



## Legal Action Report and Minutes

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

DATE: **Tuesday, November 29, 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 5:52 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: None

#### Staff Present:

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

#### 2. Approval of Minutes from November 17, 2022

The Minutes from the meeting of November 17, 2022 were approved by a voice vote of 7 to 0.

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

Information was provided by Chair Crum on the history, purpose, and objectives of redistricting.

Comments were made by Scott Egan, Miguel Ortega, Katherine Weasel, Patrick McKenna, and John Burr.

It was moved by Committee Member Robles, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 7 to 0, to close the public hearing.

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

### **5. Recommendation of Redistricting Option(s) for Mayor and Council Consideration** (Items 4 and 5 were considered concurrently.)

Chair Crum initiated a discussion on Proposals #2-a and #2-c and considerations related to the public comments. Committee Members expressed thanks to the community for their participation, input and respective insights on the redistricting process. Committee Members sought clarity from legal counsel on the hierarchy of the six redistricting objectives. They further discussed the need to include in their recommendation to the Mayor and Council, a review and clarification of the objectives due to particular objectives being mutually exclusive.

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, that a section be included in the recommendation a request for clarification of the source and relative priority of each of the objectives in advance of the next Redistricting Advisory Committee session in 2024.

Discussion ensued.

Committee Member Darland offered a friendly amendment to include facilitation of a more thoughtful conversation and a more participatory process through an intentional strategy to engage representation from the broader community, including historical neighborhoods and barrios.

Committee Member Alvarez offered an amendment that the clarification and ranking of the policy objectives should follow the establishment of a participatory inclusive process of consultation in advance of establishing a Redistricting Advisory Committee and changes the current dynamic of the approach to redistricting for future Redistricting Advisory Committees.

Committee Member Hendel presented an amended motion, to include in the recommendation letter, a request to the Mayor and Council to start engaging the public far in advance of the next redistricting meeting to identify the desires and goals of the people of Tucson, start the redistricting committee process as early as they are legally allowed to, and clarify the source and relative priority of each objective in cases where they are mutually exclusive.

Following discussion, Committee Member Hendel withdrew the motion as amended.

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, and passed by a roll-call vote of 7 to 0, to include in the recommendation letter to the Mayor and Council, the following requests:

1. Start engaging the public one year in advance of each redistricting deadline, either via the official Redistricting Advisory Committee or a redistricting task force. Starting the conversation just a few months in advance of the deadline results in rightful frustration among both the committee and the broader public.
2. Identify the earliest possible start date for the official meetings of the 2024 Redistricting Advisory Committee and start the appointment process well in advance of that date so the committee can start meeting as soon as legally allowed.
3. Clarify the source of each of the Committee's policy objectives, e.g., United States Supreme Court mandate(s), City Charter, City Code or City policy, and the relative priority of each objective in cases where they are mutually exclusive.

Further discussion ensued related to addressing rough proportionality, the creation of a minority-majority ward, and the process for the creation of additional wards.

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, to recommend Proposal #2-c to Mayor and Council.

Discussion ensued.

Committee Member Robles offered a friendly amendment, to put both Proposal #2-a and #2-c in the recommendation letter to the Mayor and Council. The amendment was not accepted by the motion-maker.

The motion made by Committee Member Jaramillo failed by a roll-call vote of 3 to 4 (Committee Members Aitken, Crum, Darland and Robles dissenting).

It was moved by Committee Member Robles, that the Redistricting Advisory Committee recommend Proposal #2-a to Mayor and Council.

Committee Member Darland offered a friendly amendment, accepted by the motion-maker, to include Proposal #2-c in the recommendation. The motion, as amended, was duly seconded.

Chair Crum offered a friendly amendment, accepted by the motion-maker, to modify Proposal #2-a by incorporating Precinct 45 and splitting it between Wards 1 and 6 along Stone Avenue, and referencing the modified map as Proposal #2-d.

Committee Member Robles clarified that the motion, as amended, was to recommend Proposals 2-a, 2-c, and 2-d to Mayor and Council. The motion, as amended, was passed by a roll-call vote of 6 to 1 (Committee Member Aitken dissenting).

Discussion ensued about the timeframe to provide a proposal to the Mayor and Council and that the final proposal be accompanied by recommendations for long term community engagement in advance of the next redistricting.

## **6. Next Steps**

It was moved by Committee Member Hendel, duly seconded, to cancel the Redistricting Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for Wednesday, November 30, 2022. Following discussion, the motion was withdrawn.

It was mutually agreed to hold the Redistricting Advisory Committee Meeting, scheduled for Wednesday, November 30, 2022, in order to finalize the recommendation letter to the Mayor and Council.

## **7. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 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 (Chair)	Ward 6

Absent:  
None

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

=====

- 1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: The Redistricting Advisory Committee,  
2 Tuesday, November 29<sup>th</sup>, 2022. Agenda. Call to Order. (Inaudible)  
3 CLERK: Maribel Alvarez?  
4 MS. ALVAREZ: Present.  
5 CLERK: Patrick Robles? Jenifer Darland? Ed Hendel?  
6 MR. HENDEL: Present.  
7 CLERK: Jon Aitken?  
8 MR. AITKEN: Present.  
9 CLERK: Bobby Jaramillo?  
10 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.  
11 CLERK: Mark Crum?  
12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Present.

1 CLERK: Honorable Chair, with seven members present, a  
2 quorum of the Redistricting Advisory Committee is established.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Item No. 3, Public Hearing  
4 on Redistricting on proposals. Now if you would, I'm going to read  
5 what I've read at prior meetings. Just sorry if you've heard me  
6 before, but here goes.

7 The Redistricting Advisory Committee is continuing to  
8 review and consider options to adjust ward boundaries and equalize  
9 ward population. The one person, one vote requirement of the United  
10 States Constitution requires that members of an elected body be drawn  
11 from districts, wards of substantially equal population.

12 A city redistricting plans constitutional validity under  
13 one person, one vote, is measured by its MPD, or Maximum Population  
14 Deviation. The goal is that an MPD should be less than 10%, which the  
15 Supreme Court considers a minimal deviation and presumptively  
16 constitutionally valid.

17 The current MPD for the city is 13.4%. This is due to a  
18 change in ward population in the city. The Committee first reviewed  
19 2020 Census data and determined that the redistricting is necessary.  
20 In addition to federal requirements, any redistricting plans must  
21 comply with the City Charter which states, quote.

22 "No redistricting plan shall be drawn for the purpose of  
23 favoring or disfavoring any political party or person, nor for the  
24 purpose of diluting the voting strength of any racial or ethnic

1 minority group to the extent reasonably practicable. Wards shall be  
2 equal in population and shall be contiguous and compact.”

3 Additional policy objectives include:

4 1. Maintain established and recognizable ward boundaries with  
5 a minimum of disruption.

6 2. Sustain the compactness of the wards as they previously  
7 exist.

8 3. Maintain ethnic balance so as not to dilute the Hispanic  
9 vote.

10 4. Give preference to options that will advance rough  
11 proportionality of minority voting power.

12 5. Give preference to options that reduce dilutions that may  
13 otherwise exist from prior packing, or fragmenting. And,

14 6. Reduce voter confusion on realignment of precincts having  
15 populations represented by more than one ward.

16 The Committee held a public hearing on November 3<sup>rd</sup> and  
17 voted to continue the hearing to allow additional community input  
18 (inaudible) and again on November 29<sup>th</sup>.

19 At our meeting last week, the Committee voted to put  
20 forward two proposals for public consideration. They are marked as  
21 Proposal 2-A and 2-C. The MPD for both proposals is below the 10% the  
22 Supreme Court considered - consider presumptively valid.

23 With that introduction, ladies and gentlemen, this is the  
24 time and place for a public hearing for redistricting proposals.

1 Speakers are limited to five-minute presentation. The public hearing  
2 is scheduled to last approximately one hour.

3 Speakers must observe rules of decorum. Speakers should  
4 speak in an orderly manner and shall not make any remarks that are  
5 profane, obscene or defamatory and shall not make any remarks or  
6 gestures that are threatening or otherwise impede the conduct of the  
7 meeting.

8 Please come forward when I call your name, and make your  
9 presentation. State your name, whether or not you live in the city,  
10 whom you are representing and whether or not you are a paid speaker.  
11 Scott Egan.

12 MR. EGAN: Good evening. I appreciate this opportunity to  
13 speak with you. My name is Scott Daniel Egan. I've lived in Tucson  
14 for almost 50 of my 70 years on Mother Earth; the bulk of that time in  
15 Barrio Hollywood. I understand I'm supposed to declare, and I  
16 definitely do declare that I am not a paid speaker. However, I am  
17 always open to offers.

18 I would certainly prefer to be doing something else with my  
19 time right now, but I've made the effort to come out here to make sure  
20 that you do not attempt again to politically divide our barrios  
21 against our community interests at the behest of your political  
22 masters.

23 While I heartily support the residents in Precinct 47,  
24 and Precinct 244, along with the residents of West University and  
25 Feldman's, all of whom definitely do not want to be moved into Ward 1.



1 And believe me, I am totally sympathetic with that. I understand why  
2 they are resistant to go into Ward 1, but my main purpose here is to  
3 encourage you to reject any attempt to redistrict out Precinct 37 from  
4 the west side.

5 The question arises, why did some of you, three that I  
6 counted at the last meeting, why did three of you try to rip El Rio  
7 Neighborhood Barrio Sovaco (ph.) out of the west side, when only two  
8 years ago, we rose up in opposition to the same movida tried then?

9 Two Commission Members here from Ward 3 and Ward 5 clearly  
10 and unequivocally warned the rest of you that it would be opening up a  
11 hornet's nest by trying to remove Precinct 37. But you tried to do it  
12 anyway, and were only deterred by us again organizing an effective  
13 community protest. We - I am here today to make sure you do not  
14 reverse yourselves at the last minute again.

15 But the question remains. Why did the three of you attempt  
16 to disenfranchise the unity of our barrios, not only after you were  
17 very clearly warned against attempting such a dumb move by your fellow  
18 commissioners, but also by the fact that taking our any precinct from  
19 the most under-populated westside Ward 1 had absolutely no logical  
20 justification, because the Commission clearly needs to expand the  
21 westside Ward 1, not reduce it.

22 It is the east side Ward 4, not west side Ward 1, that  
23 needs to give up some precincts. But I watched all of your hearings,  
24 and any Ward 4 changes were hardly discussed because a few of you were  
25 so obviously obsessed and directed, I believe, to cut out El Rio from

1 Ward 1, that nothing else seemed to matter.

2           Anyone can watch these recorded meetings to see this  
3 reality. But the question remains. Why? Why did you try to do this?  
4 Perhaps the reason for this seemingly nonsensical maneuver can be  
5 found in the definition of a word most famously used by Lee Harvey  
6 Oswald when asked by a reporter if he had really assassinated  
7 President Kennedy. He replied. "No. They are taking me in because  
8 of the fact that I lived in the Soviet Union. I am just a patsy."

9           Looking at the term "patsy" indicates that it's an  
10 (clearing throat) Excuse me. It's an original American slang  
11 describing a gullible or weak-minded person. It is also explained  
12 that, quote. "A patsy is often someone with good intentions, but who  
13 is easily deceived, taken advantage of and manipulated."

14           A patsy could be called a dupe, a sucker, a fool, sap, or  
15 a pushover while still telling themselves that they are only traveling  
16 on a paved road of good intentions. One source claims that the term  
17 patsy originated when Irish immigrants came to the United States  
18 during the English-imposed famine in the 19<sup>th</sup> century when loads of  
19 poor Irish people entering the working class were being easily duped  
20 by American crooks and fraudsters, kind of like the coyotes we see on  
21 the border today.

22           The Oxford English Dictionary links patsy with the  
23 ethnically-disparaging anti-Irish slur "paddy" to describe the  
24 stereotype of, and I quote, "A bog trotter just off the boat."

1 This definition's, of course, from the Oxford English Dictionary and  
2 the English have always liked to use the term "paddy".

3 Interestingly, the American Heritage Dictionary states that  
4 patsy actually derives from the Italian word, pachio (sic), meaning  
5 fool. But whether the origins are Brit or Italian, today the term  
6 "patsy" is no longer considered a derogatory slur directed only  
7 against Irish immigrants.

8 To quote from the Urban Dictionary, quote. "A patsy is now  
9 usually used in modern society by American dads to scold their sons."  
10 Calling someone a patsy is -

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Would you try to conclude your comment?

12 MR. EGAN: Yes. I'm almost done. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

14 MR. EGAN: Calling someone a patsy today is, and this is  
15 quoted from the dictionary, not my words. Calling someone a patsy is  
16 almost like saying, "Don't be a gullible pussy." Quote, unquote.

17 Let me just finally conclude and say I hope none of us have  
18 to come back here again in two years to fight the same damn battle,  
19 just with different well-intentioned patsies who may try to excuse  
20 themselves, as some, as some of you have done by saying, "Hey, I  
21 wasn't here two years ago."

22 Well, this comes back again, maybe some of you aren't gonna  
23 be here in two years or whenever this comes back. Maybe some of the  
24 Mayor and Council aren't going to be here, God willing when this comes  
25 back. But I'll tell you will be here. We will be here. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. Miguel Ortega.

2 MR. ORTEGA: Good evening. My name is Miguel Ortega.

3 I am representing myself, but also representing the Ironwood Ridge  
4 Neighborhood Association which is just west of El Rio, just west of  
5 the Joaquin Murrietta Park there, and south of Grant. And I'm not  
6 paid for, for my, my words here tonight.

7 So, tonight, I'd like just to kind of focus on the  
8 importance of making sure that the record is clear for Mayor and  
9 Council, because really at the end of the day, this is what our, our  
10 biggest rule is. This is the most important task at hand is making  
11 sure that the Mayor and Council is guided in direction to take action,  
12 take no action, accept your recommendation or not.

13 Let's just be very clear of where we are on the west side,  
14 and actually Tucson-wide. We had an incredible turnout of 50 people  
15 right at the beginning of the holidays, once again from the west side,  
16 adamantly opposed to your proposal of moving Precinct 37 into Ward 1.

17 We had the Barrio Neighborhood Coalition represented. We  
18 had Barrio Hollywood, Patrick McKenna representing that neighborhood.  
19 Myself representing Ironwood Ridge Neighborhood Association. We had  
20 supporters from (Inaudible), El Rio and Sovaco area, the, the area in  
21 question.

22 We've had, to date, over 300 on-line signatures opposing  
23 this move. And let us - let's be very clear that two years ago, there  
24 was also a major organizing against this move of people that was  
25 proposed. We walked door-to-door then, and counted (sic) on hundreds

1 of doors as we did this last time, this time. So, it's very clear  
2 where we stand, right?

3 But what I think is important to understand as well as  
4 that, we, we're all adults here. We understand how politics work. I  
5 used to work for the City of Tucson, to work for Ward 3 and, and what  
6 we do is we try to make it easy for our Council Members to make a  
7 tough decision, a controversial decision.

8 So, it's obvious that the conversation that, that folks  
9 are trying to propose is to create a third ward or, you know, of, of  
10 minority-majority representation. And so, some of the theories have  
11 been is, well, let's make the - let's get the westside people all  
12 angry and, and then get them talking.

13 And then, then we'll say "no" to that, we'll vote, you  
14 know, unanimously against that. But then, we'll come to Mayor and  
15 Council, say, "Man, the community's fired up. They really want to do  
16 something." Come on, man. We're not, we're not that dumb.

