

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 610 E. HIGHWAY 260, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS' CONFERENCE ROOM, PAYSON, ARIZONA.** THE AGENDA IS AS FOLLOWS:

---

**REGULAR MEETING - MONDAY, AUGUST 15, 2011 - 10 A.M.**

- 1 Call to Order - Pledge of Allegiance – Invocation
- 2 **REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:**
  - A Information/Discussion/Action to receive Gila County supervisory and community college redistricting mapping alternatives from the Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) and to dissolve the Committee. **(Linda Eastlick/Roberto Sanchez, Chairman of the RAC)** Dissolved
  - B Information/ Discussion/Action to authorize the Chairman's signature on the APS Landlord Tenant Rider between Gila County and Gila Community College. **(Don McDaniel)** Authorized
  - C **(Motion to adjourn as the Gila County Board of Supervisors and convene as the Gila County Library District Board of Directors.)** Approved  
Information/Discussion/Action to approve an agreement between Gila County Library District and Creative Empire, LLC. d/b/a Mango Languages for the provision of a Library Premium Subscription for a Full Language Package, for three years, beginning on September 1, 2011, through August 30, 2014, at the rate of \$3,142 per year. **(Jacque Griffin)**  
**(Motion to adjourn as the Gila County Library District Board of Directors and reconvene as the Gila County Board of Supervisors.)**
  - D Information/Discussion/Action to set primary and secondary property tax rates for 2011 for all taxing jurisdictions within Gila County and convey tax rates for all jurisdictions to the County Treasurer, and adopt Resolution No. 11-08-10 providing for the collection of taxes for all jurisdictions by the County Treasurer for fiscal year 2011-2012. **(Don McDaniel)** Adopted
  - E Information/Discussion/Action to approve the submission of a United States Department of Agriculture, Rural Housing Service, Rural Housing Preservation Grant Preapplication in the amount of \$100,000. **(Malissa Buzan)** Approved
  - F Information/Discussion/Action to approve a Subscription Service Approved Agreement between CAPLUCK, Inc and the Gila County Division

of Community Services, Community Action Program/Housing Services, whereby CAPLUCK, Inc. will provide software services that will allow for the universal collection of data and demographics of assistance provided to eligible citizens residing in Gila County at a charge of \$3,500 per year. **(Malissa Buzan)**

- G Information/Discussion/Action to authorize the Chairman's signature on Amendment No. 1 to the Ground Lease and Use Agreement-Central Heights Complex between Gila County and the Miami Unified School District to extend the Agreement for an additional 10 years beyond the original termination date of September 26, 2021, to September 26, 2031, and the APS Landlord/Tenant Rider form. **(Steve Stratton)** Authorized
- H Information/Discussion/Action to authorize the advertisement of Request for Proposals No. 070111-1 for janitorial services at County facilities located in Globe, Arizona. **(Steve Stratton)** Authorized
- I Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 11-08-09, which pertains to a roadway exchange between Erik C. and Cheryl D. Long and Gila County, and to authorize the Chairman's signature on a Quit Claim Deed for said roadway exchange. **(Steve Stratton)** Adopted
- J Information/Discussion/Action to authorize the advertisement of Invitation for Bids No. 071911-1 for the purchase of one or more new SUV special service vehicles and one or more new 6/7 passenger minivans for Gila County Fleet Management. **(Steve Stratton)** Authorized
- K Information/Discussion/Action to authorize the advertisement of Request for Bids No. 080211-1 for the Public Works Roadyard Shop Area Paving Project. **(Steve Stratton)** Authorized
- L Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 11-08-04 approving the disposal of an unnecessary public roadway being a portion of Evalinda Drive, King Addition Subdivision, official map no. 196, and to authorize the Chairman to execute and deliver in the name and under the seal of the County of Gila, a quit claim deed conveying the abandoned roadway to John D. Cotterill. **(Steve Sanders)** Adopted
- M Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 11-08-05 approving the disposal of an unnecessary public roadway shown as a portion of Christopher Creek Loop, and authorizing the Chairman to execute and deliver in the name and under the seal of the County of Gila, 3 separate quit claim deeds conveying the abandoned roadway to Lynnne Raichert; Edwin G. and Mary C. Schuck; and George and Ruth Deming. **(Steve Sanders)** Adopted



- N Information/Discussion/Action to adopt Resolution No. 11-08-06 Adopted  
 approving the disposal of an unnecessary public roadway shown  
 as a portion of Christopher Creek Loop, and authorizing the  
 Chairman to execute and deliver in the name and under the seal  
 of the County of Gila, a quit claim deed conveying the  
 abandoned roadway to Manuel Gene Bettencourt. **(Steve  
 Sanders)**
- O Information/Discussion/Action to direct staff to begin the Approved  
 process to abandon a portion of Smelter Street from Coplan to  
 Silicate between blocks 16 and 17 as shown on the Plat of  
 Arlington Heights, Gila County Recorded Map 31. **(Steve  
 Sanders)**
- P Information/Discussion/Action to direct staff to begin the Approved  
 process to abandon a portion of Upper Pinal Creek Road as  
 shown on Gila County Record of Survey Map 3841A-C. **(Steve  
 Sanders)**
- 3 **CONSENT AGENDA ACTION ITEMS:**
- A Approval of Amendment No. 1 to Contract No. DE106003-008 Approved  
 between Gila County d/b/a Gila Employment and Special  
 Training Program, and the Arizona Department of Economic  
 Security, Rehabilitation Services Administration, to replace the  
 current Attachment 1, RSA Fee Schedule, with the revised  
 Attachment 1, RSA Fee Schedule Application dated June 23,  
 2011.
- B Approval of Amendment No. 1 to an Intergovernmental Approved  
 Agreement (Contract No. DE111093-001), Career  
 Exploration/Supported Education, between Gila County d/b/a  
 Gila Employment and Special Training and the Arizona  
 Department of Economic Security, Rehabilitation Services  
 Administration, to replace the current Attachment 6, Facility  
 Location and Staffing Chart-Gila County, with the revised  
 Attachment 6, Facility Location and Staffing Chart dated June  
 23, 2011.
- C Approval of CDBG (Community Development Block Grant) Approved  
 Contract No. 150-09 Close-Out Report to finalize the contract  
 between the Arizona Department of Housing and Gila County  
 Community Action/Housing Services, which will successfully end  
 the contract and enable Gila County Community Action/Housing  
 Services to be in compliance with all requirements for the CDBG  
 contract.
- D Approval of FY 2012 Victims' Rights Program Award Agreement Approved  
 No. AG# 2012-004 between the Gila County Attorney's Office and  
 the Arizona Attorney General's Office in the amount of \$33,350 to  
 cover the existing salary and employee-related expenses for a full

