



Meeting Minutes

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC)

DATE: **Monday, September 9, 2024**
TIME: 12:00 p.m.
LOCATION: City Hall
255 W. Alameda Street
Mayor and Council Chambers, 1st floor
Tucson, Arizona

1. Roll Call

The Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. by Shawna Lee, City Clerk's Office.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Appointor:</u>
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor
Vanessa Gallego	Ward 1
Tre'Davon Rhodes	Ward 2
Ed Hendel	Ward 3
Robert Jaramillo	Ward 5
Raquel Abel	Ward 6

<u>Absent:</u>	
Jon Aitken	Ward 4

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

2. Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2004

(This item was continued until September 23, 2024.)

3. Election of Officers

Shawna Lee, City Clerk's Office, invited nominations for Chair and Vice Chair of the RAC.

Committee Member Alvarez nominated Committee Member Hendel for Chair. Committee Member Rhodes nominated himself for Chair. No other nominations were made.

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 (Committee Member Aitken absent), to elect Committee Member Hendel to Chair.

It was moved by Chair Hendel, duly seconded and passed by a roll call vote of 6 to 0 (Committee Member Aitken Absent), to elect Committee Member Rhodes for Vice Chair.

4. Consideration and Discussion of Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) Scope of Duties as Described in the August 30, 2024, Memorandum from the City Attorney's Office

Chair Hendel asked that the August 30, 2024, memorandum from the City Attorney's Office be read for the benefit of audience members in attendance.

Mike Rankin, City Attorney, discussed the August 30 Memorandum. He explained that because the Maximum Population Deviation (MPD) was at 2.9%, Mayor and Council will not consider any redistricting proposals this cycle. He recommended the scope of duties for the Committee to include:

- To review and discuss the demographic and population data.
- To ask questions regarding the data.
- To confirm the MPD and that no redistricting is required.
- Report to Mayor and Council by the end of the year.
- Suggestions for Mayor and Council for future processes of the RAC.

Discussion of this item continued after Item 6.

6. Call to the Audience

(This item was taken out of order.)

There were no speakers.

4. Consideration and Discussion of Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) Scope of Duties as Described in the August 30, 2024, Memorandum from the City Attorney's Office

Discussion of this item resumed after Item 6.

Chair Hendel proposed the need to start the process earlier. Mr. McLaughlin stated annexations could be a factor in redistricting as a point of information.

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded and carried by a voice vote of 6 to 0 (Committee Member Aitken absent), that since the MPD is comfortably below the 10% threshold, no redistricting is required in 2024 and the RAC will not be proposing any maps or redistricting this year.

5. Consideration and Discussion regarding the Process and Related Information for Formulating RAC's Recommendation to Mayor and Council

Discussion ensued regarding a timeline for future committees.

It was moved by Committee Member Alvarez, duly seconded and carried by a voice vote of 6 to 0 (Committee Member Aitken absent), that the next meeting be a study session to discuss demographics of the City with as much granular information as possible.

Discussion continued; no further action taken.

6. Call to the Audience

(This item was taken out of order and considered after Item #4.)

7. Schedule for Future Meetings

Discussion ensued regarding members' availability to meet in the future.

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 6 to 0, (Committee Member Aitken absent) that the next meetings of the RAC would be:

- Monday, September 23, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.
- Monday, September 30, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.
- Monday, October 7, 2024, at 5:00 p.m.

8. Future Agenda Items

The following agenda items were identified for the Study Session to be held on September 23, 2024:

- Call to the Audience
- Continuation of Item 5, with a focus on demographics

9. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:32 p.m.

1 opt out. So, please let us know if at any time you don't need the
2 hard copies.

3 Third. We've requested, or we've received a request that
4 Call to the Audience be moved up on the Agenda so the Committee can
5 consider public comments prior to discussing Items 4 or 5.

6 Taking items out of order is up to the Chair. So, once you
7 elect your Chairperson, it'll be up to them to grant this request.

8 And last, before we go to roll call, please remember to
9 turn on your microphone before speaking. That will help us get an
10 accurate recording. So, with that, we'll go to roll call. Maribel
11 Alvarez.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: Present.

13 MS. LEE: Vanessa Gallego.

14 MS. GALLEGO: Present.

15 MS. LEE: Tre'Davon Rhodes.

16 MR. RHODES: Present.

17 MS. LEE: Ed Hendel.

18 MR. HENDEL: Present.

19 MS. LEE: Jon Aitken is absent. Robert Jaramillo.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.

21 MS. LEE: Raquel Abel.

22 MS. ABEL: Present.

23 MS. LEE: We do have a quorum. Item 2, is Approval of
24 Minutes from the August 28th, 2024 meeting. While you've received
25 the Legal Action Report for the last meeting, the verbatim transcript

1 was received this morning, which didn't allow you time to review it.
2 So, we'll continue this item to the next meeting. We do have a hard
3 copy in your handouts, so, you can review it before then.

4 So, moving on to Item 3. Election of Officers. The
5 Committee needs to elect a Chair and a Vice-Chair. What we'll do
6 first is open the floor for nominations. We'll consider the
7 nominations for Chairperson first, have the Committee vote on that.
8 Then we'll consider nominations for Vice-Chair and take that vote.

9 Once the officers are elected, I'll turn the meeting over
10 to the Chair to complete the meeting. So, are there any nominations
11 for Chairperson?

12 DR. ALVAREZ: I'd like to nominate Ed.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: Second.

14 MR. HENDEL: Thank you.

15 MR. JARAMILLO: Second.

16 MS. LEE: Okay. Anyone else? Okay. So, we have a
17 nomination for Ed to serve as Chair. Ed, if you are elected, are
18 you agreeable to serving?

19 MR. HENDEL: Yeah. I'm happy to do it. Anyone else wants
20 to, I (inaudible)

21 MR. RHODES: Can I elect myself as Chair?

22 MS. LEE: You can certainly nominate yourself.

23 MR. RHODES: I'm nominating myself (inaudible)

24 MS. LEE: All right. Okay. Anybody else? All right.

1 So, what we need now is a motion for the Committee to vote on. Would
2 anyone like to make a motion to elect Ed or Tre'Davon as Chairperson?

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Make a motion to elect Ed Hendel.

4 MS. LEE: We have a motion. Is there a second?

5 MS. GALLEGO: Second.

6 MS. LEE: Okay. Now, we'll go to roll call on the vote -
7 motion to elect Ed Hendel as Chairperson. Maribel Alvarez.

8 DR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

9 MS. LEE: Vanessa Gallego.

10 MS. GALLEGO: Yes.

11 MS. LEE: Tre'Davon Rhodes.

12 MR. RHODES: Yes.

13 MS. LEE: Ed Hendel.

14 MR. HENDEL: I'll abstain. Is that allowed?

15 MS. LEE: No, sir.

16 MR. HENDEL: Okay. I'll vote "yes".

17 MS. LEE: Robert Jaramillo.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Aye.

19 MS. LEE: And Raquel Abel.

20 MS. ABEL: Yes.

21 MS. LEE: All right. The motion passes by a vote of six to
22 zero. So, next, we'll move on to Vice-Chairperson.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I'd like to nominate Tre'.

24 MS. LEE: Okay.

25 DR. ALVAREZ: I'll second it.

1 MS. LEE: Anyone else? All right. Tre', if you are
2 elected, are you willing to serve?

3 MR. RHODES: Yes.

4 MS. LEE: So, Ed, is that a motion?

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes. I move that we nominate Tre' for
6 Vice-Chair.

