

Alaska Redistricting Board Minutes Packet 12/15/2021
Table of Contents

September 10, 2020	1
December 3, 2020	4
December 10, 2020	7
December 12, 2020	9
December 19, 2020	11
December 29, 2020	14
January 8, 2021	17
January 26, 2021	19
February 26, 2021	22
March 2, 2021	26
March 6, 2021	28
April 16, 2021	31
May 26, 2021.....	33
June 28-30, 2021	35
August 23-24, 2021	36
September 7-9, 2021.....	42
September 17, 2021	49
September 20, 2021	58
November 2-4, 2021.....	76
November 5, 2021.....	84
November 8-10, 2021.....	93



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting September 10, 2020 | 3:00 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on September 10, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Presentation: IT Services and Managed Services Options
- Staff Hiring Process
- Court Reporter for Meeting Minutes
- Board Member Comments
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 3:02 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Bahnke noted that the Planning Committee report included a suggested training for the board to participate in. Mr. Binkley proposed to add this as a discussion item under board member comments on the agenda.

Ms. Marcum noted that the board should consider hiring a court reporter or an individual to record meeting minutes for all board meetings. This has been created as an action item and added to the agenda for discussion.

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as amended. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Presentation: IT Services and Managed Services Options



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Mr. Binkley introduced Tim Banaszak, Information Technology Manager for the Legislative Affairs Agency. Mr. Banaszak reviewed the attached proposal and options (ACS and GCI) for IT and managed services. Upon Ms. Borromeo's request to provide a recommendation, Mr. Banaszak recommended ACS for all services except for internet connection services, which can be provided by GCI. Both vendors confirmed they could work together for internet connectivity.

Ms. Marcum moved to choose ACS' IT proposal without the internet service and for three in-office lines and to choose GCI for internet service. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Cell Phone Service Quotes

Mr. Kestel, Procurement Officer of Legislative Affairs Agency, reviewed the cell phone quotes and noted that the AT&T quote has expired and would need to be updated. Each board member will work directly with Mr. Kestel to obtain cell phone service.

Mr. Simpson moved to purchase all items in section two of the managed services proposal. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Staff Hiring Process

Mr. Binkley is seeking support from Skiff Lobaugh, Human Resources Manager, at the Legislative Affairs Agency for the staff hiring process.

The board discussed staffing requirements for the board. Ms. Marcum noted that in her discussion with the previous executive director, it suggested that two to three staff members was appropriate, with the addition of legal counsel.

Mr. Binkley will work with Mr. Lobaugh on job descriptions and provide these drafts to the board for comments. A meeting will be held to formalize the job descriptions and the recruitment process.

Me. Binkley noted that after hiring for the Executive Director position, the board will need to seek legal counsel from a law firm to represent the board. Ms. Marcum advised that legal counsel be hired soon.

Court Reporter for Meeting Minutes

Mr. Binkley acknowledged Ms. Marcum's comment on retaining a court reporter to record meeting minutes for all board meetings. Ms. Marcum suggested that Mr. Binkley contact the Chairman of the Redistricting Planning Committee for more information on an offer made to provide meeting minutes.

Board Member Comments

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Mr. Binkley will obtain more details on the webinar trainings made available to board members as suggested by the Planning Committee. Mr. Kestel will assist the board with the webinar trainings as well.

Adjournment

Mr. Simpson moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:01 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting December 3, 2020 | 3:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on December 3, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley
Melanie Bahnke
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson
Nicole Borromeo
JC Kestel
Tim Banaszak

Chair of the Board
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Procurement Officer, LAA
IT Manager, LAA

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Adoption of Agenda
- IT Updates
- Discussion: Virtual Redistricting Seminar
- Discussion: Executive Director Hiring & Timing
- Executive Session
- Board Member Comments
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

IT Updates

Mr. Banaszak reported the following updates:

- Laptops are configured and ready to be used with Microsoft Office and redistricting software loaded. Mr. Banaszak will individually e-mail board members to get their preference on whether to ship or hold their laptops until census data has been received.
- Email accounts have been created, configured, and ready to be set up across multiple



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

devices. Contractors will contact each board member to provide them with their email account credentials.

- The redistricting software is ready for 2020 census data once ready. Training for the redistricting software is available through pre-recorded videos, a live training session, or an on-site training session further in the future. Mr. Banaszak recommended beginning this training once census data has been received.

Mr. Kestel recommended that Mr. Presley test the software configuration to ensure the software provides all features needed as intended to be procured by the Planning Committee and the board. Ms. Marcum offered to participate in testing user features. The board had no objections in having Ms. Marcum and Mr. Presley work together to test software features.

Discussion: Virtual Redistricting Seminar

Mr. Binkley noted that the board is registered for the seminar in January 2021. All board members were encouraged to attend.

Discussion: Executive Director Hiring & Timing

Mr. Binkley noted that an executive session will take place to begin discussion on the details of the applicants.

Board members discussed how the board should proceed with hiring and the timing of the process. The board agreed that each board member will individually review the applicant list, create a reduced list of selected applicants, and compare each list as a whole to identify overlaps. Then, interviews will be scheduled, and then the board will reconvene to make a final decision.

Mr. Binkley expressed urgency for the process to take place and noted that the timeline for receiving census data is still unknown. This provides the board with an opportunity to begin working on maps in the interim using data from 2018 and 2019.

Executive Session

Ms. Bahnke moved to enter executive session to discuss personnel matters. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board entered executive session at 4:12 p.m.

The board exited executive session at 4:51 p.m.

Board Member Comments

No comments were given by board members.

Adjournment

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Ms. Bahnke moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting December 10, 2020 | 8:30 a.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on December 10, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Executive Session: Executive Director Candidates
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 8:41 a.m. A quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Binkley noted that the board will spend the day conducting interviews for the Executive Director position. Once interviews are complete, the board will return to public session and then adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt the agenda as written. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Session: Executive Director Candidates

Ms. Bahnke moved to enter executive session. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board entered executive session at 8:43 a.m.

The board exited executive session.

Mr. Binkley noted that a board meeting will be held on December 12, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. to discuss

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

the hiring of the Executive Director position.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting December 12, 2020 | 1:00 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on December 12, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Executive Director Hiring for the Alaska Redistricting Board
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 1:06 p.m. With all members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as written. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Director Hiring for the Alaska Redistricting Board

Mr. Binkley noted that the Executive Director position was advertised for thirty days after which the board went through a review process of the applicants. The board selected several finalists and spent a full day interviewing the finalists.

Ms. Bahnke moved to hire Peter Torkelson for the Executive Director position and to authorize the Chairman of the board to negotiate with Mr. Torkelson on the salary. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Ms. Marcum moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 1:13 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting December 19, 2020 | 10:00 a.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on December 19, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- General Discussion with Executive Director
 - Workplace Environment and Ethics Training Options
 - Timeline and Process for Legal Counsel Selection
 - Organizational Chart
 - Developing Budget
 - Establishing Board Policies
- Other Personnel Matters (*possible executive session*)
- Board Member Comments
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 10:09 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt the agenda as written. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

General Discussion with Executive Director

Mr. Torkelson confirmed that the board can attend workplace environment and ethics trainings with other legislative employees in January 2021, and that the board has been offered a dedicated training session for board members and staff. Training also includes components specific to the Alaska legislative ethics law that applies to all legislative employees.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Board members provided thoughts on the discussion above:

- The board should proceed in participating in workplace environment and ethics training sessions.
- Training sessions should include a component on maintaining confidentiality. Mr. Torkelson will seek training that covers this topic.
- It was requested that Mr. Torkelson provide additional details and information on training topics on legislative staff training.

Mr. Torkelson has been advised by the previous board Chair and Executive Director to retain legal counsel for the board as soon as possible. Mr. Torkelson noted that facilitating this process would likely involve putting out a request for proposal (RFP) and gave an overview of the RFP process.

The board expressed the need for the RFP process to begin soon and for the board to be involved in the hiring process.

Mr. Torkelson reviewed the proposed draft organizational chart and noted that a Deputy Director should be hired quickly. Additionally, Mr. Torkelson recommended that if the board sees the need to hire additional staff outside of the Executive Director and the Deputy Director, this hiring should occur earlier in the process to be prepared.

Ms. Bahnke proposed two additions to the organizational chart: 1) a redistricting consultant and 2) the board's attorney – both positions should report to the board and the public should be aware of their positions in the redistricting process. Ms. Bahnke also noted that the legislature and administration should be aware that additional resources may be needed for board staffing through the redistricting process.

The board discussed the development of the budget. Ms. Marcum noted that some items listed as purchased in the board budget were already paid for in the Redistricting Planning Committee's funds. Mr. Torkelson will provide additional budget details to present to the board for further discussion.

Mr. Torkelson recommended that the board adopt the legislative procurement code now that the board is under the legislative branch. The board requested additional information on both the administrative and legislative procurement codes to understand the key differences and procurement processes.

The board agreed that a procurement code should be adopted soon to expedite the process in seeking legal counsel and agreed to meet again on December 28th or 29th to review additional details on both codes and decide on which code to adopt.

Executive Session: Additional Personnel Matters

Ms. Bahnke moved to enter executive session for the purpose of discussing personnel matters. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The board entered executive session at 11:10 a.m.

The board exited executive session at 1:43 p.m.

Board Member Comments

No board member comments were given.

Adjournment

Mr. Simpson moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting December 29, 2020 | 2:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on December 29, 2020. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Discussion: Procurement Code Options, Legislative vs. Administrative
- Adoption of a Procurement Code
- Discussion: Request for Proposals for Independent Legal Services
 - Review of 2011 RFP
 - Timeline for Publishing RFP and Selection of Firm
 - Review Options to Proceed
 - Provide Direction to Executive Director
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 2:35 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as written. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Procurement Code Options, Legislative Vs. Administrative

Mr. Torkelson stated that in the previous cycle, the legislature appropriated funds to be administered to the governor's office. At this time, the board used the administrative procurement code to manage its purchases. In this cycle, the legislature appropriated funds to be administered to the legislative branch. As an independent body, the board now has a choice to adopt the legislative or



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

the administrative procurement codes.

The board discussed modifying the chosen code to accurately reflect the board as the body rather than the Legislative Council. Mr. Torkelson noted that provisions to either code may be made if the board's motion to adopt the code reflects these proposed changes.

Adoption of a Procurement Code

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the legislative code with the following changes: 1) Replaces the term "agency" with "Alaska Redistricting Board" and 2) restrict protests to procurement bidders only. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board with adoption of the code with the understanding that the code has been adopted with the proposed changes. Staff will modify the code and present the revised code to the board.

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Request for Proposals for Independent Legal Services

Mr. Torkelson referenced the 2010 Request for Proposal (RFP) responses for legal services and the winning RFP response in the board meeting packet. Mr. Torkelson noted that a request for proposal (RFP) process or a request for Information (RFI) process could be pursued and requested for direction from the board on which process to pursue.

The board discussed their preference for which process to pursue based on the current need to expedite the pursuance of legal counsel. The following concerns were expressed:

- Mr. Binkley expressed concern for pursuing the RFP process and the timing required to pursue this process and recommended pursuing the RFI process due to its shorter timeline.
- Mr. Simpson noted his support for pursuing the RFI process with a thirty-day window, rather than a ten-day window, for the RFI being open to submissions to allow for as many qualified respondents as possible to submit their information.
- Ms. Borromeo directed for the RFI to be open for submissions by January 11, 2021 through January 29, 2021. The board agreed on this timeline.

Ms. Borromeo moved for the board to begin a RFI process for legal counsel and appoint Budd Simpson as the project director with the understanding that the board must approve the final RFI document prior to publishing. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Torkelson confirmed that staff is pursuing court reporter recommendations for board meeting minutes to be developed.

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Adjournment

Ms. Marcum moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting January 8, 2021 | 1:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on January 8, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley
Melanie Bahnke
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson
Nicole Borromeo
Peter Torkelson
TJ Presley

Chair of the Board
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Executive Director
Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Discussion: Request for Information for Legal Services
 - Timeline for RFI Closing
 - Routing of RFI Related Inquiries
- Adoption of Request for Information for Legal Services
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as written. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Request for Information (RFI) for Legal Services

Mr. Torkelson noted that submissions for the RFI are due on January 29 and asked board members for their feedback on the deadline. Board members agreed that the submission deadline was adequate in providing respondents with sufficient time to submit a response.

Based on feedback from board members, it was decided that Mr. Torkelson will serve as the single point of contact for general inquiries regarding the RFI. Other inquiries will be brought to the board's



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

attention to address.

Adoption of Request for Information (RFI) for Legal Services

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt the request for information for legal services as presented. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The board discussed the need to consider the participation a respondent has had in other litigation matters involving redistricting, ensuring that a respondent is not litigating for more than one party, and evaluating a firms' ability to be objective.

The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Procurement Code

Ms. Borromeo moved to amend the agenda to add the approval of the procurement code as presented by staff. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

Mr. Simpson noted that the changes made by staff to the code were ministerial. The draft was provided several days in advance of the current board meeting date allowing board members ample time to review and provide feedback on the code.

To add context to the discussion, Mr. Binkley noted that the board had two options for codes: the general state procurement code and the legislative procurement code. Because the board was funded through the legislative branch, it was appropriate to adopt the legislative procurement code, which refers to the legislature on actions. Due to this, the code was modified to change the areas in that code referring to the legislature to refer to the board instead and redefines interested parties to individuals who have responded with a bid or an offer.

The revised code document is posted to the public documents section of this meeting on the Alaska Redistricting Board website.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Ms. Bahnke moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting January 26, 2021 | 2:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on January 26, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley
Melanie Bahnke
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson
Nicole Borromeo
Peter Torkelson
TJ Presley

Chair of the Board
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Executive Director
Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Board Policy Review and Discussion
 - Public Meeting and Notice Policy
 - Public Records Policy
 - Member Compensation Policy
 - Member and Staff Travel Per Diem Policy
- Adoption of One or More Board Policies
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as presented. The motion was amended to add an additional discussion regarding the board's web page as the sixth agenda item and to move adjournment to the seventh agenda item. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Board Policy Review & Discussion

The following draft polices were presented and reviewed by Mr. Presley and Mr. Torkelson:



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Public Meeting and Notice Requirement Policy
- Public Records Policy
- Board Member Compensation Policy
- Board Member and Staff Per Diem Policy

The following clarifications, concerns, and questions were raised regarding the policies above:

- Board meeting notices are being posted on notice.alaska.gov, akleg.gov, and the Alaska Redistricting Board website. The public can also sign up to receive board meeting notifications.
- The daily compensation rate for board members encompasses the time that board members also spend outside of meetings on board matters.
- Ms. Bahnke requested that her compensation be provided to her employer and not directly to her as a reimbursement for her wages. Staff will consult with legislative legal services regarding this request and follow up. The Board Member Compensation Policy may be amended after adoption to reflect any changes pending the advice from legislative legal services.
- Mr. Simpson and Ms. Borromeo expressed concern for the board receiving a full day's worth of compensation for a short length meeting. Ms. Borromeo noted that a sliding scale could be implemented for compensation to be made to board members based on the amount of time spent in the meeting.
- The board discussed modifying the Board Member Compensation Policy to include language that board member compensation applies to board meetings and/or public hearings.
- The board agreed to move forward with the Board Member Compensation Policy with the agreement that the policy would be revisited in the future.
- For the Board Member and Staff Per Diem Policy, the maximum reimbursement for lodging is capped at \$229 per day, meals reimbursements are capped at \$60 per day, and incidentals reimbursements are capped at up to \$25 total.
- Ms. Borromeo raised concern for the meal cap set at \$60 as it may not be enough for three meals in one day.
- Mr. Simpson suggested merging incidentals and meals together for a total of \$85 per day. The board agreed to adopt this modification to the Board Member and Staff Per Diem Policy.

Adoption of Board Policies

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt all four policies with the following amendments: 1) Inserting language into the Board Member Compensation Policy that compensation applies to board meetings and/or public hearings, 2) merging meals and incidentals totals together in the Board Member and Staff Per Diem Policy for a total of \$85 per day, and 3) expenses incurred under the Board Member and Staff Per Diem Policy must be submitted for approval at the discretion of the Board Chair for meals and incidentals expenses totaling over \$85. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Web Page Discussion

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Mr. Torkelson reported that the web page is anticipated to go live in the next two weeks and will serve as the single point of access for maps. Board members have received some web page mockups and Mr. Torkelson requested feedback from board members.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo requested that the board and staff prioritize meeting with the public to educate on the board, redistricting, and the overall process.

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting February 26, 2021 | 2:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on February 26, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Staff Public Outreach Directive
- Response Protocol for Meeting Requests
- Software Training Availability
- Executive Session: Interview with Legal Services RFI Respondents
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Staff Public Outreach Directive

Mr. Torkelson stated that staff received notice from the US Census Bureau stating that the census results would not be provided until September 30, 2021 at the latest. Due to the delay in census information, staff have discussed the idea of being proactive in outreach, primarily to interest groups that have historically been involved in redistricting (i.e., local governments), and forming new relationships. During this time, staff could take the opportunity to network and educate on the following: 1) census timeline, 2) how the timeline impacts the board's schedule and 3) the board's



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

constitutional requirements.

Mr. Torkelson requested that board members guide staff and inform on the local governments within their areas that are the most active and would be the most interested in hearing from the board.

The board discussed the following regarding public outreach:

- Educating the general public, community groups, and non-profits during this effort is important.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- It was requested that staff develop a presentation and/or bullet points to fully inform on the outreach support needed from board members.
- The outline of the outreach directive provided to the board could be modified to add more community groups, timelines, locations, and additional outreach planning.
- It was suggested that a process to request formal engagement from the board be developed specifically for outreach matters.

There was a consensus among the board for staff to move forward with outreach efforts.

Response Protocol for Meeting Requests

Mr. Torkelson anticipates numerous requests from various entities and individuals for the board to engage in various meetings. Staff requested direction from the board on the protocol for meeting requests.

The board held a discussion regarding the protocol for meeting requests and highlighted the following:

- Although it may be helpful for there be a policy for individual board members not to engage in off-record discussions, this is also a valuable way to gain public input.
- Ms. Bahnke suggested that if the board allows itself to individually engage with the public and community groups in their formal role as Redistricting Board members, a record of the engagement activities of each board member should be publicly shared.
- Ms. Marcum acknowledged that there will be a challenge in defining and tracking the varying types of conversations between board members and the public.
- It was requested that all group meeting requests be directed to staff. If an individual board member receives a cold call, the caller will be redirected to staff. This procedure will serve as the interim policy until a formal protocol is in place.

Software Training Availability

Mr. Torkelson noted that there are twelve virtual software trainings available for board members. Staff will provide board members with the links for these trainings. Additionally, the software training contractor has offered to provide a corporate virtual training seminar to the board.

Executive Session: Interview with Legal Services RFI Respondents

Ms. Marcum moved to enter executive session to interview a respondent of the legal services RFI. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The board entered executive session at 3:14 p.m.

The board exited executive session at 4:22 p.m.

One more interview will be held with the second RFP respondent on March 2, 2021.

Ms. Bahnke asked if resources available for the board's outreach efforts, such as a public relations firm to develop messaging with a goal to educate and engage the public on the redistricting process. Mr. Presley answered that staff will include public relations firm suggestions and collateral for the board to review and approve.

Adjournment

Mr. Simpson moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Borrromeo seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting March 2, 2021 | 3:00 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on March 2, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Executive Session: Interview with Legal Services RFI Respondents
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Simpson moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Session: Interview with Legal Services RFI Respondents

Mr. Torkelson stated that staff has consulted with the Legislative Council on whether an executive session would be the appropriate forum to discuss request for information (RFI) responses. The legislative attorney provided informal advice and referred to the following:

- Section 195 of the board's procurement code states that until a selection has been made, proposals are to be opened in a confidential manner. Thus, discussion of the proposal is permissible under the Open Meetings Act referenced in Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310 (c)(4) which states that an executive session may be used for matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Because the board is discussing ideas from respondents about the legal strategies to avoid litigation or to prevail in the event of a lawsuit, these topics of discussion are permissible in an executive session as stated in AS 44.62.310 (c)(1).
- Because the board is interviewing attorneys regarding their performance potential, the board could unintentionally prejudice a reputation. This subject may be discussed in executive session as stated in AS 44.62.310 (c)(2)

With these recommendations from the legislative attorney, Mr. Torkelson recommended that the board proceed with discussion in executive session.

Mr. Simpson moved to enter executive session to interview a proposing law firm and to implement one of the Open Meetings Act exceptions in subsection (c)(4) relating to records that are not subject to public disclosure. Unanimous consent to the motion was requested. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

The board entered executive session at 3:09 p.m.

The board exited executive session at 4:28 p.m.

Mr. Binkley stated that no decisions were made while in executive session after interviewing the respondents for the RFI.

The board will reschedule its meeting on March 12, 2021 to March 6, 2021 in the afternoon to discuss the selection of RFI respondents. Once a time has been confirmed, this time will be advertised.

Mr. Torkelson requested an additional agenda item to the March 6th meeting to discuss formal meeting protocols. Mr. Binkley confirmed this addition to the agenda.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting March 6, 2021 | 3:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on March 6, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley
Melanie Bahnke
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson
Nicole Borromeo
Peter Torkelson
TJ Presley

Chair of the Board
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Executive Director
Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Discussion: Legal Services RFI Responses (*brief executive session if needed*)
- Select Legal Representation
 - Delegation of Contract Negotiation Duties
- Meeting Request Protocol
 - Staff Handling of Incoming Meeting Requests
 - Discussion: Meeting Protocol
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Discussion: Legal Services RFI Responses

Mr. Torkelson stated that the Alaska Constitution, Article 6, Section 9 requires that the board contract for independent legal counsel. In December, the board adopted a procurement code and issued a formal request for information (RFI) for legal services in January. Five responses to the RFI were received. Per the board's procurement code, all RFI responses must remain confidential



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

until a selection has been made. Upon selection, copies of RFI responses may be provided to the public upon request. Requests can be made on the Alaska Redistricting Board website at www.akredistrict.org on the "Contact Us" page.

A subcommittee of the board reviewed the responses and upon consensus, two respondents were selected to proceed to the interview process which have both taken place.

Mr. Simpson moved to enter executive session to discuss the selection of a potential legal counsel with reference to Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310 (c)(4) regarding matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The board directed Mr. Torkelson to follow up with both law firms regarding financial arrangements and fee structures. These items will be discussed in executive session.

The board entered executive session at 3:37 p.m.

The board exited executive session at 3:56 p.m.

Select Legal Representation

Mr. Simpson moved for the selection of the Schwabe, Williamson, and Wyatt to provide legal services to the Alaska Redistricting Board and this selection is subject to the negotiation and execution of a satisfactory written engagement agreement with this firm. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Simpson requested that the Executive Director draft and send correspondence on behalf of the board to all RFI respondents notifying them that a respondent has been selected.

Meeting Request Protocol

Mr. Torkelson reported that a draft staff meeting request protocol was sent to board members. The public can access this information on notice.alaska.gov and akleg.gov. This protocol states that 1) meeting requests and attachments informing the request will be forwarded to board members and 2) staff members may assist with meeting arrangements and preparation at the request of a board member.

The following items were discussed:

- It was clarified that requests are for private meetings as opposed to public presentations.
- If members of the public request to make a public testimony, they will be directed to the board's next public hearing.
- Staff has contacted the Anchorage Legislative Information Office (LIO), which has a large conference room that is designed for in-person and virtual meetings. The Anchorage LIO



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

manager has permitted the board to use this facility as needed for future meetings.