-time advocate, with no cash match funds required, and for the period July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.

- |   |   |                    |
|---|---|--------------------|
| E | Approval of Contract No. HG752219 between the Gila County Division of Health & Emergency Services, Health Department, and the Arizona Department of Health Services in the amount of \$51,160 to continue the funding of the Prop 201 Smoke Free AZ Contract for the period July 1, 2011, through June 30, 2012.  | Approved           |
| F | Approval of the December 7, 2010, BOS meeting minutes.  | Approved           |
| G | Approval of the June 2011 monthly departmental activity report submitted by the Clerk of the Superior Court.  | Approved           |
| H | Approval of the Human Resources reports for the weeks of August 9, 2011, and August 15, 2011.   | Approved           |
| I | Approval of finance reports/demands/transfers for the weeks of August 9, 2011, and August 15, 2011.   | Approved           |
| 4 | <b>CALL TO THE PUBLIC:</b> Call to the Public is held for public benefit to allow individuals to address issue(s) within the Board's jurisdiction. Board members may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to Arizona Revised Statute §38-431.01(G), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to criticism, or scheduling the matter for further discussion and decision at a future date. | No<br>Comments     |
| 5 | At any time during this meeting pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02(K), members of the Board of Supervisors and the Chief Administrator may present a brief summary of current events. No action may be taken on issues presented.  | Discussion<br>Only |

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****August 15, 2011****MEETING MINUTES**

\*\*\*\*\*

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay, regular agenda item 2A, information discussion action to receive Gila County supervisorial and community college redistricting mapping alternatives from the redistricting advisory committee, RAC, and to dissolve the committee. Linda Eastlick, Roberto Sanchez, chairman of the RAC. And I won't be ignoring you. I'll be listening, but I'm trying to get logged on."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Okay. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. The redistricting advisory committee is here today to present the work that they have been doing over the last few months, and at this time, we'd like to present the board the mapping alternatives. While there won't be any action on these maps today because of course we'll be doing further work at our work session next week, the committee would like to present those, present their findings, and also we would like to acknowledge the committee after the presentation."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "All right. Thank you very much."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Good morning, Mr. Chairman and fellow board members. My name is Roberto Sanchez, and I'm the chairman of the Gila County Advisory Committee."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Roberto, let me see if -- Shirley, can you hear everything okay?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Yes."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. For those who may not know, Shirley is up in Salt Lake City, I believe, and she's --"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "I am at Brigham Young University --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Oh."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "-- attending the education week."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. And we've got her on the phone here, so that's why I was double checking that she get here."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Okay. Good morning, Shirley. Okay. You want to go to our goals? The redistricting advisory goals were to meet with and inform the public. We wanted to review the public input and submit at least two maps for the supervisory and the college district to the boards of supervisors so that they can make a decision on these votes. Instead of submitting two, we decided to submit three, to give you a better chance. The committee was made up of 12 members. Five of them were democrats, four were republicans, two party not designated, one independent, and five alternates. In addition to that, we had one Native American, three Hispanics, and eight Anglos in



the committee. We had -- the committee held nine meetings between 22 March and 29 July. At our first meeting that we had in Star Valley, the open meeting laws were discussed, redistricting criteria was presented to us in the Voting Right Act. We had census data and documentation on public input, and then Linda gave the committee a responsibilities and the redistricting principles and general information that she had. At our second meeting that we had, we were able to select a chairman, which was me, and we had a vice chair, Mr. Gary Andress (phonetic), who's from Claypool as the vice chair. At our 10 May meeting, the committee wanted to change the guidelines to include study groups, and Linda said that she would address that to the board and then we discussed general information. During our 6 June meeting, Linda presented us with the PowerPoint presentations that she had developed to put out to the public and also informed us that the board had approved our request for the study groups. One of the most important meetings that we had was on the 19th of July, and they told us that we had to get the information in by 4th of August, so what we did is we broke off into study groups, and Gary Andress was the -- in charge of the college study group and I was in charge of the supervisory group. The study group, the -- for the college, eight maps were submitted for review by the committee. All eight maps met the requirements of the constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the Department of Justice. The study group was able to select three maps to submit to the full committee so that we could vote on it. Now, the supervisory district, we had 21 maps submitted. Of the 21 maps that were submitted, 20 did not meet the requirements of the constitution or the Department of Justice. At this meeting, we received the Tonto Apache Tribal Council map. That too did not meet the requirements of the Department of Justice type of thing. We asked our consultant, who was with us at that meeting, to review that map and see if he could adjust to have it work for the -- so that we could submit that map for review. We also had two maps that were very close to meeting the requirements of the DOJ and the constitution, and we asked Tony, the consultant, to review those maps too and see if he could revise those maps, submit them to us, and then we would review them again. On the 25th of July, we met again, the study group of the supervisors, and we reviewed the revised maps, selected three of them, and on the 29th of July the full committee met again and we selected three maps to submit to the supervisors. All meetings were held in Globe. We had a forum at each one of our meetings except for the first one, which was in Star Valley. We also had 11 public meetings with the public from the 8th of June to the 6th of July, the county election staff together with members of the redistricting committee conducted a series of 11 public meetings in Gila County, and those are the places that we visit. "The first one was San Carlos, and that one that says Tonto Basin 2 is because our first meeting conflicted with a meeting that they had with the bridge down there with Mr. Pastor, so we had a second meeting later on. But we went from San Carlos all the way to Pine Strawberry. We met a lot of people. We had a lot of questions, especially those people from Payson. But the -- these meetings were held to inform citizens about the redistrict -- why the redistricting was taking place, to encourage input from the public regarding what changes they would recommend for the district maps, what procedures to follow when submitting changes, and the requirements of the constitution and the Voting Right Act of



