



Meeting Minutes

City of Tucson Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC)

DATE: **Monday, September 23, 2024**
TIME: 5:00 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 5:02 p.m. by Chair Ed Hendel.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Appointor:</u>
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor
Vanessa Gallego	Ward 1
Ed Hendel, Chair	Ward 3
Robert Jaramillo	Ward 5
Raquel Abel	Ward 6

<u>Absent:</u>	
Tre'Davon Rhodes, Vice Chair	Ward 2
Jon Aitken	Ward 4

Staff Present:
Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk
Yolanda Lozano, Chief Deputy City Clerk
Maria Talamante, Assistant City Clerk
Jesus Acedo, City Clerk's Office
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

2. Approval of Minutes from August 28, 2004 and September 9, 2024

It was moved by Committee Member Jaramillo, duly seconded, and carried by a voice vote of 5 to 0 (Vice Chair Rhodes and Committee Member Aitken absent), to approve the Minutes from the meetings of August 28, 2024, and September 9, 2024.

3. Call to the Audience

There were no speakers.

4. Consideration and Discussion regarding the History of Redistricting, Demographic and Population Data, and the Process and Related Information for Formulating RAC's Recommendation to Mayor and Council

Information and presentation were provided by Robert Hunter, City Clerk's Office, on the history of Redistricting as it pertains to the City of Tucson.

Dennis P. McLaughlin, Principal Assistant City Attorney, added three points in regards to the presentation:

1. When the City had quadrennial Redistricting, the City maintained the voter registry rather than the county,
2. In the 1960s, the use of registered voters as opposed to total population began being challenged,
3. At this same time (1960's) the concept of Maximum Population Density (MPD) was established.

Discussion ensued regarding demographic and population data and the process for formulating the RAC's recommendation to Mayor and Council.

Chair Hendel stated that the recommendation to Mayor and Council will not include any maps for redistricting but will include recommendations regarding the process and timelines for 2028.

Committee Member Alvarez asked for clarification from the 2020 RAC proposal. Chair Hendel stated that there were two options, Option A and Option B, presented to Mayor and Council. Mayor and Council chose one option but received protests at the public hearing and Mayor and Council then chose the other option.

Suzanne Mesich, City Clerk, stated that was possibly correct, but would provide supporting material to the RAC.

Chair Hendel advocated for community education and listening sessions in which the public can engage the Mayor and Council and be part of the process.

Discussion ensued; additional comments and questions were made by Committee members Alvarez, Gallego, Jaramillo, and Abel.

No formal action was taken.

5. Future Agenda Items

The following agenda items were identified for the Study Session to be held on September 30, 2024:

- Call to the Audience
- Draft recommendation letter to Mayor and Council

6. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:42 p.m.

Upon roll call, those present and absent were:

<u>Present:</u>	<u>Appointor:</u>
Maribel Alvarez	Mayor
Vanessa Gallego	Ward 1
Ed Henley, Chair	Ward 3
Robert Jaramillo	Ward 5
Raquel Abel	Ward 6

<u>Absent:</u>	
Tre'Davon Rhodes, Vice-Chair	Ward 2
Jon Aitken	Ward 4

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

=====

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. So, I believe we have everyone
2 here who is able to make it today. So, I will go ahead and call the
3 meeting to order. Thank you guys for coming. We can go ahead and
4 start with roll call. Does the Staff typically do that, or should I
5 do that?

6 MR. HUNTER: I can take care of it. Maribel Alvarez?

7 DR. ALVAREZ: Present.

8 MR. HUNTER: Vanessa Gallego?

9 MS. GALLEGO: Present.

10 MR. HUNTER: Tre'Davon Rhodes? He's absent. Jon Aitken?
11 Absent. Robert Jaramillo?

12 MR. JARAMILLO: Present.

1 MR. HUNTER: Raquel Abel?

2 MS. ABEL: Present.

3 MR. HUNTER: Ed Hendel?

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Present.

5 MR. HUNTER: We have quorums.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you very much. Okay. Next item is
7 Approval of the Minutes from both August 28th and September 9th. So, if
8 anyone would like to make a motion for that or if there's discussion
9 of the items first, any revisions that need to be made, we can
10 (inaudible)

11 MR. JARAMILLO: Make a motion to approve the matter that's
12 submitted.

13 MS. GALLEGO: I second that motion.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. I'm sorry. I couldn't hear the
15 motion. Was it to approve both of them?

16 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Thank you. All right. Do we have
18 any discussion?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. All in favor?

21 (Affirmative.)

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: All opposed?

23 (No response.)

24 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Motion passes. Okay. Next item is Call
25 to the Audience. However, I don't see anyone. So, we will, we'll

1 skip that. If people come, we'll try to get them in at the end.
2 Okay. So, we'll move on to Item 4. Consideration and Discussion
3 of the History, Demographic and Population Data, and then we'll have
4 our discussion. So, maybe we'll start with - we'll start with the
5 history.

6 So, the Staff, thank you so much for preparing the history
7 that you put together. That's great stuff and we'd love for you to
8 maybe kind of walk us through it, or got any highlights that we should
9 be aware of, this would be a good time for that.

10 MR. HUNTER: That will be me.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: (Inaudible)

12 MR. HUNTER: So, this was kind of slapped together in the
13 period of about a day and a half. We had to run to our record center
14 and pull the files for the last almost 100 years. I won't read it
15 (inaudible)

16 So, I won't read through this verbatim, I'll just touch on
17 some of the points. If you have questions, you can ask. If you want
18 any additional information as we go through this, let me know and I'll
19 make a note of it and pull that.

20 So, the City Charter, it was ratified March 29th by the
21 Mayor and Council. It was approved by the Governor of Arizona in
22 1930. Section 8 of the Charter divided the city into six wards, each
23 of them containing as nearly as possible the same number of registered
24 voters. So, we're looking at total voters now. At that time, it was
25 registered voters.

1 The records between , and really the, the early '70's,
2 there's a few more records in the '50's and '60's, but there's a big
3 gap in the record between especially '30 and '56. So, there's not a
4 whole lot for that first meeting, or that first redistricting. We
5 don't have a map, for example. We don't have our first map until
6 1956.

7 What we do have is a description of the original ward
8 boundaries, and that's in there for you in case that you're
9 interested. We don't know, and I'm sure with some research we could
10 find what the map of Tucson looked like in 1930, and use this guide to
11 delineate the ward boundaries. We don't have a map from the 1930's in
12 our redistricting file. So, we didn't try to do that.

13 The interesting point to note is the population of the
14 original wards. And we had to do a little bit of extrapolation there
15 because we don't have a breakdown for that first redistricting or -
16 yeah. Or would that be districting?

17 Anyways, we know what the total population was per the
18 census and divided that by six. So, it comes to about 5,418 people
19 per ward. And what's interesting about that is now the ideal ward
20 population is 90,393. So, that's about a 1,000, I think Jesus did the
21 math on this - 1,568.3% increase in the size of the wards since their
22 creation.

23 One of the questions that was put to us was the number of
24 redistrictings that have occurred since 1932, which was the first

1 scheduled redistricting. And because of that gap, we don't know
2 exactly what that was.

3 Again, what we had to do is look at the language of the
4 original - of the Charter, which called for quadrennial redistricting.
5 So, based on that, it wasn't until, I guess I'll get there, but it
6 wasn't until, hmm, what was that? '93, '73, '93? But when they
7 established the current redistricting schedule. Was it '93 or '97
8 that went into effect in 2000?

9 So, prior to 2000, the redistricting schedule was
10 quadrennial, beginning with 1932. So, '32, '36, '40, so on and so
11 forth. So, based on that, there were approximately 26 redistrictings.

12 Now what happened between 1930 and '56, whether they missed
13 one - so, up until 19- -- 1993 is when the Mayor and Council created
14 the Redistricting Advisory Committee.

15 Prior to that, the Mayor and Council were doing the
16 redistricting work themselves, which might account for the condition
17 of the files prior 1993, because from '93 onwards there, everything's
18 there. The demographics, the population data, the census, raw census
19 data, it's all there. Prior to that, not so much.

20 They also spent years on redistricting prior to that where
21 in '93 onwards, there was a finite amount of time set by the Mayor and
22 Council for this work to happen. Prior to '93, they often started a
23 year before the redistricting year and worked a year or two prior
24 before they came up with any decisions. So, this stuff was spread
25 out.

1 Ward population growth percentage, we hit that. There's a
2 list of notable recent changes to redistricting. That includes the
3 '93 ordinance that established the Redistricting Advisory Committee.
4 The 1997 ordinance that created the current redistricting schedule.
5 2022 ordinance that added rough proportionality as a
6 consideration. And this recent 2024 ordinance that added additional
7 language for the consideration of the disruption of the wards.

