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| 1 2022-April-Redistricting-Proclamation | 337 |
| 2 Table of Appendices | 339 |
| 3 2022-April-Proclamation-All-Maps | 342 |
| 3.1 2022-April-Anchorage | 342 |
| 3.2 2022-April-EagleRiver | 343 |
| 3.3 2022-April-Fairbanks | 345 |
| 3.4 2022-April-Kenai-Peninsula | 346 |
| 3.6 2022-April-Southeast | 347 |
| 3.7 2022-April-Statewide | 348 |
| 3.8 District01-A | 349 |
| 3.9 District02-A | 350 |
| 3.10 District03-B | 351 |
| 3.11 District04-B | 352 |
| 3.12 District05-C | 353 |
| 3.13 District06-C | 354 |
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| 3.17 District10-E | 358 |
| 3.18 District11-F | 359 |
| 3.19 District12-F | 360 |
| 3.20 District13-G | 361 |
| 3.21 District14-G | 362 |
| 3.22 District15-H | 363 |
| 3.23 District16-H | 364 |
| 3.24 District17-I | 365 |
| 3.25 District18-I | 366 |
| 3.26 District19-J | 367 |
| 3.27 District20-J | 368 |
| 3.28 District21-K | 369 |
| 3.29 District22-K | 370 |
| 3.30 District23-L | 371 |
| 3.31 District24-L | 372 |
| 3.32 District25-M | 373 |
| 3.33 District26-M | 374 |
| 3.34 District27-N | 375 |
| 3.35 District28-N | 376 |
| 3.36 District29-O | 377 |
| 3.37 District30-O | 378 |
| 3.38 District31-P | 379 |
| 3.39 District32-P | 380 |
## Word Index

1. **-ooo- (1)**
2. **00:00:00 (1)**
3. **1 (1)**
4. **10 (10)**
5. **10th (1)**
6. **11 (6)**
7. **12 (1)**
8. **12-F (1)**
9. **13 (2)**
10. **14 (6)**
11. **15 (4)**
12. **15-minute (1)**
13. **15th (5)**
14. **16 (5)**
15. **16th (3)**
16. **17 (6)**
17. **17-year-old (2)**
18. **171-page (1)**
19. **18 (2)**
20. **18-year-old (1)**
21. **18th (1)**
22. **19 (1)**
23. **19-J (1)**
24. **2 (2)**
25. **20 (6)**
26. **20-J (1)**
27. **20-page (1)**
28. **200 (1)**
29. **2000 (1)**
30. **2012 (2)**
31. **2021 (1)**
32. **2022 (1)**
33. **21 (4)**
34. **21st (1)**
35. **22 (4)**
36. **22-K (1)**
37. **23 (9)**
38. **24 (4)**
39. **25th (1)**
2.2.1 adding (1)
2.2.2 addition (2)
2.2.3 address (6)
2.2.4 addressed (3)
2.2.5 addressing (2)
2.2.6 adhere (1)
2.2.7 adjacent (1)
2.2.8 adjourn (1)
2.2.9 adjourned (1)
2.2.10 adjust (2)
2.2.11 adopt (15)
2.2.12 adopted (10)
2.2.13 adopting (3)
2.2.14 adoption (5)
2.2.15 advance (1)
2.2.16 advantage (1)
2.2.17 advocate (2)
2.2.18 advocating (1)
2.2.19 affidavit (2)
2.2.20 affiliations (1)
2.2.21 affinity (1)
2.2.22 afternoon (8)
2.2.23 age (1)
2.2.24 agenda (9)
2.2.25 agreed (1)
2.2.26 ahead (5)
2.2.27 ahold (1)
2.2.28 aired (1)
2.2.29 airport (1)
2.2.30 Alaska (28)
2.2.31 Alaskan (4)
2.2.32 Alaskans (11)
2.2.33 alienate (1)
2.2.34 aligned (1)
2.2.35 allowing (1)
2.2.36 Alps (1)
2.2.37 alternative (1)
2.2.38 amazing (1)
2.2.39 amended (1)
2.2.40 amount (2)
2.2.41 analysis (1)
2.2.42 analyst (1)
2.2.43 Anchorage (71)
2.2.44 Anna (5)
2.2.45 announce (2)
| 2.3.5  | Barry (1)        |
| 2.3.6  | base (4)         |
| 2.3.7  | based (2)        |
| 2.3.8  | Basher (1)       |
| 2.3.9  | basic (1)        |
| 2.3.10 | basically (1)    |
| 2.3.11 | basis (1)        |
| 2.3.12 | Bay (2)          |
| 2.3.13 | Bayshore (1)     |
| 2.3.14 | Bayshore/klatt (1)|
| 2.3.15 | bear (2)         |
| 2.3.16 | began (1)        |
| 2.3.17 | Begich (2)       |
| 2.3.18 | begins (1)       |
| 2.3.19 | behalf (10)      |
| 2.3.20 | behavior (1)     |
| 2.3.21 | beings (1)       |
| 2.3.22 | belabor (1)      |
| 2.3.23 | believes (1)     |
| 2.3.24 | belong (2)       |
| 2.3.25 | benefit (1)      |
| 2.3.26 | Benny (5)        |
| 2.3.27 | Bernie (4)       |
| 2.3.28 | Bethany (7)      |
| 2.3.29 | bias (1)         |
| 2.3.30 | big (1)          |
| 2.3.31 | bike (2)         |
| 2.3.32 | bills (1)        |
| 2.3.33 | Binkley (9)      |
| 2.3.34 | BIPOC (2)        |
| 2.3.35 | Bistro (1)       |
| 2.3.36 | bit (4)          |
| 2.3.37 | black (7)        |
| 2.3.38 | block (1)        |
| 2.3.39 | board (79)       |
| 2.3.40 | board's (12)     |
| 2.3.41 | body (1)         |
| 2.3.42 | boggling (1)     |
| 2.3.43 | bombing (1)      |
| 2.3.44 | border (3)       |
| 2.3.45 | bordering (3)    |
| 2.3.46 | born (2)         |
| 2.3.47 | borough (17)     |
| 2.3.48 | Borromeo (70)    |
| 2.3.49 | Boulevard (1)    |
2.3.50  boundaries (3)
2.3.51  boundary (2)
2.3.52  box (1)
2.3.53  bracket (1)
2.3.54  Brawley (4)
2.3.55  breakfast (1)
2.3.56  breaking (2)
2.3.57  briefly (3)
2.3.58  bring (1)
2.3.59  bringing (1)
2.3.60  brings (1)
2.3.61  broad (1)
2.3.62  broadcast (1)
2.3.63  broke (1)
2.3.64  Brown (7)
2.3.65  Bruce (3)
2.3.66  Budd (1)
2.3.67  build (1)
2.3.68  Bunde (1)
2.3.69  business (4)
2.3.70  businesses (1)
2.3.71  Cabin (1)
2.3.72  Calista (2)
2.3.73  Calista's (1)
2.3.74  call (9)
2.3.75  called (5)
2.3.76  caller (3)
2.3.77  callers (1)
2.3.78  calling (10)
2.3.79  calls (2)
2.3.80  camera (1)
2.3.81  cameras (1)
2.3.82  Candace (4)
2.3.83  Cantwell (16)
2.3.84  capacity (6)
2.3.85  care (4)