1965. They were encouraged to participate in the redistricting process by voicing their concerns and submitting ideas and comments.

"Map alternatives. One of the nice things that we were able to accomplish was none of the incumbents were thrown out of their districts. All maps appear to meet the constitutional requirements of one person, one vote principle and some maps may require further adjustment to adjust the minority population to satisfy the Voting Right Act of 1965 and other federal regulations. And the mapping packages, what we'll do here, is we'll go to a map -- a package of a map as it's shown and we'll go through the map. Can you go through the map, Dave? And then we'll come back to this one, if you want. They'll all be explained in the same thing. Okay. Here's a map submitted by Mrs. Feasor, number 16. And what this map does is shows you what she is recommending for the new supervisory district. And all maps are six pages. Go ahead to the next page. One of the maps is -- gives you the statistical (sic), and see that little brown, little square box down there? That gives you the difference in population because we wanted to have 17,866 in each district, and that deviation is 1.66 that it show there. Go ahead, Dave, next page. This is a graph. You can see the current and the proposed, how very close the proposed lines are to the requirements that we were looking for, all three districts. Go ahead, Dave. And this one here is the one that gives you the proposed plan, the current plan, and the changes by statistics. You can read those figures yourselves. There's not too much. Over there on the left hand side, if you'll see, on the middle column is the proposed change from the other ones, which are not too bad. Okay. Go ahead, Dave. Okay. We get to the last page. You don't have a last page? Okay. There was a last page that goes on there and it gives you the final thing and it gives the consultants' comments. The consultant would tell us if the -- if we were within the range that the requirements that we were supposed to meet, and whether they met the requirements of the Voting Rights Act and the constitution."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Roberto?"

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Yes, sir?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "You made comment that the first map was number 16. That was 16 out of the total --"

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Of the 20 --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. All right."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "-- 21. Next map, Dave. Okay. These are the three maps that we are recommending for you. All three maps almost meet the requirements of the constitution and the Voting Rights Act. They may need a little tweaking, but they'll pass. The map submitted by Tom Moody is a very good map, except it doesn't -- puts the three tribes in District 3 as they had -- as the Tonto tribe had requested. Other than that, it's a very good map. The map that was submitted by Mrs. Feasor moves all the three tribes into the District 3, but does not move Gisela into District 3 as they requested. And the map from -- the map submitted by the Tonto Apache Tribal Council has a lot of potentials but it still needs some work before it can be approved.

All the college maps, again, met the requirements of the Department of the Justice and the constitution, and these are the three people that we selected -- or the three maps that we selected to be submitted to the Board of Supervisors. They are all -- they're all



within the range. They may need a little bit of tweaking, but they're all good. I won't go into all of them because you have copies of those maps as it is.

"Okay. Now we'd like to acknowledge some of the people that really helped us around here. Mr. Brian Chambers, he briefed us on the open meeting laws. He was very concerned that we might get sued if we didn't get -- do it right. We haven't been sued, so we're okay."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Knock on wood, Robert."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "I -- we had a Mr. Addison from the -- from Washington. He briefed us on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and gave us information on the redistricting criteria. And one of the big, big guys that really helped us was Tony Sisson, and I -- is he here? Tony here today?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "No, he's --"

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Poor Tony. Tony, I want to thank you for sharing your experience and your knowledge in the redistricting area. Without your help, we'd still be in first place. First base, I mean. And I want to thank my colleagues for their cooperation, their support. I think we worked well as a team, and it took a team effort to get this project completed. I want to thank them. I would like to give special thanks to Mack Feasor. Mack Feasor is some sort of an expert on statistics and when we had a question about population or race or anything, all we had to do is say, hey, Mack, what's the population of a -- District 2, Gila County, Gisela, and he'd come up, oh, there's 800 people that live there and he gave us all those kinds of statistics that were fantastic and we couldn't have done it without him. Thanks, Mack. I know you're out there in Payson. And then I would really like to thank the Gila County staff, Josephine. Josephine, when we gave our briefing at San Carlos, she presented the PowerPoint in Apache. Nobody understood a word she said, but it was very nice. Thanks, Josephine. Liz Mata (phonetic), who works with the election committee. She was very helpful, easy to work with. Pleasing personality. And Mr. Dave Rogers, what a guy. You were the first one at all our meetings, the last one to leave. And whatever we asked of Dave, he did it. And I just want to really, really say thank you, thank you, thank you very much, Dave. And finally, Linda. This was an easy one for me. Linda's smart, compassionate, with an unshakable determination. She earned her pay during these last five months, and I thank you, Linda, for your guidance and support and then finally, Shirley up in Utah. Thank you for selecting me to be on this committee. I made a lot of new friends. I went to places in the county that I had never been before, and really enjoyed doing the work. Thank you. Any questions, sir?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Thank you, Robert, and I too would express my thanks to all of those who worked the many months going through all the data and dealing with all of the different arguments and everything. I think you folks have presented a pretty good packet here for our review. And I'm sure that the public will have plenty of comments once we decide to take these to the public for public comment and the -- I'm sure Linda will get a schedule out and it'll be in the paper and everything. There are a couple of comments. I have some public -- requests from the public, and I will recognize them first and then we'll continue on with the presentation. The first one is Mr. David Cook of 10178 Icehouse Canyon Road. Mr. Cook? Would you care to



