



## Legal Action Report and Minutes

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

DATE: **Thursday, November 10, 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 5:32 p.m. by Chair Mark Crum.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Appointor:</u>
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor
Patrick Robles	Ward 1
Jenifer Darland	Ward 2
Ed Hendel	Ward 3
Jon Aitken	Ward 4
Bobby Jaramillo	Ward 5
Mark Crum, Chair	Ward 6

#### Absent:

#### Staff Present:

Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk  
Yolanda Lozano, Chief Deputy City Clerk  
Maria Talamante, Assistant City Clerk  
Randy Hammel, City Clerk's Office  
Robert Hunter, City Clerk's Office  
Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Attorney

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from November 3, 2022

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to approve the Minutes from the meetings of November 3, 2022.

### **3. Call to Audience**

Comments were made by Katherine Weasel.

### **4. Consideration of Redistricting Proposal(s)**

Discussion ensued on Proposal #2-a and suggestions of various amendments to see improved minority representation across all Wards, but particularly in Ward 3.

It was moved by Committee Member Alvarez, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 6 to 1, to advance Proposal #2-a as it is and to create a Proposal #2-b, an amendment to Proposal #2-a which moves Precinct 37, currently in Ward 1 to Ward 3, both of which would be put forth at the Public Hearing on November 17, 2022.

It was moved by Committee Member Darland, duly seconded, to reject proposals that were no longer being considered, so that there was clarity on this with regard to the public.

Committee Member Hendel offered a friendly amendment to the motion, accepted by the motion-maker, that Proposals #1, #2, and #3 and Rough Proportionality #1 and #2 be categorized as rejected, so that there was clarity on this with regard to the public. The motion, as amended, was carried by voice vote of 7 to 0.

### **5. Discussion of Recommendation to Mayor and Council**

No discussion took place.

### **6. Future Agenda Items**

The following items were identified for the next meeting agenda:

- Public hearing at November 17, 2022 meeting
- Additional meetings and public hearing dates
- Post-hearing review of Proposals #2-a and #2-b

### **7. Next Meeting Date(s)/Time(s)**

Discussion ensued regarding the map proposals presented and about future meeting dates and an additional public hearing.

It was moved by Committee Member Robles, duly seconded, to hold the public hearing scheduled for November 17, 2022, and an additional public hearing following, to ensure ample opportunity for the public to comment on the proposals.

Committee Member Hendel offered a friendly amendment to the motion, accepted by the motion-maker, that a public hearing be scheduled during a regular meeting on Tuesday, November 29, 2022. The motion, as amended, was carried by voice vote of 7 to 0.

**8. Adjournment**

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to adjourn.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

---

---

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Appointor:</u>
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor
Patrick Robles	Ward 1
Jenifer Darland	Ward 2
Ed Hendel	Ward 3
Jon Aitken	Ward 4
Bobby Jaramillo	Ward 5
Mark Crum	Ward 6

Absent:  
None

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

=====

1           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. If I may, I'd like to get  
2 started. This is the November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022, Restructuring (sic) Advisory  
3 Committee meeting, and I'd like to begin with roll call.

4           CLERK: Maribel Alvarez.

5           MS. ALVAREZ: Present.

6           CLERK: Patrick Robles.

7           MR. ROBLES: Present.

8           CLERK: Jenifer Darland.

9           MS. DARLAND: Present.

10          CLERK: Ed Hendel.

11          MR. HENDEL: Present.

12          CLERK: Jon Aitken.

13          MR. AITKEN: Present.

1 CLERK: Bobby Jaramillo.

2 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.

3 CLERK: And Mark Crum.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Present.

5 CLERK: Chairman Crum, with all members present, a quorum  
6 of the Redistricting Advisory Committee is established.

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right.

8 MS. MESICH: (Inaudible) Mr. Aitken.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Me, too.

10 MS. MESICH: (Inaudible)

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Go ahead.

12 MS. MESICH: Good evening, Mr. Aitken. Welcome and thank  
13 you for joining us on short notice. We understand you are the new  
14 Ward 4 Appointee to the Committee. I just wanted to introduce you  
15 because you are on line.

16 So, everybody on the Committee on your laptops in front of  
17 you, Mr. Aitken is present. He has taken the oath of office and  
18 (inaudible) participate fully on your deliberations this evening.

19 MR. AITKEN: Thank you.

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Item No. 2. Approval of  
21 Minutes from November 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022. Any changes, additions? Hearing  
22 none, do I hear a motion to approve the Minutes?

23 MR. JARAMILLO: Like to make a motion to (inaudible)

24 MR. AITKEN: This, this is Jon Aitken. I'll make a motion  
25 to approve.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second?

2 MR. HENDEL: I second that.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you very much. All in favor say  
4 "aye".

5 (Affirmative.)

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. The Minutes have been approved.  
7 Item, No. 3. Call to the Audience. Katherine Weasel.

8 MS. WEASEL: Hello. Hello. Can you hear me? Okay. My  
9 name is Katherine Weasel. I'm a Ward 1 citizen representative. I'm  
10 also President of Enchanted Hills Neighborhood Association. I've been  
11 in that residence for over 20 years. I've also been in Ward 1 for  
12 over 20 years.

13 Let me tell you, I'm very disappointed. I'm very  
14 disappointed with Ms. Maribel Alvarez. So, worried about what the  
15 Mayor and Council - want to make sure that they get their, their land,  
16 their, their precinct, their property, whatever.

17 I can assure you that the last thing that Ward 1 needs is  
18 more responsibility. I can assure you that what we do not need is  
19 Ward 1 representation from Santa Cruz. We do not need more of no  
20 response to my neighborhood to get my washes clean, to get my roads  
21 done, to clean up my area, to compile trash cleanup.

22 I do not need more non-response to crime in my area. I do  
23 not need more response of, of code enforcement non-compliancy. I do  
24 not need more response of someone taking a nuance. And for those you  
25 who do not know what that is, that's our natural undeveloped open

1 spaces which we really protect. We work with Tucson Mountain Park,  
2 the barrios, the westside development, code enforcement and SSNAP, and  
3 we find this very offensive that all you worry about is that the Mayor  
4 gets more.

5           It's not acceptable. She does not take care of Ward 1.  
6 Maybe she does on the north end, maybe she does downtown, but she does  
7 not take care of my neighborhood. She does not take care of anything  
8 south of Starr Pass.

9           She does not help take care of anything in - before South  
10 Tucson, or South Tucson, which I know is not her responsibility. So,  
11 that way the rest of the neighborhood can all blend in.

12           She does not need more. If anything, she needs less. The  
13 downtown area, the U of A area has nothing, nothing in compliance with  
14 us as westside, southwest people trying to keep our natural open  
15 undeveloped spaces.

16           Trying to keep our barrios intact, which I find offensive  
17 that you bring in Ronstadt and name it after her when she was one of  
18 the biggest fighters against what you were doing in the barrios.

19           So, now she's a little sick, and you name something after  
20 her. I find that offensive 'cause we know Linda Ronstadt did not like  
21 what you did to the barrios, and we don't like it now what you're  
22 doing to the barrios.

23           The barrios are historic. El Rio Park was the first Civil  
24 Rights protest ever in Tucson. It started with Oyama getting married  
25 to his wife, okay? We have Oyama Elementary right across the street

1 from my neighborhood. We have down the road, we have La Cholla High  
2 School right down the road. We have Fred Archer Center right down the  
3 road. Those things tie us together to protect Ward 1 on our end.

4           What you do downtown, what you do at the U of A is a whole  
5 different kind of living. It's a whole different reality. These  
6 people have been in their homes for 40 or 50 years. Some of them are  
7 being forced out now because of your infrastructure in your: Oh,  
8 gotta get imminent domain.

9           I saw the video where you guys were schooled on how to take  
10 those properties. I saw that video February 8<sup>th</sup>, and I saw that video  
11 where you're talking about how you're doing this and you're doing  
12 that. Okay. Let me tell you something - maybe y'all should stop  
13 doing something and really participate in the community, 'cause I go  
14 out and I pick up trash.

15           And you know what happened the last time I had a trash  
16 drive? Let me tell you what happened. I had it set it up for two  
17 months. I called Tucson Clean and Beautiful. I had it all set up.  
18 Went through the proper channels.

19           Went and got the tools, went and did everything I was  
20 supposed to do. Nobody showed up. Tucson Clean and Beautiful forgot  
21 my event. Heather came and took my picture with the trash in the back  
22 of my pickup.

23           Okay? I used to clean my traffic island because at that  
24 time, I was much younger, I had a trailer, and I could do that. And  
25 I would get all the teenagers in the area. We'd clean it all up.



1 We'd haul it all away, and then we would go for breakfast. That's  
2 what I call community.

3 I used to have meetings. I had neighborhood meetings once  
4 a month and I had to stop and cease, desist because, A, I couldn't get  
5 into the Archer Center after a certain time. B, the library quit  
6 meetings. So, for two years, I've not been able to, to have my  
7 neighborhood meetings. Okay? That's not acceptable.

8 Our town is going in the pits. And all you want to  
9 concentrate is where the money is. Okay. Maybe we don't have money,  
10 but we are community. We're the ones out there picking up the trash.  
11 We're the ones cleaning up our neighborhood. We're the ones  
12 protecting our nuance. Okay?

13 We do not need more to go to Ward 1 until they start  
14 representing what is already there. And this map is not acceptable.  
15 Take your downtown, your little 47 and your 244, give it to the  
16 downtown. Give it to I don't care who. But we do not need more  
17 responsibility. We already have a ton of responsibility.

18 One. We never get police out there - ever. Number two.  
19 We have drug runners running through our alleyways, sufficient through  
20 Ward 1 letting everything just go. I'm done.

21 (Inaudible) I don't like this map, I don't think Ward 1  
22 deserves anything more 'cause we are tired of dealing with 20 years of  
23 Ward 1 ignoring our amendment annexation. Okay?

24 We voted on that and now it's five - less than five  
25 minutes, they take it away and put it in their land development,

1 their housing. Housing that isn't even - it doesn't even relate to  
2 our side of town 'cause we're the working people, and we have working  
3 homes. We have working incomes. Okay?

4 We're not making 40, \$50,000 a year. Some of us are lucky  
5 to make 10 to 15,000 a year. And we have to stay in them homes  
6 because we couldn't afford to go anywhere else. And you have not -  
7 they have not done anything for our roads.

8 I went downtown to Reid Park. She's: Oh. Come, come help  
9 us, come support us. We're gonna get road money. We're gonna get  
10 road money. We're gonna get this, we're gonna do that. I still  
11 haven't seen it.

12 The only time my damn road got paved on Mission was when  
13 they had the bike El Tour. That's the only time you get a road paved  
14 is if you have a bike.

15 I'm sick of it. I will protest every meeting, and I will  
16 put ads in the paper. I will do what I have to. Ward 1 needs nothing  
17 more.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Thank you, Ms. Weasel. Is  
19 there anyone else that would like to speak? Okay. Hearing none, the  
20 Call of the Audience is now closed.

21 Item No. 4. Considering - Consideration of the Newest  
22 Redistricting Proposals. And I'd like to ask the City Clerk to begin  
23 by just summarizing the high points between the proposals.

24 MS. MESICH: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Members of the  
25 Committee. At last week's meeting, you asked us to come up with

1 another proposal using the Proposal Two Map that you had last week  
2 with as minimum number of moves as we could make precinct-wise, and  
3 keeping the MPD as low as we could.

4           So, we came up Proposal 2-A, which I believe we're bringing  
5 up the map. And if you make any changes or ask us to change maps, it  
6 takes a few seconds. So, we'll give Randy time, but I figure we're  
7 ready.

8           What we've done on this map is Precinct 11, which is on the  
9 very bottom south end of what is currently Ward 4, and Precinct 275,  
10 we proposed could be moved to Ward 5.

11           Precinct 47, which is just south of South Tucson and  
12 actually is - encompasses South Tucson, would be moved to Ward 1.  
13 And Precinct 244 would move from Ward 5 to Ward 1.

14           Those were the only changes we made from the Proposal Two  
15 Map and it keeps the MPD at 2.96%

16           MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

17           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

18           MR. ROBLES: As the Ward 1 representative on this  
19 Commission, I would like to know that boundaries are arbitrary.  
20 We live in the City of Tucson and services serve everybody. And I  
21 believe some of these nuances tend to guide some of the critics of the  
22 proposal at hand. If folks aren't happy with representation, folks  
23 can run for office. That's the beauty of our democratic system.

24           Now, I, I, I'm still open to conversations around how we  
25 can continue to build a majority, add another majority-minority ward

1 and make sure that we are crossing this sort of barrier at hand, which  
2 is the freeway. The freeway has served as a barrier to redistricting  
3 for many years and has, therefore, concentrated the Latino population  
4 into one to two wards.

5 It's going to take bold actions from this Commission if  
6 we're going to try to diversify our wards and expand political power  
7 amongst our diverse Tucson community.

