleagues -- let's look at something different and echo my  
4 colleague, Dr. Alvarez's comments, that let's reimagine these  
5 precincts and go big with what these wards should look like these  
6 next two years.

7 CHAIRMAN CRUM: I think I absolutely agree with  
8 you about the time schedule; and I think the first folks that  
9 would agree to that is the City Clerk's Office. And part of that  
10 is that we're not always in control of the schedule, for example,  
11 if you would?

12 MS. MESICH: I think I mentioned this at the first  
13 meeting, but for people in the audience, redistricting starts at  
14 the State level and it was a tough year, and still I don't think  
15 all issues have been resolved in court yet. I could be wrong.  
16 After the State has redistricted, it goes to the County where  
17 they -- they are the ones who draw the precincts and do their own  
18 redistricting. They finished in July and that put us behind to  
19 begin with, and then to get the Committee compiled took some  
20 additional time. So, yes, I -- I would like nothing better than  
21 to have much more time in the future and will do everything I can  
22 to see that that happens.

23 MR. ROBLES: Thank you, Madam Clerk.

24 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Oh, attorney -- yes?

25 MALE SPEAKER: Chair Crum, Madam Clerk, members of

1 the Committee, just to supplement that the question is a very  
2 useful one earlier, though, about possibly extending your time,  
3 and just for everybody to have full information, agreeing with  
4 everything that's been said. The -- the Charter requires that  
5 the Mayor and Council redistrict by December 31st of this year.

6 Now, your operating ordinance as of now says you have  
7 until November 30th to give a recommendation. In theory, that  
8 can be not just a theory, it can be extended by Mayor and Council  
9 if they want to pass an ordinance. The problem is, as was  
10 pointed out, there's the -- the last meeting they'll actually  
11 have this year is December 20th, so just remember: If you  
12 lengthen your time, you're shortening their time. So that -- I  
13 just want everybody aware of that. Thank you.

14 DR. ALVAREZ: I -- I have some questions of  
15 clarification, two questions. One, can -- can we split a  
16 precinct? That's my first question.

17 MALE SPEAKER: And I think --

18 DR. ALVAREZ: The answer is?

19 MALE SPEAKER: -- the short answer -- the short  
20 answer, Mr. Chair, members of the Committee, is, yes, you could.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: Okay. My other question is: In the  
22 MPD deviation, 13.4 is above what Supreme Court standard gives us  
23 of 10%, but Proposal 1 gives us 2%. Well, we have still room  
24 there for some changes and still -- you can be at 3%, 4%, 5 --  
25 you can go up to 9%, 9.5%, and still have compliance with the

1 standard; so there's a lot of wiggle room there. Could you speak  
2 to that, Madam Clerk, in terms of the -- the -- the range of  
3 possibilities that we have in that?

4 MS. MESICH: And our attorneys could probably  
5 speak better. But the MPD, the deviation that's been upheld by  
6 the U.S. Supreme Court is 10%, and anything at that or below is  
7 considered --

8 MALE SPEAKER: Presumptively -- if I may, Mr.  
9 Chair, members of the Committee, presumptively valid. And then  
10 this is all a bit of a numbers game because it's all precedents.  
11 Between about 10 and 17, there's no presumption of validity. If  
12 somebody challenges you, you're going to have to defend it. And  
13 then above 17 is presumptively invalid. That's -- that's just  
14 based on case law precedent, but what -- the cases that have come  
15 before them. But you do have lots of room up to the 10%  
16 certainly.

17 MR. HENDEL: I wonder if we should consider  
18 something that brings us down to 9% with like extremely minimal  
19 changes or -- I don't know. Because like no one's complaining  
20 about the current situation, right? We don't have anybody here.  
21 I haven't seen any emails that said we want to move to a  
22 different ward. Correct me if I'm wrong, but it seems like the  
23 only problem with the status quo is that the MPD is within that  
24 range where we could be challenged and we'd have to defend it.  
25 So what if we just made the fewest possible changes that we could

1 in order to bring us down below 10%?

2 DR. ALVAREZ: But that's not the only -- we also  
3 would have to contend with rough proportionality and border  
4 dilution of Hispanic voters at least -- for example, no one has  
5 mentioned Ward 2 where there seems to be a real  
6 disproportionality there. Since they're not here, we can just  
7 take it all from them. Just kidding. Actually, that's a really  
8 good point, but I think that we would still have to address those  
9 other -- those other mandates a little bit, play with it. But it  
10 seems to me like we have some wiggle room to get up to 9.5 if we  
11 needed to, in deviation, and still see how the numbers -- and  
12 that may not be done tonight. Our next meeting, we may all be on  
13 the board and then do what Chairman Crum says, it's like what if  
14 this one was -- what if -- and then just play in real time with  
15 -- with the numbers.

16 CHAIRMAN CRUM: I thought that was an excellent  
17 question about can we split precincts? And we can. Now, why  
18 that's germane to me and we're -- now we're talking about  
19 numbers. This might sound maybe crazy, but as it relates to  
20 Precinct 42, I believe that's composed -- and that's one of the  
21 things that Steve Kozachik felt strongly about -- but it's  
22 composed of North University and Feldman's. Feldman's happens to  
23 be a historic district. So he told me he -- it's Feldman's that  
24 he really wants to keep, it's not necessarily North University;  
25 and those are not minority necessarily neighborhoods. So we

1 might consider doing that where it's -- it's reasonable to do  
2 that.

3 MR. HENDEL: Isn't that how it is now?

4 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Pardon me?

5 MR. HENDEL: Is that how it is right now? If you  
6 look at the base map, 42 is already split with Feldman in Ward 6,  
7 and north --

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Yes.

9 MR. HENDEL: -- north of that in Ward 3, correct?

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: It's -- but it's one -- in one  
11 precinct. But if you look at the neighborhoods -- within that  
12 precinct there are two neighborhoods. And my Council Member  
13 would like to keep one of them and give the other one to your  
14 Council Member. And your Council Member didn't mention --

15 MR. HENDEL: But would it be giving it to Ward 3  
16 or just -- it's already in Ward 3. That's the current -- that's  
17 the -- what -- what you're describing is how it is right now.

18 CHAIRMAN CRUM: And the recommendation, though, is  
19 that it go to Ward --

20 MR. HENDEL: Right.

21 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- 3.