- Ms. Bahnke suggested adding an additional item to future meeting agendas for public comments.

The board agreed to withhold taking action on the meeting request protocol until proper legal review of the protocol has been completed.

Adjournment

Ms. Bahnke moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:11 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting April 16, 2021 | 2:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on April 16, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borrromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Matt Singer	Guest
Inmaly Inthaly	Guest

The following board member was absent:

Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
----------------	--------------

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony
- Adoption of Minutes from Past Meetings
- Request for Information for Voting Rights Act Consultant

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 2:32 p.m. With five of six board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Simpson moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Ms. Borrromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

No public members were present to provide a testimony.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Adoption of Minutes from Past Meetings

Mr. Presley introduced Inmaly Inthaly of Star Assist, a contractor for the Alaska Redistricting Board, who has been contracted to develop meeting minutes for all board meetings.

Mr. Simpson suggested the following formatting changes to all meeting minutes: 1) Add meeting dates to the top of the document, 2) Add a section in the minutes that outlines the meeting agenda, and 3) Remove the words "motioned" and replace with "moved" or "made a motion". The board agreed with the suggested changes.

The board agreed to table the approval of meeting minutes to the next meeting.

Request for Information for Voting Rights Act Consultant

Mr. Torkelson reported that upon consulting with the board's attorney, Matt Singer, it was advised that the board pursue a relationship with a Voting Rights Act consultant as soon as possible. A draft Request for Information (RFI), which was reviewed by legal counsel, was presented to the board. The RFI asks for documentable experience as well as witness testimony experience. The deadline for responses as noted in the draft is May 3, 2021.

Mr. Torkelson clarified that the board would be responsible for the consultant's travel costs upon approval by the board.

After discussion, the board agreed to extend the RFI response submission deadline to May 14, 2021 and to revise the language to remove the two specific references to experience in Alaska so that respondents can provide all relevant experience.

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt the RFI with two amendments to strike the requirements for Alaska experience and to extend the submission deadline to May 14th with direction to staff to publish the RFI and notify potential vendors of the RFI. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 2:56 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting May 26, 2021 | 2:30 p.m.

The Alaska Redistricting Board virtually met on May 26, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Matt Singer	Guest

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony
- Adoption of Minutes from Past Meetings
- Executive Session: Voting Rights Act Consultant RFI Respondents
- Board Discussion: Voting Rights Act Consultant, Possible Action
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 2:43 p.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to modify the agenda to eliminate the adoption of minutes from past meetings. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

Mr. Simpson suggested adding a footer to each page of the minutes to add the date, page number, and the acronym "A.R.B."

The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Marcum moved to adopt the agenda as amended. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Public Testimony

Former Senator Cathy Giessel thanked the Board for their proactiveness in procurement of a Voting Rights Act Consultant and expressed concerns on privacy manipulations with census data as it could unfairly distort Alaska's data. Ms. Giessel noted that the proactive procuring of a Voting Rights Act Consultant will be helpful in identifying and confirming distortions in the data.

Executive Session: Voting Rights Act Consultant

The Board entered executive session at 2:59 p.m.

The Board exited executive session at 4:52 p.m.

Discussion: Voting Rights Act Consultant

Ms. Marcum moved for the Board to enter into contract with the preferred candidate for Voting Rights Act consulting services subject to acceptable terms for expert witness testimony and that the Chair, with staff and counsel assistance, negotiate and execute the contract in a timely manner in a form which best benefits the Board. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting June 28 – 30, 2021 Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503

The Alaska Redistricting Board met from June 28 – 30, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Matt Singer	Legal Counsel
Lee Baxter	Legal Counsel

Agenda

- Worksession: Software Training

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order on June 28, 2021 at 11:15am.

Establish a Quorum

Mr. Torkelson called the roll, all members were present and the Board moved into a work session.

The Board recessed on June 28 at 4:31pm.

The Board exited recess on June 29 at 9:44am and entered a work session.

The Board recessed on June 29 at 3:45pm.

The Board exited recess on June 30 at 9:43am and entered a work session.

The Board adjourned on June 30 at 12:51pm.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
August 23, 2021 | 10:00 a.m.
August 24, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st
Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503

The Alaska Redistricting Board met on August 23, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order
- Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Adoption of Revised Travel/Per Diem Policy
- Adoption of Public Testimony Policy
- Public Testimony
- Census Data Overview
 - Overview Report on Alaska Population Changes
 - Legacy Data and Population Change
- Redistricting Timeline and Schedule for Adoption of Draft and Final Maps
 - Understanding Alaska's Constitutional Timeline
 - Discussion: Adoption of Timeline
- Workflow Process
 - Staff Recommendations for Workflow Process: Possibilities & Logistics
 - Regionalization Possibilities
 - Discussion: Workflow Process, Adoption
 - Next Steps: Initial Map Drawing, Task Assignments, Public Input Schedule
- Executive Session: Presentation on Litigation Lessons from Alaska Redistricting Caselaw
- Map Drawing Board Member Comments

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the agenda as presented. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adoption of Revised Travel/Per Diem Policy

Mr. Torkelson stated that a Travel/Per Diem Policy was adopted on January 26, 2021. The Legislative Affairs Accounting Department suggested capping the lodging rate at the published federal per diem rate used by the Department of Defense. This would bring the policy in line with other legislative policies. Staff presented the board with a revised policy that adds a cap to the hotel lodging expenses at the federal per diem rate.

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the revise Travel/Per Diem Policy. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Adoption of Public Testimony Policy

Mr. Torkelson stated that Public Testimony Policy authorizes the Board Chair to limit spoken public testimony to two minutes per speaker in case there may be a large amount of public testimony speakers.

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the Public Testimony Policy. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Former State Representative Kay Brown encouraged the board to use the maximum deviations that are legally allowable to achieve and assist with socio-economic integration and encouraged the board to avoid gerrymandering the map.
- Anchorage Assemblymember Christopher Constant shared that the Municipality of Anchorage is engaging in its own redistricting process and looks forward to close collaboration with the board to ensure that its maps are in close alignment with the state's maps.
- Chair of Alaskans for Fair Redistricting, Joelle Hall, thanked the board for the work that they are doing, encouraged the board to consider deviations in terms of mass and population, and hopes the board will consider the growing diversity, especially in urban centers.
- Anchorage Resident Yarrow Silvers noted that Senate Districts M and N bisect East and South Anchorage and pairs the bisected portions together that creates inaccurate representation for both areas which have largely different issues and concerns.
- Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) resident Ret. Major Felicia Wilson noted that JBER is not monolithic and that JBER residents tend to do community service around the gates they live near. Major Wilson encouraged the board to reapportion JBER around the gates they are located by.
- Hooper Bay resident William Naneng advocated for Hooper Bay to be part of the Bethel region in this year's redistricting process.
- Doyon Limited shareholder, Sarah Obed, shared that Doyon is partnering with Tanana Chiefs Conference, Fairbanks Native Association, and Sealaska to create maps and district planning documents to assist the board and ensure that the state continues to support Alaska Natives and rural representation in the legislative process.

- Anchorage resident Paul D. Kendall asked for the immediate removal of Juneau as the capitol and for the capitol to be moved to Anchorage. Additionally, Mr. Kendall suggested that the board consider shoreline communities as opposed to interior communities.
- Member of Alaskans for Fair Redistricting, David Dunsmore, suggested that the board look at population statistics by Borough to inform the regionalization process because one of the most objective criteria is respecting local government boundaries.
- Doyon Limited associate, Nathaniel “Tanner” Amdur-Clark urged the board to look at the statewide map and think of various options for different regions or to start with one area of the state, think of the issues and areas of friction in that area, and speak with the public on how to resolve these frictions.
- Gulkana resident James Squyres asked the board to consider decreasing the size of District 9 and as it is a largely diversified district. Additionally, the Delta Junction area should be oriented more toward Fairbanks rather than the Mat-Su Valley.
- Senator Tom Begich cautioned the board on dividing the work into groups and noted that there are no existing districts with a reapportioned map; the districts are built from scratch from the socioeconomic relationships identified in the Alaska Constitution and by the federal guidance. Additionally, Valdez and Delta Junction are not necessary to complete the Mat-Su Valley map as Delta Junction is more oriented toward Fairbanks. The deficits in the Kodiak district can be addressed by adding Valdez into the Prince William Sound district and moving Cordova into a broader district that includes the Doyon region.
- Beaver Village Chief Rhonda Pitka voiced strong support for the board considering the map developed by Doyon Limited, Fairbanks Native Association, Tanana Chiefs Conference, and Sealaska.
- Doyon Limited President, Aaron Schutt, noted that Interior Alaska is one economic and cultural unit, including the urban parts of Fairbanks and the rural parts of Interior Alaska. Additionally, Mr. Schutt shared that Doyon and its partners intend to be resources to the board as they work on the redistricting process.

Census Data Overview

Mr. Torkelson introduced Eric Sandberg, demographer with the Department of Labor, who presented to the board on what the 2020 census data shows about Alaska’s population changes.

Mr. Torkelson gave an overview on when and how census data was received (August 12, 2021), processed and validated. Mr. Torkelson concluded that after the data was processed and validated, he is confident that the data the board is working with is correct. The Census Bureau will ship fixed media that cannot be overridden and upon receipt of this item on September 30, 2021, Mr. Torkelson will re-verify that the data is correct.

Executive Session

Matt Singer, legal counsel to the board, explained that the board will meet in executive session to review his legal memorandum and opinion. Under Alaska law, legal opinions are privileged and the reason for an attorney-client privilege is to allow for private and confidential discussions for Mr. Singer to provide the best legal advice.

Ms. Borrromeo moved to transition into executive session under Alaska Statute (AS) 44.62.310 (c)(4) for matters involving consideration of government records that are not subject to public disclosure. No action will be taken in executive session. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board entered executive session at 12:28 p.m.

The board exited executive session at 1:50 p.m.

Redistricting Timeline and Schedule for Adoption of Draft and Final Maps

Mr. Torkelson noted that because the Alaska Constitution states that one or more draft plans must be adopted after the official reporting date, which staff originally had been told was September 30th, staff believed that the earliest date a draft plan could be adopted was on October 1st. However, after staff noticed the word “official” next to the August 12th date while compiling the packet for this board meeting, staff contacted the Census Bureau to confirm the official reporting date. The Census Bureau gave an informal response that the August 12th and September 30th dates are official. After speaking with legal counsel, Mr. Torkelson recommended that the board adopt at least one initial draft plan by September 11th, which is the 30th day after August 12th. Staff have also outlined a redistricting timeline proposal in case the board chooses to adopt it.

Mr. Singer added that in all prior decades, the release of the census has occurred in March. However, this year, the timeline has been delayed. The Alaska Constitution sets a 90-day deadline (30 days to [adopt one or more proposed redistricting, also known as “draft”, plans] , 90 days to adopt a [final redistricting plan and issue a proclamation of redistricting]) which are intended for the process to move expeditiously. Treating August 12th as the official date for the census release for is most consistent with the Alaska Constitution.

Mr. Torkelson noted that a single final plan must be adopted by November 10th and recommended to the board that a draft plan be adopted by September 11th and to allow any third parties that may wish to bring plans an additional week to work on their plans, giving them a delivery date of September 17th. On or around that date, a public hearing would be held and, if a third party brings a full plan (including 40 districts), the board will hold 30 minutes of public hearing time to deliver their plan.

Ms. Bahnke noted that the board is still waiting on an official letter from the U.S. Census Bureau and that the board is operating with the best information they have.

Ms. Borromeo moved that the board adopt at least one draft plan by September 11th and welcome third party plans on or before September 17th at which time a public hearing will be held, and a public plan will be adopted by November 10th. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Workflow Process

Considering the legal issues that arose in the last redistricting process where the board assigned different areas of the state to one individual member who would draw and bring the map back to the board for explanation, staff suggests having subcommittees of the board consisting of two board members to prevent legal issues from happening. The board may also choose to draw the whole map together if they please. If the board chooses to break the work down, staff suggests that the board consider drawing the state into regions, a process called regionalization.

In the regionalization process, two board members could work with one staff member or one staff member could be assigned to a district with floating board members; this would allow for every board member to work on different districts. Work sessions would be open to the public. To facilitate this process, staff has set up their offices with a large screen for the public to view live work sessions and for board members and staff to collaborate comfortably. Subcommittees would report back to the board on key questions, recommendations, and rationale for recommendations.

Mr. Eric Sandberg, demographer with the Department of Labor, suggested regionalization to

address having leftover areas and a way to break up the work more easily. Mr. Sandberg noted that a process where regions were drawn and subdivided would avoid a process where the board draws “38 or 39 districts as you like, and the remainder trips you up.” Mr. Sandberg presented on new population trends and gave a demonstration on drawing new regions with this data which resulted in six regions. The board discussed various regionalization configurations with Mr. Sandberg and Mr. Torkelson.

Ms. Borrromeo expressed her preference to draft together as a board, but this may be a challenge to complete with the compressed timeline. If the board cannot draft together, Ms. Borrromeo proposed for board members to choose a couple different combinations to work with more than one board member on different regions.

The board agreed to begin working on initial map drawing before going into recess and to adopt the workflow plan and solidify task assignments and public input schedule after the recess.

The board began the initial map drawing process. Districts were sorted by deviations and the board began working on the district that had the most deviations, District 4. Mr. Torkelson noted that a decision the board will have in the coming days is whether to share the extra population in the greater Mat-Su area with the interior region of the state or with the northwestern region of the state. Mr. Binkley noted that shifting the Mat-Su down to Anchorage seems to be more socioeconomically connected.

The board entered recess at 4:38 p.m. and agreed to continue public session the next day, August 24, 2021, at 9:00 a.m.

The board entered back into public session on August 24, 2021, at 9:03 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Mr. Torkelson noted that as of August 22, 2021, the public map drawing tool is live, and the legacy data has been successfully loaded. This tool works best on a web browser and gives a member of the public the same level of precision and control that the board has in their professional software when drawing a district. This tool provides the public with the ability to build a map and submit it to the board for review. Mr. Torkelson gave a demonstration of the public map drawing tool.

Mr. Torkelson shared the following guidance and quotes from the Alaska Constitution for the board to consider:

- “A doughnut district may be contiguous.”
- “Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area. Each shall contain a population as near as practicable to the quotient obtained by dividing the population of the state by forty.”
- “Consideration may be given to local government boundaries.”
- “Drainage and other geographic features shall be used in describing boundaries wherever possible.”

Mr. Presley proposed a workflow for the current session based on the discussions in the prior work session: Because of Anchorage’s large size, one option is to remove Anchorage from the six areas to work on, leaving five work groups which could be equally divided by all board members. Anchorage would be worked on by all board members and staff. The first two hours of the work session could be used to work on the draft Anchorage map together and then break into work groups after lunch.

The board discussed the following regarding Mr. Presley's proposal:

- Mr. Binkley suggested that the board and staff also work on Districts 3 and 4 together.
- Ms. Marcum noted that it was challenging to follow along while the whole board worked on Anchorage and suggested dividing Anchorage into smaller groups to ensure all board members can be involved while making the process manageable.
- Ms. Bahnke suggested that before working together as a group, the board should first individually become familiar with the areas and tools.
- Ms. Borromeo suggested beginning with a smaller region before working on the Anchorage map.
- Mr. Simpson did not oppose the suggested approaches.
- Ms. Bahnke requested to have a staff member assigned to her to drive the map while board members are in work groups.

The board began working on the initial map drawing process again using the public map drawing tool. During the process, Doyon Limited associate, Marna Sanford, noted that if Cordova is included in Southeast Alaska, then the quotient [deviation] would be too high. The population of Cordova is such that the quotient would be significantly over 1 percent, therefore the board will need to decide on whether the quotient in Southeast Alaska will be too high or too low.

After the initial map drawing process, Mr. Torkelson noted that one way to move forward in the workflow process is to allow board members to work on any district at any time with any staff member to develop as many ideas as they'd like. The various map ideas would then be brought to the full board during the week of September 7th through September 10th which would allow the board to view more refined ideas in public sessions. If the board is amiable to this concept, staff will individually work with board members to schedule work sessions either in person or virtually via screenshare. Then, the board would decide on a draft [proposed redistricting] plan by close of business on September 10th. On September 17th, members of the public shall present their plans to the board and the board will provide initial comments on the plans. Mr. Torkelson encouraged third party plans to be submitted a few days in advance of September 17th to allow staff time to upload, review, and educate themselves on the plans prior to presenting them to the board.

The board had no objections to this process. Ms. Bahnke asked that the plans presented from the public be reviewed by staff for completion prior to being added into the packet for board review. The board agreed that plans must be submitted prior to September 17th.

The board agreed to scheduling a meeting in Anchorage on September 21st or 22nd to finalize the plans they would like to present to the state. Additionally, public testimony will be available at the beginning of every meeting. At the end of these meetings, the board can then adopt additional draft plans. After September 22nd, the board will transition from the initial drafting phase into the community outreach phase. Ms. Bahnke requested that virtual outreach be planned in case travel is not possible.

The board entered into work session at 1:18 p.m.

The board exited out of work session at 4:09 p.m.

Ms. Marcum moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The board adjourned at 4:11 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
September 7, 2021 | 10:30 a.m
September 8, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
September 9, 2021 | 9:00 a.m
September 10, 2021 | 9:00 a.m. (cancelled)
Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st
Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503

The Alaska Redistricting Board met between September 7th through September 9th.
Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order and Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony
 - Review of Maps Submitted through Web Mapping Tool
- Staff Report: Mapping Processes, Identified Challenges
- Map Drawing Work Session
- Public Testimony
- Adoption of Proposed Redistricting Plan(s)
- Guidance to Third-Party Map Drafters
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order on September 7, 2021 at 10:44 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Bahnke moved to amend the agenda to add an "Executive Session" item for the purpose of receiving legal advice after the "Staff Report: Mapping Processes, Identified Challenges" agenda item. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Bahnke moved to adopt the agenda as amended. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Anchorage Resident Paul D. Kendall reviewed his written testimony regarding censorship, lack of public notification, public involvement, and leadership in government; public access to government records; societal issues that need immediate action; “UFOs” and societal evolution; and moving the state capitol.
- Doyon Limited shareholder, Sarah Obed, stated that Doyon has submitted maps to the board that meets criteria and addresses concerns raised in the last testimony and previous redistricting cycles. Ms. Obed shared the current draft of the maps with the board.

Staff Report: Mapping Processes, Identified Challenges

Mr. Torkelson reported the following:

- The constitution requires the board to adopt one or more proposed plans within 30 days of receiving census data. The data was received on August 12, 2021, therefore making the deadline to adopt the plan(s) on September 11, 2021.
- The board intends to adopt one or more plans by the afternoon of September 10, 2021, which will be the first proposed plans and are not a final product. After the adoption [of the proposed redistricting plans], a “robust” public process will begin.
- The deadline to adopt a final redistricting plan is on November 10, 2021.
- Mr. Torkelson recited the four constitutional factors to consider during the redistricting process: each house district shall be formed of a contiguous, compact, relatively integrated socio-economic area containing “as near as practicable” the population of the state divided by 40, which is 18,335. All board members have considered these factors during the map drawing process. Additionally, no political data has been uploaded to ensure that the process is strictly confined to the four constitutional factors.
- The constitutional factors can sometimes be in a dynamic tension and only the board can decide how to address those tensions. Legal counsel is present to assist the board in understanding the caselaw during the process.
- Through the web-based application, a full 40-district plan was received but contact information was not provided. Mr. Torkelson reviewed the map with the board.
- Staff realized that if the board chose to focus on some key factors, this would reduce the total number of maps from thousands to a manageable amount. Staff requested that the board consider receiving guidance on a few key issues prior to building a composite map. A list of key challenge questions were prepared to facilitate the discussion if the board chooses to do so.

After discussion, the board agreed to hold an executive session to receive legal advice from Matt Singer, legal counsel, to inform the process and direction moving forward. Following the executive session, Mr. Singer will provide a summarized public statement on how the board would like to proceed with consideration to the constitutional factors.

Executive Session

Ms. Bahnke moved for the board to enter executive session for the purposes of receiving legal advice under Alaska Statute (AS) 44.62.310 (c)(4) for matters involving consideration of government

records that are not subject to public disclosure. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board moved into executive session at 11:18 a.m.

The board exited execution session at 1:06 p.m.

Staff Report: Mapping Processes, Identified Challenges (cont.)

Mr. Singer presented on the board's direction with regard the constitutional mandates and referenced the Hickel case where a lesson learned is that the constitutional requirements of Article VI (to draw compact, contiguous, and socio-economic districts) must be honored and prioritized. After a district is drawn that the board believes meets all three requirements, the population deviation should be reviewed for whether the percentage can be closer to zero, and if so, whether that would negatively impact the three requirements that must be met. The Board should seek to have as little population deviation as is practicable in light of the other constitutional requirements.

Additionally, the Alaska Supreme Court has indicated that following political subdivision boundaries is appropriate and that communities within an established borough boundary are, by definition, socio-economically integrated. Therefore, it is appropriate to use borough and municipal boundaries as district lines are drawn.

All board members presented the draft plans they worked to develop. Mr. Binkley noted that the plans presented are not final and that the board will continue to work together to coalesce the plans into one or multiple plans with a preliminary plan to be adopted by September 10, 2021.

After discussion, the board agreed to first attempt a joint map drawing work session and, if this method is unproductive, the board will reassess their process and adjust as necessary. Additionally, the board agreed to hear public testimonies prior to beginning the work session.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Alaskan for Fair and Equitable Redistricting representative, Randy Ruedrich, noted two items: 1) It is convenient to look at all the defined socio-economically integrated locations first. 2) Typically, Anchorage has shared a House seat with either the Kenai Peninsula Borough to the south or the Mat-Su Borough to the north. Instead, the Anchorage population should be looked at from the south rather than the north.
- Anchorage resident, Yarrow Silvers, voiced concerns about a version of a map presented by the board where part of East Anchorage was pushed into Eagle River while another part of East Anchorage was pushed into South Anchorage. East Anchorage includes some of the lowest income neighborhoods in Anchorage whereas South Anchorage has some of the highest, showing clear socio-economic factors which should preclude East Anchorage from being pushed into South Anchorage and Eagle River. Ms. Silvers reiterated her request to consider East Anchorage as a defined socio-economic part of Anchorage to give fair representation.

Map Drawing Work Session

The board entered a work session at 3:15 p.m.

The board exited out of work session at 4:52 p.m.

Mr. Simpson moved to enter into recess until September 8, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The board entered recess at on September 7, 2021 at 4:54 p.m.

The board left recess on September 8, 2021 at 9:05 a.m. All members were present and a quorum was established.

Mr. Torkelson suggested that when the board begin to work on the urban areas of the state, such as Fairbanks, and the Mat-Su Borough, it may be most productive to display member-drawn maps side-by-side as a starting point. The board had no objections to this method.

Public Testimony

No members of the public were present in person or telephonically to provide public comment.

Map Drawing Work Session (cont.)

The board entered a work session at 9:06 a.m.

The board exited out of work session at 2:25 p.m.

