

PURSUANT TO A.R.S. SECTION 38-431 THE GILA COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS WILL HOLD AN OPEN MEETING IN THE SUPERVISORS' AUDITORIUM, 1400 EAST ASH STREET, GLOBE, ARIZONA. ONE OR MORE BOARD MEMBERS MAY PARTICIPATE IN THE MEETING BY TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL OR BY INTERACTIVE TELEVISION VIDEO (ITV). **ANY MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC IS WELCOME TO ATTEND THE MEETING VIA ITV WHICH IS HELD AT 6:10 E. HIGHWAY 260, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' CONFERENCE ROOM, PAYSON, ARIZONA.** THE AGENDA IS AS FOLLOWS:

WORK SESSION - TUESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 2010 - 10 A.M.

- 1 Call to Order - Pledge of Allegiance
- 2 Presentation/Discussion regarding Redistricting of Gila County and Proceeding with an Application to the Department of Justice to Bailout from Section 5 Obligations Pursuant to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. **(Linda Eastlick)**
- 3 Presentation/Discussion regarding a report of recently completed Secure Rural Schools Title II Grant, and an analysis and evaluation of potential projects for Secure Rural Schools Title II Special Projects application for 2011 Title II grant funds that will become available in 2011 in the estimated amount of \$432,000 for projects in Gila County. **(Jacque Griffin, Steve Stratton, Steve Sanders)**
- 4 Presentation/Discussion regarding the Boards, Commissions, and Committees Report and an analysis and evaluation of each BC&C's current status of compliance with applicable statutes, laws, policies and procedures. **(Don McDaniel)**

IF SPECIAL ACCOMMODATIONS ARE NEEDED, PLEASE CONTACT THE RECEPTIONIST AT (928) 425-3231 AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE TO ARRANGE THE ACCOMMODATIONS. FOR TTY, PLEASE DIAL 7-1-1 TO REACH THE ARIZONA RELAY SERVICE AND ASK THE OPERATOR TO CONNECT YOU TO (928) 425-3231.

THE BOARD MAY VOTE TO HOLD AN EXECUTIVE SESSION FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING LEGAL ADVICE FROM THE BOARD'S ATTORNEY ON ANY MATTER LISTED ON THE AGENDA PURSUANT TO A.R.S. SECTION 38-431.03(A)((3).

THE ORDER OR DELETION OF ANY ITEM ON THIS AGENDA IS SUBJECT TO MODIFICATION AT THE MEETING.

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS MINUTES
GILA COUNTY, ARIZONA**

Date: December 07, 2010

MICHAEL A. PASTOR
Chairman

JOHN F. NELSON
Clerk of the Board

TOMMIE C. MARTIN
Vice-Chairman

By: Marilyn Brewer
Chief Deputy Clerk

SHIRLEY L. DAWSON
Member

Gila County Courthouse
Globe, Arizona

PRESENT: Michael A. Pastor, Chairman; Tommie C. Martin, Vice-Chairman; Shirley L. Dawson, Supervisor (via phone conference); Don McDaniel, Jr., County Manager; Marilyn Brewer, Deputy Clerk; and Bryan Chambers, Chief Deputy County Attorney.

Item 1 – Call to Order – Pledge of Allegiance

The Gila County Board of Supervisors met in a work session at 10:00 a.m. this date in the Board of Supervisors hearing room. Tommie Martin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Minutes for Redistricting item only...

Item 2 - Presentation/Discussion regarding Redistricting of Gila County and Proceeding with an Application to the Department of Justice to Bailout from Section 5 Obligations Pursuant to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Linda Eastlick, Elections Director, introduced Tony Sissons, President/Owner of Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix, Arizona, and Bruce Adelson, Attorney at Law/CEO of Federal Contract Compliance in Potomac, Maryland. Ms. Eastlick stated that both of these gentlemen worked with Gila County on the redistricting process in 2000, although at the time Mr. Sissons was working for the County on the submissions side and Mr. Adelson was working for the U.S. Department of Justice on the review side; however, Mr. Adelson now has his own private company. These 2 consultants will serve as legal and process consultants for the current Gila County Redistricting process. Mr. Sissons began a PowerPoint presentation entitled “Redistricting of Supervisor Districts.” Mr. Sissons provided a brief background on himself and Mr. Adelson and what the role of each would be during Gila County’s redistricting process. He explained that Gila County has to redistrict for the following 2 reasons: 1) the U.S. Constitution, under the principle of “one person, one vote” requires that the districts from which we elect representatives be equal in population, and 2) 2