17 We, we recognize that there's also conversations with  
18 CHEESPA and LUCHA (sic). They do great work in Phoenix, they really  
19 do. They do some work here in Tucson as well. But they don't  
20 represent our barrios, okay? And so, for the record, the people  
21 here outnumber Staff, okay?

22 So, when you do talk to your, your Mayor and Council, make  
23 sure that you are clear with what you tell them. There was never  
24 anyone jumping up and down and saying, "We want some kind of dramatic

1 redistricting. We really have to have more brown people on the  
2 Council.”

3           What people actually are fired up about is affordable  
4 housing, addressing the homelessness issue. Better jobs, living  
5 wages, union jobs. That’s what the people of the barrio want.  
6 That’s what brown and white working people, everybody wants.

7           But for, for anyone here to attempt to try to manufacture  
8 some kind of weird narrative of people fired - getting fired up and we  
9 need some kind of majority-minority third ward, that is not the case.

10           If that were the case, and if CHEEPA and LUCHA were doing  
11 their job, and if they were the, the, the spokespeople of La Raza on  
12 the west side, they would be here during the redistricting committee  
13 meeting.

14           They’re not here. They may come later on. They’ve got  
15 lots of money, and they may do whatever the Mayor and Ward 1 Council  
16 wants them to do. But that would be a manufactured narrative. We’re  
17 just not that dumb.

18           So, when you consider that recommendation, we’re not gonna  
19 feel like if you vote against this like big, huge dream in the sky,  
20 you know, about changing everything up, if you vote against that,  
21 we’re not gonna think that you’re like, “Oh, my gosh, you’re against,  
22 you know, brown - more brown people on the Council.”

23           What brown people want is what everybody wants, okay?  
24 That’s what we want. Mayor and Council needs to do their job now.  
25 We, we need to address pressing issues now.

1           Gentrification can be easily addressed by the people that  
2 are sitting here now. And might I remind you that we fought against  
3 the Mayor, okay? A Latina who tried to gentrify our barrios when she  
4 tried to sell off El Rio to Grand Canyon University, okay? So, we  
5 want good people. I don't care what they are, just be good  
6 progressive people doing good by, by, by the working, working class,  
7 all right?

8           So, again, let's be clear on the record. Just make sure  
9 that when you talk to your Council Member that you're, that you're  
10 representing about the people who really did attend. Who really did  
11 organize, who really did knock on the doors. Make sure that's on the  
12 record.

13           And make sure that you are honest, and you say there was no  
14 huge amount of people demanding that we have some huge reorganizing of  
15 the districts, okay? So, thank you. And again, you know, hands off  
16 of 37 and make sure that Mayor and Council focus on the things that  
17 matter, not some political movidas to get more political power.  
18 Thanks.

19           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. Katherine Weasel.

20           MS. WEASEL: Good evening. So, I just want to say I was a  
21 little rough on you last week, and I apologize for that, but I was  
22 fired up. But today I'm real calm and I've looked over the maps.  
23 I really don't care if Ward 1 has anything more because they can't  
24 handle what they have now. That's where I stand, and I'm pretty sure  
25 you know that.

1 I've been in Enchanted Hills Neighborhood Association for  
2 over 20 years. I've been a Ward 1 representative for over 20 years,  
3 and I would like, if you have to choose a proposal, I would wish you  
4 would choose 2-C. That's the least invasive for Ward 1. It would  
5 help us. It's not gonna hurt us that much and I would be willing to  
6 negotiate with that.

7 But I would also like for you to tell your Mayor and your  
8 Council that, A, this rushed meeting sequence kind of things don't fly  
9 anymore. We want public meetings. We want people to be able to talk.  
10 We want enough reference time to be able to check out references, to  
11 go knock on doors to make sure we find out exactly who our neighbors  
12 are.

13 We don't want some pre-empted census mojo, okay? We just  
14 want a good life. We want to take care of our community. We respect  
15 our elders. We protect our veterans, our children, and that's what  
16 life is about.

17 And I would like to say the, the purpose of life is not to  
18 be happy, it is to be useful, to be honorable, to be compassionate and  
19 to have it make some difference, that you have lived and lived well.  
20 And kudos to you for working on a board. I know it's rough.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. Patrick McKenna.

22 MR. MCKENNA: Hello. Good evening again. I just wanted to  
23 thank the Committee for your work. I really do appreciate taking the  
24 time that you've taken here to consider this important question.



1           Sorry. Patrick McKenna, seventh generation Tucsonan from  
2 Barrio Hollywood, and I'm not a paid speaker. But I am officially  
3 representing the barrio.

4           I did feel that this Committee was really lacking some  
5 context, and you deserve to know some things that maybe you don't  
6 know. Why Precinct 37 is such a hot spot for us. Why such a  
7 tinderbox.

8           But there's a history that goes back. That is where the  
9 barrio empowerment movement started in Tucson. So, not only is there  
10 a historical significance there, but something happened very recently  
11 where the westside barrios had to get together and sue the City of  
12 Tucson.

13           Now, Cecilia Cruz, who was our main plaintiff that  
14 represented the westside barrios, was here at your last redistricting  
15 meeting. And she was the plaintiff that represented the westside  
16 barrios because we had questions about what the City of Tucson was  
17 doing with El Rio Golf Course.

18           Which you all might not know is that we were told by Mayor  
19 Rothschild and Council Member Romero at our - one of our neighborhood  
20 meetings that we would - if anything was going on in our neighborhood  
21 and our neck for the woods, we would be the first to know about it.

22           However, that was not the case when it came to El Rio Golf  
23 Course, and this proposal that the City of Tucson and the Real Estate  
24 Department had been working in secret for about a year without even  
25 notifying us, telling us anything at all (sic), they had worked out

1 this deal with Grand Canyon University to turn over those 99 acres of  
2 the El Rio Golf Course.

3 Now, the City of Tucson stonewalled us. They did not want  
4 to give us public records that referred to, anything to do with the  
5 posed lease agreement with Grand Canyon University. And when we  
6 actually sued and found out why, now that was very interesting because  
7 the City actually had the 99 acres of El Rio Golf Course appraised as  
8 a dirt lot, okay? As a dirt lot.

9 So, that was one of the, one of the corrupt items that we  
10 found. Basically, they were trying to sell that land off for pennies  
11 on the dollar, and we prevented a very bad deal from happening. A  
12 very bad deal for the taxpayers by actually having to sue the City.

13 Now if you go back and you look at why the arguments that  
14 the City of Tucson made actually in Superior Court here, they actually  
15 made the argument that they couldn't release the records to us 'cause  
16 Arizona has a very strong public records clause, okay?

17 But they actually made the argument that they couldn't -  
18 they could not release the records to us because it would be so  
19 embarrassing to the City that they would no longer be able to actually  
20 negotiate with companies that make deals. That it would be so  
21 damaging to them that they wouldn't be able to move forward with  
22 economic development deals if they revealed what they had proposed to  
23 give to Grand Canyon University.

24 And when we sued them, we got those records and found out.  
25 We found out exactly why they were trying to hide (inaudible) So,

1 there's actually a lot there. And, and please don't believe this  
2 narrative that's being spun that the westside people just are lacking  
3 education. We don't understand the task that your Committee is being  
4 given, okay?

5           We do very well understand the task that you're being  
6 given. But let's be realistic, okay? Let's, like I said to you in  
7 the last meeting. Let's go ahead and take away Precinct 37 and what  
8 do you got? Does that make it all of a sudden possible to elect the  
9 minority in Ward 3? Come on. Don't fall for it. Please continue on,  
10 on the path that you are considering, the input of the public.

11           But you know what? We're not the enemy here, okay? We're  
12 not the enemy. We're trying to give you a little bit more insight,  
13 okay? You may be putting in all this time for nothing if you don't  
14 really consider these options carefully and really consider that  
15 there's a whole lot of movidas that have gone on before.

16           So, it's not like we're here, we're crazy reactionary  
17 people that are just angry and we want to come in, and, yeah, take  
18 our frustrations out at you. No. It actually goes a lot deeper than  
19 just this precinct being moved, okay? There's a lot to it.

20           So, you know, just think about that and think about how we  
21 had to sue the City of Tucson just to get public records about public  
22 facility right across the street from our neighborhood, okay? And  
23 that is why you get such a strong reaction. Thank you.

24           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you, Patrick.

1 All right. That concludes the pile of, small pile of  
2 speakers that I have. Is there anyone else wishing to speak?

3 MR. BURR: Evening, Commissioners. My name is John Burr.  
4 I live in the city. I'm not paid. I'm soon to be the Vice-President  
5 of Armory Park Neighborhood Association again. I want to thank you  
6 for, you all for your hard work. I want to thank you again for not  
7 stripping Armory Park out of Ward 6, which we had requested a couple  
8 of meetings ago.

9 But I also listened to a lot of our colleagues in the  
10 barrios and Pedro said, "We don't want to go to Ward 1, we want to  
11 go to Ward 5." So, later in the meeting after the public hearing  
12 concludes, Precinct 45 is back on the docket again, and you're toying  
13 with it, and you do exactly what you were requested not to do earlier  
14 in the evening.

15 I'm not sure that there's any easy panacea here. Item 2-A  
16 splits, you know, Barrio Santa Rita y Ochoa in half. This new  
17 proposal going up Stone for splitting Precinct 45 now puts Barrio  
18 Viejo, or Barrio Historico, or El Membrio (ph.), or however you want  
19 to call that storied neighborhood, in Ward 1.

20 But it also splits the historic districts yet again, and it  
21 puts most of downtown in Ward 1 that does not have staff prepared for  
22 it, and takes Ward 6's voice out of the downtown redevelopment  
23 equation.

24 And to be fair, (Inaudible) has been instrumental on making  
25 sure that community agreement benefits, and all sorts of other things,

1 to reduce gentrification and have a public process be in place. Has  
2 been really very strong and the Ward 1 Office has not.

3 I'm here tonight because I want to see what you all do  
4 after we are no longer allowed to speak, so, that we know how to  
5 direct our comments to Mayor and Council. One thing I do want to  
6 caution, you are splitting up neighborhoods.

7 Armory Park has been split between Ward 6 and Ward 5 for a  
8 number of years. 2-A splits Barrio Santa Rita y Ochoa. I stand with  
9 the barrio wanting to be represented by the people that they currently  
10 are represented by. And that is not what is actually on these  
11 districts.

12 The ward offices work things out with neighborhoods, and we  
13 are, generally in Armory Park, entirely represented by 6, even though  
14 it has split representation. Barrio Viejo works with Ward 5. Barrio  
15 Historico and the historic district are that neighborhood, works with  
16 Ward 6.

17 What goes on on the ground is very different than maps.  
18 And you really need to consider the context, the people involved, the  
19 personalities, and how they integrate and represent and talk to their  
20 communities. So, again, I'm curious to see what you do after this  
21 hearing is closed.

22 I look forward to seeing what Mayor and Council do with it  
23 later in December. I do want to thank you all for your service, but I  
24 do also want to say neither 2-A or 2-C is an ideal map. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. Is there anyone else who  
2 would like to speak? All right. Hearing none, I'd like to continue  
3 on with our agenda.

4 Discussion of Redistricting Proposals. I'm referring now  
5 to the most recent press release says, "At its second public hearing  
6 held on Thursday, November 17<sup>th</sup>, the Committee voted to create a new  
7 map for consideration called Proposal 2-C, and remove Proposal 2-B  
8 from consideration. The Committee is now considering Proposals 2-A  
9 and 2-C." With that, I'll open the meeting up for comments,  
10 considerations by this Committee.

11 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, before we do that, we have a  
12 housekeeping item to take care of, and that is to close the public  
13 hearing. If you would entertain a motion to close the public hearing.

14 MR. ROBLES: I'd like to move the - for the closing of the  
15 public hearing.

16 MR. HENDEL: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All in favor? Aye.

18 (Affirmative.)

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you, Ms. Clerk.

20 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

22 MR. ROBLES: I would like to thank folks for coming out  
23 this evening. Public input is very important for the work that we do.  
24 I'd like to remind folks that our goal here is to redraw the districts  
25 here in the city.

1           Of course, we're concerned about other - of the myriad of  
2 issues facing the city. But that's the goal of this Committee here.  
3 And when I chose to accept the appointment to sit on this Commission,  
4 which I'm absolutely grateful for, I was very mindful of the fact that  
5 I'm 21 years old. I'm a lifelong Tucsonan, I'm a third-generation  
6 Tucsonan, graduate of Sunnyside High School, and this is all guiding  
7 my perspective because I know I'm gonna be here for the next 40, 50,  
8 60 years.

9           And I want to see the city grow. And I believe that this  
10 city grows when we begin to challenge the status quo. The same old  
11 neighborhoods have been moving back and forth. And I want to be  
12 clear, Ward 1 has no intention of putting Precinct 37 back on the  
13 table.

14           But I do want us to continue to challenge the, challenge  
15 the, the very notion of, of how redistricting has taken place so far.  
16 And at the last meeting, 2-C, Proposal 2-C was put on the table with  
17 the, with the idea in mind that this would have the least amount of  
18 public outcry.

19           Here we are this evening dealing with public outcry against  
20 a proposal, and this was the very reason that guided our perspective  
21 in taking away Proposal 2-B, which I'm proud to have seconded. But  
22 if, if, if we're going to abide by the, the policy object- -- policy  
23 objective number one that calls for minimum disruption, we're not  
24 going to make any sort of substantial progress when it comes to  
25 redistricting the city.

1           Now I want to remind folks that ward boundaries are  
2 arbitrary. I know for a fact that Ward 5 has helped the Sugar Hill  
3 Neighborhood, which is in Ward 3. This is something that's akin to  
4 something that takes place all the time within wards. They go beyond  
5 the ward boundaries to help other neighborhoods.

6           I, I read a comment tonight that talks about how - and this  
7 is what the comment says. "Wards are not little (inaudible) for  
8 Council people to rule over."

9           Folks don't want to move to other wards because they don't  
10 want to lose representation from a certain Council Member. So, what  
11 happens when that Council Member doesn't run for reelection? What  
12 happens when that Council Member loses reelection?

13           Then that defeats the very argument that, very arguments  
14 that are motivating some of the, some of, some, some of the public  
15 (inaudible) against the proposals at hand? So, I, I want to urge my  
16 colleagues this evening, as this conversation moves forward, that we  
17 need to challenge the traditional notions that have guided this  
18 redistricting committee for decades. Thank you.

19           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you. Anyone else?

20           MS. ALVAREZ: Chairman Crum, I, I have -

21           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah.

22           MS. ALVAREZ: - some questions perhaps for the City  
23 Attorney or City Clerk. The revi- -- the policy objectives that guide  
24 - there are six of them. I've been spending a lot of time this week  
25 reading them and re- -- rethinking what the charge is.



1 My question is, before I make my comment, are those policy  
2 objectives written into the City Charter, or the City Code? And is  
3 there a difference with that, and who has the power? Can the Council  
4 amend the code? Can the Council amend the Charter? Those are my  
5 questions. And then I'll make comments.

6 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee.  
7 Charter is the - I'll try to take these in some, some order, but maybe  
8 reversed.

9 The City's Charter is its Constitution, so, the Mayor and  
10 Council can propose amendments to the Charter, or they can be proposed  
11 by initiative that has to be a vote of the people to change the  
12 Charter.