2.4  Index: careful..confusion
2.4.1  careful (1)
2.4.2  carefully (1)
2.4.3  caring (1)
2.4.4  Carlson (2)
2.4.5  Carolyn (7)
2.4.6  carried (1)
2.4.7  Carrs (1)
2.4.8  case (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.9</td>
<td>cases</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.10</td>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.11</td>
<td>catching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.12</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.13</td>
<td>Caucus</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.14</td>
<td>Caucus's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.15</td>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.16</td>
<td>census</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.17</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.18</td>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.19</td>
<td>certainty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.20</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.21</td>
<td>chaired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.22</td>
<td>chairing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.23</td>
<td>chairman</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.24</td>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.25</td>
<td>challenged</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.26</td>
<td>challenges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.27</td>
<td>championing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.28</td>
<td>champions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.29</td>
<td>chance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.30</td>
<td>chances</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.31</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.32</td>
<td>changed</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.33</td>
<td>changing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.34</td>
<td>Chanshtnu</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.35</td>
<td>characterization</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.36</td>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.37</td>
<td>check</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.38</td>
<td>chiefly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.39</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.40</td>
<td>choices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.41</td>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.42</td>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.43</td>
<td>Chugach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.44</td>
<td>Chugiach</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.45</td>
<td>Chugiak</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.46</td>
<td>Chugiak/eagle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.47</td>
<td>churches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.48</td>
<td>circle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.49</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.50</td>
<td>citywide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.51</td>
<td>Claman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.52</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.53</td>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>connect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>connected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>connection</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>connections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.6</td>
<td>consider-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.7</td>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.8</td>
<td>considered</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.9</td>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.10</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.11</td>
<td>constantly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.12</td>
<td>constitution</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.13</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.14</td>
<td>constitutionality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.15</td>
<td>constitutionally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.16</td>
<td>contiguous</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.17</td>
<td>continue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.18</td>
<td>continued</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19</td>
<td>continuity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.20</td>
<td>contrary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.21</td>
<td>controversy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.22</td>
<td>conversations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.23</td>
<td>core</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.24</td>
<td>corner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.25</td>
<td>corners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.26</td>
<td>Corporation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.27</td>
<td>correct</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.28</td>
<td>correction</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.29</td>
<td>corrections</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.30</td>
<td>cost</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.31</td>
<td>costs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.32</td>
<td>council</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.33</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.34</td>
<td>couple</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.35</td>
<td>court</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.36</td>
<td>Court's</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.37</td>
<td>courts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.38</td>
<td>crazy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.39</td>
<td>create</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.40</td>
<td>created</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.41</td>
<td>creates</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.42</td>
<td>creating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.43</td>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.44</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.45</td>
<td>criticizing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.46 crossing (1)
2.5.47 Crow (5)
2.5.48 cruising (1)
2.5.49 Crush (1)
2.5.50 current (6)
2.5.51 Curtner (6)
2.5.52 cycle (2)
2.5.53 data (6)
2.5.54 David (6)
2.5.55 day (4)
2.5.56 days (1)
2.5.57 deadline (5)
2.5.58 dealt (1)
2.5.59 death (1)
2.5.60 Debarr (1)
2.5.61 debate (1)
2.5.62 debating (1)
2.5.63 debit (1)
2.5.64 decade (1)
2.5.65 decades (1)
2.5.66 December (1)
2.5.67 decided (3)
2.5.68 deciding (1)
2.5.69 decision (16)
2.5.70 decisions (3)
2.5.71 decisive (1)
2.5.72 deck (1)
2.5.73 declared (1)
2.5.74 deep (1)
2.5.75 deeply (2)
2.5.76 deficiencies (1)
2.5.77 deficiency (3)
2.5.78 definitive (1)
2.5.79 delay (5)
2.5.80 delayed (1)
2.5.81 delays (1)
2.5.82 democracy (2)
2.5.83 Denali (3)
2.5.84 deny (1)
2.5.85 denying (1)
2.5.86 department (3)
2.5.87 deserve (1)
2.5.88 deserves (1)
2.5.89 Desubaro (1)
2.5.90 detail (1)
2.5.91 detailed (4)
2.5.92 determined (1)
2.5.93 develop (1)
2.5.94 developed (1)
2.5.95 development (1)
2.6 Index: deviation..entire
2.6.1 deviation (1)
2.6.2 deviations (1)
2.6.3 differently (3)
2.6.4 difficult (3)
2.6.5 difficulty (2)
2.6.6 diminish (1)
2.6.7 direct (1)
2.6.8 directed (7)
2.6.9 direction (4)
2.6.10 directions (2)
2.6.11 director (1)
2.6.12 disappointed (1)
2.6.13 discharged (1)
2.6.14 discuss (3)
2.6.15 discussed (7)
2.6.16 discussing (1)
2.6.17 discussion (2)
2.6.18 disenfranchisement (1)
2.6.19 dishonestly (1)
2.6.20 dismayed (1)
2.6.21 display (1)
2.6.22 dispute (1)
2.6.23 disregarded (1)
2.6.24 district (109)
2.6.25 districted (2)
2.6.26 districts (38)
2.6.27 diverse (4)
2.6.28 divided (1)
2.6.29 dividing (1)
2.6.30 division (1)
2.6.31 documents (1)
2.6.32 domino (1)
2.6.33 doubled (1)
2.6.34 downtown (5)
2.6.35 dozens (1)
2.6.36 draft (3)
2.6.37 drafted (1)
2.6.38 dragged (1)
2.6.39 drawn (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>drew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drug</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunsmore</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>early</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echo</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eddington</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effectively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egregious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiseman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>election</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elections</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electoral</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloquently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elyse</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>embrace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emphasis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouraging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ending</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enemies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engaged</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoyed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.85</td>
<td>enormous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.86</td>
<td>entertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.87</td>
<td>entire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Index: entrusted..gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1</td>
<td>entrusted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2</td>
<td>equal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3</td>
<td>erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4</td>
<td>error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.5</td>
<td>errors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.6</td>
<td>essentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.7</td>
<td>establish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.8</td>
<td>established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.9</td>
<td>Ester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.10</td>
<td>ethic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.11</td>
<td>evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.12</td>
<td>evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.13</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.14</td>
<td>excused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.15</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.16</td>
<td>exhausting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.17</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.18</td>
<td>expect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.19</td>
<td>expedited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.20</td>
<td>expeditiously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.21</td>
<td>experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22</td>
<td>expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.23</td>
<td>explained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.24</td>
<td>explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.25</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.26</td>
<td>extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.27</td>
<td>extremely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.28</td>
<td>fact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.29</td>
<td>factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.30</td>
<td>fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.31</td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.32</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.33</td>
<td>Fairbanksan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.34</td>
<td>fairest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.35</td>
<td>fairly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.36</td>
<td>fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.37</td>
<td>faithful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.38</td>
<td>fall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.39</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.40</td>
<td>familiarize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.41</td>
<td>families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.42</td>
<td>family (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.43</td>
<td>Farnsworth (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.44</td>
<td>fashion (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.45</td>
<td>fault (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.46</td>
<td>favor (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.47</td>
<td>February (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.48</td>
<td>feedback (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.49</td>
<td>feel (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.50</td>
<td>felt (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.51</td>
<td>FEMALE (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.52</td>
<td>fight (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.53</td>
<td>fighting (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.54</td>
<td>figure (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.55</td>
<td>figured (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.56</td>
<td>filed (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.57</td>
<td>filing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.58</td>
<td>final (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.59</td>
<td>finality (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.60</td>
<td>finally (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.61</td>
<td>finals (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.62</td>
<td>find (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.63</td>
<td>finding (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.64</td>
<td>fine (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.65</td>
<td>finger (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.66</td>
<td>finish (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.67</td>
<td>finished (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.68</td>
<td>finishing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.69</td>
<td>fire (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.70</td>
<td>Firstly (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.71</td>
<td>Fischetti (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.72</td>
<td>fix (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.73</td>
<td>fixed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.74</td>
<td>fixing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.75</td>
<td>flatlands (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.76</td>
<td>flatly (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.77</td>
<td>flawed (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.78</td>
<td>floor (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.79</td>
<td>focus (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.80</td>
<td>focused (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.81</td>
<td>folks (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.82</td>
<td>follow (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.83</td>
<td>Foothills (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.84</td>
<td>force (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.85</td>
<td>form (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.86</td>
<td>fortunately (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.87</td>
<td>forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.88</td>
<td>found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.89</td>
<td>foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.90</td>
<td>Fred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.91</td>
<td>freshman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.92</td>
<td>friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.93</td>
<td>front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.94</td>
<td>full</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.95</td>
<td>fully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.96</td>
<td>fulsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.97</td>
<td>funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.98</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.99</td>
<td>gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Index: galling..house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>galling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>games</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>gather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
<td>gave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.5</td>
<td>gears</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
<td>generally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.7</td>
<td>geographic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.8</td>
<td>geographical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9</td>
<td>George</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.10</td>
<td>gerrymander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.11</td>
<td>gerrymandered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.12</td>
<td>gerrymandering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.13</td>
<td>get-go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.14</td>
<td>giant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.15</td>
<td>Giessel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.16</td>
<td>Girdwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.17</td>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.18</td>
<td>giving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.19</td>
<td>glad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.20</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.21</td>
<td>goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.22</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.23</td>
<td>Goldstream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.24</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.25</td>
<td>government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.26</td>
<td>grateful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.27</td>
<td>gratitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.28</td>
<td>gravel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.29</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.30</td>
<td>grew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.31</td>
<td>grilled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.32</td>
<td>Groh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.33</td>
<td>grouped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.34</td>
<td>grouping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.35</td>
<td>Growden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.36</td>
<td>guess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.37</td>
<td>guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.38</td>
<td>Guttenberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.39</td>
<td>guys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.40</td>
<td>Haida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.41</td>