Public Testimony

The following public comments were given:

- Robin O'Donahue, Fairbanks resident and Coordinator for the Alaskans for Fair Redistricting Coalition, offered some outlook on the Fairbanks region: 1) The current map keeps the Fairbanks North Star Borough together, but the split within the borough as the lines are currently drawn breaks communities of interest and does not factor in the north-to-south socio-economic integration of communities within the borough. 2) Another way to think of how communities are related is through the public school system. 3) If the east/west axis that currently splits Fairbanks was rotated clockwise to a north/south axis to better capture the western and eastern communities, it would also keep the communities of interest together.
- David Dunsmore, member of the Alaskans for Fair Redistricting Coalition, suggested an alternative to placing the Russian "Old Believer" villages in the same district as Razdolna and Voznesenka and placing those villages in Ninilchik. Additionally, Mr. Dunsmore provided some historical and religious context to this suggestion.

The board entered recess at on September 8, 2021 at 2:39 p.m.

The board left recess on September 9, 2021 at 9:08 a.m.

Public Testimony

The following public comments were given:

- Robin O'Donahue and David Dunsmore, members of the Alaskans for Fair Redistricting Coalition, gave a public testimony following up to their testimony on September 8, 2021. The board was provided with two plans to review. Mr. O'Donahue restated concerns of the current draft plan which breaks existing communities of interest within the borough.

One of the two plans submitted would break the boroughs slightly and share some population with a district outside of Fairbanks resulting in a net deviation of 0. The other plan would keep the borough contained. Mr. Dunsmore reviewed the maps with the board.

- Senator Tom Begich gave a presentation highlighting the redistricting criteria and the following issues: 1) Mat-Su and Anchorage are underpopulated meaning that these two areas are entitled to add to their populations, 2) Kenai Borough and Fairbanks North Star Borough are overpopulated and their population should be reduced, 3) Southeast Alaska, with four House districts, is underpopulated and needs to add to their population. Mr. Begich suggested adding Yakutat and reconfiguring the districts to have four nearly identical deviations, and 4) the four rural districts in the current plan have intact populations and should be retained to meet the federal Voting Rights Act.

Map Drawing Work Session (cont.)

The board entered a work session at 9:48 a.m.

Prior to the board entering a lunch break, Ms. Borromeo voiced the following concerns for the purposes of discussion:

- There have been allowances and disallowances on the time given for public testimony and the amount of time given to public members has not consistently been adhered to.
- Unilateral decisions have been made on allowing work sessions individually and with other board members.
- Map drawing should be the board's responsibility; staff should not be doing this as the lines in the map must be defended by the board.
- There have been comments disparaging the joint work sessions as being tedious. The benefit of joint work sessions is for each board member to give input on where the lines should be drawn as every board member has different expertise and connections to various areas of the state. Ms. Borromeo asked for these comments to be refrained from moving forward.
- Some board members are not included and are not getting the benefit of the board's counsel. If a meeting is held where staff and Mr. Singer are present, the full board should be given notice even if it is solely an administrative meeting.

Ms. Borromeo concluded by requesting for more consistent actions from the board. Mr. Binkley thanked Ms. Borromeo for the constructive nature of her comments and agreed that it is the board's responsibility to draw the map lines.

Ms. Bahnke requested that any deliberations must be on the record and that no side conversations between board members should take place that consist of map drawing and could impact the outcome of the overall map. Additionally, Ms. Bahnke addressed a comment made about there being no cultural bearing on socio-economic considerations and stated that there are cultural considerations that are apart of socio-economic indicators, including predominantly Native communities – this is part of caselaw history. Ms. Bahnke encouraged the public to review the definitions, which are also linked to caselaw, on the Alaska Redistricting Board website.

During the work session, Mr. Singer addressed a question from a member of the public about

whether senate pairings would be included in the preliminary plan(s). Mr. Singer stated that in Article VI, Section 10 of the constitution, it is indicated that the final plan should include the senate districts. Therefore, the board has some discretion and does not have guidance from the constitution on whether to include the senate districts in the preliminary plan(s). Public input may be helpful to the board as they consider senate pairings. Eric Sandberg recalled that in the last cycle, senate pairings were not made in the draft plans, but were made in the final plan. Mr. Binkley noted that it would be instructive to review the third-party plans that will be presented on September 17, 2021.

Ms. Borromeo suggested that, to maximize the board's time together, the board continue to draw another version of the map that takes Valdez out of the rural interior and places it into the Mat-Su Borough or the coast. The board made the following comments on this suggestion:

- Ms. Marcum stated that this may cause more ramifications.
- Mr. Simpson was not opposed to reviewing other options for Valdez and would like to hear suggestions from third-party maps.

At the end of the work session, the board settled on two draft plans to present to the public. Prior to formally adopting the plan, the board decided to hear public testimony.

Public Testimony

The following public comments were given:

- Joelle Hall, member of Alaskans for Fair Redistricting, asked for the case referenced during the discussion on the Mat-Su Borough and Anchorage being socio-economically integrated despite having borough boundaries. Mr. Singer responded to Ms. Hall and stated that the discussion was within the Alaska Supreme Court stating that there is some socio-economic integration between Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough, not that the borough is entirely socio-economically integrated. Mr. Singer will follow up with Ms. Hall to provide more information on the language.
- Anchorage resident, Bruce Farnsworth, noted that, currently, District 27 is outlined to consist of Muldoon running north to south along the foothills of the western slope of the Chugach mountains. The district up to the southern border is socio-economically integrated and similar even as you go further north along Muldoon where the socio-economic status shifts slightly. Mr. Farnsworth has heard discussions among the board about breaking the district down and combining pieces of the district with the north end of District 27 and the south end of District 28; this would violate the efforts to keep the district relatively similar in socio-economic status.
- Anchorage resident, Brian Hove, referenced Senator Tom Begich's public testimony where two court cases in 2001 and 2011 were mentioned regarding cities within boroughs and asked for the citations. Mr. Singer will follow up with Senator Begich on these cases for more information.

Adoption of Proposed Redistricting Plan(s)

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10 of the Alaska Constitution, Ms. Marcum moved that the board adopt the following proposed redistricting plans: Board Composite Version 1 as presented on September 9, 2021 and Board Composite Version 2 as presented on September 9, 2021. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Guidance to Third-Party Map Drafters

Staff requested that third-party map drafters [presenting on September 17 2021] submit their files no later than 12:00 PM on September 15, 2021 to ensure that any technical issues are resolved and that plans are being presented to the board in the best way possible. Additionally, staff requested that no partisan or political data be brought the board's attention unless the board requests this information at a future time.

Ms. Bahnke requested that staff make the plans submitted by third-parties available to the public before the board adopts a final plan. Staff agreed to make the plans available to the public on the website.

Adjournment

The following items were requested from the following board members:

- Ms. Bahnke requested that an agenda item be added to all future meeting agendas to identify next steps for the board. Specifically, Ms. Bahnke would like to have an idea of the next steps for the community outreach phase. Additionally, a next step is to address the senate districts.
- Ms. Borrromeo requested to make a uniform lunch break for 1-hour.

Now that the board has taken official action to adopt two plans, staff will work to publish the two adopted proposed plans to the website map gallery on the "Map Gallery" page of the Alaska Redistricting Board website [www.akredistrict.org/maps].

Ms. Marcum moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

The board adjourned on September 9, 2021 at 3:00 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

**Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
September 17, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st
Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503**

The Alaska Redistricting Board met on September 17, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley
Melanie Bahnke
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson
Nicole Borromeo
Peter Torkelson
TJ Presley

Chair of the Board
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Board Member
Executive Director
Deputy Director

Agenda

- Call to Order and Establish a Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony
- Presentations from Third-Party Map Drafters
- Board Discussion on Proposed Maps
- Public Testimony
- Next Steps
- Public Hearings & Outreach
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order on September 17, 2021 at 9:05 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Mr. Binkley moved to have a brief presentation by the Executive Director to update on the status of the redistricting process.

Mr. Simpson moved to adopt the draft agenda with the addition of a brief presentation by the Executive Director before public testimony. Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Executive Director Presentation

Mr. Torkelson stated that the board has met the constitutional deadline and adopted two initial draft proposed plans, a product of a ten-to-twelve-day mapping session. Following the adoption of the two plans, the board continued to work toward greater compactness and fewer deviations; the board also addressed concerns expressed about Southeast Alaska and will be bringing new versions of this area to the September 20, 2021 board meeting. At that meeting, third party maps will also be reviewed, and the board will decide which maps to adopt for the public outreach tour while also looking at revisions to their own proposed maps.

Mr. Torkelson emphasized that the redistricting process is a public process and that the board will now enter a six-to-seven-week public outreach process with a goal of intending as much public input as possible. With COVID-19 restrictions in consideration, the board will also open up its website as a place for the public to provide feedback at any time. Today, the board invites third party groups to present their maps and offer their perspectives.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Anchorage resident, Tahnee Conte-Seccareccia, asked the board to ensure that the process for redistricting is nonpartisan and focused on ensuring that all Alaskans have adequate representation. Ms. Conte-Seccareccia expressed concern on how some areas in Anchorage, but also Greater Alaska, are being split or combined.
- Former legislator, David Guttenberg, addressed District 32 on the map, stating that to get from the west side to the east side of the district, you must drive through three other districts; this results in a gerrymandered district.
- Fairbanks resident, Calvin Rogers, expressed concern about the way the proposed maps that split up Fairbanks shows great injustice to the Fairbanks community.
- Downtown Anchorage resident, Lois Epstein, noted that she is a resident on West 15th Avenue and L Street. Ms. Epstein stated the following concerns: 1) In District 12 in Version 2 of the maps, the district extends from downtown to Spenard and past the Ted Stevens International Airport which is a concern as her representational interests lie within the downtown neighborhood. 2) Both adopted map versions have excessive population numbers in the Fairbanks region for Districts 31 through 35, resulting in less representation for Fairbanks residents than in other parts of the state. 3) The board should identify senate districts as it is impossible to fully assess representation without doing so.
- Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) resident, Major Felicia Wilson, stated that the JBER district is divided in a way that splits the communities according to the areas that surround the three gates. Major Wilson expressed concerns with Districts 20 and 21 on the map as multiple neighborhoods extend to Mountain View; this is overly expansive. Major Wilson urged the board to remember that JBER and its residents are not monolithic.
- Fairbanks resident, Rose O'Hara-Jolley, expressed concern about the inequities displayed in the proposed maps, dissecting communities and diluting votes into two or more house districts and reduces residents' abilities to accurately represent themselves. The proposed maps have also overpopulated districts and created areas where voters are underrepresented.
- Anchorage resident and President of Ahtna, Michelle Anderson, stated that Ahtna supports the map submitted jointly by Ahtna, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Fairbanks Native Association, Sealaska, and Doyon. The villages within the Ahtna region have strong ties with united cultures. It is important that these villages remain unified.
- Anchorage resident, Karen Baker, expressed opposition to the proposed maps as the maps,

especially in the interior and southeast areas of the state, are gerrymandered. Ms. Baker urged the board to not adopt the proposed maps.

- Anchorage resident, Leon James, addressed the Board Composite Version 1 map and noted that combining Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough does not represent a socio-economically integrated area as both areas have distinctly different interests and geography. Additionally, District 18 is spread too far and goes over the population target. Mr. James noted that the district includes areas (e.g. the east and west sides of Boniface) that are distinctly different and represented by different community councils.
- Anchorage resident, Emily Becker, lives in the Airport Heights neighborhood, which is currently District 19. The Board Composite Version 1 map splits the Airport Heights in half and puts Airport Heights Elementary School in District 18; this also puts 70% of families who attend this school in District 20. Cutting the community in this way would weaken the voices of families.
- Anchorage resident, Constance Quinley, stated that Board Composite Version 1 has parts of Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough combined; these communities do not go together. East Anchorage and Eagle River are not compatible and are both distinctively different from one another. Ms. Quinley suggested that if balancing the population for redistricting purposes is needed, JBER citizens should be included rather than East Anchorage.
- Fairbanks resident, Kasey Casort, expressed disappointment in the proposed maps that seem to be gerrymandered. Ms. Casort expressed support for the map that will be submitted by Alaskans for Fair Redistricting and asked the board to reference this map moving forward for her community.
- Juneau resident, Will Muldoon, noted that when you deviate using the “white board approach” to Southeast Alaska districts going from east to west and north to south, the inverse of this creates a non-compact district. If the Southeast Alaska maps in both proposed maps were to stand, Alaska may find itself in litigation over these maps.
- Dyea resident, Kathy Hosford, stated that for the last ten years, Dyea has been grouped with Downtown Juneau and Douglas; this has never made sense to Dyea residents as they believe they have more in common with the northern part of Juneau. Ms. Hosford suggested combining Dyea with District 34 and making Downtown Juneau and Douglas its own district.
- Gulkana resident, James [Squyres](#), noted that there is little in common between the Delta and Whittier communities and each community should be separated to better represent their communities. Mr. [Squyres](#) expressed opposition for the way District 36 was drawn in the proposed maps.
- Anchorage resident, Beverly Churchill, reiterated some points that have been made in prior testimonies: 1) Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough should not be combined as they are distinctly different communities. 2) Ms. Churchill encouraged the board to review the community councils as they are divided by neighborhood and represents what makes the neighborhoods distinct in Anchorage. 3) It is not in Eagle River’s best interest to be combined with East Anchorage. Ms. Churchill suggested that the board add Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) to Eagle River instead as there are more connections between the two areas.
- Anchorage resident, Jamie Rodriguez, shared some examples in which the proposed maps are gerrymandered. One example shared was in Juneau, Ketchikan, and Anchorage where representatives were taken out of their districts and moved into neighboring districts.
- Anchorage resident, Lynette Pham, noted that East Anchorage and Eagle River are two distinct communities and grouping these two communities together takes away from the voices of the two communities. Additionally, the proposed maps splits Ketchikan into two districts and disconnects the Ketchikan International Airport from the district.
- Chugiak resident, Gretchen Wehmhoff, noted that on the Board Composite Version 2 map, the board is moving in the right direction by separating the Mat-Su Valley from Anchorage and by combining similar areas such as Eklutna, Birchwood, and Chugiak in District 22.

- Anchorage resident, Judith Conte, noted that the proposed maps are not politically neutral. Merging West Anchorage, Spenard, and Downtown Anchorage together as they are in the proposed maps is unacceptable as each of these areas are culturally, demographically, and socio-economically distinct and would benefit from independent representation. Additionally, Anchorage and the Mat-Su Valley are distinctly different on many levels. Ms. Conte urged map drawers to use integrity when drawing maps.
- Fairbanks resident, Lee Drake, testified in response to Robin O'Donoghue's earlier testimony regarding the proposed maps where Mr. O'Donoghue noted that the proposed District 31 was a substantial departure from the current District 5. Mr. O'Donoghue argued that Chena Ridge, Ester, and Goldstream Valley should be one district based on socio-economic integration of the communities with the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Ms. Drake suggested combining Eielson, Salcha, and Moose Creek to be integrated with the westside of the Tanana and Chena Rivers as Salcha and Moose Creek are highly dependent on Eielson Air Force Base. Additionally, Ms. Drake noted the projects that are in the Salcha and Moose Creek areas with strong ties to the academic world.
- Anchorage resident, Forrest McDonald, noted that on the Board Composite Version 2 map, Downtown Anchorage is split three ways to Muldoon, Kincaid, and Midtown; this is too partisan and results in a more stretched out and less compact Anchorage map. Additionally, Mr. McDonald noted that some callers giving public testimony are being coached on their testimonies and are part of political groups that do not represent all of Alaskans' interests. Mr. McDonald encouraged the board to take steps to prevent partisan activist groups from subverting the public process.
- Juneau resident, David Hanna, agreed with Dyea resident, Kathy Hosford, who testified earlier regarding the underrepresentation of the Upperland Canal district.
- Fairbanks resident, Elizabeth Dalton, expressed support for the Fairbanks area in the proposed maps as all the current incumbents remain in their present districts. Additionally Ms. Dalton agreed with Mr. McDonald's sentiments regarding some testifiers being coached on their public testimonies.
- Anchorage resident, David Nees, expressed support for the Board Composite Version 2 map and noted that community councils do not have much influence on the legislative process as they were set up to advise the Anchorage Assembly. Mr. Nees encouraged the board to review how many legislators' districts are changing and using that as a metric to determine whether the maps are gerrymandered.
- Anchorage resident, Robert Hockema, noted that it seems the maps were deliberately drawn with partisan intentions as certain incumbents have been combined in certain districts together. The maps seem to make districts less competitive and forces House majority coalition members to run against each other, thus reducing the amount of incumbents that the House GOP has to run against in the 2022 elections. Mr. Hockema implored the board to reconsider the maps.
- Representative Geran Tarr asked the board to consider holding public testimony outside of business hours as this would be beneficial to Alaskans and give the board an opportunity to hear from more diverse voices in the community.
- Anchorage resident, Yarrow Silvers, addressed the Anchorage portion of the maps which seem to have not been drawn with transparency and without indication of how the board arrived to those maps. Specifically, the way East Anchorage was drawn in the Board Composite Version 1 map has diluted votes and has residents underrepresented. District 19 was drawn in a way that appears to be gerrymandered in favor of an incumbent. Additionally, the Board Composite Version 1 map removes Chianshtnu Park from East Anchorage and places it into Eagle River, indicating that the map does not adequately take socio-economic factors into consideration.
- Petersburg resident, Donna Marsh, urged the board to reconsider the proposed maps and proposed for the board to keep the maps as they are presently drawn, especially Southeast Alaska.

- Anchorage resident, Robin Smith, expressed concern for the proposed maps not currently identifying House district pairings to form the senate districts as the Alaska Constitution requires. Without this being defined, the plan is incomplete. Additionally, Ms. Smith expressed concern for the proposed maps not respecting board and city boundaries, and there does appear to be partisan gerrymandering in the proposed maps.
- Anchorage resident, Bruce Barnsworth, asked the board to think of how a map would look if all individual board members had no allegiance to any political party; doing so would be acting in the spirit of the state's founders.
- Anchorage resident, Brian Hove, noted that in the southside of Turnagain in Anchorage, this area is much more connected to the airport than they are to the downtown area and that drawing the map in a way that connects Turnagain with the downtown area is problematic.
- Anchorage resident, Ellen Jaimes, noted that she noticed that in both maps, several community council districts are split up and asked the board to follow the community council boundaries. Additionally, in the Board Composite Version 1 map, Ms. Jaimes expressed opposition for combining Anchorage with Eagle River and the Mat-Su Borough.

Presentation from Third-Party Map Drafters

Sarah Obed, Tanner Amdur-Clark, and Marna Sanford presented a third-party map drawn in partnership between Doyon, Ltd., Tanana Chiefs Conference, Sealaska, Ahtna, and Fairbanks Native Association.

Ms. Obed introduced the map and noted the following:

- The map was drawn within the guidelines of the Alaska Constitution and includes compactness, contiguity, socio-economic integration, and equal representation.
- The collective also worked to develop rural districts that considers local government and ANSCA regional boundaries.
- Two additional factors were kept in mind during the map drawing process: minimal population deviation and undiluted voting power of the residents; the map has a maximum population deviation of 6.1 percent.
- Boundaries on the map were drawn with respect to natural features such as watersheds, river systems, islands, and coast lines.
- To a practicable extent, communities of interest were combined.
- There are concerns about District 2 in both proposed maps by the board and whether it is visually non-compact due to reasons unrelated to the geography of the coast lines.

Mr. Amdur-Clark and Ms. Sanford reviewed the map with the board. The following clarifications were made:

- Clarification from Mr. Binkley was requested on the Denali Borough, Mat-Su Borough, and Cantwell. The Denali Borough connects with Mat-Su Borough around Cantwell which is part of the Ahtna region.
- Palmer is one district.
- Port Graham and Seldovia are paired in District 37 with the Aleutians and Dillingham as they are maritime-based communities and keeping these communities together keeps them socio-economically integrated. This would make more sense than pulling populations from the interior rural communities that are north of the district.
- Girdwood has conjoined with the northern part of the Kenai Peninsula due to socio-economic integration of the communities. Additionally, Girdwood is serviced by Whittier and has a strong relationship with that community.

Mike Wenstrup and Erin Parker presented a third-party map drawn by the Alaska Democratic Party and noted the following:

- The map consists of 40 House districts containing a cohesive group of voters bound by socio-economic similarities, and adheres to municipal, borough, and city boundaries.
- Accessibility and accurate representation for Alaskans were both priorities in preparing the map.
- Overall, the map has a population deviation of under 10 percent.
- Rural districts were approached in a manner that applies standards of unifying cultural interests to the maximum extent possible in less densely populated areas.

Mike Wenstrup and Erin Parker reviewed the map with the board. The following clarifications were made:

- The group attempted to not break borough boundaries. Any broken boundaries in the map were only broken once.
- Anticipating the arrival of the F-35's at the Eielson Air Force Base, the group tried to be conservative with population deviation in this district while acknowledging that the population will grow. The group attempted to not overpopulate the district, but also attempted to avoid under populating the district by the projected population growth. Ms. Borromeo asked Matt Singer, the board's legal counsel, to give guidance on whether the board should be considering projected changes in population. Mr. Singer advised that the United States Census data is the only population that the board is permitted to consider.
- Turnout and historical partisan responses were reviewed during the map drawing process, but community cohesive was a priority throughout. The map adheres to the Alaska Constitution guidelines.

Steve Colligan and Randy Ruedrich presented a third-party map drawn by Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting. The following items were noted:

- The map can be viewed on the Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting website.
- The Alaska Constitution states that districts must be relatively integrated in socio-economic areas; the courts have found that any borough meets these criteria. Therefore, everything in a borough is equally socio-economically integrated and the group looked at natural manmade barriers to create boundaries within the map.
- Currently, the map has an overall population deviation of 3.36 percent.
- While the rest of the state has a population surplus, Southeast Alaska and Fairbanks have a population deficit. Thus, Fairbanks and Southeast Alaska must be treated uniquely.
- Mr. Ruedrich noted that Saxman is more closely associated with Sitka from a socio-economic standpoint. Mr. Binkley answered that after presenting the board's proposed plans, about 35 residents from Ketchikan commented that Saxman is more socio-economically connected to Ketchikan than Sitka. Mr. Ruedrich noted that they will continue to work with the board to improve their map.
- The plan was audited to ensure that no blocks were left out in the process.
- Mr. Singer noted that he does not recall that the Alaska Supreme Court has weighed in on prioritizing rural boundaries versus ANCSA boundaries.

Mr. Ruedrich reviewed the map with the board. The following items were clarified:

- No political data was used to draw the maps, only census data was used.
- The group worked with their Alaska Native corporation partners to give feedback on the maps during the process.

Mike Brown, Manager of the Mat-Su Borough, presented a third-party map and noted the following:

- The Mat-Su Borough recently adopted a resolution directing Mr. Brown to develop a state redistricting plan that allocated the borough with 6 house districts and 3 senate districts. Specifically, the borough is requesting that the board adopt the following districts for the borough: Eastern district, Goose Bay district, Houston northwest district (this district can be paired with the Denali borough), Wasilla district, Palmer district, and a Southern district between Palmer and Wasilla.
- If the board determines it is necessary to include additional populations to areas extending outside of the borough, the borough supports including residents to the east toward Glenallen, but not toward Anchorage.
- If boundaries of the borough must be crossed, the borough prefers to cross to the east where it does not extend into a separate municipality.
- Mr. Brown asked the board to consider combining the areas east of Palmer (Butte, Lazy Mountain, and Knik River) with the district that extends east to Sutton as this combination closely aligns with how residents are represented at the local government.
- The borough is not opposed to pairing Valdez with communities east of the Mat-Su Borough.