13 The code is amendable by Mayor and Council without vote.  
14 The policy objectives, I actually need to look and see. I believe  
15 they are code, not Charter.

16 And the clerk is nodding, so, I, I, I will stand confirmed  
17 there. And I'm sorry. Your, your last question?

18 And those, the objectives are just that. They're  
19 subsidiary to the, the MPD concept, which may be part of your  
20 question. And I can't remember your last question.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: No, that, that's very helpful.

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, if I may, though, just for my own  
23 clarification, are City policies equal to those provisions of the City  
24 Code?

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I think the hierarchy would be federal  
2 constitution, charter, code and then policies. And in an ideal world,  
3 furthering the code, if that makes sense.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: Thank you. That's, that's very helpful.

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Still got the floor.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: Then I can - yeah, thank you, Chairman Crum.  
7 So, right now, the way that the objectives are laid out, they're,  
8 they're impossible to meet. One cancels the other.

9 This Commission, I'm gonna ask us tonight to tell Mayor and  
10 Council a number of recommendations. One of them, not the only one,  
11 but one of them, that they do need to engage in a consultation with  
12 the public to consider amending the code where these policies are  
13 outlined.

14 And I will say this. Why? Why do I say that? Because in  
15 the objectives, the policy objectives, first one is to maintain the  
16 established ward boundaries with a minimum of disruption.

17 The second one is to sustain the compactness of the wards  
18 as they previously exist, previous to the Commission, to the  
19 redistricting. Okay. That - if that had been the only two policy  
20 directives, then we would have not even had any of the controversies  
21 we had with any of them 'cause then it would have been just sort of a,  
22 a tweaking of numbers to achieve those two, which are - that's one and  
23 two.

24 But then, three says that the objective should be to  
25 maintain an ethnic balance so not to dilute the Hispanic vote.

1 So, Tucson is a minority-majority city where the Latino population is  
2 packed into two wards. Therefore, it is diluted by definition of the  
3 Supreme Court, and that was the 1994 decision.

4 The Supreme Court was asked to weigh on the question, "How  
5 would you measure dilution? How would you measure that?" And they  
6 said, "You measure dilution of the, of the vote of minorities when you  
7 pack the votes into districts that maintain the integrity of the  
8 district ethnically representative culturally, but you then take it  
9 away from the others in the district."

10 In a city like Tucson where the Latino population is  
11 roughly 50%, roughly, that's where they came up with a concept called  
12 "rough proportionality". Roughly, 50% of the wards should be  
13 minority-majority, but they're not.

14 So, in that sense, here's a major American city in the  
15 Southwest with a minority-majority population where the Latino  
16 population vote is already diluted. This is not like we will dilute  
17 it. It is.

18 Now, it's clear that the proposal we considered last week  
19 would not have changed that if we had moved District - Precinct 37.  
20 It wasn't gonna change it. In fact, it was gonna change it so  
21 minimally, that's why I said, "Well, that's not the point."

22 I must have been confused when we were looking at a map the  
23 previous week, because I remember making the comment on the record  
24 that I thought the move of 37 was going to give a chance of minority  
25 representation in Ward 3 around 44%. 44 to 46. You may all remember

1 that. That was a mistake. That, that didn't happen when it came down  
2 to the actual map.

3 I don't know if it was that I read the map in a moment when  
4 we were still in (inaudible) It was incomplete. However, here's how  
5 fluid this is. The 2020 proposal by this same Commission in 2020, two  
6 years ago, that would have moved Precinct 37 would have given Ward 3 a  
7 44% - 43% Hispanic population, moved from 36 to 43, which was then  
8 closer to this rough proportionality.

9 Going back to my point. When you begin to read, then, the  
10 other objectives, they even get more confusing because then it says  
11 that you should maintain the established ward. You should sustain the  
12 compactness. You should maintain the ethnic (inaudible) so not to  
13 dilute. But then number four says that we should give preference to  
14 options that advance rough proportionality.

15 So, really, we're - if we had done our job here, we would  
16 have accepted the, the maps that were proposed, that gave preference  
17 to rough proportionality and disrupted all of the, all of the ward  
18 boundaries which was contradict (sic) principle one and two.

19 And then number five says that not only should we give  
20 preference to the options that advance rough proportionality, it uses  
21 the language that we should give preference to options that reduce  
22 dilution, that may otherwise exist from previous packing. So, in  
23 other words, says that's what we should do and reduce voter confusion  
24 (inaudible) Okay, I have sat with this all week, through Thanksgiving.  
25 This is a Rubic's Cube. This is impossible to accomplish.

1           So, I will be speaking to the Council when it goes  
2 before the Council. And I will urge tonight to make some sort of  
3 recommendation that tells the City Council that they need to consider  
4 amending these objectives to determine which one really should be the  
5 preference so that future Redistricting Commissioners are not put in  
6 this impossible landlock situation where you will be called all kinds  
7 of names, all kinds of things because you're trying to balance this.

8           That is aside from the question of general comprehensive  
9 outreach and study sessions that need to precede the short time frame  
10 that the State imposes on us for this. That cannot happen, we cannot  
11 wait again because the same thing will happen.

12           This has to be - many of the opposition, many of the people  
13 who are conflating wards boundaries with political power, all of these  
14 things have to be put on a study, open sessions. It's gonna be very  
15 messy, it's gonna be very emotional, but the City has time to do this  
16 in advance of the next (inaudible)

17           Because with these objectives and with these sentiments, it  
18 will lead exactly to the same results. It will be impossible to do  
19 the job, and it will simply never, never redistrict anything. Yet the  
20 population is changing dramatically in such a way that two years ago,  
21 changing Precinct 37 to 3 would have resulted in 44% Hispanic,  
22 changing it two years later. This is how the population change would  
23 have changed nothing. That's how much the population in Ward 1  
24 changed within two years.

1           So, all of these very sort of complex and overlaying facts  
2 that, in the current scenario, I am convinced will be impossible to  
3 meet this charge. Those are my comments for the record, and when the  
4 time comes, I will formulate that into a recommendation to go along  
5 with our proposal. Thank you.

6           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you very much. Anyone else?

7           MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I, I think it would be good to get some  
8 clarity on the ranking of each of these guidelines, 'cause you're  
9 right. They are, in some cases, in a lot of other cases, mutually  
10 exclusive. Like the MPD is like a Supreme Court thing. That probably  
11 outranks some of these other ones. Some of them are City policies.  
12 Some of them are in the City Charter.

13           So, I guess it goes Supreme Court, Charter, policy. But  
14 it's not clear from this document which is which, and so, I think it  
15 would be - I would definitely support a motion to ask for further  
16 clarity and, and rankings of these priorities in the case so they're  
17 mutually exclusive.

18           MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, on behalf of the City Attorney,  
19 I would simply say that I think Mr. Hendel has got it correct. I'm,  
20 I'm not commenting on how you want to -

21           MR. HENDEL: So, which -

22           MR. McLAUGHLIN: - solve that, but you, you've stated it  
23 accurately.

24           MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. So, MPD is the only one -  
25 that's the top one. That's the Supreme Court one.

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Correct.

2 MR. HENDEL: Then there's maintain established and  
3 recognizable boundaries with minimum disruption. Is that policy or  
4 Charter?

5 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Sorry. I need to look (inaudible)

6 MR. HENDEL: No. No problem. We're putting you on the  
7 spot.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Hendel, isn't rough proportionality also  
9 Supreme Court, except not at this same level?

10 MR. HENDEL: No. Rough proportion- -- I'm pretty sure  
11 rough proportionality is the lowest of the three. It's City policy,  
12 it's not Charter and it's not Supreme Court, is that correct?

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yes. Mr. Chair, Members, to my knowledge,  
14 rough proportionality is not a Supreme Court mandate. Not - it's not,  
15 not like MPD.

16 MR. HENDEL: I think it was put in as a policy by Mayor and  
17 Council like this year or last year, between the previous meeting of  
18 the previous redistricting commission and this one.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: This past summer.

20 MR. HENDEL: This summer. Okay.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: But, but the defi- -- that would be important  
22 to clarify because the definition of rough proportionality derives  
23 from a Supreme Court decision, an opinion in 1994. Now it may be  
24 optional, it may not be encoded in the same way as the other one.

1 But it would be important to clarify whether that - do cities have  
2 the, the choice to abrade that or not.

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Members, it's something for you  
4 to consider; the rough proportionality. It's a factor for you to  
5 consider like other factors. Something to have in your, in your head  
6 as you're considering options. So, not - it's not the level of legal  
7 mandate that you have on, for instance, MPD. I don't know if that  
8 helps.

9 MR. HENDEL: That is helpful. Thank you. So, then Items  
10 1-B and 1-C, which are maintaining established and recognizable ward  
11 boundaries with minimum disruption and sustaining compactness and  
12 contigu- -- and contiguity of the, of the wards as they presently  
13 exist, are those policy or Charter?

14 MR. McLAUGHLIN: The clerk is kindly bringing up the  
15 Charter for me. My recollection is that most of those are stated in  
16 the code, the Tucson Code. (Inaudible)

17 MR. HENDEL: So, that would be -

18 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Subordinate to the Charter. But, but it  
19 is enacted by Mayor and Council.

20 MR. HENDEL: So, that would be above policy, but below a  
21 charter?

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: In - yes. In -

23 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

24 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - (inaudible) terms, yes.

25 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.



1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh.

2 MR. HENDEL: So, it looks like these are written roughly in  
3 the order of priority in our document, which is good. So, I think all  
4 we should do, or at least the minimum of what we need to do is ask for  
5 next year, the, the next redistricting committee's document to specify  
6 these are in order of priority. And better yet, to include where they  
7 all come from. That would be nice, too.

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Members, with great respect to  
9 Mr. Hendel, I would, I would say I don't know that that's correct,  
10 that they're actually meant - intended to be listed in order of  
11 priority. You're free to think of it that way based on what you've  
12 been hearing, if that makes any sense.

13 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. It, it could very well be a  
14 coincidence. Thank you. Appreciate the clarification.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: (Inaudible) And as I say, you're free to  
16 treat them that way. I'm not sure you have a legal obligation to do  
17 that. That's all I'm saying.

18 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And if I may? Section 8 of Chapter 16:  
20 The City shall be divided into six wards, each ward containing as  
21 nearly as possible the same total population, beginning with the year  
22 2000, and quadrennially thereafter.

23 And in addition, during the second year following the year  
24 of any decennial United States Census, that would be this year, the  
25 Mayor and Council may, if necessary to equalize the total population

1 contained in said wards, one with another, redistrict the said city as  
2 to said ward. And said redistricting shall be done between the first  
3 day of October and the 31<sup>st</sup> day of December of said years.

4           Then there's a Redistricting Advisory Committee, and let me  
5 just read you that. Then I'll stop. In any year in which  
6 redistricting of the city's wards is permitted under this Charter,  
7 or whenever redistricting is otherwise mandated by law, the Mayor and  
8 Council shall establish a Redistricting Advisory Committee which shall  
9 make written recommendations regarding the redistricting of wards.  
10 Formation term and activities of the Committee shall be regulated by  
11 ordinance.

12           No redistricting of the city's wards shall occur prior  
13 to the consideration by the Mayor and Council of the Redistricting  
14 Advisory Committee's written recommendations. And I read that to  
15 imply that everything that you're thinking of as the considerations is  
16 in the code, not, not further in the Charter. Thank you and now I'll  
17 shut up.

18           MR. HENDEL: No, thank you. That was helpful. So, a  
19 question for, I guess, Staff. What is the structure with which we  
20 want to do this meeting? Like the, the final goal of today's meeting,  
21 my understanding is to have a letter that our Committee is going to  
22 send to Mayor and Council.

23           And so, it seems to me that one way to do this would be to  
24 make motions to include clauses in that letter, for example, what Dr.  
25 Alvarez was just suggesting. So, is that the correct way to go about

1 this? We make a motion to include a specific clause in the letter.

2 We vote on that, then that goes in the letter, and we do that a number  
3 of times until the letter is done? Is that how this works?

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Would you like to make that  
5 motion, or anyone?

6 MR. HENDEL: Like a motion about how motions work?

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, to include our recommendation to  
8 the Mayor and Council that a section be included that, -

9 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I can make (inaudible)

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - what I wrote down. Go ahead.

11 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I move that we include in our letter to  
12 Mayor and Council a request to clarify the source and relative  
13 priority of each of the Committee's objectives in advance of the next  
14 Redistricting Advisory Committee session in 2024.

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second?

16 MS. ALVAREZ: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Discussion? I'd like to add something  
18 to that. I guess it's just a part of my education, in terms of what I  
19 look for, and how do I for the, or for that matter, any future  
20 Commission Member apply, for example, the words "rough  
21 proportionality"? What are the actual factors to consider?

22 And for that reason, I'm seeking some sort of consistency  
23 and predictability in terms of what to look at rather than, what I  
24 have right now for myself is my own individual opinion on how to apply  
25 that. So, yes, I would support that motion and a second just for the

1 purpose of achieving some consistency and predictability not only of  
2 proportionality, but the other considerations of what's "disruptive"?

3 Well, we've heard one of them could be a Council Member,  
4 someone to like. I don't think that's a good reason for what  
5 disruptive means. But it could be, I don't know.

6 So, I think for the Council, whether it's by a separate  
7 committee or an ad hoc committee, or however it may be, it might be  
8 useful to have someone look at particularly the policies and see if  
9 they're sufficient to achieve the predictability, the consistency, the  
10 definition that I think is being proposed. Thank you. Anyone else?

11 MS. ALVAREZ: After we consider this vote on this motion, I  
12 would like to propose another motion that specifies some of the points  
13 of study that include your comments.

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I, I prefer to hear them right now, and  
15 let's see if we could include that as part of the write-up.

16 MS. ALVAREZ: I think that part of the study session - so,  
17 if the motion can include that not only does Council clarify this, but  
18 that Council engages a participatory consultation with the public at  
19 large, with an extensive time for studying, including the centers of  
20 this process during this time, that, that facilitates the definitions  
21 on the, the barrios that shall guide that.

22 For example, what are the, the confluences between  
23 geography and the political boundaries? It's clear that we don't  
24 have the power as a Commission to change the west side, the south  
25 side. I mean, nobody does that. The west is the west. The south is

1 the south. But the political boundaries that criss-cross that get  
2 conflated with the identity of west side, south side, east side.

3 That, that's what I think Patrick is saying is arbitrary,  
4 right? But here, we got to a situation where the arbitrariness got  
5 really specific, to the point that you really couldn't even like tweak  
6 any of the edges.

7 One letter that we received said that, for example, and I'm  
8 not making a case for it 'cause I already was on record voting against  
9 moving 37 last week after we had the discussion, but somebody said  
10 that moving 37 was against our policies, the City policies because it  
11 was a major disruption. But what was major and minimum? It was only  
12 one precinct. It was not major by numbers.

13 So, are we talking about a definition that has to do with  
14 culture identification with the, with the geography or the political  
15 lines represent the minimum? I mean what is the standard there?  
16 That's just an example, random, about the interpretation of the word  
17 "minimum" versus "disruption", versus "maximum".

18 It was a major disruption for the neighborhood. But  
19 really, it turns out the numbers here in the guidelines, it was  
20 minimum, if you look at the, at the way that they were. So, that's an  
21 example.