the County must redistrict after every decennial census and whenever there is a change in the number of districts. The official estimate of Gila County population in 2009 was 57,204, which shows an increase of 11.4% since 2000. If that population figure turns out to be close to the official Census count, each supervisorial district's ideal size would be estimated to be 19,068, which includes all people, regardless of age, eligibility to vote, or citizenship. Chairman Pastor stated that since there has been a challenge as to the legality of the citizenship of a resident, he wanted to know the reason Mr. Sissons was stating that citizenship has no basis in the Census. Mr. Sissons explained that every decade there are many challenges to the way the Census Bureau administers its responsibilities of counting population for representation. If there are people that are in this country without a legal right to be here, the greatest likelihood is that they never answered the Census in the first place. The Census Bureau has done studies on this to look at the self-exclusion and the reasons for same and the Census Bureau has never lost a court case to date. Chairman Pastor also inquired about part-time residency. Mr. Sisson replied that the instructions the Census Bureau gives to its enumerators is that it is up to the respondent to decide where they live, but the guidance that the enumerator will give is how many nights out of the year does the resident spend in one place versus the other place and whatever that predominance is, the Bureau will then consider that to be the residence of that person. Mr. Sissons continued with his presentation by stating that in the past, district populations could vary as much as 10% without having to give an explanation; however, in 2004, a Federal court decision in a Georgia case reduced the allowable variance. Block-level redistricting allows flexibility to achieve a small variance. To comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act, Gila County must draw new districts that have "neither the purpose, nor the effect, of diluting the voting strength of racial, origin or language minority populations." To avoid "retrogression" in minority voting strength, it must be understood what "benchmark" minority proportions are that the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) will be using. The DOJ looks at the minority populations that exist today (2010 Census) in the most recently pre-cleared districts, not at the proportions that existed when the districts were drawn. Those proportions won't be known until the 2010 Census data arrives in March 2011. Mr. Sissons stated that in 2000, the voting-age minority populations in Gila County were as follows: District 1 - 5.94%; District 2 - 28.48%; and District 3 - 47.70%. None of the districts were "minority-majority," but District 3 was close. The 2010 Census will provide information as to whether population shifts during the decade will now require drawing a minority-majority district. In regard to redistricting principles, Mr. Sissons stated that as a result of laws and court cases, certain common "district design" rules have evolved. In some circumstances, these rules can conflict with each other. It will be up to the Board of Supervisors to prioritize how it wants the districting principles applied. The discussion and adoption of those priorities should be held in a public session. He then explained both the common and less common redistricting principles. The courts and the DOJ want the redistricting process to be an assertively public process and the public record should clearly demonstrate that Gila County paid attention to its residents and did not just "give lip service" to public input. He stated that the preliminary studies will include examining, mapping and documenting the physical and demographic makeup of Gila County;

