



MINUTES
NAVAJO COUNTY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
May 24, 2011

Committee members in attendance: Marlin Gillespie, Alice Franco Anderson, Robert Black, Jr., Michael Peddie and Leonard Eltsosie.

Consultants: Tony Sissons and Michael Mandell.

Navajo County staff in attendance: Jason Moore, Lisa McKee, Ryan Taylor, Veronica Dale and Laura Sanchez.

Public in attendance: Ed Dowdle

Meeting held at the Navajo County Code Talker's Conference Room, Holbrook, Arizona—Time: 12:07 p.m. to 2:53 p.m.

Jason Moore called the meeting of the Navajo County Redistricting Advisory Committee to order.

Item #1 – **Introductions**—Mr. Moore asked that everyone introduce themselves.

Item #2 – **Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman** Alice Franco Anderson nominated Marlin Gillespie as Chairman; Robert Black, Jr. seconded the motion. Motion unanimously passed.

Marlin Gillespie nominated Robert Black, Jr. as Vice-Chairman, Alice Franco Anderson seconded the motion, motion unanimously passed.

Item #3 – **Training for Advisory Committee** Jason Moore referred to the Board of Supervisor's Resolution 09-11 for the duties of the Committee members. Tony Sissons, with the legal assistance of Michael Mandell gave an overview of the redistricting process and answered questions of the Committee and staff.

Item #4 – **Review current Supervisorial & College District Lines** Mr. Sissons went over the current Supervisorial and College District lines, gave examples and demonstrated an online mapping application which will also be available for Navajo County submittals from the public.

Item #5 – **Census Information.** Mr. Gillespie felt that Items 5 and 6 had already been covered during the discussion of Items 3 and 4.

Item #6 - **Discussion amongst committee members and staff regarding responsibilities of the Committee.**

Item #7 - **Review schedule of first round of community meetings.** Mr. Gillespie asked each Committee member if there were any conflicts. Ms. McKee brought up the location on the Hopi Reservation, so it will be looked into on an alternate/central location. Melissa Buckley was asked to revise the dates for District II and V. Ms. Buckley will edit the schedule and send to all parties.

The Committee recessed at 1:58 p.m. and reconvened at 2:08 p.m.

Item #8 - **Training Re: Open Meeting Law.** Jason Moore handed out a presentation to the Committee members and gave an overview of the process of the Open Meeting Law. Mr. Moore answered questions of the Committee and staff.

Item #9 - **Next Redistricting Advisory Committee Meeting**—July 26, 2011 at noon—Code Talker's Conference Room. The Committee and staff all agreed on the remainder of the schedule and added a "if necessary" meeting on July 27, 2011.

Item #10 - With there being no further business to come before the Redistricting Advisory Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:53 p.m. a motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Alice Franco Anderson. Leonard Eltsosie seconded the motion. Motion carried.



MINUTES
NAVAJO COUNTY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
September 27, 2011

Committee members in attendance: Marlin Gillespie, Alice Franco-Anderson and Michael Peddie.

Committee members appearing telephonically: Robert Black, Jr., Lennard Eltsosie

Consultants: Tony Sissons and Michael Mandell.

Navajo County staff in attendance: Jason Moore, Johnathan Roes, Dusty Parsons, David Tenney, Jesse Thompson, J.R. DeSpain, Melissa Buckley, Ryan Taylor and Veronica Dale.

Navajo County staff appearing telephonically: Jerry Brownlow.

Public in attendance: Larry Matyas, Frank Lucero, Dale Patton, Tom Poscharsky, Jason Whiting, Paul Watson, W. Kent Foree, and Alberto Peshlakai.

Meeting held at the Navajo County Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona—Time: 12:09 p.m. to 2:18 p.m.

Item #1 – **Call to order**—Marlin Gillespie called the meeting of the Navajo County Redistricting Advisory Committee to order.

Item #2 – **Pledge of Allegiance** – Mr. Gillespie led the Pledge of Allegiance. Dale Patton provided the invocation.

Item #3 – **Roll Call**. Mr. Gillespie introduced the Committee members present and noted that we were waiting on 1 more committee member to appear.

Meeting was recessed at 12:14 p.m. to allow time for committee member to appear.

Meeting reconvened at 12:23 p.m.