22 The other one is in relationship, the other definition that  
23 would be very important is exactly those words "give preference to"  
24 that are indicated right now in the language. If you give preference,  
25 that sort of presumes that that's what you should prioritize.

1           So, the third one would be, what is the rough  
2   proportionality standard? Is it really the, the majority, then, wards  
3   by a certain population? All of these things need to be studied and  
4   discussed because the only way to not be landlocked like this again  
5   would then have to be a map that completely disrupted then everybody  
6   equally.

7           But all of the wards were reimagined completely. But that  
8   wouldn't change the fact that you still had a westside ward and an  
9   eastside one, and a south. That wouldn't change the geography, but  
10   what would be the, the, the horizon, the elasticity of the public  
11   understanding wards versus geography versus cultural attachment?

12           That cannot be done between October 1<sup>st</sup> and November 29<sup>th</sup>  
13   with the considerations of study and, and sensitivity to this  
14   attachment if this next committee's gonna do its job.

15           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, and understanding, though, that  
16   the Mayor and Council, by law, have to adopt the redistricting plan by  
17   December 31<sup>st</sup>, 2022. So, there, I'm, I'm, I'm afraid to do - that in  
18   order to do this justice, the work of whoever looks at particularly  
19   the policies, need more time.

20           And what you're saying, I hear you saying, is there needs  
21   to be a public participation component in the development of these  
22   policies because certainly I'm, I'm sympathetic to a major disruption  
23   being particular to a parti- -- to, to one precinct and not  
24   necessarily a number of adjoining precincts.

1 MS. DARLAND: Mr. Chair? Could I ask if this is going to  
2 be a friendly amendment to Ed's motion, just because I feel a little  
3 bit like his recommendation is to get clarity from the City Council.  
4 But what I'm hearing is an alternative that there should be a more  
5 thoughtful conversation.

6 And I would, I would agree, it is unfortunate that we go  
7 through this exercise where individuals come, after a long, hard day,  
8 to make their voices heard in a, in a process that's not necessarily  
9 participatory.

10 So, I, I agree about an intentional strategy to engage  
11 representation from historical neighborhoods, from the barrios to  
12 participate in the design of, of what, what this looks like versus a  
13 passive process that largely these people feeling more marginalized  
14 than they did before the process got underway.

15 So, if, if possible, if there's an opportunity, if my  
16 colleague here would entertain a -

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, I think -

18 MS. DARLAND: - friendly mo- -- amendment to the motion, I  
19 think -

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, I'm not certain because it sounds  
21 like you're complementing the, the, the initial motion and the second.  
22 And I'm not certain that it's, it's changing any of the intention to  
23 what the, the maker and the seconder were saying.

24 But I'll let them speak for themselves. But if there is,  
25 if it's necessary, it could just be a - an amendment, and checking to

1 see if it's approved by the maker and the, the seconder. So, I'll  
2 leave that up to -

3 MR. HENDEL: I'm, in theory, open to amendments. I'm just  
4 not sure exactly what, what would be the wording of the amendment.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. So, the first, I think, Madam Clerk,  
6 the, the, the motion was to, as to recommend that City - the Mayor and  
7 Council (inaudible)

8 MS. MESICH: Where I find the source of the policy  
9 objectives and rank them?

10 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. And - yeah, the relative priority in  
11 case this is where they're mutually exclusive. I wrote down  
12 (inaudible)

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And define that.

14 MR. HENDEL: Would that be helpful, or -

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah. But not this -

16 MS. MESICH: (Inaudible) very much.

17 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: But not, not just prioritize them, but  
19 also define them further so we're not necessarily -

20 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: That's why I wasn't sure -

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - defining each one individually.

23 MS. ALVAREZ: That's why I wasn't sure if there were two  
24 amend- -- you know, two, two different motions, and I should have come



1 back later with one. But yours is City, Mayor and Council should  
2 amend and clarify this.

3 And the second part is, but they should do that after they  
4 establish a participatory inclusive process of consultation way in  
5 advance of the actual establishing of a redistricting commission so  
6 that there's plenty of study groups, people; folks who dissented from  
7 the work that was being done here should have the opportunity to have  
8 maps that they can draw that meet some of that - in, in a, almost like  
9 a mock commission approach in advance of the formal legalistic, 'cause  
10 by the time you get to us, we were like, "Okay. This is October 1<sup>st</sup>,  
11 do this. You have a few weeks." And, and obviously that didn't work.

12 MR. HENDEL: Huh-uh.

13 MS. ALVAREZ: So, that's - the amendment is, can Mayor and  
14 Council do what you're suggesting through a process that changes the  
15 dynamic of how redistricting is approached for future commissions?  
16 Something like that?

17 MR. HENDEL: That sounds okay to me. And let me just write  
18 it up so I can read it coherently. And then, we'll see if you like it  
19 and we'll, -

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Okay.

21 MR. HENDEL: - we'll see what we want to do.

22 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum? Oh, Madam Clerk -

23 MS. MESICH: No. I'm sorry. Go ahead.

24 MR. ROBLES: No, I, I just would like to say that I very  
25 much agree with my colleague, Dr. Alvarez's proposal that's been put

1 on the table. I know in this particular situation this year, the  
2 timeline was pushed back because of the State's redistricting process,  
3 according to Madam Clerk.

4 So, I, I would just like to know whether like, if, if this  
5 proposal (inaudible) will, will, yet again, be like impacted? And  
6 next thing you know, the community aspect of this proposal is rushed  
7 as well. And if there's any way to maybe get ahead; I know we're,  
8 we're essentially brainstorming at this point.

9 But when this Comm- -- when this Committee reconvenes in  
10 two years or four years? Two years. Will, will, will those future  
11 members, once again, be negatively impacted by the timeline, possibly,  
12 that the State has in place when it comes to their redistricting  
13 process?

14 MS. MESICH: So, Mr. Chair, Mr. Robles, the State will be  
15 redistricting again in '24. However, we'll check on that for sure.

16 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

17 MS. MESICH: It - there are some options for starting this  
18 process earlier.

19 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

20 MS. MESICH: And I think I would strongly encourage you to  
21 put - make them part of the recommendation.

22 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right.

24 MR. ROBLES: Fantastic. Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, recommendation to the Mayor and  
2 Council; I think this particular item that we're talking about right  
3 now should be set off in a separate section rather than hidden  
4 somewhere else in a, in a, in a longer narrative.

5 MR. HENDEL: Well, right now I'm typing a draft of a motion  
6 that would ask Mayor and Council for three things. And I'm curious to  
7 hear your, your guys' thoughts on this.

8 One. Start engaging the public far in advance of the next  
9 meeting so that we can identify the desires and goals of the people of  
10 Tucson early rather than making them show up to these last-minute  
11 hearings. That would be one.

12 Two, is start the official Redistricting Advisory Committee  
13 process as early as you're legally allowed to, which I don't know. I  
14 guess October 1<sup>st</sup>, but we're not really sure. So, I'll just say as  
15 early as we're legally allowed, if you guys like that wording.

16 And three. Clarify the source of each of our objectives  
17 and the relative priority of each objective in cases where they're  
18 mutually exclusive. That's what I'm thinking now. I'm curious to  
19 hear thoughts on it.

20 MS. DARLAND: I think that sounds great. My one  
21 recommendation would be that (inaudible) that you said start it in  
22 October, as early as possible. My thought would be that this  
23 conversation should probably be part of what we - what happens in our  
24 community ongoing.

1           So, rather than it being October before it's going to have  
2 to happen, have it start as a community-building process at least  
3 maybe 12 calendar days in advance of the latest date in which a  
4 commission would have to be coming together to make recommendations to  
5 put before the community and public hearings and before Mayor and  
6 Council for consideration.

7           MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. That, that's a great point. And I  
8 wonder if we're talking about something that is not the Commission,  
9 but like a task force or a study group, or something that precedes the  
10 legal mandate of a commission that could start, you know, in January  
11 or February, just because the process of building consensus about  
12 these dramatic changes.

13           It's going to take more than people are busy, people have -  
14 it's gonna take months of participatory engagement where people look  
15 at, "No, that's impossible. That will never work in Tucson," type of  
16 conversations.

17           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah. However it's called, I think we  
18 leave that up to the Mayor and Council whether it's an ad hoc  
19 committee or, - yes. Exactly.

20           Now if I may, though, I'd like to return back to what  
21 the agenda is tonight, and not that this isn't a part of the agenda,  
22 but we still need to consider which redistricting proposal we're going  
23 to recommend to the Mayor and Council, be it 3-A or 3-C. 2-C.

24 (Inaudible)

1 MS. MESICH: And, Mr. Chair, you are not limited to one  
2 proposal. You can give the Mayor and Council an option.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Jaramillo, can you tell us a little bit  
4 about 2-A? And there are two current five, Ward 5 precincts that will  
5 be moving to 1. Do you have any comments on that on 2-A?

6 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes. That would be, I believe it's 47 and  
7 244. From our previous meetings that we've had, you know, I believe  
8 that we have to take into consideration what the community has said  
9 and spoken for as far as not, not wanting to be moved and stay in Ward  
10 5. So, that's why I made that recommendation.

11 And I think it's important that we, at this point in time,  
12 listen to what the community is saying. I know that by whatever map  
13 we decide to recommend, I know some people will probably not be very  
14 happy people, but you know, we're trying to do the best we can with  
15 what we have.

16 And then, you know, to be quite honest with you, I've been  
17 on many committees and this is probably one of the hardest committees  
18 I've ever been on as far as the, deciding which way we want to go.  
19 So, now I'd like to make a recommendation, if it's proper, Chairman  
20 Crum, that we recommend to City and Mayor and Council Proposal 2-C.

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a, for discussion purposes  
22 only, is there a second?

23 MS. DARLAND: (Inaudible)

24 MR. HENDEL: There's still the other motion, though.

1 MS. DARLAND: Yeah. Okay. I'm getting a little confused.  
2 I don't know if we - do we need a - would it - for the purpose of  
3 parliamentary procedure, and not scrambling everybody's bacon (sic)  
4 too much, do we need to table this first motion? My colleague over  
5 here is (inaudible)

6 MR. HENDEL: It got it. I'm done.

7 MS. DARLAND: You've got it done?

8 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

9 MS. DARLAND: Okay. So, all right.

10 MR. HENDEL: So, -

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: We would not even propose -

12 MR. JARAMILLO: Recommend -

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Recommend, rather.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: - Proposal 2-C.

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: 2-A is what we're saying.

16 MR. JARAMILLO: 2-C (inaudible)

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: But 2-A is off the table.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And don't discuss - it doesn't even  
20 (inaudible)

21 MR. HENDEL: So, I, I think we should do that - or discuss  
22 that motion, but let's do it after we do the housekeeping. I think  
23 we're all going to agree on this and if we don't, let's discuss it and  
24 make something we can all agree on. Yeah. Can I put text up there?

1 MS. DARLAND: Is there any - I just think about our  
2 colleague in Ward 4 who can't see what my colleague in Ward 3 has  
3 typed up. Is there a way for us to share it for folks who are viewing  
4 as well? Okay.

5 MR. HENDEL: How, how are we gonna get it from my laptop to  
6 this thing? I think I'll just have to read it, right?

7 MS. MESICH: Yes.

8 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Let me, let me just read it and I think  
9 we're just all gonna agree on this. So, it shouldn't - and then I  
10 can, I can type it up for you after if you want, or however this went.  
11 No, no, no. That's okay. Okay. So, there's already a motion on the  
12 floor, so, I have to withdraw that one.

13 So, I withdraw the motion on the table. Do, do we need a  
14 second to withdraw as well? No? Okay. We're good. I move that in  
15 our letter to Mayor and Council, we request three things.

16 One. Start engaging the public far in advance of the next  
17 redistricting meeting to identify the desires and goals of the people  
18 of Tucson early, perhaps via a task force or similar body, starting a  
19 conversation just a few months in advance of the deadline results and  
20 rightful frustration among both the Committee and the broader public.

21 Two. Identify the earliest possible start date for the  
22 official meetings of the 2024 Redistricting Advisory Committee and  
23 start the appointment process well in advance of that date so the  
24 Committee can start meeting as soon as possible.

1 Three. Clarify the source of each of our objectives e.g.  
2 Supreme Court mandate, City Charter, City Code or City policy, and the  
3 relative priority of each objective in cases where they are mutually  
4 exclusive.

5 MR. ROBLES: I, I think it sounds great so far. I think  
6 the first recommendation mentioned in your motion is a bit ambiguous  
7 in terms of starting early. So, perhaps this Committee can agree on,  
8 maybe we're talking January or February, whatnot. This way, whoever's  
9 on the Council at that point in time, their version of - sure that  
10 their version of early is not August, right? Or September?

11 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, I agree with that. Okay. I'll amend it  
12 to, instead of saying far in advance of the next redistricting  
13 meeting, I'll just say January 2023? Does that work?

14 MR. ROBLES: Sure. That, that, that sounds okay to me.

15 MR. HENDEL: All right. So, that's the motion.

16 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I'm sorry, though, I should have called  
18 you out of order because we had another motion on the floor which was  
19 the adoption of a particular -

20 MR. HENDEL: That was ineligible because it was during  
21 another motion, right?

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Excuse me. Mr. Chair, Madam, Members of  
23 the Committee, just for clarification in aid of opening, in aid of a  
24 suggested motion. Two, two quick things. As I read Tucson Code,  
25 Chapter 10-A, Section - or Article 5, there is no limit - the, the



1 Mayor and Council is required by resolution to establish a committee  
2 in, in the years where it needs to establish a committee.

3           There is no limit on when they do that. So, I think it  
4 would be consistent with what you're saying about very early. The  
5 problem comes for the Committee in terms of timing comes only in any  
6 committee that's dealing with the second year after the census because  
7 that's when the State redistricts.

8           And so, that's when we get behind the eight ball on having  
9 things having to happen before this Committee can do anything, or  
10 Mayor and Council can form the Committee. Bottom line is in two years  
11 and in six years, this Committee can meet as early as you want in the  
12 year, and start doing these things, and isn't gonna be limited in the  
13 way you were. I hope that makes sense and I'll answer, answer any  
14 questions.

15           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you.

16           MR. HENDEL: So, don't really need to say make a separate  
17 task force. We can have it be the RAC.

18           MR. McLAUGHLIN: But, but I hasten to add, it could be  
19 whatever you want it to be. Whatever you want to recommend.

20           MR. HENDEL: Right.

21           MR. McLAUGHLIN: 'Cause it - you could also recommend a  
22 task force outside that time frame, if that makes sense.

23           MR. HENDEL: But if we're allowed to start as early as we  
24 want, we could just say, "Start the next Redistricting Advising  
25 Committee in 2023," right?

1 MS. ALVAREZ: If I could say - I just feel that there's  
2 something about trust here that has been broken. And I think that  
3 when people - I would speak for myself. I would love to participate  
4 as a citizen, as an advocate, as an activist in a study group with  
5 neighbors and community.

6 I am not looking forward to being a commissioner who's been  
7 appointed to that role in a process that it was difficult, convoluted  
8 and that distorted the priorities of the values of some of us sitting  
9 on this body.

10 But I would definitely think there's something more open  
11 about a task force and group of citizens studying and deliberating an  
12 issue before they're formally appointed as a commission which clearly  
13 was a process of appointment, political appointments. We won't deny  
14 that.