7 MS. ABEL: (Inaudible)

8 MS. LEE: And Raquel, was that second?

9 MS. ABEL: Yes.

10 MS. LEE: All right. So, we have a Motion and a second.
11 Now we'll go to roll call. Maribel Alvarez.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

13 MS. LEE: Vanessa Gallego.

14 MS. GALLEGO: Yes.

15 MS. LEE: Tre' Davon Rhodes?

16 MR. RHODES: Yes.

17 MS. LEE: Ed Hendel.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes.

19 MS. LEE: Jon Aitken is absent. Robert Jaramillo.

20 MR. JARAMILLO: Aye.

21 MS. LEE: And Raquel Abel.

22 MS. ABEL: Yes.

23 MS. LEE: All right. That motion passes by a vote six to
24 zero. Congratulations to you both. Chair Hendel, I'll now turn the

1 meeting over to you with the reminder of the request that Call to the
2 Audience be moved up earlier on the Agenda if you so desire.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes. All right. Well, thank you,
4 everybody. I appreciate the nomination for Chair. I was on this
5 Committee in 2022, so, I - and I am the President of another
6 organization as well, so, I, I do know a thing or two about running
7 meetings. But obviously, Staff, if I go out of order or need to add
8 anything, please don't hesitate to jump in.

9 So, I like the idea of moving the Call to the Audience up
10 because I do see we have a number of people. The one thing I would
11 propose is that we, before that is, I don't know if the memo from the
12 City Attorney has been made public, I'm not sure.

13 But we received a memo that stated that we were not
14 supposed to propose a map for this year, and that the City will not
15 be redistricting this year. So, my preference would be to have that
16 memo read into the record so that the people in the audience know that
17 before they speak.

18 I'm open to other ideas if people have thoughts, but I
19 think that might be the best way to have people informed and able to
20 participate to the greatest extent possible with the most knowledge.
21 Are Chairs allowed to make motions?

22 MS. LEE: Yes, sir.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, I guess I'll just - who would
24 be the right person to read that into the record? Would that just be
25 me or would Staff want to do that?

1 MR. McLAUGHLIN: So, two points. I, I think, Chairman
2 Hendel, it would be better if someone else made the motion formally.
3 I'm not sure that the Chair can make motions. I'm not sure you can or
4 can't.

5 FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes.

6 MALE SPEAKER: Yes.

7 FEMALE SPEAKER: Sorry to interrupt, but the Chair can
8 recommend a motion or ask for a motion.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And then someone could just say, "So
10 moved."?

11 FEMALE SPEAKER: Exactly.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Great. So, I will make a motion
13 for this, but who, who do you think would be the appropriate person to
14 - or, or even just summarize if you don't want to read the whole
15 thing. But do we want to have someone (inaudible) that from Staff,
16 or should I do it myself?

17 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, Members. I think you can
18 have whoever you would like read it, read it.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: He's right there, so -

20 MR. RANKIN: Here.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I didn't see you. But you (inaudible)

22 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Are we - yeah.

23 MR. RANKIN: Good morning, or afternoon. I'm Mike Rankin.
24 I'm the City Attorney. I authored the memo in question. I don't

1 know that you need to have me read it word-for-word, although it's
2 relatively short.

3 But fundamentally, the purpose of the memo was to - people
4 were questioning, "Well, why are we calling the Committee together if
5 it doesn't look like that we need to have a redistricting?"

6 Well, both the City Charter and the City Code actually
7 require that the Mayor and Council constitute this Committee every
8 year that is a potential redistricting year.

9 And so the memo goes into, "Well, what does potential
10 redistricting year mean?" And it's every four years except, it's
11 also every two years after a decennial census. But regardless, this
12 is a potential redistricting year.

13 So, to comply with the Charter and the Code, which is
14 something we always want to do, the Mayor and Council acted and called
15 the Committee together. But in doing so, the Mayor and Council also
16 noted that they won't be considering any specific redistricting
17 proposals this cycle.

18 And the reason for that is, is because the population
19 deviation numbers are such that no redistricting is required this
20 year. It's only 2.9%. So, no redistricting is required.

21 And the way the Code is written is that some of committees
22 work in terms of the examination of the different potential
23 redistricting options. Well, that's only to occur if, in fact, a
24 redistricting is required.

1 So, that doesn't mean, however, that the Committee doesn't
2 have any work to do, or that there's not anything important to talk
3 about, because there still is.

4 What I would recommend is that the scope of the duties of
5 the Committee this cycle is to review and discuss the population and
6 demographic data as provided by the City by the City Clerk's Office.
7 Ask any questions that you have about that data. Confirm what we
8 believe to be true in terms of the maximum population deviation, to
9 confirm that no redistricting is required.

10 And report back to the Mayor and Council before the end of
11 the year with any recommendations, any concerns, any questions you
12 have based on that review of the population and demographic data.

13 I also put in the memo that I think it'd be useful that
14 even though no redistricting proposal will be considered in this
15 cycle, if the work of the Committee reveals that you have some
16 suggestions about the future process about when the Committee should
17 be pulled together, and what type of information should be provided,
18 and what type of public outreach should be made.

19 Then certainly you should talk about that as well and give
20 any relevant recommendations as part of your report back to the Mayor
21 and Council once your work is done.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you. I appreciate that. I do have
23 one quick question for you if you don't mind. The next redistricting
24 cycle is in 2028. If the MPD is still below 10% in 2028, will we be -

1 will the Redistricting Advisory Committee be asked not to redistrict
2 once again, or will it be a judgment call by the Mayor and Council?

3 MR. RANKIN: It'll still be a judgment call by the Mayor
4 and Council. So, say, for example, it's still below 10%, but it's
5 nine, right? And it looks like it's headed towards 10.

6 The Mayor and Council at that time might say, "Go ahead and
7 provide us some options so that we don't, you know, because another
8 four years could pass. We'd go above the 10%, etc." But in this
9 particular cycle, they've indicated they're not gonna request any
10 options, or recommended options from the Committee.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you very much.

12 MR. RANKIN: Sure.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Any other questions? Okay. Well, so,
14 with that knowledge that we will not be redistricting this year and
15 we'll be focusing on confirming the MPD and thinking about process for
16 2028, and thinking about, you know, longer-term goals here, I would
17 like to propose that we move to move the Call to the Audience to the
18 next Agenda item. How do people feel about that?

19 DR. ALVAREZ: Second that.

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. We have - actually, and so, could
21 you make the motion, yeah, 'cause I can't make motions. So, just say,
22 "So moved."

23 DR. ALVAREZ: So, moved.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: We're still learning how this works, but
25 I think that's correct. Thank you. So, do we have a second?

1 MR. JARAMILLO: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. We have the motion and a second.

3 Is there any discussion? Okay. I don't think we need roll call.

4 Let's just do a voice vote. All in favor?

5 (Affirmative.)

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And as the Chair, do I vote? Okay. Aye.

7 All opposed?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Motion passes unanimously. Thank
10 you. So, with that, we will open it up to Call to the Audience. Do
11 we have - did people fill out cards? Do we have like names for me to
12 call on or anything?

13 MS. LEE: I'm seeing that there are no cards submitted.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Well, why don't - can we just have
15 people line up and speak, or do they have to do a card?

16 MS. LEE: You may ask if there are any members of the
17 public who would like to speak if they have not submitted a card. But
18 we do ask that they submit their name for the record.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Okay. So, if there's anyone out
20 there in the audience who would like to speak, we'd love to hear from
21 you, but you will have to fill out a card. Where are the cards?

22 MS. LEE: (Inaudible)

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Back there. Okay. So, does anyone want
24 to speak? Okay. Well, that simplifies things. All right. So, we
25 can move on to Item 4 in the original Agenda.

1 Consideration and Discussion of Redistricting Advisory
2 Committee Scope of Duties as Described in the August 30th memo from
3 the City Attorney's Office, which we just received a description of.

4 So, I'll just open the floor if anyone wants to provide
5 some thoughts on where to get started. I have ideas, too, but anyone
6 else wants to kick us off?

7 MR. JARAMILLO: I'd, I'd like to a comment if I may.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: Based on the memorandum received from
10 legal counsel, I feel at this time that we should go, based on the
11 recommendation that, that MPD is at 2.9%, and we worked really hard
12 the last time we were here to get it down to 2.9.

13 So, my recommendation is to leave it as is for now, maybe
14 going to some other type of research that we, we need to have and
15 recommendations for future agendas. Thank you.