<td>half</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.42</td>
<td>Halford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.43</td>
<td>halfway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.44</td>
<td>Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.45</td>
<td>handful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.46</td>
<td>hang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.47</td>
<td>happed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.48</td>
<td>happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.49</td>
<td>happened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.50</td>
<td>happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.51</td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.52</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.53</td>
<td>harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.54</td>
<td>harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.55</td>
<td>hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.56</td>
<td>HD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.57</td>
<td>he'll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.58</td>
<td>head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.59</td>
<td>health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.60</td>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.61</td>
<td>heard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.62</td>
<td>hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.63</td>
<td>hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.64</td>
<td>heartbreaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.65</td>
<td>heavily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.66</td>
<td>Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.67</td>
<td>held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.68</td>
<td>helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.69</td>
<td>helping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.70</td>
<td>Hensel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.71</td>
<td>higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.72</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.73</td>
<td>highlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.74</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.75</td>
<td>Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.76</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.77</td>
<td>historic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.78</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.79</td>
<td>Hodge-growden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.80</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.81</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.82</td>
<td>home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.83</td>
<td>homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.84</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.85</td>
<td>honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.86</td>
<td>honors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.87</td>
<td>Hooper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.88</td>
<td>hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.89</td>
<td>Hopkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.90</td>
<td>host</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.91</td>
<td>hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.92</td>
<td>hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.93</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Index: human..lawsuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.1</td>
<td>human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2</td>
<td>hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.3</td>
<td>hundreds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.4</td>
<td>idea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.5</td>
<td>ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.6</td>
<td>identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.7</td>
<td>identify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.8</td>
<td>ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.9</td>
<td>illegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.10</td>
<td>illegally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11</td>
<td>immediately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.12</td>
<td>impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.13</td>
<td>implore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.14</td>
<td>importance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.15</td>
<td>important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.16</td>
<td>impressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.17</td>
<td>in-person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.18</td>
<td>inappropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.19</td>
<td>include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.20</td>
<td>included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.21</td>
<td>including</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.22</td>
<td>inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.23</td>
<td>incumbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.24</td>
<td>indiscernible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.25</td>
<td>individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.26</td>
<td>individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.27</td>
<td>inexplicably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.28</td>
<td>information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.29</td>
<td>infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.30</td>
<td>initially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.31</td>
<td>input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.32</td>
<td>insane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.33</td>
<td>inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.34</td>
<td>instances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.35</td>
<td>Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.36</td>
<td>instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.37</td>
<td>integrated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.38</td>
<td>integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.39</td>
<td>interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.40</td>
<td>interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.41</td>
<td>interestingly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.42</td>
<td>interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.43</td>
<td>Interior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.44</td>
<td>intimately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.45</td>
<td>intimidating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.46</td>
<td>intricate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.47</td>
<td>introduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.48</td>
<td>introducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.49</td>
<td>invalid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.50</td>
<td>invite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.51</td>
<td>involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.52</td>
<td>involves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.53</td>
<td>issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.54</td>
<td>issued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.55</td>
<td>issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.56</td>
<td>item</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.57</td>
<td>Jamie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.58</td>
<td>January</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.59</td>
<td>JBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.60</td>
<td>job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.61</td>
<td>Joelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.62</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.63</td>
<td>joined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.64</td>
<td>joke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.65</td>
<td>judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.66</td>
<td>judicial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.67</td>
<td>jumped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.68</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.69</td>
<td>jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.70</td>
<td>justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.71</td>
<td>justification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.72</td>
<td>Karen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
local (2)
locally (1)
locations (1)
logical (3)
long (5)
long-time (1)
longer (1)
looked (6)
loss (1)
lot (8)
lots (1)
loud (2)
love (2)
Luke (16)
Madam (12)
made (7)
main (1)
majority (4)
make (20)
makes (7)
making (2)
managed (2)
manager (1)
managing (1)
maneuvering (1)
manner (3)
map (38)
mapper (1)
mapping (1)
maps (18)
March (3)
Marcum (7)
Martinez (5)
Mary (3)
Mat-su (6)
Matanuska-susitna (1)
Matt (7)
matter (4)
Matthews (7)
mayor (1)
means (1)
meant (1)
meat (1)
Medicine (5)
meet (8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.71</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.72</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.73</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.74</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.75</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.76</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.77</td>
<td>mention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.78</td>
<td>mentioned</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Index: met..order</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.2</td>
<td>method</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4</td>
<td>microcosm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5</td>
<td>microphone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.7</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.8</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.9</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.10</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.11</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.12</td>
<td>minimize</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.13</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>minute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.15</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.16</td>
<td>misrepresented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.17</td>
<td>mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.18</td>
<td>mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.19</td>
<td>moderator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.20</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.21</td>
<td>moment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.22</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.23</td>
<td>Monday's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.24</td>
<td>months</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.25</td>
<td>morning</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.26</td>
<td>motion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.27</td>
<td>motives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.28</td>
<td>mountains</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.29</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.30</td>
<td>moved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.31</td>
<td>movies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.32</td>
<td>moving</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.33</td>
<td>Muldoon</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.34</td>
<td>Muldooners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.35</td>
<td>multi-family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.81</td>
<td>one-person/one-vote (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.82</td>
<td>one-session (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.83</td>
<td>one-vote (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.84</td>
<td>online (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.85</td>
<td>open (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.86</td>
<td>opening (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.87</td>
<td>opinion (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.88</td>
<td>opportunities (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.89</td>
<td>opportunity (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.90</td>
<td>oppose (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.91</td>
<td>opposition (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.92</td>
<td>optional (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.93</td>
<td>options (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.94</td>
<td>order (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2.12 | Index: ordered..previously |
| 2.12.1 | ordered (1) |
| 2.12.2 | organization (1) |
| 2.12.3 | original (1) |
| 2.12.4 | outcome (2) |
| 2.12.5 | outlined (2) |
| 2.12.6 | overturning (1) |
| 2.12.7 | Oxford (4) |
| 2.12.8 | p.m. (2) |
| 2.12.9 | Pacific (1) |
| 2.12.10 | pair (3) |
| 2.12.11 | paired (4) |
| 2.12.12 | pairing (22) |
| 2.12.13 | pairings (64) |
| 2.12.14 | paper (1) |
| 2.12.15 | parade (1) |
| 2.12.16 | Park (3) |
| 2.12.17 | parks (1) |
| 2.12.18 | parsimony (1) |
| 2.12.19 | part (13) |
| 2.12.20 | participate (1) |
| 2.12.21 | participated (2) |
| 2.12.22 | participation (1) |
| 2.12.23 | parties (1) |
| 2.12.24 | partisan (6) |
| 2.12.25 | partisanship (1) |
| 2.12.26 | parts (1) |
| 2.12.27 | pass (3) |
| 2.12.28 | passed (1) |
| 2.12.29 | passing (1) |
| 2.12.30 | past (8) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12.31</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.32</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.33</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.34</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.35</td>
<td>periodically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.36</td>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>personal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>perspective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>Peter's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>petitions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>phase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>phonetic</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>place</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>places</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>plaintiffs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>plane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>plans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>playing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>ploy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>point</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>points</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>policy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>political</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>politically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>popped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>population</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>portion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>portions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>position</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>possibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>Powder</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>practical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.28</td>
<td>publicly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.29</td>
<td>pull (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.30</td>
<td>pulled (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.31</td>
<td>purposes (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.32</td>
<td>put (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.33</td>
<td>quen (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.34</td>
<td>question (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.35</td>
<td>questionable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.36</td>
<td>questioned (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.37</td>
<td>questions (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.38</td>
<td>queue (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.39</td>
<td>quick (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.40</td>
<td>quicker (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.41</td>
<td>quickly (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.42</td>
<td>quorum (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.43</td>
<td>Rabbit (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.44</td>
<td>raise (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.45</td>
<td>raised (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.46</td>
<td>random (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.47</td>
<td>Randy (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.48</td>
<td>ranked-choice (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.49</td>
<td>rational (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.50</td>
<td>rationale (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.51</td>
<td>reach (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.52</td>
<td>reachable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.53</td>
<td>reached (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.54</td>
<td>ready (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.55</td>
<td>realizing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.56</td>
<td>reapportioning (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.57</td>
<td>reapportionment (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.58</td>
<td>reason (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.59</td>
<td>reasoning (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.60</td>
<td>reasons (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.61</td>
<td>recent (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.62</td>
<td>Recently (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.63</td>
<td>recognize (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.64</td>
<td>recognized (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.65</td>
<td>recognizing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.66</td>
<td>recommend (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.67</td>
<td>recommendation (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.68</td>
<td>recommendations (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.69</td>
<td>recommended (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.70</td>
<td>reconnect (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.71</td>
<td>record (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.72</td>
<td>recording (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.13.73 recovering (1)
2.13.74 recreate (1)
2.13.75 redistricting (30)
2.13.76 redistrictings (1)
2.13.77 redo (2)
2.13.78 refer (1)
2.13.79 referred (1)
2.13.80 reflect (1)
2.13.81 reflection (1)
2.13.82 reflects (1)
2.13.83 regard (1)
2.13.84 reinvent (1)
2.13.85 rejecting (1)
2.13.86 related (2)
2.13.87 relationships (1)
2.13.88 relevant (1)
2.13.89 remand (2)