15 MS. DARLAND: Would it be poss- -- would it be appropriate  
16 to say when we say "as early as possible", to be no more than - or no  
17 later than 12 calendar months before the State redistricts? And would  
18 that keep us as least fluid enough that we take into consideration  
19 when the State's going to redistrict so that this work can get started  
20 well in advance of - or is that still just as muddy?

21 MR. HENDEL: Well, so, the State redistricts every ten  
22 years, but the City redistricts every four years, plus one additional  
23 after the census, right? And so, the, the four-year ones have a more  
24 flexible start date, which is any time you want. And the census ones

1 every ten years, you have - you basically have to wait until October,  
2 is that correct?

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, non-census years, they're every four  
4 years, redistricting is considered. They don't have to redistrict if  
5 the factors don't require it, for instance, MPD just as an example.

6 And then, the - when there is redistricting by census, we  
7 can, we can try to - I think we can try to start early, but we're not  
8 gonna have, really have data that is useful to us until a certain  
9 point in the process that we don't control. Is that, is that an  
10 accurate statement, Madam Clerk?

11 MS. MESICH: (Inaudible)

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Okay.

13 MR. HENDEL: So, in, in the off-years when it's not coming  
14 off a census, where does the data on population changes come from?

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Generally, annexations. And you can  
16 correct me, intermediate census, what I'll just call intermediate  
17 census data, -

18 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

19 MR. McLAUGHLIN: - or interim, or whatever. And to your  
20 colleague's question, there could be a start earlier than the current  
21 10-A says in a redistricting year, form a committee. Two things could  
22 happen.

23 They could amend and say, "Well, we're gonna potentially  
24 empower you to start earlier," or they could leave that alone and  
25 simply say, because they also have this power, to form ad hoc advisory

1 committees, for instance, the task force just to shorthand it - that  
2 could do this in a non-redistricting year. And you could start that  
3 anytime. I don't know if that helps.

4 MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Sir?

6 MR. JARAMILLO: Do we have to take into consideration also  
7 when the County does their redistricting?

8 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. And I think the County only  
9 redistricts every ten years.

10 MR. JARAMILLO: Every ten years as well? Is that right?

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Yeah. I don't think the County is any  
12 different from the State in terms of they do it when the census  
13 changes, when the official census, decennial census changes.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Thank you.

15 MS. MESICH: Mr. Chair, we have a motion on the floor.  
16 I did not hear a second.

17 MR. HENDEL: Well, am I allowed to amend it before it has a  
18 second, or no?

19 MS. MESICH: Sure.

20 MR. HENDEL: Okay. 'Cause I want to just amend it to be  
21 something we all agree to, even though maybe that's not the official  
22 Robert's Rules process.

23 But what if we say: Start engaging the public one year in  
24 advance of each redistricting deadline, either via the official  
25 Redistricting Advisory Committee, or a redistricting task force.

1 Would that work? I mean, 'cause it's just a recommendation. They're  
2 gonna do whatever they want, but -

3 MS. ALVAREZ: It works for me.

4 MR. HENDEL: Okay. (Inaudible) Okay.

5 MR. ROBLES: Second.

6 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Now does that make number two  
7 superfluous, identify the earliest possible start date and start the  
8 appointment process well in advance so the Committee can start meeting  
9 as soon as possible.

10 I guess we can leave that in there 'cause that might be a  
11 different committee. There might be a task force for January through  
12 October, and then a committee from October through November. So, I'll  
13 leave that in there.

14 Okay. So, I should like read the whole thing again, or  
15 type it on this laptop?

16 MS. MESICH: You have the transcript on, so -

17 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

18 MS. MESICH: - it will show on mine.

19 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Cool. So, I'm amending my own motion  
20 to read as follows: "I move that in our letter to Mayor and Council  
21 we request three things."

22 "1. Start engaging the public one year in advance of each  
23 redistricting deadline, either via the official Redistricting Advisory  
24 Committee, or a redistricting task force, starting the conversations

1 just a few months in advance of the deadline results in rightful  
2 frustration among both the Committee and the broader public.”

3 “2. Identify the earliest possible start for the official  
4 meetings of the 2024 Redistricting Advisory Committee, and start the  
5 appointment process well in advance of that date so that the Committee  
6 can start meeting as soon as legally allowed.”

7 “3. Clarify the source of each of our objectives, e.g., Supreme  
8 Court mandate, City Charter, City Code or City policy, and the  
9 relative priority of each objective in cases where they are mutually  
10 exclusive.”

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Now shall we in, in that third point, shall  
12 we include a specific part that says - that’s asking the Council, that  
13 this is a duty of the Council to direct Staff to review the six  
14 policies, their origin and their priority?

15 MR. HENDEL: That’s I intended it to say.

16 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

17 MR. HENDEL: Did anybody second that?

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Discussion? Hearing none, all in favor  
20 of the motion and second?

21 (Affirmative.)

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: It’s unanimous. Thank you. Now just to  
23 close one other item that was - came up in our very first meeting,  
24 because I don’t want somebody coming up and saying, “Oh, what happened  
25 to this, ‘cause I remember.” I - this is what I wrote at the time.

1           “The Committee also discussed at length various options  
2 which could create a desi- -- designate another minority ward within  
3 the boundaries of the existing six wards. While the Committee’s  
4 efforts were not successful at the time -,” and we spent about a half  
5 an hour figuring out how to do - how we could do it, did not.

6           “The Committee thought it important, nonetheless, for the  
7 Mayor and Council to be formally involved in a continu- -- in  
8 continuing the discussion of this matter.”

9           “Accordingly, the Committee is, is requesting that the City  
10 Clerk report to the Mayor and Council not less than once annually the  
11 changing and shifting populations, along with the attendant map or  
12 maps which would drive consideration of the creation of an additional  
13 minority ward.” Is that still something that three of you were  
14 interested in at the time?

15           MR. HENDEL: It’s, it’s something that I’m, I’m willing to  
16 support adding to our recommendation to the Council. I’d also like to  
17 add language in there, entertain - that entertains, and I’ll formally  
18 put this together, but I’d like to add language in there that  
19 entertains and looks at how - right now, it’s roughly 90,000 per ward.  
20 You got cities like Chicago, Boston, who got 50K people per, per ward,  
21 or district, or however they label their, their areas.

22           And I’m assuming that by the end of this decade, by the  
23 middle of this decade, we’re not gonna have just 90,000 people roughly  
24 per each ward. It’s gonna go up, and I think it’s, it’s in the best  
25 interests of equitable representation and, and sustain the leadership

1 that we have, conversations that add not just a third minority-  
2 majority ward, but ideally, two more wards.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, and, and I also added, finally  
4 after the initial one, finally adding an additional - oops, here it  
5 is. (Mumbling.) Finally adding an additional ward was mentioned with  
6 the understanding that an additional ward to the six that we have now,  
7 a seventh ward, understanding that approval would require a Charter  
8 change, and there- -- and therefore, approval by the voting public.

9 And I'm so happy in terms of the original motion, the  
10 motion that was just passed saying: Let's start on this early because  
11 if you wait until you say: "Okay, we got the population," it could  
12 take two or three years later before it actually appears. And so you,  
13 -

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Uh-huh.

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - if you're really interested, people  
16 need to start on this really early, -

17 MR. JARAMILLO: Uh-huh.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - because it's not just about  
19 definitions and things like that. It's changing people's opinions and  
20 emotions, or validating them as well.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: Chairman Crum and Madam Clerk, I believe when  
22 you prepare the memo looking at the, the, the template you gave us,  
23 you actually explain in Section 2 the options considered by the  
24 Committee. So, at one point, you will say there that you gave us two  
25 maps, Rough Proportionality Map 1 and Map 2.



1           And it should reflect that we, we like those maps in that  
2 they achieve rough proportionality and they also achieve MPD. But we  
3 recognize that at this time, the sentiment of the public and the - it  
4 just was not aligned to do such a major disruption in that I believe  
5 for the record we need to say we understand that a major disruption  
6 may be necessary in the future, as the population changes, to  
7 accomplish these things.

8           But to get there, and push that at this time would just -  
9 we, none of felt that it was tenable to do that, but that we did  
10 consider those maps. I think that will be reflected in that memo  
11 because the way of you, the way that you gave us the template. But if  
12 we can also add a little bit of comment there as to the reason why we  
13 thought that we rejected it.

14           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yeah. But I'm not certain we achieved  
15 rough, rough proportionality citywide.

16           MR. HENDEL: Yes. Just to clarify the record. We, we  
17 never had a map that achieved rough proportionality and was below 10%  
18 MPD.

19           MS. ALVAREZ: Yeah. We, we have it here.

20           MR. HENDEL: What map was that?

21           MS. ALVAREZ: This is Rough Proportionality Map 1, had MPD  
22 as 6.4. Rough Proportionality Map 2 at 5 points.

23           MR. HENDEL: Okay. I stand corrected. Thank you.

24           MS. DARLAND: In my review of that -

25           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: However, I'm looking at Proposal 2-C.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: No, not - those were others (inaudible)

2 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: What was the date? Yeah.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Those were sugg- -- those were given to us  
6 for the November 8<sup>th</sup> meeting, I think. November 10<sup>th</sup>, uh-huh.

7 MS. DARLAND: Well, at to that point, you know, while the  
8 maps are no longer a consideration, it, it created, I believe, from  
9 just even visually, what I could only imagine a great deal of even  
10 more voter confusion, which is one of the objectives that we're trying  
11 to avoid.

12 So, to your earlier point, and the genesis of, you know,  
13 the third point of the motion to help us avoid this, almost needs to  
14 start with a map that doesn't have any of the wards drawn, and redraw  
15 from there in a, in a hypothetical setting, so that, you know, not  
16 knowing, of course, that it's not necessarily something that's - just  
17 to look at what that would like and what that would take to get to the  
18 ideal as, as hopefully in the future articulated through the  
19 prioritization of the various different objectives in the, in the  
20 code.

21 MS. ALVAREZ: It's such an interesting proposal. The fact  
22 that if the, if the public was invited to a participatory process that  
23 had no color of wards, they could still advise on your graphical  
24 attachments and say, "Come on. This is the west side," and not have  
25 any colors.

1           And then, from there, they, themselves, will be challenged  
2 to say, "Okay. But then I think these could be a little bit more  
3 central. These could be a little bit more south. These could be a  
4 little bit more north," but we (inaudible) the wards starting  
5 essentially from scratch.

6           Even if that eventually leads nowhere, seems to me like at  
7 some point in the process of democracy and deliberation, it could be  
8 very liberating, and really instructive for people to play with that  
9 exercise.

10           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Now are we ready to get back to  
11 recommending a proposal to the Mayor and Council? And do you have a  
12 motion which recommended -

13           MR. JARAMILLO: Yes. I motion that we recommend Proposal  
14 2-C to Mayor and Council.

15           MR. HENDEL: Second.

16           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. So, it's - motion has been made  
17 and seconded. Discussion?

18           MR. ROBLES: Well, Proposal 2-A by my colleague, excuse me.  
19 Proposal 2-A by my colleague, Proposal 2-A, excuse me. It's been a  
20 long day. Thank you.

21           Yes. So, so, earlier this evening, my colleague mentioned  
22 how we had folks within Precinct 47 and 244 speak out against Proposal  
23 2-A at the last meeting. And that's now just justifying not moving  
24 Proposal 2-A forward.

1 But at tonight's meeting, we had community members from  
2 Precinct 45 come forward and speak out against Proposal 2-C. So, I  
3 would just like to know like how, how far are we willing to go in, in  
4 utilizing public comments in determining which map we choose to move  
5 forward with because both, both maps have people publicly opposing and  
6 coming to, to, to our meetings and speaking out against this.

7 MR. HENDEL: Can I, can I make a point? I, I'm not - so,  
8 2-A, we, we got a good number of complaints via e-mail, and, and at  
9 the last public hearing against 2-A specifically because of Precincts  
10 47 and 244.

11 There must have been at least 10 or 15 total people between  
12 the e-mails and that meeting. We have maybe one person speaking out  
13 against 2-C, although that person, I believe, is from Armory Park, and  
14 we're not moving Armory. And their ask at the first public hearing  
15 was to not move Armory Park from Ward 6 into Ward 1.

16 I believe the gentleman tonight said neither Map 2-A nor 2-  
17 C is ideal which - fair enough. But I think we have - if we're not  
18 moving Armory Park, seems like the amount of public resistance to Map  
19 2-C is pretty minimal, whereas, 2-A has quite a bit of opposition.  
20 So, if we're just measuring the magnitude, I don't think it's  
21 particularly close.

22 MR. ROBLES: Well, and if we're just - if we're measuring  
23 magnitude in general, you, you just mentioned we had 15 people come  
24 forward. I think there's more than 15 people that live in Precinct 47  
25 and 244.

1           So, I'm not sure if this perspective is the healthy way  
2 forward. I think either way, we're going to have to move forward with  
3 upsetting folks. And if it's between 15 and two people, neither of  
4 those numbers are, I don't - I believe, are reflective of the  
5 community at hand.

6           MR. HENDEL: I actually think we've heard quite a bit from  
7 47 and 244, from people who represent the communities. Didn't we hear  
8 from the leaders of neighborhood coalitions there who do represent  
9 like hundreds of people?

10           I mean we can't really expect thousands of people to show  
11 up. These people have lives and jobs and things going on. In fact,  
12 my understanding is that some people found out kind of late in the  
13 process about this idea because the whole thing has been so rushed.

14           And, you know, people in low-income communities often have  
15 two jobs. They don't subscribe to their City counselors' newsletters  
16 and they might, you know, have some other stuff going on. They don't  
17 really hear about it 'til the last minute. So, I actually think the  
18 amount of representation that we saw is pretty substantial from those  
19 two.

20           MR. ROBLES: And in addition to that, Proposal 2-C has a  
21 deviation - has a negative deviation for Ward 1. We're, we're at  
22 85,000, and in Proposal 2-A, we're at least moving up to 89,000  
23 residents. I believe the Council Member from Ward 1, Council Member  
24 Santa Cruz, would not agree with our population remaining stagnant  
25 compared to other wards in the city.

1           We, we want to make sure that we have each ward at a level  
2 playing field and, and I don't believe 2-C does that. And 2-C does -  
3 and it seems like we only have - we have Proposal 2-C because we have  
4 the least amount of folks speaking out against that. And I don't  
5 think that we should use that as our sole purpose as moving forward  
6 with this.

7           MR. JARAMILLO: Chairman Crum?

8           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

9           MR. JARAMILLO: By moving forward with a recommendation  
10 that we made earlier to City and Council, this would be kind of a - of  
11 an issue that would be handled in the future to make, to (inaudible)  
12 being transparent and informational.

13           So, if and when the people of the community, community  
14 members meet to discuss this, this is the kind of issues that they'll  
15 have to discuss. I think that's important. I, I still recommend that  
16 2-C is probably the ideal way to go to date. I'm not saying it's the  
17 best thing for the future, to date.

18           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: My, my primary heartache is with the,  
19 the Mayor and Council. 2-A, the MPD is 2.96%. 2-C is 9.38%. So,  
20 about .3% close to what the Supreme Court will say, "This is bad."

21           So, I'm looking at it and we're saying - I'm saying: We're  
22 kicking the can down the road. The only difference is the normal road  
23 is way out there. We can see the end of the road.

24           MR. JARAMILLO: Uh-huh.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: When it's 9.8%, we know the end of the  
2 road is pretty close to us. And the end of the road, it has concrete  
3 and asphalt in it, and the Supreme Court is gonna say: Remove some of  
4 it, and we don't have a choice, and we have - and it has to happen.

