MEMORANDUM

TO: **BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**
FROM: **JODY N. KLEIN**
SUBJECT: **REDISTRICTING**
DATE: **November 18, 2011**

The Cochise County Board of Supervisors is charged with the task of setting new Precinct boundaries, Board of Supervisors Districts, Community College Precincts, and Justice of the Peace Precincts.

The basic information for decision-making has been set forth in prior meetings and memoranda. The Redistricting Team has put on presentations in Bisbee, Benson, Sierra Vista, Douglas and Willcox. There has been little feedback received and the meetings have been sparsely attended.

Precincts

The Redistricting Team presented a number of changes that would reduce the number of precincts from 64 to 49. Those changes include:

1. Combine Pearce Precinct and Cochise Precinct.
2. Combine Sierra Vista Busby and Sierra Vista Central Business Precincts.
3. Combine Sierra Vista Carmichael, Sierra Vista Fort, and Sierra Vista Fry Precincts.
4. Combine Sierra Vista Middle School and Sierra Vista Hopi Precincts.
5. Combine Sierra Vista Village 1 and Sierra Vista Yaqui Precincts.
6. Combine Sierra Vista Pueblo del Sol and part of existing Sierra Vista Avenida del Sol Precincts.
7. Eliminate Sierra Vista Charleston Precinct, moving its population into Sierra Vista College, Sierra Vista Avenida del Sol, and Sierra Vista Moson Precincts.
8. Combine BI Bisbee, BI Iron Man, and the northern part of BI Lowell Precincts.
9. Combine BI Warren, BI Terrace and the remainder of BI Lowell Precincts.
10. Combine BI Don Luis and BI San Raphael Precincts.

11. Combining 7 Douglas Precincts into 5 new Precincts.
12. Combining 3 Benson precincts into 2 Precincts.
13. Combining 4 Willcox precincts into 3 Precincts

We reviewed the existing Cochise Precinct for modifications along its southwest boundary, but are not recommending any change other than the proposed consolidation with Pearce. We are also recommending minor changes to both the Douglas and Bisbee precincts after meeting with representatives of both cities. They are each in the process of revising their City Ward lines to equalize population and we are accordingly proposing minor modifications to better match those lines. We are also recommending a minor change near the Webb-McNeal Precinct boundary, which would better fit the reduction in precinct parts. Some discussion occurred at the Board over whether the Parker Canyon Lake area should remain with the SV Fort Precinct or moved into Palominas Precinct. We are recommending that it be a part of Palominas Precinct, which would also coincide with the IRC Legislative line (should that eventually be adopted).

It should be recognized that if the Independent Redistricting Commission (IRC) ultimately adopts maps such as the Draft Maps they have produced, the County will likely have to re-do its precincts to match those lines, even though it may conflict with the December 1 statutory deadline. The recommended changes will provide savings to the County by reducing precinct parts (fewer ballot types to be produced) and by reducing the number of poll workers. Precincts will generally experience between 500 and 1000 voters at precinct places. The Board must however insure that election precincts are properly staffed with trained poll workers so that voters do not experience undue delays in exercising their right to vote.

It remains the recommendation of the Redistricting Team that the above consolidations be adopted by the Board of Supervisors.

Board of Supervisors' Districts

Four Scenarios were developed for consideration. Each one meets the requirements for equality in population under Arizona Revised Statutes and meets the other criteria for redistricting. Attachment A shows the demographic data for each of the four Scenarios, and it is apparent that there is little difference with respect to changes in minority voting concentrations between the Scenarios.

1. Scenario 1. Those residents in the Palominas area south of Sierra Vista (current Palominas Precinct) would be moved from District 1 into District 2. Those residents west of 7th Street who are currently in District 1 (current SV Central Business, SV Carmichael, and SV Fry precincts) would move from District 1 into District 3.
2. Scenario 2. Same as Scenario 1, except that only the southeast portion of Palominas, rather than the entire precinct, would move from District 1 into District 2. In other words, Palominas precinct would be split into two precincts. The area west of 7th Street would again be moved from District 1 into District 3.