16 MR. RHODES: I agree (inaudible)

17 DR. ALVAREZ: Yes. I think even last week before the
18 attorney's opening came, we were inclined in that direction that less
19 than 3% was not - but I still think we saw a role for us as a study
20 committee. And perhaps one that can think a little bit less
21 passionately about some of the steps and improvements that the process
22 may need to get a good outcome.

23 The only think I want to put on the record is that '28 is
24 quite a bit down the road. So, when we enter into our - the scope of
25 our recommendations, we should consider the timing of like, are we -

1 or, or scaffold the timing of, are there things that we think Council
2 and Mayor should be concerned about in '25, '26, '27 meeting? And
3 then the year of the redistricting.

4 So, that's just for the record to a temporal sort of grid
5 that things that we're talking about here do not then get lost four
6 years from now, but mid-term, short-term, long-term. Thank you.

7 MR. JARAMILLO: If I may. I, I think that that's a good,
8 a good valid point based on all the development that we're having in
9 our community and all the homes that are coming up in all parts of
10 Tucson. So, I concur with that. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I agree very much. In 2022, we proposed
12 maps, we had - there was a lot going on. I think the MPD was
13 something like 12 or 13%. So, we had our work cut out for us just to
14 bring it down. We had three public hearings, there was a lot going
15 on.

16 This time, we can focus more on future process proposals.
17 Last time, we actually did include in our letter to Mayor and Council
18 that we wanted a task force to start as early as possible.

19 I think - I don't think this made it into the final letter,
20 but we were thinking like around January, maybe like a year in advance
21 of redistricting, we should start having community outreach, listening
22 sessions, education, things like that. Possibly even, you know,
23 starting the Redistricting Advisory Committee a year in advance.

24 Obviously, that, that didn't end up happening and given
25 that we're not redistricting this time, perhaps that might not have

1 been necessary. So, fair enough. But I do think that it would make
2 sense to focus our recommendations on a, a process like that. I think
3 definitely starting more than a few months in advance would be very
4 important.

5 Last time, we had a lot of people I think rightfully
6 complaining that we were just going too fast. There wasn't enough
7 time to consider the proposals properly. And they felt that things
8 were being kind of rammed through a bit.

9 And again, I, I think all of us on the Committee last time
10 agreed with that assessment from the public, and we shared that
11 frustration ourselves. So, I think that could be a big part of our
12 recommendations for 2028, starting early.

13 So, let's see. Item 5 is essentially what we're talking
14 about right now. So, we could, we could hold a vote. I'm open to
15 ideas here, but one idea is to hold a vote to not make any map
16 proposals this cycle. Or, yeah, any, any redistricting changes.

17 I believe that is what the City Attorney suggested,
18 although he also mentioned that we should like verify the MPD numbers.
19 So, to be honest, I'm not quite sure how to verify the numbers like we
20 just have, we just have numbers in the binder.

21 I guess we could take a look at a map and if there's a
22 particular process that you'd like us to go through to verify that
23 the numbers are correct, okay. He's shaking his head. So, I think,
24 I think it's just a matter of - oh, yeah. Please.

1 MR. RANKIN: (Inaudible) who counts and who doesn't,
2 anything like that just so that comfortable that you understand the
3 information that's been provided.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: It's very interesting that I, I - when we
6 look at it, and I'd like to propose that we have a study session on
7 the demographics to identify for Mayor and Council maybe some patterns
8 that could develop.

9 There is some packing in some of the districting of the
10 wards in terms of concentration of minorities. There, there are some
11 things there - nothing that is alarming, nothing that disturbs the
12 order and, and the propriety of what we're doing. But there are some
13 trends and we should also have a conversation about - I mean Tucson is
14 undergoing rapid change.

15 So, those populations change based on development and Plan
16 Tucson may actually have dramatic impact four years from now in terms
17 of what housing is being infilled and concentrated and different
18 things like that.

19 So, I think that we should have a study session focused on
20 the demographics alone and that we come with that mindset. A lot of
21 the questions that we're asking, preparation regarding minorities,
22 census categories.

23 And I think that we'll do a service to the city, if nothing
24 else, for one more meeting to just identify some potential issues to
25 look at. And I don't think that that would be wasteful in any way.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I completely agree we should do that.
2 Thank you. Were there any changes from the 2.9%? My recollection is
3 that's what we got it down to in 2022.

4 So, it sounds like that has not changed in the last two
5 years. Have there been updates that we should be aware of in terms
6 of changes in these numbers since 2022? I know there hasn't been a
7 census since then, but my understanding is that there are somewhat
8 regular updates in between the ten-year census.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. Between, between 2022 and 2024, the
10 biggest change would be just exactly like you said, the little census
11 updates. It's very minimal and has not changed deviation.

12 Additionally, since 2022, the, the State, as well as the
13 County did, did change a few precincts around, but they were combining
14 empty precincts into precincts that had voting population (inaudible)
15 So, those really are the only two changes between '22 and today.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Empty precincts meaning like business
17 areas where there are no houses, things like that?

18 MALE SPEAKER: Correct. Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: (Inaudible) Thank you.

20 DR. ALVAREZ: I think we - one of the things that is a
21 little bit hidden, and this is not our fault, or it's just the way
22 that the census and the Supreme Court have laid out some of these
23 rules.

24 The, the conflation of race and socio-economics becomes
25 sort of hidden in the map. By that, I mean are poor people

1 concentrated in areas with, you know, representation that is impacted
2 in a different way from - but I know we're not mentioning that. You
3 know, the, the call is for demographic based on race and ethnicity.

4 But if, if our own analysis ends up as a layer of that,
5 revealing that that's the case in a city that is undergoing such
6 (inaudible) or development, whichever, whichever one you want to call
7 it, I think that would be really insightful conversation to have and
8 to watch for. And some of us have already instinctive knowledge about
9 how that happens.

10 But I think it's a question of fairness and justice that
11 eventually could really be important for a growing city. But, yet,
12 again, that will take some study and some layering of observations
13 that are not immediately obvious when you look only at race and, and
14 the geography.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think that's an excellent point. And
16 to add to that, we have, in our binders, you know, we have the seven
17 goals that we're trying to meet, right. We've got getting the MPD
18 below 10%. We've got minimizing disruption. We've got rough
19 proportionality. We've got a couple more.

20 I believe that one thing we can do, if we want, is
21 recommend changes or additions to that. For example, we could say
22 some sort of rough proportionality like principal, or, or some sort of
23 consideration of socio-economic status in addition to just the race
24 from the census.

1 I think - I don't have a specific idea in mind at the
2 moment, but what I'm saying is that like, for example, Item D, which
3 is the rough proportionality principal, that is not a Federal Court
4 issue. That's not, you know, written in stone.

5 We, we - that was added by Mayor and Council prior to the
6 2022 Redistricting Advisory Committee, which I think means they could
7 add another one next time if they want. So, we could propose that
8 they add - like they, they can't mess with the MPD one. That's,
9 that's higher up. That's from, you know, Supreme Court level.

10 But some of these are just City policy that can be, can be
11 added to. So, they could add a socio-economic factor, and we could
12 propose that. And since we have four years this time, I think there'd
13 be plenty of time. If we, if they want to do that, we could propose
14 that.

15 DR. ALVAREZ: I also want to say that I learned a lot last
16 time. As you know, it was a very contested time, difficult time. I
17 learned a lot about the, the perception of the community in terms of
18 compactness and recognizable boundaries.

19 And I think that - I mean I, I recall - not one, not one
20 of my finest moments, when I sarcastically talked about, "We can't
21 move the geography. If you live on the west side, you'll be on the
22 west side. We can't make the west east, we can't make the north
23 south. That's just not a power of this Commission."

24 But beyond that sarcastic comment, not the finest moment, I
25 think that there was also a sense that some boundaries are iconic and

1 symbolic for people in the community. And, and that that has to be
2 accounted for when you interpret City policy of compactness and
3 recognizable boundaries.

4 But if you go down that path too narrowly, then you're
5 talking about this street versus that street creating a boundary and
6 you not being in Six and being in Five, which at that time also felt
7 like an impossible scenario because the boundary wasn't significantly
8 altered but the precincts had to be, you know, just where they did.