8 What you have, continuing onward are, are basically bits
9 and pieces of stuff that stood out in the historical record that we
10 had. Ward maps and you can see - sorry. The earliest ward map was
11 in '53, not '56, and some events that occurred between then and now.

12 There was a big boom in population in Tucson. I believe it
13 was the biggest population increase in a decade, from 1950 to 1960.
14 Population grew from 45,000 to 213,000 in that one decade alone. I'm
15 going to say that we didn't see many changes affecting redistricting
16 following that.

17 There was a lawsuit in '64, but it kind of carried on
18 through '67. We don't have the outcome of that lawsuit, so, we have
19 the original filing. We have a restraining order that was put to the
20 City of Tucson preventing them from moving forward with redistricting.
21 And that was - let me just refresh my memory.

22 Oh, and that, that had to do with them redistricting based
23 on voter registration and not total population. And actually in
24 redistricting, redistricting that took place once or twice before this
25 year, there were citizenry that spoke up and said, "Hey, you should be

1 using the total population." They didn't. Finally a lawsuit was
2 filed. And so in the subsequent redistricting of '72, they're using
3 total population and not just the registered voters.

4 There's some population sporadically peppered throughout
5 just to show you how the city of Tucson was growing through the years.
6 In '73, there was a lawsuit, another lawsuit, Robert Royale vs. - or
7 Royal vs. The Mayor and Council, and the City of Tucson.

8 The City wanted to redistrict 45,500 people from three
9 wards, and a resident developed his own map that showed you could meet
10 the kind of MPD - they were using 10% since the '50's as a measure of
11 equalization of the wards.

12 So, this particular resident put his nap together and
13 showed that you could move one-seventh of those 45,500 people and
14 achieve an MPD under 10%. He took the City to court. He won.
15 Basically, the judgment was, "You have 14 or 20 days to come up with
16 a, a map of your own that reflects one-seventh of the population -," -
17 - sorry, Suzanne.

18 MS. MESICH: No, I was just gonna say the name "Robert
19 Royal" sounded familiar to me. He was a Council Member at that time.

20 MR. HUNTER: Oh. Okay. Probably why he knew how to draw
21 up a map. So, they had - the City had the option of drawing up their
22 own map that reflected the change of one-seventh of the population
23 fell under 10% MPD, or they were going to defer to Mr. Royal's map.
24 They didn't. They deferred to a City map, but -

25 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: So, a City Council Member sued the City?

1 MR. HUNTER: I guess so. I didn't know - I saw another
2 (inaudible) I deferred to my boss.

3 MS. MESICH: Unless that was a different Robert Royal.

4 But, -

5 MR. HUNTER: Yeah.

6 MS. MESICH: - he was on the Council for several years.

7 MR. HUNTER: (Inaudible) And it would have to be a really
8 knowledgeable person because they went and redrew the map on their
9 own. So, you know how complex that is.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And the Judge ruled that minimizing
11 disruption was -

12 MR. HUNTER: So, there's a - there is a - another point to
13 this. The - that 45,500 people were being moved ward-wise was, was a
14 secondary issue.

15 The, the big issue was they were being disenfranchised
16 from their vote because there was a primary that was coming up shortly
17 after this, and none of those 45,500 people would have been allowed to
18 vote in it. That was the primary reason that was - yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Affected.

20 MR. HUNTER: It wasn't - it was the 45,500 when you could
21 have done a seventh of that, but that was a secondary reason.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

23 MR. HUNTER: And the rest of the information you have.
24 Basically some population data and that's through 2010. There is
25 an awful lot of records for the years '88 really and, and forward.

1 So, as you deliberate, if you want particular population data that's
2 more in detail, demographic detail, that's stuff that we can pull.

3 It's - there's a lot of material, and it would take time.

4 So, but we have, just so you know, if you're looking for, for records
5 previous to '76, that'll be a, a bigger task.

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Well, thank you so much for putting this
7 together. This is fantastic work, and it's very helpful to us. I
8 mean you can see all the wards have grown quite drastically. So, each
9 City Council Member is representing like ten times more people now.
10 So, thanks again. Great, great presentation. Yeah?

11 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee.
12 Yes, all praise to Robert and the City Clerk's Office. I just wanted
13 to very briefly add three little legal wrinkles, or things that I just
14 remember since I've been working on this for a long time.

15 One of the things connected with quadrennial redistricting
16 since '32 was that at that time, the City, I think, essentially ran
17 its own voter registry. It knew who was registered, and that was,
18 that was one of the thing they did. Now we use County data, right?
19 And which, in turn is census data. That's one point. We don't do our
20 own voter registration rolls anymore.

21 And then two points on the, the history. Exactly as Robert
22 said, in - it was in the '60's that, first of all, they started
23 challenging voter registra- -- registered voters as opposed to total
24 population. That started being questioned as early as like '66. So,
25 it's, it's clear why, why there was this shift going on.

1 The other thing was also in the '60's, that's when we get
2 MPD, that it's, it's one person, one vote and that there's, you've
3 gotta have a relatively equivalent weight under the (inaudible) clause
4 for state and local redistrictings. That's all I wanted to say.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you very much.

6 MR. McLAUGHLIN: Great - again, great job by Robert and the
7 clerk.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I'm curious if we know why the rough
9 proportionality that was implemented as a guideline in 2022 is for
10 only voting age instead of total population, whereas the other metrics
11 are based on total population. I'm just curious if we know.

12 MR. McLAUGHLIN: I'm not sure I know why, why that was -
13 that was what was determined, but I, I simply don't know. Sorry.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Fair enough. That's all right. We can
15 ask our Council Members. I think some of them helped implement that,
16 so - okay. Any questions or thoughts about historical documents?

17 DR. ALVAREZ: Just a quick comment. From looking back, it
18 seems to me that when, when the City has a metric that it has to meet,
19 it meets it very adequately all the way going back to the era before
20 Civil Rights legislation, you know. You have to have one vote, you
21 know, the proportion. They are sort of similar, you can see the, the
22 wards pretty equal in population.

23 So, it seems like when you have a metric, we know what to
24 do. But when it came to minority packing certain districts, because
25 there's no metric even - I mean rough proportionality can be that

1 metric if we, if we advance that. But short of that, that was not a
2 consideration.

3 So, you could have, over time, a slow process where the
4 minority population is concentrated to the point that I think it's
5 something I hope we talk about a lot that the way that, that legal
6 scholars, and I, I'm not one.

7 But I've been doing some, some homework. Loyola Marymount,
8 CLU, and a bunch of things just trying to wrap my head around it.
9 Seems to me that one of the arguments is that when you pack, you
10 dilute.

11 The dilution of the voting power of a minority group comes
12 as a result of the packing because you are then preventing that
13 representation of that group from having a voice in what would be the
14 larger jurisdictions of the city as opposed to the particularity of
15 the neighborhoods of the areas where they live.

16 And that took a while for me to understand the relationship
17 of almost like two sides of the same sheet, you know? Like packing
18 (Spanish) I was just thinking Spanish. Packing leads to dilution
19 and that the rough proportionality could be a remedy to that if it
20 establishes that as a metric, which now the Council has approved.

21 But it's pretty clear that short of having that metric as
22 (inaudible) imposed, we were not doing a good job of monitoring that
23 over the last several census data. So, I just wanted to - to me,
24 that, that's a really revealing behavior from the - which is a good
25 thing. I mean we, we, we do what we're told to do. And when we

1 don't, we're not - we don't tell ourselves what to do, things can
2 slip.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: As a data scientist, I completely agree.
4 I like to have concrete metrics and numbers, so, I'm with you there.
5 Any other thoughts on the historical aspect before we move on to - I
6 guess Item 4 is kind of three different pieces, so, -

7 MS. MESICH: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. I need to correct
8 myself. Robert Royal was not a Council Member at the time. He was a
9 Coun- -- he was out of office by then. So, -

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay.

11 MS. MESICH: - not sure what was going on then, but just
12 wanted to correct the record.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That makes sense. So, the City wasn't
14 suing itself but, but he had a history and knew how to do this kind of
15 stuff, yeah. Thank you. Okay. Well, with that, I mean we don't -
16 it's all within Item 4. It's just kind of a bigger discussion. But
17 the next two pieces are just discussing all the data we have and, and
18 long-term planning would be the next piece.

19 So, at the next meeting, if we're able to come to an
20 agreement, at that time, we're gonna trying to put together our
21 recommendation for Mayor and Council which, just to remind everybody,
22 is not going to include any maps for redistricting. It'll just be any
23 recommendations regarding process or timelines for 2028. So, we can
24 talk about that now.

1 I just want to say one quick thing first which is that you
2 guys hear a lot about like, "Oh, in 2022 we did this, we did that.
3 This happened, that happened." I do want to make sure, we do have two
4 new members here today and also Tre', who's not here, but you know,
5 about half of our Committee is the same as 2022, but we also have new
6 people.