2.14 Index: remanded..settled
2.14.1 remanded (2)
2.14.2 remarks (1)
2.14.3 remedies (1)
2.14.4 remedy (1)
2.14.5 remind (1)
2.14.6 remove (2)
2.14.7 removing (1)
2.14.8 repair (1)
2.14.9 repeated (2)
2.14.10 replace (1)
2.14.11 replaced (1)
2.14.12 report (6)
2.14.13 represent (1)
2.14.14 representation (7)
2.14.15 representative (5)
2.14.16 represented (4)
2.14.17 representing (9)
2.14.18 request (4)
2.14.19 require (1)
2.14.20 requirements (4)
2.14.21 requiring (1)
2.14.22 residences (2)
2.14.23 resident (9)
2.14.24 residential (5)
2.14.25 residents (13)
2.14.26 resolution (4)
2.14.27 resolve (2)
2.14.28  respect (1)
2.14.29  rest (5)
2.14.30  restoring (1)
2.14.31  result (2)
2.14.32  resulted (1)
2.14.33  resulting (2)
2.14.34  resume (1)
2.14.35  return (1)
2.14.36  returned (2)
2.14.37  reversed (1)
2.14.38  review (4)
2.14.39  reviewed (1)
2.14.40  reviewing (1)
2.14.41  revised (2)
2.14.42  revisit (1)
2.14.43  Rich (7)
2.14.44  Richardson (1)
2.14.45  Rick (1)
2.14.46  Ridge (2)
2.14.47  Rim (1)
2.14.48  ripple (2)
2.14.49  River (41)
2.14.50  River's (1)
2.14.51  River/chugiak (1)
2.14.52  road (1)
2.14.53  roads (2)
2.14.54  Rodriguez (4)
2.14.55  Rogers (1)
2.14.56  roll (1)
2.14.57  rolling (1)
2.14.58  room (4)
2.14.59  round (1)
2.14.60  ruled (3)
2.14.61  rulings (4)
2.14.62  run (3)
2.14.63  running (1)
2.14.64  rural (8)
2.14.65  sacred (1)
2.14.66  safe (1)
2.14.67  Scammon (1)
2.14.68  Scenic (1)
2.14.69  schedule (1)
2.14.70  scheduled (3)
2.14.71  school (2)
2.14.72  schools (3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.14.73</td>
<td>science</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.74</td>
<td>screen</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.75</td>
<td>secede</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.76</td>
<td>second-to-the-last</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.77</td>
<td>seconded</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.78</td>
<td>section</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.79</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.80</td>
<td>senator</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.81</td>
<td>senators</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.82</td>
<td>sense</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.83</td>
<td>sentiments</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.84</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.85</td>
<td>series</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.86</td>
<td>serve</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.87</td>
<td>served</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.88</td>
<td>serves</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.89</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.90</td>
<td>session</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.91</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.92</td>
<td>settled</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.15 Index: Settling...successful 509