9 However, there were some things we were trying to do when
10 it involved the freeway and the entire separation of one area from
11 another across, you know, I-10.

12 You know, I, I, I listened to that, and I thought, "Yeah,
13 you know, people feel that in a different way than they feel it's
14 around the corner, (inaudible) but that's just over there." That's an
15 entire pieces of land that were dividing those communities.

16 So, I think that those nuances could also be noted as part
17 of a study session in the future, so that there's more transparency
18 about the interpretation of some of those terms with both room for
19 improvement that gives the community a little bit of forgiveness of
20 those who are in a commission, but it also gives the commissioners a
21 sense that people are responding to something that feels real to them.

22 MS. GALLEGOS: (Inaudible) both comments. I think it also
23 helps with establishing trust with our community, especially with the
24 last round of being so contentious. It's just other ways that we can
25 educate and, and continue to repair some communities that have been

1 historically left behind. So, I think thank you for sharing that
2 (inaudible)

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. I think that's a great point.
4 Thank you. I agree with that. And we, we had - we learned a lot in
5 2022 from the public hearings. I personally was surprised by some of
6 the comments that we heard from numerous people.

7 And then I, you know, I - you know, prior to that, I hadn't
8 really thought too much one way or the other what ward I lived in.
9 That wasn't, you know, an especially important thing to me personally.
10 But we learned that a lot of people do feel passionately about the
11 history. You know, they've been in this ward for a long time.

12 You pointed out some examples of that last time. We heard
13 people in the downtown area. We heard from people around like El Rio.
14 We heard from people in Ward 5 on the south side of Tucson like -

15 MR. JARAMILLO: Ward 6.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Downtown Ward 6, they - we, what
17 we did last time is we, we split one of the precincts in half because
18 half of the precinct really, really didn't want to move. And the
19 other half was seemingly fine with it.

20 So, we split it in half and took that one half, moved it,
21 which helps get the MPD lower. And we left the other half where it
22 was because that's what the people wanted.

23 But I think we, or at least I was surprised by how
24 passionately people feel an identify with their, with their ward.
25 But that's definitely something we need to keep in mind going forward,

1 you know, sense of community and belonging in history that, you know,
2 we just have to keep that in mind.

3 And the - we tried to do - we, we, we had some maps drawn
4 up for the rough proportionality principal that would have shifted
5 everything. It was sort of like a clockwise motion of, of precincts
6 from Four to Five, Five to One, One to Three and, and I think Three to
7 Two and Two to Four. I can't remember that part, but, but it was just
8 like tons of changes would have needed to have been made to actually
9 achieve the principal of creating a third majority-minority ward.

10 And we discovered that a lot of people would have been
11 upset. So, you know, we got our work cut out for us, but we
12 definitely learned a lot.

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chair, Madam, Members of the
14 Committee. Just a point of information. One area that I haven't
15 heard questions about that you might want to ask the clerk about,
16 'cause it can affect a lot of areas is annexations.

17 Annexations have actually not been, if they will tell you
18 and you can ask, significant in this period, but they can be
19 significant. They're probably the most significant population-adder
20 (sic) between censuses. So, to (inaudible), just you might want to
21 ask questions about that.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: No, I love it. Please keep it coming.
23 Any, any good questions we should be asking, please do tell us. I
24 appreciate that.

1 Madam Clerk, would you like to tell us about annexations?

2 Are there any major annexations planned for the next couple of years
3 that we should be aware of that (inaudible)

4 MS. LEE: Mr. Chair, -

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - demographics?

6 MS. LEE: Yes. And Members of the Committee, there've been
7 several annexations over the last - since December of 2022 when you
8 last met. Most of them are in U of A Tech Park area around I-10
9 between Wards 4 and 5. We've had smaller annexations on the outskirts
10 of the city, but very small in population.

11 So, it's mainly that, that area around I-10 that - in
12 Wards 4 and 5 that have seen annexations which might inform the total
13 population in Ward 4 being slightly higher. So, that is something
14 that we would bring to you at your request.

15 We've checked with the Annexation Office. They don't
16 anticipate any annexations in the near future. So, the map that we
17 have shown you now is with all existing annexations that have taken
18 place since you last met.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. And so, the reason the MPD stayed
20 the same is because neither Ward 4 nor Ward 5 is our most deviated
21 population. So, therefore, it didn't affect the calculation. But
22 there were some, some changes in, in the 4-5 area.

23 Okay. And just to remind everybody, or for people in the
24 audience who might not know, the population deviation, MPD that we're

1 discussing, is calculated by doing some math with the, the most over-
2 represented ward and the most under-represented ward.

3 And so, if changes occur to wards that are more in the
4 middle, that will not affect the number. So, that's why significant
5 changes were made, but the MPD is the same. I guess it's hard to know
6 annexations four years out. We probably can't really predict too much
7 about - well, is that true, Madam Clerk? Do we have any idea in the
8 next four years if anything's coming up?

9 MS. LEE: The question that we ask was, "Are there any
10 annexations coming up that would take effect before you need to
11 redistrict," so that we would know if any areas were affected by
12 the annexations. And the answer we got was, "No, not this year."

13 That we can ask, I think the time for an annexation is at
14 least six or eight months, so they would be starting fairly soon if
15 they were gonna do annexations next year. So, we can ask that
16 question again in a different way and (inaudible) what the answer is.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think, I think the question you asked
18 is the more important one. So, I appreciate that. I don't, I don't
19 think there's gonna be a great way to build in the next four years
20 worth of annexations into our recommendations this year aside from
21 just saying, "We'll have to see what it looks like in four years."
22 So, I, I'm not too worried about that at this point.

23 MS. LEE: And, and depending on the process that you
24 recommend, if, if you meet annually or, or such, then we would provide
25 an updated ward map so that you see any annexations that have taken

1 place and what the demographics, any changes to those as the city
2 annexes more land.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you very much.

4 (Inaudible discussion.)

5 DR. ALVAREZ: Last time, we also confronted quite a bit of
6 - and I think is because it felt really rushed and it was above 10%
7 and we felt we had to act. But there was a real misunderstandings of
8 some of the basic concepts we were using.

9 Rough proportionality, it's, it's something that the
10 Council, the Mayor and Council adopted as a City policy with the idea
11 of empowering minority, minority voters. And that's something that I
12 don't think came across clearly that in order to accomplish that
13 greater goal, sometimes some of the precincts in the wards had to have
14 some movements.

15 But I also felt on the other flip side, it, it was too
16 much constructed as - at times in the discourse as a political ploy
17 to necessarily endorse a change or a political candidate.

18 And that's, that's not what it is. It, it doesn't speak at
19 all to whoever is running in that ward, even if it is a minority ward,
20 it could be a non-minority person.

21 And that's just, that's just up for them to get the trust
22 of that community, but it was a factor of our minority communities
23 dominant in the city, and the majority of the wards are not reflective
24 of that.

1 But I even - I remember having to read two or three times
2 that memo and understand that word and go on-line and look - do some
3 search on, "Oh, what does it mean? And why did it come about? And
4 was what the origin of the Supreme Court decision on that? Who
5 challenged that?" I mean that was a whole education that we had to
6 do.

7 And I feel like if the public had been more informed about
8 that, if we had had more time to do education sessions only on the
9 basic factual description of some of the terms, we would (inaudible)
10 as we ended up having some folks be really hurt about the attempt to
11 do rough proportionality as an attempt to curtail minority voting
12 power which was exactly the opposite of what "deter" means.

13 But again, that was because it was very rushed and very
14 quickly, and the maps were confounding. It's like now we have the
15 opportunity to expand that horizon of education and basic starting
16 with the same deck of cards. This is what we mean by that.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: One thing I thought was interesting last
18 time, and I've, I've been reflecting on this a lot the last two years
19 is that the concept of dilution is complicated, right?

20 Like the one definition of dilution could be, you know,
21 packing minorities into just Wards 1 and 5. And so, that's the goal
22 of rough, of rough proportionality is essentially to undo that, or fix
23 that, which is a noble goal, in my opinion.