address us, or do you want to just leave your comments on the --Okay. All right. The other request is Mr. Steve Titla of P.O. Box 1143, Globe, Arizona. Mr. Titla, would you like to address the board?"

**Resident, Steve Titla:** "Yes."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. If you'd come to the podium, please? Do you need any identification? Okay."

**Unidentified Party:** "You're a resident of --"

**Resident, Steve Titla:** "Good morning, Gila County Board of Supervisors. Thank you for letting me address the body here. I haven't been before the county for a long time. The last time I was here, Bunchy Guerrero (phonetic) was sitting here, I think. So --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "That's a long time."

**Resident, Steve Titla:** "Yeah. The late Bunchy, God bless his soul. At any rate, I can't remember what the subject matter was back then, it's been so long ago. At any rate, I'd like to thank the Gila County Redistricting Committee for working on this area. It's very hard work, and I think maybe a thankless job for -- you guys get a lot of criticism in that area. At any rate, Chairman -- Chair Emblar (phonetic) asked me to attend the meeting and to -- I put down object to the map submittal by the Gila County Redistricting Committee, you know, simply because the tribe has not had a chance to really study the submittals by the Gila County district. The chairman asked me to remind the county supervisors and the redistricting committee that Arizona's a Section 5 state, which means that any maps submitted, and by the IRC, independent redistricting committee, has to be pre-cleared by Department of Justice. And in 2001 the San Carlos tribe along with the Navajo Nation and the Hispanic groups in the state filed suit in federal district court because we objected to the IRC maps that were submitted in 2001 and we were in litigation at that time. And in this case, here, what we want to point out is that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 need to be complied with and that we want the issue of a community of interest to be considered by the tribe, the San Carlos Apache. We've been in contact with White Mountain Apache, San Carlos Apache, Navajo Nation about getting the compliance with the Voting Rights Act and to ensure that the community's interest be respected. I think that the community's interest with respect to the Apache tribes outweigh the competitive issue -- competitive district issue, and so the tribe will be studying the maps, and we would like to submit a map very soon, after having looked at these maps and -- maps here and may be draw our own map to see what we can do. But thank you for letting me say those few words. Thank you."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Thank you, Mr. Titla. Linda, would you -- do you -- would you like to address the issue of another map or --"

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "Yes, yes I do. Thank you."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay, Robert."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "We looked at the Tonto Apache map, and it has a lot of potential, and they had a nice letter of justification why, because basically what the previous individual stated, but -- and we are giving it a lot of consideration, and it's one of the maps that we're submitting to you. And I'm pretty sure it'll pass without any problem, but -- and like the original justification that they requested was that all three tribes be put together in the same district. And we did that. We did that. The only request that we did not do with -- from the tribe was put Gisela in in District 3 with them."



Other than that, the Voting Right Act is right on the button for voting. There's no -- the difference that's listed on the maps are very little that they'll pass. So --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Uh-huh."

**Supervisor, Roberto Sanchez:** "-- I think we've got it covered. Maybe Linda can go into more than I could. Go ahead, Linda."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Just this past Friday I was advised by Marvin Mull that the tribe was interested in -- or they were asking whether they could still submit a map. And on Friday I sent them an email telling them that, of course, we were presenting this morning, so while it was too late to present to the redistricting advisory committee because the committee will be disbanded today, that we would be happy to -- that I was sure that the board would be interested in seeing what their issues or concerns or their ideas were if they could get us something by this coming Friday so that we could discuss it at the next board meeting, which is next Tuesday.

The schedule from here on --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "That will be a work session, just for --"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "That is a work session."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- terminology."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Next Tuesday, where we will be talking about all of the ideas that have come from the redistricting committee and I'm hopeful that the tribe could bring us their ideas by the end of this week so I can get them ready for the board to see on Tuesday. And, of course, ours have nothing to do with the IRC because the IRC is the state redistricting committee, and our maps only apply to Gila County. There was no action brought against Gila County in the last redistricting. All actions were on a state level because of problems with the state plan, not because of county problems."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "And just for the public's information, the work session that's next Tuesday is also a public meeting."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Yes, it is."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "The public is invited to it, so if there's people who wish to attend, I don't know how the comment session works on that, but we'll work out some logistics on all that."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Yes."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "The -- I would imagine you're going to have the suggested maps published in the newspaper?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Yes. What we'll do, we won't publish the maps before next Tuesday. Once you guys have your work session and determine which maps will be going back out for public review, because we'll have a second round of public meetings, then we will publish those maps, because those are the maps that you guys will be saying these are the ones we want the public to consider.