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15.1</td>
<td>Settling</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.2</td>
<td>sewer</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.3</td>
<td>shape</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.4</td>
<td>shapes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.5</td>
<td>share</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.6</td>
<td>shared</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.7</td>
<td>shareholders</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.8</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.9</td>
<td>shift</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.10</td>
<td>shop</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.11</td>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.12</td>
<td>shore</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.13</td>
<td>short</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.14</td>
<td>showed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.15</td>
<td>showing</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.16</td>
<td>shows</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.17</td>
<td>side</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.18</td>
<td>sides</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.19</td>
<td>significant</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.20</td>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.21</td>
<td>silenced</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.22</td>
<td>Silvers</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.23</td>
<td>similar</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.24</td>
<td>similarities</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.15.70 spoke (2)
2.15.71 spoken (1)
2.15.72 staff (1)
2.15.73 stall (1)
2.15.74 stand (3)
2.15.75 standard (1)
2.15.76 star (9)
2.15.77 start (4)
2.15.78 Starting (2)
2.15.79 state (15)
2.15.80 States (1)
2.15.81 statesman (1)
2.15.82 statewide (1)
2.15.83 stating (2)
2.15.84 status (1)
2.15.85 stay (2)
2.15.86 stepped (1)
2.15.87 stop (2)
2.15.88 straight (2)
2.15.89 straightforward (2)
2.15.90 street (2)
2.15.91 Strip (1)
2.15.92 strong (2)
2.15.93 strongly (4)
2.15.94 Strum (1)
2.15.95 Sturm (6)
2.15.96 subject (1)
2.15.97 submitted (1)
2.15.98 suburban (1)
2.15.99 successful (1)
2.16 Index: suddenly..truncation 510
2.16.1 suddenly (1)
2.16.2 suggest (1)
2.16.3 suggested (5)
2.16.4 Suho (1)
2.16.5 summarize (2)
2.16.6 summary (2)
2.16.7 summer (2)
2.16.8 Superior (6)
2.16.9 support (8)
2.16.10 supported (4)
2.16.11 supports (1)
2.16.12 supposed (1)
2.16.13 Supreme (28)
2.16.14 surprised (2)
2.16.15  Susan (3)
2.16.16  swift (1)
2.16.17  swiftly (1)
2.16.18  switch (1)
2.16.19  system (3)
2.16.20  table (1)
2.16.21  talk (1)
2.16.22  talked (1)
2.16.23  talking (1)
2.16.24  task (3)
2.16.25  tasks (3)
2.16.26  taught (1)
2.16.27  Tavern (1)
2.16.28  tax (1)
2.16.29  taxpayers (1)
2.16.30  technical (1)
2.16.31  technologic (1)
2.16.32  technological (1)
2.16.33  technology (1)
2.16.34  telephone (1)
2.16.35  ten (3)
2.16.36  ten-minute (1)
2.16.37  term (1)
2.16.38  terms (3)
2.16.39  testified (7)
2.16.40  testifier (2)
2.16.41  testifiers (3)
2.16.42  testify (14)
2.16.43  testifying (4)
2.16.44  testimony (43)
2.16.45  that'll (1)
2.16.46  theory (1)
2.16.47  thing (5)
2.16.48  things (6)
2.16.49  third-party (2)
2.16.50  thought (3)
2.16.51  thousand (1)
2.16.52  Thunderbirds (1)
2.16.53  ticking (1)
2.16.54  ties (1)
2.16.55  tight (1)
2.16.56  time (32)
2.16.57  timely (2)
2.16.58  times (1)
2.16.59  timing (1)
2.16.60 tiny (2)
2.16.61 tiring (1)
2.16.62 Tlingit (1)
2.16.63 today (33)
2.16.64 tomorrow (1)
2.16.65 toolbox (1)
2.16.66 tools (1)
2.16.67 top (2)
2.16.68 Torkelson (11)
2.16.69 toss (1)
2.16.70 totally (1)
2.16.71 Totem (1)
2.16.72 touch (1)
2.16.73 tracts (1)
2.16.74 transcribed (1)
2.16.75 transcribing (1)
2.16.76 transferred (1)
2.16.77 transition (1)
2.16.78 transitions (1)
2.16.79 transparent (1)
2.16.80 transportation (1)
2.16.81 treat (2)
2.16.82 treated (1)
2.16.83 treats (1)
2.16.84 trial (8)
2.16.85 trip (1)
2.16.86 truncation (4)