24 But, we heard from a bunch of people at the public
25 hearings, that they were using dilution in the exact opposite way.

1 They were saying by splitting up Hispanic communities in Ward 1 and
2 putting some of them into Ward 3, we are diluting the block of power
3 that, you know, the, the - those communities share. And, you know,
4 by splitting them up, we're diluting them.

5 And so, I was hearing the word "dilution" meaning kind
6 of the exact opposite thing coming from both sides. And just as a
7 philosophical matter, I, I kind of see both sides. I, you know, that
8 would be good to, to get that, get that sorted out for next time
9 because I think both sides have a good point.

10 Like if, if, if your priority is maintaining a block of
11 power in your ward, I can see how you might not want to split those
12 up. On the other hand, at a citywide level, having just two majority-
13 minority wards is not necessarily proportional.

14 So, it kind of depends on your perspective there. I just
15 thought that was interesting and hard to, hard to (inaudible) It's
16 hard to know what to do with that.

17 MS. GALLEGO: If I can add, and I think that's the value
18 that we can bring this time around. As you're saying, Maribel, like
19 having a workshop, right, where we're able to go over these terms
20 again.

21 And a new person like me coming in and learning from y'all
22 last time, and just having those terms be part of our vocabulary,
23 where the public is able to come and, and, and identify.

24 It'd be like this is the term that, that really speaks to
25 us, whether it's diluting or whether it's loss of power, however it's

1 perceived. And I think that's where the value really comes from
2 these, these meetings this time.

3 And I think that's one thing that, that, that we can do
4 again to, to uplift the community and, and be able to have them be
5 here present and really claim what's, what's needed. But at the same
6 time, helping them understand that this is power, too. Right?

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Absolutely. Other thoughts?

8 (No response.)

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: We're sort of floating between Item 4 and
10 5 here. I'm trying figure out when, when to call No. 4 and move on to
11 No. 5. So, there's sort of - it's all just a broad discussion. But
12 it's been a fantastic discussion so far. And I'd, I'd encourage
13 people to continue to share their thoughts.

14 Although one thing, I want to just quickly pause. I know
15 we're in the middle of a workday, right? People have classes and
16 things. Is there a particular time that we need to adjourn? I can
17 make sure we let people out on time.

18 MS. ABEL: Think we were planning on only going until 2:00.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

20 MR. RHODES: If we're able to, I'd like to go to like 1:30.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. I think that's doable. Okay. I
22 think we can keep to 1:30. We have 40 more minutes. That should be
23 okay. Yeah.

24 Well, one idea is we could just make the memorandum from
25 the City Attorney, you know, official in our proposal. We could say,

1 "We - given that the MPD is below two - is below three percent, we
2 don't need to redistrict this year and we do not suggest that that
3 occur."

4 I mean that's essentially what we're - Mayor and Council basically
5 already, you know, stated that.

6 So, I don't think this would be breaking news or anything,
7 but we could just kind of - I think that's kind of the goal of Item 4
8 here, so, that's what I'm thinking. But if anyone has other thoughts,
9 I'm open to that as well.

10 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. I can phrase it better. I mean -
12 well, okay. So, the ultimate goal of this, of this Committee is to
13 present a letter to Mayor and Council with our recommendations. So,
14 we could just vote now to include, you know, so kind of start our
15 letter with essentially that.

16 We're not writing the letter this week. We're gonna have
17 another meeting and study session, etc., but we could just kind of
18 check that box if we want. How do, how do people feel about that?

19 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, let me, let phrase it better
21 then, and then someone will just have to say, "So moved." Okay. So,
22 "Given - I move -," no. "I propose a motion that states that given
23 that we are comfortably below the 10% threshold for MPD, we believe
24 that no redistricting is required in 2024, and we will not be
25 proposing any maps or redistricting proposals this year."

1 MR. JARAMILLO: So moved.

2 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you. We have a motion on the
3 table. Do we have a second?

4 MS. ABEL: I second it.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you. Any discussion?

6 (No response.)

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: All right. All in favor?

8 (Affirmative.)

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: All opposed?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Motion passes. Thank you very much. And
12 with that, we will move on to Item 5. Consideration and Discussion
13 Regarding the Process and Related Information for Formulating our
14 Recommendation to Mayor and Council.

15 So, we're the timeline process and kind of task force,
16 community education, listening sessions, do we want to meet annually,
17 or do we just want to start a year in advance? Anything like that.
18 I think this would be a good time to discuss that type of thing.

19 DR. ALVAREZ: I like a lot of the ideas on the table.
20 I'd like to move that the next meeting be the study session on the
21 demographics of the city by as much granular information as we can get
22 in, in the session.

23 And then I'd like to note for the record some of the ideas
24 that have been mentioned, the ones you just referred to and then come

1 back to that as possible elements in our final letter to the Mayor and
2 Council.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. We have a motion on the table.

4 Do we have a second?

5 MS. GALLEGO: I second that motion.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you. Any discussion? Personally,
7 I agree. I think, I think deciding on the process recommendation
8 should probably be one of the later things we do, and not doing that
9 right now would make sense. I think doing the study session first
10 makes sense. Any other discussion? Okay. All in favor?

11 (Affirmative.)

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: All opposed?

13 (No response.)

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Motion passes. We're unanimous on
15 everything today. Okay. Great. So, that, that doesn't mean we
16 necessarily have to stop talking about this right now. But we have
17 now decided that we will have a study session at the next meeting, and
18 after that, we will decide on process recommendations.

19 So, I guess I'll just open it up back up for more
20 discussion. I have a couple of things I could mention but anyone
21 else has any general points they want to make or questions for Staff
22 or anything?

23 DR. ALVAREZ: I have a question for Staff. I, I don't know
24 if the same - if in a year where there is no mandate to do - to
25 convene the Commission, the Study Advisory Commission. If - then the

1 thing that replaces us, is, is it a task force? Is it a study group?
2 Is it a different group with a different mandate? I don't know what
3 are the legal boundaries of this Commission doing this work versus
4 another group of people (tape skips) It could be larger, it could be
5 smaller, that is actually ad hoc almost. So, I'd like to ask that.

6 FEMALE SPEAKER: And my response would be, what is your
7 recommendation, because you could continue as the task force or
8 recommend that you continue the work that you've started. You could
9 propose additional members, an outreach plan.

10 There's enough time where it's almost like wide open for
11 whatever you think would be best for informing the public and also
12 allowing as much public participation as we can. That would be my
13 recommendation is you think about it and decide what you want to
14 advise Mayor and Council.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And that's a phrase we did not hear very
16 often last time. There's plenty of time to -

17 FEMALE SPEAKER: I know.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - figure out what you want to do. So,
19 that's music to our, to our ears.

20 MR. McLAUGHLIN: And Mr. Chair, Members, just to supplement
21 what the clerk said, I agree completely. There's some legal
22 flexibility, too. You could have an ordinance that extends your
23 (inaudible) specifically this Commission.

24 Also, under Chapter 24, the Charter, the Mayor and Council
25 are free to create whatever advisory committees they want. So, it

1 wouldn't have to necessarily be within the framework of, quote, end
2 quote, "A Redistricting Advisory Committee". So, there's lots of
3 options here.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Would it be - do we have the option to
5 extend this exact body, or would we have to get renominated and redo
6 our oaths and all that kind of stuff? Don't we expire in December?

7 MR. McLAUGHLIN: In, in theory, I think you expire in
8 December or I'm not sure what the ordinance says. But you also can
9 have a separate ordinance that would extend your life, yes, this
10 Committee.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: So, we would, we would have to ask Mayor
12 and Council to do that. They would create an ordinance, -

13 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Right.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - and it would be done. Okay.

15 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Uh-huh. That's, that's what I think
16 that's one way you could do it.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, we have a lot of options.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: If I may. I, I think it's (inaudible) we
19 try to have the people know that communities, let community members
20 know that we want to be as transparent as possible.

21 I think that's what might have been lacking the last time
22 was a misunderstanding that people had because we were - a time limit
23 that we had as well.