examining County and DOJ records to get a complete picture of the County's preclearance history; and then catalog recent state, county and city election results at the precinct level. When the Census data arrives, the population, race and ethnicity values in the current districts will have to be determined along with the size of population shifts necessary to equalize districts. The minority race proportions in each current district will also have to be determined as well as the permissible population movements necessary to equalize district populations without diminishing minority voting strength. Finally, the magnitude and extent of any racially-polarized voting will have to be examined. Mr. Sissons stated that there will have to be a major outreach to all of the community leaders to explain the process, determine their expectations, and encourage their participation and leadership. Also, a contact list of people and organizations will have to be developed as suggested by key leaders. Public information will be prepared to include maps illustrating topics examined in the preliminary studies; information handouts/booklets describing the various aspects of the redistricting process; as well as citizen redistricting kits, which will include a printed booklet of instructions, data and foldout base maps along with a redistricting map on the County's website. Initial meetings will be held with the Board and elected officials in the form of a work session to go into more detail on the process, legal setting, roles and responsibilities; to discuss districting principles; and to obtain Supervisors' direction on priority ranking of districting principles. This will be followed by individual meetings with Board members and staff to obtain input on possible or preferred configuration of districts. The first round of resident 30-minute public hearings/workshops will include 3 meetings, one in each of the current districts. The meetings will include viewing exhibits, a short presentation on scope, purposes, process, timelines and legal issues; stressing that no maps have been drawn yet and that the request for input is genuine; and invite citizens to try their hand at drawing their perceptions of 'communities of interest' important to them on tracing paper laid over County maps. This will be followed by the County analyzing the plans and community-of interest maps submitted by citizens, preparation of 3-4 alternate plans and then have the proposed alternate plans published. A second round of resident 30-minute public hearings/workshops will again include 3 meetings, one in each of the current districts and will include a short formal presentation that describes the features of each plan; stresses the extent to which plans incorporate ideas gathered in various public-input meetings; and describe ways for citizens to register their views or choices of plans or plan features and, in this case, that would be with the redistricting committee. The consultants and County staff will be present to answer questions. After all the meetings are held, then the consultants will prepare final versions of 2-3 plans for consideration by the Board. The plans will be displayed on the County's website and in the 4 newspapers. The public will be invited to send in comments and to attend the plan adoption meeting. At a regular meeting of the Board, the redistricting committee along with the consultants and staff will present plans to the Board at a meeting held specifically for that purpose. The consultant team's preclearance expert will examine the adopted plan for compliance with the new DOJ Section 5 regulations. In conclusion, Mr. Sissons stated that the consultants will prepare the preclearance application files and exhibits requested by the County Attorney because the submission on the

County's behalf has to be prepared by the County Attorney. Daisy Flores, County Attorney, inquired about the time frame and when she should expect a final decision. Mr. Sissons stated that the supervisorial plan should be adopted in early December 2011. Chairman Pastor stated that Mr. Sissons mentioned providing technical and legal assistance to the Gila County staff and redistricting committee, if one is formed, and inquired if it is required to have a redistricting committee or if that was just a recommendation. Mr. Sissons replied that to his knowledge it is not a requirement, but a committee was used for the 2000 Census. Upon inquiry by Vice-Chairman Martin as to when the Census data will arrive, Mr. Sissons stated that it should arrive any time after March 15, 2011, because the Census Bureau is required to have all of the data to all the states where it then gets passed down to the jurisdictions and that deadline is April 1, 2011. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that the only other special district in Gila County that is population based is the Gila County Community College District (GCCCD); the other districts such as fire and water are land based. She inquired if the GCCCD would be included. Mr. Sissons stated that even judicial districts are not required to balance their populations, but any changes to those districts are still subject to the DOJ preclearance. The GCCCD will be included; however, 10 years ago when the County did the supervisorial districts, the GCCCD had not come into existence. When the map was drawn by staff with the College's 5 districts, he was asked to review it and it was done on the basis of whole precincts. He stated it will be a matter of whether the County and the GCCCD can come to an agreement as to which entity will actually manage the process of drawing those districts. Mr. Sissons stated that because GCCCD's maps were drawn so recently, they probably won't need to be redistricted because the populations would be approximately the same. His advice would be, and he will check, that they will need to be redistricted because it is highly unlikely that they will still be in population balance. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that she would like to have that information. Mr. Sissons stated that it was not part of his contract at this point and the issues that arise out of whether or not the Board gives the redistricting advisory committee the responsibility to do those and should they run a parallel process or do one after the other are decisions that will need to be made internally. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired whether there would be a different committee for that or whether the same committee would be used. Mr. Sissons replied that a separate committee could be created and he was thinking in terms of not so much the DOJ view of things, but possible court challenges. He stated that redistricting is one of those processes in which some people can feel like they have been really aggrieved by the outcome and decide to take it to court, so it has to be looked at by how the process would be viewed by the court, which he would refer to the County Attorney. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired if Mr. Sissons would recommend that the County look at the judicial district. Mr. Sissons replied that by looking at a map, he could sort of plot and analyze them, but they really are sized and proportioned to administrative activity within the district. The matter of representation is not a constitutional matter; it's simply a decision by the U.S. Supreme Court many years ago that judicial districts of any sort would not have to comply with 'one person, one vote.' Supervisor Dawson stated that the County is embarking on a very complicated process. She was reviewing the guidelines of forming the redistricting committee, which she knows will be a challenging