At your work session, you'll be discussing whether you want changes made, what about this, asking the consultants well, if we do that, what happens here. So that will be a real work session --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "-- that you'll get into the details. The tentative schedule, which I have a copy here and I have updated it somewhat, provides that we'll



have our work session on August 23rd, then on September 6 the board will actually approve the three or two, however many you decide, maps that you want to go out to the public for another round of public review. Those public meetings will be September 6th through the 16th. All the maps will be published in the papers. They'll be on line. People can make comments on line. They can come to the public meetings and make comments.

"Then it's intended that citizen comments would be due by September 16th to be ready for the board having another work session discussion on any public comments that have come in that may affect those maps on September 20. We would intend that, on October 4th, the board would approve the final college district and supervisorial district map, and then after that we will forward those on to the Department of Justice for their review and we would expect their review back within 60 days. So that's kind of the schedule from here on out."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Our hope is to be finished so that we don't have any problem with the upcoming election, which will be the presidential preference in January or February. We have to have -- the recorder's office has to have all of the voter records changed in order for that election to move forward and we also have candidate packets that need to be ready by mid-January, first of February by -- people will start collecting petition signatures by then. Their petition signatures, excuse me, are due no later than -- the first day to file is April 30. The last day to file is May 30, so people will want to start collecting signatures early in the year."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Before I go to the supervisors, Mr. Cook had indicated that he wanted his comments just as written, but I'm required by law to read what those comments are so it will be in the record. And I will do that and then I'll go to Shirley and Tommie and the folks up in Payson, okay? So, Mr. Cook's comments were that the board should send a request for comments to local tribal government and city and towns before making a decision. If decision is made today, the Moody plan is the best. Those are Mr. Cook's comments, and they are now official to the record."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "And so that the board is aware, these plans have been sent to the tribal councils, the ones as they exist right now, with a note that they would be presented to the board today for no action today but that there would be the work session next week. They have gone to the cities and the towns, and they have also gone to the political parties."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. Thank you, Linda."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Uh-huh."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Shirley, do you have any comments? Questions?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Thank you, chairman. I just want to really express my gratitude. I was kind of shocked when Roberto said thank you for appointing him to the committee. I was concerned during some of those meetings that he might be after my hide for appointing him. I concur with what they have brought forward. I know that this committee has worked hard and diligently. I appreciate the participation from Marvin Mull and Loretta Stone. Marvin was an alternate that attended almost all the meetings and has the same contact with the -- Loretta and I met. These efforts have been a



yeoman's job, and I really appreciate what they've done. I second Roberto's comments about our county staff. I looked at the expertise that David Rogers has with the computers and being able to get this information to the people. There's never a no. It's just I will get it, and he does. Linda and the other staff there felt the same, and Liz, how excellent they handled what started out as a very contentious situation and just been handled professionally and certainly in a way that no one in Gila County could say they haven't had an opportunity and now, as we go through these next steps, they will begin (indiscernible \*\*4:54:01). So I appreciate how Linda organized this and how the committee headed by Roberto (indiscernible \*\*4:54:11) was able to come up with the recommendations to us. Thank you."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Thank you, Shirley. Supervisor Martin:"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Mr. Chair, I also want to point out that we have two of the members and one of the alternates up here, which -- and I know more them are down there, and it's interesting to me the interest and the continued interest that these folks have in this issue. And very much appreciate it and thankful. It was not easy. It was not an easy task either with the supervisor or the college because it's such a political issue. Contentious might not be even the right word, but it -- but to me it's a political issue. And I just want to thank them for the work they've put in this. There was so little they could do once the numbers showed up, and I feel like they've handed us six really good maps to discuss next week, and put out in front of the public. That's probably my comments, Mr. Chair, at this stage of the game."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. Thank you, Tommie. And once again, I would thank the committee for their hard work, for their many hours spent on this task. It's -- I've gone through the book a couple of times, probably four times in the last two days, and I'm still trying to absorb everything. And I'm sure that the public will -- I would hope the public would step up and provide us any comments or concerns on the maps that they have. I will state right now that I'm available. I'm in my office. My secretary knows how to get a hold of me if you want to call in and leave your comment or fax me a comment or come in and visit me. You're more than welcome to come. I would like to have as much input as possible before we have to make this decision. I think it's important, and it is going to affect this county for the next 10 years, so I understand the importance of it, and I appreciate all the effort that went into the task. So I thank you all, and I believe we have to -- the chair would entertain a motion to dissolve the redistrict and advisory committee at this point."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the supervisorial and community college district mapping alternatives from the committee and that we dissolve the committee with our thanks."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Second, Mr. Chair."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "A motion's been made and seconded. Is there any further discussion?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Mr. Chair, I just would like to, again, thank them so much and ask them to continue to look over our shoulder over the next few months."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "The information and the insight they could help bring, we still need."



**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Oh, yes. I --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "And although we're dissolving them, I hope that they're still right here sitting with us until we actually make the decision."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "I would encourage that participation also, Tommie, so thank you for your comments. Motion's been made and seconded. I will call for the vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Aye."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Aye."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Aye."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Opposed? Hearing none, motion carries. Thank you, Roberto, and committee. I appreciate all the work, and I know the other two supervisors do too. Linda?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "We have some certificates for the committee and I'd like to recognize those members of the committee that are present both here and in Payson. In Payson, I see you have Mr. Mack Feasor and Mr. Paul Bates and I think Mike Vogel was there, but I believe he has left."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "He had to step out."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Okay."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech)."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "So we will -- we'll send the certificates up to you gentlemen this afternoon. Here in Globe -- I almost said Salt Lake. Here in Globe we have Roberto Sanchez and Gary Andress. They were our chair and vice chair. Tom Moody, Adelaida Rodriguez, and Linda Pierce. And -- hmm? Oh. And Joe Skamel (phonetic). Didn't see him in the back. And I'd like to thank the committee. They've worked very hard and gone through a lot of paper. So thank you very much. And we'd like to get a picture of you guys if you would take a moment. That would be marvelous. Thank you."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "What's the last name?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Joe --"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Thank you."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- Skamel, S-k-a-m-e-l."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Joe?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Joe Skamel."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "S-k-a-m-e-l. "

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Come on, Linda. You should get in there too. And be recognized. And just for the public's information, we did have five alternates and most of them, I believe, participated in the meetings, and they were there to pick up if somebody dropped out, and I don't think anybody dropped out, did they? No?"