Robin O'Donoghue and David Dunsmore presented a third-party map drawn by Alaskans for Fair Redistricting and noted the following:

- Mr. O'Donoghue read a letter from organization's chair, Joelle Hall, to the board.
- The group's process included preliminary research using data from the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, weekly coalition meetings, educational public outreach to increase engagement in the process, regional mapping input sessions, and collaboration with existing coalitions and organizations.
- The largest deviation upward is 2.67 percent and the largest downward deviation is 2.21 percent.
- The maps respect borough, municipality, and city boundaries while ensuring that communities are fully represented. The Anchorage, Matanuska Susitna, Fairbanks, and Fairbanks North Star boundaries were broken once, the Kenai Peninsula boundary was broken twice, and the Ketchikan Gateway boundary was not broken.

Mr. Dunsmore reviewed the map and the key differences between the group's plan and the board's proposed plans.

Senator Tom Begich presented a third-party map drawn by the Senate Minority Caucus and noted the following:

- This is not to be construed as an endorsement of the group, but rather as an example of how a map may meet the constitutional requirements that are before the board.
- The plan has an overall deviation of 3.14 percent which was a result of moving the city of Deering into District 39 from District 40.
- The map meets or exceeds the required deviation standards that have been set.
- By retaining boroughs and only going beyond boroughs to address population surplus, socio-economic standards are adhered to as recognized in court decisions.
- Maps that have been presented by other parties reduce the voting power of the Fairbanks North Star Borough and gives more voting power to other communities. Packing 5 districts into the Fairbanks North Star Borough could lead to litigation. This map resolves that issue.
- Senator Begich referred to the language in the Hickel v. Southeast Conference case that states that "a municipality should not be made to contribute so much of its population to

districts centered elsewhere that it is deprived of representation which is justified by its population.”

- The map maintains contiguity between all House districts.
- If the board chose to opt for a smaller deviation number in rural districts, the board could shift Deering into District 39 rather than District 40.
- Districts 37 through 40 on the map all fall within the allowable deviation and are significantly more balanced in population than the wider deviations shown in other presented maps. The map also associates the districts with their hub communities, does not violate rural boundaries, and follows the Yukon and Kuskokwim rivers.

Senator Begich reviewed the map with the board. The following clarifications were made:

- The map shows that you can meet all the constitutional obligations at the highest possible standards with low deviations, compactness, contiguity, and with respect to socio-economic boundaries. It is not endorsed by the Senate Minority Caucus, but all members of the caucus reviewed, commented, and drew the map prior to the presentation of the map.
- Senator Begich gave the rationale behind including Cordova in District 6: In prior redistricting processes, Cordova was included in interior districts. The inclusion of Cordova and/or Valdez can be done through the Richardson Highway. In terms of population, Cordova is an unorganized borough, therefore it can be included in an area that would include interior districts while still being held up constitutionally. Additionally, from a process standpoint, once the original map is drawn, it is adjusted according to compactness, contiguity, and socio-economic integration, then the map is adjusted to meet deviations. Finally, additional populations are found for the interior district to maintain the coherence and integrity of the southeast, northwest, and southwest sections of the map. Also, including Cordova in District 6 is a way to include the Doyon villages within a district.
- Mr. Binkley requested that Senator Begich provide the map’s senate pairings.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Anchorage resident, Steve Aufrecht, made the following recommendations to the board: 1) Each board member should publicly record all involvement of non-board members with map drawing and how they’ve helped, 2) the board should make a policy to not protect and/or target incumbents, and 3) board members should not consult with non-board members regarding map drawing except in public meetings, and if the board receives information or suggestions about map drawing from the public, they should provide a written report of this for the public to be notified.
- Glenallen resident, Karen Linnell, expressed concern for the representation of the unorganized boroughs and combining them with pieces of other boroughs with larger communities. This results in the rural communities’ voices being lost.
- JBER resident, Major Felicia Wilson, thanked the board for considering the public’s questions and concerns.

Next Steps

The following next steps were identified:

- The board will hold a public meeting on September 20, 2021; this will be the last meeting prior to entering the public outreach phase. Public testimony will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting and third-party maps will be discussed with potential changes made to the board’s initially proposed maps.

- The public outreach phase will begin on September 27, 2021. Each visit will generally consist of two board members and one staff member with a goal of holding hearings in the evenings. The board intends to visit 20 to 30 communities over the next month.
- Ms. Marcum asked that all testifiers follow up verbal testimonies with a written testimony. Written testimonies can be provided on the website after which it is uploaded to a database for the board and staff to easily access.
- The board agreed to work with staff over the weekend to further analyze the third-party maps and re-enter into a public session on September 20, 2021. The board intends to adopt the maps as soon as possible, but they may find that more time is needed to review and discuss the maps prior to making a final decision. Thus, the board agreed not to commit to a certain date for adoption of the maps.
- Ms. Marcum requested guidance from the board's legal counsel during the September 20th public session. An executive session will be placed onto the agenda for the board to receive guidance.
- Mr. Torkelson cautioned the board members about the public outreach schedule and noted the five-week window the board currently must reach 20 to 30 communities, equaling 5 to 6 communities per week. The schedule may be adjusted as needed, although there is some pressure for the board to reach a resolution soon.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The board adjourned at 3:17 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

**Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
September 20, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st
Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503**

The Alaska Redistricting Board met on September 20, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Lee Baxter	Legal Counsel

Agenda

- Call to Order & Establish Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony
- Evaluation and Discussion of Submitted Third Party Maps
- Review of Improvements to Board Proposed Plans v1 and v2
- Adoption of Maps for Inclusion in Public Outreach Tour
- Public testimony
- Next Steps
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Mr. Binkley called the meeting to order on September 20, 2021 at 9:10 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Ms. Borromeo moved to adopt the draft agenda. Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Anchorage resident, Former Senator Cathy Giessel, recommended that the board reject the proposed District 32 on the maps proposed by Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting. This proposed district is neither fair nor equitable as it connects the Hillside and Turnagain Arm down to the southwest and encompasses the Nikiski community. The issues between the two communities are significantly different from one another. Ms. Giessel acknowledged the contiguity over large expanses of water, but combining of these communities does not represent socio-economic integration.
- Fairbanks resident, William Stapp, testified against breaking the Fairbanks North Star Borough boundaries to draw other districts. Doing so would not maintain a well-represented and socio-economically coherent district.
- Anchorage resident, Ann Brown, referenced two cases, one of which was a 2001 redistricting case where the Alaska Supreme Court stated that “Anchorage neighborhood patterns cannot justify ‘substantial disparities’ in population equality across districts.” The court also held that “Anchorage is by definition socio-economically integrated and its population is sufficiently dense and evenly spread to allow multiple combinations of compact contiguous districts with minimal population deviations.” Ms. Brown also referenced the Groh v. Egan case where the court states that “there are few if any homogeneous socio-economic areas within the Greater Anchorage Area Borough, and that patterns of housing, income levels and minority residency are difficult to delineate. While such patterns may form a basis for districting, they lack the necessary significance to justify the substantial disparities of 5.9, 6.5 and 8.6 percent. In an urban area such as Anchorage, more mathematical exactness can be achieved than in the sparsely settled portions of the state...”. Ms. Brown spoke in favor of the map taking these two statements into consideration.
- Anchorage resident, Yarrow Silvers, reviewed the third-party maps that were presented at the September 17, 2020 public session and stated that the maps presented with the Alaska Democratic Party and Alaskans for Fair Redistricting kept East Anchorage intact most and only shared population as needed with Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). Ms. Silvers believes this is appropriate. Additionally, Ms. Silvers noted the importance of maintaining community council boundaries as the councils meet, advocate, volunteer, seek redress, and support their communities together. Ms. Silvers asked the board to use the map presented by Alaskans for Fair Redistricting as an alternative map to bring to the public.

Evaluation and Discussion of Submitted Third Party Maps

Senate Minority Caucus Map:

Mr. Torkelson noted that the Senate Minority Caucus made some minor changes to their map which was submitted to the board on the morning of this public session. The changes are the following: 1) The North Slope district was changed to include the entire extent of the Northwest Arctic Borough, bringing Deering into the North Slope district. 2) The Mat-Su regional map was changed to respect the city boundary of Houston entirely. These changes resulted in an overall map deviation increase from 3.14 to about 4 percent.

Senator Tom Begich, Senator Jesse Kiehl, Senator Scott Kawasaki, and Jennifer Gifford, representing the Senate Minority Caucus, were present to discuss the map submitted by the Senate Minority Caucus. The board asked the following questions regarding the map:

- Senator Begich noted that the change in Houston was made to a zero-population block that was inadvertently omitted. The change ensured that the Houston city limits were incorporated into one district.
- Ms. Marcum asked the group for the rationale behind the placing of Valdez and Cordova in the interior district.

- Senator Begich answered that both Valdez and Cordova are unorganized boroughs and the connection that Valdez has to the Kodiak borough resolves the underpopulation issue. The Cordova district, historically, was placed in a senate district with the interior in lieu of overpopulating Southeast Alaska. Additionally, Senator Begich noted that the map presented by the Senate Minority Caucus is meant to be a template map that provides a starting point for the board and the public to review.
- Ms. Borromeo commented that although the presented map has low deviations, there are also odd pairings and shapes, lack of compactness, and questionable socio-economic integrations. For example, District 39 shows socio-economic disparities that combines the Bering Strait with the Yukon-Kuskokwim region with the Upper Kuskokwim subregion by taking in McGrath and Nikolai. Ms. Borromeo asked for evidence of socio-economic integration between the Upper Kuskokwim Doyon villages with the Yukon-Kuskokwim region, specifically the Bering Straits.
 - Senator Begich answered that the lower part of the district follows the Yukon River upwards, and the socio-economic integration of this district represents portions of an old House district. In prior reapportionment cases, relationships between Unalakleet and McGrath were documented in studies from 20 to 30 years ago while also being upheld in prior reapportionments. The socio-economic relationships consist of trade relationships that expand from the Athabaskan areas of McGrath and Nikolai to Unalakleet. Additionally, several historical trails were also documented in these areas and these records were used to justify the socio-economic integrations.
- Regarding proposed Districts 37 and 38, Ms. Borromeo asked for the rationale behind the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta region being split into three districts (37, 38, and 39) while the residents of this area have expressed their desire for being combined into one district.
 - Senator Begich answered that he conferred with the Calista Corporation during the map drawing process, and they requested to, wherever possible, use the two rivers moving upwards while looking at river boundaries to ensure that the district boundaries also followed corporate boundaries. Additionally, District 37's depth into the interior was reduced, making a population difference in the lower part of the district. The populations connected to Bethel are included in District 38. District 37 takes in enough population around Goodnews Bay to balance the populations overall.
- Regarding the proposed District 32, Ms. Borromeo noted that Port Graham, Valdez, Seldovia, Halibut Cove, Kodiak, and Tyonek were combined; this district unites three ANCSA regions with Cordova being excluded. The Hickel v. Southeast Conference decision in 1992 was critical about Alaska Native groupings being paired together, due to a lack of historical and economic evidence. Ms. Borromeo asked why the group decided to pair these three ANCSA regions.
 - Senator Begich answered that the Tyonek relationship to the other villages in the southern part of Kachemak Bay is based on the communities being in the Kenai Peninsula Borough. In a prior court decision, the court stated that while ANCSA regions are important to consider, the socio-economic relationships of the boroughs should be considered first. The only material difference between this map and the constitutionally approved map in the last reapportionment cycle is the change from Cordova to Valdez. Otherwise, the relationships and connections remain.
- Regarding proposed District 33, Ms. Borromeo noted that the map combines Downtown Juneau with Haines and Skagway. Ms. Borromeo asked for the rationale behind this coupling.
 - Senator Begich answered that the primary reason is that we cannot separate a city where a municipality or a borough can have two House districts, and a senate district, it should be included. We also know that there are direct relationships within southeast between Juneau, Haines, and Skagway. The borough is a socio-

integrated area. We also know the court upheld the same approach to this map, ten years ago, as they could show the socio-economic relationships between the three communities.

- Senator Kiehl added that the court has upheld this map in the past. Additionally, there are connections between the communities due to the significant maritime elements and infrastructures and between the Tlingit Haida headquarters and community councils.
- Regarding proposed Districts 38, 39 and 40, Ms. Bahnke noted concerns about District 39 being spread across three ANCSA regions and to get to McGrath from Nome, one would have to fly from Nome, to Anchorage, to Fairbanks, and then to McGrath. There is no hub where the communities can shop, work, and recreate together. Additionally, another concern is on the Yukon-Kuskokwim area, which has tremendously grown – this area has been pushed into three ANCSA regions. Although the group has answered that there are historical trading ties between these areas, Ms. Bahnke noted that in the modern day, this does not seem to connect the communities socio-economically.
 - Ms. Borromeo commented that Nome, McGrath, and Anchorage have an aviation connection as McGrath is the halfway point between Anchorage and Nome and has a full-sized runway.
 - Senator Begich answered that the group’s goal for the map is to avoid repeating difficulties with the maps created one decade ago, extending deeper into Arctic villages with districts connecting to Nome. Partially due to the population in the Calista region, there is now more flexibility to reduce these boundaries and ensure that less of the Doyon region is represented in District 39; this is a benefit. Additionally, Senator Begich acknowledged that the map is not perfect, but is a spirited effort to reduce disparities rather than extend them and ensures one vote for each person. Senator Begich expressed hope that the board consider this map to be presented to the public for further commentary.
- Upon request for clarification by Ms. Bahnke, Lee Baxter, Legal Counsel, clarified that there is precedent that local political boundaries (boroughs and municipalities) are, by definition, socio-economically integrated, but there is no precedent on ANCSA boundaries. ANCSA boundaries can provide a way of determining whether an area is socio-economically integrated.

Doyon/Sealaska/Tanana Chiefs Conference/Fairbanks Native Association/Ahtna Coalition Map:

Nathaniel Amdur-Clark and Marna Sanford were present to discuss the map submitted by the coalition. The board asked the following questions regarding the map:

- Ms. Marcum followed up about a recent question on Palmer being dissected in the proposed map.
 - Ms. Sanford and Mr. Amdur-Clark answered that this dissection was unintentional and may have been due to a software issue; the coalition intends to fix this and submit an updated map to the board which is slightly different than the board’s proposed maps and the current Mat-Su Borough map.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark commented that in spite of the map being submitted today, the coalition acknowledges that there will be public commentary that will result in internal updates to their map. The coalition will record public comment given on the map during the public outreach process and update the map as necessary.
- Ms. Marcum noted that the areas south of Girdwood are joined with north Kenai, crossing the municipal boundary; this also occurred on the northside of the municipal boundary by incorporating some of the Mat-Su Borough population into Anchorage.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark answered that this was intended due to the reality of the

populations in Southcentral Alaska in order to build populations of the right size. For example, some parts of Kenai must be added to Kodiak to build the population and the best socio-economically integrated way to achieve this is by including Seward. There is Alaska Supreme Court precedent stating that these areas are socio-economically integrated as well. Similarly, when building the Mat-Su borough areas with the interior, there is some additional population that must be given up elsewhere. With Alaska Supreme Court precedent on the socio-economic integration, the best way to achieve this is to include the southern part of the Mat-Su borough as the coalition has done in the proposed map.

- The board reviewed the Yukon-Kuskokwim area of the map to review how many districts the region is split into and the southern part of the Denali borough – specifically Cantwell. Mr. Binkley asked for the rationale behind including Cantwell in District 36 based on guidance given by the board’s legal counsel stating that that borough boundaries can determine socio-economic integrity and that there is no precedent on ANCSA boundaries.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark answered that, under the Alaska Constitution, the board can consider local government boundaries, including boroughs. However, this does not mean the board cannot consider other socio-economic integration indicators. Ultimately, the voting power of residents within the borough cannot be diluted.
- Ms. Borrromeo stated that the Kenai Peninsula Borough took sizeable hits to its boundaries and asked for the rationale behind the breaches to the borough boundaries.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark answered that the way Kenai is currently mapped does not make Valdez integrated with the interior. If Valdez is kept whole with the rest of the Prince William Sound communities when building a map of Southcentral Alaska, Kenai must be built the way the coalition builds it in the presented map. Mr. Amdur-Clark added that this is not necessarily a reflection of keeping the interior Ahtna and Doyon communities together.
 - Ms. Sanford added that this map endeavors to keep the Prince William Sound communities whole. Additionally, there has been public testimony from the City of Cordova that they desire the power to be all together. When determining whether to choose Homer, Seward or Valdez to balance out Kodiak, the coalition believes the map shown today makes the most sense.
- Regarding proposed District 37, Ms. Borrromeo noted that in the district with the Aleutians and the Yukon-Kuskokwim areas, there is Tyonek, Seldovia, Halibut Cove, and Port Graham. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the rationale behind including these communities in this district and the evidence for the socio-economic integration in these communities.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark answered that this is most socio-economically integrated way of mapping this area. In every map presented by the board and third-parties, there will be at least one district that is relatively downwardly deviated depending on the choices made. District 37 has the largest downward deviation of any of the mapped districts. The deviation would have been higher if these communities were not included, thus risking the “one person, one vote” issue.
 - Mr. Amdur-Clark added that regarding the socio-economic integration evidence, the maritime coastal native communities on the peninsula and other parts of Southwest Alaska have a connection. Combining these communities makes sense in comparison to the other option which is to connect the communities in one long district across the whole Southcentral Alaska coast. While the trade-offs are not entirely ideal, they believe this approach is the best way to address the area from an overall perspective. Additionally, the collective is open to suggestions and feedback on mapping the area in a way that is more socio-economically integrated while ensuring population requirements from the Alaska Constitution are met.
 - Ms. Sanford commented that there is not a way to keep the Prince William Sound community whole while also tying it with other maritime communities. To keep all communities together (Valdez, Cordova, Chenega, Tatitlek), and continue having

them in a maritime-only district is impossible given the population, in their opinion. This is the only map to keep these areas together as an entire voting block.

- Regarding proposed District 24, Ms. Borrromeo asked for the reasoning behind the Butte, Peters Creek, and the Municipality of Anchorage boundaries being breached with the Mat-Su Borough with an odd appendage into Eagle River.
 - Ms. Sanford answered that they believed this was one single neighborhood that needed a population change. They elected to do this as opposed to bringing the map to stretch down south into JBER more. We believed taking part of Eagle River was a better socio-economic connection.

Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting Map:

Randy Ruedrich was present to discuss the map submitted by Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting. Mr. Ruedrich commented that new shape maps were submitted to the board. The new maps clean up a few zero-block files and a few material items. In the previous map, there were 29 districts that were below 1 percent deviation. In the current map, there are now 35 districts below 1 percent with a new overall population deviation of 2.8 percent. Ms. Borrromeo noted that she has not reviewed the newly submitted maps and will be asking questions based on the maps presented at the previous public session. The board asked the following questions regarding the map:

- Regarding proposed District 1, the Alaska Supreme Court stated that removing Saxman from Ketchikan and breaking the borough boundary is unconstitutional and asked for the rationale behind the map doing so.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that Saxman has several in the community who do not rely on resources from District 2 in the Sitka area. Several health and other benefit organizations divide resources for Saxman and other villages throughout the area. Due to that, the group felt this was the best way to draw the map. The map can be readjusted for an alternative solution and Mr. Ruedrich committed to looking at this area of the map to build a better solution for Districts 1 and 2.
- Regarding proposed District 2, Ms. Borrromeo expressed concern about Metlakatla and Hyder being grouped together with Sitka and outer coast communities while citizens of these communities have been vocal about being aligned with Ketchikan. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the rationale behind this grouping.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that he tried to group citizens together who have a likely benefit of association with Sitka as it was indicated to him by Alaska Natives in District 2. By building a bypass district, this addresses a population deficit. Additionally, Southeast Alaska has always had problems when trying to build districts due to its extreme length and lack of width.
 - Ms. Borrromeo noted that grouping Metlakatla with Sitka does not work for part of this state and noted that, from her own experience traveling in this area, Metlakatla should be grouped with Ketchikan.
- Mr. Simpson commented that the board attempted to draw a similar looking map and when the map was released to the public, there were several comments giving feedback on integrating Ketchikan, Saxman, and Metlakatla communities due to an error the board made in missing a portion of Ketchikan on the south end of the island; this resulted in the numbers being off. The configuration of the population for this area has been challenging. When placing these communities back into Ketchikan, District 1 could not reach up to Wrangell; this changes the configuration of the area. The board reviewed the map again and will be correcting this error today.
- Regarding proposed District 38, Ms. Borrromeo noted that the map unites Hooper Bay and Bethel and pointed out an appendage to the southeast with Quinhagak making District 38 non-compact. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the rationale behind this.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that this area of the map was done in partnership with Calista

- and Hooper Bay whose request was to include Hooper Bay, Chevak, and Scammon Bay with Bethel in the principal Calista district – these are all communities that have traditionally been included in the north Calista population. A large portion of the lower Kuskokwim school district was placed into District 37 to accommodate the Hooper Bay cities being in District 37. Additionally, Mr. Ruedrich noted that Calista intends to testify and provide reasoning for their desire for this accommodation.
- Ms. Borrromeo noted that the 56 villages around Bethel in the Yukon-Kuskokwim district all have significant ties to Bethel and expressed concern for the map as it has been drawn as it seems to present more problems than solutions.
 - Regarding District 39, Ms. Bahnke expressed concern for the way the Yukon-Kuskokwim region is split into three areas and with how Saxman is mapped. Ms. Bahnke asked the board's legal counsel to confirm whether the court has precedent on mapping Saxman out of Ketchikan.
 - Mr. Baxter confirmed that there is Supreme Court precedence that this is not permissible.
 - Mr. Ruedrich noted that by moving some villages into District 37, there is no requirement to have Doyon villages above the northern boundary of the Calista region; he views this as a positive impact on western districts in Alaska. By this adjustment among the Calista villages, 100 percent of Doyon villages have been eliminated in District 37; this is a large step toward compactness.
 - Ms. Borrromeo requested for an authorized member from Calista and the 56 villages around Bethel to either submit a written testimony or participate in the public hearing process.
 - Regarding proposed District 39, Ms. Borrromeo noted that the district comes down the coast from Shishmaref, breaks slightly below Amaknak, and then over to the upper subregion of the Kuskokwim. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the evidence of socio-economic integration in this district.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that this was done to minimize population deviation as there is not enough population in this area to avoid a severe deviation issue.
 - Ms. Bahnke expressed concern for the district breaking borough boundaries and being comprised of communities that are located within four different ANCSA boundaries. Ms. Bahnke also expressed concern for there being too much emphasis placed on minimizing deviations over ensuring compactness, contiguity, and socio-economic integration.
 - Regarding proposed District 32, there is a breach in the borough boundary into the Kenai Peninsula that includes Nikiski. In public hearings, a resident has expressed opposition for the southern part of Anchorage being grouped with Nikiski. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the reasoning behind this grouping.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that the two villages placed into District 39 from the NANA region are in an area that has seen deviation challenges. In the 2001 map, the court directed that Shishmaref be added to the North Slope district to minimize deviations. In the 2011 and 2012 maps, the population was not large enough to accomplish this, resulting in the whole Koyukuk area being included in the NANA district. This time, the population of the two boroughs are large enough to have a surplus with the largest population deviation. To achieve equal representation, this is the appropriate thing to do even if it impacts the socio-economic integration.
 - Ms. Borrromeo noted that the board will need to learn from Kenai residents about which is more important: breaching borough boundaries or shedding the population north to Anchorage and south to the coast?
 - Regarding proposed District 5, Ms. Borrromeo asked for the socio-economic integration evidence of including Cordova into an interior district.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that the only option was to place Cordova with the eastern part of Alaska since putting Cordova with Southeast Alaska would result in severe

- overpopulation. Additionally, a significant socio-economic similarity is that many of the villages, including Cordova, do not have road access.
- Ms. Borrromeo noted that there are several unusual appendages in the Anchorage districts where borders also encroach into other districts. Ms. Borrromeo asked for the rationale behind the Anchorage mapping.
 - Mr. Ruedrich answered that the updated maps that the group submitted this morning resolves the issues Ms. Borrromeo asks about.
 - Ms. Borrromeo noted concern for the compactness that has resulted as a function of the low deviations. In addition to her observations in the Anchorage area, this same issue lies within the Fairbanks North Star Borough where the boundary is broken with unusual couplings with Badger, Salcha, South Van Horn. Ms. Borrromeo expressed appreciation for the group working to reduce deviations, but this comes to a sacrifice of the other constitutional requirements that the board is required to take into consideration.
 - Tom Leonard, representing the Calista Corporation, joined the public session and noted the following:
 - Calista has invited comments from communities throughout the Yukon-Kuskokwim Delta region, the Alaska Native Regional Corporation Association, the Kuskokwim Corporation, and other regions.
 - Specific requests from Hooper Bay for the inclusion in the Bethel district creates a series of positive results: 1) The three villages of Hooper Bay, Scammon Bay, and Chevak are moved from District 39 to District 38. 2) To reduce excess population in District 38, the southwestern Calista villages of Kwigillingok, Kongiganak, Quinhagak, Goodnews Bay, and Platinum, were assigned to District 37. Additionally, Calista Kuskokwim River villages form the northern boundary of District 37. With this complex rotation of Calista villages, District 37 does not need to include any Doyon villages.
 - District 40 has an overpopulation that will impermissibly dilute residents' votes. Calista proposes that Buckland and Deering be in District 39 as a placeholder solution, however, they are open to other legal solutions to the District 40 overpopulation that is proposed by the board and other parties.
 - Comments from the 55 communities around Bethel were invited and received and they have a call scheduled with the Association of Village Council Presidents. Calista encouraged these communities to submit their comments to the board.

