

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:

---

**WORK SESSION - TUESDAY, AUGUST 23, 2011 - 10 A.M.**  
**R E V I S E D**

- 1 Call to Order - Pledge of Allegiance
- 2 Presentation/Discussion regarding redistricting of Gila County supervisorial and college districts and alternative redistricting maps. The Board may also discuss alternative Arizona State redistricting plans. **(Linda Eastlick)**
- 3 Review and discuss 4 new proposed Countywide policies. **(Joe Heatherly)**

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.

**ARF-716****2****Work Session****Meeting Date:** 08/23/2011**Submitted For:** Linda Eastlick, Elections **Submitted By:** Linda Eastlick, Elections  
Director Department**Department:** Elections Department**Presenter's Name:** Linda Eastlick

---

---

InformationRequest/Subject

Gila County Supervisorial and Community College redistricting (NOTE - attachments will be provided by August 15)

Background Information

The Gila County Elections staff, redistricting consultants and Redistricting Advisory Committee have been working over the last several months to develop mapping alternatives and ideas for the Board's consideration. The Committee submitted their ideas to the Board of Supervisors on August 15, 2011. The next step in the process is for the Board to review and discuss all ideas submitted by staff, consultants, the committee, and the public during a work session.

Evaluation

It is proposed the Board review and discuss in detail all information provided by the Elections staff, redistricting consultants, public comments, and the mapping alternatives submitted by the Redistricting Advisory Committee. This review should include in-depth discussions of the Redistricting Principles adopted by the Board in April, pertinent voting pattern analyses including minority regression, and other U. S. Department of Justice preclearance requirements.

Conclusion

The Board has the ultimate responsibility and authority to approve redistricting plans for the County. Prior to making final decisions, the Board of Supervisors can take this opportunity to consider all of the information provided by the Redistricting Advisory Committee, hear input from staff and/or consultants, and discuss redistricting alternatives.

Recommendation

The Elections Director recommends the Board discuss mapping alternatives, consider all options, and hear comments during the work session.

Suggested Motion

Presentation/Discussion regarding redistricting of Gila County supervisorial and college districts and alternative redistricting maps. The Board may also discuss alternative Arizona State redistricting plans. **(Linda Eastlick)**

---

# BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

August 23, 2011

## MEETING MINUTES

\*\*\*\*\*

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay, so I will -- we will move to agenda item 2, which is presentation and discussion regarding redistricting of Gila County supervisorial and college districts and alternative redistricting maps. The board may also discuss the alternative Arizona State redistricting plans. Linda Eastlick."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Good morning, Chairman, members of the board. We're here today in a work session so that we can go through the mapping alternatives that have been provided by the redistricting advisory committee that was --

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Are we on, or not on?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Okay. That was put into effect by the board early this year. We also have with us our consultants, who will talk with us about some of the issues that we have to be concerned about if we go through and finalize our plan, and we thought we would start with a general discussion of the statistics or the outcome of the mapping proposals that we have and then discuss voting rights, the issues that we have there, and then we'll get into more detailed conversation about the maps themselves. Bruce, do you want to begin, or Tony, with the statistics?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Thank you. Yes, Linda, I think -- Tony is the math guy, so he'll do the statistics."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Oh, you want me to talk?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Do you want me to pass those out?"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Please, yeah. All right. Thank you. Well, when the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "District Chairman, do we have a copy of what he's --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Oh, boy."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "-- (indiscernible \*\*9:51:36) up?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Oh, we'll get --"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "No, we didn't, but we can --"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "-- fax you right now."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "This is (indiscernible - away from mic \*\*9:51:40)."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Okay. If you'll give it to Gina, she can scan it."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "And if there's any other handouts we're going to use, could I just have them do them now?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Well --"

**Elections Supervisor, Linda Eastlick:** "I don't think there are any others."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Did these maps go up there?"

**Elections Supervisor, Linda Eastlick:** "Those have gone up. Uh-huh."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "I -- am I too close to it?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "You've got the maps, right, Tommie?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "And you have your book of the maps?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "I -- I'm beginning to get the maps, yes."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Okay. And you have your book of maps?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "I didn't --"

**Elections Director, Linda, Eastlick:** "So, and that'll be our discussion."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "You have your big book, right?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Got my big book."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "More than -- more information than we needed. No. We need it all."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Gina's going to scan and fax those up right now, Tommie. Thank you."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Uh-huh. Thank you."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Thank you, Mr. Chair. Sorry for the delay. This is just one of those area's we've got to get a little sharper about, because I've always got (indiscernible \*\*9:52:55) here if I'm not here."

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

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "You know? And we'd like to have them, like, by 9:00 o'clock anyhow, to get them copied. Pam thinks I'm giving her a workout today running back and forth. She says she needs one."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Is there enough for the public?"