8 And I like what I'm seeing so far in terms of the proposals  
9 with Precinct 47, Precinct 244. And I would like to see how else we  
10 can expand Ward 1 and Ward 5. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: Is the question open now on 2-A? Are we  
13 having a discussion -

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: - on 2-A?

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: In fact, you can, if you're happy and  
17 put on anything, you, you're more than welcome to do that, but 2-A is  
18 on the table right now as well.

19 MS. ALVAREZ: I, I like the work. I congratulate the City  
20 Staff for really doing excellent work in short time. I was looking at  
21 2-A and wondering whether 37, Precinct 37, 18, and 143, that little  
22 corner there by the freeway on the west, west of the freeway, could  
23 be, could be made into Ward 3, since Ward 3 has the, again, the most  
24 potential for, for acquiring Hispanic votes, I think, representation.

1           So, that was just something that I, I was curious about  
2 in the map if that little corner there west of the freeway could be  
3 adjacent to, to Ward 3. What would that give us? And I'm talking  
4 about 37, 18, and 143.

5           MS. MESICH: Would you like us to make those moves on the  
6 map now and -

7           MS. ALVAREZ: If my -

8           MS. MESICH: - see how it comes out?

9           MS. ALVAREZ: If my colleagues here are okay with just  
10 seeing how it plays out in the - on the screen, I would. Yes, it's,  
11 it's this little corner.

12           MS. MESICH: And Members of the Committee, Mr. Chair,  
13 while, while we're doing that, there are two other maps for you  
14 tonight that we've just termed Rough Proportionality based on the  
15 motion last week to come up with a third majority-minority ward.

16           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: (Inaudible)

17           MS. MESICH: Please, by all means study them and make  
18 suggestions. This was just our work to try and get it done, and give  
19 you something to review.

20           MS. ALVAREZ: I, I would like to hear from the Members of  
21 the Commission if they, if they follow the logic of what I'm trying to  
22 say in terms of that little piece adding to 3. Yeah, going to 3.

23           MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

24           MS. ALVAREZ: From 1 to 3.

1 MR. ROBLES: I wonder if that would reduce the population  
2 of Ward 1 in a way that would be counter-productive for the total MPD  
3 because right now Ward 1 is too small. And so, taking more away from  
4 them means we have to give even more to them from elsewhere if we're  
5 gonna try to keep the populations equivalent among the wards.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah, that, that's a really good point and,  
7 and it may be that there's another of the other adjacent districts,  
8 precinct can make up for that. For example, 160 and 51.

9 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

10 MS. ALVAREZ: It's just, it's just the coloring, you know -

11 MR. ROBLES: Right.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: - changing the colors. I believe that's  
13 somewhat arbitrary, the lines. I don't know what huge difference it  
14 will make, for example, to make that switch, you know, turn, turn  
15 those on the north side of the, of 1, turn them blue, and the ones  
16 below on 5, turn them green, you know. Just, just wondering. I'm not  
17 set on this, I'm just curious. Maybe almost a wash.

18 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

19 MS. ALVAREZ: Could we make those changes?

20 MS. MESICH: Oh, okay. Got it.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

22 MS. MESICH: So, you can see the MPD with those moves is  
23 18.7, moving 160 and 51 from Ward 5 to Ward 1, and the other moves of  
24 37, 18 and 143 from Ward 1 to Ward 3.

25 MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. So, that's the death of that idea.

1 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh. (Inaudible)

2 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. That's what this is all  
3 about. Throwing those things out and seeing what the impact is.  
4 Speaking of impact, I, I have two comments about from Ward 6.

5 Precinct 42, you have a horizontal split, and actually,  
6 more accurately the split between the neighborhoods should be  
7 vertically.

8 I don't know if that makes a big difference in terms of  
9 population or not, but that's just - I'm just being - those are the  
10 details.

11 MS. MESICH: So, can you give us a street for the vertical  
12 split?

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Sure. Hold on just a moment, let me  
14 find it.

15 MS. MESICH: I don't know if that's something we can do.  
16 We can? Okay.

17 MS. DARLAND: Chair, is that Euclid Street? Would that be  
18 more of a horizontal, or vertical?

19 MS. MESICH: Yes. Thank you. I think that's Euclid.

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Good. And the other  
21 consideration, whether or not this makes your job harder or easier  
22 or it doesn't matter, but should you consider looking at Precinct 72.

23 If you would like to give that to Ward 3, we would not be  
24 opposed to that. Just a consideration. It doesn't, doesn't matter

1 one way or the other, but if you get into it and the tradeoffs are  
2 getting diff- -- difficult, you're certainly, -

3 MS. MESICH: Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - you can make that -

5 MS. MESICH: So, I believe -

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - tradeoff if you choose.

7 MS. MESICH: - we were making the vertical split in 42 now.

8 And then when that's complete, we'll try the move of 72 to Ward 3.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Very good.

10 MR. ROBLES: So, this is based on Proposal 2-A, correct?

11 Okay. 'Cause then Proposal 2 would - 72 is going to Ward 6. So, now  
12 we're thinking about going the other way for, for a different map  
13 based on 2-A?

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: That -

15 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - would be correct.

17 MR. ROBLES: Cool. Sounds good.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: How does Ward 3 feel about that? Or do  
19 you have (inaudible) I just don't want to do something that you're -

20 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. Well, let's see what the map shows.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We still have time to go back to our  
22 Council Members and talk about these things, but -

23 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - I just want to be out-front with  
25 everybody here and (inaudible)



1 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I think I'd probably want to go back  
2 and speak with my Council Member about that, but certainly good to  
3 discuss in the meantime. I, I don't think it's very likely that he  
4 would oppose getting more people in his ward.

5 I think the main concern was losing some of the people that  
6 Ward 3 has invested a lot of time and funds into. So, this would be  
7 getting new people, not losing anybody.

8 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Exactly.

9 MR. HENDEL: So, I don't, I don't foresee a lot of problems  
10 there, but I should probably double-check.

11 MR. AITKEN: What, what were the precincts that Council  
12 Member Dahl was concerned about losing?

13 MR. HENDEL: Ward - Precinct 43, and particular was  
14 (inaudible) A lot of the, kind of the westside ones. Those are areas  
15 that are economically disadvantaged and Ward 3 has put a lot of funds  
16 from various City programs into those wards and built a lot of  
17 relationships with them.

18 MR. ROBLES: So, I, I'd still like to entertain the  
19 original idea that my colleague, Dr. Alvarez, brought up about 37  
20 and 18. I'm still trying identify precincts that Ward 1 can possibly  
21 gain from Ward 5 in order to make up for that population loss.

22 And I remember the term counter-clockwise vaguely from our  
23 last meeting. So, I want - just bear with me throughout this evening.  
24 I just wanted to put that bug in, in all of your ears, but 37 and 18  
25 is still on the table (inaudible)

1 MR. HENDEL: I think I - so, that would be like El Rio and  
2 Barrio Hollywood, correct? I'm looking at the neighborhood map now.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: That's correct. And that's why I think that  
4 there's a, there's a common interest with Ward 3 in that sense. Not  
5 only in terms of the Hispanic vote and Rough Proportionality, but also  
6 in terms of the, Council Member Dahl's intent in neighborhood building  
7 and support, there seems to be some contiguous interests there. I  
8 agree with maybe looking back at 37 or, or maybe - yeah. That St.  
9 Mary's-Speedway area.

10 MR. ROBLES: I think it's certainly worth considering,  
11 although there's a good chance that people there would - I think I've  
12 heard that people in that area kind of identify as westsiders, and  
13 they might not love the idea of moving, I don't know.

14 I can't speak for people, but we should make sure that we  
15 give them plenty of notice if they want to come to the hearing which I  
16 believe we have part two of the hearing next week. So, you may want  
17 to see if they have thoughts on that.

18 MS. ALVAREZ: We, we could also try to - I mean the numbers  
19 that I offered before didn't work out in terms of the MPD, but there's  
20 almost like a swap between 37 - 37 and 143 can almost be swapped for  
21 160, or 51 on District 5. So, you will, you will pull this - Ward 1  
22 will go south more, more solidly.

23 MS. MESICH: One thing we have to keep in mind in precincts  
24 is we cannot redistrict a Council Member out of their residence. I  
25 don't see that happening, but Ward 1 Council Office is in Precinct 18.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: Eighteen.

2 MS. MESICH: Thank you.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.

4 MR. HENDEL: (Inaudible)

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Okay. That's important. Thank you. Thank  
6 you.

7 MR. HENDEL: I didn't realize that.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. So, that wouldn't work.

9 MR. ROBLES: In theory you could still do 37 and 153, which  
10 is currently split.

11 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah.

12 MR. HENDEL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. ROBLES: And, you know, you could further - you could  
14 do 97.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. You can swap for, for - with District  
16 - you can swap with 5, Precincts 160 -

17 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

18 MS. ALVAREZ: - and 51, for example, which is sort of  
19 little bit of, of a natural there. 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Drexel.

20 MR. ROBLES: I think the new map that Staff made last  
21 week and again I want to thank you for making that, the Rough  
22 Proportionality Map No. 2, takes this idea and actually goes even  
23 further with it, and basically brings most of what 3 and - most of the  
24 west side into Ward 3 and moves Ward 1 south. And it's a whole  
25 clockwise - sorry. Counter-clockwise shift.

1 I think that this particular proposal would result in so  
2 many people moving that it might be chaos, but at least as a  
3 conceptual idea, this kind of moves in the direction that you're,  
4 you're thinking about here.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah.

6 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum. I, I would like some  
7 clarification as far as the population breakdown on certain precincts,  
8 if I may. This one. I'm looking at 183 and 262 on the east side.  
9 What would be the population breakdown there?

10 MR. HENDEL: 183 has 2,315 people. What was the other one?

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Twenty-three one five? And then 262, the  
12 breakdown of 3,791, is that correct?

13 MR. HENDEL: That's what I have, yeah.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. Now are these, where the, where the,  
15 you know, I'm - this is - that's where I'm starting on the east side.  
16 Are we taking into consideration all registered voters here or just  
17 the population?

18 MS. MESICH: The maps have a breakdown of all voters,  
19 voting age population, minority voting age population and total  
20 population.

21 MR. JARAMILLO: That'll be actually registered voters, or  
22 we don't know? That's another question, right?

23 MS. MESICH: Right.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. That's - 'cause that's, to me it's  
25 a big factor. If we had that - I mean it'd be nice if they were all

1 registered voters and we can all get them, get them there some way or  
2 another.

3 MS. MESICH: I'm not sure that the number of registered  
4 voters is something that -

5 MR. JARAMILLO: I know.

6 MS. MESICH: - the Committee should concern -

7 MR. JARAMILLO: But it's something.

8 MR. ROBLES: So, the voting population and our population  
9 by precinct document is voting age, not necessarily registered voters.  
10 Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Now on 113, we have a figure there of  
12 6,214. Is that just - now what would be the breakdown of 113 - of  
13 the 6,214 if 113 was split from 426? We have 6,214 there but we don't  
14 have where the cutoff plan would be. How many registered vo- -- or  
15 possible voters would be on one side, on the north versus south of  
16 that line.

17 MR. HENDEL: Commissioner Jaramillo, could you speak into  
18 the mic? I'm having a hard time hearing.

19 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. On 113, we have a number there at  
20 6,214. If you were to break that down to Ward 6 and 4, what, what are  
21 the numbers there? Like you do have - like you have distinguished in  
22 183 and 263, you have twenty-three - 2315 in one, on the north side of  
23 it, and 3791. On this one, it just says 6,214 and didn't distinguish  
24 from one, one side to the other.

1 MR. HAMMEL: Members of the Committee, the, the population  
2 information is available via the - they're called census blocks within  
3 here. So, if you're looking at the screen now, when I am clicking in,  
4 you can kind of see a highlight.

5 And we can see that within this block that you can see on  
6 the screen, there are 56 - there are 68 population there. So, we can  
7 definitely get you that number, but it would have to be a calculated  
8 number after clicking on each and every one of these blocks  
9 separately.

10 MS. MESICH: So, each precinct is divided or, or is  
11 contained by census blocks which are much smaller geographic areas.  
12 We would have to click into each one and put them into a spreadsheet  
13 and come up with a total for the split precincts.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Is that a possibility of doing that for  
15 future (inaudible)

16 MS. MESICH: For future meetings, yes. Do you want that  
17 for all the splits or just -

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Well, I'd like to see it for 113, which it  
19 didn't signify; 82, 153. And then, if we're gonna consider 37 going  
20 into Ward 3 - and, and that one, if I can voice myself on that one.  
21 That would be - I know a lot of folks that live in that area, and it's  
22 - they would probably feel the same way that 82 felt when they were  
23 here last week as far as moving out of Ward 1.