Item #4 – **Call to the Public** – Tom Poscharsky said he prefers the plans as originally submitted without the adjustments being made and commented that the new plan submitted splits Winslow and Holbrook up.

Dale Patton spoke on behalf of the City of Winslow and recommended the plan TLP04 with a majority of the communities or cities being kept together and opposes the new plan, as it splits Winslow, Holbrook, Woodruff, Taylor and gerrymanders in District I.

Item #5 – **Discussion/Consideration of second round of community meetings and public input received regarding the five plans previously approved by Redistricting Advisory Committee for circulation within the community** – Mr. Gillespie said the City of Holbrook adopted a Resolution in support of TLP04 plan and commented that at the Winslow meeting their concern was to keep them together. Michael Peddie said he did not hear any comments from the residents of Pinetop-Lakeside on any plans. Mr. Peddie asked for an explanation of adjustments made on the plans from Jason Moore or Tony Sissons. Alice Franco-Anderson said she didn't think that the best solution or plan has been submitted yet. Ms. Franco-Anderson said maybe they need to consider having more deviation, keeping the districts more compact or contiguous and that the committee could continue to choose 3 maps. Mr. Gillespie called upon the consultants to explain the adjustments. Jason Moore asked Ryan Taylor to show the plans which voting precinct adjustments have been made. Tony Sissons explained that with the direction given, he made the adjustments to try to stay within the city limits, while trying to balance out the population, keeping the deviation below 10 percent and trying for even under 5-6 percent. Mr. Sissons said that in his experience in working on redistricting of other counties, it's easy to talk about making change to districts but implementing it has ramifications in different directions. Mr. Poscharsky appreciated the explanation of the adjustments and he is fine with the TLP04 even with the adjustment made to the West side of Taylor. Ms. Franco-Anderson asked for a closer look of precincts in Winslow to see if the plan RB06 had all Winslow precincts together. The map did show that it is together.

Item #6 – Discussion/Consideration/Action on any new plans submitted for the Redistricting Advisory Committee’s consideration and any modifications that can be made to improve existing plan proposals.

Ms. Franco-Anderson referred to the NNHRC map and if it split Heber-Overgaard. Mr. Moore said the plan did split several precincts which would create different ballot styles; increases cost for the County and would introduce error to happen. Mr. Patton commented on another precinct issue North of Joseph City, which has no population but would create a new precinct. Ms. Franco-Anderson asked which precincts are split on the NNHRC plan. Mr. Taylor demonstrated the number of precincts that were split on the NNHRC plan, as well as Johnathan Roes from the Election department. Mr. Roes pointed out the congressional precincts and that they have been working off the assumption of splitting the Hopi tribe. There was further discussion on population adjustments made to the precincts in the NNHRC plan. Paul Watson commented that we need to look at what has been submitted, listen to the communities’ input and blend that to get a plan, even if we don’t have a ‘perfect’ plan before us.

Mr. Gillespie announced that Robert Black, Jr. and Supervisor Jerry Brownlow are appearing telephonically. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Black on the philosophy behind the NNHRC map. Mr. Black said the Commission’s interest is to keep the numbers for Districts I and II. Mr. Moore explained the concerns of the NNHRC plan which splits communities of interest and voting precincts. Mr. Moore said by splitting and changing the voting precincts, it causes problems such as added expense to the County, no polling places in the proposed precincts, and creating new ballot styles. Mr. Black asked that the Committee consider the NNHRC map for Board approval. Mr. Gillespie asked if the Committee were to make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors, do they have the legal authority to consider additional maps from other entities or public. Mr. Moore explained that the Committee is to make a recommendation to the Board; the Board will make the decision. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Black if there is anything additional on Item #5. Mr. Black said he only attended 1 of his 2nd round meetings and would be in favor of having additional meetings. Mr. Gillespie asked if there was further discussion on Item # 6. Mr. Moore commented that if it is the desire of the committee to ask the consultants for any changes to the 5 plans or to adjust NNHRC to consider a version of it, then we would most likely not be able to move forward with Item #7. Ms. Franco-Anderson asked if they were to make a recommendation to the Board, can the Board ask for adjustments to be made and will that be a public meeting? Mr. Moore said if the committee wants to ‘keep in your hands’ you can do so, but the Board will need to approve by December 1st. Mr. Patton suggested that the only way to come up with a plan that will work is to place the deviation figure higher. Mr. Moore said the deviation level is 10 percent. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Sissons regarding deviation, the recommendation he made to the county is to keep it close to 5 percent. None of the plans are close to that figure. Mr. Sissons explained that he has no problem with raising the deviation higher, but realize the larger you make the deviation figure you become a target for legal action. Mr. Sissons referred to the Georgia 2004 case and explained that by not knowing exactly what the Department of Justice will do, you should try to stay under the 5 percent deviation figure. Mr. Sissons continues that there are overriding reasons to a higher deviation and that is if the reason is to better the situation in terms of the voting rights act or to solve a retrogression problem. The Department of Justice doesn’t enforce the ‘1 person, 1 vote’ but if they see a plan and it has a wide diversion of population. Mr. Sissons explained that he was instructed to keep the communities of interest together, but realizing now that that goes beyond the city/town limit lines, it is the whole voting precinct even if that is outside of the town limit line. The issue is the voting precinct is a larger block than the town limits.