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

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

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "All right. So the one page handout that I've -- well, that we've just handed out -- maybe that's why they call it hand out. It really covers the supervisorial plans and the community college district plans, and the plans that we're talking about are plans that the redistricting advisory committee examined -- some of the plans are ones that members of the redistricting advisory committee themselves created using an on-line mapping system that we developed and made available. And some plans were plans that were submitted by the public. So then two subcommittees of the redistricting advisory committee met to decide on three supervisorial plans and three community college district plans to recommend to the board to begin the second phase of the redistricting process, and that's of course the phase at which we -- whichever plans the board decides to move forward will then be circulated, you know, on the web sites and maybe newspaper articles with -- and then public hearings. So the purpose of this meeting, right now -- well, I -- let me back up a bit. I think the 15th of this month the redistricting advisory committee made a presentation to the board to present these maps, and so this is a work study session to -- for the board to kind of take a look at, with more detail, at the maps and then decide whether all six go forward or just some combination of supervisorial and -- or community college maps. The table that I have in front of you really doesn't talk about any raw population figures. You just have to sort of understand that the -- all six of the plans are within the total population, one person, one vote tolerance. What we're pretty much concerned with is the racial balance within each of the districts. Obviously, in the work that Bruce and I have done,

we've made some determinations as to the extent of racially polarized voting in various districts within the county. And where -- and Bruce, please correct me if I misstep here - - but where we find, generally, that minority voters have been successful in exercising their electoral responsibilities and been able to elect candidates of their choice, we have to make sure that, in the changes that we make to those districts, that we do not lessen their ability to do so. And so, on this table, let me just quickly run through this table so you kind of get a -- it's just a mass of numbers right now until we explain it a little. But the, obviously, the top part of the table pertains to the supervisorial districts, and the last three columns are the three plans. The TATO 1 is a plan that we received from the Tonto Apache tribe. Then the other two plans, I believe, are both from redistricting advisory committee members. And then down below, in the community college plans, I'm really not sure who AZ Bandit is. I mean, these names really come from people's emails -- email addresses. But then the second two columns, or the last two columns in that area are also by members of the redistricting advisory committee. In each area, we basically give the statistics for the total minority -- voting age total minority residents followed by the voting age Hispanic and voting age non-Hispanic Native American. And, excuse me, and of course, the second column, you know, the real second column that has the column heading "current," those are the racial proportions that exist in the districts today, and those are the -- those are kind of the bench mark proportions that the Department of Justice will be looking at when it evaluates the degree of change proposed under the maps that the county adopts.

"Where I have put a shading behind a number, that indicates a situation where there appears to be a retrogression of the -- in the minority proportion, retrogression being a matter of a diminishment of the minority proportion. And so, I mean, for instance, in District 2, in the supervisorial plan, the current percentage is 30.16 percent. The first two plans don't lower that figure, but they -- the last plan, the TJM01 plan, does drop that percentage just very slightly. But just slightly is enough to cause the Justice Department to take a second look at why that happened, so I flagged that as a potential problem.

"Any questions at this point on the table?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "I have a question. You say that the TJM1 that you have highlighted also, the TAT one, on District 3, 43.91 percent --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Right. That is also a --"

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

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "-- would be a retrogression for that plan in District 3, correct, yes. Yes?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Yes, ma'am -- yes, sir?"

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Just for clarification, current column is with 2010 population, not with population of the 2000 -- this is --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "That is correct, yeah. That -- all of the population figures that we used for balancing the one person one vote aspect and also the proportions that were used in the voting rights issues are all from the 2010 census, but certainly the -- on

the current column, those are calculations based on the 2010 census figures in the shapes that were created 10 years ago, your current districts."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "I need you to explain -- okay. The current column in District 1, 2 and 3, what that percentage is indicating."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Okay. In District 1, for instance, the total voting age minority proportion within, you know, found by the census a year and a half ago was 9.13 percent of the population in the category of total minority -- total voting age minority residents. By total, here we're talking about Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians, any -- essentially anybody who is not Anglo would be in the category of total minority residents."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "So going from 50 to 43 percent is considered a significant drop? What is their variance that they wouldn't be concerned about?"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Right. And the answer to that question kind of depends on where the current value is to start with. If a current value is very, very low, in all likelihood, that minority group has not had any ability to affect outcome of elections and, you know, any percentage probably -- certainly below 20 percent is probably not even going to be on the -- on DOJ's radar of concern."

"In the 30s, 40s, and 50 percentage, that's, you know, very much of concern, because at that level, minorities are able to certainly have -- affect the outcome of elections to the extent that they can coalesce with other groups to be successful, and certainly once the -- as in the case here -- the current aggregate minority percentage being 50.28 percent, technically making that a majority -- minority majority district, then changing a plan to basically drop about seven percentage points from that figure takes it out of the category of being a minority majority district, I think which is kind of one of the largest flags that DOJ would notice."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "And, excuse me, if I could elaborate on that a little bit and talk more about the Justice Department process. And, as you know, I had -- I was an attorney with the Department of Justice, and we reviewed virtually every county's redistricting plan during the last redistricting, including the state's redistricting, which my team objected to."

"I want to address just briefly that percentage change that Tony mentioned, and then talk more about the process as a whole, the preclearance process, and then we can get, I think, into the nitty gritty."

"There's really no bright line number for which DOJ says, okay, a drop of two percent, eight percent, nine percent, that -- that's a problem. District 3, as it's currently constituted (sic), is a coalition district, in that you have two large minority populations, Native American and Latino, that our analysis has determined coalition or coalesce to support many of the same candidates. What that does is that creates a district where minorities can elect candidates of choice under the Voting Rights Act. If minorities are able to do that, that ability cannot be weakened, reduced, diminished, altered in a way that changes that ability. A drop of seven percent would do that. And when I was with

the Justice Department, if I saw any drop of, could be as little as two percent, certainly when you're getting above five percent, that would be an immediate red flag, and I'd take out a highlighter and highlight that change and say, immediately, without doing any analysis, that may present a problem that we're going to have to look at. So let's -- we can talk a little bit more about that specific district, but let's talk about the process as a whole, and what the county's burden under federal law is. Under Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, as you know, no voting change, including redistricting plan, can be implemented or used without preclearance or approval by the United States Department of Justice, excuse me, as the county, as the jurisdiction that has the burden of submitting a redistricting plan.