process. Supervisor Dawson stated that she believes the Board is going to ask for people to submit their names if they are interested in serving on this committee. She inquired how often the redistricting committee would have to meet during this 6-8 month process. Mr. Sissons stated that they would probably need to meet approximately 8 times because they would be the ears and eyes of the process for each of the 6 public meetings and would probably be involved in a couple of meetings before those 6 meetings. The committee would also be involved in presenting the plan to the Board. Supervisor Dawson stated that because of the way the County is divided with isolated small populations of Native Americans on either side of the Salt River Canyon, in Canyon Day, Cedar Creek, Carrizo Creek and Cibecue, she inquired if they should be represented on this committee also. Mr. Sissons stated that in reading the rules that staff have come up with that parallel the state rules on selecting a committee, he believes one of the requirements is that there be 3 members from each of the 3 supervisorial districts. In terms of appearance, it would probably be a very good idea to make sure that each of the racial minorities within the County are accounted for in the composition of the committee to the extent that is possible. Bill Rapport, Mayor of the Town of Star Valley, questioned, "Will you be able to select people from each individual area, town, etc. in each district to be represented on this committee and who would make the final decision?" Mr. Sissons stated that as he understands it, people generally will be invited to put in an application to be on the committee and the final decision will be the prerogative of the Board of Supervisors. Chairman Pastor stated that in regard to having the committee represent the entire County, he believes that further on in the work session and through the discussions this morning, "We will be able to figure out some kind of process that we want to develop in order to recruit folks from all over the County." Chairman Pastor stated that there has been some mention of a radio campaign to see if people want to volunteer and in his community meetings, he's going to encourage those people to submit a letter requesting the opportunity to serve. Ms. Eastlick stated that this is just the kickoff meeting and there will be further discussions with the Board on recommendations on the appointments. She has some preliminary guidelines as to how the committee should be developed. Mr. Rapport wanted to ensure that he is kept informed of the 6 process. Vice-Chairman Martin stated that even though there will be a formal committee, nothing precludes the communities from coming together and providing input into the process. Mr. Sissons stated that the committee will be a very visible conduit for the opinions of the residents and during the last redistricting process there were several groups that drew complete County-wide plans so he does expect that to happen. Mr. Adelson then addressed the Board and explained that his role will be to manage all of the consultants that manage the process working with the County and the County Attorney's Office to ensure that everything is done properly so the County doesn't get in trouble. He then explained the reason the County has to deal with the DOJ in getting preclearance before any changes can be implemented. Mr. Adelson stated that redistricting is thought to be the highest priority for the DOJ to review. Having reviewed all of the County submissions during the last round as the team leader for the DOJ's review of the state-wide legislative and congressional plans, Mr. Adelson knows that mistakes were made and he wants to avoid those same mistakes to ensure that the DOJ does not enter an objection. If the DOJ objects to