5 Oh, okay. Let me finish, though. So, we're - we know  
6 where the end of the road is. We need to remove it and we're telling  
7 the Mayor and Council: Go ahead and take this one, but we know in  
8 potentially one or two years, we're gonna be exceeding potentially  
9 that 10%. And that's what gives me the heartache mostly is if my  
10 Council Member's saying, "Well, Steve, you're screwed."

11 And I don't - and I, and I have problems doing that, quite  
12 frankly. But I necessarily don't have a problem with 2-C other than  
13 we're so close to reaching that max (inaudible)

14 That's, that's something else to start out early on is  
15 saying: What precincts can we move where we're not going to get any,  
16 anyone who says, "No, I don't want you moving it."

17 And if the same thing happens this time around, next time  
18 around, it's gonna be bad because that stuff at the end of the road is  
19 only gonna be higher. We can't negotiate population, or analyze  
20 population. Okay. That's it for me. And Mr. (Inaudible)? Yes, sir,  
21 Mr. (Inaudible), you have something to say?

22 MR. (INAUDIBLE): Yeah. Thank you very much. I've been,  
23 I've been quietly listening and, and I think that what my ward is in  
24 the position of saying is that we really just need to get 2-A and 2-C

1 to the Mayor and Council. They're, they're gonna make a decision  
2 regardless of, of what we say, and whatever we recommend.

3 I, I think we're bending ourselves into mental pretzels  
4 trying to figure this out. And so, we should give both  
5 recommendations to them, but then also give them our rationale behind  
6 each recommendation, and really just help them decide. I mean that's  
7 our charge anyway, right? That's all I really wanted to say. Thank  
8 you.

9 MR. HENDEL: So, I've been thinking about MPD a lot. And  
10 one point I noticed is that nowhere does it say we have to minimize  
11 it. It just says it has to be below 10%. So, the reason to minimize  
12 it further would be so that it's not kicking the can, so that we can  
13 keep this map for ten years before we have to redo it.

14 But given what we just said in the motion that passed a few  
15 minutes ago, we're gonna be thinking about some bigger picture ideas,  
16 maybe moving towards rough proportionality. I don't think anyone's  
17 gonna say, "Oh, well, now 2-A is so fantastic, let's just keep it for  
18 ten years."

19 Like they're going to want to make more changes next time  
20 around. We're in a lucky position that there's only two years between  
21 this and the next meeting. So, we can afford to kind of kick the can  
22 down the road for two years while being very clear that we want to  
23 start the next process as early as possible.

24 I personally think that would be the best way to do this,  
25 and I, I don't really like the idea of saying, "Well, let's just throw



1 47 and 244 under the bus and everyone else who complained, you got  
2 exactly your way. But those two who complained. Sorry. We're  
3 throwing you under so that we can minimize MPD even further."

4 Like that's not really a - that's not even one of the goals  
5 of the Committee.

6 So, in an ideal world, I don't love the idea of kicking the  
7 can, but we're gonna be redoing this in two years anyway. So, let's  
8 try to have as little disruption and, and not throw these precincts  
9 under the bus who may have just found out a couple day ago, or a week  
10 ago that we're doing this. And so, I would - that's why I support 2-C  
11 and not 2-A. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Any further discussion?

13 MR. ROBLES: Are we really so sure that the folks in  
14 Precinct 275 know that, that they may be moving to Ward 5 from Ward 4?  
15 I mean it's - again, I feel like there are, there's some, some, some  
16 fallacies in our arguments this evening. Kicking the can down the  
17 road. Well, why not now? Well, kicking the can down the road. Not  
18 now. Let's do it later. Why not now?

19 I mean, I get that there have been some issues in terms of  
20 public engagement. But I would - if I'm a betting man, I would bet  
21 that these very issues plagued the Committee two years ago. Folks  
22 wanting to wait two years later. Here we are, two years later, -

23 MR. HENDEL: Was it (inaudible)

24 MR. ROBLES: (Inaudible) two years later?

1 MR. HENDEL: Well, the difference is that this time we're  
2 gonna start the process a year in advance instead of month in advance.  
3 So, we'll have more time to figure out who opposes what. And there  
4 won't be any issues of people being surprised at the last second,  
5 unable to show up at the hearing because they're, they're working  
6 their second job, you know?

7 And as for 275, I mean that's been on the table since the  
8 very beginning, I think. And we haven't heard a single comment on it  
9 in five weeks? However long we've been doing this. So, I feel, I  
10 feel more comfortable about moving 275 than I do about the ones that  
11 were proposed much more recently.

12 MS. DARLAND: Well, -

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Any further discussion on the -

14 MS. DARLAND: Yes. The, the question - the one thing that  
15 I think is really important. We, we just passed a, a motion with  
16 three recommendations. The Mayor and Council have not accepted those.

17 So, to assume that 2-C gets to be revisited January of next  
18 year, we can start that process earlier, assumes a vote that has not  
19 yet been taken by Mayor and Council as to whether or not they want to  
20 adopt that recommendation.

21 So, to the point that our colleague in Ward 4 made with  
22 respect to both proposals going before Mayor and Council for  
23 consideration, I would almost - and I don't like that much at all  
24 because my concern with 2-C is the fact that one ward is seeing a  
25 substantial decrease compared to the other.

1           And 5,000 might not be much, but it does concern me a  
2 little bit when we are talking about one of the two minority-majority  
3 districts losing voters, and seeing the proportionality spike upward.

4           I guess that concerns me. But to that point, I would be  
5 more inclined to - I don't know if the proposer of the amendment, or  
6 I'm sorry. Of the motion would be willing to accept a friendly  
7 amendment to consider our, our colleague in Ward 4's recommendation  
8 that both proposals go forward for Mayor and Council.

9           And then, whichever way they should decide on the previous  
10 successful motion with respect to the three recommendations would gui-  
11 -- could guide which proposal they choose to move forward with.

12           MR. HENDEL: I, I respect that idea. I don't want to  
13 accept it as a friendly amendment, but we could vote on a regular  
14 amendment.

15           I do just want to clarify for the record, though. We've  
16 been hearing about Ward 1 losing numbers. That's - people are saying  
17 relative to the other proposal, it's losing numbers, quote, unquote.  
18 But they would actually be gaining population under either one of our  
19 proposals. Both of our proposals increase the size of Ward 1 relative  
20 to where it is now. So, I just want to clarify that.

21           It is true that one of our proposals grows Ward 1 by more  
22 than the other one does. But it's important to note that they both  
23 grow Ward 1.

24           MR. ROBLES: The Ward 1 population, I believe, grows by  
25 1,000. So, I mean I just - I'm not - I don't think I'm willing to

1 accept an argument that says: Let's keep Ward 1 as the low- -- as the  
2 ward with the lowest amount of folks, as compared to the other wards  
3 because Ward C (sic) causes - I mean, excuse me. Proposal C causes  
4 minimum amount of disruption. The act of redistricting is disrupting.  
5 I mean, what we're doing, it's, it's every year. That's why we have  
6 people come to this Commission and speak during Call to the Public.  
7 So, you know, I think we can go back and forth all night.

8 I'm, I'm willing to, to, to contemplate the idea of  
9 including two proposals as a recommendation to the Mayor and Council  
10 because at the end of the day, I mean we could say all we want and,  
11 but we, we don't make the decision. I'm in- -- I'm interested in how  
12 the rest of our colleagues feel.

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Are we ready to vote?

14 MR. ALVAREZ: Made the motion - Mr. Jaramillo made the  
15 motion to proceed with Proposal 2-C.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Now hearing no objection, okay?

17 MR. ROBLES: If - I would like to - I make an amendment to  
18 this motion to include Map 2-A, that we move forward with Maps 2-A and  
19 2-C as the recommendation. Did I abide by Robert's Rules of Order?

20 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is that acceptable to the maker of the  
21 motion, as well as the seconder?

22 MR. JARAMILLO: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: And, and I'll tell you why. You know,  
25 we're looking at the MPD; MPD for 2-A,.96. Whereas, 2-C will take us

1 to 9.8, closer to the, closer to the (inaudible) recommendation that  
2 they made. So, that's, that's why.

3 And then, there'll be future committees that with the  
4 growth of the popu- -- population, so they can study this. And at  
5 that time, help them make the decision.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: But even at that point, and this is me  
7 speaking for my ward as well, by the way, would be two years later,  
8 would be - we'd be even more or less excited to give up a precinct?  
9 And right now, I don't, I don't see these folks willing to give up any  
10 of their precincts, being a whole precinct or being a split precinct.

11 MR. AITKEN: Mr. Chair?

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

13 MR. AITKEN: I'm, I'm troubled by not wanting to offer  
14 Mayor and Council flexibility. I, I think - I, I can think of a  
15 couple of reasons why it's critical to do so.

16 One. You know, if, if we don't give Mayor and Council  
17 flexibility and options, we're, we're painting them into a box. So,  
18 what happens if they don't like it? The option, the, the singular  
19 option that we, we provide for them.

20 And further, since we are gonna be doing this again in a  
21 couple of years, we can illustrate that one of these two options  
22 potentially provides greater growth and flexibility so that, you know,  
23 if there need to be changes down the line, they don't have to go  
24 through as much difficult change and consternation in order to, to  
25 satisfy the redistricting requirements, if we give them two options

1 that potentially create more flexibility. So, I, I, I think it's a  
2 bit myopic and short-sighted to only advance one, one option to Mayor  
3 and Council.

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, currently, if we vote, it's either  
5 for against 2-C, correct? That's a motion. Are we ready to vote?  
6 Roll call.

7 MS. MESICH: Mr. Aitken?

8 MR. AITKEN: No.

9 MS. MESICH: Dr. Alvarez?

10 MS. ALVAREZ: Yes.

11 MS. MESICH: Mr. Crum?

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: No.

13 MS. MESICH: Ms. Darland?

14 MS. DARLAND: No.

15 MS. MESICH: Mr. Hendel?

16 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

17 MS. MESICH: Mr. Jaramillo?

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes.

19 MS. MESICH: Mr. Robles?

20 MR. ROBLES: No.

21 MS. MESICH: Motion fails four to three.

22 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I'd like to make a motion that we  
23 include in our letter to Mayor and Council that they do not move  
24 Precinct 37. And the reason - I'll, I'll expand on that during  
25 discussion.

1 MR. ROBLES: 37 or 47?

2 MR. HENDEL: 37.

3 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: But does - what is (inaudible)

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I'll, I'll expand on it now. Because  
6 in our letter to Mayor and Council, it's just gonna be one document  
7 that they'll read, and as Mr. Aitken pointed out, they, they, you  
8 know, might not like what they see. They might want to think about  
9 other options.

10 And, you know, they're pretty busy. They might not have  
11 the time to read the Legal Action Report and Minutes of our previous  
12 meeting where we all unanimously voted to kill the map that moved  
13 Precinct 37.

14 They might not know that that happened. I think we should  
15 include that in the document so that if, so that if they want to  
16 change what we recommend, they know that we already studied that and  
17 rejected it unanimously.

18 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum, Madam Clerk. Does Mayor and  
19 Council have the ability to look at our map and then redraw the whole  
20 thing?

21 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee. Yes,  
22 they could. It's - they, they have to consider your recommendation.  
23 They do not have to follow your recommendation.

24 MR. ROBLES: Okay. Thank you.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: I, I, I feel strongly that we should not  
2 single out any single precinct as a matter of, of our letter. I mean  
3 if we did that, we will, we will open Pandora's Box for almost every  
4 other precinct that has been contested here. What are we gonna  
5 mention? Don't move Armory Park?

6 And, and some of these things, remember, we already  
7 accepted the premise that some of these things are emotionally valid,  
8 but irrational when it comes to the distinction between a street and  
9 (inaudible) including, by the way, which I have no quarrels with  
10 saying, some of those distinctions on 47, which is essentially, when  
11 you're there, Mr. Jaramillo, when you're visiting 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, 12<sup>th</sup>  
12 Avenue, you, you are in the neighborhoods -

13 MR. JARAMILLO: Uh-huh.

14 MS. ALVAREZ: - in a porous way on the south side. The  
15 fact that folks are attached to this ward coming through this street,  
16 and that street, it, it's, it's so granular, that if we mention that,  
17 37, then we'll have to mention 47. Then we'll have to mention -

18 MR. HENDEL: There's a key distinction here. We already  
19 voted on this. In, in the Legal Action Report from last session, it  
20 says it was moved, seconded and carried by a voice vote of seven to  
21 zero to eliminate Map 2-B, and that Precinct 37 be excluded from  
22 redistricting consideration.

23 All I'm suggesting is that we put that sentence from the  
24 Legal Action Report into our letter so that they know that that  
25 happened. It did happen. We, we, we're not changing our vote on



1 that. I just want them to know that we did that so that they don't  
2 try to go back to that as an option.

3 MS. DARLAND: Well, to that point, I would imagine that  
4 that would be summarized in the, in the second section of the letter  
5 that kind of summarizes the various different plans and proposals and  
6 why they were rejected. And to the point of Dr. Alvarez, I, I also  
7 agree with that, because then we're - I mean, I am also concerned that  
8 when - two things.

9 First of all, I mean, we've got a number of splits that all  
10 of a sudden have been - and they've been made splits because of  
11 previous conversations around the contesting of moving these folks  
12 into - not even really moving people.

13 It's not - it's a physical - it's not even a physical thing  
14 that happens. But by reassigning precincts to other wards create a  
15 conversation consternation and then we have a split.

16 And so, if we're going - then we start to, basically, if we  
17 say it can't be considered, I, I wonder what the ramification is from,  
18 again, the one prevailing motion that we have which is for a really  
19 robust and thoughtful community conversation over what this could look  
20 like if we single out these sacred areas within our community? What's  
21 the point of the prevailing motion that we've already passed?

22 We've, we've basically said, "Here's what we want you to  
23 do. We want you to do something really monumental and take a really  
24 bold step and a, and a courageous step in taking, and engaging the  
25 community in a really big and, and meaningful conversation. Oh, but

1 don't include this precinct and preserve these splits." We've done  
2 nothing here. We've just - we, we really haven't.

3 MR. HENDEL: It, it's just the, the reason is we put them,  
4 we put them through this two years ago. We put them through it again  
5 last - two weeks ago. And I just want to make sure that the Mayor and  
6 Council know that they should not do it a third time because the same  
7 thing will happen.

8 I mean, maybe this doesn't have to be a motion. I guess  
9 I'll ask the Staff, is that vote gonna go in the final letter anyway?  
10 Maybe we don't even have to vote on this, 'cause we voted on it last  
11 time.

12 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Before we proceed any further, is there  
13 a second to the - a second to going with (inaudible)

14 MR. HENDEL: The motion was to include in our letter that  
15 at the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, we voted seven-zero to not move Precinct  
16 37. We don't -

17 MS. MESICH: So, I'm advised -

18 MR. HENDEL: You guys don't even want to tell them we did  
19 that?

20 MS. MESICH: I'm advised that we do not need to do that by  
21 motion; that that will be part of the proceedings that are in Section  
22 2 of the recommendation. You will have to vote on the recommendation  
23 and what might - I, I don't know if you prefer to go through the  
24 recommendation now, and kind of list what you want included so that we  
25 can get a draft to you.