2.17 Index: trust..work 511
2.17.1 trust (4)
2.17.2 truth (1)
2.17.3 Tuesday (1)
2.17.4 turn (7)
2.17.5 Turnagain (9)
2.17.6 turned (3)
2.17.7 two-minute (1)
2.17.8 type (2)
2.17.9 U-MED (1)
2.17.10 U-MED/AIRPORT (1)
2.17.11 U.S. (2)
2.17.12 ultimate (1)
2.17.13 ultimately (1)
2.17.14 unanimously (1)
2.17.15 uncertainty (1)
2.17.16 unclear (1)
2.17.17 unconstitutional (7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>undemocratic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>underlying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unethically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unique</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uniquely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>university</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unmute</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpopulated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprecedented</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unusually</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upcoming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uphold</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban/suburban</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urge</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urging</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdez</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vast</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>version</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>versions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vetted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>video</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videoconference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>violated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>visit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vital</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volunteer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vote</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voters</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>votes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.18.15  Zoom (3)
2.18.16  Zuckerberg (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3</th>
<th>Transcript Formats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ASCII/TXT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ARB2000178-000284  2022-04-04-ARB-Transcript-Full

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Transcript</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Caption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Page 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Page 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Page 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Page 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Page 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Page 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Page 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>Page 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>Page 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>Page 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>Page 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>Page 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>Page 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>Page 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>Page 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>Page 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>Page 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>Page 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Page 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Page 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Page 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Page 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>Page 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>Page 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>Page 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>Page 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>Page 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>Page 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>Page 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>Page 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Page 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>Page 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>Page 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>Page 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>Page 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>Page 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

513 514 515 516 517 518 519 520 521 522 523 524 525 526 527 528 529 530 531 532 533 534 535 536 537 538 539 540 541 542 543 544 545 546 547 548 549 550 551
### 2 Word Index

2.1 Index: -ooo-..afternoon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1.1</th>
<th>-ooo- (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>00:00:00 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>10 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4</td>
<td>10:00 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5</td>
<td>11 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6</td>
<td>11th (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7</td>
<td>12 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8</td>
<td>13 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.9</td>
<td>14 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10</td>
<td>140 (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.11</td>
<td>15 (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.12</td>
<td>15th (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.13</td>
<td>16 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.14</td>
<td>17 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.15</td>
<td>18 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.16</td>
<td>19 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.17</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.18</td>
<td>200 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.19</td>
<td>2001 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.20</td>
<td>21 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.21</td>
<td>21/22-K (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td>22 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.23</td>
<td>23 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.24</td>
<td>24 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.25</td>
<td>25 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.26</td>
<td>25th (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.27</td>
<td>29 (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.28</td>
<td>3 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.29</td>
<td>30 (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.30</td>
<td>36 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.31</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.32</td>
<td>40 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.33</td>
<td>4th (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.34</td>
<td>8:00 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.35</td>
<td>9 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.36</td>
<td>90 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.49</td>
<td>audio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.50</td>
<td>autobound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.51</td>
<td>automatically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.52</td>
<td>avalanche</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.53</td>
<td>avalanches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.54</td>
<td>avoid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.55</td>
<td>aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.56</td>
<td>back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.57</td>
<td>badgered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.58</td>
<td>Bahnke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.59</td>
<td>Bahnke's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.60</td>
<td>Bahnke/simpson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.61</td>
<td>barking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.62</td>
<td>Barrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.63</td>
<td>based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.64</td>
<td>basic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.65</td>
<td>basically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.66</td>
<td>beg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.67</td>
<td>belabor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.68</td>
<td>beliefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.69</td>
<td>belongs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.70</td>
<td>benefit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.71</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.72</td>
<td>Bethany's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.73</td>
<td>bifurcate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.74</td>
<td>bifurcating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.75</td>
<td>big</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.76</td>
<td>Binkley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Index: bit..close

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>bits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>black-and-white</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>blindness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>block</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>blocks</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7</td>
<td>board</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8</td>
<td>board's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.9</td>
<td>boat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.10</td>
<td>borough</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.11</td>
<td>Borromeo</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.12</td>
<td>Borromeo's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.13</td>
<td>boundaries</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>boundary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.15</td>
<td>bounded</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.16</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.17</td>
<td>bring (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.18</td>
<td>broke (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.19</td>
<td>Budd (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.20</td>
<td>Budd's (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.21</td>
<td>bunch (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.22</td>
<td>Bunde (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.23</td>
<td>business (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.24</td>
<td>Calista (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.25</td>
<td>call (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.26</td>
<td>called (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.27</td>
<td>calling (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.28</td>
<td>calls (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.29</td>
<td>camera (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.30</td>
<td>campaigns (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.31</td>
<td>Cantwell (35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.32</td>
<td>Cantwell's (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.33</td>
<td>cards (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.34</td>
<td>care (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.35</td>
<td>careful (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.36</td>
<td>carries (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.37</td>
<td>carve (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.38</td>
<td>carve-out (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.39</td>
<td>case (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.40</td>
<td>catch (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.41</td>
<td>category (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.42</td>
<td>Cathy (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.43</td>
<td>Celeste (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.44</td>
<td>census (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.45</td>
<td>center (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.46</td>
<td>certainty (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.47</td>
<td>Chair (146)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.48</td>
<td>chairman (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.49</td>
<td>challenge (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.50</td>
<td>chance (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.51</td>
<td>change (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.52</td>
<td>chastised (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.53</td>
<td>check (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.54</td>
<td>checking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.55</td>
<td>choices (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.56</td>
<td>choose (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.57</td>
<td>choosing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.58</td>
<td>Chugiak (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.59</td>
<td>Chugiak/eagle (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.60</td>
<td>circumstances (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.61</td>
<td>city (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.62</td>
<td>clarification (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.63</td>
<td>clarifications (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.64</td>
<td>clarify (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.65</td>
<td>clarifying (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.66</td>
<td>clear (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.67</td>
<td>clicked (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.68</td>
<td>close (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4  Index: closely..cutout