You also have the burden of proving that your plan is nondiscriminatory; that your plan doesn't retrogress the rights of minority voters. Retrogression means putting minority voters in a position that weakens their right to -- their ability to elect or diminishes it in any way. The new regulations that the Department of Justice is operating on, which were just promulgated this year, are stronger than the regulations that we operated on nine years ago. The retrogression standard is stronger, which creates more of a burden for you.

If the county does not meet its burden, if the county, in sending a big folder to the Department of Justice with your redistricting plan, if you haven't proved to their satisfaction that your plan is not retrogressive, then they will not approve your plan. They can object, which is what we did nine years ago at the state level. Which means the plan is -- has no value under federal law, cannot be implemented, cannot be used, and you have to draft another plan.

When I say burden, it's important to realize that the Department of Justice doesn't give you an advisory opinion, doesn't tell you what you should or should not do. Frankly, you're supposed to know that. The law is very clear in what your burden is, what your obligations are, and what you have to do to prove that you're not retrogressing; that you're not discriminating. You basically get one chance.

If the Department of Justice feels that you haven't given them enough to understand what you're trying to do; if the Justice Department feels that you have not proven to their satisfaction that you're not discriminating, they can do one of two things. They can send you what's called a request for additional information, which will be a detailed letter explaining all the things they want you to give them, or they can give you an objection, which means we have found your plan to violate federal law, and you're not allowed to use it. You'll have to come up with something else.

In the preclearance process, you have -- Justice Department has 60 days to review a plan and make all these determinations and analyses. If they feel that you have not satisfied them, and send you that request for additional information, that 60 day clock stops and then it's put on you, the county, so that you now have 60 days to get them all the information they've asked for. If you don't meet the 60 day deadline or if you don't give them what they would like or that you're satisfied that you've met their burden, they will object. And that's what we did at the state level nine years ago. If you happen to look at the letter that we wrote nine years ago, the -- part of the objection was not on the substance of what the state did. Part of the objection was saying we don't really



understand what you're trying to do. We've asked you to explain it. You haven't, to our satisfaction, so we're objecting.

So that's basically the process. When the Justice Department receives a submission, they scan it, copy it, make copies of whatever electronic media are sent, then the submission is assigned to an attorney. Gila County likely has already been assigned to an attorney who is just waiting for your plan to start reviewing it. Then the clock begins, and Justice does all the analyses that we've talked about.

The analyses that Tony and I have been doing the last couple of months are the same analyses that Justice will do. Justice will run the same numbers, do the same analyses. They may have questions, and they may call to ask questions. If they're satisfied with all the information that they've received, and the plan is not retrogressive, which, as you know, is certainly our intent, then they pre-clear within the 60 day period, and you move forward with your election administration. That's basically a -- an overview, from the Justice Department's perspective, of the process. Are there any questions about that process that I talked about?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "I think I understand the process. I just, in looking at these statistics that you presented to us, to me, you're looking -- in looking at the voting age Hispanics, we're looking at retrogression in every proposal."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well let's talk a little bit about retrogression. I think the retrogressive change that Tony indicated is a literal drop in population, which is the literal meaning of retrogression, meaning reduction. But let's talk about what may be problematic under federal law, which may not be all of these numbers. If -- would you like me to do that?"

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

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Okay. The District 3, at the supervisory level, is that coalition district that I talked about. There's no one group, no one minority group, that has an absolute numeric majority. It's a coalition with two groups, Latinos and Native Americans, forming a narrow majority. Now, with the current configuration of the district and at the current numbers, we've determined that minorities in that district, Native Americans and Latinos, can elect candidates of choice by coalitioning, coalescing, to support many of the same candidates.

Once that ability has been established, it has to be set in concrete. It cannot be weakened or diminished. A reduction in the proposal of about seven percentage points for the Latino population is, to me, in my opinion, a retrogressive -- problematic retrogression under federal law, because you are reducing the ability of the coalition by as many as seven points. That's not the same as a one percent reduction or a .5 percent reduction. Seven percent reduction is significant, so that that would reduce the ability of minorities in that district to elect whom they want. The amount of the reduction doesn't matter. The amount of the -- as far as reducing the ability doesn't matter. The key is that if minorities can elect, which they can, and if you are reducing that ability, that's retrogression, which is prohibited by Section 5.

So our concern is that that is a large reduction. There can be de minimis reductions of a half a percentage point, one percent, maybe even two percent, depending on the district, but seven percent reduction is significant, and that's larger than a reduction that I've seen in other jurisdictions around the state at this time. If I had seen that seven

years ago, I would have immediately called Linda's predecessor and asked her a series of questions about that reduction; why did you do that, what are your justifications, and prove to me that minorities in that district can continue to elect whom they want."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "So, Mr. Chairman, my question is, with what I've heard said, and my understanding of what has been said, then therefore all three proposed maps exceed on the voting age Hispanics, the seven percent that you're saying. That we don't have a map that you're saying would pass --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "No, the -- there's only one map that has the -- the TAT01 has that seven point swing. There aren't any other maps that have that seven percent drop at the supervisory level for District 3."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "The second map is about a -- I'm just looking at it -- one and a half percent drop."

