PIMA COUNTY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SUMMARY OF MEETING

Wednesday, April 6, 2022
3:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present
Steve Lynn, Chair, District 1
Dr. Augustine Romero, Vice Chair, District 5
Dr. Sylvia Lee, District 2
Larry Hecker, District 3 (arrived at 3:08pm)
Frank Antenori, District 4

Committee Members Absent
None

1. **Roll Call**

   Chairman Lynn called the meeting to order at 3:04 pm with a quorum of 4 members.
   Mr. Hecker joined at 3:08 pm after approval of the meeting summary.

2. **Pledge of Allegiance**

3. **Approval of March 23, 2022 Meeting Summary**

   MOTION: Dr. Lee moved, seconded by Mr. Antenori, to approve the March 23, 2022 meeting summary. Motion approved 4-0.

4. **Public Hearing (began at 3:07pm)**

   Debbie Kenyon, President of the Green Valley Council (GVC), addressed the Committee. Ms. Kenyon began going over the various projects and services the GVC provides or works on with Pima County. She indicated that the 2020 Census shows a population of 22,000 in Green Valley, and the community does not want to be divided into multiple Districts. She stated that Option 2e is the most beneficial to Green Valley at this time.

   There were no other speakers present to address the Committee.

5. **Map Options – Committee Review, Deliberation and Possible Action**

   Chairman Lynn expressed his desire for the Committee to complete their work today and asked Ms. Fyffe to summarize the recently released redistricting legal review reports. Ms. Fyffe stated that the County Attorney’s Office had retained legal counsel regarding redistricting and compliance with Federal law, including equal protection under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act.
The Board of Supervisors was presented with reports from those legal experts during Executive Session on April 5, waived privilege, and the reports were provided to the Committee and posted on the County’s redistricting website. In short, the County is legally required to maintain two districts where Hispanics are able to elect a candidate of their choice, and Options 2e and 2e.1 are concerning due to the amount by which they drop the Hispanic Citizen Voting Age Population (CVAP) compared to the current districts.

Mr. Antenori asked what the drop was that is concerning and what data impacted the drop. Ms. Fyffe responded that the analysis found that while the County does not have true majority-minority districts, meaning 50% or more Hispanic, Hispanics are the plurality in Districts 2 and 5. The legal experts advise maintaining those percentages close to the current districts and avoiding decreases of 5% or more in Hispanic CVAP. Options 2e and 2e.1 result in a drop of 5% in Hispanic CVAP.

Chairman Lynn provided a brief overview of the criteria considered by the Committee so far during this process, both legally required and not:

- Equalizing population in all districts with a population deviation of 5% or less up or down from the ideal.
- Maintaining Hispanic plurality of two minority districts to comply with Voting Rights Act.
- Placing Marana and Sahuarita in as few districts as possible.
- Maintaining the Tohono O’odham and Pascua Yaqui Tribe in their current districts.
- Including portions of the City of Tucson in all districts.
- Not displacing a number of PCC and BOS incumbents from their home districts.
- Considering the ratio of urban [incorporated] vs. unincorporated areas in each district.
- Considering districts that are growing the fastest versus those that are not, and overpopulation the northwest and southeast areas so they can grow into equality.

Chairman Lynn pointed out that Option 2b.2 appears to meet most, if not all of these criteria, and suggested that the Committee use 2b.2 as a starting point. He asked if anyone authored this map, but no one knew who authored it. He further pointed out that Option 2b.2 evolved from Option 2.

Dr. Lee indicated that she would need more time to assess drops in minority populations and jurisdictional populations for Option 2b.2.

Mr. Antenori asked what precincts in the legal review analysis diluted the minority populations to cause a 5% drop in CVAP, to which Ms. Fyffe responded that the percent drop was not based on individual precinct data, but instead the summation of precinct level data for minority CVAP by district compared to the current districts.
Ms. Fyffe noted that in reviewing changes in voting age population and citizen voting age population by race and ethnicity, they track very similarly.

Dr. Lee identified her concerns with Option 2e, including that too much of District 2 was moved to District 4 and that being what most likely affected the Hispanic CVAP.

There was discussion about the change in the percent of registered voters by party in District 3, with recognition that there was not much of a change.

Dr. Lee then suggested starting instead with Option 2b.1. She summarized Option 2b.1 as having moved Marana into District 1, Sahuarita would primarily be in Districts 2 and 3, the San Xavier District was moved into District 5, and the change in incorporated vs unincorporated population within the districts. Ms. Fyffe noted that 2b.1 places the Tohono O’odham Nation and the San Xavier District in two separate Board of Supervisor districts, whereas during the last redistricting effort the Nation requested that both areas remain in a single district. Option 2b.2 maintains both the Tohono O’odham and the Pascua Yaqui tribal areas in single districts, Districts 3 and 5 respectively.

Chairman Lynn stated that he would not support Option 2b.1 since it does not address growth areas in the northwest and southeast. Ms. Fyffe clarified that the Mayor and Town Manager of Marana had requested that the Town be consolidated in one district, specifically District 3.

**MOTION:** Mr. Antenori moved that the Committee focus and work off map Option 2b.2. Mr. Hecker seconded the motion for the purposes of discussion.

Several Committee members expressed support of the motion but were not comfortable with making a final decision that day.

Vice-Chair Romero stated that he conducted an impact analysis on his map Option 4, with regard to Section 2 issues, which shows that Option 4 has the greatest impact on increasing minority populations in those districts and is closer to creating a third majority-minority district. He summarized the focus of Option 4, including maintaining incumbents in home districts, enhancing minority voting strength, and moving precinct 151 (Tucson Mountain Park) back to District 5. It was noted that Option 2b.2 is close to Option 4 regarding the Voting Rights Act issues.

Chairman Lynn brought up concerns that Option 4 does not address the vote and comments submitted by the Towns of Marana and Sahuarita. Vice-Chair Romero asked each committee member what concerns they might have with 2b.2. Mr. Antenori responded that 2b.2 addresses the Town of Sahuarita’s request. Dr. Lee responded that a Pima Community College Governing Board member incumbent is moved out of their home district. Mr. Hecker responded that he would like to digest the information further.

The Committee voted 4-1 to approve the motion to focus and work off map Option 2b.2.
Hard copies of the 2b.2 map and data were requested, including the incorporated vs unincorporated population by district that Mr. Glenn calculated during the meeting. The Chairman called a 15-minute recess at 4:17 pm. The meeting was reconvened at 4:38 pm. The Committee discussed the need for an additional meeting to provide more time to review the data. This would also provide the public with more time to provide input on Option 2b.2.

6. Future Agenda Items

The next meeting was scheduled for April 12 and the Committee will meet in person in the Board of Supervisors Hearing Room, from 3-5pm. The main agenda item will be deliberation on Option 2b.2

7. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 pm.

For a recording of the meeting, please visit the County’s redistricting webpage at www.pima.gov/CountyRedistricting for the April 6, 2022 YouTube recording link.