3. Scenario 3. Residents north of Fry Blvd. and Highway 90 East, who are east of Coronado Drive but west of Moson Road (in proposed SV College Precinct), excluding those in Mountain Mesas Estates, would move from Supervisors' District 1 into District 2. Once again, those residents west of 7th Street who are currently in District 1 (current SV Central Business, SV Carmichael, and SV Fry Precincts) would move from District 1 into District 3.
4. Scenario 4. Residents in Sierra Vista Estates and Golden Acres Subdivision (current precinct SV Estates) would move from District 1 into District 2. Also those voters in Mountain Mesa Estates in Sierra Vista would move from District 2 into District 1. Once again those residents west of 7th Street (currently in SV Central Business, SV Carmichael, and SV Fry precincts) would move from District 1 into District 3.

The Redistricting Team has concerns with Scenario 2 because it divides an existing precinct, Palominas, into two precincts. While a portion could be attached to the existing Hereford Precinct, the remainder of the precinct has only 1438 persons and it would split the residents in the immediate Palominas area. There is also a fairly strong probability that the Draft IRC Legislative Map will be adopted, which would require the entire Palominas Precinct to remain whole. If this occurs, Scenario 2 would no longer be viable. We believe that the other three Scenarios are therefore better options.

Scenario 1 reflects the likelihood that District 2 will increasingly move toward the south and east sides of Sierra Vista. It however does not provide District 1 with direct contact with the San Pedro Riparian Conservation Area, a preference previously expressed by the Board of Supervisors.

Scenarios 3 and 4 are both viable options, and both provide a compact core area of Sierra Vista. One factor worth considering is the future growth of Cochise County, and how future Boards would approach redistricting. District 3 has gradually expanded into Sierra Vista from the north. Choosing any of the recommended Scenarios will result in the entire area west of 7th Street becoming a part of District 3. It is likely that Sierra Vista will continue to grow faster than the rest of the County. If that occurs, District 3 would most likely have to expand to other areas north of Fry Blvd. or move into the heart of Sierra Vista (east of 7th Street). It does make some sense to begin to move north of Fry Blvd. and that would eventually bring the College Precinct into District 3. If that is the future direction, then it may not make sense to move the College Precinct from District 1 into District 2, if the ultimate result is that it will eventually end up in District 3. Scenario 4, just as Scenario 1, would be consistent with District 2 eventually moving into the entire south and east side of Sierra Vista. Thus, the Team would support the adoption of Scenario 1, 3 or 4.

<u>Cochise Community College District</u>

Three Scenarios for the Cochise Community College District Precincts have been developed. All meet the criteria for redistricting, and there is again little difference in

minority concentrations in each of the Scenarios. Attachment B shows the demographic data for each of these Scenarios.

Scenario 1. Move those residents in the greater Tombstone area (Tombstone Precinct) from College Precinct 5 into Precinct 2. Move those residents residing east of Avenida del Sol and south of Hwy 90 East, plus those in Mountain Mesa Estates (proposed SV Avenida del Sol precinct) from College Precinct 4 into Precinct 5. Move those residents south of Snyder Blvd. and east of Hwy. 92 (current SV Snyder Precinct) from College Precinct 5 into Precinct 4. Move those residents west of 7th Street and South of Fry Blvd. (current SV Central Business and SV Busby precincts) from College Precinct 4 into Precinct 3.

Scenario 2. Move those residents in the greater Tombstone area (Tombstone Precinct) from College Precinct 5 into Precinct 2. Move those residents residing south of Yaqui Blvd but north of Ramsey Canyon Road and West of Hwy. 92 (current SV Yaqui and SV Village 1 Precincts) from College Precinct 4 into Precinct 5. Move those residents south of Snyder Blvd and east of Hwy 92 (current SV Snyder Precinct) from College Precinct 5 into Precinct 4. Move those residents who are east of Avenida del Sol but south of Hwy. 90 (proposed Avenida del Sol Precinct) from College Precinct 4 into Precinct 3.

Scenario 3. Move residents in the Portal area (Portal Precinct) from College Precinct 1 into Precinct 2. Move those residents in Mountain Mesa Estates (will be a part of new Avenida del Sol Precinct) from College Precinct 5 into Precinct 4. Move the residents who are west of 7th Street and south of Fry Blvd (current SV Central Business and SV Busby Precincts) from College Precinct 4 into Precinct 3.

Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 both provide a contiguous and compact core area for Sierra Vista (Precinct 4). Scenario 3 provides for the least amount of change over the existing precincts, but it does leave an odd-shaped configuration for District 4. Accordingly, the Redistricting Team would recommend either Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. The Cochise Community College Board and Administration has expressed a preference for Scenario 2.