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

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "And the last one just about --"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "So you can compare it to --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "-- one percent."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "-- what currently got by Department of Justice?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Yes. And that's called the benchmark. Your plan that you currently have is the benchmark plan. The benchmark plan is the last pre-cleared plan from the Department of Justice. The numbers on the left, the current column, are the current census data numbers, which Justice has and has already inputted, just as we have. So they take, as we take, current population, superimpose them on your current districts to see what that benchmark number of voters is and the benchmark voting strength of minority groups. So the current benchmark in District 3 is 50.28 percent voting age population. So, as I said, that that's the -- it's a bare majority of -- majority minority district, but there is no one minority group large enough to be an absolute majority.

Let's assume that Native Americans in that district were 55 percent by themselves. I would be much less concerned about a five percent drop or a four percent drop when one group is an absolute majority, because that groups ability to elect would likely be stronger than two groups that have to depend upon each other to elect candidates of choice."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Thank you."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "You're welcome."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Go ahead, Tony. Are there any other questions?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "One comment that I might make. Tony, on community college districts, while we're talking about the retrogression issue, in District 5 and the percent of total minority residents?"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Right."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "That one is higher rather than lower. So that's really --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Right."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "-- not a --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Well, in one respect it might be viewed as a retrogression in that that proportion was already very high in that district, so under this plan, making it

even higher, you know, unnecessarily increasing the size of a very, you know, significant minority proportion to start with sort of denies adjacent districts the possibility of having that sort of excess proportion added to them.

So I think, Bruce, correct me if I'm wrong, but maybe retrogression may not be the right term to use here, but I think it's a movement that would not -- I don't think would please the Justice Department."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "What that's called in the technical redistricting language is packing. Packing means if I have one district, which District 5 currently is, for the community college that has a substantial minority population in the 70s and I put even more minority voters there, more than are needed for minority voters to maintain that ability to elect, I am packing minority voters into one district and depriving, arguably, minority voters in another district the potential to have an ability to elect.

At 76 percent, in my experience, I've never seen a jurisdiction in the United States where minority voters need as many as 76 percent to continue to elect whom they want. But there are jurisdictions that have 75, 80, 90 percent minority voters, for their own reasons, which frankly I don't necessarily think are consistent with Section 5. I think invariably those districts are packed, and packing a district creates liability issues for the county under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, which is provision that prohibits the dilution of minority voting strength.

So as Tony was saying, it -- 78 percent's a lot, and I think we have concluded that's too many as far as being needed to maintain the ability to elect. That 78 percent is typically a very high percentage."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Tommie, do we have any questions from anybody up there?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Can you hear me?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "I can hear you a little bit."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible \*\*10:18:44) turn up the volume on that little blue box there, maybe?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "On this box here?"

**Unidentified Speaker:** "(Indiscernible \*\*10:18:50)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Yeah. We're raising it now. Can you hear us okay?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Oh, yeah. Yeah. (Indiscernible \*\*10:18:58)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Well, shucks, let us turn it down."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "I do have questions. I have questions for Tony on this. And I, first of all, need to start by saying that Ivan Smith with Tonto Apache called this morning and said that we had scheduled over something that they have, I think it's their council meeting today, and they wanted to be here and answer any questions that we might have and would in the future, felt like the paper that we -- they sent us would be self-explanatory, but if we needed questions answered, they'd be happy to do that."

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

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Questions that I have for Tony, couple things that have come into my mind. Number one was, I'm beginning to get some indications that Hayden Winkelman is in favor of the Tonto Apache plan. Now, then I was wondering what would Justice say if, in fact, we have a plan here that is submitted by one minority and it's supported by the other minority. Is that the kind of thing that you're talking about

for justification in that plan? If in fact the two minorities that the -- that we claim that we're trying to protect, in fact, are in favor of doing what the Tonto Apache had proposed. What would Justice say about that?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Supervisor Martin, if you don't mind, I'll answer that question."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "You bet. I don't mean Tony -- Bruce, I'm sorry. I mean, I was -- I did want to ask you."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "That's okay. We both have glasses on, so that's okay."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "I know. So do I."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "I think -- let -- let's presume -- let's imagine that I'm still a justice and that submission came to me and I looked at it. The -- I would -- my first question would be twofold. What would be the reasons why the citizens of Hayden and Winkelman are supporting it, and also, what analysis do you have that shows that minorities in that district could continue to elect whom they want. Whether or not people support something anecdotally will not be enough for the Justice Department to pre-clear. That does not satisfy your burden under federal law of proving that something is retrogressive or not. The Justice Department will take that into consideration and do its own investigation and speak to people in those communities, but you will still have to prove that, at 43 percent, the minority voters in that district will not have their ability to elect candidates reduced, diminished, or weakened."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Another -- well, and anecdotally, that was one of the questions that one of the gentlemen down there called about, was how could they officially weigh in. My answer back was once the maps were out, I think it would be the burden upon them to officially inform us one way or the other on, I mean, at that point, then the public weighs in."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Do you mean the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:22:08) that | --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Excuse me. Do you mean the Justice Department officially informing?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "No, no, no, no, no. I mean on these three maps, a gentleman from Hayden Winkelman, one of them, had said how do we formally weigh in, and I said, well, we have a public -- my expectation is that we will lay the plans out there, and then the public has a couple of weeks to give us input on those two plans, and that that would be the time for them to do more than have just an anecdotal support, but they actually would have time there to, in some fashion, formally weigh in on the plans that they do support or don't support."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, I agree that once you --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "So --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "I agree with you that it's certainly incumbent upon members of the public and community to provide various opinions about what your choices are, but it's the county's federal legal obligation to provide the Justice Department with whatever analysis or support to show that your plan, excuse me, does not violate Section 5. So if I live in a particular community, and I favor a particular plan, yes, I should weigh in and inform you what my opinions are. But you, as the county, have the non-delegable, non-assignable obligation to provide whatever information is needed to Justice to prove that