7 And I don't want you two to feel like, you know, you're
8 behind or like, you know, if you have any questions, there, there's
9 like no stupid questions, right? We're - we all learned it last time
10 but, you know, I just want to make sure everyone feels empowered to
11 speak their mind and please don't feel like you're, you know, slowing
12 us down or something if you, if you don't know something that happened
13 last time.

14 Each, each one of us was chosen by our City Councilor and
15 we're all equally important, so, just wanted to say that. And with
16 that, I'll just open it up for discussion on demographic and
17 population data. This can just be open-ended. We can go anywhere
18 we want, so, if you have any thoughts.

19 MR. JARAMILLO: May I have a clarification? So, the next
20 scheduled redistricting is not 'til, what, 2028?

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah, that's correct.

22 MR. JARAMILLO: Okay. Thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And I believe Robert mentioned that the
24 City Council, when they did this themselves, they would take like a
25 year to do it. I think in 2022 we felt the same way, that trying to

1 do this in a couple months was not, not realistic if you were gonna be
2 making really big, major changes. So, I think most likely that will
3 probably be part of our recommendation to Mayor and Council, would be
4 to start the process earlier.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: I wanted to ask about 2020, if you could,
6 if the clerk can clarify that. I, I have the, the document of the
7 recommendation from the Commission - Committee. And, and they had
8 a proposal, they had Option A, Option B, and they had specifically
9 outlined the impact on minority populations trying to get to
10 proportionality, rough proportionality.

11 But I believe that that was rejected? That - can you
12 tell us a little bit about what happened when the Committee in 2020
13 recommended Option A, then B, and then what was the action, 'cause I
14 can't believe that it wasn't what the Committee recommended what
15 happened.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I have my recollection, but do you want
17 to - you might know better.

18 MS. MESICH: It's probably better than mine.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Well, I, I, I e-mailed the Staff
20 about this a few weeks ago, and we got clarification on which of the
21 two items was approved. So, this, this part I'm not completely
22 certain about, but I think the, the Redistricting Committee suggested
23 both. They gave them two options.

24 The Mayor and Council chose one of them. I'm not sure how
25 final that was. I don't think it was officially voted on. I'm not

1 completely sure, but they in some way indicated which one they
2 preferred. And then a lot of people got mad, packed the public
3 hearing and, and had protests and stuff.

4 And, and then the City Council changed their mind and went
5 with the other option that was less disruptive. Please correct me,
6 Staff, if I'm mistaken, but that's my recollection from looking into
7 it. Okay. We're seeing some nodding.

8 MS. MESICH: I think that is what happened, and we can
9 provide that material to you tomorrow so that you've got the proposal
10 by the Committee and the vote by the Mayor and - the action by the
11 Mayor and Council.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think we have that already actually.

13 MS. MESICH: I think it should be in your binder, but -

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Let me look in the historical - I
15 just remember when we got our original binder, it wasn't clear which
16 of the two was passed. But now, now we have clarification on that.
17 And then in 2022, some of the same -

18 MS. MESICH: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - precincts were considered to move.
20 And the same groups protested and kind of the same thing happened,
21 although at that time in 2022, it, it didn't get to the Mayor and
22 Council. They, they came and protested us instead of waiting until
23 the RAC got - yeah, that's, that's good. I mean that's, that's what
24 we're for.

1 I think they had like a press conference right outside and
2 there were a lot of people filling out the seats there. It's funny to
3 see zero people now.

4 DR. ALVAREZ: And I think in 2022, we were caught in
5 the dilemma that the, the mandate that we had said that we had to
6 privilege, least least disruption in having the community members
7 feel that that was severe disruption and not having the metric
8 adopted.

9 It was hard for us to not support that because we were
10 trying to achieve another objective. But that wasn't even - but now
11 Council has changed that, Mayor and Council have changed that.

12 Hypothetically, if we were to do this, which we're not
13 going to do this year, but if we were, we could have more wiggle room,
14 or a future committee would have more wiggle room of saying, "Yes, it
15 disrupts you, but it also meets this other over-charging -- overriding
16 objective which has already been found by Council to be important.

17 That, hypothetically, would have not made people happy but
18 would have given a, a reasonable basis to go against the public, which
19 we didn't feel, I think, that we really had that in '22 in good faith.
20 That still wouldn't mean that the public would be happy or understand
21 the principal.

22 And I think that's where we come down to, "What can the
23 Council do?" You know, it's like when you have kids and you want them
24 to do something, you want them to believe that it was their idea? So,
25 it's almost like the same thing. Like how would you get the populous

1 to the point where what, what they want is rough proportionality. I
2 mean that's an education process.

3 MR. JARAMILLO: Educational (inaudible) That's what I was
4 gonna say.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: (Inaudible), right?

6 MR. JARAMILLO: And I think that's a crucial point 'cause
7 if you're gonna make a decision that's gonna affect the community, I
8 feel that they should have, or should be heard, and then go from
9 there. And, you know, they have to have the (inaudible) otherwise,
10 they're gonna be knocking at your door all, all day, you know?

11 And we can sit here and go around in circles and, which
12 the next scheduled redistrict is not 'til 2028, and we can make our
13 recommendation because by then, I don't know if any of us are gonna be
14 a part of that committee. And they're gonna have their ideas.

15 So, I don't know if, if, if we'd just be wise just to
16 submit our letter of recommendation as we see, or agree on, and go
17 from there. I just - that's my, my two cents worth.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Thank you. I'll just say, I, I
19 think community education is a good idea. But in the same spirit, I
20 would like to have, you know, listening sessions where people can talk
21 to the City Council on -

22 I, I sort of, you know, the City Council is supposed to
23 represent the will of the people that they were elected by. So, I
24 don't, you know, community education is great and I'll certainly
25 support that, but it shouldn't always just be like the Council trying

1 to convince the public that they want something that they currently
2 don't want.

3 The education's great. There, there can be some aspect of
4 that if, if the Council feels that the community is misunderstanding
5 some key concepts, that's certainly fair. But I think at least as
6 much there should be listening to the people out in the community.
7 And if they want a certain policy, then, you know, it would be
8 incumbent on their elected leaders to try to enact that as a
9 democracy.

10 MR. JARAMILLO: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's my perception.

12 MR. JARAMILLO: That's (inaudible) I agree.

13 DR. ALVAREZ: Yes. I, I agree with that, but right now,
14 the City of Tucson is majority Hispanic, or minority. Is it?

15 MR. HUNTER: No.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It's 43%?

17 MR. HUNTER: Not quite.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah, we had the number. It's definitely
19 not majority. It's forty-two point something percent, I believe.
20 Okay.

21 DR. ALVAREZ: For, for the rough proportionality concept,
22 the minor- -- the, the Hispanic population is concentrated really high
23 in Ward 1 and 5. And the others are not representative of that, and
24 otherwise - if you wanted to be crass and just call it like white or
25 Hispanic, you could just say two districts are Hispanic, four are

1 white, and that doesn't reflect the balance of the rest of the city.
2 It's not 42%. That's what the proportionality is.

3 So that, hypothetically, there should be a third district,
4 a third ward that could have a majority. You would have to lower the
5 Hispanic population on 1 and 5, and distribute it to another district
6 adjacent, 'cause you can't completely like draw some crazy map -
7 that's part of the mandate - adjacent district that would take a
8 little bit from 5, a little bit from 3, balance those out at less
9 than, what, 80% or whatever they are now.

10 And that's where - that's, that would meet that principle
11 that then the city would have three districts that have the majority
12 of the minority, right? The majority of minority being able to be
13 represented.

14 So, that's where this balance is right now by the numbers.
15 But what we found out was that even in - even Hispanic population,
16 'cause we saw that from district - from Ward 1 and 5 where feeling
17 that actually to, to break that was actually diluting. And they were
18 using the word "diluting" the Hispanic block power.

19 And while it is true that in some cases, representation by
20 pack- -- by getting a large majority of people really is important,
21 that's when that loop, that mental loop happened of packing is
22 actually diluting. But they were using diluting in the sense like
23 you're breaking, you're taking voters, Latino voters out of Ward 5.
24 You know, you're a Council Member from 1. So, you're, you're breaking
25 this coalitions of voters.

1 But from the bigger picture, breaking those coalitions
2 meant you're giving more Hispanic power and voice to other districts
3 which then brings more proportional.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: And I tell you, it's really hard. I found
6 that it was - what I want to tell Council, and I don't know how we
7 will write this, say, "Somehow you have to go from that being simply
8 an intellectual argument," 'cause even intellectually it's hard to
9 grasp.

10 Has to go from being an intellectual argument to being a
11 value that, that this community (inaudible), "Oh, I understand it now.
12 I will actually be stronger in my voice as a minority voter if there's
13 more."