Alaskans for Fair Redistricting Map:

David Dunsmore and Robin O'Donoghue were present to discuss the map submitted by Alaskans for Fair Redistricting. The board asked the following questions regarding the map:

- Regarding proposed District 1, Ms. Borrromeo asked for the rationale and socio-economic integration evidence behind the mapping of Thorne Bay and breaking up Prince of Wales Island.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that it was necessary to add population into the district and there are economic and transportation connections, especially with the eastern and southern parts of Prince of Wales Island through the Ketchikan area. Additionally, Ketchikan is a hub for the Prince of Wales Island with transportation connections by ferry and air travel. The most commercial flights to access Thorne Bay go through Ketchikan.
- Regarding District 4, Ms. Borrromeo asked for the socio-economic integration evidence for the grouping of the remaining communities of Prince of Wales Island with Petersburg and Juneau.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that this district was drawn with a desire to correct major

socio-economic flaws with the status quo district that currently fails to recognize close socio-economic ties between Petersburg and Juneau, and the distinction of road systems in Haines, Skagway, and Klukwan. The group reviewed transportation data and saw that a vast majority of Petersburg's transportation goes through Juneau, which has the largest non-road system in the state. Also, Ketchikan is not in the top 10 destinations for Petersburg. The group completed the district and determined that the northern part of the Prince of Wales Island had connections with Petersburg.

- Regarding proposed District 2, Ms. Borromeo noted that the outer islands were coupled with Sitka while also including Haines and Skagway and asked for the socio-economic integration evidence behind this grouping.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that while places like Sitka and Angoon are off the road system, Skagway, Haines, and Klukwan are on the road system and the group noticed that the socio-economic tie for the smaller communities are the maritime resources and small plane activity between the communities.
 - Mr. Dunsmore added that the group is willing to update their recommendations as the board receives feedback from the state.
- Regarding proposed District 5, Ms. Borromeo asked for the socio-economic ties within this district.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that upon research and outreach, the group discovered there are more socio-economic and cultural ties achieved when the lake and peninsula borough is included. This allows the Alutiiq and Sugpiaq communities on the Alaska Peninsula to be with similar cultural and linguistic communities on Kodiak Island and in the greater Gulf Coast region. Similarly, it allows the Dena'ina communities to be in the same district as Tyonek. Additionally, there are strong transportation links.
- Ms. Marcum asked for the rationale behind splitting Kenai and Soldotna into two districts.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that they believe this creates a more compact and better reflection of the community ties along the Sterling Highway to Soldotna and along the Kenai Spur Highway with Kenai.
- Ms. Borromeo noted that Valdez is coupled with interior villages and that the Doyon region is split to reduce the geographic size east to west. Ms. Borromeo asked about the commonalities between Valdez and these communities.
 - Mr. Dunsmore noted that mapping Valdez is a challenge. Through the group's coalition process, they heard that Valdez felt their main socio-economic connections were along the Richardson Highway and thus, prefer to be in a district going up the Richardson Highway, including the Alaska Highway areas. The group also tried to balance feedback given from Doyon and surrounding rural communities about keeping their region integrated with road systems of the Doyon region.
- Ms. Bahnke asked for the evidence of socio-economic integration in District 39.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that this area was also challenging to map. During the group's outreach process, they heard two conflicting concerns: 1) The Doyon region desires to have their region incorporated into as few districts as possible. 2) The Hooper Bay community desires to have their district included with Bethel and Calista. To balance both concerns, District 38 was built between the Yukon-Kuskokwim River mouths. Additionally, there are some historic commerce ties across the district along with mining where the Nixon ford Mine lies within the Doyon portion of the district.
 - Ms. Bahnke noted that historically, while there were commerce ties, there was also warfare between the interior Athabaskan and Yupik communities along the Bering Strait region and Mr. Dunsmore's answer does not provide the socio-economic ties in this district.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that the group will continue to monitor public input on the map and work with the Doyon Coalition to find creative ways to better address

concerns.

- Regarding proposed District 33, Mr. Binkley noted that the district loops down below Van Horn Road and extends east to Lakeview Terrace. Mr. Binkley asked for the rationale behind this appendage.
 - Mr. Dunsmore noted that the Lakeview Area consists of trailer parks outside of city limits. When filling District 31, the group looked at most urban parts of Fairbanks that were not within the city and felt that Lakeview did not meet the criteria to be included in District 31. When determining the district it should go in, the options were District 35 (North Pole) or District 33 (Western Fairbanks) and the group opted for District 33 where the residential parts of Lakeview are similar to some trailer parks in the area. Overall, they opted to place similar neighborhoods in the same district.
- Regarding proposed District 31, Mr. Binkley noted an appendage that comes into the neighborhood along the Chena River and asked for the reasoning behind the separation.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that this separation is a result of trying to meet the necessary population. The way the census blocks are carved out would result in overpopulation in the district. The group felt that, since the Chena River is used as a boundary, to balance the population given the nature of the census blocks, this was the best way to map the area. Splitting some Chena neighborhoods was required for this district.
- Regarding proposed District 31, Mr. Binkley noted that there is a delineation between Aurora and Totem Park with Noyes Slough on the west. The northside goes beyond Noyes Slough to include the area of the boundaries on the north College Road. Mr. Binkley asked for the rationale behind this.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that Danby Street was used as a boundary for District 32 as a major collector street is a strong boundary to use. Additionally, communities on the other side of the slough from Aurora are similar in character and have a connection with the Aurora neighborhood.
- Regarding proposed District 31, a neighborhood is accessed through an area to the east and seems to have more in common with the area to the east of it than across the slough to the north and west. Mr. Binkley asked for the rationale for including residents who live around the lake are in District 33 rather than District 31.
 - Mr. Dunsmore answered that this may be a minor amendment that the group can discuss and may not have an objection to.

Alaska Democratic Party Map:

Mike Wenstrup and Erin Parker were present to discuss the map submitted by the Alaska Democratic Party. The board asked the following questions regarding the map:

- Mr. Binkley asked for the group's rationale behind combining Petersburg with the south end of Juneau.
 - Ms. Parker answered that this was based on population constraints and the desire to respect political boundaries and proximity.
- Regarding proposed District 38, Ms. Borrromeo asked about the appendages on the northeast side of the district and by Eek.
 - Ms. Parker answered that there are two census blocks that form the appendage on the northeast side where the population is largely concentrated to the west. The large shape of the census block resulted in the appendage. The desire was to stick with natural existing boundaries as well.
- Regarding proposed District 6, Ms. Borrromeo asked for evidence of the socio-economic integration between the communities (rural interior villages, Salcha, Valdez, and Eielson Air Force Base) in the district.
 - Ms. Parker and Mr. Wenstrup answered that the group experienced challenges with

- mapping this district and several drafts were explored. The group worked to minimize conflation and reduce the number of highly concentrated communities.
- Ms. Borrromeo asked for the socio-economic integration evidence of proposed District 5.
 - Mr. Wenstrup answered that the population outside of the North Pole is much more similar and that Chena Hot Springs Road is used to travel to North Pole for services, resulting in a socio-economic connection to these areas.
 - Ms. Borrromeo noted the wide deviation spread between District 5 and the neighboring districts and asked if the group considered the deviations when drawing the Fairbanks North Star Borough.
 - Ms. Parker answered that although some boundaries are broken, they strived to keep communities as contained as possible thus the variation for deviations in the district.
 - Regarding proposed District 4, Ms. Borrromeo requested explanation on the deviation of 0 percent while being an odd-shaped district with an appendage into the westside of the city.
 - Ms. Parker answered that the appendage that follows the outside of the Fairbanks.
 - Ms. Borrromeo asked for the thought process behind the mapping of Fairbanks as there is a lack of compactness.
 - Ms. Parker answered that going out of the city boundaries of District 1 was required to increase the population. The group tried to keep cohesive neighborhoods together to achieve a compact district.
 - Regarding proposed District 6, Mr. Binkley asked for the rationale behind the appendage that reaches out near Moose Creek and grabs a portion of District 5.
 - Ms. Parker answered that this follows the boundary to the Eielson Air Force Base in the associated precinct.
 - Regarding proposed District 39, Ms. Bahnke asked for the rationale behind leaving Deering and Buckland in District 39 and about the socio-economic connection between the interior villages and western coastal communities.
 - Ms. Parker answered that Deering and Buckland were included in District 39 due to underpopulation. The group experienced challenges balancing the population in these areas and pushed the district's boundaries east and north to achieve an acceptable deviation. Additionally, Ms. Parker noted that ANCSA boundaries were considered first when mapping this area.
 - Ms. Bahnke noted concern for the district including four distinct ANCSA regions.
 - Regarding Districts 29 and 30, Ms. Borrromeo expressed concern for several appendages in both districts and asked for the reasoning behind the shape and several appendages in the districts.
 - Ms. Parker answered that these are a result of following the census blocks and the natural barriers that create the census blocks. Ms. Parker added that this area was hard to draw due to the relationship these areas have with District 32. With Kenai and Seward both being hubs, they saw commonalities which led to the current proposed shape of the district.
 - Regarding Anchorage, Ms. Borrromeo noted the higher deviations and expressed worry for the court raising concern about these deviations. Ms. Borrromeo asked for an explanation behind the deviation gaps.
 - Ms. Parker answered that the group recognizes the deviations are high in Anchorage and this was also a struggle. The primary tradeoff in this area is either to have high deviations or conflating Anchorage with surrounding communities even after Anchorage and the surrounding communities have expressed that they do not feel like conjoined communities. Overall, this was a response to the feedback given by the residents in this area to not combine Anchorage with the Mat-Su. If Anchorage was pushed south to the Kenai Peninsula, this would also raise unfairness as both communities are very distinct. Thus, the group chose higher deviations which keep Anchorage contained, except for combining Whittier with Girdwood.

- Regarding Districts 13 and 14, Ms. Marcum noted that both districts are highly overpopulated while neighboring Districts 15 and 19 are underpopulated. Ms. Marcum asked why the district boundaries were not adjusted to balance the populations.
 - Ms. Parker answered that Eagle River and its surrounding communities see themselves as autonomous and residents are actively organizing to exit the municipality. With respect for that, the district was contained while adding some population from JBER. They've tried to organize base precincts in conjunction with the gates; this has resulted in the unbalanced populations, but there are also socio-economic connections in the districts.
- Regarding proposed District 10, Ms. Borrromeo questioned the compactness and shape of the district.
 - Ms. Parker answered that this was based on where additional population could be grabbed to keep the district an appropriate size with respect to the adjacent district line.
- Regarding proposed District 11, Ms. Borrromeo asked why the district reaches close into the Wasilla city boundary.
 - Ms. Parker answered that this was based on where other lines were drawn and, given the size of Palmer, more population needed to be added which resulted in the shape of the district.
- Regarding proposed District 9, Ms. Borrromeo noted the geographically expansive district and asked why the group chose to pick up population going north rather than south.
 - Ms. Borrromeo answered that the group heard feedback from Valdez residents that they prefer not to be included with the Mat-Su Valley. Additionally, the group struggled to map this district as they felt that a number of combinations would be challenging.
- Regarding proposed Districts 9 and 6 boundaries, Ms. Marcum asked for the rationale behind splitting the Copper Center and Glennallen communities.
 - Mr. Wenstrup answered that this separation was due to members of the area expressing that they preferred to be included in the Valdez area rather than the Mat-Su area.

Review of Improvements to Board Proposed Plans v1 and v2

Mr. Torkelson stated that the board adopted two proposed plans on September 9, 2021, and began working on September 10, 2021, to address items in the map to be changed. Board members spent several hours to revise the maps and are now presenting replacement versions 3 and 4, respectively

The board reviewed Board Proposed Plan Version 3 and highlighted the changes:

- The following changes were made to Southeast Alaska:
 - An area with a population worth several hundred was omitted from the originally proposed map and, when added to the map, the population deviation was pushed to an unacceptable number. Petersburg was moved from District 1 into District 2 and population was added back into District 1 from the southern part of the district to include Hyder and Metlakatla.
 - Due to the changes in District 2, Districts 3 and 4 were changed to include Gustavus with District 4, thus adjusting a few census blocks to balance the population.
- The following changes were made to the Mat-Su region:
 - Based off feedback given from residents in the Mat-Su Borough and Anchorage municipality, the map was revised to keep these two areas separate. To accommodate the new dividing line, the lines in Districts 9 through 30 were redrawn.
 - Mat-Su was redrawn to accommodate a population of 800 that was previously in South Knik in the Anchorage map. To achieve more compactness, Butte and Lazy

- Mountain were added.
- District 30 includes Cottonwood, Finger Lake, Sutton, and Chickaloon and goes out to the borough boundary, staying north of the Matanuska River.
- District 26 takes in Fairview Loop and Cottonwood.
- District 27 maintains city boundaries and adds compact census blocks to achieve a desired target population.
- District 28 takes in Houston, Big Lake, and Point Mackenzie to add compactness. This allowed Districts 27 and 28 to have a clean northern border with District 29, following major roads and rivers.
- The population of District 29 was short by 500 as the previous map had Nenana included with an interior district. Since Nenana is contiguous with the Mat-Su Borough, it was added into District 29.
- With the changes, the Mat-Su Valley has a total deviation of .39 percent.
- The following changes were made to Eagle River and Anchorage:
 - Based off testimony heard on opposing the combining of Eagle River with Anchorage, the revised map does not combine the two communities.
 - Eagle River is split into two districts: District 23 encompassing the outer parts of the community and District 24 encompassing the core of the community.
 - A total population of 300 from Fort Richardson was added to District 23 to achieve a population high enough to create a district and based off testimony stating that many military members live in and have associations with Eagle River.
 - When drawing Anchorage, the goal was to balance compactness and deviations. The revisions reflect a more balanced map with acceptable deviations. All but one district achieved a less than 1 percent deviation.
 - District 18 is a compact district encompassing Elmendorf Air Force Base and the neighboring Mountain View community.
 - The orientation and shape of the airport is a driver for the block shapes around the airport.
 - District 17 took in a few neighborhoods to the south to achieve a balanced population.
 - To meet the population target for District 16, this district includes the neighborhoods in Northwood.
 - District 15 has an odd appendage as the airport is included but keeps District 14 as intact as possible.
 - District 13 follows the northern border of Dimond and uses the highway and Johns Road for most of its western boundary.
 - Due to the odd census block shapes, District 19 was challenging to draw, but it is compact and practicable.
 - District 22 encompasses the southern part of Fort Richardson and neighborhoods in the eastside of Anchorage that had previously been included with Fort Richardson in the Version 1 map.
 - District 21 was filled in with Nunaka and Turpin neighborhoods.
 - Districts 19 and 20 are not as compact, but the configuration achieved tight deviations.
 - The revised District 10 is the most compact configuration with the tightest deviation.
 - District 9 encompasses the southside of Anchorage down the Seward Highway to Girdwood and includes Whittier due to close socio-economic ties.
 - Anchorage has a total deviation of .88 percent.
- There were no changes to the Gulf Coast and Kenai Peninsula districts.
- There were no material changes to Fairbanks, but the districts increased in compactness and have tighter deviations.
- There were no changes to Western Alaska.

The board reviewed Board Proposed Plan Version 4 and highlighted the changes:

- Ms. Borrromeo noted that Board Proposed Plan Version 2 was not completely built out, but an exercise to show Alaskans and the board that Anchorage could be drawn in a way that respects municipal boundaries and the Mat-Su boundary to the north.
- The following changes were made to Fairbanks:
 - To bring District 36 up to the population threshold, population was taken from the Fairbanks North Star Borough by breaching the borough boundaries on the east as there are close socio-economic ties (shopping, entertainment, drawing paychecks) between rural villages outside of Fairbanks and Fairbanks itself.
 - The borough was broken at Eielson Air Force Base and the base was coupled with rural interior villages, allowing communities such as North Pole to be reserved. The borough was breached as military service members tend to be transient and service members who are usually in Alaska on military orders, meaning they are highly likely to end up residing in other states; the Groh v. Egan caselaw was referenced. Due to this reason, Ms. Borrromeo chose to shed that population to the interior, leaving Valdez out of the rural interior villages and using the Glenn Highway as a southern boundary.
 - Glenallen is kept whole by using Goose Creek as a boundary.
 - District 32 encompasses all of Fairbanks and was drawn based off public testimony, starting in the east and working toward the west and using existing Fairbanks city boundaries.
 - District 31 encompasses part of the western downtown population of Fairbanks and was drawn based on public testimony stating that the University of Alaska-Fairbanks is socio-economically integrated with neighborhoods around the university, which were included in this district. To meet the population target, the map grabs 75% of the city limits in the east to the downtown area to make the district whole.
 - City boundaries were preserved in District 33 and Badger Road is included in the district. Eielson Air Force Base was used as an eastern border, Tanana River as a southern border, Fairbanks as the western border, and major transportation corridors as the northern border.
 - District 35 uses the Fairbanks North Star Borough boundaries as the south, west, and north boundaries and major transportation corridors as the east boundary. This district was mapped based on public testimony.
 - District 34 encompasses all of the rural parts of Fairbanks to preserve this grouping as much as possible.
- The following changes were made to the Mat-Su area:
 - District 25 was included in the rural Mat-Su district as the Mat-Su Borough is underpopulated by 20 percent, but there is no population available to grab from in the south and west and the borough boundary to the north was already breached once. This leaves the last option of including Valdez to meet the population target. Additionally, there is Alaska Supreme Court precedence that states it is permissible to connect Valdez with the Mat-Su.
 - District 30 was mapped beginning with the premise of keeping Houston, Wasilla, and Palmer whole. Houston, Big Lake, and Point Mackenzie were included as census-designated areas. The district deviation is 2.94 percent. This district was mapped based on borough boundaries and the naturally occurring boundaries.
 - District 29 includes Wasilla and Meadow Lakes. Because Wasilla does not have enough population to create its own district, Meadow Lakes was added to create a total deviation of 1.76 percent. The mapping was based on naturally occurring boundaries.
 - District 28 includes Palmer, Lazy Mountain, and Butte. This district has the highest deviation (within the constitutional bounds) in the Palmer-Wasilla borough at 4.04

- percent due to highly populated census-designated areas along the Palmer-Wasilla Highway.
- District 27 has Copper Creek, Cottonwood and the railroad. Used railroad and existing precincts as the boundaries. Deviation is 1.3 percent based on naturally occurring geographic dividers and transportation corridors.
 - District 26 is Palmer-Wasilla Gateway, outside of Palmer and Wasilla. Wanted to respect the boundaries and respect those who chose not to live within the city limits. Used Wasilla and major transportation corridors as boundaries. Shaped that way to the west due to city boundaries.
 - The following changes were made to Southeast Alaska:
 - When looking at the region, Southeast Alaska has enough population for 3.94 legislative seats and is underpopulated by about 1,100 Alaskans for 4 districts. Ms. Borromeo placed half of the population into District 1 for compact, contiguous, and socio-economically integrated reasons. School districts were used as major connectors, and it was noted that the Southeast Island School District is split by design. Overall, there is a 2.4 percent deviation for the following reasons: Keeping Prince of Wales communities intact, following naturally occurring geographic boundaries, and avoiding the same mistake that was addressed in the Hickel v. Southeast Conference case where the Alexander Archipelago was split in an unconstitutional manner.
 - District 2 includes Yakutat, Prince of Wales Island communities, Sitka (the hub), and Petersburg, which is included to meet the population target and achieve compactness and contiguity. School districts were used as connectors.
 - There are two diverse options for Alaskans to choose from when it comes to District 3 as there have been opposite pieces of feedback heard from Skagway residents on where they prefer to be coupled with. The goal of mapping this district was to keep the city and borough of Juneau whole. Haines and Skagway were included as they both heavily rely on tourism – like Downtown Juneau.
 - The following changes were made to Anchorage:
 - The map drawing of Anchorage was approached with a goal of keeping the municipal boundaries intact and considering public testimony asking to keep East Anchorage and South Anchorage separated.
 - Roadways were used as barriers all over Anchorage.
 - District 9 includes Whittier, Girdwood, and Potter's Marsh, using major roadways as barriers. The main population anchor is in Potter's Marsh.
 - District 10 includes Oceanview and is drawn in a way that keeps Campbell Lake intact, giving the benefit of having a compact area in the community.
 - District 11 keeps the entire Campbell Lake whole.
 - District 12 includes Turnagain and the Ted Stevens International Airport as a result of the feedback given from several residents on the importance of keeping Turnagain with the airport. Ms. Borromeo noted that this area of Anchorage has changed the most within the last ten years as a large sized subdivision was placed into Sand Lake; this has transformed the look of Anchorage dramatically which is why some districts appear to be very different.
 - With several Spenard residents requesting to be kept as a separate district from the Turnagain and downtown areas, District 13 was drawn to achieve this.
 - District 14 encompasses the midtown part of Anchorage. The boundary is jagged due to the shape of the census block.
 - District 16 looks large due to the large park area but is not high in population density.
 - District 17 is the U-Med District that is bound by the University, Providence, and Alaska Native Medical Center as a socio-economic integration point. The puzzle piece shape of the district is a natural occurrence of the geography of Anchorage's parks and trails systems.