your plan is not retrogressive. So whether people provide information or not, you still have your continuing burden to provide information to Justice."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Well he had -- one of the questions he had asked me is were we -- if we have the absolute proof that, in fact, the two minorities voted together. It -- had -- did they -- did we absolutely know that. His opinion was that they didn't. And that as well was the Tonto Apache opinion that they didn't necessarily. "

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, and --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "So --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "-- and I take that -- your last word is very important, necessarily, because whatever -- to whatever extent there is coalition voting in any district, coalition voting will not occur for every single election. But if it occurs for one or two elections, or one or two candidates, and the minority voters in that coalition are successful in electing whom they want, then that ability to elect has been established. There's no minimum or maximum number of elections to create this ability to elect. Once it has occurred, once it has been demonstrated, then federal law is clear that that has been established, and if you reduce that, it is retrogressive. So if the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Well that was his questions to me was he would like to have the proof that, in fact, we have the proof that they were a coalition vote. I don't know if we have that. I don't know enough about the information that you all have looked at in that committee, but he was wanting to be able to see for sure. And what it did for me, it drove me into looking at some of the -- huh. I have read more about this than I ever hoped to, and what I find, is a coalition, and you tell me if I'm wrong, that the language for coalition voting was stronger under a Sandra Day O'Connor opinion, which it looks to me like was overturned with the new -- ratification of the new Voting Rights Act, that, in fact, it turned her coalition language on its head."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, and --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "So --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "-- Supervisor Martin, you are -- you're talking about turning things on their -- on its head. The Supreme Court has done that a lot, and I -- the decision you're talking about, I believe, is the Georgia versus Ashcroft Supreme Court decision, which the congress reversed in 2006. In --"

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

**Consultant, Bruce:** "-- Barrett versus Strickland, (phonetic) which is a subsequent Supreme Court decision that dealt with various aspects of the Voting Rights Act, the Supreme Court has not specifically gone into a tremendous amount of detail about the Section 2 requirements for coalition districts, vis a vis Georgia v. Ashcroft and the congressional reauthorization from 2006.

Your -- I agree with you up to a point that the congress did certainly overturn Georgia v. Ashcroft. Coalition voting is basically where you have the situation where there is no numerical majority of a minority group, and you have one or more racial or language minorities coalescing, to some extent, to support the same -- some of the same candidates. That has occurred in 3. It is occurring in 3. It does not occur in every election; it does occur in some elections.

So, once minorities have that -- have demonstrated an ability to elect, which they have in 3, congress has determined that that cannot be weakened or reduced. That's what the reauthorization in 2006 said, and that's bedrock Section 5 law."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Well, thinking that that would be -- me thinking that would be (indiscernible \*\*10:27:23), I'm also wondering if we have asked you all to look at those figures, because that was the other thing that I had talked to Chairman Smith about, was I'm not sure we had asked you to look at those figures, and take their plan and move it to where it abides, but yet is still their plan."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "No, that's true. We have not changed the plan. We haven't made any adjustments. That's correct. We have looked at the plan and done coalition voting analysis, but that is correct. We have not moved precincts around so that you would have the opportunity to see what your committee has produced. And what the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:28:06)."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "-- and also, excuse me, what the public is -- and as far as the Tonto Apaches have suggested."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "But, yeah, you have done that with the other two; is that right?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "I'm sorry, done?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Done major or minor modifications to those other two plans to make sure that they fit within --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Did you?"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Yes, they have."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "We did some very minor modifications."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:28:28)."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Yes, and not the Tonto Apache plans."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "But we did not do anything on the Tonto Apache plan."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "And the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Have you did it privately? I mean, in other words, you -- have you played with those numbers at all? Do you have anything to present at all that would bring it closer to in line?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "No, not at this point, we do not, Tommie. We can do that upon instruction by the board. We wanted to bring today what the redistricting advisory committee had brought forward to the board for further discussion. Any of these plans can be adjusted at what we call the census block level. Most of them have been created by the mapping tool, which was not divided into 5,000 itty, bitty pieces, so there is adjustment that can occur. In most cases, we should be able to adjust those plans to the point that they would meet Department of Justice guidelines and still maintain the initial intention of the proposer.

It's interesting, as we start looking at the individual maps, the Kristine Feaser (phonetic \*\*10:29:37) map, and Kristine is a citizen in the county, which is the KLF map, is actually quite a very good compromise of the Tonto Apache plan. It's very similar to that plan, but it does not create the same issues that the Tonto Apache plan creates. So it's -- as you look at those, as we go into detail, you'll find that later.