**Unidentified Speaker:** "(Indiscernible - away from mic \*\*4:59:25)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Oh."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "(Indiscernible - away from mic \*\*4:59:26)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Smile Folks. It's over. Once again, thank you, folks, for helping. Okay."



**ARF-701****Regular Agenda Item 2- A****Regular BOS Meeting****Meeting Date:** 08/15/2011**Submitted For:** Linda Eastlick,  
Elections Director  
**Submitted By:** Linda Eastlick, Elections Department**Department:** Elections Department**Presenter's Name:** Roberto Sanchez

---

---

**Information****Request/Subject**

Gila County Supervisorial and Community College redistricting mapping alternatives (NOTE - mapping alternative attachments will be provided by August 8)

**Background Information**

The Gila County Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) was formed by the Board of Supervisors to assist in the supervisorial and college district redistricting process. The RAC was to work with elections staff and redistricting consultants to gather input from the public, evaluate public input, and present mapping alternatives for the Board's consideration.

**Evaluation**

The RAC has conducted numerous committee meetings and attended numerous public meetings in order to be educated about the redistricting process, receive and review Gila County census information, receive information from the County's redistricting consultants and elections staff and to hear public comments.

**Conclusion**

The RAC is now prepared to provide mapping alternatives for the supervisorial and college districts to the Board of Supervisors for further consideration. The Board will determine mapping alternatives to be circulated for public input at a work session to be held August 23, 2011.

**Recommendation**

Following the presentation of mapping alternatives, the Elections Director recommends the Board of Supervisors thank the Committee for the work they have done, accept the mapping alternatives, and dissolve the committee. The Committee's work is now complete and the Board will make further mapping decisions at the work session on August 23, 2011.

**Suggested Motion**

Information/Discussion/Action to receive Gila County supervisorial and community college redistricting mapping alternatives from the Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) and to dissolve the Committee. **(Linda Eastlick/Roberto Sanchez, Chairman of the RAC)**



---

Attachments

Supervisory Mapping Alternatives

Community College Mapping Alternatives

Report to the Board



## **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. Address chaired the College Distinct 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



**Changes Proposed to Gila County  
Community College Districts by AZ Bandit  
Plan CC02**



▭ Precincts  
▭ Current Districts  
**Proposed Districts**

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

0 10 20 30  
Miles



Plan AZBanditCC02, Payson Area

Payson #8

Payson #5

Payson #4


Star Valley

Payson #3






Payson #6

Payson #1


Payson #2

 Current Districts  
Voting District


**Proposed Districts**

-  1
-  2
-  3
-  4
-  5

0 .5 1 1.5  
Miles



# Plan AZBanditCC02, Globe Area





**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
TOTAL POPULATION BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN  
PLAN SUBMITTED BY: AZ Bandit, Plan CC02**

<u>Number:</u>	<u>District 1</u>	<u>District 2</u>	<u>District 3</u>	<u>District 4</u>	<u>District 5</u>	<u>Total, All Districts</u>
Hispanic, of any race	915	834	2,262	4,253	1,324	9,588
Non-Hispanic White	9,611	9,600	7,856	5,851	2,380	35,298
Non-Hispanic Black	55	46	45	59	43	248
Non-Hispanic American Indian	247	179	356	458	6,735	7,975
Non-Hispanic Asian	66	71	72	84	28	321
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	13	14	10	2	0	39
Non-Hispanic other race	15	12	18	14	7	66
Non-Hispanic two or more races	8	11	13	14	16	62
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>10,930</b>	<b>10,767</b>	<b>10,632</b>	<b>10,735</b>	<b>10,533</b>	<b>53,597</b>
<u>Percent:</u>						
Hispanic, of any race	8.37%	7.75%	21.28%	39.62%	12.57%	17.89%
Non-Hispanic White	87.93%	89.16%	73.89%	54.50%	22.60%	65.86%
Non-Hispanic Black	0.50%	0.43%	0.42%	0.55%	0.41%	0.46%
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.26%	1.66%	3.35%	4.27%	63.94%	14.88%
Non-Hispanic Asian	0.60%	0.66%	0.68%	0.78%	0.27%	0.60%
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	0.12%	0.13%	0.09%	0.02%	0.00%	0.07%
Non-Hispanic other race	0.14%	0.11%	0.17%	0.13%	0.07%	0.12%
Non-Hispanic two or more races	0.07%	0.10%	0.12%	0.13%	0.15%	0.12%
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
Ideal Population	10,719	10,719	10,719	10,719	10,719	<b>Total</b> 10,719
Total Population	10,930	10,767	10,632	10,735	10,533	deviation: 397
Numeric deviation from Ideal Value	211	48	-87	16	-186	-1.74%
Percent deviation from Ideal Value	1.96%	0.44%	-0.82%	0.15%	-1.74%	<b>3.70%</b>

Source: Census 2010 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary file, Arizona  
 Tabulation: Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix AZ (602) 230-9580