Mr. Gillespie announced that Lennard Eltsosie and Mr. Black are now on the telephone.

Mr. Moore said the obvious suggestion that’s being made is to keep the total populations in Districts I and II smaller than in the other districts. This would most likely allow keeping the Native American voting population higher, if you didn’t have to take out of District III. Mr. Sissons said there are 2 supervisor districts that are largely Native American populations; he wouldn’t worry that the Justice Department would think that those districts are packed in regards to the voting rights act. If you reduce the proportions in 2 districts how or where else can they be placed to bolster the minority proportions in a 3rd district? There has to be some way to sensitively or appropriately place the populations. Mr. Moore said the Navajos know what percentage they need to elect a candidate of their choice. The Navajo Nation might challenge one of the 5 plans for retrogression, as it jeopardizes the numbers and a form of packing. Mr. Moore suggested that to keep more people happy, we will have to raise the deviation figure. Mr. Peddie asked when retrogression becomes something we need to worry about and he is not in favor of raising the deviation. Mr. Sissons said it’s a value judgment, it depends on what it is dropped to. Mr. Peddie asked if a 20 percent drop would worry him. Michael Mandell said that retrogression is defined as the minority population in a district no longer

having the ability to elect a candidate of their choice. There is no number that we can give you that will be ok, it's all part of the analysis and looking at the voting district. Mr. Moore asked that the 5 plans adopted for circulation to communities is there a retrogression problem with those in Districts I and II. Mr. Mandell said anytime you go below the numbers you would need to see what the previous voting history is and see if there were any other races that ran in those elections to see how close they were, it's part of the analysis. However, the NNHRC plan does have a lower percentage in District II and that fact that they propose it and would testify that they are in agreement to it; it could pass the Department of Justice approval. Ms. Franco-Anderson said she is not comfortable with committee members not all being present and to request the consultants to address deviation and retrogression issues. Mr. Gillespie said he does not have a problem with having another meeting but if we ask the consultants to make some adjustments, how much time would we be looking at. Mr. Sisson said if the committee moves forward to approving 3 maps, he could possibly have it analyzed within a week. Mr. Moore pointed out that a couple of the maps are similar and suggested that the committee possibly blend some of the similar maps together. The maps that are similar are: AFA01 and DP01; MG07 and RB06.

Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Eltsosie if he would like to add anything to Item #5 discussion, since he was not on the telephone at that time. Mr. Eltsosie said in regards to District I, there was discussion at a District council meeting about the NNHRC map and would like to submit that as their recommendation.

Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any motions. Mr. Moore said if the committee wants to make any modifications or if you want to accept NNHRC submittal that should be made at this time. If modifications are requested, Item #7 may have to be tabled. If there are modifications to be made or maps to be blended, some of the maps can be eliminated. Mr. Gillespie asked if there is a motion to any new maps to add to the current 6 maps. Robert Black, Jr. made a motion to add on the map that was provided by the NNHRC to be added to the 5 maps to be considered for adoption by the Board and if possible to ask the consultants make changes to not impact the original submittal. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Black if the motion is to add the NNHRC plan to the 5 being considered by the committee. Mr. Black agreed. Mr. Eltsosie seconded the motion. With there being no discussion on the motion, 3 voted in favor of the motion and 1 opposed, Michael Peddie. Motion passed with a vote of 3-2.