14 "But for that, it means that from my very engorged
15 district, I give a little so that another one can -," but, but that I
16 found was too much of a leap. It's only, it's only rational, it
17 wasn't emotional.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

19 DR. ALVAREZ: It wasn't value base. People didn't get it.
20 And so that was just very hard -

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

22 DR. ALVAREZ: - to do. Like, "I'm doing this for your
23 good." It sounded almost like that. And you know how communities
24 react when you tell them, "I'm doing it for your own good, but you

1 don't get it." It was just - it felt anti-democratic, like you said,
2 Ed.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. And people, I mentioned this last
4 time, but I thought it was interesting that people were using the term
5 "dilutions", I mean sort of opposite things. There was, you know,
6 some people, you know, would say, "Dilution is putting, you know,
7 the majority -, " or not the majority, but having only two majority
8 minority wards is diluting the minority vote, which makes sense
9 certainly.

10 But then the people at the hearing were all saying, "You're
11 trying to dilute our block of power within our ward by breaking up the
12 barrios and, and moving some into Ward 3, or moving some out of Ward
13 5." I think we heard that as well.

14 So, it's sort of diluting on what scale? Are you diluting
15 within neighborhoods or within a ward or within the whole city. And
16 different people had different priorities. Some people were thinking
17 citywide, some people were thinking about their own ward.

18 Some people were thinking about the park across from their
19 house that they want to - I remember some of them were saying like,
20 "We want to stay in the same ward as this park that we all go to so
21 that we have more control over the, the budgeting for the, the park
22 maintenance," and things like that.

23 So, it's just everyone's thinking on a different scale. I
24 thought that was interesting and certainly hard to parse. By the way,
25 I, I just looked it up. We've confirmed it's 42.2% of the voting age

1 population in Tucson is minority, which is defined as anything except
2 for white alone, which in the census is a category that essentially
3 means you're, you're not partially some other race.

4 You know, you can have multiple races, but if you are white
5 alone, you're - that's one category. And then anything else besides
6 that is minority. And so that minority is 42.2% among the voting-age
7 population.

8 So, rough proportionality right now, 33% of our wards are
9 majority minority. So, we're, you know, we are, we are about 10%, 9%
10 too low. So, if you were to put it to three of the six, you'd be at
11 50%, slightly over-shooting.

12 So, because we have only six wards, you can't actually get
13 the map to work out perfectly. If we had 20 wards, this, this rough
14 proportionality would be easier.

15 DR. ALVAREZ: How did you solve that problem? I'm asking
16 my fellow Committee Members. Like what's - where'd you go from there?

17 MS. ABEL: So, I'm very ignorant about this, but I'm not
18 clear why it matters if it's all citywide voting (inaudible) Is it
19 because of, of your Council person?

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It's a good point. Yeah. We do have a
21 sort of unusual system. But the primaries are just within the ward.

22 MS. ABEL: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And then the whole city votes on the
24 election, in the general election. So, in Tucson right now, all six
25 of the City Council Members, plus the Mayor, are in the Democratic

1 Party. And so, the primary is kind of where the action is in some, in
2 some sense.

3 Not that the general is not important, but you know, it's
4 often not that close in the general. So, I think that's kind of where
5 the impact would, would come from.

6 MS. ABEL: One Democrat (inaudible)

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Right. Exactly.

8 MS. GALLEGO: I want to begin as a new Commissioner. And
9 seeing it from the - seeing it from 2022, you all dealt with a lot.
10 And me coming on to here, it, it was scary in the sense that y'all
11 were dealing with people's real fear of losing power in the
12 perception, and so, I, I do echo that we need to continue the
13 education.

14 But I think, where do we go from here is that empowerment
15 to continue to feel that that - that there's growth within the
16 community. I, I, I was - my business was right outside the rezo- --
17 the redistricting. And I heard a lot from my neighbors, from both
18 business and residents.

19 And one of the things that would echo was - and you
20 mentioned it - it was like "my park", right? Like how cannot - how
21 can my voice not give to that park if I'm not part of that?

22 And, you know, and I, and I think it - and it's (inaudible)
23 I told my neighbor, "Well, it doesn't stop you from giving that input.
24 You're just not - the means are different," right? But there was a
25 real fear with that person was like, "How - I'm not gonna be able to

1 be part of this community." So, it's like how do we empower this
2 community to feel like, "No. You're still part of this, and it's
3 more."

4 So, as I see here and how right now we're not moving, we're
5 not redistricting, but in 2028, how do we prepare those communities to
6 be like, "This might be your future neighbor," you know, in a
7 different way, right?

8 How do we prepare those communities to be like, start
9 thinking of growth, right? Because that is coming down the pipeline.
10 That's coming from us, right? And how, how do we empower them to feel
11 like, "You're gonna be part, and this is gonna be -," like, like we're
12 saying here. We're saying what we want to happen. How do we, how do
13 we do that?

14 So, as I say, (inaudible) this is a huge task. And luckily
15 we're not tasked in redistricting. So, we have the, the, the fun
16 part, right, I guess we should say, where we get to inspire and put
17 that vision, right? So, then, when whoever sits here in 2028, we've
18 done that legwork and feed said hope in (inaudible) positivity (sic).

19 So, I, I'll - that's where I can address that, 'cause it
20 is a lot to take in. I want to say "thank you" so much for, for the
21 historical point of view. This - that, that was, that's a lot. So,
22 thank you for that effort (inaudible) in doing that, so, I'll end with
23 that.

24 MR. JARAMILLO: I, I feel that the ward should be out now
25 rather than have to wait 'til later. If, if, if we keep people in the

1 dark, or they feel like they've been kept in the dark, that's not
2 good.

3 So, if we - with our recommendation is start now reaching
4 out to your communities out there that's gonna be affected, or may or
5 may not be affected. Also, of the 42%, do we take into consideration,
6 I know that we brought it up, how many of those are registered voters?

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It's, it's actually not whether it's
8 registered, it's whether they're voting age. So, over 18.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: The voting age, at a voting age.

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

11 MR. JARAMILLO: But -

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I don't know the registered number, but
13 the rough proportionality principle as written specifies voting age.

14 MR. JARAMILLO: Voting age.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Whether or not they're actually
16 registered.

17 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think the data that we got -

19 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible) I think that's, that's a big
20 part of the equation, you come up with a, with an answer. It's just -
21 if that's not gonna be taken into consideration, or it's not currently
22 taken into consideration, I think that's, that's not right.

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. That's a good point. I don't, -

24 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - I don't think we have that data of
2 registered voters by ward. Do we have that, or it's not known? I
3 wonder if there's differences -

4 MS. MESICH: We can bring up the County Recorder's website
5 which only has active registered voters by ward, -

6 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. That'd be great.

7 MS. MESICH: - if Randy doesn't mind sharing his screen.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you.

9 MR. JARAMILLO: 'Cause the vote of some will affect the
10 outcome for everybody -,

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

12 MR. JARAMILLO: - you know? And, and that's why I feel
13 (inaudible) education, or - and, and getting the word out sooner, why
14 it's important to get registered to vote. So, you can be, it can be
15 an inclusive process, not just a handful of people making a decision
16 for all.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Absolutely.

18 DR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. I think that there's, you know, like
19 we, we have designations that we'd like Tucson to have (inaudible) as
20 the City of (Inaudible) and, you know, the Book Festival is the third
21 largest in the United States. You know, I mean it's like all these
22 really nice things.

23 One designation we now have by default is that we're one
24 of the top, you know, 20 or whatever American cities -

25 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

1 DR. ALVAREZ: - where there is a phenomenon of packing,
2 that there's no rough proportionality in our wards.

3 You know, that's not a good designation. It simply means
4 that we have a community where there is, over time, a slow
5 concentration of minorities in certain areas. And that the logic in
6 the language, which I really like, was that that prevents that voice
7 from being, from having more of a jurisdictional impact in the larger
8 cities.

9 So, it is true that your park may be very particularly well
10 cared for because you're advocating for the park. But you know,
11 there's that other park that is getting the nicer pool, and that it's
12 getting the ni- -- you know, other resources. And you don't have
13 proportionally a voice for your community necessarily in the same way
14 that you have in relationship to your park.

15 So, the, the danger with that is that eventually, it's like
16 you're very powerful but you're also very segregated in the resources
17 that are allowed to you. So, you have that park, but you don't have
18 the same voice on that other park. It happens to be the (inaudible)
19 partisan in Ward, you know, 6 or with 3.

20 So, those arguments are almost like you need something
21 where people eventually will understand that core principal of, "Ah,
22 yes. My interests are in the entire - the representation across the
23 city." But that's what you were saying that com- -- that's how we
24 were speaking about it. But that's not how people were feeling.