- District 18 is comprised of Nunaka Valley and SE Anchorage with Debarr split.
- District 19 is comprised of Penland Parkway and Mountain View with the middle fork of Chester Creek. The board has heard public testimony that Mountain View is a distinct community and this map respects that feedback.
- District 20 is comprised of Merrill Field and Chester Creek. The district is large and irregular in shape due to the way the airport is drawn and the naturally occurring geographic shapes.
- District 21 is comprised of the port and base areas. Even though testimony was heard from the public about the base being divided between their gates, the base remains united. Ms. Borromeo referenced the Groh v. Egan caselaw that states that military members are transient and are likely to exercise residency in other states. The map is drawn in respect to the feedback given from Anchorage residents to keep East Anchorage separated from the base communities.
- District 22 looks like two large districts due to the significant amount of park lands, which are not populated by a high number of residents.
- District 23 is comprised of Northeast Anchorage and remains compact.
- District 24 is comprised of the South Eagle River district. Though there was an attempt to keep the urban rural concept of the district, this concept was abandoned to keep the districts more compact and contiguous.
- Overall, Anchorage's deviation is low, and districts are compact in nature.
- Ms. Borromeo noted that the state's demographer and the Alaska Redistricting Board staff helped her with this map drawing. No third-party organizations were contacted, nor did they contact Ms. Borromeo regarding mapping.

Adoption of Maps for Inclusion in Public Outreach Tour

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Marcum moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt the following proposed districting plans: Board Proposed Plan Version 3 as discussed September 20, 2021 to replace Board Composite Version 1 originally adopted September 9, 2021 and Board Proposed Plan Version 4 as discussed September 20, 2021 to replace Board Composite Version 2 originally adopted September 9, 2021.

Ms. Borromeo seconded the motion and proposed an amendment to the motion to add that Alaska Redistricting Board staff review the census blocks primarily in the Mat-Su region for outliers, make corrections as necessary, and notify the board of all changes made to the map.

There were no objections to the amended motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Bahnke moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt, as a proposed redistricting plan, the proposal submitted by the coalition of Doyon, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Fairbanks Native Association, Sealaska, and Ahtna as presented on September 17, 2021.

Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Bahnke moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt, as a proposed redistricting plan, the proposal submitted by the Alaska Democratic Party as presented on September 17, 2021.

Mr. Binkley seconded the motion.

The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Simpson moved to rescind the action in adopting the Alaska Democratic Party plan.

Ms. Borrromeo seconded the motion.

The board discussed the motion:

- Ms. Borrromeo expressed opposition to the proposed plan by the Alaska Democratic Party due to the way the Kenai Peninsula, Northwest Arctic, and North Slope boroughs were sliced. Ms. Borrromeo believes there are other third-party plans that have mapped these regions in a better way.
- Mr. Binkley agreed with Ms. Borrromeo's statement.
- Ms. Marcum agreed with Ms. Borrromeo's statement and noted that it may be best to limit the number of plans being adopted as there have been many opportunities for the public to comment and testify regarding the proposed plans to date.
- Ms. Bahnke expressed support for the Alaska Democratic Party's proposed plan and all other plans proposed by third parties. Further, Ms. Bahnke noted that not all Alaskans have had the opportunity to give feedback and/or comments on the proposed maps by the board and third parties and expressed the importance of giving all Alaskans an opportunity to weigh in on all proposed plans.
- Mr. Binkley agreed with Ms. Bahnke and opposed the rescinding of the motion.

The motion passed with 3 to 2 votes and the original motion was rescinded.

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Bahnke moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt, as a proposed redistricting plan, the proposal submitted by Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting as presented on September 17, 2021.

Ms. Borrromeo seconded the motion.

Ms. Marcum clarified that, although Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting has created updated versions of the map after presenting to the board on September 17, 2021, the board will be adopting the version of the proposed map as presented to the board on September 17, 2021 as the changes were not submitted in time to be included in the board's meeting packet.

Mr. Torkelson noted that the Senate Minority Caucus submitted changes to their map which have been included in the board's meeting packet.

Ms. Borrromeo noted that although the Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting has presented a map with problematically proposed districts in much of rural Alaska, there is some concern about the overall map. However, because the map is supported by the Mat-Su Borough, the map should be moved forward for the board's consideration and for public testimony.

Mr. Simpson expressed support for the proposal.

The motion passed unanimously.

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Bahnke moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt, as a proposed redistricting plan, the proposal submitted by Alaskans for Fair Redistricting as presented on September 17, 2021.

Ms. Marcum seconded the motion.

Mr. Simpson and Ms. Marcum expressed support for the proposal.

The motion passed unanimously.

In accordance with Alaska Constitution Article VI, Section 10, Ms. Bahnke moved for the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt, as a proposed redistricting plan, the proposal submitted by the Senate Minority Caucus as presented on September 17, 2021 with the amendment requested in writing on September 19, 2021 which respects the Northwest Arctic Borough boundary.

Mr. Binkley seconded the motion.

Ms. Borromeo, Mr. Simpson, and Ms. Marcum expressed support for the proposal.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Anchorage resident, Brian Hove, expressed concern for the maps potentially breaking the Fairbanks North Star Borough boundary and one way to approach this region is to have a break down the southeast side down the highway.
- Anchorage resident, Robert Hockema, expressed concern about the plan submitted by Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting and noted that the districts are drawn to make the House majority coalition much less competitive. Mr. Hockema also noted that competitiveness is a factor the board should consider during the redistricting process.

Next Steps

The following next steps were identified:

- Staff will work to publish the adopted maps as soon as possible for public viewing.
- The public outreach tour will be held throughout October with 5 to 6 community visits per week. Mr. Torkelson requested that if any community would like the board to visit in-person or virtually, please submit the request to testimony@akredistrict.org.
- Mr. Torkelson noted that the tour must be completed by around November 1 as staff and the board will need time to collate the information and maps and have a final plan adopted by November 10, 2021.

Adjournment

Ms. Borromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

The board adjourned at 3:06 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
November 2, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
November 3 – 4, 2021
Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room,
1st Floor, 1500 W. Benson Blvd, Anchorage, AK 99503

The Alaska Redistricting Board met from November 2 to November 4, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Juli Lucky	Staff Member
Matt Singer	Legal Counsel

Agenda

- Call to Order & Establish Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Adoption of Minutes
- Public Testimony
- Executive Session with Legal Counsel
- Voting Rights Act Compliance in 2020 Proposed Plans
- Review of Sept 16 Census Physical Delivery Data
- Public Hearing Tour Summary
- Review & Discussion: Tasks Ahead, Key Decisions
- Mapping Work Session
- Adopt Final Redistricting Map
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Chairman Binkley called the meeting to order on November 2, 2021 at 9:05 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Adoption of Agenda

Member Marcum moved to amend the agenda to have the "Adoption of Minutes" item moved to the November 5th Board meeting. Member Borromeo seconded the motion.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The motion passed unanimously.

Member Bahnke moved to adopt the amended agenda. Member Borromeo seconded the motion.

Peter Torkelson noted that the board will enter executive session at 10:30 a.m. and expects the session to end at about 12:00 p.m. unless members have additional questions, the session will extend longer. After the executive session, lunch will take place and then the board will enter back into public session at 1:00 p.m.

The motion passed unanimously.

Public Testimony

Public comment was given as follows:

- Alaskan for Fair and Equitable Redistricting (AFFER) representative, Randy Ruedrich, stated that he has submitted evidence at a prior public hearing that lists the average deviations of specific areas that the Supreme Court urged the 2002 Alaska Redistricting Board to reduce. That board reduced deviations in municipalities and boroughs, specifically in Fairbanks where the deviation was significantly reduced. The current overpopulation in Fairbanks is significant compared to the ideal district size in 2002. Mr. Ruedrich advocated for the deviation to be minimized everywhere to achieve full representation. Additionally, Mr. Ruedrich noted that the AFFER map includes, not only the Denali Borough and the Mat-Su Valley to justify 6 seats, but the map also adds the Glennallen precinct and some nearby population to achieve a full 6 units of population for a near zero population deviation. The map presented in Fairbanks draws a northside district and goes east to west; this northside district should be a competitive district and leaves 21% of the population to be included in District 5, which is the rural Athabascan village district that has been discussed in prior comments.
- Representative Matt Claman noted that the 1998 amendment to the Alaska Constitution changed the language on deviation which impacts how the Board does its work to bring the deviation number as low as possible. Additionally, Representative Claman noted that population deviation should be the starting point and then socioeconomic integration. Rep. Claman highlighted Cordova and stated that there is a Supreme Court Case that suggests it should not pair with Southeast Alaska (noting this opinion was written when there was a change in the ferry system causing a major social and political issue), but this may have changed since and the Board should consider grouping Cordova with Southeast Alaska since they are socioeconomically integrated.
- Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (AFFR) representatives, Robin O'Donoghue and David Dunsmore, stated that AFFR submitted a report that includes a summary of public comments through November 1, 2021. They found that the AFFR map had the most statewide support and was supported by most regions, except the southwest, western, and the Aleutians regions. It was noted that there were 5 comments in support of Mary Jackson's conceptual map; this was excluded from their report. AFFR analyzed the six mapping options and detailed issues on the constitutionality of those plans and how the plans break borough



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

boundaries. The updated third-party plans were not analyzed, only the originally submitted plans were analyzed. Comments on the Voting Rights Act were included. AFFR did not submit any updated versions of their map, but they did include two modifications for technical amendments that they would make if the Board chose to adopt their map. AFFR asked the Board to give the public ample time to review and comment on the Senate pairings and to continue taking public comment during map drawing sessions through the final adoption day.

- Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (AFFR) representative, David Dunsmore, recited a *Hickel v. Southeast Conference* citation: “We recognize that it may be necessary to divide a borough so that its excess population is allocated to a district situated elsewhere. However, where possible, all of a municipality’s excess population should go to one other district in order to maximize effective representation of the excess group.” And stated that in 2011 cases, the court extended that similarly to the City of Fairbanks because they are a city within a borough with a large population. The AFFR map is the only map that has achieved this in a contiguous, compact, and socioeconomically integrated way. There was one area where a borough was divided twice while other plans do this two to three times. David Dunsmore outlined the two modifications made to their map: 1) Within the city and borough of Yakutat, the portions that were west of the Canadian border were inadvertently put into the Gulf Coast district instead of the southeast district. There is no population, but the intent was for the entire Yakutat Borough to be in a single district. 2) Within Anchorage, a portion of Elmore Road was inadvertently placed into District 14 instead of District 17. There is no population in this area. Additionally, AFFR asks the Board to consider the following amendments: 1) Move Nunam Iqua to District 38 instead of District 39 as the people of Nunam Iqua have close familial and cultural ties to people in the villages of Emmonak and Alakanuk. The intent behind using the Yukon River as a boundary was to maximize as much of the Calista Region in the same Senate district and to be responsive of Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay wanting to be in the same district as Bethel, but because Nunam Iqua has closer ties to the villages on the other side of the river than Scammon Bay, Hooper Bay, or Chevak, this amendment is reasonable for the Board to consider. This would provide better deviations for both districts. 2) In Southeast Alaska, move the portions of Prince of Wales Island that are currently in District 4 into District 2, and move the portions of Admiralty Island currently in District 2 into District 4. This amendment would result in all of Admiralty Island being in one district with Downtown Juneau, Douglas, and Petersburg Borough and would allow all of Prince of Wales Island, except for Thorne Bay, to be in a single district. AFFR does not believe it is possible to draw constitutional districts that do not put at least a portion of Prince of Wales Island within the Ketchikan District due to the population math and Thorne Bay is the most appropriate place on the island due to their close socioeconomic links to Ketchikan through the interisland ferry service. This amendment would make the district slightly more compact, but also slightly increases the plan deviation by about 30 people. David Dunsmore reviewed some regions where AFFR believes that the record has clearly demonstrated that the AFFR plan most recognizes the socioeconomic integration of the state and the desires expressed by Alaskans in public testimony.
- Anchorage resident, Brian Hove, voiced support for Board Map v.4 and AFFR’s map for the way the maps draw West Anchorage.

Executive Session with Legal Counsel



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Member Bahnke moved for the board to enter executive session under Alaska Statute (AS) 44.62.310 (c)(3) and (AS) 44.62.310(c)(4) respectively involving matters which by law, municipal charter or ordinance are required to be confidential and matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Member Marcum seconded the motion.

The board entered executive session at 10:48 a.m.

The board exited executive session at 1:11 p.m.

Voting Rights Act Compliance in 2020 Proposed Plans

The board received consultancy from its Voting Rights Act consultants, Bruce Adelson and Dr. Jonathan Katz, to ensure that the board is compliant with the Voting Rights Act. The board's legal counsel, Matt Singer, summarized the findings of the Voting Rights Act consultants and highlighted the following:

- Staff and legal counsel are preparing a Voting Rights Act report that will detail their analysis. Once the board adopts a plan, the report will be finalized and issued.
- The Voting Rights Act has been part of Alaska redistricting since its passage in 1965. Until the current cycle, the redistricting plan has been subject to pre-clearance review by the Department of Justice. The United States Supreme Court struck down the pre-clearance process in 2013, but the subsequent requirements of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act continue to apply to the board's work.
- The Voting Rights Act requires that if there is a geographic area in which a minority population can theoretically hold a 50% or greater population and is politically cohesive, and if there is racial block voting, the board has an obligation to ensure that its districts do not minimize or harm the minority group's ability to elect candidates of its choice.
- After the board adopted proposed plans, Dr. Katz conducted a racially polarized voting analysis of Alaskan districts between 2014 and 2020 to determine if there is statistical evidence that Alaska voting may be racially polarized in some circumstances. This analysis and statistical work concluded that racially polarized voting does occur in some rural districts; a report is available to the public for viewing. The conclusion of this work is the following:
 - Districts 37 through 40 are protected by the Voting Rights Act. It is important that the final maps continue to protect the ability of Alaska voters to elect candidates of their choice.
 - Board Map v.3 was analyzed as a test to determine if any modifications may be required to the plan considered; it was concluded that it does not require any modifications as there is sufficient Alaska Native voting age population in Districts 37 through 40 to protect the ability of the minority group to select candidates of their choice.
 - It was noted that some of the districts have a very high population of Alaska Native voting populations. In the Voting Rights Act, there could be two concerns: "cracking" and "packing". Cracking is diluting the vote of a minority group by spreading it across multiple districts thereby minimizing the ability of the minority group to elect candidates of its choice. Packing occurs when minorities are packed into one district



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- resulting in their inability to influence the outcome of elections in other districts.
- After investigating the possibility of drawing a fifth Alaska Native controlled district, it was concluded that a fifth district could not be drawn due to various reasons. One reason is that the Alaska population is distributed to have high densities of Alaska Native populations in a ribbon along the coast. The population numbers would not allow for the creation of a fifth district.
 - It was observed that Anchorage has neighborhoods that are increasingly diverse with non-white voters; this is an emerging trend. The distribution of population in Anchorage was reviewed. For example, in House District 19, 33.4% of voters identify as White, 9% identify as two or more races, 14.2% identify as Asian, 12.5% identify as Hispanic, 12.4% identify as Alaska Native or Indian, 9% identify as Black or African American, and 9% identify as Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, .4 or .5% identify as some other race. Therefore, there is a very diverse population of voters in this community and in several other neighborhoods particularly in Northeast Anchorage. Observing this, a Voting Rights Act analysis was done to determine if the “Gingles factors” are met, which means that the minority coalition has a 50% or greater voting age population, is politically cohesive, and practices racial block voting. In conclusion, there was no statistical evidence to support that there is political cohesion among the diverse neighborhoods in Anchorage or that there is racial block voting.
 - There will be a detailed written report of all the findings once the Board draws its final Anchorage map.
 - In conclusion, legal counsel encourages the Board to continue its focus on the redistricting factors set forth in the Alaska Constitution. The Voting Rights Act consultants and legal counsel confirm that the Voting Rights Act does not dictate any alteration to the currently considered plans by the Board. The final plan will undergo a Voting Rights Act review. Any arising concerns will be brought to the Board’s attention immediately.

Review of Sept 16 Census Physical Delivery Data

Peter Torkelson reviewed the census data with the intention of showing the Board and the public how it is certain that the data being mapped is the exact and only data that the Census Bureau intended to provide the state. This exercise must be completed as the Census Bureau chose to release its data through a link on their website first.

Peter Torkelson highlighted the following:

- At the time, the data downloaded on the Census Bureau’s website was the only data that staff had available to work through. The data was validated, cross-checked with the Department of Labor, and uploaded into the software. Districts proceeded to be mapped using this data.
- Upon physical delivery of the Census Bureau data, Mr. Torkelson and Mr. Presley signed for and examined the package which included a DVD and thumb drive copies of the data.
- When the data is unzipped, the file structure is the same as the file downloaded from the Census Bureau’s website.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- To further confirm that the downloaded data is the same as the data provided in the physical package, hashing, a process that compares two electronic messages to ensure that they are precisely the same, was completed. This is a mature and reliable process in cryptography. The current hashing standard was published by the Department of Commerce titled "FIPS PUB-180-4".
- Through the hashing process, there is a mathematical function that compares the files and is designed to detect even the smallest changes that are then expressed as a different digital fingerprint.
- Upon completion of comparing the fingerprints of all data files, it was concluded that the hashes are identical. Therefore, staff have confidence that the Board is mapping with Alaska population numbers that the Census Bureau published for Alaska.

Public Hearing Tour Summary

Peter Torkelson gave a brief overview of the public hearing tour and highlighted the following:

- Six proposed plans were adopted, and the plans were taken to every tour location for the public to view and give public testimony on.
- Due to weather challenges, the Board was unable to travel to Dutch Harbor.
- The following locations were visited during the public hearing tour: Juneau, Haines, Sitka, Valdez, Anchorage (2 hearings), Kotzebue, Ketchikan, Petersburg, Wrangell, Nome, Seward, Homer, Kenai, Kodiak, Delta Junction, Fairbanks, Bethel, Dillingham, Palmer, Wasilla, Cordova, and Utqiagvik.
- Considering the rise in COVID-19 cases, the Board held two 6-hour statewide call-in sessions to allow all Alaskans to dial in to provide public testimony.
- A couple of "Meet the Maps" virtual sessions were held where the public received a walkthrough of the maps on the Board's website.
- Some statistics were shared including that there were 63 hours of public testimony and 1,788 pages of written testimony, and hundreds of Alaskans generously offering food, transportation, and encouragement to the board.

Review & Discussion: Tasks Ahead, Key Decisions

Peter Torkelson reiterated that the Voting Rights Act analysis is incomplete as the board does not have a complete map yet. The Voting Rights Act discussion will be ongoing as the Board moves through the final days of the map drawing process.

Peter Torkelson strongly recommended that the board adopt a final map by November 5, 2021 considering that there are a number of requirements to address on the days following the adoption of the final map. The Alaska Constitution requires that a final map must be adopted by or on November 10, 2021.

The following tasks and key decisions lie ahead:

- Mr. Sandberg, with the Department of Labor, must write metes and bounds for 40 districts.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- The Board was contacted by several GIS Departments of various municipalities of local governments expressing concern that some of the lines drawn bisected properties and some structures; this is not wanted in the final map. The Board has been working with several GIS Departments who will take the shape files, run them through their local GIS system, and help the board identify any lines that bisect properties and structures.
- Senate pairings must be chosen. & Senate terms and election cycle must be chosen. To do this, a Core Constituency Report must be run to identify the percentage of voters that have voted in the previous Senate district. Considering the Core Constituency report, the board must determine what percentage change constitutes a substantial change, which would require that senate seat to be subject to election in the next cycle and could result in truncation of the current term – where a senate term would be cut short. The board not only must decide which seats must run again regardless of when they're due to run, but they also must assign all the seats laid out in a table which shows the election cycle each seat will belong on.
- From a legal standpoint, the adoption of the final map will not be complete until the official proclamation has been adopted.

Peter Torkelson recommended that the Board move to the Alaska Redistricting Office beginning November 3, 2021 to begin the map drawing work session and to begin drafting a final map that reflects the legal requirements set forth by the Alaska Constitution and the public testimony given. Upon completion of the map drawing work session, Peter Torkelson recommended that the Board return to the LIO to hold a formal public session to explain the rationale behind the final map and formally adopt the map. Peter Torkelson noted that the map drawing work session is open to the public and recommended that the Board take public testimony on the morning of November 5, 2021 and specifically for Senate pairings.

After discussion, the Board agreed on the plan recommended by staff and to begin the map drawing work session immediately.

Public Testimony

Public testimony was given as follows:

- Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (AFFR) representative, David Dunsmore, testified regarding the Voting Rights Act memo issued by the Board and stated that there is evidence of racially polarized voting in East Anchorage and North Anchorage. AFFR concurs with the conclusion of the analysis for rural Alaska. Mr. Dunsmore suggested that the Board ask its Voting Rights Act consultants to supplement the report with information on how Proposition 2, which changes the threshold with which a candidate can win an election, would interplay with the Voting Rights Act analysis.

Mapping Work Session

The board entered a mapping work session on at 2:12 p.m.

The board entered recess on November 2, 2021 at 5:00 p.m.

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The Board returned from recess on November 3, 2021 at 9am and entered a mapping work session

The Board entered recess on November 3, 2021 at 4pm

The Board returned from recess on November 4, 2021 at 9am and entered a mapping work session

The Board entered recess on November 4, 2021 at 4pm



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

**Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
November 5, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
Alaska Redistricting Board Office, 3901 Old Seward Highway, Suite 141,
Anchorage, AK 99503**

The Alaska Redistricting Board met on November 5, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Juli Lucky	Staff Member
Matt Singer	Legal Counsel

Agenda

- Call to Order & Establish Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Adoption of Minutes
- Public Testimony
- Executive Session with Legal Counsel
- Voting Rights Act Compliance in 2020 Proposed Plans
- Review of Sept 16 Census Physical Delivery Data
- Public Hearing Tour Summary
- Review & Discussion: Tasks Ahead, Key Decisions
- Mapping Work Session
- Adopt Final Redistricting Map
- Adjournment

Mapping Work Session

The board exited recess and entered a mapping work session at 9:00 a.m.

Member Simpson moved for the Board to enter executive session for the purpose of receiving legal advice under Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) and AS 44.62.310(c)(4) respectively involving matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential and matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Member Bahnke seconded the motion.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The board entered executive session at 9:05 a.m.

The board exited executive session and entered back into a mapping work session at 10:40 a.m.

The board exited the mapping work session at 12:26 p.m.