a redistricting plan, then the County is legally prohibited from using it. If the DOJ requests additional information in writing, then that delays the possible implementation of the plan. The DOJ is the boss of the process and nothing can happen until the DOJ approves the plan. He assured the Board that in working through the process, those mistakes will not be made. Mr. Adelson also stated that this process will take approximately 1 year as the data will not be available for another 4 months. It will take months to develop a plan, and it will take a significant amount of time to prepare the plan for submittal to the DOJ and then the DOJ has to preclear the plan. He stated that the ideal situation is that the plan is precleared and everything is all set a year from now because then the County has to have its candidate qualifying dates that have to be met the following year. He explained that the State of Arizona, because of the delays in getting information requested by the DOJ, caused a delay in the plan process and the candidate qualifying dates were all missed. Jesse Bryant, a reporter for KQSS Radio, inquired, "Are candidates and elections pretty much up in the air until this process is finalized? What is the expectation of a candidate that might be on the fringe of a district now that could potentially be excluded when the process is done?" Mr. Adelson replied, "I think the expectation is that all the lines will likely change. How they change and where they change, we can't predict. So if someone is in a particular district now, that person may or may not be in that district when the data comes out and we do all of our analyses. The redistricting requirement applies to every jurisdiction in the state that elects by district." He stated that this is a decennial process that involves millions of people across the United States every 10 years; it is a very complex and complicated process with a high level of analysis. If there is a bump in the process from the DOJ or a lawsuit, then that's problematic and everything else could be delayed; elections could be delayed; candidate qualifying could be delayed and the County or any jurisdiction could find itself in a great deal of difficulty. Chairman Pastor inquired that with boundary lines possibly changing and if a person is in a 7 position or an office with a term that extends past 2012, will that person serve out his/her term and then the change is made for the new district or after the term is expired? Chairman Pastor stated that he was inquiring because there are some overlapping terms at the Gila County Community College District that go beyond 2012. Mr. Adelson stated that all of those things are a part of the calculation that goes into redistricting, which is a very complex process. He stressed that by federal law all entities that redistrict have the burden of showing that they are not violating federal law and that they are not discriminating. He stated, "You have to prove that. DOJ doesn't have to prove it or disprove it. You do. And if you don't prove it, you lose." He also emphasized that DOJ decisions are final and not appealable. The only alternative is to go to court and ask the court to grant permission to use an interim plan temporarily, but the court cannot overturn the DOJ objection. Mr. Adelson then explained in more detail about the provision in the Voting Rights Act, Section 5, which deals with the bailout process or becoming exempt from preclearance. He explained that every jurisdiction in Arizona that is covered by Section 5 has the legal right to apply to bailout; however, cities, school districts and other sub-jurisdictions below the County level can bail out without being tied to the County. In order to bail out successfully, the County must have a clean record for 10 years of Section 5 preclearances by the DOJ including all sub-

jurisdictions within the County. The County cannot bail out on its own. The DOJ also does not have a problem with retroactive preclearance. However, if there is any discrimination in the past that hurt the rights of minority voters, then the County could not bail out and the process stops. He then explained the process that the DOJ goes through to approve a bailout. Once the bailout has been approved by the DOJ, then the County and the DOJ file a joint lawsuit with the federal court in Washington. It's a consent lawsuit, so it's non-adversarial. The court then signs an Order, which allows the County to bail out and once the County is out from under Section 5, it is out forever unless it should do something blatantly discriminatory, which has never happened before. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired about subjurisdictions such as fire districts and water districts that are bound by land barriers and not population barriers and whether they have to opt out. Mr. Adelson stated that any district that holds its own elections is covered by the Section 5 requirements. Vice-Chairman Martin inquired who would help these sub-jurisdictions through the bailout process because they wouldn't have any idea how to do same? Mr. Adelson stated that in his experience, the smaller the jurisdiction, the less experience they have with the intricacies of Section 5 and his part in working with the County on bailout will be to help these jurisdictions to understand what federal law says and what needs to be done in order to move forward with the bailout. Ms. Eastlick advised that tonight at 6:30 p.m. a meeting will be held in the Globe Board of Supervisors' hearing room and also by ITV in Payson in which all special districts, school districts, cities and towns have been invited to attend and learn about the whole bailout process and she hopes that at least 1 member from each district will be participating. In order to proceed with the bailout, these districts' assistance 8 will be needed to provide information to put together the retroactive submissions. Ms. Eastlick also encouraged the Board to attend. Chairman Pastor thanked Mr. Sissons and Mr. Adelson for their presentation. No action was taken by the Board.