1 And I don't, you know, being a professor and all, I would
2 think, "Oh. If we had a task force or a report, or somebody did a
3 report that explained that," but that's never changed anybody's mind,
4 you know? More paper that says that's the outcome, this is what we
5 need.

6 Have to be more of a - almost a commitment to do some- --
7 within, within the City Clerk's Office or somewhere a process of real
8 community input, community education, workshops, display some of the
9 basic history, the basic terms of what the legislation means. It's
10 almost like one-on-one, not in a way of influencing that, but of
11 saying, "Did you know that?" This is what happens.

12 "Do you know that this happened in this other city?" And
13 that this is how they were impacted by that, 'cause we don't have any
14 of that. And again, I don't, I don't know that there's any part of
15 the city right now that would be empowered or funded, certainly
16 probably not the Clerk's Office, to run an entire, you know, multi-
17 year education campaign with workshops and slide deck and, you know,
18 that went around just doing this sort of democratic education. That
19 is a big ask for the Council, but it's almost like the only solution,
20 you know?

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I just want to quickly ask Staff. Do we
22 - is that true that Tucson is one of the 20 most packed cities in the
23 country? I, I hadn't heard that. 'Cause I've known that - is Tucson
24 like known for being - I just hadn't heard that before.

25 MS. MESICH: (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Oh. Okay. Okay. So, we don't, we don't
2 know on that.

3 MS. ABEL: I do think that education is, is essential. And
4 we may not have funds to do, you know, massive public education in the
5 form of meeting.

6 But I think that we could do things like put this history
7 on line and put other things on line, and then try to encourage more
8 community meetings to discuss and have commentary about the history of
9 it.

10 And starting it sooner rather than right before would allow
11 for education as the population grows, and as people start to become
12 more aware of the impact of population growth.

13 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Absolutely. Thank you.

14 DR. ALVAREZ: Sometimes research still works, you know,
15 like people are really excited in the neighborhoods about the racist
16 covenants and that work came from the University, was well documented.
17 It was a data base, it provided examples. And now you see
18 neighborhood after neighborhood sort of talking about that and we're
19 doing -

20 So, I think that they're - people are still very willing
21 to, to respond and to be educated and to be active if it comes in a
22 form that, that explains the issues of power, and the issues of fear,
23 and exclusion, I think that that could work.

24 Again, I don't know which. When we write our letter to the
25 Council and Mayor, I don't know which that is our responsibility to

1 say, "Which department does that?" But I know that in transportation,
2 for example, you, you spend years doing surveys and things with people
3 just trying to get information of the impact of something.

4 You go to, you go to events, you gather surveys, you do
5 presentations, you know, like - and I don't - I wonder if this process
6 could be modeled after some of those efforts.

7 MS. GALLEGO: I beat you.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Go ahead.

9 MS. GALLEGO: That's exactly what I was thinking as well,
10 you know, that engagement. And you mentioned transportation. Yes.
11 Yes. I, I think that's an investment that we need to do in our
12 community. And when we talk about addressing years like that, that,
13 that's a great way to start, and where I don't know where it would
14 lay, right?

15 But I know that it begins with, you know, saying here that
16 we value that, that we think that Tucson deserves it, and, and the
17 value has long - something that we can't put a price on. And that's
18 the pride that we're building that camaraderie between wards in, in,
19 in a, in a different way. And, and that, that, that excites me in, in
20 the way that we can really put that like some type of allocation of
21 funds. And, and again, I don't know where this lays, but that it can
22 come from here and grow into something.

23 And, and I like the idea of where you were saying a form of
24 (inaudible) as the way a department does for the better or good of
25 Tucson.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Thank you.

2 MR. JARAMILLO: I think that we're, we're - it should start
3 with the neighborhood associations.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

5 MR. JARAMILLO: Getting the word out to them, 'cause
6 they're the ones that are there. They're the folks that are known to
7 have their meetings. And some of them are well attended and I've been
8 to some that, you know, you get maybe a handful of people.

9 I think that would be - get the, get the information out to
10 neighborhood associations, and let them run with the ball, and have
11 them, you know, be part of the solution as well.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Absolutely. I like that idea and I
13 believe we have a map, or a list of all the neighborhood associations.
14 I think we have a map and a list in one of these tabs here. Tab 4.
15 Behind the maps there's a - behind the City maps, there's a - at the
16 end of Tab 4, we have a map of each ward and its registered
17 neighborhood associations.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And some of them came out in 2022 and
20 said, you know, "I'm here on behalf of - I'm the President of my
21 neighborhood association." Yeah. But I think the City has a way of
22 distributing information to every neighborhood association. Not sure
23 exactly how that works, but I believe that is a capability we could
24 have them, you know, with any kind of any redistricting related thing,

1 we could say, "Please send this out to all the neighborhood
2 associations."

3 MS. ABEL: I think the question would be, then, what do you
4 do with neighborhoods that don't have neighborhood associations?"

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's harder. And that's important,
6 though, 'cause you don't want to ignore, you know, large swaths of the
7 map, obviously. So, that's something we could brainstorm. That's a
8 trickier one. I think fundamentally - I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 DR. ALVAREZ: Well, I think part of the involvement and,
10 and to listen to what Vanessa was saying is I also learned that, I
11 think I said this last time, even though the bigger picture was always
12 in front of me, the, the greater good of more representation, more
13 fairness, more voice, I did learn that there were decisions that a
14 commission could do specific to parks or a street, iconic things that
15 people really felt that they couldn't live without.

16 And that was really hard because sometimes you were like,
17 "Well, but where else do we take that precinct," you know, is the one.
18 But I also feel like an effort like this going forward doesn't have to
19 be only theoretical, you know, and like, "Oh, the greater good is
20 (inaudible)"

21 It could also say, "Well, it's actually a problem 'cause we
22 have (inaudible) goals, and we think your goal is important, too,"
23 which is we know that you're attached to that park. We know - or
24 specifically between 1 and 5, 1 and 3 was the freeway, right?

25 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

1 DR. ALVAREZ: People were really sensitive about that.
2 And I think that's a legitimate thing, you know, because freeways have
3 been imposed on people. So, why would people now have to be the
4 benevolent ones and say, "Oh, yeah. It's okay. It doesn't really
5 matter to me that is the freeway all the way across," when they were
6 the ones originally that were affected, and nobody asked, you know.

7 So, I also think that listening to the community, I heard
8 that, too, and it didn't have to be one or the other. Sometimes it
9 was then like, "Okay. Well, then where do we find, where do we find
10 another 5,000 people to move, you know, if it's not that?"

11 You know, that's a problem, but it was - it shouldn't be
12 presented only as an opposition, like, "Oh, you're opposing something
13 because you're stubborn." No, I think people have affection for some
14 areas and some iconic places, yeah, culture of those neighborhoods.

15 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I'll just point out, we do now have on
16 the screen the map of total registered voters in each ward. And at a
17 glance, it looks like it is more divided - the MPD of that would be
18 higher than our actual MPD which is, to Mr. Jaramillo's point, kind
19 of, you know, potentially something to, to look at.

20 If we've got certain wards have lower percentages of
21 registered voters, then, you know, make of that what you will. I'm
22 not, I'm not quite sure what to do with that, but it does look like
23 there's - like look at 5 versus 2. Those have pretty similar total
24 population. I need to pull up the numbers, but the number of

1 registered voters is like 40-something percent higher in 2 than it is
2 in 5, so, I bet the MPD of that would be much higher.

3 So, that, you know, hypothetically, could be something we
4 put in our letter and say, "We think you should consider this as
5 well." You know, again, I'm, off the top of my head, I'm not quite
6 sure what to do with that, but certainly worth thinking about.

7 (Inaudible comment.)

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think so. Well, I'll just also
9 mention, I think I said this last time. But in 2022, we sort of tried
10 to do rough proportionality and create a third majority minority ward
11 which would be Ward 3.

12 And what we found is that you have to do a lot of movement,
13 and there was a large amount of total disruption, and it was sort of
14 in a clockwise direction where to get, to make Ward 3 majority
15 minority, you had to take minorities out of Ward 1 and put them - do I
16 have the map (inaudible) Where's the big map (inaudible)

17 So, you had to take minorities out of Ward 1 and move them
18 into Ward 3. That makes Ward 3 majority minority, but then it messes
19 up the total population because Ward 1 was already too small. And
20 taking people out of Ward 1 made it even smaller. So, to fix that,
21 the only other - you, you can move from 6 into 1, which I believe we
22 did a little bit in our final redistricting.

23 But one of the reasons that's challenging is that the
24 people we tried to move were very, very upset. And so, we ended up
25 cleverly splitting one of the wards where half of - the western half

1 of the ward was seemingly fine with it, and the eastern half was
2 furious at the idea. So, we just split it in half, moved the west
3 into Ward 1.

