

## **Gila County Redistricting Advisory Committee Report to the Board of Supervisors – August 15, 2011**

**GOAL:** The goal of the committee was to meet, inform and review public input and to provide the Board of Supervisors with at least two formal recommendations for consideration.

**COMMITTEE:** The committee consisted of one Native American, three Hispanic and eight Anglos. Five Democrats, four Republicans, two Party Not Designated and one Independent. There were also five alternates. All committee members were volunteers.

The committee members were:

|              |                    |                 |
|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Gary Andress | James Muhr         | Roberto Sanchez |
| Mac Feezor   | Bob Pastor         | Joe Skamel      |
| Bob Dalby    | David Prechtel     | Loretta Stone   |
| Tom Moody    | Adelaido Rodriguez | Mike Vogel      |

The alternate members were:

|             |                    |              |
|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Paul Bates  | Christine Harrison | Linda Pearce |
| Bob Hibbert | Marvin Mull        |              |

**COMMITTEE MEETINGS:** The committee held nine meetings between 22 March and 29 July 2011.

Our first meeting took place in Star Valley on 22 March 2011. Mr. B. Chambers briefed the committee on Open Meeting Law. Redistricting criteria and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 were discussed by Mr. Bruce Adelson. Census Data and documenting and recording public input were reviewed by Mr. Tony Sissons and finally committee responsibilities, redistricting principles, public participation consideration and general information was provided by Linda Eastlick, Director Gila County Department of Elections.

At our second meeting on 12 April 2011 the committee selected Mr. Roberto A. Sanchez, a resident of Star Valley as the Chairperson and Mr. Gary Andress from Claypool as the Vice Chair. Linda Eastlick presented the committee with general

information, i.e. travel reimbursement, availability of interactive mapping tool on line and the Redistricting Principles.

During our 10 May 2011 meeting, Mr. Chambers briefed the committee on general information regarding emails and open meeting law. Mr. Sissons discussed receiving and documenting public input and the on-line redistricting mapping tool. The committee discussed and presented the idea of having study groups. Linda Eastlick informed the committee on dates and locations for the first round of public information meetings.

Linda Eastlick presented the committee with information regarding citizen handout materials, the mapping submission process, and submission forms at our 6 June 2011 meeting. The committee was briefed on collecting information and committee members were provided a Power Point presentation which they then could use for presentation at community meetings. Linda also discussed the tentative redistricting timeline and informed the committee of the Board of Supervisors approval of revised guidelines to include Study Groups.

At our 19 July 2011 meeting, Linda Eastlick reviewed changes to the redistricting timeline including presentation of maps to the Board of Supervisors on 15 August 2011. The committee then separated into study groups for round table discussions. The purpose of the study groups was to review mapping alternatives submitted by the public and discuss public opinions expressed during the first round of public meetings. Maps were reviewed to see how closely they met the Constitutional one person, one vote criteria and the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Andress chaired the College District study group and Mr. Sanchez chaired the Supervisorial District study group.

The study groups had Mr. Sissons make minor adjustments to some of the maps they were seriously considering for submission to the Board of Supervisors. The Supervisorial study group decided to meet again on Tuesday 26 July 2011 to select the maps to be presented to the full committee.

The College District Study Group was able to select three maps to submit to the full committee at the 19 July 2011 meeting. A total of eight college district maps were submitted. Five maps were rejected due to large population or minority deviations which would not be approved by the Department of Justice.

The Supervisors District study group met again on Tuesday, 25 July 2011 and after review of the maps revised by the consultant and further discussion, they selected three maps to present to the full committee.

At our 29 July 2011 meeting, the committee voted unanimously to approve the three maps recommended by the College District Study Group and the three maps recommended by the Supervisorial Study Group. Twenty-one maps were submitted for the Supervisorial Districts. Most of the maps were extremely retrogressive and/or did not meet required population deviations or the redistricting principle of being contiguous.

**PUBLIC MEETINGS:** From June 8 thru 6 July, the Gila County Election staff, together with redistricting committee members conducted a series of eleven public meetings in Gila County:

Meetings were held in:

|                               |               |                          |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| San Carlos                    | Globe         | Payson                   |
| Star Valley                   | Young         | Tonto Basin (2 meetings) |
| Pine/Strawberry               | Town of Miami |                          |
| Tonto Apache Tribal Counsel   |               |                          |
| White Mountain Tribal Counsel |               |                          |

These meetings were held inform citizens about why redistricting is taking place and to encourage input from the public regarding what changes they would recommend to the district maps. The public was also informed as to the procedures to be followed when submitting changes and the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The public was encouraged to participate in the redistricting process by voicing their concerns and submitting ideas, comments and maps.

**MAPPING ALTERNATIVES:** The committee recommends the following maps for your consideration. None of the maps have drawn any incumbents out of their districts. All maps meet the Constitutional requirement of one person, one vote. The college maps may require slight adjustments for minority percentage reductions. The Tonto Apache recommended map has been submitted “as is” for the Board to review and it too will require adjustments for minority percentage reductions.

## **Supervisory District Maps**

Map submitted by Mr. Tom Moody, TJM01. This map meets all the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. The deviation from the ideal district size of 17,866, is 1.02%. There are minor variances in voting age minority population changes, none of which are significant nor retrogressive. This plan keeps the Tonto Apache Tribe in District 2.

Map submitted by Mrs. K. Feezor, KLFSP01. This map also meets all the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act. The deviation from the ideal district size of 17,866 is 1.66%. There are minor variances in voting age minority population changes, none of which are significant nor retrogressive. This plan places all three tribes into District 3, however, it does not move Gisela from District 2 to District 3 as recommended by Tonto Apache Tribal Council.

Map submitted by the Tonto Apache Tribal Council, TAT01. This map was submitted by the Tonto Apache Tribal Council. It meets the requirements of the Constitution as the deviation from ideal district size of 17,866 is 3.04%. However, the Redistricting Advisory Committee is concerned that (1) the voting-age Hispanic population in District 3 is decreased by 7.14%; and (2) total minorities in District 3 are decreased by 6.37%. The Committee and the consultants believe this plan has a lot of potential, but it will require additional adjustments by the consultants if the Board selects this alternative for further public review and discussion.

## **College District Maps**

Map submitted by Tom Moody, TJM06. This map meets the requirements of the Constitution as the deviation from ideal district size of 10,719 is 4.44%. The plan does produce minority voting age variance reductions as follows:

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 3                 | -3.27%. |
| Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 3 | -2.69%  |

Map submitted by Mrs. K. Feezor, KLF06B. This map meets the requirements of the Constitution as the deviation from the ideal district size of 10,719 is 3.01%. The plan produces minority voting age variance reductions as follows:

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Percent voting age Hispanic, District 3 | -2.22% |
| Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 5 | -7.63% |

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 3 | -2.99% |
| Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 5 | -4.02% |

Map submitted by Blaine Kimball, AZBandit CC02. This map meets the requirements of the Constitution as the deviation from the ideal district size of 10,719 is 3.70%. The plan produces minority voting age voting age variance reductions as follows:

|   |        |
|---|--------|
| Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 5                 | -7.60% |
| Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 2 | -2.11% |
| Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 5 | -4.01% |

All three college plans will require additional adjustments by the consultants to address reductions in minority populations.

Respectfully

Roberto A. Sanchez  
Chairperson, RAC for Gila County