24 But we, you know, we have to make them understand, "Hey,
25 this is what we're gonna be doing." We have to be transparent as much

1 as we have to be to gain that trust. (Inaudible) the community
2 members (inaudible) don't have much trust in city government or
3 federal government (inaudible) Let's face it. But I think if we put
4 the word out to say: We want, we want your input (inaudible) it's
5 value, it's value that people speak of. And we adhere to them. Thank
6 you.

7 FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, regarding the motion that you
8 approved to recommend or make official to Mayor and Council's decision
9 that no redistricting is necessary, and in light of, of your comment,
10 we might want to use part of the study session at the next meeting to
11 review language as part of your interim recommendation to Mayor and
12 Council that no redistricting will take place.

13 You want to continue the work on recommending a process for
14 the 2028 redistricting. That is something that then we, we could make
15 a public record. We could disseminate that information as widely as
16 possible.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Absolutely. Thank you.

18 DR. ALVAREZ: I think that the public didn't really
19 understand what was the value of doing a redistricting. Like what was
20 the core value that was being upheld?

21 so, I, I think in terms of representation and democracy
22 and the, the way that people's interests are through the wards, sort
23 of channeled to be - to attending to the business of quality of life.
24 All of those things were like not connected, the dots were not
25 connected.

1 And I'm thinking of when, you know, the, the planners and
2 the architects do a process of (inaudible), you know, when they come
3 to a community and I've now seen it in the south side, even
4 beautifully with Legos and things, you know, where people say, "Here's
5 this empty lot, and what would you like to happen here?" And, "Here's
6 a fountain and here's a playground," and you know, people have a
7 chance to play with those.

8 It's almost like we couldn't do a lot of that because we
9 were binding legally to offer to the Mayor and Council. We're not
10 there to play, you know, last time. It was just like rush, rush,
11 rush, and everything (inaudible) that map had implications for like
12 the recommendation.

13 But I'm wondering if in the years leading to, what would it
14 look like if we had a more truly civic education approach and the
15 public got to play a little bit with some of the maps and the
16 boundaries and there's this wonderful computer program where you can
17 move this and it's like, "Oh, look what the -,," you know, all of that
18 it seemed to me like would build trust in the process being - but you
19 have to do that when you're not in a binding situation that you are
20 the one to recommend and to make the change because then you can let
21 the imagination fly and people may come up with solutions that we
22 haven't even seen in the map.

23 But I, I, I want to put that in the record because I think
24 that whatever happens next needs to be funded and empowered enough by

1 the Mayor and Council so that the City Clerk's Office can conduct that
2 type of work with that type of resources to be able to do that.

3 To have people play with the map and take it to a
4 neighborhood and say, "We're here. What would it look like if we
5 changed this? Oh, boom, look at that." I think it just, just changed
6 the dynamic completely of how people feel once they look at the map
7 the next time, so, -

8 But that last time, every, every word out of our mouth was
9 like consequential. I think that you get to do that kind of community
10 building when, when you know that the stakes are not going to be
11 punitive to anybody.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: This time we have four years instead of
13 like three days, right? Last time we had a new map, a public hearing
14 three days later, a vote an hour later. It was just - yeah. No, I
15 agree.

16 As for playing with the map, is there any way to make that
17 more accessible to the public? Like I don't - I'm not - I think the
18 answer might be "no", but is there like an easy way to make some kind
19 of on-line tool that people could use to make their own map or is that
20 really, really difficult?

21 MALE SPEAKER: You are correct in assuming that the answer
22 would be "no".

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

24 MALE SPEAKER: The, the most accessibility that we can do
25 is upload like a (inaudible) file to where people can zoom in and see

1 specific demographic data about precincts that they may be clicking
2 on. But as far as changing the representation of the different
3 precincts to a different ward, that would not be possible.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. And we, we discussed briefly the
5 e-mail, a possibility of us getting access to some of the data that
6 has like precinct-level census data. Is that, is that possible? Just
7 for us. I'm not - just so we can play with things a bit ourselves?

8 MALE SPEAKER: Yes. Yes. So, most of that census data
9 is locked behind the, the vendor software that, that you see on the
10 screen now. And we have to get specific instructions from the vendor
11 to extract that, to extract that data. And we'll be getting to it at
12 a later time once we actually have that data on board because -

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

14 MALE SPEAKER: - we can, we can see it now. But as far as
15 getting it into a Excel spreadsheet for you is the difficult part.
16 You can kind of see it on your screen here onto the lefthand side.
17 We, we have all of this data, but just getting it for you is the part
18 that we're waiting on.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, do, do you need anything from
20 us on that or, or do you have - like do we need a motion or anything
21 or, or are you just working on that on the side?

22 MALE SPEAKER: We do not need anything from you. We are
23 just working on it.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

25 MALE SPEAKER: You will be notified when we have it.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.
2 So, the, the final output will be like a giant Excel sheet basically?

3 MALE SPEAKER: Correct. A giant Excel sheet. I think it's
4 about 170 columns total.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. That's fine. Thank you. Yeah.
6 I'm a professional data scientist, so, I can, I can wrangle it a bit.
7 It looks like there's a lot of like - where is all that stuff? I'll
8 figure it out.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah. You - they have the census shorthand
10 for most of the columns, and you'll be getting a key along with
11 (inaudible)

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Yeah. Any kind of data dictionary
13 or key would be, would be great. And on the, the two - I believe this
14 was e-mailed to the whole Committee. I had asked some questions of
15 Staff, and we got some great answers. So, thank you guys for that.

16 As far as what - and we'll, we'll get more into this in
17 the study session, so, just a quick preview. But the definition of
18 "minority" for the purposes of redistricting is anyone who's not
19 listed as "white" alone, which I believe means if you are both white
20 and Hispanic, you would count as minority for the purposes of
21 redistricting.

22 So, that'll be some, some - like that, that column in the
23 spreadsheet will be important, the "white" alone column. And then I
24 guess like just the whole population of the precinct minus that would
25 be the minority population, correct? Okay.

1 Some of it was a little hard to figure out like how the
2 numbers added up, like they add up to way more than a hundred percent
3 obviously because you have people with multiple racial backgrounds.
4 And so the way to get it to add up a hundred is total minus "white"
5 alone.

6 Anyway, we'll, we'll, we'll get into that more at the study
7 session, but that's kind of it, at least for rough proportionality.
8 That's like the key piece of math that, that needs to be done.

9 MALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair? I'm sorry, but I just can't
10 resist asking. The 170 columns on the Excel, do you find that
11 daunting or do you find that exciting?

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I mean if it's - yeah, more, more
13 exciting. Honestly, I'm gonna delete most of them 'cause like the,
14 the numbers we were looking at there was like number of, you know,
15 like Taiwanese, zero.

16 There were a lot of zeros in there? I don't know. If
17 you could pull that up again, but I remember seeing a whole bunch of
18 zeros. So, I, I don't mean to say that, you know, we should be
19 deleting people from our calculations.

20 To clarify, I mean to get a sense of the total minority
21 population you actually don't need all of those columns. So, I'll be
22 deleting them for, for the purposes of calculating that number to do
23 rough proportionality. Does that make sense?

24 MALE SPEAKER: Yes. And I'm figuring anything over a
25 hundred columns would still be exciting.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes. It'll be a large file. It'll take
2 a lot to open on your computer, but -

3 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - that's okay.

5 MALE SPEAKER: Thank you. I think what I'd love to see,
6 and I, I can just make this and - or, or Staff could make it or
7 whatever, but just the minority percentage in each precinct because
8 that - you could even put that on a visual map and then you could say,
9 "Oh, look," but I'm just making this up to be clear. "The, the west
10 half of 153 is much more Hispanic than the right - the, the, the right
11 of 153, which is split in half."

12 So, if we recombine those, that would increase the
13 percentage of minority population in Ward 3. Like it would just give
14 you a way to visually see what would happen if you moved. Whereas
15 right now, all we have is we can ask to Staff to do it, and watch what
16 happens on the map.