1 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

2 MS. MESICH: Because what I'm foreseeing, Staff can correct  
3 me if I'm wrong, we will be drafting it with the understanding that  
4 you have approved what we're going to draft and you're going to sign  
5 it electronically. There can't be another meeting unless you call or  
6 agree to meet, you agree to meet tomorrow.

7 MR. HENDEL: So, I guess I'll just ask Staff. Are all of  
8 our previous - the, the maps that we rejected and the votes that we've  
9 taken in the past, will that be in the final letter to Mayor and  
10 Council?

11 MS. MESICH: It will if you tell us that's part of your  
12 recommendation, yes.

13 MR. HENDEL: Okay. So, that's kind of what I'm trying to  
14 do here. I guess I'll broaden it. I move that we include a brief  
15 summary of all of the maps that we voted to reject, and why in the  
16 letter.

17 MS. DARLAND: Yes, to that point, in the draft that was  
18 circulated, it does state on the second page. It does say at its  
19 November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting, it goes over the proposals that were (inaudible)  
20 before. And then the second, the last paragraph is both proposals  
21 were put forward at the public hearing.

22 The Committee, Committee also voted to show all previous  
23 studies as rejected. Well, actually I'm sorry. I take back my  
24 comment. November 17 isn't - actually, we don't have a notation  
25 there. So, I, I reject (inaudible)

1 MR. HENDEL: Right. That's, that's what I'm saying.

2 MS. DARLAND: No, I hear what you're saying. My apologies.

3 MR. HENDEL: In the paragraph that starts, "At its November  
4 17<sup>th</sup> meeting and public hearing, comma -, " there's no end of the  
5 sentence because you're gonna fill that in later.

6 All I'm saying is that we put in that spot that we voted  
7 seven-nothing not to move Precinct 37. That shouldn't have to be a  
8 controversial thing.

9 MS. ALVAREZ: Mr. Hendel, if, if I were to be a conspiracy  
10 theorist, which I'm not, I would be so intrigued by why you find so  
11 absolutely necessary to ensure that Precinct 37 never makes it to Ward  
12 3. I mean what's -

13 MR. HENDEL: Because we tried to -

14 MS. ALVAREZ: - the logic there?

15 MR. HENDEL: Because we tried to do that two years ago, and  
16 they -

17 MR. JARAMILLO: Chair Crum?

18 MR. HENDEL: - made protests and convinced Mayor and  
19 Council not to do it.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: If I also -

21 MR. HENDEL: We, we unadv- -- excuse me. I have the floor.  
22 We unadvisedly did it again at the previous meeting, and they made the  
23 same protests as last time. We should stop doing this to people that  
24 have already made their thoughts very clear.

1           This shouldn't be controversial. All the other ones are in  
2 there already. I'm just saying we should put in there what we voted  
3 on.

4           MS. ALVAREZ: Transparency here, the transparency here is  
5 that -

6           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: You're out of order.

7           MS. ALVAREZ: - Precinct 37 becomes your single focus here  
8 (inaudible)

9           MR. HENDEL: We voted on it. There was a vote. You voted  
10 "yes" -

11          MS. ALVAREZ: I voted (inaudible)

12          MR. HENDEL: - not to move Precinct 37.

13          MS. ALVAREZ: Not in the context of forever. If you raise  
14 (inaudible)

15          MR. HENDEL: The motion specifically says not to move 37,  
16 and we all voted for it.

17          MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum?

18          CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

19          MR. ROBLES: So, Precinct 37 today, are we considering  
20 Precinct 82 now as well? Because we had a lot of folks come up to our  
21 second meeting, our third meeting. I mean it's, it's - this is, I  
22 think we're setting a precedent that is unhealthy for this Committee  
23 two to four years from now.

24                 And if we're talking about moving this city forward, we're  
25 gonna have to consider precincts all over town, and we're gonna

1 emotions involved. We're gonna have neighbors involved, and if it's,  
2 if it's Precinct 37, next Precinct 82, what about Precinct 129? I  
3 mean we're just -

4 MR. HENDEL: Because the motion was to say never in the  
5 entire future of Tucson are we gonna touch 37. That's not the motion.  
6 The motion is to say that last meeting, we voted seven-nothing not to  
7 move 37 at this redistricting session. That happened. We all voted  
8 for it.

9 MS. DARLAND: Understood. But that was also the proposal  
10 as a whole. So, I think that that - and there were other, there were  
11 other pieces of that proposal. 37, yes, absolutely one of them.

12 But I think that it - I think that, I think that we want to  
13 be thoughtful that we rejected other proposals because I believe the  
14 split in 82 was discussed. And so, -

15 MS. ALVAREZ: That is correct.

16 MS. DARLAND: So, I want to - I certainly want to -

17 MR. HENDEL: In the Legal Action Report, it says that we  
18 voted seven-nothing, quote, "To eliminate 2-B as an option, and that  
19 Precinct 37 be excluded from redistricting consideration."

20 Now we debate whether the legal action report is correct,  
21 but that was the motion. It specified 37, it singled it out, and we  
22 all voted "yes".

23 MS. ALVAREZ: I believe that it referred to the proposal at  
24 hand, not to the entire process of redistricting that Council and  
25 Mayor have authority over.

1 MR. HENDEL: But isn't the reason we voted to kill 2-B  
2 because 37 packed the house and we all agreed that we shouldn't move  
3 it? Is that not why we all voted "yes"? That was clearly why.

4 MS. ALVAREZ: That's not clearly why.

5 MS. DARLAND: I, I -

6 MS. ALVAREZ: That, that goes to the ratio among many  
7 others.

8 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: If -

9 MS. DARLAND: I -

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: If, if, if I may, just in a spirit of  
11 compromise, as it relates to Precinct 45. That was Armory Park and  
12 Barrio Historico and that particular split. My Council Member is not  
13 particularly tied to one proposal or the other. So, Precinct 45 could  
14 also be under 2-A if you so wanted it.

15 Right now, Proposal 2-A does not contain 45. Just so you  
16 know, if you want to put 45, my Council Member doesn't mind giving up  
17 that split portion to Ward 1 or Ward 5 or whatever.

18 MS. DARLAND: Mr. Chair, may I ask a question of the Staff  
19 quickly? I'm sorry. With respect to the Legal Action Report, I do  
20 understand those are all also provided to Mayor and Council as well,  
21 alongside with the letter of recommendation.

22 So, all action relative to the vote and such are also  
23 available and provided to Mayor and Council as well in the final  
24 package, or -

1 MS. MESICH: If you would like us to be - LAR's, the Legal  
2 Action Reports, aren't currently listed as an attachment, but we can  
3 certainly do that.

4 MS. DARLAND: No. I, I was just making sure that it was  
5 actually part of the report. And I think that I - I'm, I'm sorry.  
6 The lateness of the hour - it's not very late, but I'm not as young as  
7 I used to be.

8 But I, but my - I think that we're - I understand  
9 stipulating is part of the record. The fact that it was rejected was  
10 one thing, but what I misun- -- I think what I initially heard in the  
11 initial making of the motion was basically to direct Mayor and Council  
12 to not consider it.

13 So, maybe I misunderstood the motion as not necessarily  
14 noting for the record what transpired on the 17<sup>th</sup>, but rather was  
15 giving direction to Mayor and Council to eliminate from consideration  
16 a potential move of any precinct that may have been considered in a  
17 previous proposal, but more specifically, 37.

18 MR. AITKEN: Mr. Chair? This is Jon Aitken. May I speak?

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes. Go for it.

20 MR. AITKEN: (Inaudible) I just - I, I, I see you guys on  
21 a small screen, so, I'm not sure if you're signaling me or not. But  
22 the, the Mayor and Council, they receive all the Minutes. They  
23 receive all of the information that we have.

24 I, I don't know that there's a need to provide additional  
25 information and inundate their In Box with more stuff because



1 presumably this is such an important topic, they will have done all  
2 their homework prior to getting our, our recommendation.

3           So, I'm just, I'm just putting that out there that they're  
4 probably well aware of all the stuff that we, we are, are talking  
5 about. And, you know, the LAR's will be in the Mayor and Council  
6 materials for the sixth meeting anyway. So, I, I just don't know that  
7 there's a need for additional stuff.

8           And may I also just procedurally ask? I, I think I got a  
9 little bit lost. Where - what is the current motion on the table?  
10 What, what, what is the - I, I don't even what the current motion is  
11 right now.

12           MS. MESICH: The current motion is to include a brief  
13 summary of all the maps that you voted to reject and why. And  
14 specifically containing the sentence from the LAR that you voted seven  
15 to zero not to move Precinct 37 and to remove it from consideration.  
16 I have not heard a second to that motion.

17           MR. AITKEN: Which, which is information that they already  
18 have anyway. So, it doesn't need to be included.

19           MR. HENDEL: I'm just concerned they're not gonna have time  
20 to comb through all the Legal Action Reports, but I mean -

21           MR. AITKEN: I, I wouldn't be concerned about it because  
22 this is such an important high-level topic with such high visibility  
23 and such public - yeah. I, I just - I, I, I wouldn't be concerned  
24 (inaudible)

1 I mean listen, with my eight years on the school board  
2 anytime a topic of this high visibility comes to us, we're poring  
3 through every single sentence that comes to our In Box, or Minutes or  
4 whatever. So, I - respectfully, I wouldn't be concerned that they're  
5 not gonna have time to read it.

6 MS. ALVAREZ: I would also like to say that the scope, the  
7 global scope to which Mr. Hendel refers to, was not the intent, in my  
8 interpretation, of that vote. It simply said that it will not be  
9 considered in the process of generating a new map because it would  
10 have led us to yet one more impasse.

11 But it, it's preposterous to suggest that any precinct will  
12 not be under consideration by the Council and Mayor under any larger  
13 consideration of redistricting at all. In the particular motion that  
14 we took, it made sense because we were rejecting Map 2-B, and we were  
15 saying in the next map that we create, Map 2-C, or D, or E, let's not  
16 go down that road again.

17 But the, the fact that we would make a statement that would  
18 be so globally scoped as to limit Mayor and Council consideration of  
19 any precinct seems to me that is beyond our, even our mandate here.  
20 That's not our job. (Inaudible)

21 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second to the motion so we  
22 can continue discussion?

23 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I withdraw the motion but, but it will  
24 be in the letter that we voted to reject Map 2-B, and it will explain  
25 that Map 2-B differed from Map 2-A only in that it moved 37, correct?

1 That we don't have to vote on that? That's already gonna happen, is  
2 that correct?

3 MS. MESICH: We'll go back and listen to the recording and  
4 transcribe the motion as it was voted on.

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, right now, we don't have a  
6 recommendation for the Mayor and Council to consider.

7 MR. ROBLES: Chair Crum. I would like to make a motion  
8 that the Redistricting Advisory Committee moves forward with  
9 recommending Proposal 2-A to Mayor and Council.

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second to that motion  
11 recommending 2-A?

12 MS. DARLAND: Is now an appropriate time to request that we  
13 would be amenable to a friendly amendment, amendment?

14 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: (Inaudible)

15 MS. DARLAND: Because I do - I, I would like to see two  
16 proposals, you know, for consideration. I do understand, and I'm  
17 sympathetic to constraining the Mayor and Council to only one proposal  
18 for consideration. Especially considering in a previously prevailing  
19 motion, and how that could be (inaudible) Would you be willing to  
20 consider adding both 2-C and 2-A?

21 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

22 MS. ALVAREZ: Are you amending the motion?

23 MR. ROBLES: Yes. So, with, with that being said, I would  
24 like to make a motion that we move forward with Proposals 2-A, and 2-C

1 as the official recommendation by the Redistricting Advisory Committee  
2 to Mayor and Council.

3 MR. HENDEL: I second.

4 MS. DARLAND: Second.

5 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Good. And I would like to amend it in  
6 terms of 2-A to include Precinct 0045, moving that from Ward 6 to a  
7 split between 1 and 6. And the splitting street is Stone, just to  
8 make it clear.

9 MR. HENDEL: I'll second that.

10 MR. AITKEN: I don't think you can second that. It's an  
11 amendment so the, the original person who made the recommendation has  
12 to -

13 MS. ALVAREZ: Second the motion.

14 MR. AITKEN: Yeah.

15 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

16 MR. ROBLES: Okay. So, with that, I'll re-read the whole -

17 MR. AITKEN: (Inaudible) I mean it has to be - then it has  
18 to be re-seconded.

19 MR. ROBLES: Okay. So, I'll re-read the motion again with  
20 the additional amendment. I would like to move that we move forward  
21 with Proposals 2-A and 2-C, with 2-A having 45 split between Ward 6  
22 and Ward 1.

23 MR. HENDEL: Quick point of clarification, for the sake of  
24 the public understanding what we're doing. Call that 2-D, 'cause it  
25 is a new map that we've never done before. I mean, I'm fine either

1 way, just asking. I guess for Staff, like is it easier for you guys  
2 to say 2-A, but amended to move 45? Or is it easier just to call it  
3 2-D?

4 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And 2-C already includes 45, okay.

5 MS. MESICH: And it's split at Stone. So, I'm not sure  
6 that we even need that as a motion because it's 2-C as it exists now.

7 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

8 MR. ROBLES: So, just asking for clarification. Proposal  
9 2-A is Proposal 2-A with the addition of 45. We're not considering  
10 Proposal 2-C? Okay. Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Thank you for asking.

12 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

13 MS. ALVAREZ: I don't, I don't believe that that's correct,  
14 Mr. Chairman. I believe Mr. Hendel is correct in that. That will be  
15 a new map. That will be Proposal 2-D.

16 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

17 MR. HENDEL: And are we, are we considering the amended  
18 version of 2-A versus, or, and 2-C? I think you just said we're not  
19 considering 2-C. I think -

20 MR. ROBLES: Apologies.

21 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

22 MR. ROBLES: So, it's to my understanding that we've  
23 got both proposals. But then on Proposal A, we're including the  
24 recommendation that we split 45 in half. So then, both maps have 45  
25 splitting in half.

1 MS. ALVAREZ: But that would make it a third map.

2 MR. ROBLES: So then, two, two - I mean I'm, I'm okay with  
3 moving forward with Map 2-D. I guess I was just explaining that in a  
4 context that helped me understand, and hopefully others. I guess -

5 MS. ALVAREZ: Then we should generate a Map 2-D to, to  
6 obtain the correct MPD and everything else for that new configuration.

7 MR. ROBLES: Okay.

8 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: That's a decent suggestion. Thank you.  
9 Because that also (inaudible) change the MPD as well, too.

10 MR. HENDEL: At a glance, it looks like MPD would actually  
11 go down, right? 'Cause you're adding a little bit to Ward 1, which is  
12 slightly too small, and removing a little bit from Ward 6, which is a  
13 little bit too big. So, I think this will bring the MPD down even  
14 more beyond - it's already pretty low, but this'll bring it down even  
15 more, I believe.

16 And just to make my stance know, I, I prefer 2-C, but we  
17 already voted on that and it failed. So, therefore, I'm okay with my  
18 colleague's suggestion to, to consider 2-C and 2-D as our joint  
19 suggestions. So, I would vote "yes" on that.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: Would the motion then be that we forward to  
21 Council and Mayor three maps?

22 MR. HENDEL: I think it's just two maps. We're killing 2-  
23 A, right? And we're replacing it with 2-D.

24 MR. ROBLES: Well, they haven't necessarily said that  
25 directly, but now we have two maps and, well, I guess, folks who had

1 issues with 2-C were able to speak out tonight. So, I'm assuming that  
2 we can say that there was room for public comment ideally. Well, how,  
3 how are my colleagues feeling?