24 MR. HENDEL: I'm sorry. Which one are we talking about?  
25 Which precinct?

1 MR. JARAMILLO: 37 going to -

2 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

3 MR. JARAMILLO: - Ward 3.

4 FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

5 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah. Is that Barrio Sovaco (sic). And  
6 a lot of those folks have been living there for generations, and I'm  
7 sure that they wouldn't want to be taken out of Ward 1. And then I  
8 have - I'd like to see a population split (inaudible) And then 47.  
9 From my understanding, 47 is in South Tucson.

10 MS. MESICH: Most of 47 is South Tucson, but there's a  
11 portion on the north and south that are City of Tucson in Ward 1.

12 MR. JARAMILLO: And, and 47, okay. Now it (inaudible) If  
13 244 is proposing to go to 41, and 1, and 5 to 1 - and then what's the  
14 split there? What would be the split there, the population breakdown?

15 MS. MESICH: The population of 244.

16 MR. JARAMILLO: 244 is 2,077.

17 MS. MESICH: Seventy-seven.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay.

19 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: And then 47 is 3,342. Of all those folks,  
21 are they living in South Tucson, -

22 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

23 MR. JARAMILLO: - the most part? And then also the  
24 recommendation of 160 going to Ward 1, I, I, I can guarantee that

1 wouldn't be a good move at all, because those folks have been there  
2 for God knows how long as well.

3 MR. HENDEL: Which map has 160 going to Ward 1?

4 MR. JARAMILLO: It was just a recommendation.

5 MR. HENDEL: Oh. Okay. Gotcha. Thank you. So, just to  
6 zoom out a little bit briefly - Oh, sorry. Were you -

7 MR. JARAMILLO: No, go ahead.

8 MR. HENDEL: Go ahead.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: I, I would just like to see the, the  
10 breakdown, the population breakdown in those areas that I brought up,  
11 if I may, and for the future, for the future meeting.

12 MR. ROBLES: So, just to zoom out a bit - I'm sorry. Yeah.  
13 Go ahead. Go ahead.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: I don't know if I mentioned 153 or not.  
15 That, that's the last I have.

16 MS. MESICH: You did. Thank you. We have 153.

17 MR. ROBLES: I think it's worth kind of going over some of  
18 the big picture that we have here. I guess I'm curious to hear the  
19 Committee's thoughts more broadly. So, we have the status quo, which  
20 is not actually legal, according to the Federal Courts, to continue.  
21 So, we have to do something.

22 Then we have Proposal One which was met with staunch  
23 opposition from the Broadmoor Neighborhood last, at the public  
24 hearing. We have Proposal Two, and then now 2-A, which are pretty



1 similar. As far as I can tell, those don't have an enormous amount of  
2 opposition, at least not that, that we've seen on this Committee.

3 Proposal Three, which had a lot of opposition from the  
4 historic neighborhoods moving - that did not want to move from Ward 6  
5 to 1. We saw that at the hearing last week.

6 And then we have the two Rough Proportionality maps which  
7 I'm guessing we all agree are too radical and it's just like hundreds  
8 and changes. And that would probably be tough to do that within a  
9 two-week period. Again, if anyone feels differently, please let me  
10 know. I'm just -

11 MR. JAMAMILLO: Uh-huh.

12 MR. ROBLES: - kind of saying my opinion here. So, it  
13 seems like the consensus both among the Committee and the population,  
14 you know, from our comments that we've received by e-mail and the  
15 public hearing is that we should (inaudible) 2, 2-A, or something new.  
16 I'm curious to hear the Committee's thoughts on that.

17 MR. AITKEN: And, and to add onto your comments, I think  
18 I'd like to respectfully disagree with my, my colleague and, and  
19 friend, Mr. Jaramillo.

20 I believe this is what has held our city back from growing  
21 and, and being bold is by us using these arbitrary barriers to  
22 identify who we are, where we come from.

23 If lived and I used to live on 12<sup>th</sup> and Nebraska, let's see  
24 where, where's that at right now? That's in Ward - sorry. I don't  
25 have my glasses. I was gonna be in Ward 5. If that precinct moved to

1 Ward 1, I wouldn't be - identify myself as a westsider all of sudden.  
2 I'd be from the south side because that's the south side.

3 So, you know, I, I, I still want to keep the conversation  
4 going in seeing what we can do to expand Ward 1 beyond the freeway.  
5 It's - I've been paying attention to the Biden and Harris  
6 Administration.

7 They've been talking about how we need to rid  
8 infrastructure as serving as these sort of natural, but not so  
9 natural barriers to communities growing.

10 And, you know, we've, we've gotta - think we've, we've,  
11 we've gotta roll the dice here and, you know, I, I, I'm in Ward 1  
12 right now and, and I'm just down the street. And if, if Ward 5  
13 acquired my precinct, I'd know I was still living in downtown, not  
14 the south side, right? And just wanted add those comments.

15 MR. HENDEL: Just to clarify. When you say not, not  
16 letting the freeway be a barrier, do you mean adding precincts that  
17 are currently in Ward 5 and moving them to Ward 1, like around like  
18 160, 51, like those or am I misunderstanding?

19 MR. ROBLES: Sorry. If we (inaudible) Sorry. There's so  
20 many maps. And if, if we look at the original map, the Ward 1 is  
21 drawn all along the freeway. And maybe you drive, or walk just across  
22 the street, and the precinct is still there.

23 But like we need a challenge the norm here, folks. And I  
24 think we do so by 37 and 18 going into Ward 3. I'd love to continue  
25 to entertain the conversation about 160 and 51 going into Ward 1.

1 Ward 3 would gain 7,150 folks, citizens, residents. Ward 1 would gain  
2 8,533 and I'm sure that doesn't count children who aren't 18 yet.

3 But I'm, I'm still, again, having trouble to saying, "Okay.  
4 What can make up for 8,000, 8500 loss for Ward 5?" So, I'm still  
5 looking at these precincts, and then, of course, see what Ward 4 gets  
6 in terms of Ward, Ward 5 going into Ward 1. Yes, that's how - my  
7 response.

8 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Uh-huh.

10 MR. JARAMILLO: May I answer? I respectfully - my  
11 colleague here, I, I would totally disagree of putting 160 and 51 into  
12 Ward 1. I know they're - I know you, you wanted to expand Ward 1 but  
13 at the cost of moving 160 and 51, I will have to stand my ground on,  
14 on those two.

15 Personally, I've lived in 160 for over 60 years, and I know  
16 the, I know the community well, as 160 and 51 as well. So, for us  
17 just to sit here and say: Hey, tradition goes out. I won't, I won't  
18 agree with that, and I know the folks that live in that area as well.  
19 Have been there for a good 70 years, 75 years and I will stand firm on  
20 moving those. Thank you.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: I - yeah. I, I respect Mr. Jaramillo's  
22 perspective there. That - I, I can see the loyalty these people have  
23 to Dis- -- you know, Ward 5 and versus 1. I, I've done some work in  
24 that area. I understand it. I'm not sure that we should dismiss,

1 however, Mr. Robles' point about 37. I know that that's El Rio  
2 Neighborhood, Barrio Sovaco (sic).

3 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: But that's exactly to the point that he's  
5 making, that the freeway becomes the natural barrier and I learned  
6 a new term this week just doing some research and reading.

7 When, when the Supreme Court in 1994 allowed for the notion  
8 of Rough Proportionality, the counter-site to dilution, to diluting  
9 the vote is some single packing. And that's where the real problem  
10 is, in that you're packing a particular ethnic vote to a certain area.

11 So, dilu- -- diluting sounds more like: Oh, okay. Well,  
12 you know, take a few here. But that's really not even the point. The  
13 point that we should be talking is to the extent that we continue to,  
14 to understand the demographics of the city, and that we continue to  
15 understand that we are packing Hispanic votes into two districts and  
16 not when we possibly have the, the, the power or the possibility of  
17 doing something a little hybrid.

18 I don't think looking at the Rough Proportionality maps  
19 that this Commission will be in a position to in good faith fully  
20 recommend any of those. They're really disruptive.

21 What we can do is what we say we would do which is advise  
22 Council and Mayor to say: You have a real serious issue here as the  
23 next two years come and the demographics of the city change, and you  
24 really ought to even have the metric or a guideline as to how is it

1 that the City Charter will consider dilution, by when does that  
2 happened, you know, like we don't have a clear metric.

3 But we do have the opportunity to get closer to it by  
4 trying to make some attempt. Right now, that seems most likely by  
5 tweaking further, further, further 2-A. Map 2-A seems to give us -  
6 and that may have to mean something like Precinct 37, 18 or 143, you  
7 know, being the ones that we can possibly realign with Ward 3.

8 Again, I'm not set on it, but I'm saying Mr. Jaramillo's  
9 right, and Mr. Robles is also right. And we have to do something that  
10 balances those two.

11 MS. MESICH: I'll just remind you that Ward 1 Council  
12 Office, Precinct 18.

13 MS. ALVAREZ: Excluding 18.

14 MR. ROBLES: So, the rule is we can't move a precinct where  
15 the current City Council Member lives, or where the Council Office is,  
16 is that correct? Okay. Thank you.

17 MR. ALVAREZ: That's just 18. 143 is, is okay. Yeah, we  
18 can play with that and 37. And I understand. I mean, yeah, you know,  
19 we have had historic fights in this city over that area in 37, so,  
20 it's not like I'm saying that's gonna be everybody's liking.

21 But it will send a message that Mr. Robles is talking about  
22 in terms of the freeway breaking that barrier for saying we're not  
23 going to just accept that anymore as the only measure of contiguous  
24 power.

1 MR. ROBLES: I, I don't know where the current Council  
2 Member from Ward 1 lives. Is, is she in 37? 18. Oh, okay. That  
3 simplifies it. So, there's just one that's completely off limits, but  
4 (inaudible) we can play with.

5 MS. DARLAND: Chair Crum, well, I, I want to basically just  
6 acknowledge, you know, the really important context that my colleagues  
7 are offering with respect to the impacts on these neighborhoods that  
8 are really (inaudible) in a great deal of tradition and community.

9 And I have a great deal of respect for that and I feel very  
10 much like I'm vocalizing a perspective here that I want to be very  
11 sensitive to things of which I do not know.

12 Thinking about things from a global perspective, knowing,  
13 too, what my colleague, Mr. Robles, noted, thinking about the  
14 infrastructure projects that our city is going to be looking at to  
15 improve the economic situation for folks who live along that corridor  
16 and the economic opportunity for communities and neighborhoods that  
17 have missed out on some really important revenue for their  
18 revitalization and things that can reflect the needs of folks who  
19 are residents there.

20 I think it's important to have a cohesive representation  
21 there and I do agree that sometimes having some of these artifices  
22 that do create divide are, are also obstruction to community  
23 connection to those opportunities, and it creates barriers  
24 economically as well. The, the thing that I just would encourage that  
25 I, when we are looking at getting to a proportionate state, which is

1 important to me because I live, you know, in Precinct 99 in Ward 2. I  
2 have little minority representation in my ward.

3 I can do only so much to vote with that in mind, but the  
4 more I can have neighbors who can bring in different mindset, the more  
5 I would like to see us get there as a community.

6 The question that I would have for Staff is, do we continue  
7 to study this outside of the redistricting process so that we can sort  
8 of see change over time? To see, are we getting to that community  
9 goal for ensuring that we aren't packing to my colleague's point  
10 because that is absolutely correct. We want to avoid that as well.

11 But are we getting to this so we can start to see that  
12 mobility of representation and for future committees, we're also to  
13 know that we're getting to that bigger, broader goal of making sure  
14 that our, that our voting population, our wards are properly  
15 representative of the folks who are residing in our city.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: If I could, I'd like to ask our the City  
17 Clerks to report back on the impact of some of the changes that are  
18 being proposed upon equalizing population.

19 MS. MESICH: We can do that. And if I may address what was  
20 just said. I believe it's been brought up at last week or the week  
21 before that the possibility of part of your recommendation being that  
22 while we may need to redistrict by December 31<sup>st</sup>, the work can go on  
23 with updates in population, periodic meetings of this Committee or  
24 another one designated by Mayor and Council to really get into the,  
25 the meat, so to speak, of, of the redistricting process.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: Chairman Crum, I, I think that's a - and, and  
2 thank you for that comment. That, that's exactly what I think we will  
3 - we, we can recommend that we did the job that we were asked to do  
4 with the best - to the best of our ability with what we have at the  
5 time.

6 But I think that our recommendation that a, a study group,  
7 or a task force be established. And not only that, but that that task  
8 force engages in a very proactive series of (inaudible) conversation  
9 neighborhoods about what would it look like to have that Rough  
10 Proportionality interpreted, because if people are going to feel the  
11 pain of some change, it should be plenty of time to deliberate on that  
12 with public forms, and arguments and debates and maps.

13 At the same time, that Commission should also try to  
14 establish some kind of metric that would be acceptable in the City  
15 Charter. But would that - what would Rough Proportionality mean here?