But the small percentage decrease in the Tom Moody plan easily can be fixed. The Tonto Apache plan, that may take a little more work and may require a little more movement, because that's a fairly large number of people, that seven percent."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "But, Linda, the one question, back to Bruce, I would like to see that analysis that you've done on whether or not they have coalesced and voted together. The guy specifically asked me for that information down there. The -- and he wasn't sure that that had happened. It -- the one that said necessarily were the Tontos that said it necessarily happened, but the gentleman in Hayden Winkelman said I'd like to see that analysis, because I'm not sure that we, in fact, vote together in these elections."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "I --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "And I said that if you had made that analysis, then I'm sure that it's there to have."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, I appreciate --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Is that true?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Yeah, I -- I'm sorry. I appreciate that, and we can certainly -- I'll discuss that. We can discuss that with Linda when we're done, and discuss the process, and what's involved in the --"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "The other thing I --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "I do need that analysis."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "The other question I would have is, Linda, have you met with the Tonto Apaches since they went over this map, and since they submitted theirs, and have they looked at the proposal from Feasor as far as whether it meets what they're trying to achieve?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "I have not met with them. They do, in fact, have all of the six maps, the three supervisorial and the three college district maps with all of the statistics and the comments back on their own map as to the reduction that occurred. We do have -- we have meetings that we'll be having with each of the tribal counsels following your adoptions of those maps that we're going to go forward with for public comment."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "And really, I believe that's what we -- we're here for today, is to determine if we want to adopt all three of the supervisorial proposed maps, and if we want to adopt all three of the community college proposed maps as they are right now, and then encourage or ask you, along with the consultants, to do the adjustments that you feel are necessary to get us out of the retrogression discussion."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "That's right, because today we really aren't going to adopt. Today you're going to direct us as to what you would like us to do if you want us to do any further analysis with these maps, if you have other ideas, answer questions, and then we will actually, on the September -- I'm going to get the date wrong, the 6th, at that meeting you will adopt those maps that will go out for public comments, and there'll be a whole another round of public meetings. So today it's, you know --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Today is just to get --"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "-- this is what we have; what do you want us to do from here."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Today is to get our feelings as to what we want you to do, such as what Supervisor Martin --"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "That's right."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- is asking of the -- okay. So we're on the right track, anyways."

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

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Oh, absolutely. I think that when you look at this process as involving the thousands of moving pieces and not the literal moving pieces of voting precincts, it's a very complex undertaking. So I agree with you, Mr. Chairman, getting information out so that you see what the committee has done, what the Tonto Apaches have done, to discuss what the various issues are, I think that's very important keeping things on track so that the pre-clearance submission can be made as timely as possible and put the county in the best possible position to get pre-clearance timely so that that doesn't interfere with your election calendar next year."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "And I would probably, Tommie, agree with you that we probably need to have the consultants look at the Tonto proposal and make those adjustments that are necessary, because we have done it for all the others, I believe, and that was the one thing that I personally noticed was, well, I know that's a good starting point, but why didn't we go ahead and do that -- what was needed to complete it. So I think that step is needed."

I've gone through these maps, and I'm getting color blind, and all the numbers are meshing together, and you can't understand a whole lot of it. So I think what the committee has proposed to us and presented to us is a good proposal. It's a fair proposal, and I think it's up to us to direct Tony and Bruce here to fine tune all six of the maps that they feel is necessary, not just the Tonto Apache. There's probably some fine tuning that needs to go into all of them a little bit more, and then come back to us in September 6th, 8th, September 8th. The only date I remember is the 7th because it's my birthday, so --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Just a little hint."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "It'll be --"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "The 6th."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- September 6th, okay. So everybody gets off easy, see?"

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "I have some really great sour grapes."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "So I, you know, with that, I, you know, I would open it up for any discussion that's out there that needs to be had. I think if the public wants to make some comments, this would probably be the appropriate time. I don't know how much further you wanted to go into this discussion of -- it seems like we've gotten to a point where we need to ask questions and answer questions before we go any further, maybe."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Mr. Chairman, let me just make one more comment about the Tonto Apache plan, and the reasons that we didn't make any adjustments to it. The resolution that we received from the tribe was very clear that their theory behind the plan was that, since they had created a situation where there was sort of no



retrogression for Native Americans in District 3 and no retrogression for Latinos in District 2, they saw that as being, you know, philosophically a non-retrogressive plan. And so, in discussions with the redistricting advisory committee, their thought was that, you know, it may be unfair for the committee to direct me to make changes to that plan that would move it away from the philosophy that they -- the tribe wanted to, basically to test."