4 MR. HENDEL: We could give them all three.

5 MS. ALVAREZ: So, the, the, the first motion that failed  
6 was for only forwarding 2-C. That failed.

7 MR. ROBLES: Uh-huh.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: Then the new motion was to only forward 2-A.

9 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

10 MS. ALVAREZ: And we didn't act on that. It wasn't moved.

11 MR. ROBLES: The friendly amendment.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: Then you amended that to say that we should  
13 forward 2- -- both of them, 2-C -- 2-A and 2-C.

14 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

15 MS. ALVAREZ: And then, Mr. Crum suggested get one more  
16 map, which is a map that would be 2-D that would include that split of  
17 45.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: 2-D would be identical to 2-A, except it  
19 would include Precinct 45.

20 MS. ALVAREZ: It, it'll - no. 2-A already has that. 2-A  
21 has the split.

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. Very good.

23 MS. MESICH: I may have misspoken earlier. Sorry, Mr.  
24 Aitken. Go ahead.

1 MR. AITKEN: No. That's okay. I just wanted to say there  
2 has not been an opportunity for public comment for this new map that  
3 we sort of seem to be sneaking in here, 2-D.

4 I, I'm not - I, I can't support adding a, a. right third  
5 map right now because just thinking from the outside in, the public's  
6 gonna be like, "Hold on. You, you snuck this one in." Especially,  
7 anybody that might be impacted on this.

8 So, this is a bad idea, and I'm just wondering legally or  
9 logistically if, if we just give Mayor and Council 2-A and 2-C if we  
10 make this as a comment, they can make this administrative adjustment  
11 based on our recommendations.

12 'Cause I think as Council said earlier, we - they don't  
13 have to do anything we said. They could make Map 2-F for all we know.  
14 But this one just hasn't been made available for public comments. So,  
15 this is a bad idea.

16 MR. HENDEL: That's a fair point, although it is just a  
17 combination of the two. So, we, we've - the public has had a chance  
18 to comment on the split of 45. And it doesn't seem like there's -

19 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: I cannot see where Proposal No. 2-A  
20 makes any reference to Precinct 04 (sic).

21 MR. HENDEL: Yeah, that's correct.

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. I just wanted - make - you don't  
23 have to do it. I just think it helps the population shift to Ward 1  
24 and perhaps helps its demographics.



1 MS. ALVAREZ: And we look at it, and we look at what it  
2 would do, it's (inaudible)

3 MR. HENDEL: That we have on the screen?

4 MS. MESICH: Showing on the monitor now comes in with an  
5 MPD 2.96%.

6 MR. HENDEL: So, the MPD is exactly the same down to the  
7 hundredths place? That seems kind of unlikely.

8 MR. AITKEN: And Ward 1's population goes up by roughly  
9 about -

10 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: If it confuses things, let's not do it.  
11 But I'm just saying that we're prepared Ward 6 is going to - is  
12 saying, "Hey, we got a request at the public hearing to move 45 out of  
13 Ward 6." And we're saying, "Yup, that works for us except for that  
14 part of 45 that is still in Armory Park."

15 MR. ROBLES: Chair, Chair Crum.

16 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: The rest would go to Ward 1.

17 MR. ROBLES: And, and quite frankly, Chair Crum, this is a  
18 proposal that we'd be willing to support.

19 MR. HENDEL: I'm fine with it, too, although I am just  
20 curious why the MPD is exactly the same. I'm wondering, is it still  
21 calculating, or is that just a - it's still calculating. Okay. I  
22 mean, not that it really matters. It's probably gonna go down. And  
23 even if it doesn't, it's very low anyway.

1           So, I guess we could recommend all three of these maps, 2-  
2 A, C and D. Or we could just do any two of those. I don't - up to my  
3 colleague who made the motion.

4           MR. ROBLES: Well, I'll start all over again. I would like  
5 to make a motion that this Committee moves forward with Maps 2-A, 2-C  
6 and 2-D.

7           CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Second it? It's your call. Is there a  
8 second to that motion?

9           MS. ALVAREZ: Second.

10          CHAIRPERSON: Any further discussion?

11          MR. AITKEN: This, this is Jon Aitken again. Hold on.  
12 Hold on. I'm just reiterating my objection to, to adding a third  
13 map without public conver- -- conversation.

14          I realize that very subcutaneously 2-D was discussed sort  
15 of in, in public meetings, vis-à-vis, conversations about 2-A. But 2-  
16 D explicitly was not put forth as an option to the public. So, I, I  
17 will be voting "no".

18          MR. HENDEL: That's a fair point. I could kind of go  
19 either way because I, I definitely see that point. On the other hand,  
20 it's just a combination of two maps that we've already been looking at  
21 and we know what the comments would be. So, I'm gonna vote "yes", but  
22 I definitely respect -

23          CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Is there a second?

24          MR. HENDEL: She seconded it already.

25          CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Got it. Thank you.

1 MR. HENDEL: I'm, I'm not officially voting. I'm just  
2 stating my support, despite the reasonable points made by my  
3 colleague.

4 MR. ROBLES: I would just like to thank this Committee. It  
5 seems, you know, after some very intense discussions, we were able to  
6 reach some sort of compromise, and I believe compromise is good and  
7 healthy for a democracy. I do want to reiterate the comments that  
8 I've been saying throughout this whole process and that is that we  
9 need to be - we need to start to thinking boldly.

10 We need to start thinking about star- -- beginning the  
11 steps to initiate the creation of a third minority-majority ward, and  
12 adding two more wards, ideally, towards the end of this decade.

13 And I think we're, we're, we're taking baby steps, but with  
14 one of the map proposals, or two, I would say 2-A and 2-D, I believe  
15 we're, we're taking those baby steps. Hence, you know, that this is  
16 some baby steps. But I am, I am grateful to this Committee and the  
17 compromise we were able to reach. Thank you.

18 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And I, too, would like to add that - my  
19 appreciation, particularly in this Committee, Committee wanting to  
20 clean up the process, 'cause I once had a boss who said, "The Devil's  
21 not in the details, the Devil's in the process."

22 And if you really want to understand anything, and improve  
23 things, you look at the process. And I really like moving in that  
24 direction, and moving ahead with, hopefully, with enough time that

1 people will be able to examine the process and improve it where  
2 necessary.

3 MS. ALVAREZ: Members of the Commission, I, I believe  
4 that the work we did was the work that we could do, given the  
5 circumstances. But I do believe that unless this process is  
6 significantly revised with some transparency and some honesty about  
7 the issues at hand, this, this redistricting process is doomed to fail  
8 again and again and again, even with what we heard.

9 I heard some pretty surprising and concerning things where  
10 people were conflating and equating their neighborhood attachments to  
11 higher principles that were actually contradicting the higher order of  
12 equality and voting power for marginalized populations only in  
13 response to a particular precinct being attached to a particular  
14 geography and artificial ward line.

15 Those things baffle me. They, they concern me because it  
16 demonstrated an incredible lack of understanding of the higher  
17 principle at work, not necessarily the geographic limitations of the  
18 map. I believe those things will have to be discussed with great  
19 intensity and deliberate - an intention to get somewhere that this  
20 Commission process did not allow.

21 I also believe that a certain attitude prevailed during our  
22 deliberations of a populous orientation that if enough people show for  
23 this or that. That's not necessarily how a democracy works  
24 necessarily by people insisting on only one single interest at the  
25 expense of the greater interest and a mandate, especially in the

1 hierarchy that we have outlined which I 100% agree needs to be  
2 clarified. Otherwise, you never get anywhere. If all of the points  
3 are equal are equal, then there was no possible path forward.

4 All of that to say the maps that we're sending, the work  
5 that we did was the less, the less ideal situation in every single  
6 instance. And (inaudible)

7 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And understanding because I've been  
8 there before, that you could possibly say that of every former  
9 committee that operated under the same rules, conditions and  
10 limitations. So, it's just not us. It finally caught up with us.  
11 And now we're saying, "Wait. Enough is enough. Let's try to get it  
12 right the next time."

13 So, you're right. The next commission, or committee  
14 doesn't have to go through what we went through. It was just our bad  
15 timing to get involved with certain issues. All right.

16 MR. ROBLES: Chairman Crum?

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes, sir.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: My, my feeling on this is we, we make the  
19 final decision. But I feel that the community also has to have a  
20 voice in, in what we decide. And their, their input, to be valued.  
21 You know, I've been to a lot of other public hearings. And the people  
22 that, that speak there are not taken for value. I think that's wrong.

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Right.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: Thank you.

1 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And, and that's why it was mentioned  
2 earlier that when this (inaudible) if the Mayor and Council say "yes",  
3 we need to appoint an ad hoc committee, or another commission, or  
4 whatever it may be. That, that can contain a public participation  
5 component that goes beyond just public hearings, perhaps. But other,  
6 other ways of accomplishing that. So, it finally is moving on to Item  
7 6.

8 MS. MESICH: We need to vote on the motion, Mr. Chair.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Okay. I thought we had.

10 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. So, I'd like a roll call (inaudible)

11 MS. MESICH: This is on the motion to forward maps 2-A, 2-B  
12 and 2-C to Mayor and Council for their consideration. Mr. Aitken?

13 MR. HENDEL: Sorry. Just to clarify. You mean 2-A, 2-C  
14 and 2-D.

15 MS. MESICH: I'm, I'm sorry. 2-A, 2-C and 2-D.

16 MR. HENDEL: Thank you.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

18 MS. MESICH: Mr. Aitken?

19 MR. AITKEN: No.

20 MS. MESICH: Dr. Alvarez?

21 MS. ALVAREZ: Yes.

22 MS. MESICH: Mr. Crum?

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Yes.

24 MS. MESICH: Ms. Darland?

25 MS. DARLAND: Yes.

1 MS. MESICH: Mr. Hendel?

2 MR. HENDEL: Yes.

3 MS. MESICH: Mr. Jaramillo? Mr. Robles?

4 MR. ROBLES: Yes.

5 MS. MESICH: Motion carries six to one.

6 MS. DARLAND: Mr. Chair, just for clarification. I do not  
7 recall that approved the Minutes. Did we, did we approve the Minutes?  
8 I, I don't mean to be (inaudible) Okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: No, you're correct. Thank you so very  
10 much. Returning to Item No. 2, Approval of the Minutes from November  
11 17<sup>th</sup>, 2022. All in favor of the Minutes as sent?

12 (Affirmative.)

13 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Unanimous. Thank you.

14 MS. DARLAND: And one more -

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: You, you get an A-plus for the night.

16 MS. DARLAND: I'm sorry. I, I follow the agenda. My last  
17 question is with respect to the tentative meeting. Is there - and  
18 twofold. Do we need to do anything with respect not having that  
19 meeting?

20 And then the second question is, the only other piece of  
21 consideration, you know, procedurally, with the - if there are any  
22 other - I, I know we had a mo- -- a pretty big motion, and I don't  
23 want to belabor anymore topics, but there were other things that may  
24 percolate between now and the final draft that we can send forward

1 for, for Staff's consideration. I don't want to - but I also don't  
2 want to do it outside of the counsel of my colleagues here.

3 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: You get another A-plus. That's Item No.  
4 6, which is -

5 MS. DARLAND: Oh. What did I do?

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - Next Steps.

7 MS. DARLAND: Okay.

8 MR. HENDEL: So, I'll move that we cancel tomorrow's  
9 meeting.

10 MS. DARLAND: I second.

11 MS. MESICH: Housekeeping items as far as getting the  
12 recommendation to you. What I have is that we will add the  
13 information on the motion on rough proportionality or, or just double-  
14 check that motion from November 17<sup>th</sup>, and finish the, the end of that  
15 meeting and what proposals were forwarded to tonight.

16 For the final - for part three of the recommendation, the  
17 final recommendation to Mayor and Council, that will contain tonight's  
18 motion. We can draft this. I'm a little concerned that it needs more  
19 review than just us sending it to you.

20 If you cancel tomorrow's meeting, we will do our best, but  
21 there can't back, back-and-forth. It'll be a violation of the Open  
22 Meeting Law. So, it's -

23 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: If there's back-and-forth, it's  
24 individual peer (inaudible)



1 MS. MESICH: But it changes your final recommendation which  
2 is your official action.

3 MR. JARAMILLO: And with that, I'd like to move that we  
4 keep tomorrow's meeting, and Madam Clerk buys us all pizza for - I'm  
5 just kidding. I'll keep that, that item out, but, but I believe we  
6 have to keep tomorrow's meeting, just making sure that we get  
7 everything that we'd like on this proposal.

8 MS. ALVAREZ: That would be so that we can review it and it  
9 could be a short meeting if we're all in agreement, or a long meeting  
10 if we have to tweak it.

11 MS. MESICH: Exactly.

12 MS. ALVAREZ: 'Cause we have to be together.

13 MS. MESICH: Yes. If you're changing the recommendation,  
14 which is your official action, then -

15 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, we'll be in -

16 MS. MESICH: - there needs to be a final vote.

17 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: - compliance with the Open Meeting Law  
18 because it's been announced.

19 MR. HENDEL: So, what, what possible changes might need to  
20 be made at tomorrow's meeting? Like just some hypothetical examples  
21 would be helpful.

22 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: Well, becau- -- besides just rough  
23 proportionality, there's several other Mayor and Council pol- --  
24 policy items that need to be defined, not just rough proportionality,  
25 for example. I think those were mentioned, weren't they?

1 MS. MESICH: They were. They were. I just want you to  
2 have the opportunity to review the final draft because it can't go to  
3 Mayor and Council if you don't approve it. And it can't be approved  
4 outside of a meeting.

5 MS. DARLAND: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: And I would prefer to meet tomorrow  
7 because I'm single, and I don't have a life and I'm cold. So, no.  
8 In all honesty. I agree if, if there's any tweaking that needs, needs  
9 to be done without tomorrow's meeting, that's going to be really  
10 difficult. And then most of us is going to sign it as well.

11 MS. MESICH: And we'll do the best we can so there's a  
12 minimal tweaking just to get through pizza and then -

13 MR. HENDEL: But - so, that, that signing makes perfect  
14 sense. But just to get a better sense, what, what are some tweaks  
15 that might need to be made? Like what, what are we putting in the  
16 letter that might have disagreements or con- -- confusion?

17 A FEMALE CLERK: It could be that you don't like how we  
18 worded something, or the way we said. Maybe it's not what you  
19 intended it to be. That's the kind of thing I think Suzanne's talking  
20 about. We just want to make sure that it is correct, and it is  
21 exactly what you want to present to Mayor and Council.

22 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. And what time, roughly  
23 speaking, will we receive a draft prior to the meeting?

24 MS. MESICH: Well, we have a lot of work to do on that  
25 draft, so -

1 MR. HENDEL: Okay.

2 MS. MESICH: - it won't be before noon. And I would assume  
3 it will probably be pretty lengthy, in the afternoon if we can get it  
4 to you at all before the meeting.

5 MR. HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: So, we know it'll be to us at 5:30.

7 MS. MESICH: Yes.

8 MR. HENDEL: All right. Motion withdrawn.

9 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All in favor of adjourning?

10 (Affirmative.)

11 CHAIRPERSON CRUM: All right. Thank you.

12 (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: 12/22/2022

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