22 MR. HENDEL: We could keep that ward split -- I  
23 mean, keep that precinct split the way it is now. I don't think  
24 that would be considered creating a split precinct; it would just  
25 be keeping the precinct split in exactly the way that it

1 currently is and that sounds fine to me. I would be okay with  
2 that.

3 I -- I wonder if we could create like -- it seems like  
4 Proposal No. 2 is the least controversial of the three, but it's  
5 not fully uncontroversial because -- mostly because of Feldman.  
6 So what if we did Proposal 2, but keeping ward -- but keeping  
7 Precinct 42 split the way that it currently is and the way that  
8 our Chairman just suggested his Council Member would like it to  
9 stay? I bet we'd still be way below 10%.

10 MS. MESICH: Would you like us to bring that up --

11 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Absolutely.

12 MS. MESICH: -- and make that change?

13 MR. HENDEL: I think at that point we would at  
14 least have something that no one so far has voiced opposition to,  
15 but correct me if I'm wrong about that. For members of the  
16 audience, if you look at the TV screen up there, they're doing  
17 this in real time, so soon you'll be able to see what that would  
18 look like. I guess my broader point is that I think it is  
19 possible to create a map that no one has opposed so far. Sorry.  
20 A map that moves precincts enough to bring us below 10%, but does  
21 not move any precincts that have expressed concerns at this  
22 hearing or in the emails. And, of course, we're going to  
23 continue the hearing and I would not be surprised if we do get  
24 some opposition at that one. But it's a iterative process and  
25 that would at least be progress towards a consensus map.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. ROBLES: Do we know what the minority  
2 population of that particular precinct is?

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: The last -- this is an excellent  
4 discussion. Thank you.

5 MR. HENDEL: I do -- I do have that. Let me pull  
6 that up -- or if Staff -- if Staff has that. Forty-two --  
7 Precinct 42, total population 9,300. The minority population is  
8 3,300, and so that's about, what, a third? Three- -- 3,358  
9 minority, 9,351 total.

10 DR. ALVAREZ: That offers interesting math on 42,  
11 because if we were to split it for the demographic minority,  
12 right now Ward 3 is 34.5 Hispanic. If you added -- if you began  
13 to add more to Ward 3, you could have the chance of making that  
14 closer to a 40 -- to a closer majority Hispanic which will  
15 accomplish -- and that would be the best -- most logical thing is  
16 to increase that, because you have 34.5 that would be in one --  
17 oh, on -- I see what you say. Okay. Proposal 2 then?

18 MR. HENDEL: The base map.

19 DR. ALVAREZ: On the base map.

20 MR. HENDEL: Right now.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: I see, 36 -- okay.

22 MR. HENDEL: (Unintelligible; audio cuts out.)

23 DR. ALVAREZ: Okay. Then let me rethink that  
24 then. I was looking at the wrong map.

25 MS. MESICH: So the change was made on the map

1 that's on the monitor, and I think some of you have it on your  
2 laptops. You can see in the upper right corner, the blue is the  
3 overall City MPD, keeping Precinct 42 as a split in Proposal No.  
4 2.

5 MR. HENDEL: So that is no longer below -- so that  
6 went from 3% to nearly 12% just by not -- hmm, all right. Well,  
7 thank you for putting that together. I'm surprised. But that's  
8 how the math works, so that's not going to be a viable option.

9 MS. MESICH: Unless you make other changes on that  
10 same proposal.

11 MR. HENDEL: Right.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: But couldn't you move some  
13 precincts, I don't know which one, on Proposal 2 from Ward 1 to  
14 Ward 3? So, for example, if you added -- if you added Precinct  
15 37 to 3, and even possibly Precinct 97, Silverbell, Speedway and  
16 Grant areas, which would probably add to the minority count. You  
17 -- in other words, what I'm saying is take it from -- from the  
18 robust ward that has the strongest minority and give it to the  
19 next possible ward that could go majority. So the only way to do  
20 that will be take it from -- from 1, give it to 3.

21 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I want to ask a clarification  
22 question for Staff. The rough proportionality principle that  
23 we've been discussing, which says that 45% of our wards should be  
24 majority/minority, is the -- first of all, how binding is that?  
25 Is that -- because that's not on the same level as the federal



1 Supreme Court ruling that you can't have, you know, less than  
2 10%. Well, I guess it's beneath that in terms of how legally  
3 binding it is I believe. Correct me if I'm wrong. But, also,  
4 I'm wondering does it have to be mathematically perfect? Like,  
5 do you just have to round to the nearest matching number of  
6 wards, and so 45% would round either -- would round up to 50%,  
7 and right now we're at 33%, so we're undershooting by too much?  
8 Or is it instead just that you have to be like within one of the  
9 -- does anybody know? I'm guessing no one actually has a firm  
10 answer to this, but just curious.

11 MALE SPEAKER: So, Mr. Chair, Madam Clerk, members  
12 of the Committee. I'll take a stab. The -- you are absolutely  
13 right that the rough proportionality is not at the same  
14 constitutional level as, say, MPD. As to your second -- but it  
15 is something for you to consider and that's kind of -- to your  
16 second question. I don't think it's meant to be like there's  
17 some mathematical right or wrong. It's a concept for you to be  
18 considering as best you can within the framework of the other  
19 concepts. I hope that helps.

20 MR. HENDEL: Thank you. That is very helpful. I  
21 guess I think that if we had only one majority/minority ward,  
22 that would be a huge problem because then we'd be at, you know,  
23 way below the 45%; or if we had five majority/minority wards,  
24 we'd be way overshooting the percent of the City that's minority.  
25 But it seems to me that two or three out of six are both at least

1 acceptable, if not necessarily optimal. But I think we could  
2 leave it as it is and no one could say, oh, you're -- you're  
3 dereliction of duty, you know, you're not -- you're not following  
4 that principle. And -- and creating a third would be closer but,  
5 you know, still not perfect.

6 DR. ALVAREZ: I -- I wonder if you have any  
7 insights about Ward 1, what would it mean to -- to change  
8 Precinct 37 and 97? And we don't have to decide today, we can  
9 consult with Council Member Santa Cruz. But 37 and 97, if they  
10 were moved to Ward 3, what would happen there?