Work Session**2****Meeting Date:** 12/07/2010**Submitted For:** Linda Eastlick, Elections
Director**Submitted By:** Linda Eastlick,
Elections
Department**Department:** Elections Department**Presenter's Name:** Linda Eastlick

InformationRequest/Subject

Presentation/Discussion regarding redistricting of Gila County and proceeding with an application to the Department of Justice to bailout from Section 5 obligations pursuant to the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

Background Information

Redistricting: ARS 11-212 requires the Board of Supervisors to meet following the decennial census and divide the county into supervisorial districts.

Thus, redistricting for Gila County will be done in 2011. The Board of Supervisors may appoint a citizens Redistricting Committee. The Redistricting Committee will work under the auspices of the Board of Supervisors, the Gila County Director of Elections, and consultants from Federal Compliance Consulting to obtain public input, hold public hearings, and review alternative redistricting plans.

Bailout: The State of Arizona entered into a Consent Decree with the United States Department of Justice (DOJ) on November 1, 1972 due to prior discriminatory voting practices. This original 25-year consent decree has been extended for another 25 years and requires every jurisdiction in the County which holds elections to pre-clear with the DOJ any change that impacts voters, including forms, polling sites, mail elections, etc. The County would like to "bailout" of this very expensive and time-consuming process for all affected jurisdictions.

Evaluation

In order to proceed with these two major projects, we have arranged for our consultants, Bruce Adelson, a former DOJ Civil Rights Division Senior Attorney, and Tony Sissons, a Census project management expert to meet with the Board of Supervisors. The consultants will provide the Board with background information and recommendations for progressing the redistricting and bailout processes and the Board can provide input and direction for the the consultants and County staff. In addition to presentations by the consultants, there will be open discussion about the information provided by the consultants and that the Board provide direction for proceeding with the projects.

A new resolution of the Board of Supervisors establishing guidelines for the selection of the Gila County Redistricting Committee will also be discussed. It is

intended that content of the resolution be discussed and staff be directed to finalize the resolution for adoption at the December 14, 2010 meeting.

Conclusion

These presentations and the open discussion of Redistricting and Bailout with the Board of Supervisors will provide opportunity for the Board to provide important input and direction to these two projects. Both projects are complex and will be subject to much scrutiny on the part of the public, elected officials, County jurisdictions and the Department of Justice. A firm understanding of legal requirements and the Board of Supervisors desires is critical to ensuring the successful outcome of both projects.

Recommendation

Arrange for Bruce Adelson and Tony Sissons to make presentations to the Board of Supervisors on the topics of Redistricting and Bailout. Conduct open discussion of both Redistricting and Bailout with the Board of Supervisors, consultants, and County staff. Receive direction from the Board of Supervisors.

Suggested Motion

Presentation/Discussion regarding Redistricting of Gila County and Proceeding with an Application to the Department of Justice to Bailout from Section 5 Obligations Pursuant to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. **(Linda Eastlick)**

Attachments

Redistricting/Bailout Consultant Background and Experience

Federal Compliance Consulting LLC

Our Redistricting Expertise

CEO Bruce L. Adelson is a former U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division Senior Attorney. During his Department of Justice career, Bruce had national enforcement responsibility for all federal voting laws. Bruce is a nationally recognized expert concerning the U.S. Department of Justice, federal voting laws, Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, redistricting, and federal mandates for non-English language assistance.

Bruce L. Adelson's U.S. Department of Justice career gives him unique experience and insight into the Section 5 preclearance process and its application to redistricting.

During his DOJ career, Bruce was the team leader for the U.S. Attorney General's Section 5 review of many redistricting plans during the 2000 redistricting cycle, especially in Arizona. During the 2000 redistricting cycle, Bruce was the Department of Justice's team leader for the Section 5 review of the City of Phoenix's City Council redistricting plan and Arizona's Congressional and legislative redistricting plans. His team's analysis led to the Department of Justice's rejection of Arizona's 2002 legislative redistricting plan.