Ms. Franco-Anderson believes the committee is not ready and should all be together in 1 room to make a decision. Mr. Moore said that if the committee wants to ask the consultants make adjustments, it should be done in Item #6. Mr. Gillespie asked if there was an additional map added to the 5, would we still be looking at a week time line? Mr. Sissons said a week would be making adjustments to 3 of the maps. Mr. Moore's recommendation would be to ask Mr. Sissons to take DP01 and AFA01 and work on those together to make an improvement to that plan. The same to be done with plans MG07 and RB06. Take plans of TLP04 and NNHRC to blend together in a way that combines on what is being identified as communities of interests and to maximize the total Native American populations for Districts I and II. Ms. Franco-Anderson said she would like to make a motion to what Mr. Moore just suggested. Mr. Peddie asked about the combining of the maps. Mr. Peddie asked that we eliminate some maps now and suggest they move forward with 3-4 maps. Mr. Peddie said to strike the DP01 and MG07. Michael Peddie made a motion that we have 4 maps: AFA01, RB06, TLP04 and NNHRC. Ms. Franco-Anderson seconded the motion. Ms. Franco-Anderson said to consider increasing deviation in order to reduce retrogression, if possible. Mr. Sissons asked for clarification of the city limits and voting precincts. Mr. Moore said we can ask for their comments but in this process, not everyone will get everything they want. Mr. Patton said Winslow has a small city boundary and requested the surrounding precincts be considered with the city.

Mr. Gillespie asked for a vote on the motion made by Mr. Peddie. Motion passed with a vote of 4 in favor and none opposed.

Item #7 – Discussion/Consideration/Action regarding recommendation of two or more Redistricting Plans to the Navajo County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Gillespie asked if there is a motion to table Item #7 until the consultants have an opportunity to return with results. Ms. Franco-Anderson moved on the motion. There was discussion on a date for a future meeting. Mr. Gillespie said Melissa Buckley will coordinate the meeting. The committee agreed on November 8, 2011 for the next RAC meeting to discuss Item #7. There was some discussion on the plans to be adjusted. Motion passed with all in favor. The next RAC meeting will be November 8, 2011 at 1:00 p.m.

Item #8 - **Adjourn.** With there being no further business to come before the Redistricting Advisory Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m. a motion was made to adjourn the meeting by Alice Franco Anderson. Marlin Gillespie seconded the motion.



MINUTES
NAVAJO COUNTY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
August 5, 2011

Committee members in attendance: Marlin Gillespie, Alice Franco Anderson, Robert Black, Jr., and Leonard Eltsosie

Committee members absent: Michael Peddie

Consultants: Tony Sissons and Michael Mandell

Navajo County staff in attendance: Jason Moore, Ryan Taylor, Melissa Buckley and Laura Sanchez

Meeting held at the Frontier Conference Room, Show Low, Arizona–Time: 12:00 p.m.

Item #1 – Call to order. Chairman Marlin Gillespie called the meeting of the Navajo County Redistricting Advisory Committee to order.

Ryan Taylor led the invocation. Mr. Gillespie introduced Navajo County staff.

Item #2 – RAC Members share with consultants what they have learned from constituents in their Districts about redistricting. Robert K. Black, Jr., committee member representing District I, said he had 2 meetings, Kayenta and Pinon. The Kayenta meeting was an introduction of the redistricting process and policies being explained. Though it was the more heavily attended meeting, they associated it more with the congressional alignments. The Pinon meeting was a smaller crowd, their concerns were more technical, regarding the census blocks and the Federal requirements that need to be put into consideration to get the Department of Justice's approval. Overall, both meetings were more of an introduction to the process.

Lennard Eltsosie, representing District II, had 4 meetings in his District which included: Winslow, Dilcon, Kykotsmovi and Hotevilla. Mr. Eltsosie explained that the general consensus was to try and keep the boundary lines as is. The Hopi would like to be within 1 district and Dilcon brought up the issue that the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission is working on a map they would like to submit on behalf of the tribe. The number of participants was low but those that did attend voiced their concerns.