11 MS. MESICH: So we have that up on the map --  
12 reduce the previous MPD data to 9.57, if I can read that  
13 correctly.

14 DR. ALVAREZ: That would be the impact on the ward  
15 in total minority then?

16 MS. MESICH: Can somebody read the numbers? I  
17 can't see from here. Sorry.

18 MALE SPEAKER: With moving Precinct 37 and 97 from  
19 1 -- from Ward 1 into Ward 3, it moves the plan deviation up to  
20 13.01%.

21 MR. HENDEL: And right now Ward 1 is already too  
22 small as it is in the base map in the current situation. So we  
23 can't move too many people out of Ward 1 without bringing even  
24 more people into it; otherwise, we're going to have trouble with  
25 our total deviation percentage.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 DR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, the deviation doesn't --  
2 doesn't help, doesn't accomplish what we need.

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Right.

4 MR. HENDEL: That's the tricky thing. In theory,  
5 you know, if you wanted to make a third majority/minority ward,  
6 you'd move people from 1 to 3. But 1 is already too small. You  
7 can't move too many people out of it, so there's not really a  
8 clean way to do it. As Suzanne mentioned, creating that third  
9 majority/minority ward is really difficult and it's -- yeah, I  
10 can -- I can see why.

11 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Well, here -- here's --

12 MS. MESICH: There was --

13 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- another consideration if I may  
14 -- it's not to confuse things, but just to be safe -- make it  
15 visible to everyone, and that is the changes that we would have  
16 of -- what the change would be upon the neighborhood or  
17 neighborhoods where we're changing precincts. And a previous  
18 group -- and, indeed, this is later adopted by the Mayor and  
19 Council. They wrote:

20 "Although neither the Tucson Charter nor  
21 Tucson Code provide for review for this type  
22 of impact, that is, the impact it would have  
23 upon the neighborhood, the committee felt it  
24 was an important consideration in maintaining  
25 the established and recognizable ward

1 boundaries with a minimum of disruption."

2 And so at some point in time, if we do make a change in  
3 terms of where a precinct may be, we need to go back to the -- my  
4 opinion, we need to go back to the Council Member and also  
5 announce it to the neighborhood, my opinion, in terms of -- to  
6 see what their feelings would be about that; and it may be  
7 nothing.

8 DR. ALVAREZ: Thank you. I think that there's a  
9 couple of other possibilities that I'd like to see. For example,  
10 Precinct 72 on Proposal 2, what if that went to -- to Ward 3?  
11 Potentially, you could also do Precinct 99 and 107; that seems to  
12 be kind of a contiguous cultural area if you think about it,  
13 through Pima, Alvernon, Craycroft, Swan, there's something there,  
14 72, 99, 107. So you will be taking from Ward 2 to -- again, my  
15 goal here is to get -- my -- my goal is to -- the most economical  
16 path for an increased majority would be to build it on -- on Ward  
17 3.

18 MR. HENDEL: I think those precincts are all --  
19 not majority/minority, so that would actually make it further  
20 from having a third majority/minority precinct. If I'm -- if  
21 Staff could correct me -- if I'm wrong, let me know. But, from  
22 this chart, it looks like those three wards are all  
23 majority/majority. Would that be the right term,  
24 majority/majority?

25 DR. ALVAREZ: Hmm. I was never so good at math.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MS. MESICH: So it looks like moving 72, 99, and  
2 107 into Ward 3 left us with an MPD of 11.83, and minority  
3 population of 43. Can you read that? Oh, one more change. Got  
4 it.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: Yeah, it looks like -- it looks like  
6 to do what I'm trying to do, you have to then keep moving the  
7 pieces and do it clockwise, and move another one and another one,  
8 and then you may -- which may be okay to do. I don't know.  
9 Maybe I'm on the right track, maybe I'm not. I'm not sure. But  
10 we may play with that. But I don't -- I don't think we can  
11 accomplish it tonight.

12 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Getting on with another  
13 consideration perhaps, Precinct 43 -- and I go back to the first  
14 proposal -- and moving that from Ward 6 as it is now into Ward 3.  
15 What would be the impact of that?

16 MR. HENDEL: Currently, I see 43 is in Ward 3.  
17 And --

18 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay.

19 MR. HENDEL: -- and -- and, by the way, that --  
20 that's one of the ones that Council Member Dahl has invested a  
21 tremendous amount of money and time into, so he would be opposed  
22 to -- to losing that one.

23 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: I'm assuming that if public  
25 comments are going to continue to next week, probably going to

1 have to push out another proposal ideally? Or is the goal of  
2 this Committee to use the comments to further guide our -- our  
3 drawings of the wards? Because, if so, I'd like to get an idea  
4 what the timeline is; this way we can allow for public comment.  
5 But, secondly, if we're going to go back to, like, our Council  
6 Members and ask them for suggestions, we -- you know -- and we  
7 bring those suggestions with us to the next meeting, like I just  
8 want to get an idea of where the Committee's feeling on this,  
9 because we -- we haven't set -- I love the ideas we discussed,  
10 but we haven't set anything in stone. This way folks can come  
11 prepared with -- with their thoughts.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: That's -- that's a really good  
13 question. I think what we're -- what we're getting at is that we  
14 are respecting -- we're trying to do what the neighbors are  
15 asking us to do for -- in this -- in Ward 6, specifically  
16 Precinct 92. I think that we're all feeling like, look, just to  
17 focus on that precinct, it's just sort of -- it's just symbolic  
18 violence that we don't need to do and mess with, you know? But  
19 there are other edges where we can chip away and move around, and  
20 I think that's what we're trying to do.

21 And -- and maybe there's something incredibly important  
22 that I don't know that has happened at the edge of Craycroft and  
23 Pima, you know, that is not here tonight and we don't know. But  
24 I haven't heard that and neither do I envision it from my  
25 knowledge of Tucson in the way that I envision Armory Park,

1 downtown, and Broadway. You see what I'm saying? So I'm trying  
2 to see what -- where is wiggle room on the edges of those things,  
3 moving clockwise, that will give us those things, a protection of  
4 the -- every -- acknowledging what we heard tonight and also  
5 still trying to accomplish our goals. That's kind of what I'm  
6 trying to do. I think that's what we're trying to do. And, like  
7 I said, maybe that's not fair to those people who are not here  
8 tonight and we don't have exactly -- but -- but the areas we  
9 heard from are really kind of like core areas of identity and  
10 belonging in the City, as opposed to some of the outer suburbs.