**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
VOTING-AGE POPULATIONS BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN  
PLAN SUBMITTED BY: AZ Bandit, Plan CC02**


<u>Voting-Age Number:</u>	<u>District 1</u>	<u>District 2</u>	<u>District 3</u>	<u>District 4</u>	<u>District 5</u>	<u>Total, All Districts</u>
Hispanic, of any race	584	554	1,538	2,971	892	6,519
Non-Hispanic White	8,254	8,276	6,661	4,725	2,006	29,922
Non-Hispanic Black	33	21	37	38	42	171
Non-Hispanic American Indian	183	138	240	316	4,268	5,145
Non-Hispanic Asian	52	55	61	66	18	252
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	8	13	8	1	0	30
Non-Hispanic other race	6	9	16	8	5	44
Non-Hispanic two or more races	6	9	8	9	11	43
<b>Voting-Age Population</b>	<b>9,106</b>	<b>9,075</b>	<b>8,569</b>	<b>8,134</b>	<b>7,242</b>	<b>42,126</b>

<u>Voting-Age Percent:</u>	<u>District 1</u>	<u>District 2</u>	<u>District 3</u>	<u>District 4</u>	<u>District 5</u>	<u>Total, All Districts</u>
Hispanic, of any race	6.19%	6.10%	17.95%	36.53%	12.32%	15.48%
Non-Hispanic White	90.64%	91.20%	77.73%	58.09%	27.70%	71.03%
Non-Hispanic Black	0.36%	0.23%	0.43%	0.47%	0.58%	0.41%
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.01%	1.52%	2.80%	3.88%	58.93%	12.21%
Non-Hispanic Asian	0.57%	0.61%	0.71%	0.81%	0.25%	0.60%
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	0.09%	0.14%	0.09%	0.01%	0.00%	0.07%
Non-Hispanic other race	0.07%	0.10%	0.19%	0.10%	0.07%	0.10%
Non-Hispanic two or more races	0.07%	0.10%	0.09%	0.11%	0.15%	0.10%
<b>Voting-Age Percent</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Source: Census 2010 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary file, Arizona  
 Tabulation: Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix AZ (602) 230-9580



**Race and Origin Composition of Current and Proposed Gila County  
Community College Districts  
Plan submitted by: AZBandit, Plan CC02**




Source: Census 2010  
Redistricting Data (Public  
Law 94-171) Summary File,  
Arizona


**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
PLAN SUBMITTED BY: AZ Bandit, Plan CC02**

	<b>Current Districts</b>	<b>Proposed Plan</b>	<b>Change</b>
Population, District 1	11,670	10,930	-740
Population, District 2	11,342	10,767	-575
Population, District 3	10,231	10,632	401
Population, District 4	8,972	10,735	1,763
Population, District 5	11,382	10,533	-849
Population deviation, District 1	951	211	
Population deviation, District 2	623	48	
Population deviation, District 3	-488	-87	
Population deviation, District 4	-1,747	16	
Population deviation, District 5	663	-186	
Percent deviation, District 1	8.87%	1.96%	
Percent deviation, District 2	5.81%	0.44%	
Percent deviation, District 3	-4.56%	-0.82%	
Percent deviation, District 4	-16.30%	0.15%	
Percent deviation, District 5	6.18%	-1.74%	
Total plan deviation, number	2,698	397	
Total plan deviation, percent	25.17%	3.70%	
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 1	5.89%	6.19%	0.30%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 2	7.24%	6.10%	-1.14%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 3	19.20%	17.95%	-1.25%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 4	31.10%	36.53%	5.43%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 5	19.92%	12.32%	-7.60%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 1	1.93%	2.01%	0.08%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 2	2.37%	1.52%	-0.85%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 3	2.69%	2.80%	0.11%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 4	2.40%	3.88%	1.48%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 5	55.19%	58.93%	3.74%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 1	0.35%	0.36%	0.01%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 2	0.22%	0.23%	0.01%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 3	0.35%	0.43%	0.08%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 4	0.73%	0.47%	-0.26%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 5	0.48%	0.58%	0.10%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 1	8.97%	9.36%	0.39%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 2	10.91%	8.80%	-2.11%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 3	23.12%	22.27%	-0.85%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 4	35.12%	41.91%	6.79%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 5	76.31%	72.30%	-4.01%




**Changes Proposed to Gila County  
CC Districts by K Feezor, Plan klfcc06b  
RAS Adjustment**







# Plan KLF06B, Globe Area



**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
TOTAL POPULATION BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN  
PLAN SUBMITTED BY: K Feezor, Plan Kif cc06b**