4 And that, that helped bring down the MPD because now Ward 1
5 was a little bit bigger. And again, the problem was that Ward 1 was
6 the smallest in our whole city. But again, back to the rough
7 proportionality.

8 So, so, so if you move minorities from 1 to 3, you create a
9 third majority minority ward in 3. But now you have to back-fill 1 or
10 else your MPD goes up too high because Ward 1 is too small. There's
11 not a whole lot you can do moving 6 into 1. So, all you can really do
12 is move 5 into 1.

13 Now these border precincts, some of them were also upset
14 and, and not willing to move. We did end up moving one of them. I
15 think 47 we did end up moving. They weren't thrilled with that, but
16 we had to do something to get the MPD down.

17 So, we did move them. But if you wanted to do rough
18 proportionality, again, you're moving a lot more people out of 1,
19 so, you'd have to move a lot more from 5 into 1. And they'll be
20 upset about that, but also that makes 5 a little bit too small.

21 So, now, you have to bring people from 4 into 5. And you
22 just - it ends up being sort of a clockwise motion. I think - I don't
23 remember all the details, but there was like a lot of movement
24 happening.

1 And so, everyone was mad and, and we just decided we
2 couldn't try to do that, especially in just a couple of months.
3 I mean, a large percentage of the comments we got in 2022 were just
4 like, "How can you try to ram this through in two months," you know,
5 "You, you put out a map and then three days later, you have a public
6 hearing."

7 People were mad about that. I think we were all kind of
8 frustrated with, with that, too. We, we had no choice as far as the
9 public hearings. You know, we only had a couple of months to do all
10 this, but we felt sympathy with the public in that sense.

11 But that said, even if we had a year to do it, all the
12 groups on the border of 5 moving into 1 that didn't want to move,
13 and the groups that were on the border of 1 and 3 that didn't want to
14 move, and then, you know, potentially 6 to 1, like we'd be upsetting a
15 lot of people.

16 So, my, my personal view in 2022 was that, you know, we're
17 a democracy, we should do what the people want and, and, and do that.
18 But I do understand the other perspective, the, the greater good.
19 Like it's, you know, maybe down the road, it would actually end up
20 being better for the city, you know, the whole, like you have to break
21 an egg to make an omelet type of thing.

22 Like I, I understand that in theory. It's, you know,
23 there's, there's some, some logic to that, but I don't know. I
24 just want to like make sure we're on the same page about this.

1 Like there's nothing that will change in 2028 where we can
2 do this in a way that like won't make everyone furious. So, we can do
3 as much community education as we want, and I think we should and I'll
4 support that wholeheartedly.

5 But fundamentally, we have to kind of come to grips with
6 that unless we can think of some other clever outcome like create a
7 seventh ward or something, which would require a change to the City
8 Charter and require a vote of the people, not just the City Council.

9 So, that's harder, you know, easy for us to recommend that,
10 but that, that's a heavy lift. You know, I'm open to other ideas,
11 but I just want to, you know, all of our options are tricky here.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: Yeah. Thank you for that, Ed. I think
13 that your, your recounting of that was on point. It's exactly what
14 happened. But I do believe that the time compression was probably
15 even worse because the only chance people had to talk to us was in
16 anger.

17 And we didn't have the freedom to say - and we were doing
18 this late because I remember it was cold. I remember what I was
19 wearing and those things, and I'm like I'm wearing my linen now.
20 And then, it's like back then, I was just like bundled up. So, I
21 don't know if it's the weather or it was just like we were doing it
22 like close to December, right?

23 But we didn't have a choice to say to people, "Okay. We
24 hear you. You're upset. You know what? Come back next week and
25 let's work together on a different alternative. You go home, you take

1 the map, you guys talk about it, and bring us some ideas." We just
2 didn't have that freedom. So, we were like the authority, you know?

3 And, "Well, this is what we're gonna do," and they were -
4 so, I think that issue, even though it's always going to be messy, and
5 that's what democracy is, it's, it's messy.

6 But the time compression put us on the seat of being like,
7 "Okay. They're gonna do what they're gonna do. They don't care. And
8 we don't have - and we didn't have that option to say, "Okay. That's
9 really complicated, but why don't you help us? Give us some ideas,
10 'cause this is what the objective is."

11 Instead we were vilified like, "You are just trying to
12 break my neighborhood," you know? And it's like, "Well, could you
13 hear me out that I'm not," but we need time for that trust to grow.
14 And we just didn't have it. So, maybe, even though it's always gonna
15 be imperfect, our recommendation next week can really stress that.

16 You just, because it's so contentious and you have these
17 other objectives, you want people to come along with you, Mayor and
18 Council, you need to do it months and months in advance, and start
19 playing with those maps so that they become themselves some sort of a
20 democratic platform where people can say, "What about this?"

21 And then we go like, "Oh, okay. That's interesting. What
22 about that," you know? Like we just - that's also democracy, the, the
23 opportunity to have the liberation and play with the numbers. It's
24 not just like, "Oh, well, you don't get it."

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. No, I completely agree. I think a
2 chance to engage and not just try to push something through. I think
3 we probably all agree.

4 MS. ABEL: So, is it -

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

6 MS. ABEL: - possible to have a - or the Commission meet in
7 '25, '26, '27, -

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

9 MS. ABEL: - and be pushing the education, and then
10 inviting commentary during those annual meetings? And so that - and
11 part of that examination would be, "Where's the development happening?
12 What's happening with the population growth and, and that way maybe by
13 the time we get to the next redistricting, people will be more
14 informed and, and have an understanding of how things have changed
15 between now and 2028.

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Absolutely. I think waiting until 2028
17 would be like the first mistake, right, probably like we should start
18 at least a year early. But why not three years early, right? You
19 could have, not that we have to meet every month for three years, but
20 - yeah. Or just - yeah, twice a year. Just some -

21 (Inaudible comment.)

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. So that it's out there in the
23 public, yeah. I think it's possible that some people are inherently
24 skeptical of redistricting because, because of gerrymandering, right?

1 You look at some state maps and they have all these crazy like tiny
2 slivers of district just to get like a slim piece of the big city so
3 that the whole ward is whatever - the whole district is Democratic or
4 Republican and I'm happy to say this doesn't - I don't think we have
5 that, that problem.

6 We have some problems but this doesn't look to me that it
7 was drawn in some like nefarious way to capture slivers of population
8 centers. I think, I think the packing may be a - I mean, yeah, we, we
9 just got the history lesson. It looks like, you know, Ward 1 has been
10 the west side for forever.

11 So, anyway I'm glad that we don't have to deal with
12 gerrymandering issues. But that could be a, a cause of people
13 wondering about redistricting, whenever you hear about that. My mind
14 immediately goes to gerrymandering, and like watching for suspicious
15 shapes, you know?

16 So, so, having more public engagement could, could
17 certainly help with the, the openness. I think that's a common theme
18 of what we're all saying. We want openness, we want community
19 engagement for a significant amount of time.

20 So, we should think about what exactly would that look
21 like? You mentioned maybe annual. But our letter could be as
22 specific as we want. We can, we can say we think this exact committee
23 should extend beyond December and go into future years.

24 We can say, "Make a new committee or a task force, or start
25 the 2028 Redistricting Committee at least one year early." Or like we

1 can suggest anything we want. So, I think this, this is a good chance
2 to brainstorm some possibilities.

3 I, I don't think I have a super strong preference as far as
4 like exactly how to do this, but some version of it seems like a good
5 idea.

6 (Inaudible comment.)

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Right. So, that's every two years,
8 but in the odd years, right? So, 2025 and '7, there'll be two more
9 between now and the next redistricting.

10 DR. ALVAREZ: And I think that one of the other things that
11 is hidden is the - that fear that, that you're playing like identity
12 politics in a crass way. Like saying, "If I get a representative of
13 that same race or ethnicity, they're gonna be, they're gonna speak for
14 me," which is also not necessarily true at all.

15 But how do you account for that variances, like I'm
16 Hispanic, I live in District 3, you know. In this Commission, I'm
17 representing the Mayor, but I live in District 3. And then I see,
18 you know, a minority in District 3 almost 44% as opposed to, you know,
19 District 1 or 5.

20 But the interesting thing about that, if I use myself as
21 an example, is a lot of my social relationships are in District - in
22 District 1 and 5, culturally. So, in a lot of ways in District 3, as
23 a Hispanic, doesn't mean that I can't vote for the person that I
24 believe represents my best interests, and you know, whether they're
25 Hispanic or not.

1 But it does mean - brings us back to that question of the
2 jurisdiction, you know? Like what are my alliances? What you were
3 talking about. So, in a lot of ways, from one point of view, and that
4 would just be very, very much one point of view, I could say that I am
5 under-represented on my ward in relationship to my community values
6 and interests and alliances, you know?