During his U.S. Department of Justice career, Bruce L. Adelson was the U.S. Attorney General's team leader for Section 5 review and analysis of many redistricting plans during the 2000 redistricting cycle, including but not limited to the following:

- State of Texas - several counties' redistricting plans for Commissioners, Justice of the Peace, and Constable precincts;
- Additional redistricting plans in Alabama, Mississippi, New York, and South Carolina

To the best of his knowledge, Bruce L. Adelson is the only private practice attorney in the United States with Department of Justice legal redistricting experience from the 2000 redistricting cycle who is now advising jurisdictions about the requirements of federal voting laws, especially Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, and redistricting.

Bruce has provided technical assistance and/or given presentations about federal voting laws to many organizations, including: National Association of State Election Directors; National Association of County Recorders and Clerks; International Municipal Lawyers Association; Arizona Secretary of State's Election Officers Certification & Training Program; Arizona Attorney General; Arizona State Bar; Arizona League of Cities and Towns; New Mexico County Clerks Association; and Texas District and County Attorneys Association

For the 2010 redistricting cycle, Bruce L. Adelson is meeting with local officials to explain the Section 5 preclearance process, relying upon his inside knowledge of and expertise concerning the U.S. Department of Justice and the Obama administration's approach to Section 5 enforcement, including but not limited to a discussion of DOJ's new Section 5 regulations. These

meetings are a unique aspect of Bruce's practice and are unavailable elsewhere. Bruce also conducts a specialized pre-redistricting review to discover any unprecleared voting changes and other Section 5 issues that could adversely impact his clients' 2010 redistricting prospects.

Endorsements of Bruce L. Adelson

I worked with Bruce Adelson on a regular basis handling state preclearance submissions when I served as the State Election Director (1997-2002) and as a Special Counsel at the Arizona Attorney General's Office (2003-2006). Bruce is extremely helpful in explaining the mysteries and practicalities of DOJ... Bruce is very creative in suggesting procedures that will avoid problems in the future and which might increase the credibility of the state when working with the Department of Justice. In short, Bruce is a gifted communicator, collaborator and negotiator. I believe anyone would be well-served in having Bruce Adelson on his or her team.

Jessica Gifford Funkhouser
Attorney at Law
Phoenix, Arizona
Former Arizona State Election Director
Former Special Counsel to the Arizona Attorney General

I am convinced that Bruce is one of the most knowledgeable individuals on the Voting Rights Act and in particular, Section 5 of the Act.

Joseph Kanefield
Attorney at Law
Phoenix, Arizona
Former Arizona State Elections Director

I have known Bruce Adelson for many years. I worked with Bruce in different capacities while at the Secretary of State's Office and remained in contact with Mr. Adelson since I have been with the City of Peoria. I always found Bruce to be helpful. Contacting the Department of Justice can be a scary thing to do – at any level. Knowing that I would work with Bruce made the contact less frightening.

Mary Jo Waddell
Former Arizona State Elections Director
Former Peoria (AZ) City Clerk

R. Anthony Sissons

Since 1987 Tony Sissons, who is president of Research Advisory Services, has provided a broad range of decision-support services to state and local governments, private companies, and non-profit organizations. He has a strong professional background in research methods, evaluation techniques, quantitative analysis, statistical inquiry, Census demographics, and project management. He is a member of the American Planning Association, Arizona Planning Association, Forensic Expert Witness Association, and Arizona Governor's Council on Workforce Policy. His services specialize in the analysis of data about geographic areas - Census blocks and tracts, Zip Codes, voting precincts, land parcels, and traffic analysis zones. To manage and analyze very large files of data about thousands of small areas, he relies on geographic information system (GIS) software and database management programs. Past clients include cities and towns, county government, economic development organizations, educational organizations, law firms, and social service organizations.

Mr. Sissons provides well-researched facts and substantiated conclusions which are key to gaining the credibility needed to achieve desired results. He is a respected statewide authority in helping decision-makers get the answers they need using reliable and defensible data. He works closely with his clients in helping them represent their interests to state and local policy makers with research findings that are compelling and factually sound. He has developed sophisticated techniques for simplifying voluminous databases by: examining and displaying statistical relationships between variables, using proprietary methods for identifying and extracting relevant data, and creating thematic maps to display the geographic distribution of demographic data. He has amassed a large holding of Arizona focused data files, computer models, GIS layers and analysis methods.