December 7, 2021

Redistricting for Board of Supervisors and Pima Community College Governing Board

Background

Statutorily, Board of Supervisor (BOS) redistricting is to occur every 10 years following the release of decennial census population estimates for the purpose of balancing the population of each district to within 10 percent to better equalize representation. The deadline for this previously was December 31st. However, this year with the delayed release of Census population estimates, the Arizona State Legislature amended the statute to enable counties to have until July 1, 2022 to complete redistricting. The revised districts would then be effective for the 2024 election cycle. The Pima Community College (PCC) Governing Board uses the same district lines as the BOS.

This memorandum includes the following:

- State and federal requirements for BOS and PCC redistricting,
- Other common redistricting principles,
- Demographic and voter registration data for the current districts,
- Sample maps showing how the districts could be redrawn to equalize population,
- A recommended public process, and
- A request that the BOS provide direction to staff on how to proceed.

State and Federal Requirements for BOS/PCC Redistricting

Table 1 shows the estimated population per supervisorial district after the last redistricting effort in 2011 and for 2020. According to the estimates, District 5 was the only district to lose population. District 2 experienced the least population growth. Districts 1 and 4 experienced the greatest population growth. Overall, the highest populated district, District 4, is about 16 percent higher than the lowest populated district, District 5. This equates to a difference of about 30,000 people. As a result, and according to State Statute\(^1\), the BOS is required to redistrict (rebalance) the population to not more than a 10 percent difference. Based on 2020 Census population estimates, this equates to not more than about a 20,000-person difference between the highest and lowest populated districts. Attachment 1 includes a map of the current districts last approved in 2011.

\(^1\) ARS 11-212
In addition to State law, redistricting must comply with Section 2 of the Federal Voting Rights Act. In short, Section 2 prohibits voting practices or procedures that discriminate on the basis of race, ethnicity, or membership in a language minority group, and, in particular, government action that would leave such groups in a lesser position than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process and to elect candidates of their choice. At the time of the last redistricting, Arizona (and subsequently Pima County) was still required to seek preclearance from the Department of Justice (DOJ) for changes in voting practices and procedures, including redistricting, under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. Pima County’s prior redistricting map, which was cleared by the DOJ, included two majority-minority districts (Districts 2 and 5) that enabled minorities (in this case Hispanics) an opportunity to elect representatives of their choice.

Current population estimates show little change in the total population of Districts 2 and 5, and preclearance is no longer required. However, changes in district lines are still required to comply with Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and therefore staff will be undertaking an analysis to ensure that proposed districts remain in compliance. This includes a three-part test. For Part 1, staff has already confirmed that Districts 2 and 5 include a minority population that is sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute a majority of the voting-age population of those districts (Table 2). Sufficiently large has been defined by the courts to mean 50 percent or more for combined minorities, not necessarily the largest single minority population. No other districts meet this criterion.
Table 2
Minority Voting Age Population by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Districts</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Voting Age Population</th>
<th>% Minority by Voting Age Population</th>
<th>% Hispanic by Voting Age Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>219,327</td>
<td>181,339</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>200,520</td>
<td>150,386</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>206,982</td>
<td>164,261</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>223,742</td>
<td>182,118</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>192,862</td>
<td>156,161</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parts 2 and 3 of the test focus on whether racially polarized voting is occurring and if in prior elections a district’s White majority has typically defeated the minority’s preferred candidate. Staff reviewed a recent report developed for the Arizona Independent Redistricting Committee concerning racially/ethnically polarized voting.\(^2\) Election results were analyzed for 2018 and 2020 statewide elections, as well as congressional and state senate elections, where there were Hispanic and White candidates in the same race. Pima County and five other counties were determined to have sufficiently large and geographically compact minority populations, and therefore the data was broken out separately for these counties. Overall, the report found that more than half of the races analyzed in Pima County were racially/ethnically polarized, but to a lesser extent than the rest of the state.