16 Does it mean - because we have one metric which is the MPD,  
17 but we don't have one that tells us exactly: Oh, that one doesn't  
18 meet this criteria. And so, that would be part of a super welcome  
19 recommendation that our report will be, our report will be hefty.

20 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

21 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

23 MR. ROBLES: I just want to ask -

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Go for it.



1           MR. ROBLES: - this whole Committee what we're, what we're  
2 feeling right now. What, what the vibe is, 'cause I know I've thrown  
3 out some numbers and I, I just want to know if, if we're - we want to  
4 bring out, bring out another proposal with some of the discussions  
5 around the precincts that I propose, and if we feel like that would be  
6 worth a conversation next week. I just wanted to just kind of get an  
7 idea what folks are feeling.

8           MR. HENDEL: My main comment on that is if we're - I feel  
9 like we should try to have some kind of resolution by the end of this  
10 meeting, at least on what our current favorite is, not necessarily an  
11 official - certainly not an official recommendation yet, but because  
12 last time around, we got a lot of very justified complaints from the  
13 public about how maps came out one or two days before the hearing.  
14 And just want to remind everybody the next and last hearing is next  
15 Thursday.

16           And so, if we say, "Staff, right now, please make a new  
17 map," that takes some time, and then it takes another couple of days  
18 to get that out in the, in the paper, and everybody is newsletters and  
19 stuff, we're going to have the exact same complaints we had last time  
20 which, again, I think we all feel were very justified.

21           And so, I think if we can end today's meeting, either with  
22 endorsing, you know, or going into the hearing saying that we are most  
23 closely looking at, you know, 2 or 2-A, or another map that we create  
24 right now during this meeting, that would be good. But I don't

1 totally feel comfortable with asking Staff to make a new one and do  
2 all that before next week.

3 So, I mean if we want to make a map that just moves like 37  
4 and 52 or whatever it may be, and we want to do that right now on the  
5 spot, and then we endorse it at the end of this meeting, in theory,  
6 I'm fine with that. But I just think we should try to have a  
7 conclusion at the end of this meeting.

8 MR. JARAMILLO: Chair Crum? This proposes (inaudible) in  
9 front of us. Gives us kind of the MPD that we'll desire, probably not  
10 the best, but it's pretty close to what we have been discussion as far  
11 as moving the minimal amount of precincts, and that have jeopardized  
12 the concerns of our, our Committee Members that were here with us last  
13 week. I think they would be satisfied with this proposal.

14 But as far as moving the precincts that respectfully Mr.  
15 Robles, the recommendation that he made from 160 and 51 to go to 1,  
16 that would not meet the needs of the community.

17 MR. ROBLES: Are there others from Ward 5 that could be  
18 moved into Ward 1 besides -

19 MR. JARAMILLO: You have six -

20 MR. ROBLES: - 160 and 51 that would -

21 MR. JARAMILLO: You have 47 and 244.

22 MR. ROBLES: Yeah, those are the ones -

23 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

1 MR. ROBLES: Those are already moved in 2-A. Are there  
2 more that could be moved, or is the rest kind of like that would be  
3 a bigger problem?

4 MR. JARAMILLO: Personally, for Ward 5, I feel that would  
5 be a, a bigger problem.

6 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. AITKEN: Chairman Crum, Mr. Jaramillo. Is it in the  
8 interests of Ward 5 to expand a little bit more east? I'd like to  
9 learn more about where the Council Member is feeling on that.

10 MR. JARAMILLO: That would be probably a discussion that  
11 I'd have to have (inaudible)

12 MR. HENDEL: I'll also, I'll also point out that in 2 and  
13 2-A, they are expanding quite a bit on the southeast side with 275 and  
14 11.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: Can we do, can we redo the map right now in  
16 real time, moving only 37 and 143 to 3 and see what that gives us?

17 MS. MESICH: Have you talked to Council Member Santa Cruz  
18 (inaudible)

19 MR. HENDEL: Yes. Yes, I have spoken to Council Member  
20 Santa Cruz and, and, you know, quite frankly, we're very much of, of  
21 the interest, in the interest of moving beyond the freeway. I think  
22 this is - so, I'm, I'm definitely okay with, with that, Commissioner  
23 Alvarez.

24 MR. ROBLES: I'm not, I'm, I'm, I'm interested in learning  
25 more about why certain communities have loyalty to certain wards. I

1 think we heard some last week at the public hearing. And apologies if  
2 this is obvious to anyone, but you know, I, I think a lot of people  
3 don't even know what ward they're in. They might not show much  
4 loyalty.

5 Certainly, other people do and that's very justified. But  
6 I'm just, just as a matter of curiosity and just to hear. So, anyone  
7 listening to this meeting can hear.

8 Council Member Jaramillo, could you, could elaborate on why  
9 160 and 51 identify with Ward 5? I not trying to challenge it, I'm  
10 just genuinely curious.

11 MR. JARAMILLO: 160 and 51 have been there for quite some  
12 time. I personally live in 160 and wouldn't want to move out of Ward  
13 5. (Inaudible) from 82 out last week.

14 As far as being established there, I would tend to disagree  
15 if you ask people about who their ward is. They know down there,  
16 okay? They do know and they have known for quite, quite a few years,  
17 not decades. So, that's why I feel so strongly about moving those two  
18 out of the Ward 5.

19 MR. ROBLES: That makes sense. Thank you.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Is that the Staff?

21 MS. MESICH: Yeah. So, we have a new MPD of 11.31% moving  
22 Precinct 37 and 143 to Ward 3.

23 MR. ROBLES: That looks good.

24 MR. HENDEL: But that's not legally allowed, right?

1 MALE SPEAKER: Well, it is technically allowed, but it's -  
2 I believe it's like we're no longer presumptive - I don't remember the  
3 terminology.

4 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Members of the Committee, Chair Crum,  
5 Madam Clerk, that's well stated. Yeah, it's, it's doable, but it -  
6 you are not within the presumptive validity anymore. (Inaudible)

7 MS. ALVAREZ: I have a question about the policy objectives  
8 that were listed in the City website. The presumptive validity is not  
9 listed as one of our key criteria, Madam Clerk.

10 MS. MESICH: Apologies. That's an oversight. The policy  
11 objectives were actually an attachment to that very description of  
12 presumptive.

13 MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.

14 MR. HENDEL: If we want -

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

16 MS. MESICH: I thought I gotcha.

17 MR. HENDEL: If we want to move 37 into Ward 3 and the  
18 people in 160 and 51 feel strongly about, you know, being in Ward 5,  
19 we could consider 246, 64, 50, just like directly east of South Tucson  
20 in that area.

21 I, I don't know if people would oppose that, but I'm just  
22 looking at the map and thinking of what all the possibilities are.  
23 And that seems like 246, 64 and 50 which would just be - so, we're  
24 already adding in, in Map 2-A, we're adding 47 and 244 from Ward 5  
25 to Ward 1. I just mentioned three more precincts that are contiguous

1 with those that we're moving. We could, in theory, move those, too.  
2 I don't have any knowledge or thoughts on whether the people there  
3 would oppose that, but I don't know. It's worth at least considering.

4 MS. MESICH: I think we have a Council Member who lives in  
5 246.

6 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

7 MS. MESICH: We will provide that list to you -

8 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

9 MS. MESICH: - before the next meeting.

10 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

11 MR. HENDEL: So, 64 and 50 maybe should be considered? Or  
12 maybe if we could just check that on the map if you could take 2-A,  
13 move 37 to - from Ward 1 to Ward 3 as Council Member - Committee  
14 Member Robles suggested. And then maybe try moving 50 or 64. I guess  
15 start with 50 maybe. Does anybody know if people there would oppose  
16 that, 50 -

17 MR. AITKEN: Think they backed down.

18 MR. HENDEL: It's right next to 244 and 47. And so, it  
19 sort of -

20 MR. AITKEN: Uh-huh.

21 MR. HENDEL: - makes some amount of sense to consider  
22 moving that as well - number 50.

23 MR. AITKEN: And I, I think - and I'm certainly open to  
24 consideration. But I just want to touch on it again. At the end of  
25 the day, if, if folks don't want to move out of a ward because of the

1 Council Member, what happens in two to four years when that Council  
2 Member is not there anymore and they get somebody they don't like?  
3 You know, it's - I'm - my intentions going into this is making sure we  
4 have equity. We have an equitable spread of City of Tucson residents  
5 in wards throughout this city.

6 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

8 MR. JARAMILLO: I don't think (inaudible) who'd would be,  
9 who's, who's in office at the time as it would be more likely that the  
10 ward that they belong to and have belonged to, regardless of who, who  
11 represents them is where they want to be in Ward 5, and 160 and 51.  
12 I'm just speaking on behalf of those wards and the other wards that  
13 are within Ward 5. Thank you.

14 MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Jaramillo, you didn't see that same  
15 conflict with 47 and 244?

16 MR. JARAMILLO: I do, but the conversations that I've had  
17 with the, the ward office - and you know, and I, there is a concern  
18 there as well.

19 MS. ALVAREZ: But it's not as highly elevated -

20 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

21 MS. ALVAREZ: - as it would be on 160. Okay. Thank you.

22 MS. HENDEL: So, from what I gather from what Mr. Robles  
23 said is that you spoke with Council Member Santa Cruz, and she would  
24 be okay with giving 37 to Ward 3, is that correct? And that -

1 MR. AITKEN: Yes. It's a proposal we'd be willing to  
2 entertain -

3 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

4 MR. AITKEN: - as we move across the freeway.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

6 MR. AITKEN: Uh-huh.

7 MR. HENDEL: Is that - sorry. Go ahead.

8 MR. AITKEN: No. Go ahead.

9 MR. HENDEL: Oh, okay.

10 MR. AITKEN: Uh-huh.

11 MR. HENDEL: I, I just - I think I heard in the past that -  
12 so, that's El Rio, right? I've, I've heard in the past, was it last  
13 time or two times ago when they did redistricting, that 37, they tried  
14 to move that and the residents were extremely upset sort of in the  
15 same way that we saw last week at the hearing from 82 and 44 and 45.

16 And so, I, you know, I, I don't know for sure if that would  
17 happen again, but my understanding is that that happened pretty  
18 recently. And so, we should be very prepared for the possibility that  
19 they're going to be very upset about this if we do propose that. Just  
20 a comment.

21 MR. AITKEN: Thank you.

22 MS. ALVAREZ: And that goes to the point that my colleague  
23 here made earlier, though, that by locking in that loyalty, there's  
24 also a shortsightedness about the possibilities for development and,  
25 and breaking that artificial barrier of the freeway.



1 I mean, Ward 3 which has a mix, I mean it's as mixed as  
2 almost any - I live on 3. I drive to my neighborhood, it's like I'm  
3 in two different cities, right, all the time.

4 But, but because of that, that ward also is positioned to  
5 do incredible work of community development of housing, renovations.  
6 There's a lot of things there. So, for us to only consider that  
7 loyalty when, in fact, that neighborhood where I have friends who live  
8 there on 37, you know, it stands to benefit from the broader global  
9 approach to the growth of our city is something that really weighs on  
10 me. Whether people would see it or not, that's a really good point,  
11 but we're really looking here ahead.

12 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: As far as, could you elaborate on how the  
15 growth would affect Precinct 37 and (inaudible) I mean I've -  
16 personally, what I've seen, unfortunately, 37 has been the same for  
17 decades, and nothing - there has been no improvements there. All  
18 right, there hasn't.

19 As a long-life resident of Tucson, I haven't seen 37, 97  
20 and 16 - well, maybe 16 'cause it's on the other side of Greasewood.  
21 But as far as those - they're in dire need of improvements. And  
22 that's been known for quite some time, and yet, nobody addresses  
23 those issues.

24 MR. ROBLES: I live in that area. I can definitely tell  
25 you, Silverbell Road is (making noise).

1 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

2 MR. ROBLES: It's gonna destroy my car every time I drive  
3 down there.

4 MR. JARAMILLO: And I agree with you. I wholeheartedly  
5 agree with you that the roads citywide, they're in dire need.

6 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

7 MR. JARAMILLO: Dire need. And, but I, you know, I, I feel  
8 for 37. You know, I was there last week. I mean, I played a lot of  
9 ball there at Murietta, and they're gonna be improving that park  
10 finally. And I always compare our side of town, the west side of town  
11 versus the east side of town.

12 MR. HENDEL: Uh-huh.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: And what's provided for those folks, and  
14 what's provided for the folks on this side of town. And it's never  
15 been equitable. Never. I don't care what anybody has to say. I've  
16 seen it, I've lived it.

17 So, for them to say: I would love to see improvements in 37  
18 and the other areas on, on, on 1. And for every precinct and every  
19 ward to be equally treated the way they should be treated, whether it  
20 comes through funding for roads or parks, libraries and the list goes  
21 on. But unfortunately, it's not the case. Thank you.