11 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Well, I may -- although Ward 6  
12 does not support the proposal of -- the third proposal, the third  
13 proposal is saying, well, they'd like two of the wards -- two of  
14 the precincts from Ward 6 in, say, trade for -- for Precinct 105.  
15 Do you see where 105 is? It's way southeast. So, if that gives  
16 any room for some thought as well, as necessarily they don't have  
17 to be contiguous in terms (audio cuts out) with thoughts.

18 MR. HENDEL: I think the -- by far the two largest  
19 blocks of public opposition we've had are from the Broadmoor-  
20 Broadway Village which is 82, and the historic districts which is  
21 44 and 45, which is like the downtown area and the historic  
22 district there. And those are -- that's why a lot of Ward 6  
23 members are opposing Proposals No. 1 and 3.

24 What if we took Proposal 3 and just kept 44 and 45  
25 where they are? I'm guessing that would not bring us down below

1 the 10%, but -- because that would only be moving one precinct,  
2 which is 105; probably wouldn't do it. But that would give us a  
3 map that everyone agrees on, although it might be illegal. But  
4 could we -- could we look at that just as a point of perspective,  
5 Proposal No. 3 where you don't move 44 and 45? It seems like if  
6 that's legal, that would give us one that no one has voiced any  
7 opposition to so far. It doesn't really --

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: One more time, what are you doing  
9 -- saying do with 44 and 45?

10 MR. HENDEL: I was suggesting that we don't move  
11 those.

12 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Don't do anything?

13 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, because a lot of people from  
14 those precincts have voiced staunch opposition.

15 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Very good. Thank you.

16 DR. ALVAREZ: In that sense, I would be willing to  
17 go with the earlier comment that we pretty much are not feeling  
18 that we're going to advance with Proposal 1; that there's a  
19 consensus here that Proposal 1 doesn't get us to where we need to  
20 be.

21 MR. HENDEL: I agree.

22 MR. ROBLES: I'm -- I'm interested in learning  
23 about the feelings from Ward 5. I know there's a few precincts  
24 that are very close to Ward 6. I -- I'm just -- I'm curious to  
25 see if those thoughts can further guide our conversation about



1 what was discussed this evening and as well as increasing  
2 minority population in wards that have a deficit.

3 MS. MESICH: You can see on the map that keeping  
4 44 and 45 in Ward 6 moves the MPD back up to 13.29%; and, in  
5 addition, makes the population deviation much higher in Ward 6.

6 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Well, it was worth a shot.  
7 Thank you for trying.

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: So, if that was the case, what if  
9 Ward 6 were to give up either 98, 105, or 113, or all to either  
10 Ward 2 or -- in this case, my idea is that the minority  
11 populations are probably rather high in those three precincts --  
12 and giving them to Ward 5, which may help that clockwise  
13 strategy?

14 MS. MESICH: I think they're more contiguous to  
15 Ward 4.

16 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Ah.

17 MR. HENDEL: And Ward 4 is already too large right  
18 now. So, if we add a lot to them, we have to take even more out  
19 of them which would be giving that to Ward -- probably 5.

20 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Well, a few years ago, by the way,  
21 they actually did belong to Ward 4.

22 DR. ALVAREZ: I'm feeling like maybe -- well, I'm  
23 feeling like I need to get home, but I'm also feeling like we are  
24 starting to repeat ourselves in the way in which we're trying to  
25 do the math in the maps. And I -- I think that the hearing is

1 still open, the recording will be available of what we're  
2 thinking, we are very much in an active moment of the liberation  
3 and openness. I think we should come with a fresh mindset next  
4 week and then look at some -- where we left these things tonight.  
5 But --

6 MR. HENDEL: I -- with all due respect, I guess I  
7 think we need to make a little more progress or have some kind of  
8 motion or additional maps or something, just because we basically  
9 have three weeks left and we need to have another Public Hear- --  
10 I feel like the best way to do this would be for us to agree on  
11 one map, have a Public Hearing on that specific map, with at  
12 least a full week, if not more, of notice to the public --  
13 because probably half the comments we've gotten involved only  
14 having a matter of days or, in some cases, mere hours to study  
15 the map before having to make a comment. And I think if we just  
16 leave right now, we don't really -- I'm not sure we'll have  
17 anything new next week, right?

18 I mean, I see your point, though, this is -- it is  
19 getting late, but -- I mean, I think we could -- we could move  
20 forward with Proposal No. 2. That's the only -- there was some  
21 opposition to that, but just in terms of the numbers, neither the  
22 Broadway-Broadmoor -- it's a tongue twister -- neither the  
23 Broadmoor -- Broadmoor-Broadway Village, nor the historic  
24 neighborhoods in Ward 6, would be the affected and those were the  
25 ones that we had the most participation by. Ward 3 would not

1 lose their -- their precincts that they've put so much time and  
2 money into. It's not perfect, but it seems like it's by far the  
3 least controversial of the three.

4 DR. ALVAREZ: I could support that. And maybe we  
5 can -- we can tweak -- so I'd like -- I'd like to focus on  
6 Proposal 2. I agree that is the least -- is the one that has  
7 more consensus. It leaves intact the areas that are especially  
8 sensitive. But I'd like to push a little bit more for a greater  
9 -- for the Hispanic rough proportionality and see what -- how we  
10 accomplish that kind of hovering around the 10%. Is there -- is  
11 there a way, Madam Clerk, where you can see that happening?

12 MS. MESICH: I'd like to make a suggestion to the  
13 Committee that we work on a map for a meeting a week from today;  
14 that we get it out to the public by Tuesday, because it will take  
15 us some time tomorrow and Monday. But, Thursday of next week,  
16 it's still a Public Meeting, you would be able to do some work  
17 and include Call to the Audience rather than having a Public  
18 Hearing; maybe there would be some comments from the audience or  
19 some ideas. And then have another Public Hearing two weeks from  
20 today with, hopefully, a more finalized proposal that's a little  
21 closer to being approved.

22 MR. HENDEL: I like the timeline --

23 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Does anyone have to make a motion  
24 or is it okay to just let -- let the City Clerk to proceed as she  
25 mentioned?