Because of racially/ethnically polarized voting, the report recommends that districts that provide minority voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice must be created, or if they already exist, must be maintained. The report also examined the percent of Hispanic voting age population needed in each race for the Hispanic preferred candidate to win. In Pima County, for some of the races, crossover voting (Whites voting for the Hispanic preferred candidate) was so high that the percent of voting age Hispanics needed in a district to elect a Hispanic preferred candidate was below 30 percent. But in other races, the percentage needed was higher. The report concludes that in many instances in Pima County, the percentage of Hispanic voting age population required to provide Hispanic voters with an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice is likely to be considerably less than 50 percent (because of White cross over voting), but that a district specific analysis of proposed changes should be conducted.

Staff are now reviewing BOS and PCC past election results for Pima County’s two majority-minority districts. It should be noted that a Hispanic preferred candidate does not necessarily have to be Hispanic. If the BOS were to select a map that largely maintained the integrity of the exiting majority-minority districts (D2 and D5), then it may be unnecessary to conduct

a district specific analysis on the proposed minor changes. Staff and the County Attorney’s Office will be consulting with a Voting Rights Act expert to ensure compliance is maintained for any changes to district lines.

Other Common Redistricting Principles

In addition to equal representation and complying with the Voting Rights Act, other common redistricting principles are often considered, to the extent practicable. These include geographic continuity and compactness, respect for major natural and manmade boundaries, and communities of interest. Unlike the State legislative and congressional redistricting requirements, Arizona counties are not required to start from a blank slate and can choose to retain continuity of representation for voters and communities by maintaining the integrity of existing districts, which could be beneficial when consideration must be given to majority-minority districts. Arizona counties are also not required to consider the competitiveness of districts, and can avoid drawing districts that would create contests between incumbents.

Sample Maps and Data

Attached is a map of the current districts, as well as two maps showing how the current districts could be redrawn to meet state and federal requirements, as well as other common redistricting principles. Demographic and voter registration data for the maps is also attached (Attachment 2). Similar to the recently approved Justice Precinct reprecincting, the building blocks are the 249 voter precincts. The new or revised district is shown in a solid color. The voter precincts that were moved are outlined in blue.

The map titled Option 1 only moves one voter precinct, 69, resulting in a population difference between the highest and lowest populated districts of 9.5 percent, which is under the 10 percent maximum. (Attachment 3) While it is likely the BOS would want to balance the population even further, this map shows one example of the least amount of change necessary to meet the redistricting requirements. The corresponding data shows very little change to demographics and voter registration.

Option 2 is provided as an example of how the population of districts can be balanced to within 5 percent, and also group most of the voter precincts in Sahuarita into a single district – District 2. (Attachment 4) Similar to Option 1, the corresponding data shows little change to demographics and voter registration.

Both of these options maintain the integrity of the existing districts, and do not move incumbents (BOS and PCC) out of existing districts. Neither of these map options are proposed to replace a robust public process.
Public Process Recommendations

A public process could include:

1. A Redistricting Advisory Committee, appointed by each member of the Board of Supervisors.
2. The Committee holds public meetings and hearings (likely to be virtual) to consider redistricting principles and develop map or maps with input from stakeholders and the public.
3. The Committee recommends a map or maps to the Board of Supervisors for approval.
4. The Board of Supervisors adopts a new map after a holding a public hearing.
5. A dedicated webpage.

This public process would also include outreach to stakeholders whom are regularly asked to provide input on election-related changes, including:

- Pima County Republican Party Chair
- Pima County Democratic Party Chair
- Pima County Green Party Chair
- Pima County Libertarian Party Chair
- Chicanos por La Causa
- Pascua Yaqui Tribe
- Tohono O’odham Nation
- Pima County Election Integrity Commission

In addition, input would be solicited from cities and towns, unincorporated communities represented by coordinating councils, the League of Women Voters, and the PCC Governing Board.

Nicole Fyffe and Diana Durazo, both with the County Administrator’s office, will be managing this effort. Ms. Fyffe managed the prior redistricting effort in 2011 and both Ms. Fyffe and Ms. Durazo managed the recent Justice Precinct reprecincting effort. In addition, considerable assistance will be necessary from the IT Department in the way of GIS analysis of current and proposed districts. The Elections Department, County Attorney’s Office, and Communications Office will also be providing assistance.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. The Board of Supervisors approve the creation of a Redistricting Advisory Committee to which each member of the Board of Supervisors would appoint a representative on or before January 18th;
2. The Committee hold a minimum of five (5) committee meetings, with public hearings to be included on each agenda, for each of the five Supervisorial districts;
3. Staff report to the Board of Supervisors on a bi-weekly basis the activities that have occurred and are planned; and
4. The work of the Redistricting Advisory Committee will be completed by April 30th, to be finalized by the Board of Supervisors by May 30th, well in advance of the July 1 required deadline.