22 MS. ALVAREZ: I, I would not disagree with the, the general  
23 sentiment of your statement. I - when I was student at the University  
24 of Arizona in 1994, I lived in 37, as I could rent a house for \$400.  
25 I was a graduate student, you know?

1           And I have friends who live there. I go visit them and,  
2 and there have been changes, not, not too - not contrary to the spirit  
3 of what you're saying. But across from my friend's house, there's a  
4 really nice park, and there are housing developments and improvements.

5           And I'm not disagreeing with the sentiment. I'm saying  
6 that there are opportunities for continuous development in those areas  
7 and I don't think they've been neglected absolute. It's, it's, it's  
8 also part of the economic development picture of where the development  
9 happens in terms of businesses in the city.

10           And that's why I think that Council Member Dahl has spoken  
11 to that with a certain freshness that I think would be important to  
12 that. But again, this - we're, we're, we're on the same side here.  
13 I'm not -

14           (Affirmative comments.)

15           MS. ALVAREZ: I, I don't disagree with the sentiment.

16           MR. ROBLES: Right. And, and to add on to that note,  
17 I, I completely agree. You drive around the city, we, we know those  
18 areas where, you know, for the past ten years, they've been looking  
19 the same, you know. The AM/PM, I go get my (inaudible), you know.  
20 Roads are just the worst and all that.

21           But, no, it's, at the end of the day, it's worth, in my  
22 opinion, seeing going bold and moving this district as a proposal,  
23 moving 37 into Ward 3 and seeing how folks feel about that. And see  
24 what we can do to move across I-10 and continue to expand this city,

1 these wards beyond the natural barriers that have been in place for  
2 far too long.

3 I, I, I would, as, as a young person who's gonna be in the  
4 city for a very long time, I believe it's in - it's our responsibility  
5 to make sure we're setting these wards up for success for decades to  
6 come and we're laying -

7 I think we have a real opportunity in front of us to lay  
8 the groundwork for that. And it's taking these little pieces at a  
9 time is how we do so in my opinion.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I, I appreciate the discussion on, on  
11 official barriers and manufactured barriers and moving beyond the  
12 traditional ways of how precincts and wards have been done in other  
13 jurisdictions. And I look at street improvements that not only move  
14 across precincts, but move across wards.

15 And all of a sudden you have a larger population that is  
16 not confined to a precinct, or precincts but go across wards. And  
17 more and more, I would agree that we have to look at a changing world  
18 in terms of how cities are set up in terms of wards, quite frankly.  
19 So, thank you for those comments. I really appreciate them.

20 MR. ROBLES: Thank you, Chairman Crum.

21 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

23 MR. JARAMILLO: And, you know, I, I personally feel that it  
24 shouldn't matter what ward or precinct that individuals live. I just  
25 feel that when it comes to improvements, whether roads improvement,

1 housing improvements, it should be done equitably citywide without  
2 taking into consideration where you live, you know? Everybody should  
3 have a fair shake of that, of that purse. And I know it doesn't  
4 happen, for whatever reason.

5 And it's traditionally been like that for, for decades, you  
6 know? It just - it's unfortunate. In Nogales, right off of Old  
7 Nogales and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, I can show you where the last time we had  
8 pavement on Nebraska. That was 1963.

9 Why? Because I, I took it upon myself to put my initials  
10 there along with one of my buddies. It was 1963, and that's the last  
11 time we've ever seen any type of roads improvement there.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Uh-huh.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: So, I know. And then you go elsewhere, and  
14 you see all these wonderful roads being built and whatever. I know  
15 they're, they're done and money comes from different sources. But,  
16 you know, throw the diff- -- throw the - spread the wealth. And  
17 that's the way it should be done.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right.

19 MR. JARAMILLO: Don't just concentrate on one area.  
20 Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Of course, I've, I've had experience  
22 where someone else comes in and says: You need this improvement and  
23 the neighborhood, or neighborhoods in this particular case, say: No,  
24 we don't and it, and it doesn't get done. So, sometimes improvements

1 for improvement's sake really isn't in terms of what the neighbors  
2 want and can't do that.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: Can we - are we - do we have a picture of  
4 2-A with 37, only with the 37 precinct change? Is that the one on  
5 the board? No, not yet. Let's take a look at that and see what that  
6 gives us.

7 MR. HENDEL: I just want to - I, I, I just Googled it to  
8 confirm the, the memory that I had, and I found an article from 2020  
9 saying: The Tucson City Council bent to public pressure Tuesday night  
10 and reversed a decision to redistrict a historic Hispanic neighborhood  
11 to a different Council ward.

12 El Rio Acres, which is 37, the one we've been talking  
13 about, would have been reassigned from Ward 1 to Ward 3 under a plan  
14 approved by Council, but the Council changed course after pushback  
15 from westside residents.

16 And then there's a bunch of quotes and there's an on-line  
17 petition on Move On dot org, and it had 350 signatures that people  
18 didn't want to move.

19 Again, all I'm saying is if we do this, people are gonna be  
20 - I can't see why they would be less upset this time than they were  
21 two years ago. So, I would expect quite a bit of public outrage if we  
22 do this.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Agree.

24 MS. ALVAREZ: At the same time, I have historic  
25 documentation of a memo in support of the Council's, of the previous

1 proposals from the top five Latino voter representation organizations  
2 in the state. LUCHA CHEESPA (sic), others that said that, that, that  
3 that change would have been good because it was moving us closer to,  
4 in the original proposals. So, I mean, that's an interesting contrast  
5 right there.

6 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh. Now, and, and on that note,  
7 Commissioner Alvarez, I'd like to ask, you know, see if there's any  
8 (inaudible) knowledge here. But on, on 2-A, we have Precincts 47 and  
9 Precincts 244 being acquired by us. Is there any reason to believe  
10 that those precincts wouldn't be defiant towards this particular  
11 proposal?

12 MR. JARAMILLO: That, that I don't know. And that's a  
13 good, very good question, Mr. Robles. Very good question.

14 MR. ROBLES: I think the only evidence we have for that  
15 is that was in Proposal Two as well, and no one, no one came to the  
16 hearing and spoke against that. I don't even think we saw any - we  
17 got hundreds of e-mail comments, and I don't remember any of them  
18 being from those wards.

19 So, I mean from those precincts. So, I think if they're -  
20 they, they've sort of had a couple weeks to be outraged and we haven't  
21 heard it yet. So, that's at least some evidence.

22 MS. ALVAREZ: Is that the change that, Mr. Robles, you have  
23 your, your map there?

24 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh. Somewhere. 37 to 3?

25 MS. ALVAREZ: Can you read out the numbers, Madam?

1 MS. MESICH: So, we have Precinct 37 moved from Ward 1 to  
2 Ward 3. And Precinct 143 moved from Ward 3 to Ward 1. And that  
3 brings us an MPD of 7.93%.

4 MR. ROBLES: Removing those two?

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: That's a decent number. The Supreme  
6 Court would agree.

7 MS. ALVAREZ: And what about the demographic's minority and  
8 Hispanics and the total number in the ward?

9 MS. MESICH: We're bringing that up.

10 MR. HENDEL: As, as we're doing this, I'm reading more.  
11 I, I found the petition; 393 people signed the petition to stop  
12 specifically Ward thir- -- Precinct 37 from being moved from Ward 1  
13 to 3. I guess I'm little nervous about - I mean this was just two  
14 years ago that this happened -

15 MR. JARAMILLO: Uh-huh.

16 MR. HENDEL: - like where I feel like they are going to be  
17 rightfully furious if we say: Okay, well, we'll cave to the public  
18 pressure two years ago, and then we're just gonna try again in two  
19 years. I feel like that's kind of bad governance, like the will of  
20 the people should be heard for more than one, you know, redistricting  
21 at a time.

22 If this is the exact thing that they were furious about  
23 last time, we should listen to their thoughts and consider these  
24 petitions and I feel like it's sort of just overall bad governance to  
25 try to do this again after we, after we as a city - not, not this



1 Committee, but we as a city agreed to not do this last time. I think  
2 trying again in two years is not a good look.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: I wasn't here two years ago and I'm using my  
4 judgment this time. I don't know that that's the will of the people -  
5 could, could be represented by those numbers.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Jenifer?

7 MS. DARLAND: Yes. I'm sorry. Just - I'm not very  
8 good with math, but by my calculation of the 393 with the voters  
9 represented here on this map, we're talking about 14% of the folks  
10 were able to sway that decision. And so, I think that that, you know,  
11 numbers tell a story.

12 And I, I, I, I guess what I come back to and maybe forgive  
13 me for an ignorant question, but does any neighborhood lose its  
14 historic designation when we redistrict into a different ward? Is  
15 there a loss of historical significance when we change a ward or  
16 property value or taxation rate that I'm not aware of that I didn't  
17 read in any of the documentation prepared for us? I, I don't mean to  
18 be acting -

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: No, no.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: No.

21 MS. DARLAND: It's, it's just one of those things where I,  
22 I, I appreciate that there's a great deal of sentiment two years ago.  
23 But I do sort of say that one of the things that the people we  
24 represent and the Mayor have is this responsibility to make decisions

1 that, yes, take into consideration the 14%. But what, also, what's  
2 good for the balance of the whole? So, that's just my, my two cents.

3 I appreciate that there's a document about this, but I also  
4 just feel like to hold back from making a meaningful contribution to a  
5 decision for the Mayor and Council to consider because we're worried  
6 about a petition of 14% of a particular precinct I think denies our  
7 Council and our Mayor the opportunity to reconsider under present-day  
8 circumstances.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Of course, ours is just a  
10 recommendation. And we're obligated by law to look at a very  
11 limited number of variables that we can legitimately consider.

12 And I will admit my own ignorance when I look at a  
13 neighborhood and say: Okay. I know how they feel. And I'm  
14 absolutely wrong that they really - doesn't matter to them.

15 And that's why I say this tonight. What ward they happen  
16 to be in because the wards are so closely connected to each other  
17 regardless of who - just regardless.

18 And I thought I knew how they felt. No, they didn't feel  
19 that way at all. They didn't care. So, I'm not - I feel really  
20 reluctant to speak for certain neighborhoods because I am proven to  
21 be wrong.

22 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee, I've been  
23 advised by our great legal advisor that there are no consequences to  
24 historic neighborhoods and taxation if wards are changed, ward  
25 boundaries change.

1 MS. DARLAND: Well, and I appreciate the clarification.  
2 And I certainly, you know, I don't want to be overly presumptive that  
3 I know better than anybody. I certainly do not. This process has  
4 been very illuminating.

5 But one of the things that I shared with the Clerk before  
6 we came to order was that, you know, we're very fortunate in our  
7 community. Any one of the members which whom we sit here to represent  
8 on this body, I would more than happy to be represented by.

9 I think that we live in a very - a city that for all of its  
10 laws, has a, has a mindset and a vision for our population that takes  
11 into consideration what's in the best interests of the people who are  
12 largely marginalized folks, as well as balancing that with the needs  
13 for economic development and things that really keep Tucson being a  
14 nationally-recognized destination for a lot of investment from both  
15 national organizations and global enterprises.

16 So, I don't mean to get on a soapbox about it necessarily,  
17 and I - the sensitivity and the historic value that my colleagues have  
18 presented has been very helpful. So, thank you for allowing my  
19 moments.

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: Chairman Crum, I, I believe that the comment  
22 is correct that this would be a political fight, but that's - we're  
23 not - that's not for us to decide. What we have to do is present a  
24 proposal that says, we met the objectives. It would be, it would be  
25 below the threshold of the, of the law that we're required. It will

1 move one district closer to proportionality, not perfect but it moves  
2 it. So, that's two, check, check.

3 It actually, this rubs the natural barrier of the freeway  
4 which is a precedent to begin to change how we might consider this.  
5 Check three. And to me that would be good enough to say in good  
6 conscience, these met the criteria of the job that we were asked to  
7 do and we're putting it forward.

8 The public then can say to the Council, absolutely not, and  
9 the Council can vote and do what they did last time. In that report  
10 you read, it says "cave".

11 MR. HENDEL: Uh-huh.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: So, that's, that's okay because that process  
13 will continue. We will just make a recommendation. And on top of  
14 that, we would be making a recommendation that this process has -  
15 requires a deeper and broader thinking ahead of two years from now.  
16 And I would feel pretty good about making a recommendation like that.

17 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum, thank you, my fellow  
18 Commissioners Darland and, Alvarez. One, again, is I've been saying  
19 this throughout the evening. We, we need to stop allowing for wards  
20 to determine what our neighborhood identity is going to be. We're  
21 still gonna live in our neighborhoods whether we're - no matter what  
22 precinct a ward lands - ward or (inaudible) It's been a long evening.  
23 Whatever a precinct a ward lands in.