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. HENDEL: Well, first, we should decide if we  
2 want to do that. I guess I like the timeline that you suggested,  
3 I'm just not sure which proposal -- so I believe we -- so you  
4 mentioned that Staff was having very understandable difficulties  
5 creating a third majority/minority ward. Are -- correct -- just  
6 to clarify, are you suggesting that you continue working on that  
7 and have something by Tuesday and then that's what we'd be voting  
8 on or -- just to clarify.

9 MS. MESICH: I'm not sure that a third  
10 majority/minority ward would be possible without moving, as I  
11 mentioned, tens of thousands of people, and so that does take  
12 some time, even working clockwise and counter-clockwise, we were  
13 trying that with Ward -- I think it was 2 and 3. So I'm thinking  
14 more in terms of -- if you're going to use Proposal 2 as what is  
15 now the base map, to continue working towards the goals of the  
16 Committee using that map, if you want us to come up with some  
17 alternatives or some other moves, we can do that. It's much more  
18 helpful to hear what you're thinking and what the public has  
19 mentioned tonight so that we can work towards accomplishing  
20 those.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Clerk.  
22 I think that I would accept Proposal 2 with a motion. But I  
23 would say that the goal -- I don't think we will get the minority  
24 population or the Hispanic population in district 3 for -- in --  
25 in Ward 3, for example, to the level that matches a

1 majority/minority. But we may be able to increase it by tweaking  
2 clockwise -- Ward 2 and 4 is where we would take some. And, you  
3 know, we will recognize that in doing that, we're leaving 2 and 4  
4 even more white, but -- but if we build up 3 by taking some  
5 minor- -- you know, so that would be the goal. I don't think it  
6 will be majority/minority completely, but it may go from 35%  
7 Hispanic to maybe 40, you know, something like that. I'm not  
8 sure. But that would be acceptable to me, to proceed with 2 and  
9 then propose those two weeks as you mentioned in that timeline.

10 MR. HENDEL: Madam Clerk, I'll let you proceed.

11 MS. MESICH: I was just going to say that our  
12 wonderful map person, Randy, has said that for clarification  
13 using the iteration of Proposal 2, with Precinct 42 still (audio  
14 cuts out) and putting 72 in Ward 3 moves the MPD down a little  
15 below 10%. So I don't know if you want us to do -- include that  
16 in what we're drafting for next week or not, but let us know.

17 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, it would be good to see that.  
18 I mean, that means we probably need to do this whole thing again  
19 in a couple years because we'd drift above 10%. But, you know,  
20 that's someone else's problem.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: We could also at that time -- when  
22 we send our recommendations, say this is the best we can do now,  
23 Mayor and Council, and here are two ideas that are bold and out  
24 of the -- and -- and for you to consider that before your next --  
25 get to the next redistricting.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 CHAIRMAN CRUM: But still meet the United States  
2 Constitution?

3 MR. ROBLES: Mm-hmm. I -- I agree with that.

4 Madam Clerk, I would like to know if there's anything  
5 on the record from previous years where a majority/minority ward  
6 was proposed or is this relatively new to -- to this process?

7 MS. MESICH: As far as I know, it's relatively new  
8 to the process and was not part of the proposal or consideration  
9 in the past because it is so new.

10 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

11 MS. MESICH: Rough proportionality was just  
12 approved as an ordinance by Mayor and Council a few months ago,  
13 so this is the first redistricting process where it's fully in  
14 place.

15 MR. ROBLES: Mm-hmm. Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Going -- going to what you just  
17 mentioned, however, in the past another party was wanting another  
18 ward because they thought it would be -- they would be  
19 represented by -- their party would be more represented by adding  
20 that particular ward, but it didn't go to a minority/majority  
21 kind of consideration. It went to a strictly political  
22 consideration. But it -- but it did come up.

23 MR. ROBLES: Thank you, Chair. I -- I agree with  
24 my colleagues regarding, you know, working clockwise. But I  
25 would also like to entertain the idea, and see how my colleagues

1 feel about seeing a map with a majority/minority ward for the  
2 record, to help guide future conversations around redistricting.  
3 I think this would be helpful, not just this time around but two  
4 years from now. Is this something my colleagues would be willing  
5 to entertain? I know we don't -- I don't think we have a formal  
6 motion on the floor.

7 MR. HENDEL: Do you mean even if it's above 10%?

8 MR. ROBLES: I'm sorry?

9 MR. HENDEL: I think they tried to do that  
10 already, and couldn't, while keeping it below 10%. So do you  
11 mean making a map even if it is above 10% just for reference?

12 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

13 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

14 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Suzanne did mention that, you  
15 know, that kind of ward probably could be put together, but it  
16 would be really complex. And it may be -- I don't know how much  
17 time it's going to take, but it's going to take a bajillion years  
18 and -- and it's to be doable -- it may not be doable. But if it  
19 is, we may go back to the additional consideration part of our  
20 proposal to the Mayor and Council to say, you know, this could be  
21 done but it would take an awful lot of work, and give them -- at  
22 least it presents to them the idea of what it would take to do it  
23 in the future. Does that sound reasonable?

24 DR. ALVAREZ: I know that for Mayor Romero, the  
25 important point here is as much the principle as it is the

1 outcome. And if the principle is duly noted in our intention to  
2 understand voter dilution, Hispanic voter dilution, which --  
3 which is a statewide issue, and if we make attempts to indicate  
4 that we're moving in consideration of that, even though in this  
5 time frame we're not able to fully accomplish it, I think we  
6 would have, from the Mayor's point of view, accomplished a very  
7 important step.

8 The population of the City is likely to grow. Again  
9 we'll be doing this, and we need to watch for that element as it  
10 continues to evolve; otherwise, we will be in -- essentially  
11 segregating the -- the Hispanic vote continuously for the next  
12 decade to only two wards as the City grows and expands. I think  
13 that principle can be a firm -- and move the needle a little bit  
14 this time, without fully accomplishing it, and that would be  
15 important.

16 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, I believe Mr. Robles made  
17 a motion.

18 MR. ROBLES: Yes, I would like to make a motion  
19 that, in addition to -- or was there a motion formulated by --

20 MR. JARAMILLO: May I say something?

21 MR. ROBLES: Yes, please.

22 MR. JARAMILLO: (Audio cuts out) to come up with a  
23 proposal that causes the least deviation to meet our target if  
24 that's at all possible.