	<u>District 1</u>	<u>District 2</u>	<u>District 3</u>	<u>District 4</u>	<u>District 5</u>	<u>Total, All Districts</u>
<b>Number:</b>						
Hispanic, of any race	841	979	2,193	4,253	1,322	9,588
Non-Hispanic White	9,446	9,354	8,267	5,851	2,380	35,298
Non-Hispanic Black	47	44	55	59	43	248
Non-Hispanic American Indian	229	317	236	458	6,735	7,975
Non-Hispanic Asian	67	79	63	84	28	321
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	16	9	12	2	0	39
Non-Hispanic other race	12	18	15	14	7	66
Non-Hispanic two or more races	7	12	13	14	16	62
<b>Total Population</b>	<b>10,665</b>	<b>10,812</b>	<b>10,854</b>	<b>10,735</b>	<b>10,531</b>	<b>53,597</b>
<b>Percent:</b>						
Hispanic, of any race	7.89%	9.05%	20.20%	39.62%	12.55%	17.89%
Non-Hispanic White	88.57%	86.51%	76.17%	54.50%	22.60%	65.86%
Non-Hispanic Black	0.44%	0.41%	0.51%	0.55%	0.41%	0.46%
Non-Hispanic American Indian	2.15%	2.93%	2.17%	4.27%	63.95%	14.88%
Non-Hispanic Asian	0.63%	0.73%	0.58%	0.78%	0.27%	0.60%
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	0.15%	0.08%	0.11%	0.02%	0.00%	0.07%
Non-Hispanic other race	0.11%	0.17%	0.14%	0.13%	0.07%	0.12%
Non-Hispanic two or more races	0.07%	0.11%	0.12%	0.13%	0.15%	0.12%
<b>Total Percent</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>
Ideal Population	10,719	10,719	10,719	10,719	10,719	<b>Total</b> 10,719
Total Population	10,665	10,812	10,854	10,735	10,531	deviation: 323
Numeric deviation from Ideal Value	-54	93	135	16	-188	-1.76%
Percent deviation from Ideal Value	-0.51%	0.86%	1.26%	0.15%	-1.76%	<b>3.01%</b>

Source: Census 2010 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary file, Arizona  
Tabulation: Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix AZ (602) 230-9580




**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
VOTING-AGE POPULATIONS BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN  
PLAN SUBMITTED BY: K Feezor, Plan Klf cc06b**

	<u>District 1</u>	<u>District 2</u>	<u>District 3</u>	<u>District 4</u>	<u>District 5</u>	<u>Total, All Districts</u>
<b>Voting-Age Number:</b>						
Hispanic, of any race	512	632	1,514	2,971	890	6,519
Non-Hispanic White	8,236	7,832	7,123	4,725	2,006	29,922
Non-Hispanic Black	29	24	38	38	42	171
Non-Hispanic American Indian	174	226	161	316	4,268	5,145
Non-Hispanic Asian	54	64	50	66	18	252
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	11	8	10	1	0	30
Non-Hispanic other race	3	16	12	8	5	44
Non-Hispanic two or more races	5	8	10	9	11	43
<b>Voting-Age Population</b>	<b>9,024</b>	<b>8,810</b>	<b>8,918</b>	<b>8,134</b>	<b>7,240</b>	<b>42,126</b>
<b>Voting-Age Percent:</b>						
Hispanic, of any race	5.67%	7.17%	16.98%	36.53%	12.29%	15.48%
Non-Hispanic White	91.27%	88.90%	79.87%	58.09%	27.71%	71.03%
Non-Hispanic Black	0.32%	0.27%	0.43%	0.47%	0.58%	0.41%
Non-Hispanic American Indian	1.93%	2.57%	1.81%	3.88%	58.95%	12.21%
Non-Hispanic Asian	0.60%	0.73%	0.56%	0.81%	0.25%	0.60%
Non-Hispanic Hawaiian	0.12%	0.09%	0.11%	0.01%	0.00%	0.07%
Non-Hispanic other race	0.03%	0.18%	0.13%	0.10%	0.07%	0.10%
Non-Hispanic two or more races	0.06%	0.09%	0.11%	0.11%	0.15%	0.10%
<b>Voting-Age Percent</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

Source: Census 2010 Redistricting Data (Public Law 94-171) Summary file, Arizona  
 Tabulation: Research Advisory Services, Inc., Phoenix AZ (602) 230-9580

**Race and Origin Composition of Current and Proposed Gila County  
Community College Districts**  
Plan submitted by: RAS Adjusted Plan klf cc06b





**GILA COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICTS  
 PLAN SUBMITTED BY: K Feezor, Plan klf cc06b**

**RAS Adjustment**

	<b>Current Districts</b>	<b>Proposed Plan</b>	<b>Change</b>
Population, District 1	11,670	10,665	-1,005
Population, District 2	11,342	10,812	-530
Population, District 3	10,231	10,854	623
Population, District 4	8,972	10,735	1,763
Population, District 5	11,382	10,531	-851
Population deviation, District 1	951	-54	
Population deviation, District 2	623	93	
Population deviation, District 3	-488	135	
Population deviation, District 4	-1,747	16	
Population deviation, District 5	663	-188	
Percent deviation, District 1	8.87%	-0.51%	
Percent deviation, District 2	5.81%	0.86%	
Percent deviation, District 3	-4.56%	1.26%	
Percent deviation, District 4	-16.30%	0.15%	
Percent deviation, District 5	6.18%	-1.76%	
Total plan deviation, number	2,698	323	
Total plan deviation, percent	25.17%	3.01%	
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 1	5.89%	5.67%	-0.22%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 2	7.24%	7.17%	-0.07%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 3	19.20%	16.98%	-2.22%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 4	31.10%	36.53%	5.43%
Percent voting-age Hispanic, District 5	19.92%	12.29%	-7.63%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 1	1.93%	1.93%	0.00%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 2	2.37%	2.57%	0.20%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 3	2.69%	1.81%	-0.88%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 4	2.40%	3.88%	1.48%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Native American, District 5	55.19%	58.95%	3.76%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 1	0.35%	0.32%	-0.03%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 2	0.22%	0.27%	0.05%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 3	0.35%	0.43%	0.08%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 4	0.73%	0.47%	-0.26%
Percent voting-age Non-Hispanic Black, District 5	0.48%	0.58%	0.10%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 1	8.97%	8.73%	-0.24%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 2	10.91%	11.10%	0.19%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 3	23.12%	20.13%	-2.99%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 4	35.12%	41.91%	6.79%
Percent voting-age total minority residents, District 5	76.31%	72.29%	-4.02%