24 But Dr. Alvarez - Commissioner Alvarez, you mentioned you  
25 weren't here two years ago. Neither was I, and quite frankly, I'd be

1 willing to entertain Precinct 37 moving to Ward 3. And with that, and  
2 then one - was it, excuse me, 160 pre- -- the alternative precinct we  
3 were proposing? With all that being said, I just want to say thank  
4 you for your comments. You, you pulled up an article. Where was  
5 that, that article published?

6 MR. HENDEL: Arizona Public Media, PBS, MPR.

7 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

8 MR. HENDEL: And then the petition is on Move On dot org.

9 MR. ROBLES: I guess the highway thing is definitely an  
10 interesting idea. I don't think that's really in our official  
11 guidelines to, to try to move across the highway. And this MPD is  
12 about double the MPD of 2-A, I believe.

13 Actually, more than - it's almost triple. So, I think it's  
14 worse in terms of the MPD, and it's a lot worse in terms of public  
15 outcry. I guess I don't really see why this is better. I, I, I see  
16 some merits, but we have a proposal that people seem to like.

17 I don't - it doesn't make a ton of sense to say our  
18 recommendation is gonna be something that outrages people and the  
19 exact same thing that outraged people two years ago. I feel like  
20 that's - if this Committee ends up recommending that, we won't have  
21 really done our jobs.

22 MR. AITKEN: I think that this course is necessary, to be  
23 frank. I, I certainly believe that this course is necessary, not just  
24 for a discussion, but for the future of the city. We - I'm just, I'm  
25 thinking about the future here and it's the same old, same old, then -

1 and Ward 1 isn't interested in the status quo. So, yeah. Just give  
2 me a few, few seconds.

3 So, if my coll- -- my colleagues can - Commissioner  
4 Alvarez, we - and, and Commissioner Darland, we've discussed  
5 Precinct 37. I'm trying to remember the alternative, the, the  
6 additional precinct that we were going to swap. Was that from Ward 5?  
7 That was 160, correct?

8 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah, but that, that has been -

9 MR. AITKEN: Oh, that's right. Excuse me.

10 MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Jaramillo has spoken. It's 143.

11 MR. AITKEN: Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: It includes - these numbers include 37 and  
13 143, yeah.

14 MR. AITKEN: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: So, they wouldn't be the only single, -

16 MR. AITKEN: Right.

17 MS. ALVAREZ: - singled-out precinct.

18 MR. AITKEN: Uh-huh.

19 MR. ROBLES: But wouldn't 143 be - I guess I'm a little  
20 lost on the logic here. Moving one forty- -- are we saying moving 143  
21 to Ward 3? But then doesn't that make the highway thing worse?  
22 That's now reseparating by the highway.

23 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. That, that, that's correct. But I  
24 think 143 was just thrown in there as part of the numbers balancing.

1 It, it probably - it doesn't meet that criteria of the freeway.

2 You're right. So, we could probably do one where it's only 37.

3 MS. MESICH: Yes. The map right now has 143 in Ward 3, or  
4 excuse me, Ward 1. And 37 is in Ward 3.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: So, the map is (inaudible)

6 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

7 MR. AITKEN: Madam Clerk, do you have any access to the  
8 map that was proposed two years ago that constituted some of the  
9 conversations we're dealing with right now?

10 MS. MESICH: For 37?

11 MR. AITKEN: Yes.

12 MS. MESICH: Might be part of the material in your binders.  
13 If it's not, we can access that map.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum? This is for -

15 MS. MESICH: Tab 10. It's in, it's in - yes.

16 MR. JARAMILLO: Just a point. One of discussion.

17 Traditionally, 37 precinct; the folks there traditionally go back and  
18 they will, they will speak up.

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: They have, they have for many, many years.

21 So, if you want to recommend that - but also inform them that what was  
22 happening, and maybe invite them to a public meeting, or invite them  
23 to the public meeting to see what they have to say as well. 'Cause  
24 they're, they're a feisty bunch. And I know that from, from past  
25 history in the city.

1           They, they do speak up, they don't mind that. They might  
2 not speak up right now, but they speak up pretty loud when it need be,  
3 right? So, I, I just want to throw that out. Thank you.

4           MR. AITKEN: Was there any controversy around '89 going to  
5 Ward 6 last time? Does anybody recall anything?

6           MS. MESICH: I would have to review the Minutes of those  
7 meetings. We presented two options to Mayor and Council. Option A  
8 was to move Precinct 37 from Ward 1 to Ward 3. Precinct 89 from  
9 Ward 3 to Ward 6. And 160 from Ward 5 to Ward 1. That option was not  
10 adopted by Mayor and Council.

11           Instead, we moved - Precinct 98 was split at the time, and  
12 we moved the entire precinct into Ward 6. And that's what was adopted  
13 by Mayor and Council, just that one change.

14           MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Robles and, and Members, what about 45?  
15 Oh, it's not contiguous. Never mind. We're trying to give it to 3.  
16 Never mind. That wouldn't work.

17           MR. ROBLES: I guess I'm a little confused. Why, why all  
18 the talk of 37? Like 14% of all the people who live there signed a  
19 petition. I actually think that's quite high. I mean if you took  
20 four- -- if, if 14% of the United States signed the petition, that  
21 would be 42 million people, and that would be a huge deal.

22           I don't know. I mean I, I think that level of civic  
23 engagement is quite high. Like how, how could you expect to get like  
24 more than half of the people in a whole precinct to sign an on-line  
25 petition? I, I, I feel like I'm missing something here.



1           Why does Ward 1 want to give up people who want to stay in  
2 Ward 1 to the point where it would take a map that has almost triple  
3 the population variance and would enrage hundreds of people. I just  
4 don't get it. I feel like there must be something I'm missing here.

5           MR. AITKEN: Well, this, this goes back to my comments at  
6 the top of this meeting. I'm thinking about the future of the city.  
7 We have two wards right now that are minority-majority. I don't  
8 believe that's healthy for our local democracy.

9           We need to have more diversity in our wards to make sure  
10 that we're expanding the political power that comes with minorities  
11 being in just two wards. And I believe that comes with it. So, we  
12 have that.

13           Then we also have the fact that the freeway has acted as a  
14 historical barrier. I believe that we're in a moment in time to where  
15 we can challenge these notions that have plagued these redistricting  
16 commission conversations for the last, you know, few (inaudible)  
17 convenings of this Commission.

18           And it, it obviously didn't work out last time. But I  
19 don't believe that what happened at the meetings two years ago should  
20 dictate the decisions that this Committee, or the recommendation that  
21 this Committee with form for Mayor and Council to make a decision on  
22 before the year ends.

23           MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

24           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And if I may, I'm taking this a little  
25 bit out of order, though. I woke up last night worrying about this

1 and wrote something up in terms of we talked about the whole area  
2 of presenting the Mayor and Council with a specific section called  
3 "additional consideration".

4 And I said in my half-sleepy way, the Committee also  
5 discussed at length varying options which could create, designate  
6 another minority ward within the boundaries of the existing six wards.  
7 While the Committee's efforts were not successful at the time, now I'm  
8 saying this -

9 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - the Committee thought it important,  
11 nonetheless, for the Mayor and Council to be formally involved in  
12 a continuing discussion of this matter.

13 Accordingly, the Committee is requesting that the City  
14 Clerk report to the Mayor and Council not less than once annually the  
15 changing and shifting populations, along with the attendant map, or  
16 maps, which would drive the creation of the additional minority ward.

17 And I think it's important that there's a report annually  
18 that the Mayor and Council get because being in the bureaucracy once  
19 upon a time, sometimes these things are forgotten. If they have to  
20 report, then they'll be reported. And the good news is that the City  
21 Clerk reports to the Mayor and Council.

22 MR. ROBLES: Quick question of clarification.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, what I did do is - then this isn't  
24 enough, by the way, for me (inaudible). So, there needs to be some  
25 discussion. And tonight, I asked Dr. Alvarez to write a discussion of

1 what goes along with my - this observation. And the observation, by  
2 the way, I owe to you all because that's not me.

3 And so, Dr. Alvarez, I've asked her to talk about  
4 (inaudible) a written discussion as to why this is important being  
5 something that's informative, but also compelling. And I, I like the  
6 - this whole discussion about looking forward rather than justifying  
7 what we've had for, what, a hundred years?

8 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And I, I, I just really am really  
10 impressed by you all in terms of looking outside the box, breaking  
11 through the envelope and saying: You know, in the future, we need to  
12 really look at all of this carefully, and what we've been doing  
13 carefully, and what we've been doing.

14 So, - oh, and by the way, on Dr. Alvarez, if anyone has any  
15 - because you all down there, you had a lot of discussion about this.  
16 And if you have any additions that you'd like to see her add, or  
17 considerations, do that through Suzanne so we don't get in trouble  
18 with the Open Meeting Law -

19 MS. MESICH: Uh-huh.

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - and just go for it. And, Dr. Alvarez,  
21 if there's, you know, I know the whole idea is to keep, to keep this  
22 to the point and brief. But if there's additional discussion, provide  
23 that additional discussion as an amendment or an addendum to the  
24 report proper.

1           But, you know, you have the spirit, the experience, the  
2 academic rigor to, to do this and that's why - and I don't. And  
3 that's why I'd like you to take the lead on this part. So, -

4           MS. ALVAREZ: Well, Mr. Crum, this, this -

5           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - we're doing all kinds of interesting  
6 stuff tonight.

7           MS. ALVAREZ: I, I want to speak a little bit about what  
8 we haven't done tonight, and that is, for example, consider Rough  
9 Proportionality's Map 1 and 2. I think that all of us thought this -  
10 we're going in with two goals. I think my colleague here to my right  
11 is very strong on Rough Proportionality, and tonight, they're not as  
12 strong on that point.

13           But here, here's the irony. When we look at Rough  
14 Proportionality Maps 1 and 2, well, 1 seems like, oh, my God, it's  
15 Frankenstein, right? Like, what is this? So, we haven't discussed it  
16 because I think there's a sense among all of us that: Ah, that's too  
17 much to bear.

18           Rough Proportionality 2 is equally kind of troublesome, it  
19 completely rearranges everything we know. And yet, look at it. Rough  
20 Proportionality Map No. 2 gives us, in Ward 3, a Hispanic demographic  
21 of 46%. Well, guess what? That's kind of what we achieve by making  
22 that change in 2-A.

23           So, that means that that change of Precinct 37, which is  
24 the least disruptive, we respect Mr. Jaramillo's district, appraising  
25 where he lives. We respect the folks that were here last week. We

1 res- -- we - something has to give to shake a little bit of the status  
2 quo and guess what?

3 Not only does it achieve something close to that Rough  
4 Proportionality, too, but it actually does it in a way that also  
5 provides the metric of the MPD, and it also throws off that freeway  
6 issue which, as I have said, is not just a matter of - I mean, it'd be  
7 horrible if people there feel like they -

8 But actually, there's a bunch of good things happening  
9 along those corridors. And that freeway could actually be very, very  
10 beneficial to ship that to Ward 3, where I have also spoken about my  
11 own Council Member representative and division and the commitment he  
12 has demonstrated.

13 And not only him, but all of the neighborhoods there that  
14 are included, Blue Moon, and many others that are sort of actively  
15 trying to change the way in which the City even operates in terms of  
16 distribution. So, in that pure sense of analysis, it will be very,  
17 very much consistent with the goals that we have set.

18 But even then, it's not our final decision. If there is a  
19 political consideration and the Council caves, that's fine. But I  
20 think from our point, we are checking off things that are exactly what  
21 we said we wanted, as close as we're gonna get it 'cause we will not  
22 be able to carve a third majority district - minority district out of  
23 this. We just can't without disrupting a whole bunch of other things.  
24 But that gets us to 46% which it's, it's pretty good.

1 MR. ROBLES: And this, when you say 46, is the 44.49, is  
2 that the one you're referring to? Yeah, okay. Yeah. No, no. That's  
3 a good point, yeah. Yeah, I think I, I was hammering the Rough  
4 Proportionality thing in favor of in the first couple meetings.

5 But then once I saw these maps, they're really disruptive.  
6 I think almost all of the precincts that people have complained about  
7 would be shifting in this. And so, just your earlier comments of why  
8 I'm no longer hitting that so hard is that I just think it would be  
9 chaos. I didn't quite realize how disruptive it would be to implement  
10 this Rough Proportionality.

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, what I'm hearing is, are we getting  
12 close to a recommendation?

13 MR. ROBLES: I mean I, I still think 2-A is everyone's  
14 happy with 2-A. I, I mean not everyone, as far as the complaints and  
15 feedback we've received from the public who ultimately is who we're  
16 accountable to as the Committee here. 2-A seems pretty good to me.

17 I think it meets all the criteria that we're looking at and  
18 there's no - I'm not sure we've received a single complaint from any  
19 of the precincts that would be moving under 2-A.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Do you mean 2-A as it is tonight, or 2-A with  
21 the amended Precinct 37?