| 2.4.1 | closely (1) |
| 2.4.2 | closer (1) |
| 2.4.3 | Coalition (2) |
| 2.4.4 | coding (1) |
| 2.4.5 | coffee (1) |
| 2.4.6 | color (3) |
| 2.4.7 | colored (1) |
| 2.4.8 | combining (1) |
| 2.4.9 | comfortable (1) |
| 2.4.10 | comment (23) |
| 2.4.11 | commentary (1) |
| 2.4.12 | commenting (1) |
| 2.4.13 | comments (11) |
| 2.4.14 | commonly (1) |
| 2.4.15 | communities (5) |
| 2.4.16 | community (11) |
| 2.4.17 | compact (3) |
| 2.4.18 | compare (9) |
| 2.4.19 | compared (2) |
| 2.4.20 | comparing (1) |
| 2.4.21 | comparison (2) |
| 2.4.22 | compatible (1) |
| 2.4.23 | compelling (2) |
| 2.4.24 | complete (3) |
| 2.4.25 | completely (1) |
| 2.4.26 | complicated (1) |
| 2.4.27 | complies (2) |
| 2.4.28 | comply (1) |
| 2.4.29 | components (1) |
| 2.4.30 | comporting (1) |
| 2.4.31 | computer (6) |
| 2.4.32 | Con (1) |
| 2.4.33 | concede (1) |
| 2.4.34 | concept (1) |
| 2.4.35 | concern (2) |
| 2.4.36 | concerned (2) |
| 2.4.37 | concerns (1) |
2.4.38 concise (1)
2.4.39 conclude (1)
2.4.40 concur (1)
2.4.41 condolences (1)
2.4.42 confirm (2)
2.4.43 conflict (1)
2.4.44 conflicting (1)
2.4.45 conflicts (1)
2.4.46 confusion (1)
2.4.47 Congressman (1)
2.4.48 connected (1)
2.4.49 consideration (4)
2.4.50 considered (2)
2.4.51 consist- (1)
2.4.52 consistency (1)
2.4.53 consistent (5)
2.4.54 constituent (1)
2.4.55 constituents (1)
2.4.56 constitution (4)
2.4.57 constitutional (4)
2.4.58 constitutionally (1)
2.4.59 contained (1)
2.4.60 contemplated (2)
2.4.61 contiguous (1)
2.4.62 continue (3)
2.4.63 Contrary (1)
2.4.64 control (1)
2.4.65 controlled (1)
2.4.66 controversial (4)
2.4.67 convening (1)
2.4.68 conversation (1)
2.4.69 conversations (2)
2.4.70 cooking (1)
2.4.71 coordinated (1)
2.4.72 correct (3)
2.4.73 corrected (1)
2.4.74 correction (26)
2.4.75 corrections (7)
2.4.76 counsel (4)
2.4.77 counsel's (1)
2.4.78 counts (1)
2.4.79 couple (14)
2.4.80 court (41)
2.4.81 Court's (8)
2.4.82 courts (2)
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.83</td>
<td>crashes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.84</td>
<td>creative (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.85</td>
<td>creativity (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.86</td>
<td>criteria (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.87</td>
<td>critical (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.88</td>
<td>criticism (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.89</td>
<td>criticisms (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.90</td>
<td>current (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.91</td>
<td>cursor (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.92</td>
<td>cutoff (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.93</td>
<td>cutout (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Index: cuts..ease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>cuts (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>cutting (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>dance (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>dashed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>data (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.6</td>
<td>date (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.7</td>
<td>dates (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.8</td>
<td>David (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.9</td>
<td>day (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.10</td>
<td>days (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.11</td>
<td>dead (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.12</td>
<td>deadline (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.13</td>
<td>deal (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.14</td>
<td>debate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.15</td>
<td>debating (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.16</td>
<td>December (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.17</td>
<td>decide (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.18</td>
<td>decided (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19</td>
<td>decision (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.20</td>
<td>declaration (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.21</td>
<td>deemed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.22</td>
<td>defer (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.23</td>
<td>deference (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.24</td>
<td>deficiency (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.25</td>
<td>definitive (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.26</td>
<td>delay (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.27</td>
<td>delays (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.28</td>
<td>deliberation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.29</td>
<td>Denali (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.30</td>
<td>Denaya (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.31</td>
<td>Denny (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.32</td>
<td>denying (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.33</td>
<td>description (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.34</td>
<td>deserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.35</td>
<td>deserves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.36</td>
<td>desire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.37</td>
<td>desiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.38</td>
<td>desk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.39</td>
<td>detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.40</td>
<td>details</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.41</td>
<td>determining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.42</td>
<td>development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.43</td>
<td>deviations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.44</td>
<td>dial-in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.45</td>
<td>difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.46</td>
<td>differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.47</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.48</td>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.49</td>
<td>directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.50</td>
<td>directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.51</td>
<td>disappointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.52</td>
<td>disconnect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.53</td>
<td>discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.54</td>
<td>discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.55</td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.56</td>
<td>discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.57</td>
<td>dispose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.58</td>
<td>disservice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.59</td>
<td>distracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.60</td>
<td>distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.61</td>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.62</td>
<td>districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.63</td>
<td>divide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.64</td>
<td>divider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.65</td>
<td>dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.66</td>
<td>dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.67</td>
<td>door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.68</td>
<td>dot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.69</td>
<td>double-check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.70</td>
<td>downside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.71</td>
<td>downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.72</td>
<td>Doyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.73</td>
<td>dozen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.74</td>
<td>draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.75</td>
<td>drafted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.76</td>
<td>drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.77</td>
<td>dragging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.78</td>
<td>draw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.79 drew (1)
2.5.80 drill (1)
2.5.81 driven (1)
2.5.82 driving (1)
2.5.83 due (5)
2.5.84 Dunsmore (3)
2.5.85 duty (1)
2.5.86 dynamic (1)
2.5.87 E's (1)
2.5.88 Eagle (18)
2.5.89 earlier (9)
2.5.90 early (1)
2.5.91 ease (6)

2.6 Index: east..gerrymandering 609
2.6.1 east (4)
2.6.2 eastern (1)
2.6.3 echo (1)
2.6.4 edit (1)
2.6.5 effective (1)
2.6.6 effort (1)
2.6.7 efforts (1)
2.6.8 election (3)
2.6.9 elections (2)
2.6.10 elegant (1)
2.6.11 eloquent (1)
2.6.12 emergency (1)
2.6.13 encourage (16)
2.6.14 encouraging (1)
2.6.15 end (5)
2.6.16 ends (1)
2.6.17 engage (2)
2.6.18 entertain (1)
2.6.19 enthusiasm (1)
2.6.20 equitable (1)
2.6.21 erode (1)
2.6.22 error (3)
2.6.23 errors (1)
2.6.24 establish (1)
2.6.25 evening (2)
2.6.26 everybody's (3)
2.6.27 exact (1)
2.6.28 examples (1)
2.6.29 excuse (2)
2.6.30 existing (7)
2.6.31 expecting (3)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>expeditious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expeditiously</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fact</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fast</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>favor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figured</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finalize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finalized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>findings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischetti</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five-minute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fix</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>floor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folks</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreclosing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forever</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.77 forgot (1)
2.6.78 form (1)
2.6.79 formally (1)
2.6.80 forum (1)
2.6.81 forward (27)
2.6.82 found (2)
2.6.83 frame (2)
2.6.84 Friday (4)
2.6.85 front (4)
2.6.86 fulfill (1)
2.6.87 full (7)
2.6.88 fully (1)
2.6.89 future (1)
2.6.90 gain (1)
2.6.91 gallery (1)
2.6.92 gave (4)
2.6.93 gavel (1)
2.6.94 gears (1)
2.6.95 general (1)
2.6.96 generally (1)
2.6.97 gerrymandering (4)