25 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Is there a second?



City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. HENDEL: Well, just to clarify, by least  
2 deviation you mean least movement to create --

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah --

4 MR. HENDEL: -- the --

5 MR. JARAMILLO: -- where we're at right now in  
6 tweaking the number at the lowest percentage we can to meet our  
7 goal.

8 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I would think there would be a  
9 lot of ways to do that, so do we want to -- I agree. I think  
10 that's a good idea.

11 MR. JARAMILLO: I mean, we could be here all night  
12 going back and forth --

13 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: -- until we come up with some sort  
15 of snapshot --

16 CHAIRMAN CRUM: And by the way --

17 MR. JARAMILLO: -- and then towards the next step.

18 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- you're not saying we have to go  
19 with, you'd just like --

20 MR. JARAMILLO: No.

21 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- to see the proposal --

22 MR. JARAMILLO: Well, yeah.

23 CHAIRMAN CRUM: -- of how that would accomplished.

24 MR. HENDEL: I think I would support that, but we  
25 should give Staff a little bit more guidance; because I feel like

1 there's probably 100 ways to do that, to just bring us down to  
2 9.9%.

3 MR. JARAMILLO: There was a proposal earlier that  
4 I saw that the target was about 9.57, right?

5 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, what was that one?

6 MR. JARAMILLO: That would be about where we want  
7 to be, that -- and that's not scrutinizing -- a lot of movement,  
8 if I'm not mistaken.

9 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. Yeah, what was the one that  
10 was 9.5, just keeping 42 as split?

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Leaving our target pretty much  
12 where we want to be.

13 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, it was keeping 42 split and  
14 moving 72 from --

15 MS. MESICH: It was keeping --

16 MR. HENDEL: -- being split to Ward --

17 MS. MESICH: Three.

18 MR. HENDEL: -- 3?

19 MS. MESICH: Right.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

21 MR. HENDEL: So it was the -- it was base map 2,  
22 but leaving 42 alone and moving 72 to Ward 3; is that what that  
23 one was?

24 MR. JARAMILLO: There you go. That's the one  
25 right --

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, that's worth considering.

2 MR. JARAMILLO: And so from this snapshot, we can  
3 carry our conversation.

4 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: I think so.

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay. So there's a motion. Is  
7 there a second to the motion?

8 MR. ROBLES: Second.

9 DR. ALVAREZ: Second.

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: In favor, say aye.

11 (All Committee members respond affirmatively.)

12 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Motion has been carried -- made  
13 and carried. Motion has been made and carried.

14 MR. HENDEL: So, just to clarify, that was just to  
15 create the map and consider it, right?

16 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes.

17 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Good.

18 MS. MESICH: I believe Mr. Robles still has a  
19 motion that he's been trying to make.

20 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Yes.

21 MR. ROBLES: No, it's okay. I would like to also  
22 move that Staff create a map with a third majority/minority ward  
23 for the sake of the principle of -- this creation, that can help  
24 guide further conversations around redistricting.

25 MR. JARAMILLO: For the future?

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. ROBLES: For the future, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Is there -- there a second?

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Second.

4 MR. HENDEL: And do you want to add that it  
5 doesn't have to be -- well, I'll wait. Oh, okay. I think we  
6 should add to that motion that -- well, it's up to you, but we  
7 could add to that motion that it doesn't have to be below 10%,  
8 because it's just for future --

9 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

10 MR. HENDEL: -- planning. That would make it  
11 easier for Staff who have already been trying to do that. So I  
12 guess I'll make a friendly amendment?

13 MR. ROBLES: Yes --

14 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

15 MR. ROBLES: -- please.

16 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I make a friendly amendment  
17 that this map does not need to have less than 10% MPD.

18 DR. ALVAREZ: I -- I support that because I think  
19 that Commissioner Robles is saying let's just look at it and see  
20 what that would look like, and if it's messy and it disrupts a  
21 whole bunch of things or it goes above the -- that's fine. We  
22 just want to have it as an option to say this is what it would  
23 take and then Council and Mayor can say, okay. So I believe  
24 that's your intent?

25 MR. ROBLES: Yes, it is, Commissioner Alvarez.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Is that amendment acceptable?

2 MR. ROBLES: Yes, it is.

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: All right. All in favor (audio  
4 cuts out).

5 (All Commission members respond affirmatively.)

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Motion adopted. Thank you.  
7 Motion adopted. Thank you.

8 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum --

9 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Yes?

10 MR. ROBLES: -- I'd also like to make one more  
11 motion and this is in regards to the comments around transparency  
12 and whatnot. I would like to -- I would like to move to make  
13 these meetings live-streamed on YouTube and whatever other  
14 platforms that we can have, every sort of possibility, around  
15 transparency around our redistricting meetings.

16 MR. HENDEL: I second that.

17 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Discussion?

18 MR. HENDEL: Quick discussion. Is that actually  
19 possible?

20 MS. MESICH: We'll have to work with our PIOs on  
21 that. I think it will be possible, especially -- that we'll have  
22 enough notice to do that. We'll also have the meetings on Teams.  
23 We won't be able to open it up for public discussion through  
24 Teams, but at least people can watch it on YouTube.

25 MR. HENDEL: That seems pretty unobjectionable.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 CHAIRMAN CRUM: All in favor, say aye.

2 (All Committee members respond affirmatively.)

3 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Opposed? Motion passes. We're on  
4 a roll.

5 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Good.

7 MR. HENDEL: Good.

8 DR. ALVAREZ: That went better than I thought it  
9 was going to go.

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Excellent.

11 MR. HENDEL: Should we -- oh, sorry. Still  
12 thinking. I still feel like we don't really have a Plan A moving  
13 into next week. We do have a couple of nice peripheral options,  
14 but if it's -- if the previous motion is above 10%, we can't pick  
15 that one; and this 9.57% is really good, it's worth discussing,  
16 but there's some drawbacks to it. Namely, that we would have to  
17 redo this whole process in two years, right?