22 MR. ROBLES: The 2-A that we received a few days ago.  
23 Maybe let's call this on 2-B. Can we call this 2-B where we move 37  
24 just for the sake of consistent terminology?

1 MS. ALVAREZ: I would like to make, then, the motion that  
2 we consider a new map tonight that is 2-A with Precinct 37 going to  
3 Ward 3.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there, for discussion purposes only,  
5 is there a second to that motion?

6 MR. HENDEL: I second that.

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Discussion.

8 MR. ROBLES: So, the motion is that we're considering it?  
9 Is that the motion?

10 MS. ALVAREZ: That we create a new map tonight that -

11 MR. ROBLES: Oh.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: - is 2-A with that amendment.

13 MR. ROBLES: Well, we should think - I think that - yeah,  
14 that's valid to, to consider definitely. But I think we should think  
15 about the timeline. So, we have two meetings left, one of which is  
16 the public hearing next week. And then we have the meeting  
17 immediately after the hearing, plus one more full meeting after that.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Correct.

19 MR. ROBLES: And so, yeah. Go ahead.

20 MR. AITKEN: Oh. With, with that being said, I am very  
21 willing to entertain the idea of extending the public hearing by an  
22 additional meeting. I believe it's worthwhile if we're going to be  
23 considering a precinct that has historically demonstrated that they  
24 may not be okay with the idea. I would like to extent that. This

1 way, we can give folks in this particular community the opportunity to  
2 express themselves.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, another meeting in between the next  
4 one and our final meeting?

5 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Got it.

7 MR. ROBLES: The only problem is that's Thanksgiving week.  
8 I think it's gonna be hard for people to make it.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I can do that.

10 MS. DARLAND: Didn't we say that last week? (Inaudible)

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, maybe a Monday or a Tuesday. Is  
12 that what we're talking about?

13 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Sure. Go ahead. Thank you.

15 MR. JARAMILLO: For the folks in the affected areas, how  
16 are you gonna extend the decision that we're making tonight? Is it  
17 gonna be Councilman - put it on the website that 37 - how are we gonna  
18 inform the community members of that, of that move? I think that if  
19 we want them to hear what we're doing, I think it's important for them  
20 to -

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Know in advance.

22 MR. JARAMILLO: - know in advance. That way, if, in fact,  
23 they, they have a word to say that they're more than welcome to come -

24 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.



1 MR. JARAMILLO: - and voice themselves. I think that's  
2 important 'cause -

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Am I ever aware of that, yes.

4 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah. Right?

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes. From personal experience.

6 MR. JARAMILLO: That should be stipulated as well for the  
7 ones that are being affected, please inform community members of that.  
8 And the -

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: My suspicion is that the Ward 1 Council  
10 Member will be - will know about this (inaudible)

11 MR. ROBLES: I was already tagged in a Facebook post, so, -

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah.

13 MR. ROBLES: - folks are watching.

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah.

15 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: No, you're right.

17 MS. ALVAREZ: I have a question. On Precinct 37, of the  
18 2,803 eligible voters, what's the percentage of them who are Hispanic?

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Just a moment. We're getting you that  
20 answer.

21 MR. HENDEL: There are 1,850 Hispanic population in  
22 Precinct 37.

23 MS. ALVAREZ: 1,850?

24 MR. HENDEL: Correct.

25 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you.

1 MR. ROBLES: Is that, is that eligible or total?

2 MR. HENDEL: Voting age population is 1,356.

3 MR. ROBLES: That's different from what we have in our  
4 document.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Our document says 2,803.

6 MR. AITKEN: Is that the total population of that precinct?

7 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, that's -

8 MS. MESICH: Yes. So, was the question what the voting-  
9 age minority voting age population is?

10 MS. ALVAREZ: The total - so, the ward - the precinct has  
11 2,803 people, including children and everybody, right? Of that 2,803,  
12 what percentage is eli- -- eligible to vote?

13 MR. ROBLES: 2,031.

14 MS. ALVAREZ: 2,031? And out of those 2,031, 1,850 are  
15 Hispanic.

16 MR. HENDEL: 1,356.

17 MS. ALVAREZ: 356.

18 MR. AITKEN: 1,350? 56. Thank you.

19 MR. ROBLES: Is that Hispanic or minority?

20 MR. HENDEL: That is Hispanic population.

21 MR. ROBLES: Thank you (inaudible)

22 MR. HENDEL: 'Cause I do want to point out that there's a  
23 considerable difference between Hispanic and minority in Ward 3 under  
24 Map 2-B, if we're calling it that. So, I just want to make sure we  
25 use the right terminology there.

1 MR. ROBLES: Can we go over again the highway rationale?  
2 I'm not, I'm not fully clear on that. I have heard a little bit about  
3 - I've heard from the, the Biden administration, you know, the, the  
4 idea that highways can divide communities, and that causes a lot of  
5 harm. I'm, I'm familiar with that.

6 I guess what I'm not clear on is how having a ward cross  
7 the highway would, would help. Like would that distribute resources  
8 in some kind of more even way across the highway? 'Cause are we  
9 saying that like Ward 1 funding Ward 37 enough, but Ward 3 would  
10 because it would cross the highway? Like I'm, I'm not - just if you  
11 could help me connect those dots, I'd appreciate it.

12 MR. AITKEN: Absolutely. Well, it, it, it comes down again  
13 to where Hispanic voters are concentrated at. And Hispanic voters are  
14 concentrated in Wards 5 and Wards 1. If we move forward with the  
15 proposal that includes Precinct 37, we would then be decreasing that  
16 concentration and make sure that the Hispanic voters in both of these  
17 wards begin to have - be equitably spread out amongst wards.

18 I mean the overall goal is to see all five wards, six  
19 wards, excuse me, have an equitable amount of minority and Hispanic  
20 voters. We would then be demonstrating that we want to see Hispanic  
21 voters have a bigger presence in wards that aren't Wards 1 and  
22 Wards 5.

23 MR. ROBLES: So, I, I understand that, and that's a good  
24 point. And I, I, I do think that's a good point. I just don't see  
25 what that has to do with the highway.

1 MR. AITKEN: Well, because 37 is right next to the freeway,  
2 and historically speaking, and then Dr. Lydia Otero from, from the  
3 University writes a book called La Calle where she talks about the  
4 historical nature of gentrification happening because of the placement  
5 of the freeway.

6 I mean, before the freeway, you had communities going back  
7 and forth. And then you have the placement of the freeway, and all of  
8 a sudden you have this physical barrier that only people with cars can  
9 be able to cross.

10 And therefore, sort of preventing any, any sort of economic  
11 and community growth because it's just this nature of the freeway  
12 being this barrier. It's unfortunate, but it's not just a Tucson  
13 thing. We're seeing this across, across the country. And, you know,  
14 I don't think it's a coincidence that the freeway was built in between  
15 barrios. There's a reason why there's no freeway on the east side,  
16 right?

17 And it's, I think it's about taking back, or, you know,  
18 I'm, I'm probably getting into my radical roots here, you know, it's  
19 about going beyond this, the - this figure that has gentrified our  
20 barrios for too long, and it begins by expanding these two wards  
21 crossing the freeway.

22 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

23 MS. ALVAREZ: I, I, I also wanted to say that in this  
24 particular case, there's even a more immediate compelling argument  
25 which is that, that's why I thought that including 143 originally

1 would have made sense, and 37 sort of contiguous. And it's mostly  
2 because of the development on Grant and Oracle area with the Pascua  
3 Yaqui Tribe investing in that, in the, the old -

4 To see that area all in, in blue as part of a comprehensive  
5 master plan that crosses the freeway, but impacts that neighborhood  
6 positively with potential federal investment, tribal industry, to me,  
7 that's an incredible opportunity specific to this moment in time, and  
8 the development plans on Ward 3 of which I'm familiar with, 'cause  
9 that's my ward.

10 And, and I, I just think that that would be something  
11 rather unique for us. Now, we may not be able to convince folks, but  
12 in terms of the logic and the vision of what that could mean if Oracle  
13 and Grant development area were to encompass across the freeway with  
14 federal dollars, 37 and 143, absolutely. It's, it's like the right  
15 thing to do.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, we have a motion and recommendation.  
17 Any further discussion?

18 MR. HENDEL: Just a point of clarification. If we - I, I  
19 think we should, by the end of this meeting, have a - maybe like pick  
20 one or two or three, or however many maps, and say to the public:  
21 These are the ones we're considering for the public hearing.

22 Like I don't think we - so, I guess we may want to add that  
23 onto the motion or, or have it be a separate motion afterwards, or  
24 something like that, to specify which maps we are considering, and  
25 which ones we're scrapping, just so that we don't waste the public's

1 time parsing through, you know, parsing through seven maps if we're  
2 actually only considering two.

3 I don't know the correct procedural way to do that. I  
4 guess we could just make a motion. I'm not sure if that would be a  
5 separate motion afterwards.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: I'm willing to amend my motion that I made  
7 that, that we advance Maps 2 and 2-A with the change that we make, or  
8 I mean 2-A, I'm sorry. And then a new one that will be tonight 2-B.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is that change acceptable to the  
10 seconder?

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes, I second that.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Further discussion.

13 MS. DARLAND: Before you take a vote, Mr. Chair, may I just  
14 clarify? You would forward Map 2, 2-A and 2-B, with the only change  
15 being from 2-A moving 37.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

17 MS. ALVAREZ: What do you think of that?

18 MR. HENDEL: I think it's procedurally good. I like the  
19 idea of, you know, presenting the public with a small number of  
20 choices and, and kind of scrapping the rest. I still don't really  
21 think 2-B is a good idea just because we're going against the will of  
22 the people.

23 I do like the idea of thinking big and thinking long term.  
24 But ultimately, we are - I mean we weren't elected, but we're  
25 representing elected officials and it's, you know, in the spirit of

1 democracy, I think, you know, proposing something that we know the  
2 public is gonna hate is bad governance. And so, I'm gonna vote "no"  
3 on this.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And based upon my prior experience,  
5 let's see what they think. All right. Ready? All in favor of the  
6 motion say "aye".

7 (Affirmative.)

8 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Any opposed?

9 MR. HENDEL: Nay. And to clarify my "nay" vote, I would  
10 just prefer to go forward with 2-A only. But, you know, this, this,  
11 this motion does include 2-A, so, it's, you know, I'm glad we'll be  
12 considering that going forward. And my, my preference would be to  
13 just do 2-A, but I respect the outcome of the vote.

14 MS. DARLAND: To that point, do we need to make a motion  
15 to direct Staff to scrap the other proposals and categorize them as  
16 rejected by the Committee?

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second?

18 MR. HENDEL: For?

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: For discussion purposes.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Second.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Discussion?

22 MS. DARLAND: I did kind of piggyback on your idea. So,  
23 I'm really excited to hear what you have to say.

1 MR. HENDEL: So, the idea is to scrap 1, 2, 3, Rough  
2 Proportionality 1 and Rough Proportionality 2? In other words,  
3 everything but 2-A and 2-B, is that correct?

4 MS. DARLAND: That is correct.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Yeah. I, I support that.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is that an amendment to the motion?

7 MR. HENDEL: I think that's what she meant, right?

8 MS. DARLAND: That is what I meant. I'm sorry. Yes.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Thank you. Any further  
11 discussion? Ready? All in favor say "aye".

12 (Affirmative.)

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Opposed? Motion passes. All right.  
14 Now, the discussion of another meeting in between the public hearing  
15 and our next scheduled meeting. See? I'm old, but I kind of remember  
16 sometimes.

17 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum? So, it's to my understanding  
18 that we already have a meeting scheduled for next Thursday. Of  
19 course, the following week is Thanksgiving. I bel- -- we need a  
20 decision by December 31<sup>st</sup>, is that what I'm understanding?

21 So, you know, I know there are concerns around  
22 Thanksgiving, but if this means that we go into the wee weeks of  
23 December, then we got into the wee weeks of December and allow folks  
24 to, to give public comment.

25 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right. (Inaudible)



1 MR. HENDEL: I think we're supposed to stop by November  
2 30<sup>th</sup>, right?

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We're supposed to get the big bucks.

4 MR. HENDEL: But aren't we supposed to be, aren't we  
5 supposed to give our recommendations to Mayor and Council by November  
6 30<sup>th</sup>, and that gives them a month to make their choice?

7 MS. ALVAREZ: Didn't we have some meetings for the 28<sup>th</sup> or  
8 29<sup>th</sup> that we were considering?

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: That's, that's correct, where we, I  
10 understand, review the, the final memo that will go to, go to the  
11 Mayor and Council, and sign it. That's what our final meeting is  
12 basically about.

13 MR. ROBLES: Did we pick which day? I, I remember Staff  
14 e-mailed us all about which days were available. Did we end up  
15 figuring out which day everyone can meet?

16 MS. MESICH: We didn't get a real consensus except probably  
17 the 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup>.