17 Or we can just use our general sense of where minority
18 populations are focused, which is right now mostly in Wards 1 and 5.
19 But we have all the percentages here. But that doesn't give us a very
20 precise way of knowing what would happen.

21 So, like last, last time, we would just like take turns
22 saying, "What would happen if you moved this over here?" And then
23 we'd just try it and we would see what happens and it was sort of a
24 (inaudible) thing. So, this might give us more ability to think
25 through proposals.

1 Because if we - I think one thing we have to consider
2 carefully is that if we want to do rough proportionality, we have to
3 do a lot of changes. And last time, we had discussed this clockwise
4 pattern, people moving from 4 to 5, 5 to 1, 1 to 3, etc. But that's
5 complicated, right? It's hard to predict exactly what will happen
6 when you move one, so, -

7 Anyway, the reason I brought up this line of inquiry is
8 that you had mentioned the ability to play with maps, either the
9 public or at least us, and this will get us one step closer to that.
10 We might never have a situation where the public has like a clear tool
11 to do it themselves, but this will at least give us some ability to
12 get a sense of it.

13 FEMALE SPEAKER: I'm, I'm just gonna add that it was very
14 interesting seeing you like show like, you know, like you're pointing
15 it out, but I'm over here like peeking. And I think that's the kind
16 of stuff that we can educate the public. Like this is how we went
17 about it, and this is what, what goes into it.

18 So, say future - like there might be folks that were
19 inspiring to be here, right? And be like, "I want to be part of
20 this process." Because I think that's, that's equally the things
21 that we want to do as well is inspire others to really take part in
22 an ownership over this, so, thank you for showing me and (inaudible)
23 me over here peeking.

24 DR. ALVAREZ: I think study sessions are, are fun because
25 you can unleash all sorts of information points that otherwise you're

1 restricted from sharing with the public (inaudible) And one, one
2 really - one point that was really important for me was when you
3 compared Tucson to some of the worst and the best scenarios.

4 You know, if you compare Tucson to Chicago or to El Paso,
5 then it's like, "Whoa. I see why we're here." In, in, in Chicago,
6 the wards are, you know, are all - they also receive proportional
7 budgets.

8 So, it, it counts a lot because, you know, a rich district
9 versus a, you know - it just really goes directly to the population,
10 the representation and who gets the money of the city coffers, you
11 know. So, they are (inaudible) complete consequential.

12 In a city like El Paso (inaudible) different. You have
13 85% of the population is Hispanic, then the question there about
14 representation become less important as the question of fairness and
15 justice in relationship to areas of the city that are being under, you
16 know, under-invested in other ways.

17 And the conversation there is not about race, or ethnicity
18 'cause 85% of the city is Hispanic. But it's about all the other
19 issues that affects how socio-economics alliances with businesses,
20 with the interstate and all the, the toxic things that happen in
21 relationship to the industries around it.

22 So, it's so fascinating to see Tucson in the middle of
23 being, you know, a city that is trying to establish its rightful
24 balance of these things in the context of the worst is not here.
25 The worst is yet to come, you know? This is not the situation, but

1 it could run away from you because of the rapid development of the
2 city and of the, the balance.

3 So, to me, in a study session, we'll be able to even create
4 a couple of case studies like that where you really see like, "Oh,
5 this is consequential because we're here today," but this could
6 actually lead to (inaudible) action in the future.

7 And I thought was - but that was a (inaudible) that I
8 almost had to like do on my own, you know? Like go and pursue it.
9 And I feel that that was too much of a heavy burden to put on the
10 public.

11 Like go and get, you know, get, get a master's degree in
12 population demographics and, you know, Supreme Court case law and then
13 come and talk to us. That's, that's not fair.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's a really interesting point and now
15 you've made me curious. Does, does each ward of Tucson get an equal
16 budget every year? I guess I assume so, but I don't really know.

17 FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, Members of the Committee, each
18 ward gets the same amount budgeted to run their office. There are
19 different grants and housing programs, things like that may - will
20 differ from ward to ward, depending on the need.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Got it. Thank you. Is, in general, is
22 the amount they use to run their office like kind of a minimal thing
23 that's just like staffing and stuff, or is it a large proportion of
24 the total work that occurs in the ward?

1 FEMALE SPEAKER: It is very minimal and it's mainly the
2 cost of staff. You're right. There's some budget for community
3 outreach. When ARPA (sic) funds were available, each office was given
4 a certain amount, the same amount of ARPA funds to spend as they saw
5 fit. But now that those funds are going away, it's back to a pretty
6 minimal budget.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Interesting. Thank you very much.
8 So, for the study session, I know we discussed this last time, but I
9 can't remember. Is that closed to the public or open to the public
10 but no Call to the Audience? Like what's the difference between a
11 study session and a regular meeting?

12 FEMALE SPEAKER: Mr. Chair, a study session would be open
13 to the public. All meetings of the Committee need to be open to the
14 public. Typically, study sessions do not include a Call to the
15 Audience, but it's up to the Chair if they want to allow members of
16 the audience to speak at any time.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

18 FEMALE SPEAKER: Generally, the, the study session is more
19 for this kind of round-table discussion among the Committee members.
20 And the - a regular meeting would be more formal discussion, I should
21 say.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you.

23 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Also, Mr. Chair, although this can vary,
24 usually study sessions, (clears throat), excuse me, will not involve

1 legal action decisions. You can sometimes make decisions, but the
2 whole idea is that you discuss without deciding.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. That makes sense. So, we could
4 have a study session next time, and then one more meeting after that
5 to finalize our proposal, or more if we want. We have, we have time -
6 so nice. But probably like at least two more meetings, the study
7 session and then one to prepare our recommendation.

8 And then I, I think we actually would need one more meeting
9 after that to officially vote on the letter. If I remember correctly,
10 in 2022, we met two days in a row where one day was to do a public
11 hearing and hash out some stuff and decide what maps to propose.

12 And then the City Staff like wrote the letter quickly, and
13 did a great job with that. And then we met the next day to ratify it
14 and, and so, we probably need, I guess, three more meetings. But the
15 third one could be a quick one.

16 Okay. Well, it's 1:17. I'd like to close at 1:30. So,
17 why don't we move on to scheduling future meetings unless I'll give
18 one more chance for any other discussion items. Anybody have
19 anything?

20 (No response.)

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Let's move to Item 7, Schedule for
22 Future Meetings. So, I believe the Staff did a little poll and, and
23 found out when our availability lines up. I don't remember - is that
24 - oh, we had that hearing.

1 Okay. So, it looks like Wednesday, either - probably next
2 Wednesday maybe would be open for - okay. Let me just ask Staff. I
3 don't know if, if you had a chance to like go through this and pick
4 some dates that work for everybody. If not, that's fine. We can
5 figure it out now. But -

6 MALE SPEAKER: Except for Committee Member Aitken was
7 Mondays, 5:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. Everybody altogether schedules
8 conflicted with any other days or times other than that finite period
9 on Monday. Mondays.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Monday from - what was the time
11 issue?

12 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) 16th. Would that - you have -

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Which is for me, yeah. Right. So,
14 Monday you said - what was the time that you said?

15 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Just one hour?

17 MALE SPEAKER: One hour. (Inaudible)

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, we - yeah, that's probably not
19 enough time. Okay. But thank you for the update.

20 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And this, this is very helpful. I guess
22 I'll just ask. Could everyone please take a quick look at the piece
23 of paper we got with the scheduling and confirm that your entry is
24 correct, or if there's any updates.

25 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Right. I'm wondering if we - yeah, I
2 like the 30th -

3 (Inaudible discussion.)

4 MALE SPEAKER: 30th.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's a Monday.

6 MALE SPEAKER: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: So, that would fit. What - so, 5:00 to
8 6:00. That's because Raquel is available after 5:00, and Tre' is
9 available until 6:00. So, -

10 MR. RHODES: I can go 'til 6:30 if need be.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. Oh, okay. Okay. Both
12 sides are a bit flexible. That's wonderful. Thank you. Yeah. Am,
13 am I correct that Mr. Aitken is only available one day the entire
14 cycle, in person? Because if so, I don't - if so, we should
15 definitely have a meeting that day. I'm wondering if we should also
16 do one before that.