Sincerely,

Jan Lesher
Chief Deputy County Administrator

JL/anc – November 22, 2021

Attachments

c: The Honorable Gabriella Cazares-Kelly, Pima County Recorder
    Lee D. Lambert, Chancellor, Pima Community College
    Carmine, Deputy County Administrator, Public Works
    Francisco Garcia, MD, MPH, Deputy County Administrator & Chief Medical Officer, Health and Community Services
    Brad Nelson, Elections Director
    Dan Hunt, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Department
    Mark Evans, Director, Communications Office
    Dan Jurkowitz, Civil Deputy County Attorney, Pima County Attorney’s Office
    Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator
    Diana Durazo, Special Projects Manager, Pima County Administrator’s Office
    Erik Glenn, GIS Analyst Senior, Information Technology Department
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT DISTRICT</th>
<th>PIMA COUNTY SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>POP DEV FR MEAN</th>
<th>POP AGE 18 PLUS</th>
<th>%18 PLUS</th>
<th>18 PLUS %MINORITY</th>
<th>18 PLUS %HISPANIC</th>
<th>18 PLUS %BLACK AA</th>
<th>18 PLUS %AM INDIAN</th>
<th>18 PLUS %ASIAN</th>
<th>18 PLUS %PACIFIC ISLNDR</th>
<th>REG VOTERS AS % 18 PLUS</th>
<th>%REG DEM</th>
<th>%REG REP</th>
<th>%REG ALLOTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rex Scott</td>
<td>Catherine Ripley</td>
<td>219,327</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>181,339</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>156,954</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Matt Heinz</td>
<td>Demion Clinto</td>
<td>200,520</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
<td>150,386</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>50.9%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>98,271</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sharon Bronson</td>
<td>Maria D. Garcia</td>
<td>206,982</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>164,261</td>
<td>79.4%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>118,213</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Steve Christy</td>
<td>Meredith Hay</td>
<td>223,742</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>182,118</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>152,477</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adelita Grijalva</td>
<td>Luis Gonzales</td>
<td>192,862</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
<td>156,161</td>
<td>81.0%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>102,375</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>54.3%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviation between highest/lowest populated: 30,880
% Deviation: 16.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPTION 1</th>
<th>PIMA COUNTY SUPERVISOR</th>
<th>PIMA COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNING BOARD MEMBER</th>
<th>TOTAL POPULATION</th>
<th>POP DEV FR MEAN</th>
<th>POP AGE 18 PLUS</th>
<th>%18 PLUS</th>
<th>18 PLUS %MINORITY</th>
<th>18 PLUS %HISPANIC</th>
<th>18 PLUS %BLACK AA</th>
<th>18 PLUS %AM INDIAN</th>
<th>18 PLUS %ASIAN</th>
<th>18 PLUS %PACIFIC ISLNDR</th>
<th>REG VOTERS AS % 18 PLUS</th>
<th>%REG DEM</th>
<th>%REG REP</th>
<th>%REG ALLOTHERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Rex Scott</td>
<td>Catherine Ripley</td>
<td>210,430</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>173,274</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>149,518</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Matt Heinz</td>
<td>Demion Clinto</td>
<td>207,896</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>156,723</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>104,902</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sharon Bronson</td>
<td>Maria D. Garcia</td>
<td>203,386</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>162,815</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>117,925</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
<td>40.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Steve Christy</td>
<td>Meredith Hay</td>
<td>212,295</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>172,989</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>144,774</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Adelita Grijalva</td>
<td>Luis Gonzales</td>
<td>210,336</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>168,464</td>
<td>80.1%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>111,171</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deviation between highest/lowest populated: 8,999
% Deviation: 4.4%

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of the Census P.L. 94-171 Data (2020 Census); Esri (2021); Pima County Recorder (7-12-2021)