18 MS. MESICH: Actually, 2026.

19 MR. HENDEL: Oh, okay.

20 MALE SPEAKER: Actually, Mr. Chair, Madam -- Madam  
21 Clerk, I -- as I read the Charter, I think it is two years.

22 MR. HENDEL: My understanding is that it was every  
23 four years, plus an additional one two years after the Census.

24 MALE SPEAKER: And beginning with 2000 and  
25 quadrennially thereafter, so '24 would be six times four.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MR. HENDEL: So we would just be kicking the can  
2 most likely, which is fine. We -- we -- there's something to be  
3 said for a strategy of every two to four years we do as little as  
4 possible to be legally compliant and create minimal disruption.  
5 That's fine. But we should discuss the pros and cons of that  
6 approach because, you know, there are cons to that. What do  
7 people think about that?

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Any other discussion?

9 DR. ALVAREZ: Well, I think that it's up to us  
10 also, when we make our final recommendation, to say we don't want  
11 you to look at it in two years, just status quo, leave it alone,  
12 and then kick the can. We could also say we are doing this now  
13 in compliance, and then we urge Council to immediately regain a  
14 task force or a study group that look at all of these issues in  
15 preparation of two years from now and that could also be part of  
16 our recommendations.

17 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Right. So we have a few motions  
18 that will be discussed next time in terms of the -- in terms of  
19 Item 5, future agenda items.

20 MR. HENDEL: I think we --

21 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Is there any other agenda items we  
22 would like next time?

23 MR. HENDEL: We should at least consider saying we  
24 won't do certain things so as to avoid getting everybody upset  
25 without meaning to. Maybe that's a delicate topic, but if there

1 were a certain precinct that we all agreed should not be moved,  
2 we could make a motion to say, look, no matter what we end up  
3 doing, we won't move that one. Now, that has risks, that limits  
4 ourselves, but it would result in a lot of people not needing to  
5 write emails and attend meetings and stuff. It might be helpful  
6 to the public if we give some assurances that we won't do certain  
7 things. I don't know. What -- what do we think about the merits  
8 of that?

9 MR. JARAMILLO: Mr. Chair, my main concern is to  
10 focus on the task at hand that we have now and -- and make a  
11 recommendation for future agendas that might be -- come up due to  
12 what we're doing now. For us to go back and forth I believe is a  
13 waste of time for us right now. The main focus is the task at  
14 hand and we should just focus on that for now.

15 CHAIRMAN CRUM: So are we -- are we prepared now  
16 to discuss the next meeting date and time?

17 DR. ALVAREZ: Speaking to my colleague -- I -- I  
18 don't think that we need -- I think people will read, this will  
19 be available, people can understand our intentions, and our  
20 conversation here delivers a message of how we want to proceed  
21 and how we value the -- the input. I don't think we lock  
22 ourselves in because we don't know what we'll see a week from  
23 here -- from now or two weeks. But I think the intent of this  
24 Commission, and the integrity that we are proceeding with, is --  
25 should be apparent.



City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 CHAIRMAN CRUM: So are we going to set a meeting  
2 date and time or do we want -- for example, when is the Public  
3 Hearing going to be that we extended from tonight?

4 MS. MESICH: I think the original plan was to meet  
5 on Thursdays at 5:30. And you can schedule additional meetings  
6 during the week if that would help you get the work done.

7 MR. HENDEL: I think we should -- I don't the  
8 details of how Public Hearings work from a legal perspective, but  
9 I'd like to have some opportunity for members of the community to  
10 speak at every one of our meetings; whether it's at the beginning  
11 or the end, I don't really have a strong preference. I guess  
12 beginning would probably be better because then we can discuss  
13 what they say. So can we have a Public Hearing before each of  
14 our next two meetings or does it have to be just one? Does Staff  
15 have any guidelines on what's allowed there?

16 MS. MESICH: It takes several days in advance of a  
17 Public Hearing to get a display ad in the paper that's -- we'll  
18 get the word out through our PIOs, through our office, and news  
19 releases. You can do that. We can have a Public Hearing this  
20 time next week and the following week and --

21 MALE SPEAKER: Prior to the meeting.

22 MS. MESICH: Pardon?

23 MALE SPEAKER: Prior to our meeting.

24 MS. MESICH: If that's your desire. And we do  
25 have Call to the Audience on the agenda which is not the same as

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 a Public Hearing, but in this case you're -- you're studying one  
2 subject, I'm sure most of the Call to the Audience would be --  
3 would relate to what you're doing.

4 MR. HENDEL: That sounds good. So, members of the  
5 Committee, what do -- we have until November 30th, but the 24th  
6 is Thanksgiving. We're not going to meet that day. So, if just  
7 do Tuesdays (sic), we only have two more meetings total. We have  
8 the 10th and the 17th. Yeah. So, if we don't meet on  
9 Thanksgiving, which I'm sure we all agree we're not going to do  
10 that.

11 CHAIRMAN CRUM: I could.

12 MR. HENDEL: On Thanksgiving?

13 CHAIRMAN CRUM: I don't have a life.

14 MR. HENDEL: We'll just have a feast right here,  
15 turkey and --

16 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay.

17 MR. HENDEL: But, if that's the case, we only have  
18 the 10th and the 17th. We have two weeks to finish this whole  
19 process. We could meet again like after Thanksgiving, like on  
20 the 30th -- on Wednesday, the 30th, which is the final deadline.

21 CHAIRMAN CRUM: So, Suzanne, you've got a few --  
22 you've got some homework to do for us. When do you think you  
23 could provide that information to us for discussion?

24 MS. MESICH: The way I understand the direction,  
25 we will be using Proposal 2 to tweak clockwise Ward 2 and Ward 4,

1 to try and come up with the MPD, and also entertain the  
2 majority/minority in that proposal. And then also create a map  
3 of a third majority/minority ward, that will take longer. I  
4 would rather be able to tell you that we can get you the map that  
5 we're talking about with Proposal No. 2 possibly Monday  
6 afternoon. That's something that we could put up on our website  
7 and put out through news releases also. The minority/majority, I  
8 would just like to say we will continue to work on it and get it  
9 out as early as we can, but definitely at least 24 hours before  
10 the meeting, preferably 48.

11 Then the other thing that Dennis reminded me is with a  
12 Public Hearing, there are legal requirements for publishing ads,  
13 and that's -- I started to mention that. If we could go with  
14 Call to the Audience next week, knowing that we're going to be  
15 recognizing people to speak on this issue, and then we could  
16 advertise a Public Hearing for the 17th, with hopefully a  
17 proposal map or two that are closer to being finalized.