17 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible) There's no need for it.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It's just that October for me gets pretty
19 crazy. So, I'm, I'm wondering if we could do like the - wait. So,
20 who, who can't do Wednesday? Someone can't do Wednesdays?

21 MALE SPEAKER: Wednesdays and Thursday.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Let me just look at this for a
23 bit. Let's all - the 30th we will do. I'm just - I want to plan more
24 than one in the future. I want to plan -

25 MALE SPEAKER: Okay.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - both the study session and the, the
2 next regular meeting after that because all, all of our calendars fill
3 up and it's just - if we can get something - if we can get two of them
4 on the books, that would be great. Let's see. So, is - so,
5 Wednesdays don't work. So, Monday is our only day that works, is that
6 - what about the first half of October? What about October 7th?

7 MR. JARAMILLO: 7th is a Monday as well.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Right. So, but, but Jon is not. So,
9 Jon, Jon can come on the 30th, we'll lock that in. But he's not
10 available on - so, our options are September, all Mondays. Monday,
11 the 23rd; Monday, the 30th; and Monday, October 7th. Those are three
12 Mondays that I'd like to look at.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: When is that?

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah, October 7th.

15 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Which, of course, has a different meaning
17 that it's rather dark. But it's fine to meet that day, I think. The
18 23rd - okay. So, Jon is not available on the 23rd or the 7th of - sorry.
19 Jon is not available on September 23rd or October 7th. But I think -

20 (Inaudible discussion.)

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. What about, what about the 23rd?
22 How do - what do people think about the 23rd? Or, I guess, which one
23 do we think is more valuable for Jon to be there? 'Cause he's going
24 to miss one of the next two meetings.

25 MR. JARAMILLO: Well, the 30th he's gonna be here.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: But should we do the study session on the
2 30th -

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - or -

5 MR. JARAMILLO: Yes.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, then Jon will miss the session
7 where we actually make our recommendations, though. But I think -

8 MR. JARAMILLO: Could he be remote? He can be remote.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: No, he won't. He's not - according to
10 this anyway, he can't. So, if I were Jon, I think I would rather be
11 there when decisions are being made so I can vote. Study sessions are
12 more of a non-voting type thing.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah. But we would like -

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: So, -

15 MR. JARAMILLO: - his input.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: No, no. I mean September 23rd. How do
17 you guys feel about September 23rd, Monday?

18 MR. JARAMILLO: September 23rd?

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I guess (inaudible)

20 FEMALE SPEAKER: The workshop?

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: The stu- -- yeah, the study session.

22 FEMALE SPEAKER: Study session, the 23rd?

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Like in the evening.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: The one on the 30th?

25 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

1 MR. JARAMILLO: Because Jon will be -

2 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: If I were Jon, I would rather be here
3 when voting and decisions are occurring. I'm, I'm not Jon, so if you
4 guys know Jon or anything, you can feel free to -

5 FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

7 FEMALE SPEAKER: September, right?

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

9 (Inaudible discussion.)

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And then that leaves the 7th open for our
11 ratifying the final letter. So, I think I want to lock that down,
12 too.

13 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: 23rd, Monday. All Mondays. Do we have a
15 calendar we could pull up on the TV? That might be helpful.

16 (Inaudible discussion.)

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's okay. So, that gives us like an
18 hour and half to two hours. That's probably about as long as we're
19 gonna want to (inaudible) Yeah, Monday the 23rd of September, so, two
20 weeks from today, yes.

21 MR. JARAMILLO: The 23rd.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: 5:00 to 7:00 P.M. on Monday, the 23rd, for
23 the study session. Staff, are you available on that, that time?
24 You're like half the group, right? And we're not even asking you.
25 So, I, I feel bad about that.

1 FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes, we are available. I can't speak for
2 the City Attorney's Office.

3 MR. McLAUGHLIN: We will be available.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. We appreciate it very
5 much. And then the 30th again where we will aim to have our final
6 proposal written up, although I do want to leave open the possibility
7 that we'll extend.

8 I mean we even just recently discussed extending this
9 beyond the December deadline. So, I don't, I don't think we have to
10 commit ourselves to stopping that day. Oh, something, something came
11 up?

12 FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. That's a - hour and half is -
14 that's what we're doing today is an hour and (inaudible)

15 MR. JARAMILLO: We're gonna need it.

16 DR. ALVAREZ: That week I'm a little busy. I'm throwing a
17 party of 150,000 people. It's called Tucson Meet Yourself.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: You're, you're in charge of that? Wow.
19 Awesome. I will hopefully see you there.

20 FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: A little bit, yeah. Okay. Well, that's
22 a public service to all of us. I plan to be there, so, thank you for
23 that. I would like to propose three consecutive Mondays, the twenty-
24 -- all from 5:00 to, to 6:30 P.M. with the possibility that some
25 people will have to leave at 6:30.

1 But if we're not wrapped up, we - I, at least may need to
2 stick - a quorum may need to stick around a bit past 6:30. But if -
3 so, a quorum would be four people. So, if three of us need to leave,
4 that's okay. But rather two, 'cause Jon won't be there for two of
5 these three meetings. Yeah.

6 MR. JARAMILLO: That's okay.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think - I'm trying to think what Jon
8 would say if he were here. Do you guys agree that he, he would
9 probably want to be here when we make our proposal? Yeah. Okay.
10 And he - yeah. Okay.

11 Okay. So, what I'd like to propose is 5:00 to 6:30 P.M.
12 but a couple of us may have to stay 'til 7:00 on three consecutive
13 Mondays, September 23rd; September 30th, and October 7th. Does anyone
14 have comments or conflicts or concerns? Vanessa, does that work for
15 you?

16 MS. GALLEGO: (Inaudible)

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. I think that's everyone.

18 MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: 7:00. So, you can look at the calendar
20 there. It's a little small, but you can see 23, 30 and 7. So, three
21 consecutive Mondays from 5:00 to 6:30. So, I'd like to, I'd like to
22 propose a motion that we meet on, on September 23rd; September 30th and
23 October 7th at 5:00 P.M. And if anyone would like to make that motion.
24 We just need someone to say, "So moved."

25 MR. JARAMILLO: So moved.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. Do we have a second?

2 MR. RHODES: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Any discussion? Okay. All in
4 favor?

5 (Affirmative.)

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: All opposed?

7 (No response.)

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Motion passes. Future agenda items. The
9 23rd will be a study session. The 30th will be making our proposal if
10 we are ready to do so at that time. And the 7th will be signing off on
11 the letter, if we are ready to do so at that time. If not, the 7th
12 will just be another, another meeting for us to continue our work, and
13 we'll go from there.

14 Do we need to decide like Call to the Audience stuff right
15 now or can we decide that at the time seeing how many - if there - can
16 we just see if there's anyone who wants to speak and make a judgment
17 call, or do we need to set that now?

18 FEMALE SPEAKER: You don't need to include it on the
19 agenda. You, you can allow someone to speak at any point during your
20 meeting. However if you want it to be an open Call to the Audience
21 and advertise it to the public, that there will be an opportunity for
22 them to speak, then we do recommend you scheduling an item on the
23 agenda as such.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I mean I, I would like to do that. We
25 didn't have anyone speak today, but I, I guess I was surprised by

1 that, 'cause last time, there were like tons of people that wanted to
2 speak. So, I guess - I think we, I think I'd like to give, you know
3 15 minutes.

4 MR. JARAMILLO: Let's put it on the agenda. (Inaudible)

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, future agenda items, the 23rd,
6 we'll start with Call to the Audience for around 15 minutes depending
7 on how many people are there.

8 If there's a ton of people, we're, we're gonna have to cut
9 it off and get to our study session. I believe that's everything.

10 Call the meeting to adjourn it. Thank you all. Do we need a motion
11 on adjournment?

12 FEMALE SPEAKER: You do not.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. All right. Meeting adjourned.

14 Thank you everybody.

15 (Meeting is 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: 09/17/2024

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