Alice Franco-Anderson, District IV representative said she had the Show Low, Heber-Overgaard and Taylor meetings, but did not attend the Snowflake meeting to see what their concerns were. Heber-Overgaard did not express that they wanted to be split. Snowflake residents attended the Taylor meeting did not want to remain split, they were adamant and have passed resolutions to put Snowflake and Taylor back together. At the Show Low meeting, more of the concern was regarding Justice of the Peace precinct lines, which Mr. Moore will work with them on that. There were some questions as to the legislative lines, but we won't know the answer to that yet, as that is still ongoing. District IV will lose some population but their opinions were more of how that move will affect their district.

Marlin Gillespie represents District III. Mr. Gillespie said the Snowflake meeting was sparsely attended, with residents from Taylor. Taylor representatives expressed that they wanted to remain together with Snowflake. The Holbrook meeting did not have any residents attend, but the Taylor representatives were there. They commented that they would like to stay with Snowflake and if possible Heber-Overgaard to be within their district, as they are communities of interest. Winslow meeting was well attended and they voiced that they did not want to remain split into 2 different districts. They felt it dilutes their power to elect a candidate of their choice. Mr. Gillespie said he's had one-on-one conversations with Holbrook residents and their main point was they would like to stay intact within 1 district. Mr. Gillespie thinks that it may be impossible with the requirements of the Department of Justice and the State in equalizing the population.

Jason Moore suggested that Item #4 be the next item before Item #5 and then onto Item #3.

Alice Franco Anderson asked for the precinct of the current Board of Supervisors. Mr. Moore said Jonathan Nez resides in the Shonto #1 precinct. Teesto #1 is where Mr. Thompson resides. Mr. DeSpain resides in the Joseph City precinct. Mr. Tenney is in Linden and Mr. Brownlow is in Lakeside #1.

Item #4 – Consultants share any information they need to share with RAC members. Tony Sissons gave an overview of the internet mapping link, which the County will keep on the website. Mr. Sissons said they have reviewed and analyzed all the plans received. They focused on the changes to the racial proportions. That was their main focus of the interactive tool. They also paid attention to keeping the districts contiguous and encouraged people to submit plans which would equal out the population. He was pleased with the variety of the plans submitted. Mr. Sissons asked if any members of the committee have taken a look at the plans submitted. Mr. Gillespie said he has viewed them but found them to be confusing. Mr. Sissons said he assumed the plans submitted are from Navajo County residents. He stated that he would like to hear from the public today on their views. He said Districts III and V are pretty close to meeting the population requirement. Districts I and II are undersized and need to gain population. District V is oversized and will need to lose some of its population. Overall, it will be necessary for large population shifts within the county. What he's heard so far is about communities of interest not being separated, but that will only take us a distance in creating new plans. Mr. Sissons said he would like to get direction from the committee on drawing a certain plan. Mr. Sissons asked if there's anything else from the communities that was voiced and would like to see on a map. Mr. Sissons doesn't want the maps to drive this process. He would like to get the committees preferences on how to reconfigure Districts I and II if the population has to be taken away from District III. Mr. Watson said he felt most of the desires are trying to keep the communities together, but when you look at the numbers it is impossible. District IV has to give up some of its population. There are certain things that are going to drive this no matter what we want. Mr. Sissons said he tried not to make many changes to the voter precincts but if a plan is close to being met and he can swap minorities by changing it, then minor adjustments will be made to those precincts. When the State finishes its legislative or congressional lines, across the State, new precincts may have to be drawn. Mr. Gillespie asked if the congressional lines will be in place before the counties get theirs in place. Mr. Sissons said if the State can create and submit their plan to the Department of Justice, we'd know the lines before we finalize our plan, but most likely that will not happen. Ms. Franco-Anderson asked if they are still planning on gerrymandering the Hopi tribe. Mr. Sissons said he had read somewhere that the Hopi tribe did not mind being in the same congressional district as the Navajo, but it was not confirmed. Dale Patton commented on behalf of Winslow and voiced their concern for wanting to be in one district. They felt having two supervisors and being split in two districts is not beneficial to their city. Mr. Patton commented on four maps the city would not have objections to, which are as follows: DP1, TLP04, DMH03 and MG07. All of the mentioned plans would benefit the Hispanic vote, anywhere between 15-18 % and keep Winslow all in one district, as well as the other towns and cities that wish to be kept together. Tom Poscharsky said they tried to follow federal requirements for their submittals. They took into consideration of keeping the Hopi tribe in one district, as well as the City of Winslow, Holbrook, Snowflake-Taylor and Heber-Overgaard, since they are communities of interest; and none of the towns/cities expressed that they would like to be split.