18 MR. HENDEL: I like that.

19 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum, Madam Clerk, if we keep  
20 -- if we make next week just Call to the Audience, are we still  
21 capable of advertising our meeting as if it were a Public  
22 Hearing?

23 MS. MESICH: Yes, the only difference is we would  
24 not be advertising it through legal ads as a Public Hearing.

25 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MS. MESICH: We'll still put out news releases,  
2 try to get it out to the media, put it on our web page and do the  
3 --

4 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

5 MS. MESICH: -- sorts of outreach that we do.

6 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Which means if -- the only  
7 difference is -- basically, is it will not appear in the  
8 newspaper.

9 MR. HENDEL: But also the current Public Hearing  
10 is not over. We voted to keep it going. So is -- so I'm  
11 wondering what the implications of that are. Like is next -- do  
12 -- do we get -- is it just still going indefinitely or do we get  
13 to decide when part two occurs?

14 MS. MESICH; You do get to decide when part two  
15 occurs and you should set a date, that gives us the advertising  
16 date --

17 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

18 MS. MESICH: -- that we need, and also puts more  
19 notice out to the public.

20 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I make -- I move that we  
21 schedule part two of the Public Hearing on Thursday, November  
22 17th.

23 DR. ALVAREZ: Second that.

24 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Discussion? All in favor?

25 (All Commission members respond affirmatively.)

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Motion passes.

2 MR. HENDEL: And I -- I think we should also  
3 consider setting all of our meeting dates for the rest of the  
4 month now. Like, for example, we can't -- probably can't do  
5 anything the week of the 21st, that's Thanksgiving, everybody's  
6 busy. Our deadline is the 30th. So I -- maybe we should meet on  
7 the 30th or the 29th?

8 DR. ALVAREZ: Let's -- I propose an additional  
9 meeting on the 29th.

10 MR. ROBLES: I second that.

11 MR. HENDEL: What is the -- what is the official  
12 deadline, like midnight on the 30th?

13 MS. MESICH: I'm sorry. I was consulting with the  
14 attorney. What was your question?

15 MR. HENDEL: That's fine. The deadline is like  
16 the end of the day on the 30th?

17 MS. MESICH: Yes, and what we can do is come up  
18 with a shell report that's kind of in the format of the last  
19 couple of reports to Mayor and Council recommendations, so that  
20 we can plug in information as you're formulating the  
21 recommendation; hopefully bringing it here on the 29th and have  
22 it ready for you to sign on that day if -- if you're ready to  
23 finalize it.

24 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Do we -- how much time would  
25 Staff need between our Committee voting to approve a given

1 proposal and when you submit it to the Mayor and Council? Like,  
2 is it just done the moment we vote on it or do you need a few  
3 days to finalize stuff?

4 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Well, having worked on this a  
5 little bit before and -- not well, but I have -- I found that  
6 using the formats presented in former -- by former committees,  
7 that works very well. And in terms of filling in the details,  
8 hours, so it can be accomplished.

9 MS. MESICH: So, if you sign it on November 29th,  
10 the next day we distribute it to Mayor and Council as your  
11 recommendation and schedule it for a Mayor and Council meeting  
12 for their consideration. I would like to give them some time in  
13 December so that they can hold the Public Hearings should --  
14 should they choose, as well as discussions during study session  
15 before we bring an ordinance back to them.

16 DR. ALVAREZ: I want to say that I -- I feel  
17 really good about our meeting today. I feel that we are in -- in  
18 a general direction that is positive, that we are -- so I feel  
19 like we will get this done. And what I mean by that is we have a  
20 proposal going forward. We have set aside the one that felt the  
21 most offensive to the neighbors, we set that aside today so we  
22 don't -- you know, we're communicating that we have one that  
23 possibly accomplishes -- least disruptive, gets the legal  
24 standard, and still pushes the needle on proportionality, so I  
25 think -- I feel good about that.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1           We -- we have the 10th, we have the 17th, where we can  
2 work until whatever time it is, as long as Madam Clerk orders  
3 some pizzas. Then we're setting up another date outside of that,  
4 on the 29th, to do even more. So I think that we can feel good  
5 about that process and how transparent we've been in our  
6 conversations today about our intentions.

7           MR. HENDEL: The only minor amendment I would make  
8 is that we do have two members absent today and we don't know if  
9 they're available on the 29th. So can we have Staff email the  
10 whole -- the whole Committee and ask if -- like a poll or  
11 something for the 28th, 29th and 30th, and see which of those  
12 days has the most possible attendance?

13           MS. MESICH: We can do that.

14           MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

15           MR. ROBLES: Is -- is -- is there any way that we  
16 can hold our colleagues accountable? You know, I've got an essay  
17 to write, right? But, you know, here we are. I'm just -- sorry,  
18 public frustration. Sorry. I (audio cuts out).

19           MR. HENDEL: You mean for being absent?

20           DR. ALVAREZ: For being absent.

21           MR. ROBLES: Yes. Yeah, because we accomplished a  
22 lot tonight and -- I mean, who knows what they're going to come  
23 with at our next meeting. Is there any precedent, Madam Clerk?

24           MS. MESICH: One person is sick tonight and --

25           MR. ROBLES: Okay.

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee  
Public Hearing and Meeting - 11/03/2022

---

1 MS. MESICH: -- one who hasn't been attending. If  
2 a person misses four meetings in a row or 40% of the meetings,  
3 they're automatically removed from the Committee.

4 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Okay. Any further discussion  
6 before adjournment? Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

7 MR. JARAMILLO: I make a motion to adjourn.

8 CHAIRMAN CRUM: Second. All in favor, say aye.

9 (All Committee members respond affirmatively.)

10 CHAIRMAN CRUM: All right. We're out of here.

11 MR. HENDEL: Thank you.

12 (Meeting adjourned.)

13 \* \* \* \* \*



**CERTIFICATE**

I hereby certify that, to the best of my ability, the foregoing is a true and accurate transcription of the digitally-recorded City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee Meeting held on November 3, 2022.

Transcription completed: November 7, 2022

/S/ Danielle L. Krassow

DANIELLE L. KRASSOW

Legal Transcriptionist

M&M Typing Service