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

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Mr. Chair? Having the consultants make those changes doesn't necessarily mean we will adopt them."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Right."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "So much as to look at what that would mean, what the difference would be, and, in fact, have -- I would think that one should -- I don't foresee that done quickly enough that it could be taken back through the Tonto Apache process and see if, in fact, they agree or like what the consultants did to their plan. Let them say if they, I mean, do the same manipulations to it that we've done to everything else and see if, in fact, that meets their criteria at that stage of the game. Let them weigh in again before we, then, make this decision here in a couple weeks."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Well, I believe -- I don't -- let's see. The adjustments are going to come back to us to approve to submit to the public, I believe, and the public will have comments, so, you know, with the small time frame that's available, you -- we're looking at, what, two weeks?"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Until the --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "It shouldn't take very long, though, Mr. Chair, for them to make their adjustments and to let them run that back by the Tonto Apache. I mean, it can't take two weeks to do that, can it, to make the adjustments and let the set council look at it and --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Well, I --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "-- (indiscernible \*\*10:38:11) look."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "I would think if we're going to release it to one group, we should release it to all of the citizens of the county at the same time, just so everybody has the opportunity --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Well, we may then wind up having four maps. One that's purely the Tonto Apache, and one that is their -- the Tonto Apache with adjustments."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "That's true, and --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible \*\*10:38:34) another way of (indiscernible \*\*10:38:34)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- and then -- that may be true, Tommie, but in the final analysis, it'll come down to the three of us trying to resolve the many, many issues that are involved in this whole process, so --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Yeah. I just was thinking of a way to answer all the concerns and yet let -- if in fact we're looking at a philosophical thing, go ahead and lay those out there in two weeks, but then (indiscernible \*\*10:39:03) their philosophical map with the adjustments as well."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "And I think --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:39:09)."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- the maps will be adjusted by then, yeah. Correct? We will have --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Should be."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Yes. It'll be certainly possible if I get the direction, you know, as I think I'm getting, to move away from that sort of static stance of not making any adjustments to, you know, a sort of a well-documented, well reasoned, you know, plan, from their perspective. I can make those adjustments and, I mean, the -- as I look at trying to kind of bridge that seven point gap, that's an awful lot of people to move around. It's not just kind of the minor surgery that we've done on some of the other maps to adjust them, so, you know, if you ask me whether I can come up with a map that is not retrogressive and contains the main elements that the tribe described in their resolution, yes, I think we can get there in, you know, you know, probably by the end of this week to, you know, at least forward to staff our adjustments, and then we'll let the county decide, you know, what you want to do with it from that point."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. We could have that -- we'll have that discussion, then, and I -- we -- I think the board would direct you to make those adjustments as soon as possible and get them back to the board, and then we will move forward from that point and prepare ourselves for the September 6 meeting."

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "Very good."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "I would ask if you have any more that you would care to present --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "No, we're --"

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "-- at this point or --"

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "At this point I'm, you know, I have the computer set up in such a fashion that, because of the eight and a half by 11 color maps that we send out just don't have sufficient detail, especially on those areas that we have made the adjustments --"

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

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "-- it's possible for me to, you know, as you direct me to, to zoom in on those areas so you can take a look at the --"

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

**Consultant, Tony Sissons:** "-- the street patterns and, you know, what are those neighborhoods that we did move in those minor adjustments."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. All right. I would suggest that we go to that so we do get a look at an overview of what adjustments have been made. Then the public may have more questions. Are there any questions from the public at this time, right now? Okay, Snoop. Identify yourself, please."

**Resident, Jerry Ellison:** "Jerry Ellison. I had a question for, I -- I'm sorry, I didn't get your name."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Bruce."

**Resident, Jerry Ellison:** "Bruce. Oh, that's right."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Jerry Ellison's with the radio station."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Okay."

**Resident, Jerry Ellison:** "There's -- you start off with -- it's -- if I got it wrong, jump in there and get it, but it sounded like you started off with presumptions that there's a coalition between the Tonto Apaches and the Latinos in the community, but doesn't the -- the request from the Tonto Apaches, doesn't that pretty much put the kibosh on that idea?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "No."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, I'm not suggesting that there's a coalition between Tonto Apaches and all of the Latinos in the district. The voting rights analysis goes to the level of every voting precinct in a district to determine the voting behavior of people in those precincts. Now, there are precincts in District 3 now, for example, that are heavily Native American and if not porality (sic), then majority, Latino. And we can do various analyses to determine what candidates those precincts supported, and whether or not those candidates were successful.

In -- under federal law, Gila County is required to provide the Department of Justice with statistical and other proof that whatever it is you're proposing is non-discriminatory. Without the proof, you cannot prove that you are complying with federal law. If you cannot prove you're complying with federal law, then you will not have a redistricting plan. Whether it's whatever plan we're talking about or whatever plan there is in the future, that's federal law.

So this coalition analysis as well as all the other voting analyses that we've done and that Justice will do goes down to the very core of the county, the voting precincts, to see the behavior of voters in each precinct and in each district. And in District 3, we did that analysis to determine whether or not, on some, all, a few, a little bit of elections, Latinos and Native Americans joined together to support some of the same candidates who were successful. As I said earlier, doesn't have to be all the candidates, doesn't have to be five elections or three elections. Once that pattern has been established, once that ability has been established, if you reduce it, that is illegal under federal law."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Will the Department of Justice look at solely on candidate issues, but perhaps there's a big issue that might justify the Tontos, but it is the mining land swap. Will they look at that at all, or will it just be the -- what you said earlier, the issue -- will they look at specific issues that may affect that?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "The Justice Department, under federal --"

**Unidentified Speaker:** "(Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:44:53) voice wise.

**Consultant, Bruce:** That's okay. The Justice Department, under federal law, under Section 5, looks at one issue. The issue is whether minorities, in a given district, can elect whom they want, and do you reduce, weaken or diminish that ability. The reasons for reducing the ability are things that Justice looks at. But it's a very narrow examination in some point -- to some extent. So that's what they look at. Can minority voters elect whom they want? Do they have that ability? And have you reduced, weakened, or diminished it? If the latter is true, you have to explain why. And if the explanation does not satisfy the Justice Department, they will not approve your plan."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Has a political itself, other than, I mean --"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "No, the Justice Department, as I said, I mean, when I was there, we looked at first, oh, excuse me, we looked at the numbers."