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

8 DR. ALVAREZ: You could argue that. On the other hand, you
9 could say, "Oh, but your Council Member represents you fine, you know?
10 Just fine. So, and then, is the hidden, is the demogr- -- the
11 economics, 'cause District 3 has a lot of poor people regardless of
12 whether they're minority or not. High poverty area, you know?

13 And then I live probably in one of the better off socio-
14 economic of that district, but that doesn't mean that ethnicity
15 dictates the alliance that I have with the rest of those neighborhoods
16 around, you know? So, it's all very, very fair (sic) confusing to
17 people, and the fear -

18 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

19 DR. ALVAREZ: - of that be put in that little box. But
20 if you think about it from the other point of view of representation,
21 then it's like, "Hmm, okay. I shop in the south side. I have friends
22 who live on the west side," you know?

23 So, yeah, I'm sort of like floating in District 3 without
24 my people. That would be one argument, right? But that wouldn't be
25 the whole truth.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I mean it's 44%. It's, it's like pretty
2 close to split evenly, right?

3 DR. ALVAREZ: Well, that is not 70%.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It's 56% non-minority. So, fifty, fifty-
5 -- 56% white alone and 44% minority in Ward 3.

6 DR. ALVAREZ: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: (Inaudible) It's not exactly 50-50, but
8 it is the closest ward that we have. And I, I do - I appreciate the,
9 the point you made, you know? It's not always gonna be the case, but
10 people vote for someone of their own race, right?

11 Like the city of Tucson has a minority population of 42.2%.
12 But we elected Regina Romero as our Mayor, so, which is, which is
13 great. I actually was involved in her campaign. So, you know,
14 that's, that's - I was very pleased with that.

15 But, you know, it's not that we always end up electing
16 people of the - whichever, you know, race has the, the most voters.
17 Thankfully. I'm glad that's not how it works. Granted, sometimes
18 that is how it works in, in different places, but, but not
19 necessarily.

20 MS. GALLEGGO: And then I know that 47 was moved. What,
21 what other, off the top of your head, from Ward 5 to Ward 1? It's out
22 of curiosity 'cause I know you said 47, but -

23 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That may have been the only one.

24 (Multiple speakers - inaudible conversation.)

25 MS. GALLEGGO: Yeah.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

2 MS. GALLEGO: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: We also moved 244 -

4 MS. GALLEGO: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - from 5 to Ward 1.

6 MS. GALLEGO: That was exactly where the neighbors and
7 businesses I was talking - in 47.

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Oh. Interesting. Yeah. 47. That's -

9 MS. GALLEGO: I'm like, "Oh, yeah. That was -,"

10 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: That's right near South Tucson, right?

11 MS. GALLEGO: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I remember there were some people that
13 didn't want to move, and we, you know, we, we suggested a couple of
14 maps. That was the one that Mayor and Council chose, but I would say
15 relatively speaking, in terms of like the number of people who came
16 out, which was not a perfect metric by any, by any means, but that was
17 less of a hot button precinct than, than like several others that,
18 that we saw.

19 Okay. So, let's see. 6:20. What time are we supposed to
20 - I think we wanted to wrap by between 6:30 and 7:00. Although, I
21 think - was it Tre' that was the one who needed to leave at 6:30? So,
22 -

23 MR. JARAMILLO: Yeah.

24 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - we may have a bit of time, but we can
25 try to move towards the conclusion here, if people are ready. I mean

1 I do want to think about what we want to recommend. We can try to
2 decide this at the next meeting.

3 MS. GALLEGO: Next Monday?

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes. A week from today. Correct. But
5 we could start having a little talk about it right now so that we're
6 not just coming up with it on the spot next week. So, what different
7 - what do we want to recommend to Mayor and Council?

8 It seems like the one we all like feel pretty strongly
9 about and agree on is we should start earlier than a couple months
10 before the deadline. Are there any other - so, then, there's kind of
11 two things in my head.

12 One is, are there other major categories of feedback we
13 want to give aside from logistics and timeline? So, that's one
14 question.

15 The other question would be, you know, what should we recommend?

16 We should probably say something more than just like,
17 "Start early." I say that because we said that last time. We told
18 them to start a year early and -

19 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. I like 2026 because
21 the odd-numbered years are elections, and people might - in fact, I
22 believe in the history lesson we received today, people were very
23 upset about moving right before a primary election.

24 So, if we start in an even-numbered year, that would
25 minimize any perceptions that were scheming prior to an election,

1 'cause I, I don't think that is our intention. But in terms of public
2 perception, we want to avoid causing a misperception. So, so, I like
3 the 2026 number. Like those two full years should be plenty of time,
4 and it's not close to an election.

5 Would we want to have them convene the Redistricting
6 Committee, or some kind of a task force? Another thing to think about
7 is, do we, this exact group of people, want to continue, or do we want
8 to disband in December and let them choose new people?

9 I think we all signed up with the understanding that this
10 was a short-term commitment. So, I think we probably don't want to
11 just extend our own thing here by years. But something to think
12 about. Yeah?

13 MS. GALLEGO: I think this is the perfect place if we were
14 to make like a task force, or able to invite the community to be part
15 of the process. And where like, you know, (inaudible) will be like,
16 you know, a place of empowerment.

17 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes.

18 MS. GALLEGO: So, maybe recommending - well, it would be
19 great that the same redistricting folks be part of it. I think that's
20 where lies an opportunity to empower the community to have them in the
21 process.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I really like that idea because,
23 partially because the Redistricting Advisory Committee, as an official
24 City of Tucson Committee, I think is not really able to engage the
25 public in a really open back-and-forth way.

1 Like we can have Call to the Audience, but you may recall
2 in our first day of this cycle, we were told that we're not supposed
3 to respond directly to the public, and that we can't have, you know,
4 members of the public like sitting with us for the study session,
5 right? So, a task force could be set up in a way that doesn't have
6 those restrictions, yeah.

7 Do we want to recommend like a particular - like makeup of
8 the task force? Like who would - would it be a, a similar thing where
9 each member picks one representative, or, or something else?

10 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah, that's fair. That's true, yeah.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: More than one -

13 MR. JARAMILLO: More than one.

14 DR. ALVAREZ: - and different wards?

15 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Should we try to say like an equal
16 number from each ward? Like, for example, if one, let's say one ward
17 is especially interested in redistricting, and they picked 20 people
18 and everyone else picked one person.

19 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Like maybe we should -

21 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. Maybe we should say like the same
23 number in each ward so that each ward is equally represented in the
24 process, or something like that. I don't know. I haven't really

1 thought this through, so, I'm just trying to think of possible ways
2 this could, could -

3 DR. ALVAREZ: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: - criticize.

5 DR. ALVAREZ: Well, I think it, it being a task force,
6 it can be larger. Again, also have - like there could be some paid
7 facilitator or a consultant or somebody, like it could be the
8 University or it could be somebody, you know, it could just be
9 somebody who's a real facilitator of (inaudible) of the information
10 that is not, that is more neutral, but it also sort of informed.

11 That person could have a small budget. We're not talking
12 like a large, large contract, or something they - for somebody that is
13 able to have some speakers maybe come for some presentations. It
14 would be nice to have somebody sit in that (inaudible) like, "Oh, what
15 is rough proportionality? What, what was the case that brought it
16 about?"

17 You know, like a little bit of storytelling with
18 consultants and things like that. So, I would think that we - we want
19 to say something about some, some funded resources to conduct the
20 affairs of that task force, whatever that is in facilitation
21 dialogue, deliberation.

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: And the fund would come from the City, or
23 - okay. Yeah. Okay. So, we've got a good formulation of a plan
24 here. So, yeah.

25 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: It could be, yeah, like pick a, pick a
2 community center in each ward and do a listening session, slash
3 presentation type of thing at each one, and have -

4 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

5 DR. ALVAREZ: Because you have so much time, you could even
6 encourage Mayor and Council to - part of that task force is to convene
7 a redistricting forum, you know? Like a one day where people study
8 your presentations, power points, getting smaller groups. I mean
9 there's all kinds of interesting things that can be done with that.
10 It's just whether that -

11 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

12 DR. ALVAREZ: - who's gonna do it, you know? Somebody has
13 to be given that job and (inaudible) Because I think with the City,
14 with the, with the Staff, I think they have a lot of the data and they
15 can answer.

16 But they're not - I don't think it's fair for City Staff to
17 have to carry - be a community builder, facilitator, you know, just
18 play that role. I think that's somebody who can just play that
19 independent role of almost, almost like a (inaudible) person or
20 something. That's not the right term, but you know what I mean.
21 Someone who's -

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think the City - what about the
23 Councilors themselves? Like not to do all that work, but to attend
24 the, the meeting and hear what people have to say.