There was further discussion on the maps, such as deviation numbers.

Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any other legal matters, if recently approved, that they need to abide by.

Michael Mandell explained the process and said the same requirement are still in place and explained a little more in detail of the preclearance process.

Ms. Franco-Anderson asked for clarification as to whether retrogression is less acceptable than deviation. Mr. Mandell explained that deviation can be challenged, but would have to be brought on by an individual, group or tribe.

Item #3 – RAC Members share ideas for drawing new supervisorial district/NPC precinct maps with the consultants. Mr. Gillespie personally felt that they should decide on maps that are below the ten percent deviation. Ms. Franco-Anderson said she doesn't feel comfortable in choosing maps today and not seeing them before they go out for the second round of meetings. Mr. Moore suggested the committee give their general guidelines to the consultants for what they would want to see on the maps.

Meeting was recessed for a five minute break.

Meeting reconvened.

Mr. Moore went through each map and focused on the disadvantages of each plan as well as the deviation numbers. There was discussion between the audience, committee members and county staff on each map. They gave their input and comments as to what can be adjusted to the plans.

Supervisor Jonathan M. Nez said the Hopi tribe's position is important. Once we have that position, we will have a better understanding of which direction we can go. Mr. Nez explained that a portion of the Hopi partition land, a majority of Navajo's live on it.

Mr. Gillespie called for additional comments or questions.

Mr. Black leaned toward the plans AFA01, TLP04 and RB06 to use as maps to be displayed at the second round of meetings. Mr. Gillespie added that DP01 and MFG07 are pretty close. Mr. Eltsosie agreed with Mr. Black on his suggestions.

Mr. Black moved to make a motion to select the five suggested plans (AFA01, TLP04, RB06, DP01 and MFG07) to be displayed to the public for the upcoming meetings. Ms. Franco-Anderson seconded the motion. Mr. Moore clarified that the motion would need to include block level/precinct level adjustments as necessary to reduce deviation on minority population. Mr. Sissons said he could possibly have the analysis ready by Monday or Tuesday. Mr. Poscharsky said he is concerned with some of the problems that need to be fixed on the plans, such as keeping Taylor, Winslow and the Hopi tribe together; as it is not like that on the current plans; the motion should include the consultant to fix those major problems as well. Mr. Moore said the maps identified can be used as a baseline, with changes to be made to reduce deviation, which the consultant will have the authority of fixing any problems. Mr. Gillespie added that these will be drafts, it is not final. Mr. Patton concurred with Mr. Poscharsky's statement of fixing the problems.

Mr. Gillespie called for a vote, all in favor, motion unanimously passed.

Item #5 – Public comment period.

Item #6 – Next Redistricting Advisory Committee Meeting – September 27, 2011 at 12:00 p.m. in the Navajo County Code Talker's Conference Room.

Item #7 –Adjourn. With there being no further business to come before the Redistricting Advisory Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:23 p.m.



MINUTES
NAVAJO COUNTY REDISTRICTING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
November 8, 2011

Committee members in attendance: Marlin Gillespie, Alice Franco-Anderson, Michael Peddie, Robert Black, Jr., and Lennard Eltsosie.

Consultants: Tony Sissons and Michael Mandell.

Navajo County staff in attendance: Supervisors: Jesse Thompson, J.R. DeSpain, and Jonathan M. Nez, Jason Moore, Dusty Parsons, Melissa Buckley, Johnathan Roes, Laura Sanchez, Ryan Taylor and Veronica Dale.

Navajo County staff appearing telephonically: Supervisor Jerry Brownlow.

Public in attendance: Larry Matyas, Dale Patton, Linda Kor

Meeting held at the Navajo County Board of Supervisors Chambers, Holbrook, Arizona

Item #1 – Call to order - Marlin Gillespie called the meeting of the Navajo County Redistricting Advisory Committee to order at 1:03 p.m.