Justice of the Peace Precincts

Due to population changes that would add costs to operating Justice Precincts, the Board of Supervisors is considering adjustments to existing Justice of the Peace Precincts. Existing JP1 has 10,476 registered voters, and existing JP2 has 10,854 voters. Since they are now over 10,000 each, both would require a paid Constable. The Board proposed a Map (hereafter "Scenario 1") which would move precincts to and from all 6 Justice Precincts. Meetings were held with the Justices of the Peace and Sheriff's Offices. Alternative Scenarios have been developed. Scenarios 2 and 3 below will also (like Scenario 1) eliminate the need for additional paid Constables. Attachment C provides the relevant demographic data for each Scenario.

Scenario 1.

Move Hereford Precinct from JP1 (Bisbee) into JP5 (Sierra Vista). Move Tombstone Precinct) from JP1 (Bisbee) to JP3 (Benson). Move McNeal Precinct from JP2 (Douglas) into JP1 (bisbee). Move Webb Precinct (Elfrida area) from JP2 (Douglas) to JP4 (Willcox). Move Portal Precinct from JP2 (Douglas) into JP6 (Bowie).

Scenario 2.
The same effect would be accomplished by moving both McNeal and Webb precincts into JP1 (Bisbee area) from JP2 (Douglas) and moving Hereford Precinct from JP1 into JP5 (Sierra Vista) and Tombstone Precinct from JP1 into JP3 (Benson).

Scenario 3.
The least amount of change that would accomplish the same result is to move Hereford Precinct from JP1 (Bisbee) to JP5 (Sierra Vista) and McNeal Precinct from JP2 (Douglas) into JP1 (Bisbee).

Again, each of the 3 Scenarios would eliminate the need for additional paid Constables. The Justices of the Peace did express concerns over Scenario 1, with particular note on the further reduction in caseloads to JP1 and JP2 and the impacts of those reductions on judicial salaries. The movement of Portal Precinct into JP6 raised concerns. Sheriff's Deputies in the Portal area are out of the Douglas District. Access from the Portal area to Bowie is via a dirt road, and Douglas is a more natural shopping area for Portal residents. Moving or not moving Portal Precinct will not materially change any of the above Scenarios. In addition, if the Congressional Map of the IRC is adopted, the Portal Precinct would extend all the way south to the Mexico border, and then it would certainly make little sense to tie it to JP6 (as it would create serious concerns over "compactness").

Concern was also expressed over moving McNeal into JP1 while keeping Webb in JP2. Elfrida residents would drive through JP1 (McNeal) to get to JP2 (Douglas). Nevertheless, even with this concern, JP2 would remain a fairly contiguous and compact Precinct. Another concern expressed was the division between Webb and McNeal Precincts, which could have created one side of Davis Road being in JP1 precinct and the other side being in JP2. That concern has been alleviated by a slight shift that we have made to the boundary in both precincts to eliminate Precinct parts. Another concern expressed with Scenario 1 is having residents of Elfrida in the Willcox precinct. It was felt that they had closer ties to either JP1 or JP2 than they would to JP3, and that they tended to drive to Bisbee or Douglas and not Willcox to do business.

Accordingly, if the Board chooses not to have an additional Constables, the Redistricting Team recommends either Scenario 2 or 3. In any case, Portal Precinct should not be moved out of JP2. The Judicial System and Sheriff's Office may present information on this issue.

Both the Justices of the Peace and Sheriff's Offices suggested that having one additional Constable may be desirable. If the Board is inclined to add one paid Constable, it could do so by moving either Hereford Precinct to JP5 or Tombstone Precinct to JP3 to from

JP1 (Bisbee) (or even both precincts), and leaving JP2 unchanged. That would require a Constable in JP2, but that person could serve paper in any adjoining Justice Precinct.

Suggested Motions:

1. I move that the Proposed Precinct Map and the respective precinct boundaries be approved.
2. I move that the Board of Supervisors' Districts and their respective boundaries, as identified in Scenario __ be approved, thereby establishing new Supervisors' Districts as required by law.
3. I move that the Cochise Community College District Precincts and their respective boundaries as identified in Scenario __ be approved, thereby establishing new Community College District Precincts as required by law.
4. I move that the Justice of the Peace Precincts and their respective boundaries, as identified by _____ (Scenario __ or _____) be approved, thereby establishing new Justice of the Peace Precincts as required by law.