18 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

19 MS. MESICH: We can set that tonight if, if you're  
20 available to do that. And to answer Mr. Robles' question, the  
21 Committee, the ordinance appointing you expires November 30<sup>th</sup> for the  
22 sole purpose of the fact that the Mayor and Council have to adopt an  
23 ordinance for redistricting by December 31<sup>st</sup>. Their two meetings in  
24 December are the 6<sup>th</sup> and the 20<sup>th</sup>, with the idea of maybe if they want  
25 to schedule a public hearing -

1 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

2 MS. MESICH: - or a study session item, they -

3 MR. HENDEL: Right.

4 MS. MESICH: - have two meetings to consider.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. So, then, there's still gonna be  
6 opportunity for people to express themselves. Okay. Then, with, with  
7 that being said, we have a meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup>, 28<sup>th</sup> to, to put together  
8 a memo, essentially.

9 I'm not sure if it would be the best interest of, of the  
10 Committee to write the memo the, the same night we hear from folks,  
11 right? Because we may be feeling differently. So, it looks like we  
12 have no choice but to extend the hearing to the 21<sup>st</sup> or the 22<sup>nd</sup>. How  
13 do my colleagues feel?

14 MR. ROBLES: Well, I'm unclear on why we have no choice but  
15 to do that. Could you repeat? I'm sorry.

16 MR. HENDEL: Because we're tasked with putting together  
17 the memo the week of the 28<sup>th</sup>, 29<sup>th</sup>, 30<sup>th</sup>. I mean unless we do a public  
18 hearing Monday, and then between that, but that's, that's - and I just  
19 want to have some sort of agreement amongst this Committee of when  
20 we're okay with an additional public hearing taking place.

21 MR. ROBLES: Do you mean a third public hearing? 'Cause we  
22 have one next Thursday.

23 MR. HENDEL: Yes. So, that's, that's what was included in  
24 my motion because we're including Precinct 37. I want to ensure that

1 we give folks additional time to express themselves, and I believe  
2 that comes with an additional public hearing. But -

3 MR. ROBLES: So, do you want to have two more public  
4 hearings?

5 MR. HENDEL: Including the one next week?

6 MR. ROBLES: Yeah.

7 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

8 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Why is the one next week not  
9 sufficient?

10 MR. HENDEL: Well, I was just sort of responding to your  
11 concerns about us not giving the ample time to -

12 MR. ROBLES: Oh, I see.

13 MR. HENDEL: - a controversial precinct, or controversial  
14 decision that includes an amendment with this precinct and, and  
15 Proposal 2-B. So, this was just - I felt that it was important to  
16 include an additional public hearing. Is, is, is that - would, would  
17 you agree or -

18 MR. ROBLES: I, I - that makes sense in theory. I'm not a  
19 big fan of putting it on Thanksgiving week because so many people are  
20 out of town, both on this Committee. Oh, I don't know about the  
21 Committee, but just having a public hearing the week of Thanksgiving  
22 seems like we're gonna get racked over the coals for that.

23 People are gonna say: Oh, they scheduled their hearing  
24 during a national holiday whenever everyone's flying and traveling.  
25 I mean that's not a great look.

1 I do think that given that given that we already have the  
2 map, it's done, it's not gonna, it's not gonna take Staff two or three  
3 days. I mean, it's done right now from my understanding because it  
4 was just moving one precinct. A week might be enough time. I'm not  
5 totally sure. What do people think? Is that -

6 MR. HENDEL: If we were able to get that map out tomorrow  
7 morning, would that be enough time that we would hope - no? Okay.

8 MR. AITKEN: May -

9 MS. MESICH: I believe Mr. Aitken is trying to speak.

10 MR. AITKEN: Yeah. So, I, I don't, I don't know what the,  
11 the formal protocol is here with me zooming in and out, but with my,  
12 with my experience having countless calls to the public in my, in my  
13 previous lives, I, I don't know that more than one's necessary. As a  
14 matter of fact, we're probably opening up ourselves up to artillery  
15 fire the more public meetings we take.

16 If we give them a, a week to review the information, it, it  
17 feels to me like the one on the 17<sup>th</sup> is sufficient and if absolutely  
18 necessary, Mayor and Council can schedule another one. But I, I, I  
19 don't think it's necessary in my, in my opinion and experience.

20 MR. HENDEL: On the other hand, like if we do have one -  
21 so, Council Member Robles, your suggestion is one on the 17<sup>th</sup> and one  
22 on the 21<sup>st</sup>, -

23 MR. ROBLES: Well, -

24 MR. HENDEL: - is that correct?

1 MR. ROBLES: - my suggestion included the 21<sup>st</sup> because you  
2 had expressed concerns -

3 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

4 MR. ROBLES: - about the, about us not giving members of  
5 the public enough time to express themselves. So, this was sort of a  
6 concession that I was - wanted to put out there. But if my colleagues  
7 of this Commission feel otherwise, I'm certainly willing to entertain  
8 that.

9 MR. HENDEL: What if we do one on the 28<sup>th</sup>? Then there's a  
10 spread of - like we could do the 17<sup>th</sup> and the 21<sup>st</sup>, and then one is like  
11 kind of short notice, and the other is Thanksgiving week. So, neither  
12 is perfect, but if we have (inaudible) that's, that's solid.

13 But it might be even better to have one on the 28<sup>th</sup>,  
14 although I guess just to circle back, Staff, is it still worth having  
15 the one on the 17<sup>th</sup>, or -

16 MS. ALVAREZ: I think that we should - I agree that we  
17 proceed with next week is the public hearing. We have two maps that  
18 are very similar and we, we have pretty much done tonight as much  
19 tweaking as I think we will do because 2-A is, is acceptable to most  
20 of us. And then we are - we tweaked that for the purposes of the  
21 proportionality and all of these things that we discussed.

22 In 2-B, I think it'll be plenty to just have a conversation  
23 and hearing in a week. And then just from there, we stay that night  
24 like we did last week, and have a discussion and begin to draft our

1 memo. And if we need to come back with a final meeting, that would be  
2 the 28<sup>th</sup> or 29<sup>th</sup>. I, I will be satisfied with that.

3 MS. DARLAND: And just as a point of clarification. For  
4 our meetings on the 29th and 30th, or at least that week, we still  
5 have a Call to the Audience, correct?

6 MS. MESICH: Yes, that's correct.

7 MS. DARLAND: So, even though it wouldn't be a formal  
8 hearing, we could still conceivably hear more from folks who maybe  
9 didn't - weren't able to attend on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

10 And I, and I would agree. I, I feel like we've got two  
11 really good proposals to go forward with. The other question that I  
12 have is, if we fail evenly divided, are we - can we put forward both  
13 and let the Mayor and Council wrestle with the hard decision?

14 Because I, I really feel like I would want to make sure  
15 that they would understand how torn we were on giving them something  
16 that was for their consideration.

17 And one last question. I'm sorry. I should have asked  
18 this earlier. Current proportionality, we're at 11%, is that -

19 MR. ROBLES: Thirteen.

20 MS. DARLAND: 13% correct. So, we're kind of getting a  
21 little bit closer by being at seven. Thank you. I, I meant to ask  
22 that earlier (inaudible)

23 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. This one is (inaudible)

24 MR. ROBLES: It's currently 13.4 for anybody listening;  
25 13.4%, if we did nothing. If we made no changes.

1 MR. HENDEL: I guess I, I like Council Member Robles' idea  
2 of having a second public hearing. I, I think it might be better not  
3 to have it Thanksgiving week.

4 So, what if we do it on the 28<sup>th</sup>, and then we have our next  
5 meeting on either the 29<sup>th</sup> or 30<sup>th</sup>? That would, that would give us two  
6 more hearings which I, I agree actually is the right way to go, given  
7 that this may be controversial, -

8 MS. ALVAREZ: But we (inaudible)

9 MR. HENDEL: - but also giving us time.

10 MS. ALVAREZ: We can continue working as a Commission after  
11 the public hearing, right? So, we don't need to have a separate  
12 meeting the next day. We can just do the work on the 28<sup>th</sup> as well.

13 MR. HENDEL: That's true. And I feel (inaudible) but I'm  
14 okay with that.

15 MS. MESICH: I believe Mr. Aitken has his hand up. His  
16 virtual hand.

17 MR. AITKEN: (Inaudible) If I'm tracking all the  
18 discussion tonight, there's really only one substantive difference  
19 between 2-A and 2-B, right? It's 37?

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Yes.

21 MR. AITKEN: Yes.

22 MR. ROBLES: Do we really feel like that one change merits  
23 having a second public meeting?

24 MR. AITKEN: Yes, I do.

1 MR. ROBLES: Excuse me. Sorry I can't see your name from,  
2 from afar (inaudible), Mr. Aitken.

3 MR. AITKEN: That's okay. Aitken.

4 MR. ROBLES: Thank you for your grace.

5 MR. AITKEN: Sure.

6 MR. ROBLES: You know, we've, we've learned tonight, and  
7 throughout our conversations that Precinct 37 is, is, as a community,  
8 that is particularly passionate when it comes to redistricting, and as  
9 the representative from Ward 1 in conversation with my, my - our  
10 colleagues up here, I believe that it's necessary to provide any sort  
11 of opportunity for folks to express themselves.

12 Public hearing, Call to the Audience, I think public  
13 hearing warrants attention amongst many people in our community. And,  
14 you know, if it means we come in on a Monday, or Tuesday, that's  
15 something I'm willing to do to allow folks to express themselves  
16 whether they're in supportive of (inaudible) 2-B, or against 2-B.

17 MR. AITKEN: To be or not to be.

18 MR. HENDEL: I'm going to make a motion - I'm sorry.  
19 Go ahead.

20 MR. AITKEN: I, I was making a bad joke.

21 MR. ROBLES: Giving you an Oscar for that.

22 MR. AITKEN: Thank you.

23 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I'd like to make a motion and we'll,  
24 we'll, you know, we can discuss (inaudible)



1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We already have a motion on the table to  
2 have an intermediate meeting. And if we do, that motion needs to be  
3 withdrawn.

4 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Can I make a friendly amendment and see  
5 if that works or, or a regular amendment? I'm not sure how to -

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, I just want to -

7 MR. HENDEL: Yeah.

8 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - keep, keep the desk clean of things -

9 MR. HENDEL: Right.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - that we're not going to do anymore.  
11 But whoever made that motion -

12 MR. HENDEL: I do think we should have a second meeting.

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: (Inaudible) withdrawn.

14 MR. HENDEL: I'd like to make an amendment (inaudible)

15 MR. AITKEN: I believe I made it (inaudible)

16 MR. HENDEL: I'd like to make an amendment to the existing  
17 motion on the table that the second meeting that was made in that  
18 motion be on Tuesday, November 29<sup>th</sup> as a public hearing. And then this  
19 Committee can stay afterwards and also meet again on the 30<sup>th</sup> if  
20 necessary.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second?

22 MR. AITKEN: I second that.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Discussion? All in favor say "aye".

24 (Affirmative.)

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Motion passes. All right. Thank you.  
2 Okay. Future agenda items? I think we've talked about that, have we?

3 MR. HENDEL: And to clarify for anyone in the audience, we  
4 now have two more public hearings. One is next Thursday, the 17<sup>th</sup>, and  
5 then the next one is Tuesday, the 29<sup>th</sup>. So, if you can't make it to  
6 one of those, you can come to the other.

7 MS. MESICH: And we will continue to do news releases and  
8 use the help and assistance of our Public Information Office to get  
9 the word out in English and Spanish, and word it as the Redistricting  
10 Advisory Committee has two proposals to put forward for public input.

11 MS. ALVAREZ: And let the Hunger Games begin.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Are we ready to adjourn?  
13 All in favor? Is there a motion to adjourn?

14 MR. JARAMILLO: I move to adjourn.

15 MS. MESICH: One moment, please. I believe Commissioner  
16 Aitken didn't get to vote on the last motion.

17 MR. AITKEN: No. No, it's not that. It's I, I, I wanted  
18 to vote on the last motion, but the Chair asked for discussion on the  
19 scheduling item. And the, the other members of the Committee don't  
20 realize I, I'm also - I also serve on the Governing Board for the  
21 School District, and I was just trying to quickly check my calendar to  
22 see if there was going to be a conflict.

23 As it turns out, there's not a conflict, but I just - I, I  
24 wanted to be afforded a bit more time to, to, to do that and the Chair  
25 didn't offer any time for discussion. That's all.

1 MS. MESICH: Thank you. So, your vote was (inaudible)

2 MR. AITKEN: Yeah. (Inaudible) That's fine.

3 MS. MESICH: Okay.

4 MR. AITKEN: Yes.

5 MS. MESICH: Thank you, Mr. Aitken.

6 MR. AITKEN: Yup.

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. All in favor of adjournment?

8 (Affirmative.)

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Let's go home. Thank you.

10 (The Meeting was Adjourned.)

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

Transcription Completed: 11/18/2022

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