Item #2 – Pledge of Allegiance – Alice Franco Anderson led the Pledge of Allegiance. Mr. Gillespie provided the invocation.

Item #3 – Roll Call - Mr. Gillespie introduced the Committee members and also the consultants, Tony Sissons and Michael Mandell.

Item #4 – Call to the Public – Leonard Gorman with the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission (NNHRC) apologized for not being a part of the public meetings. Mr. Gorman explained that the Navajo Nation Human Rights Commission is here to ensure the advocacy on behalf of the Navajo Nation, where voting is done by minorities. Mr. Gorman gave a presentation which included maps for the districts I and II, which are of interest and included district V. Mr. Gorman explained the current numbers for districts I and II, which they would like to ensure that there is an effort to at least meet their threshold amounts. The numbers that the NNHRC used are from the Navajo Nation chapter voting districts. Mr. Gorman presented adjustments to what was previously submitted 9/26/11. Mr. Gorman added that they would like to have the districts coincide with the Navajo Nation chapter boundaries.

Item #5 – Review and Discussion of Updated/Revised Redistricting Plans for the Navajo County Supervisorial Districts/Northland Pioneer College Precincts –Ms. Franco-Anderson and Mr. Gillespie commented that the recommendation from NNHRC was not circulated at all the public meetings, they are up against deadlines, and the numbers were as to certain districts, how does that affect the other districts within the county. Mr. Moore clarified the deadline as going to the Board on November 29, based on the Redistricting Advisory Committee (RAC) recommendations. Mr. Eltsosie asked what the turnaround time would be on the plan submitted by NNHRC, if they were to approve it as a recommendation today. Mr. Sissons said he could have it analyzed by the end of business tomorrow. Mr. Eltsosie said he felt that after Navajo County had met with NNHRC, they as a committee have a responsibility of taking it into consideration. He said that perhaps they can reconvene once the consultant has done the analysis on it.

Mr. Gillespie called for comments. Paul Watson said he is not for or against it, but an adjustment requested from NNHRC takes out Pinetop Country Club from district V, which is a significant change. Tom Poscharsky is concerned with the new adjustments from the NNHRC and what that does to Snowflake as well as city of Winslow which is split into three districts, if anything is adopted today, keep the communities together. Dale Patton said the NNHRC is only considering the Native American population, not keeping communities of interest in mind. Winslow has expressed that they want to be kept in one district, it doesn't matter which district, just as the other towns and cities that have been involved have expressed. Deviation is not an issue, raise the deviation if need be and he would like to request that the consultants draw up a map that will keep the communities together.

Mr. Sissons explained that he received direction from the RAC for at that time a total of four maps. He was not to make adjustments to RB06 and AFA01, but was asked to take the NNHRC and TLP04 submittals to merge together. Mr. Sissons explained the adjustments made and said he was to bring back four maps to fulfill the request.

Item #6 – Recommendation of at least two alternative redistricting plans to the Navajo County Board of Supervisors for the County’s Supervisorial District and Northland Pioneer Community College Precincts. Ms. Franco-Anderson felt that AFA01 should be eliminated, since it will not work and is retrogressive. Ms. Franco-Anderson made a motion that they no longer consider AFA01, as it is retrogressive to district II and possibly III. Mr. Eltsosie seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously, with all in favor.

Mr. Patton brought up that TLP04 should still be considered. Mr. Gillespie asked Ms. Dale to clarify the minutes from the last meeting and the minutes were read. Mr. Patton also commented that TLP04 is a better map than RB06. There was some discussion as to the deviation amount; the RAC was trying to keep the deviation at or below 5%. Mr. Sissons clarified that the DOJ does not enforce that, but they will not pre-clear anything that will be challenged in court. Mr. Gillespie read Board resolution 09-11, as a reminder of the requirements.

Mr. Gillespie moved that maps RB06, TLP04 and the NNHRC map merged with TLP04 be sent to the Board of Supervisors as their recommendation for adoption. Ms. Franco Anderson seconded the motion. Motion passed with a vote of 3-2, Lennard Eltsosie and Robert Black, Jr. were in opposition.

Item #7 – Adjourn – Ms. Franco Anderson made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Gillespie seconded the motion, with all in favor, the meeting was adjourned at 2:26 p.m.