**Unidentified Speaker:** "Just the numbers?"

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Well, I said at first, we looked at the numbers. Then we got into some very significant analysis that we've been doing for the last few months. So politics, partisan issues, propositions, those are not what the Justice Department looks at. They look at can voters elect -- minority voters elect whom they want and have you reduced, diminished, or weakened that ability. That's what they look at."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Tommie, any questions up there?"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody has asked to have questions. I -- at this stage of the game, I want to thank Bruce and Tony for everything they've done for us to this point. That's -- I appreciate that perspective, and I appreciate what they have done for us, and what I'm also seeing Bruce having to do with the whole state at this stage of the game, of saying you got to pay attention to this. And I'm going to certainly appreciate the -- (indiscernible \*\*10:46:53) some written stuff, there's also, to try and better explain what the gentleman down there was coming at with me as I understand it, but I may not have the language for it yet. Because I need to be able to have more language than I've got right now to help explain back to the public, what it is you're telling me."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "And I appreciate that. And, you know, Supervisor Martin, thank you very much for your gracious comments. And I'd also ask you, if you receive comments from the public that suggest, well, Latinos and Native Americans, for example, don't vote together, if you have some written comments, explanations of that, we'd like to see that, because, frankly, that -- when you receive it, that becomes part of the record that Gila County is compiling to submit to the Department of Justice. So any written materials like that will be very important for us to review and examine."

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Okay. And that was kind of my comments back to that guy. Well, I do not know. I'm just (indiscernible \*\*10:47:55) on the phone that in the next phase it's even more important to get their written comments from the public as to the -- which one they support and why. (Indiscernible - simultaneous speech \*\*10:48:07)."

**Consultant, Bruce:** "Yes, absolutely."

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

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "No --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "That's it, Mr. Chair."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Okay. Mr. Titla?"

**Resident, Steve Titla:** "Morning. Morning. With regard to the San Carlos Apache tribe, is there any deadline to submitting a map for the tribe? We're kind of behind the eight ball as far as submitting maps go, and we met with the subcommittee, Linda and her staff came to the tribal council -- special council meeting last Friday and gave their -- they did a good job and doing a very good presentation to the council, and I think the -- making the council really think, now, that we have to get on the ball and try to submit something. I think that's -- so I guess my question's what is the deadline.

And then, a little comment on the minority majority district in District 3 from 50.28 to 43.91 to different plans, 50.30, I guess in the current voting age total minority residents, with 50.28 percent, I guess we have the opportunity to elect somebody into office with the native -- because it's not only the Tonto Apache. There's San Carlos Apache and White Mountain Apache in the districts, and so I guess as long as we have the

opportunity to elect somebody if we get a coalition between the Hispanic groups and the Apache tribes, then we have an opportunity to get together.

I think that the Hispanics and the Apache tribes, I think, are beginning to recognize that the strength in voting in coalitions is going to be an advantage to them as we go along here, and that we need to work together, even though our historical relationship probably is not the best if we look at history. But I think that now is a time to work together and have a coalition and get an opportunity to elect people that we can get in there. But the tribe will be looking at those issues, I think, as we go along here. Thank you."

**Supervisor, Mike Pastor:** "Linda, could you answer his first question about maps and time line?"

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "Yeah. Our time line is that on the -- at the meeting on September 6, the board will be selecting those maps that will be going out for further public comment. Although the redistricting committee has completed their work, I'm certain that the board would be interested if the tribal -- if the San Carlos Tribal Council wanted to submit ideas or thoughts. We are getting late in the game to start with a new map. I think, you know, it's going to put the board in a position of having to make a decision as to whether that map would be considered as one of those that would go out for public comment. We would really need to have something very, very shortly in order for there to be time for the consultants to analyze it and in order for there to be time for the board to even consider it appropriately along with the other maps that have already been considered.

I had mentioned to you previously that we would really need to have something by last Friday so that we could talk about it today, and since we don't have that, I'm thinking that within the next week, really, much beyond that puts us in a pretty bad bind with the board having to make the decisions that they have to make."

**Supervisor, Shirley Dawson:** "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Titla, I think that before us are three really good maps. I would think that the tribal council could look at these three maps and issue support of one of those maps, expressing why they agree with it. I -- last Monday when we met, I was under the impression that Native American tribes throughout the State of Arizona are justifiably concerned about the congressional districting maps, and those are the ones that I believe we get into some really questions of, is there gerrymandering going on; is there a definite effort to negate the Native American vote or weaken it. And so those are the maps that I'm more concerned about as far as the Native American being given strength to maintain their voting rights.

I believe these county maps, and -- have -- I understand the Tonto Apaches' proposal. I think that each one of the maps has a strengthening point for Native Americans and so I would think that the tribal council could sit down with what we have and show support for a particular one. Maybe there's some minor variation that you, too, would make a suggestion to. But because of time wise, as far as our county maps and as far as the supervisorial districts go, we need that this week, at the very latest."

**Elections Director, Linda Eastlick:** "That would be --"

**Supervisor, Tommie Martin:** "Mr. Chairman, I'd piggy back on Supervisor Dawson's comments. I think that the legislative district maps and the congressional district maps,