Public Testimony

Public testimony was given as follows:

- Scenic Foothills Community Council member and representative, Yarrow Silvers, read a resolution that was passed by the Scenic Foothills Community Council: "Now therefore it be resolved that the Scenic Foothills Community Council recommends that the redistricting board bring the new state redistricting plan into closer alignment with local neighborhood boundaries, including East Anchorage, and not split off part of the socioeconomically distinct East Anchorage neighborhoods, including the Scenic Foothills Community Council neighborhood, Eagle River, or a South Anchorage district which are socioeconomically distinct from East Anchorage especially done in the current proposed Board Map v.3 around the Muldoon curve." This resolution passed on November 4, 2021 with 18 votes in favor and 0 opposed. Although it was too late to make changes to the recently passed resolution the night before, the Council was shown the newly revised working maps and many Council members spoke strongly in favor of Board Map v.4 Best.
- Anchorage resident, Yarrow Silvers, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best, as it is more compact, respects socioeconomic boundaries, has acceptable deviations, considers public testimony, unlikely to violate the Voting Rights Act, and preserves the voices of racially diverse communities in East Anchorage. Yarrow expressed concerns about Board Map v.1 being analyzed for Voting Rights Act violations in the last mapping work session but was still "on the table" this morning with changes being made to the map. Although the map was adjusted during the current date's mapping work session, much of Anchorage is "still chopped up", districts have been created that "look like snakes", and natural socioeconomic boundaries are not respected. In particular, District 20 remains strangely divided with part of the district in a South Anchorage district. This option feels disingenuous and raises many questions.
- Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (AFFR) representative, Joelle Hall, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4. Additionally, Joelle suggested that a record be made on what did and did not work well in this process so that participants of the next redistricting cycle can benefit from the experiences of those who worked in this redistricting cycle.
- Anchorage resident, Felisa Wilson, expressed concern about last minute changes being made to the maps about 1 hour prior to public testimony taking place. The integrity of Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) and the minority districts around Muldoon, Northeast Anchorage, and Mountain View are best represented in Board Map v.4 Best.
- Spenard Community Council member and representative, Tahnee Conte-Seccareccia, read a resolution passed by the Spenard Community Council: "Whereas, the current boundaries in Spenard Community Council consist of 3 House districts and 3 Senate districts which makes it difficult and burdensome for the Council, and all volunteer entities, to coordinate on state projects and issues that directly affect Spenard. Now therefore be it resolved that the



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Spenard Community Council recommends that the redistricting board bring the new state redistricting plan into closer alignment with local neighborhood boundaries including the Spenard Community Council boundaries and the slightly expounded boundaries contained in the Spenard corridor plan.” This resolution was unanimously approved by the Spenard Community Council on October 6, 2021.

- West Anchorage resident, Tahnee Conte-Seccareccia, expressed concern about the recent changes made to maps and the limited time for public testimony to be given at the current public session. Tahnee spoke against Board Map v.3 and urged the board to consider Board Map v.4 Best as there are straight lines in Board Map v.4 Best and respects the idea of compactness with apparent attempts of gerrymandering. Tahnee encouraged the board to think about fair and equal representation.
- AFFR Executive Director, Veri di Suvero, noted that the board entering executive session prior to public testimony can be burdensome on the public due to extended waiting periods causing some members of the public to no longer be able to give public testimony. Veri asked the board to provide the public with another opportunity to give public testimony on the maps. Veri spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best as her neighborhood, Westchester Lagoon, is more fully represented in this map.
- Northeast Community Council member and representative, Donna Mears, read the following statement: “Although my understanding is that community council boundaries are not necessarily a consideration for district boundaries, we believe they should be. Particularly in the case of Northeast Community Council where multiple map versions have and continue to split the north and eastern portions of our community, and Bartlett High School into an Eagle River district. My experience as a Northeast Community Council board member over the last couple years is that state and local representatives are very small portions of our council district rarely, if ever, show up. This is important. In Anchorage, the most consistent and accessible opportunity for constituents to interact with the representatives is at community council meetings; this is the place where our work is done both for representatives and the community. From our perspective, in Northeast Anchorage, community boundaries are more important than a slightly larger population deviation as it provides better access to our representatives. Again, Bartlett should be in a district with families it serves and Northeast Anchorage residents should be paired with their neighbors.” Donna stated that the Northeast Community Council met on October 21, 2021 and they do not have a statement on the most current maps, but from Donna’s personal perspective, Board Map v.4 Best reflects the Northeast Community Council’s desires.
- Fairbanks North Star Borough resident, Robin O’Donoghue, strongly opposes taking the excess population in Goldstream Valley to populate the rural interior district as Goldstream Valley is essentially the suburbs of Fairbanks about 10-15 minutes out of town and is very highly socioeconomically integrated with the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. In Robin’s experience, the people of Goldstream Valley live, work, and play in the University of Alaska-Fairbanks area. Additionally, Robin pointed out that, while the Board did recognize the resolution passed by the Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly, which requested the boundary to be broken, the board did not fully recognize other parts of the resolution which requested for communities in the Borough to remain together. Placing Goldstream Valley into the greater interior does not respect the request of the Borough. Robin spoke in favor of the AFFR map’s representation of Fairbanks.
- AFFR representative, David Dunsmore, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best as it is most



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

aligned with the constitutional mandates and with AFFR's process in Anchorage of trying to ensure that communities of interest and distinct neighborhoods, to the maximum extent possible, are represented. David listed the following reasons why Board Map v.4 Best is the preferred map: 1) East Anchorage, in Board Map v.3 Alt. has odd ways in which it divides the neighborhoods of East Anchorage. 2) A portion of the Chugach Foothills subdivision along the Muldoon Road curve is placed in a district with the Huffman/O'Malley neighborhood; this is likely unconstitutional as it is a large corridor of land with no population and there are no dwelling units connecting the Chugach Foothills to the Huffman/O'Malley area. In addition to differing income levels between the two neighborhoods, both neighborhoods have nothing in common in terms of legislative needs for their neighborhoods. 3) Board Map v.4 Best creates logical South Anchorage districts that are separated from East Anchorage. 4) West Anchorage is better represented under Board Map v.4 Best. 5) One of the main problems with Board Map v.3 Alt. is that District 15 puts 3 distinct population centers into one district whereas Board Map v.4 Best has districts that are much more reasonably compact.

- Anchorage resident, Chris Nelson, stated that JBER includes military retirees and military families who live off-post in the areas adjacent to JBER. Chris Nelson stated that Board Map v.3 Alt. best suits the retiree community and military families who live adjacent to the base.
- Fairbanks resident, Savannah Fletcher, expressed concern about Goldstream Valley not being joined with the group it is most socioeconomically similar with. Savannah spoke in opposition of placing Goldstream Valley with the interior community as it is an inaccurate reflection of the Goldstream community. Communities such as Tok and Salcha make more sense to combine with the rural interior community. Additionally, Savannah expressed frustration for the public testimony process, particularly for people who have to get to back to work.
- Fairbanks resident, Kasey Casort, expressed frustration for the challenges the public had in giving public testimony during the current session. Additionally, Kasey spoke in favor of keeping Goldstream grouped with communities like Ester, Chena Pump, Chena Ridge, and the University of Alaska-Fairbanks.
- Calista Corporation representative, Andrew Guy, stated that the state and federal factors for the process are given much weight, but not cultural factors; this is what is detrimental to the Calista region. Since the 1980's, Calista has been split into multiple districts. Calista experiences the highest rates of infection and death due to COVID-19. Representation equals money, and Calista has been losing out on this for decades. The cumulative effect of these decades has resulted in one of the worst COVID-19 circumstances in rural Alaska. Calista has always given its population to other districts; they are hoping to be able to finally have a voice for the people in their region.
- Ester resident, Bryan Whitten, stated that the Goldstream community is a critical part of the Fairbanks community, particularly on the west end. It also mainly supports the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Board Map v.3 breaks Goldstream into other rural communities. Bryan requested that the Board reconsider redistricting Goldstream with rural communities.
- Anchorage resident, Erin Willahan, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best. Unlike Board Map v.3, which separates the contiguous neighborhoods of Mountain View into 3 and Fairview into 2. Board Map v.4 Best is more compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated. Board Map v.3 poses the possibility of gerrymandering and unequal representation.
- Fairbanks resident, John Perreault, spoke in opposition of Goldstream Valley being separated from Fairbanks as it is socioeconomically integrated with the rest of the Fairbanks



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

North Star Borough where their homes, jobs, schools, friends, and family are.

- Ester resident, Nicole Eisemam, stated that Goldstream Valley residents share strong socioeconomic ties with Ester, Chena Pump, Chena Ridge, and the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. The communities on the west side of Fairbanks should share representation. Nicole spoke against Goldstream being grouped with rural interior communities. Nicole suggested grouping Tok, Delta Junction, Salcha, Harding Lake, and Eilson together. Nicole expressed frustration for the Board spending much of the current session on the Anchorage community.
- Fairbanks resident, Alyssa Clinton, spoke against Goldstream being grouped with communities along the Yukon. Taking Eielson and Salcha away from North Pole and placing North Pole with Fairbanks does not make sense. Alyssa spoke in favor of the AFFR map as it best represents the socioeconomic, racial, and cultural ties in the interior communities.
- Alaska Black Caucus President and CEO, Celeste Hodge-Growden, expressed frustration on the public testimony process and spoke against the Anchorage map proposed by Board member Marcum as it sacrifices representation of the communities of color to ensure partisan power and puts parts of neighborhoods around the Muldoon curve into a South Anchorage district. East Anchorage is socioeconomically distinct from South Anchorage. Celeste spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best as it respects neighborhood boundaries, does not split East Anchorage into Eagle River and South Anchorage, and provides for better representation.
- Fairbanks resident, Kelvin Rogers, expressed frustration with the public testimony process and the newly revised maps not being posted on the website. Kelvin spoke in favor of grouping Goldstream with the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Kelvin spoke against Board Map v.3.
- Fairbanks resident, Luke Hopkins, recited the resolution recently passed by the Fairbanks North Star Borough: "Whereas, existing communities of interest should be represented based on city boundaries, geographical proximity, and interconnected neighborhoods that share concerns, interests and values... Now therefore be it resolved, to further request contiguous and compact districts that keep communities of interest together." Luke spoke against Goldstream Valley being redistricted with rural interior communities and against North Pole being redistricted with Fairbanks. Overall, Luke agrees with other Fairbanks residents' testimonies.
- Fairbanks resident, Elyse Guttenberg, expressed frustration with the public testimony process, the newly revised maps not being posted on the website, and with much of the current session being spent on Anchorage. Elyse spoke against Goldstream being separated from Fairbanks to be redistricted with rural interior communities.
- Fairbanks resident, Jacqueline Debevec, spoke against Goldstream being separated from Fairbanks and redistricted with rural interior communities and against North Pole being grouped with Fairbanks.
- Fairbanks resident, Peter Miller, spoke against separating Goldstream from Fairbanks as Goldstream residents work and recreate in Fairbanks. Goldstream deserves to have representation and separating Goldstream from Fairbanks would result in unfair representation. Peter expressed frustration for the public testimony process and long wait times to testify.
- Juneau resident, Bill Moser, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best and spoke against Board Map v.3. Bill noted that Board Map v.3 should be discounted at this point in the process.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Fairbanks resident, David Guttenberg, stated that the board is repeating the drawing of a map that has been declared unconstitutional in 2010 by breaking up socioeconomic boundaries and disenfranchising communities statewide, thus forcing underrepresentation. The proclaimed map in 2013 has the best representation of Fairbanks.
- Anchorage resident, Alex Baker, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best as it is the best map for his neighborhood in Fairview.
- Representative Zack Fields expressed concern for Board Map v.3 as it has not been publicly vetted and is less compact than Board Map v.4. Board Map v.3 also seems to be an attempt at partisan gerrymandering. The Senate Minority Caucus map does a better job at having low deviations than Board Map v.3. Rep. Zack Fields spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best as he can conclude that the person who drew the map was not knowledgeable of incumbents' places of residence, the partisanship in different precincts, and was very cognizant of Anchorage's distinct neighborhoods.
- Chugiak resident, Kelli Toth, stated that many Chugiak residents live and work on JBER. Kelli spoke in favor of Board Map v.3. because it would integrate Chugiak, Eagle River, and JBER together as opposed to districting Chugiak with the Mat-Su Valley.
- Anchorage resident, Kendra Kloster, spoke to the diversity of East Anchorage and highly recommended that East Anchorage communities be kept together. Kendra spoke in favor of Board Map v.4 Best. Kendra encouraged the board to listen to community residents as they know their homelands best.
- Doyon Redistricting Coalition representative, Tanner Amdur-Clark, addressed the following points: 1) Grouping Chevak, Hooper Bay, and Scammon Bay with a Bethel district is unfeasible and is not worth the board's time as it is impossible to group these communities together in a way that creates socioeconomic integration. 2) Board Map v.4. best represents Fairbanks. 3) Based off the feedback given to the Doyon Coalition from Anchorage community councils, Board Map v.4. best aligns with Anchorage.
- Eagle River resident, Jamie Allard, stated that there are many military personnel who live in Eagle River and are connected with Northeast Anchorage and the JBER communities. Most individuals who live in JBER are in the same district and attend Bartlett High School, Eagle River High School, or Chugiak High School. Jamie has spoken to many community members who disagree with Eagle Exit. Eagle River residents conduct business in East Anchorage by stopping to purchase gas or dinner, and to work. Eagle River students attend Anchorage School District schools and Eagle River is represented by the Anchorage Assembly. Splitting Eagle River and redistricting them with Mat-Su Anchorage would take representation away from Eagle River.
- Deltana resident, James Squyres, asked the board to not leave his community out as a "leftover district" and to apply the same effort of compactness, if not more, to District 36.
- Fairbanks resident, David James, spoke against grouping Goldstream Valley with rural interior communities as these communities are socioeconomically distinct from one another. Goldstream should be included with Fairbanks and should be treated as such.
- Fairbanks resident, Sue Sherif, expressed disappointment for the public not being able to view the newly revised Fairbanks maps as it makes public testimony difficult. Sue is a current resident of District 6 and knows what it is like to be in a district that is not associated with the place where she does her business and recreates. It would make more sense for the east area of Fairbanks to be part of an interior district than it would for Goldstream Valley to be part of an interior district.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Clergy Advocacy Board Planned Parenthood representative, Kristen Peters, asked the board to not divide or integrate communities in order to serve one's political agendas. Kristen urged the board to consider when the lines drawn turn into policies and ensure they are doing right by their neighbors. Kristen stated that Board Map v.3 takes Goldstream out of the communities it has connections to and integrates North Pole with Fairbanks, creating unfair representation for distinct communities. The map seems to be politically motivated rather than community-oriented. Kristen also expressed frustration for the public testimony process and for the Fairbanks revised maps not being posted on the board's website.
- Fairbanks resident, Gary Newman, asked the board to reconsider moving Northwest Fairbanks into District 36. The focus on Eielson being an economic engine fails to recognize the socioeconomic integration of the constitutional requirement as Eielson is a closed Air Force Base that cannot be accessed without valid reason through a gate. They have their own schools, recreations, social structure, and even their own power plant. This is nowhere close to being socially integrated into the Borough. By contrast, Goldstream Valley works, shops, and recreates in Fairbanks. Eielson Air Force Base residents are more likely to recreate (hunting and fishing) in the areas south of the Richardson. Logically, Eielson Air Force Base would be grouped best with District 36.
- Anchorage resident, Ann Brown, spoke in favor of Board Map v.3 for civilian and military populations.
- Anchorage resident, Lacey Hemming, spoke in favor of Board Map v.4. Best as it keeps the neighborhoods together with natural boundaries that follow the community councils in the area. Lacey spoke against the map drawn by Ms. Marcum as it places East Anchorage in Eagle River and the Muldoon curve in South Anchorage. Both communities are distinct socioeconomically. The map also silences the voices of East Anchorage residents and ignores the testimony given by Anchorage residents.
- Anchorage resident, Teresa Wrobel, noted that she currently lives in Anchorage but grew up in Fairbanks, specifically Goldstream Valley. Most Goldstream Valley residents have connections to the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Teresa spoke against Goldstream Valley being grouped with rural interior Alaska because it is a part of Fairbanks. Tok and Delta are also not connected to Goldstream.
- Wasilla resident, John Nelson, stated that it is important for the board to take into consideration the residents of each community and attempt to keep communities together. Separation of the Chugiak-Eagle River area is unfair. Both communities are likeminded, and they should remain together. It is discouraging to see the Denali district be connected into the Mat-Su Borough; they are separate and should be considered as such. John spoke in favor of Board Map v.3. and encouraged the Board to give the public more opportunity to give public comment after the current session given that the newly revised maps have not been uploaded to the website.
- Anchorage Community Land Trust Executive Director, Kirk Rose, stated he participates in many activities in Mountain View and Fairview and spoke in favor of these communities remaining whole and cohesive. There have been issues of representation impacting these communities for many years. For many years, both districts have only been represented by 1 Assemblymember while other districts have been represented by 2. Any maps that divide these communities is problematic for representation for these low-income and diverse communities.
- Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting representative, Randy Ruedrich, requested the



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

following on behalf of Calista: There is an issue with getting Calista villages into District 37. Calista has minimal impact in the state Senate as they are severely diluted with little to no influence. Allow some Calista villages (Platinum, Goodnews Bay, Chevak, etc.) to go into District 37 to allow them to build a small positive majority in that district. Additionally, Randy stated that it is unfortunate that those who testified today had not had a chance to see the newly revised Fairbanks map where full representation has been achieved. From testimony, there was an impression that only the far west side of the Borough is affected. The area assigned to District 36 goes over to the eastside.

- Delta Junction resident, Dawn Frazier, advocated for putting the military communities (Eielson Air Force Base, Fort Greeley, and Clear Air Force Base) together in one contiguous district. The horseshoe-shaped district that is currently there includes communities that are not socioeconomically integrated and is not compact.

Member Bahnke requested that the board receive legal counsel advice, particularly on the Anchorage map, in executive session prior to the board considering and adopting the final map.

Member Borromeo moved for the board to enter executive session for the purpose of receiving legal advice under Alaska Statute AS 44.62.310 (c)(3) and AS 44.62.310(c)(4) respectively involving matters which by law, municipal charter, or ordinance are required to be confidential and matters involving consideration of government records that by law are not subject to public disclosure. Member Bahnke seconded the motion.

The board entered executive session at 4:05pm.

The board exited executive session at 5:00pm.

The Board held extensive discussion and reached consensus on areas across the state including Mat-su, Fairbanks, Interior/Rural, and Kenai.

Board members debated two versions of Anchorage districts. Member Bahnke moved that the Board adopt an Anchorage map labeled v.4 best. Member Simpson seconded the motion. After discussion, a roll call vote was held with the following results:

In favor: Members Bahnke, Borromeo and Simpson
Opposed: Members Binkley and Marcum

Member Simpson moved that the board adopt the redistricting map labeled "Board Consensus v.7" which, if the motion passes, will be labeled the "Final Map", as the final redistricting map with the allowance that staff may make minor changes to facilitate metes and bounds, and will return a report with recommended changes to the board for review prior to final proclamation adoption. Member Marcum seconded the motion.

Chairman Binkley requested a roll call vote.

- Member Simpson voted in favor.
- Member Marcum voted in opposition.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Chairman Binkley voted in favor.
- Member Borrromeo voted in favor.
- Member Bahnke voted in favor.

The motion passed 4 to 1.

Chairman Binkley outlined the next steps:

- Staff will begin reviewing the map for technical errors, if any.
- A cartographer will work on describing every district by metes and bounds.
- If the two above items are incomplete by November 8, they will continue until they are completed.
- The map will be published onto the board's website on November 6 by noon.
- The board will reconvene on November 8 and begin the session by taking public testimony on Senate pairings.
- The board will take the 40 House seats and pair them into Senate districts that are composed of 2 contiguous House districts. The pairings will be determined after public testimony.

Member Borrromeo moved to adjourn the meeting. Member Bahnke seconded the motion.

The board adjourned at 7:09 p.m.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

**Alaska Redistricting Board Meeting
November 8-10, 2021 | 9:00 a.m.
Alaska Redistricting Board Office, 3901 Old Seward Highway, Suite 141,
Anchorage, AK 99503**

The Alaska Redistricting Board met on November 8, 2021. Present participants are below:

John Binkley	Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke	Board Member
Bethany Marcum	Board Member
Budd Simpson	Board Member
Nicole Borromeo	Board Member
Peter Torkelson	Executive Director
TJ Presley	Deputy Director
Juli Lucky	Staff Member
Matt Singer	Legal Counsel

Agenda

- Call to Order & Establish Quorum
- Adoption of Agenda
- Public Testimony on Senate Pairings
- Executive Session with Legal Counsel
- Review Map Corrections
- Assignment of House District Senate Pairs
- Lunch Break
- Adoption of Senate Truncation Cutoff
- Adoption of Senate Election Cycle Table
- Recess
- Adopt Final Proclamation of Redistricting
- Signing of Final Proclamation
- Adjournment

Call to Order

Chairman Binkley called the meeting to order on November 8, 2021 at 9:00 a.m. With all board members present, a quorum was established.