1 You know, I mean we've made two changes to the
2 Redistricting Advisory Committee guidelines in the last two sessions,
3 right? One this year and one the previous time. They could make more
4 changes if they want to if they hear certain things from the public
5 or, I don't know. That's something I would, I would hope that they're
6 involved in in some capacity. But -

7 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

8 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. I think, you know, I'm not sure we
9 can like force them to do that, but it would be nice if they were
10 there.

11 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Hmm. I see your point, yeah.

13 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah.

15 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

16 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. That's true. I, I want to make
17 sure the person is neutral. I, I'm nervous that this could turn into
18 a, like we're giving a power point presentation about why we insist
19 that we're gonna move all your wards, all your boundaries around and
20 that, you know, -

21 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Right. Right. Exactly. So, I would
23 want the facilitator to be both, you know, kind of listening, too,
24 right? I, I don't, I don't want this to turn into like, "Okay.
25 Great. We have two years to like try to convince everybody that they

1 shouldn't be mad about something that's bad for them," right? Like -
2 or we're gonna try to -

3 I mean if, if there, there is a case to be made that this
4 is, is good for the city as a whole. So, we should make that case,
5 people should make the case. But I, I want to make sure this doesn't
6 turn into like a - here's a paid consultant whose job is to convince
7 everyone that it's not a big deal if they lose access to the ability
8 to vote for the Council Member who controls their parks budget, right?
9 Or whatever it is.

10 Like I - my preference would be for it to be more like the
11 other way. Listen to the people. Consolidate what the people want
12 and tell the Council the will of the people so they can vote, right?
13 To me, that's kind of how a democracy ideally would work. So, that
14 would be, you know, just a thought.

15 DR. ALVAREZ: True. Except that if we put up for a vote
16 that people should stop at red lights, and slow down and stop at stop
17 signs, then they may vote that they don't want to. So, a democracy is
18 also framing what is in the (inaudible) I'm not disagreeing with you.
19 I'm just saying it's both.

20 It's listening to the people, and it's also guiding the
21 people to see what is a greater good than the interest of just you
22 wanting to speed through that light 'cause you are late for your job.
23 Yeah, but you're putting all the people at risk.

24 So, I think it's, it's a really good balance to have that
25 kind of dialogue. But I also think, and this speaks to the attorney's

1 office, this is almost like foolproof because there are other
2 considerations.

3 Like if the MP- -- MPD remains low and there's no
4 compelling reason. If the population change, then that group like may
5 continue to study until the year, you know, because that's also really
6 on the table for them.

7 And if, if the education is education, but at the end of
8 the day, it's like, "Well, you know, you're under 10%, there's no
9 reason to disrupt anything. Nobody's like having any major issues of,
10 you know, harm that is being -," so that, that still is safeguarding
11 there.

12 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

13 DR. ALVAREZ: The same other principles of one person, one
14 vote, and the contiguous things. You can't completely like say: Oh,
15 well, now District 1 is gonna be this, and then it's gonna go like
16 this and it's gonna be on the east side and the west side, and it's
17 gonna be, you know, you - that would be a violation.

18 So, I think there's enough safeguards to the process being
19 as open and deliberate as possible 'cause people will always come back
20 to these other guidelines.

21 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Uh-huh.

22 DR. ALVAREZ: And they may not need to do - the way that
23 Tucson's population is changing. But to your point, we don't know
24 what that's gonna look like in two years, three years, you know?

1 Maybe downtown becomes our big, new point of contention,
2 right? Or maybe there's some other hot spot. We, we don't know that.
3 And in four years, a lot can change. In, in these last four years, a
4 lot has changed.

5 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think it's unlikely that in 2028, the
6 MPD will be above 10%. I think we did a good job of not just getting
7 it slightly below, but way below in 2022. Oh, go ahead. Yeah.

8 So, unless there's like pretty substantial population
9 shifts, I would guess that 2028, we'll have the same decision to make
10 and ultimately, Mayor and Council will just have to decide, right.

11 They can, they can still redistrict even if the MPD is
12 below 10%. This time they decided that they weren't going to. Next
13 time, we'll see, you know. But it's, I think - I hadn't really
14 thought of that until you, you mentioned it.

15 But it is possible, maybe even likely, that we won't need
16 to redistrict, or we won't even be asked to redistrict until 2032, or
17 2036. Who knows how long it'll take our, our great work in 2022 to be
18 unraveled by population shift. So, it could be, it could last a
19 while.

20 We talked about that last time. We talked about, "Do we
21 want to kick the can down the road, and just make a quick fix? Or do
22 we want to (inaudible) by splitting Precinct 46," I think. We, we
23 made good progress there. Yeah?

24 MS. GALLEG0: I think another form of empowerment is maybe
25 revisiting some of the folks who came back here who were impacted,

1 like 47, and saying like, you know, a year later. Where are you at
2 now? How do you feel about that, like as a person now who, who has
3 been - who, who was moved, right? And what, what can you, what can we
4 learn from that experience, right, for future folks?

5 And also, you know, uplift their stories as well because
6 those might be your biggest advocates 20, 20, 2032. You know, I'm
7 just saying, I think the time is now to keep this - I don't think we
8 (inaudible) to forget about redistricting. I think that should just
9 be another vocabulary word that we all know when it comes to, you
10 know, Tucson empowerment, right?

11 And, and maybe form it that way, right? And how we, we
12 continue to have folks use that term. But I do believe that that's a
13 point where we can uplift somebody's story as well as learn.

14 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I really like that idea of bringing in
15 the same people who were opposing it last time. We had to do it
16 anyway. Did things go as badly as they expected or was it actually
17 not that big of a deal or was it good, you know? I really like that
18 idea. Follow up on how it went last time.

19 Okay. Well, we are getting a little bit late in the
20 evening. So, we don't have to make any votes right now. But I guess
21 we should just kind of think and, you know, talk to your Council
22 Member if you, if you'd like to, and think about what kind of process
23 we want to recommend next time. The meeting is Tues- -- Monday, a
24 week from today at, I believe, the same time. 5:00 P.M. Yes, that's
25 correct. 5:00 P.M.

1 DR. ALVAREZ: Will we draft something there that day or are
2 we able to just provide general ideas, and you draft it? Or how does
3 that work?

4 MS. MESICH: We can do it either way. We can take your
5 input next week, draft something that we bring back on October 7th that
6 you finalize because we will want you to sign it. So, that might be
7 the easiest thing is to let us draft, start the draft next week with
8 your input and then finalize it on the 7th.

9 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: I think that's probably the right way.
10 That's how we did it last time except the meetings were like a day
11 apart, and you guys had to write the letter I think literally
12 overnight. So, this time, you'll have a week. That'll be much, much
13 easier.

14 Okay. So, that's future agenda items. We'll - next week,
15 we'll just exclusively focus on the letter. I don't think we need to
16 put Call to the Audience on the agenda, but I'm open to it if you guys
17 think we should.

18 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

19 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Do you mean you think we should or you
20 think we don't need it?

21 MR. JARAMILLO: (Inaudible)

22 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Okay. Yeah. Okay, yeah. She said -

23 MS. MESICH: I'll just - yeah, I think we need it. I think
24 any chance that the public has the chance to talk to us, we should
25 leave the door open.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yeah. That's true. I, I agree with
2 that. I was, I was gonna say, if people show up, we could just add it
3 as an impromptu thing on the agenda. But now that you mention it, if
4 someone were to check the agenda and see if they wanted to come, and
5 they saw that there is no Call to the Audience, they might be less
6 likely to come.

7 So, I think you're right. Let's, let's put it on the
8 agenda with the knowledge that there's a chance that it'll be a quick
9 one. Okay. So, future agenda items, we'll do Call - we'll do pretty
10 much the exact same as today's agenda, but Item 4 will be drafting the
11 letter or voting on, on what clauses we want in that letter.

12 Okay. Well, I think we're about ready to adjourn. Are
13 there any other thoughts. We do have a few more minutes if anyone
14 has any final thoughts. Staff, any, anything we should be aware of?

15 MS. MESICH: No. Just next week when you're discussing
16 your recommendation, if you can make sure you speak into your
17 microphone so that we could get everything on the recording. That
18 will really help us out a lot. Just a housekeeping item. Thank you.

19
20 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Yes. Thank you. And I'll try to
21 remember to remind everyone, but if I forget, please do remind us at
22 that - like do we have to be like right up there, or -

23 MS. MESICH: No. But if you're in the vicinity and you -
24 you hear the little bit of feedback, you'll know that the sound system
25 is picking you up.

1 CHAIRMAN HENDEL: Got it. So, probably about like this
2 far away? I think that'll work. Okay. Great. Well, we'll call
3 the meeting to adjourn and thank you all so much. Great discussion.

4 (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: 10/03/2024

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