Public Testimony

Public testimony was given as follows:



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Anchorage resident, Alex Baker, spoke in favor of combining Districts 20 and 21 together because all of Downtown Anchorage should remain in one Senate district. Fairview is geographically blended with Downtown Anchorage; this is where Alex and many of his community members recreate, walk, drive, and frequent businesses. Alex requested that the board combine Districts 20 and 21 together as a Senate pairing.
- Fairbanks resident, Kasey Casort, stated that Ester, Chena Ridge, and Goldstream are socioeconomically integrated along the Parks Highway with close ties to the University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Kasey urged the board to pair Districts 32 and 36 together. Kasey also asked the board to pair Districts 33 and 34 together to keep the City of Fairbanks in one Senate seat. Additionally, Districts 31 and 35 should be paired together to have Salcha, Two Rivers, and North Pole together; this is contiguous and keeps North Pole in its own city, and the Air Force base in one Senate seat.
- Fairbanks resident, Luke Hopkins, stated that the adopted final map places Goldstream Valley into a district with District 36. Luke asked the board to understand that the Goldstream Valley has socioeconomic ties with the community in University of Alaska-Fairbanks. Luke spoke in favor of pairing Districts 32 and 36, pairing Districts 33 and 34, and Districts 31 and 35. These pairings would best represent what is now the House districts areas that include both Fairbanks and the central interior of Alaska.
- Anchorage resident, Jeremy Houston, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 21 and 20 in the Downtown Area. Since he has moved to the area, it has become apparent that the two areas are socioeconomically integrated. He does most of his shopping, working, and recreating in the downtown area. Additionally, many JBER military members use the downtown area to recreate as well.
- Fairbanks resident, Elyse Guttenberg, has lived in Goldstream Valley for 50 years and spoke in favor of pairing District 36 with District 32 as the closest socioeconomic ties are shared between the two. Additionally, Elyse spoke in favor of pairing Districts 33 and 34 and Districts 31 and 35 as they have much in common.
- Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (AFFR) representative, David Dunsmore, recommended the following pairings: Districts 3 and 4, Districts 1 and 2, Districts 33 and 34, Districts 39 and 40, Districts 38 and 37, Districts 5 and 6, Districts 7 and 8, Districts 9 and 15, Districts 10 and 11, Districts 14 and 16, Districts 12 and 13, Districts 20 and 21, Districts 18 and 23, Districts 17 and 19, Districts 22 and 24, Districts 26 and 29, Districts 27 and 28, Districts 25 and 30, Districts 31 and 35, and Districts 32 and 36.
- Anchorage resident, Yarrow Silvers, spoke against pairing East Anchorage with Eagle River or South Anchorage. Yarrow spoke in favor of pairing Districts 18 and 23 together. If this pairing is not practical, Districts 17 and 18 would be an alternative pairing. Eagle River and the suburb towns north of Eagle River should be paired together as they are socioeconomically integrated and should remain together for better representation. South Anchorage is a poor pairing for District 18 as it is separated by miles and results in poor representation.
- Eagle River resident, Roger Branson, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 22 and 24 together as Chugiak/Eagle River has long identified as its own socioeconomic area.
- Fairbanks resident, Gary Newman, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 32 and 36, Districts 33 and 34, and Districts 31 and 35.
- Fairbanks resident, David Guttenberg recommended that Districts 32 and 36 be paired together as it integrates a large part of the population base and its commonalities.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

- Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting representative, Randy Ruedrich, recommended the following Senate pairings: Wrangell/Ketchikan and Sitka, Districts 37 and 38, Districts 39 and 40, Districts 33 and 34, Districts 32 and 35, Districts 31 and 36, Districts 6 and 7, Districts 26 and 29, Districts 25 and 30, Districts 10 and 14, Districts 11 and 12, Districts 17 and 19, Districts 13 and 20, Districts 21 and 22, and Districts 23 and 24.
- Anchorage resident, Tahnee Conte-Seccareccia, recommended the following Senate pairings with consideration to the geographic areas and the intersection of common socioeconomic, cultural, and community interests that would benefit from being represented by the same legislator: Districts 22 and 24, Districts 18 and 23, Districts 17 and 19, Districts 20 and 21, Districts 12 and 13, Districts 14 and 16, Districts 9 and 15, and Districts 10 and 11.
- Fairbanks resident, John Davies, recommended that Districts 32 and 36 be paired together as it retains a large amount of the Goldstream Valley area, an area he represented when he was in the legislature. Additionally, John spoke in favor of pairing Districts 33 and 34 and Districts 31 and 35.
- Palmer resident, Brian Endle, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 27 and 28, Districts 29 and 30, and Districts 25 and 26. These districts have been paired together for the last 10 years and has not been problematic, so they should remain paired.
- Kenai resident, Tim Navarre, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 5 and 6 and Districts 7 and 8 together.
- Administrator of the Estate of Ralph Lord, Mark Seidenberg, expressed concerns about islands that have been added to Alaska that have not been reflected in the US Census data. Mark would like these islands to be included.
- Fritz Creek resident, Charles Lindsey, strongly supports keeping the Homer House district tied to the other coastal communities of Seward, Cordova, and Kodiak. Mapping these districts together ensures that commercial fisherman have a voice. It also makes sense to continue pairing, Soldotna, Kenai, and Nikiski together as they are sport fishing districts where many residents work in the oil and gas industry.
- Deltana resident, James Squyres, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 31 and 36. There are rail proposals that go through these districts, a mining plan that drives back and forth between the districts, and the pairing supports the spawning economic activities along these districts.
- Homer resident, Rachel Lord, spoke in favor of keeping the current pairing of Homer and Kodiak districts together as there are strong coastal and commercial fishing interests on the Lower Peninsula. Pairing with Kodiak provides Homer with the best representation in the Senate and this representation should be maintained. It also makes sense to continue keeping the pairings as they are with Kenai, Nikiski, and Soldotna as they share many commonalities that should be maintained for a strong presence in Juneau.
- Anchorage resident, Donna Mears, stated that the Northeast Community Council area is represented in the map by 4 House districts. Donna spoke in favor of pairing Districts 18 and 23.
- Doyon Limited representative, Sarah Obed, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 32 and 36 as it is a historical pairing that unifies the Goldstream and Ester communities that the board has heard much testimony about.
- Wasilla resident, Steve Colligan, stated that the combination of Districts 25 through 30 are overpopulated by 13.77% and underpopulated every other district in the Valley to meet other



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

initiatives. The only interim solution to this is to pair Districts 25 and 26, Districts 27 and 28, and Districts 29 and 30 as an interim fix. Steve also asked the board to summarize the cumulative underpopulations and overpopulations by region.

- Anchorage resident, Christopher Constant, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 20 and 21 and referenced a previous speaker that stated that there is a longstanding history between JBER and Eagle River and the connection is strong enough to make the boundaries for Government Hill and East Anchorage neighborhoods that are incorporated into that district. Effectively, there are 4 gates to JBER (Government Hill gate, Boniface gate, Tikahtnu gate, Richardson gate). Christopher Constant reference Felisa Wilson's testimony to draw the lines based on where JBER residents do business, recreate, and attend school in the areas respective to the gates they live by and noted this is a valid consideration.
- JBER resident, Felisa Wilson, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 20 and 21 and noted that pairing Eagle River districts together also makes sense.
- Homer resident, Kelly Cooper, stated that she has served on the Kenai Peninsula Borough Assembly from 2014 to 2020. As such, Kelly has had multiple opportunities to work with Senators and supports the existing pairings of Homer and Kodiak as they are both coastal fishing communities, Homer's port and harbor where many Kenai fisherman go fishing. Fisherman should have a strong voice and this pairing ensures that they do. Kenai, Soldotna, and Nikiski are freshwater sport fish districts and tends to have many residents who work in the refinery and oil industry. Kelly spoke in favor of keeping these communities together.
- Kodiak resident, Pat Branson, spoke in favor of keeping Kodiak and Homer together as they have more in common together through their ports, harbors, and fishermen. Pat would like to keep Kodiak aligned with other coastal communities.
- Seward resident, David Paperman, stated that the main part of Seward has many socioeconomic similarities with Homer and Kodiak, and very little similarities with Nikiski. David spoke in favor of pairing Districts 5 and 6.
- Delta Junction resident, Dawn Frazier, spoke in favor of pairing Districts 31 and 36 to have them included with the military bases (Eielson and Ft. Wainwright).
- Hope resident, Gregory Sorensen, spoke in favor of the existing Senate pairings.

During public testimony, member Bahnke requested that staff screen any information being brought forward to the board to ensure that any incumbent information is redacted. The board had no objections to this request.

Executive Session with Legal Counsel

Member Borromeo moved to enter executive session for legal and other purposes related to receiving legal counsel for the board. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

Chairman Binkley stated that no decisions will be made during the executive session and the board will enter back into public session at 1:00 p.m. (November 8)

The board entered executive session at 11:00 a.m. (November 8)

The board exited executive session at 12:00 p.m. (November 8)



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Review Map Corrections

Peter Torkelson gave the board an overview of the material corrections to be made to the final map:

- Two small blocks that should have been assigned to District 39 were inadvertently left in District 38. Moving the small population of these two blocks to District 39 improved the deviation.

Member Borromeo moved to approve the correction. Member Simpson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- The board expressed the intention to take in the entire legal city boundaries of Wasilla. The demographer found that a small block of 10 people was inadvertently drawn out of the city boundaries. When the block was assigned to District 29, the district and overall map deviations increased and there was no simple fix due to the existing overpopulation in the district. Adjustments were made to the neighboring Districts 26 and 27 which resulted in the total deviation improving and solved the city boundary breakage issue. Because the need to fix the error immediately was urgent, Peter Torkelson contacted all board members to notify them of the issue and the board had no objections to the correction.

Member Bahnke moved to approve the correction. Member Marcum seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- There are three blocks that staff requested to move to District 36. This adjustment would result in a cleaner line that follows the Nenana River instead of dodging and coming back out. There is a population change of 4 people.

Member Borromeo moved to approve the correction. Member Simpson seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- The District 28 boundary goes into the District 27 boundary along the Glenn highway. There is no population involved. If the area that dives into District 27 was assigned to District 28, there would be a cleaner line.

Member Borromeo moved to approve the correction. Member Bahnke seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Assignment of House District Senate Pairs

The board entered a Senate pairings work session at 1:21 p.m. (November 8)

The board exited from the work session at 5:00 p.m. (November 8)

Member Marcum moved for the board to enter executive session for legal advice with regard to the proposed Senate pairings. Member Borromeo seconded the motion.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

The board entered executive session at 5:01 p.m. (November 8)

The board exited executive session and entered recess at 6:25 p.m. (November 8)

The board exited recess on November 9, 2021 at 9:00 a.m.

The board entered executive session at 9:00 a.m. (November 9)

The board exited executive session at 10:30 a.m. (November 9)

Member Marcum moved to accept the following Senate pairings for Anchorage: Districts 9 and 10, Districts 11 and 12, Districts 13 and 14, Districts 15 and 16, Districts 19 and 20, Districts 17 and 23, Districts 18 and 24, and Districts 21 and 22. Mr. Simpson seconded the motion.

Member Bahnke opposed the motion and requested a roll call vote. The motion passed with 3 to 2 votes as follows:

In favor: Members Binkley, Marcum, Simpson

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

Chairman Binkley noted that Anchorage was the final piece of the Senate Pairings. The board had consensus, or at least a majority on all other Senate pairings. The final proclamation that the board will vote on will list all House districts and Senate pairings.

Peter Torkelson stated that the next step is for the Senate pairings to be built onto a map and a Department of Labor expert will run a cross tabulation on Senate seat constituency changes. If the underlying voter base of a Senate seat has changed substantially, then that Senate seat must be included in the 2022 election. Member Simpson confirmed that the board would like to see the information without the senators' names or senate district numbers included.

Member Borromeo moved to reconsider the last vote. Ms. Bahnke seconded the motion.

Member Borromeo expressed strong opposition against the pairings of Districts 18 and 24 as this pairing opens the board to litigation for partisan gerrymandering.

The question was called; objection was heard. A roll call vote was taken, and the motion to call the question passed with a 3 to 2 vote as follows:

In favor: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

The Board voted to reconsider the vote on adoption of the Anchorage Senate pairings. The motion failed with 2 to 3 votes as follows:

In favor: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

Opposed: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Member Bahnke expressed her preference for an alternative set of Anchorage senate pairings.

The board stood in recess until 1pm to allow staff time to prepare the Core Constituency Report.

Adoption of Senate Truncation Cutoff

Peter Torkelson stated that the Board has adopted Senate pairings of House districts. Since House District lines have changed, there are constituents of the old Senate seat, some of which are shared with the new Senate seat and some of which have changed to a different Senate seat. The Board reviewed the constituency change report that showed the percentage of constituency change for each of the new Senate districts. The report showed that there are some new Senate seats that are largely unchanged from their previous district and others which have large percentages of voter change.

Matt Singer, legal counsel, explained that the Board has an obligation to evaluate whether there have been substantial population changes as a result of the Senate pairings. If a substantial population change has occurred, the Board is to truncate the Senate seat and require a new election. The Alaska Supreme Court does not provide mathematical certainty as to what constitutes a substantial change, but there is precedent that a change of 34% would be a change substantial enough to require a truncation. There is also precedent that changes of under 10% do not require any change. Between the two percentages, the Board has discretion to decide what they believe to be substantial. Matt Singer recommended that the board go no higher than 30% and no lower than 10% and have a number closer to 30% than to 10%.

Staff presented the Board with a table of population change without seat or Senator identifications in this format:

Largest Remaining Constituency	Percentage of Voter Change
46.5	53.5
47.0	53.0
49.7	50.3
52.0	48.0
60.9	39.1
66.6	33.4
71.2	28.8
73.8	26.2
75.5	24.5
78.3	21.7
83.7	16.3
88.3	11.7
92.5	7.5
95.0	5.0
95.0	5.0
95.6	4.4
97.5	2.5



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

98.1	1.9
98.3	1.7
100.0	0.0

Member Borromeo moved that any percentage of voter change 16.3% and below are not up for truncation. Member Bahnke seconded the motion. Chair Binkley clarified that the motion is that any of the districts that have a percentage change of 16.3 percent or greater would be truncated if they would otherwise be on the 2024 cycle.

Member Simpson suggested that the percentage threshold be increased to 25% and referenced legal counsel's statement on the percentage being closer to 30%.

After discussion, the Board had consensus on the lower percentage which would leave voters with more of an opportunity choose their Senators.

The motion to truncate all senate seats with a population change of 16.3% or greater passed unanimously.

Adoption of Senate Election Cycle Table

Peter Torkelson stated that the Board has discretion to set the terms of the senate election cycles.

Member Bahnke suggested that, to avoid the appearance of partisanship, the board flip a coin without knowledge of which seats are being truncated. Chairman Binkley suggested that there be a rationale for decision-making and using the alternating method beginning with Senate district T beginning on the 2024 cycle, then moving to District S on the 2022 cycle. Member Borromeo spoke in favor of Member Bahnke's suggestion.

Member Borromeo moved to flip a coin as suggested by Member Bahnke. Member Bahnke seconded.

Member Marcum stated that alternating numbers is a method that has been used in the past and stated that she is comfortable with this method. Member Simpson stated that because he does not know the people on the list or their associated parties, the method suggested by Chairman Binkley would not appear to be partisan.

Member Bahnke reiterated that the purpose of her suggestion is to avoid the appearance of protecting any incumbents and would leave no room for debate or partisanship decision-making. Member Bahnke stated that she stands by her motion. Member Marcum noted that because the Board has not been provided with any incumbent information, the suggested method offered by Chairman Binkley is logical.

In favor: Members Bahnke, Borromeo
Opposed: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum

The motion failed 2 to 3.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Member Borromeo moved to determine the sequencing for truncations beginning with A going in the 2024 cycle. Member Bahnke seconded the motion.

In favor: Members Bahnke, Borromeo
Opposed: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum

The motion failed 2 to 3 (by voice vote)

Member Marcum moved to alternate by numerical order beginning at A starting at 2022 and then going to 2024. Member Simpson seconded the motion.

The motion passed 3 to 2 (by voice vote)

In favor: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum
Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

The Board entered recess on November 9, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.

The board exited recess and entered into public session on November 10, 2021, at 10 a.m.

Adopt Final Proclamation of Redistricting

Member Simpson moved for the Board to adopt the Proclamation of redistricting in the written form before the board. Member Marcum seconded the motion.

Member Borromeo opposed the motion and stated disapproval for splitting Districts 22 and 24 as they are natural pairings, and for pairing Downtown Anchorage with Chugiak. Member Borromeo stated that Districts 17 and 19 should have been paired, stated her intent to not vote in favor of the motion, and respectfully asked the board to reconsider the motion.

Member Bahnke opposed the motion and stated that the Final Map is not the best map and Alaskans deserve better. While about 80% of the plan is fair and nonpartisan, Alaskans could have had a 100% fair plan.

Member Marcum stated that she respects the differences of opinions on Senate pairings and noted that her focus was on socio-economic connections between military neighbors, Eagle River, and Muldoon.

Members Bahnke and Borromeo expressed concern on the integrity of the Final Map and partisan gerrymandering.

Member Borromeo requested a roll call vote.

The motion to adopt the final Proclamation passed 3 to 2 as follows:
In favor: Members Binkley, Marcum, Simpson



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

Signing of Final Proclamation

Matt Singer, legal counsel, suggested that the final Proclamation signature page have a delineation that shows board members in support and board members in opposition of the Proclamation. The Board did not oppose this and all Board members signed the final proclamation.

Chairman Binkley and members Marcum and Simpson signed in support of the Proclamation.

Members Bahnke and Borromeo signed in opposition of the Proclamation.

The Board gave final statements prior to adjournment:

- Ms. Borromeo stated the following: "I want to begin by reminding Alaskans here today and listening across the state what the goal of redistricting is as defined by the framers of our constitution and instructed by the Court in Hickel. The goal of all apportionment plans is simple: a true, just, and fair representation. Regretfully, the Board lost sight of this goal yesterday and in the process, we have failed Alaskans and we abused the public's trust and state government. Over the last 90 days, I've listened to Alaskans in 23 out of the 26 communities that the board held public hearings in. I would have been to all 26 communities; I had to come off the Redistricting Board, though, for about 36 hours and fly to Washington DC to testify in Senate judiciary about the importance of voting rights and the VRA for the Native community. When I came back together with the Board, we used the local knowledge and insights of Alaskans to draw a fair House map. I'm happy to report that the Board took the same approach early this week when it came to the Senate pairings. We abandoned that approach, though, for Eagle River and East Anchorage. When it comes to these pairings, I want to offer five legal and constitutional observations. First, the most reasonable Senate pairing for Eagle River would have been to join House districts 22 and 24. These districts share the same streets, neighborhoods, businesses, schools, watersheds, and more, including electrical co-ops. Eagle River has also been trying to exit the Municipality of Anchorage for some time now. Second point, there is no populated area – not even a military gate – that connects Districts 24 and 23. The only way that this part of Eagle River, which is actually a majority of Chugiak, Birchwood, Peter Creek, and the Native Village of Eklutna, can even access the military base is to get through the other part of Eagle River located in District 22. Member Marcum failed to offer a compelling reason not to pair the two Eagle River districts or the two Muldoon districts, besides for her subjective belief that the board failed to consider pairing JBER and Eagle River into a single House seat. We did, we considered it, and we firmly rejected it on two grounds: compactness and public testimony. Moreover, there was limited – almost no debate or justification really – for drawing these Senate districts this way on the record, and I apologize to Alaskans for that. It's also worth noting that the now paired South Muldoon and Eagle River, through Senate Seat K, do not have a single road connected meaning the residents in District 21 have to drive almost four miles down Muldoon Road through District 20 before even reaching the Glenn highway and then having to drive another twelve miles north before they can exit into Eagle River. This



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

part of Muldoon (the southern part) is not a bustling hot bedded economic enterprise. It's almost entirely residential and for us to pull the wool over the state's eyes and believe that this part of Muldoon is traveling this far to shop, play, and recreate is absurd. My fourth point is yesterday it was told to me that I had already "won too much" and now it was time that I step aside and I allow others to get some wins. This isn't about me as an individual, this is about fair maps for our state. I didn't win anything; Alaska lost. I presented and I defended fair maps that stand on their own merit because I put in the time and energy, and I can defend my maps and will defend my maps in the next round of litigation. I thank Member Bahnke for standing alongside and accepting natural pairings of these districts. And second, even if it's true – whatever that means – that I had already won too much, it's hardly a reason for rejecting the natural pairings of Eagle River as a Senate district and North and South Muldoon themselves as a Senate district. Finally, Member Marcum said that splitting Eagle River into two Senate seats would extend the electoral influence of the community resulting in "more representation" – I played that for you, and you're going to hear it for the next several months because everybody that sues us is going to play it over and over again, too. So, far from being compelling rationale, her observation exposes the board to claims of racial and partisan gerrymandering in North and South Muldoon which contains some of the highest minority voting age population concentrations in Anchorage, and one of the most diverse neighborhoods in our country. The publicly stated goal of expanding Eagle River's influence into the legislature is not only an example of partisan gerrymandering, it is a direct path for future litigants to take us on in suing us. In closing, I want to sincerely thank Alaskans from Utqiagvik to Ketchikan, for their time and attention to the solemn constitutional duty; particularly the scores of rural Alaskans who welcomed the board into their communities through the pandemic. The type of hospitality you've shown us is something that is only experienced in Bush Alaska, and I mean that. Members of the Board, the constitution demands fairness from us and nothing less. I remain dedicated to drawing fair maps with you in the next round. An unfairness of gerrymandering in even two Senate districts is not meeting our constitutional mandate. The federal vote dilution and numerous violations that have occurred in Eagle River and Muldoon over the past two days have prevented me today from signing the proclamation. I very much look forward to for being deposed by opposing counsel and I pray that litigation is swift and just."

- Member Bahnke stated the following: "As I reflect on the process – it's been 15 months of us putting our heads together. In terms of the process, I think what we saw throughout the process, for example, I started mentioning the way that the board took action to end discussion and debate yesterday which I think, procedurally and technically, was contrary to Robert's Rules of Order and I'm not expert on Robert's Rules of Order, but I don't think that was unintentional because as a former legislator, you're very well versed in Robert's Rules of Order. I'm not going to challenge that. It is symbolic of the greater issue that is our end outcome. Our outcome has resulted in the silencing or muzzling or muffling – whatever term you want to use – a particular segment of Alaskan voters. Again, throughout the process there was even at one point where the legitimacy of my authority to speak on behalf of Alaska Natives in my own district was at play and I've attempted to walk through this process in a manner that maintains decorum in order to get us moving along. I thought the ends would justify the means, so I put up with a lot in terms of where I felt I was being silenced. The process played out on a micro level of the silencing of a particular segment of our



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

population. I was discouraged yesterday, but I'm actually encouraged today. Had we adopted Senate pairings that were just, that would have been a great victory for the state, but I think the greater victory that I see playing out here is that it is shining the light of the need for Alaskans to expect and deserve better from, not only our elected officials, but also our appointed officials. Alaskans are now witnessing, on a micro level, what is happening at a statewide level. We deserve better as Alaskans whether we're Republicans, Democrats, Independents, Undeclared, rural Alaskans, urban Alaskans, brown, black, yellow, white – at the end of the day we're all Alaskans and I'm not going to end on a discouraged note. If anything, this has bolstered, not just me – because this is happening to me on a micro level, - but I think that it is going to shed a bigger light and motivate people on a statewide level to expect fairness and uphold the tenants of our democracy.”

- Chairman Binkley stated the following: “It has been a long and involved process. We've really gone to extraordinary lengths to engage the public throughout Alaska to have a fair and open process. We took a tremendous amount of testimony, not only around the state, but whenever we convened in meetings here in Anchorage or elsewhere. We began our meetings with public testimony and ended with public testimony and it was very informative for all board members to get that sense from Alaskans on what they felt, how it affected their communities, and what their preferences were in terms of how we put together this very complicated map from all around the state of Alaska. We're guided by the constitution as was mentioned earlier and that is our first priority is to make sure we are following, not only the letter of constitution, but also guided by many rulings that came out over the years as each plan has been litigated, to give us direction on how to engage and come up with a final plan. We adhered to this very tightly. We were guided by expert legal guidance throughout the process, and we look to that, really, to help us make certain that we have a legal and defensible proclamation for the State of Alaska. It's a difficult process, not only in the technical aspect of putting it all together, but also in making certain that everybody is pleased with the plan and it's unfortunate that everybody can't be happy with what the final plan is. All board members tried to put together a reasonable plan, but sometimes those are in the eyes of the beholder. Some people can look at a plan and say it's fair and others can look at the plan and say it's not fair. That's why we have the process that we do and it would have been great if we would have been unanimous in coming to a final decision on this plan, but we're not, and now the public has an opportunity to look at it and to decide whether or not they believe that it should be litigated, and more than likely it will. We'll have an opportunity to look at facts as this goes into the judicial system – not just opinions, thoughts, ideas, on what is fair – it really be on facts decided by judiciary and I think that's a wonderful part of this whole system is that in the end, we will have a fair plan that has been reviewed by the judiciary and the State of Alaska, and that's the plan that we'll go forward with. With that, I thank all my fellow board members. I know it's been a long and difficult process. It's been a tremendous amount of fun and a wonderful experience in many cases. As Nicole and Melanie have indicated, some of the rural communities that we got out to, it's always so engaging and an opportunity to meet Alaskans and they're so genuine and hospitable. It really has been a pleasure and it's unfortunate that as it comes down to making a final decision, we weren't able to reach unanimity on that, but it's an unfortunate aspect of the process. Overall, it's been a tremendous experience for me personally. I've learned a huge amount about the state, about this whole process of how we go through redistricting every

3901 Old Seward Hwy. Ste. 141
Anchorage, Alaska 99503
www.akredistrict.org
907.563.0300



John Binkley, Chair
Melanie Bahnke
Nicole Borromeo
Bethany Marcum
Budd Simpson

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

ten years, so I just want to thank all of you personally and individually for the experience. We've got a ways to go. Finally, I'd like to thank staff; they've just done an incredible job under Peter Torkelson's leadership. They put in incredible amount of time and effort. They believe in the process. They've been fair every step of the way and it takes a tremendous amount in terms of logistics and technical aspects to pull all of this together and they've just done a great job. And finally, to our legal counsel as well, they've given us great guidance, I believe and will continue to work with us as we go into the next stage of the process."

Simpson moved to adjourn. Borromeo seconded the motion.

The board adjourned at 10:44 a.m. on November 10, 2021.