2.7 Index: Giessel..instruction

2.7.1 Giessel (1)
2.7.2 give (24)
2.7.3 giving (1)
2.7.4 glanced (1)
2.7.5 goal (1)
2.7.6 good (12)
2.7.7 government (2)
2.7.8 grab (1)
2.7.9 Graham-hodge (1)
2.7.10 graphically (1)
2.7.11 graphics (1)
2.7.12 grayer (1)
2.7.13 Great (2)
2.7.14 group (2)
2.7.15 guess (4)
2.7.16 guidance (1)
2.7.17 guys (4)
2.7.18 hand (15)
2.7.19 hand's (1)
2.7.20 hands (3)
2.7.21 handy (2)
2.7.22 happen (1)
2.7.23 happened (1)
2.7.69 inadvertent (1)
2.7.70 inclined (1)
2.7.71 included (1)
2.7.72 including (2)
2.7.73 incorporate (2)
2.7.74 incorporated (1)
2.7.75 incorporates (1)
2.7.76 incumbent (1)
2.7.77 indefinitely (1)
2.7.78 independent (1)
2.7.79 indiscernible (23)
2.7.80 individuals (3)
2.7.81 information (5)
2.7.82 informative (1)
2.7.83 initial (1)
2.7.84 input (3)
2.7.85 inquiries (1)
2.7.86 instance (1)
2.7.87 instructed (1)
2.7.88 instruction (1)

2.8 Index: instructions...makes 611

2.8.1 instructions (1)
2.8.2 intact (1)
2.8.3 integrate (1)
2.8.4 integrated (2)
2.8.5 integration (1)
2.8.6 intend (3)
2.8.7 intended (1)
2.8.8 intent (1)
2.8.9 interest (1)
2.8.10 interested (2)
2.8.11 interests (3)
2.8.12 interject (1)
2.8.13 internet (1)
2.8.14 interpretation (3)
2.8.15 introduce (3)
2.8.16 introduced (4)
2.8.17 invested (1)
2.8.18 invite (5)
2.8.19 involve (1)
2.8.20 involved (1)
2.8.21 involvement (1)
2.8.22 irrational (1)
2.8.23 issue (5)
2.8.24 issues (4)
2.8.25 item (1)
2.8.26 Jack (1)
2.8.27 Jamie (3)
2.8.28 January (1)
2.8.29 JBER (2)
2.8.30 John (8)
2.8.31 join (1)
2.8.32 judge (4)
2.8.33 judge's (1)
2.8.34 judiciary (2)
2.8.35 Juneau (1)
2.8.36 keeping (4)
2.8.37 kind (9)
2.8.38 kinds (1)
2.8.39 knew (2)
2.8.40 knocks (1)
2.8.41 Knowing (1)
2.8.42 LAA (1)
2.8.43 label (1)
2.8.44 laid (1)
2.8.45 lands (1)
2.8.46 language (1)
2.8.47 laptop (1)
2.8.48 latest (1)
2.8.49 law (1)
2.8.50 lead (1)
2.8.51 learning (1)
2.8.52 leave (1)
2.8.53 leaving (1)
2.8.54 left (1)
2.8.55 legal (2)
2.8.56 legally (1)
2.8.57 legitimate (1)
2.8.58 letting (1)
2.8.59 level (6)
2.8.60 light (2)
2.8.61 lightly (1)
2.8.62 limited (2)
2.8.63 limits (1)
2.8.64 lines (2)
2.8.65 LIO (8)
2.8.66 lip (1)
2.8.67 list (4)
2.8.68 listen (5)
2.8.69 listened (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.8.70 listening</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.71 litigated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.72 litigation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.73 live</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.74 local</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.75 locally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.76 location</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.77 logical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.78 long</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.79 longer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.80 looked</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.81 loss</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.82 lost</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.83 lot</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.84 loud</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.85 lower</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.86 ludicrous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.87 made</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.88 mail</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.89 main</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.90 major</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.91 majority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.92 make</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.93 maker</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.94 makes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Index: making..mute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.1 making</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2 management</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.3 map</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.4 map's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.5 mapped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.6 mapping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.7 maps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.8 March</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.9 Marcum</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.10 Marcum's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11 massive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.12 Mat-su</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.13 Matanuska-susitna</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.14 match</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.15 Matt</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.16 matter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.17 matters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.18 Matthews</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.19 Matthews'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.20 maximize (1)
2.9.21 maximum (2)
2.9.22 meaningful (1)
2.9.23 meaningfully (1)
2.9.24 means (4)
2.9.25 meet (9)
2.9.26 meet all (1)
2.9.27 meeting (32)
2.9.28 meetings (4)
2.9.29 Melanie (24)
2.9.30 member (173)
2.9.31 members (24)
2.9.32 members’ (1)
2.9.33 memo (3)
2.9.34 mention (1)
2.9.35 mentioned (3)
2.9.36 mentioning (1)
2.9.37 message (1)
2.9.38 met (3)
2.9.39 midst (1)
2.9.40 Midtown (1)
2.9.41 military (1)
2.9.42 mind (9)
2.9.43 mine (2)
2.9.44 minimal (1)
2.9.45 minor (2)
2.9.46 minute (4)
2.9.47 minutes (19)
2.9.48 missed (1)
2.9.49 mistake (2)
2.9.50 modification (1)
2.9.51 moment (1)
2.9.52 Monday (1)
2.9.53 months (5)
2.9.54 morning (11)
2.9.55 motion (85)
2.9.56 motions (2)
2.9.57 motivated (1)
2.9.58 Mountain (1)
2.9.59 move (32)
2.9.60 moved (3)
2.9.61 moving (9)
2.9.62 Muldoon (1)
2.9.63 multiple (3)
2.9.64 municipal (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9.65</td>
<td>municipality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.66</td>
<td>mute</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>Index: name's..patience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.1</td>
<td>name's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.2</td>
<td>narrowing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.3</td>
<td>narrows</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.4</td>
<td>Native</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.5</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.6</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.7</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.8</td>
<td>Nicole's</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.9</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10</td>
<td>nobody's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.11</td>
<td>Nome</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12</td>
<td>non-native</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13</td>
<td>non-shareholders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.14</td>
<td>nonpartisan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.15</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.16</td>
<td>northern</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.17</td>
<td>note</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.18</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.19</td>
<td>notice</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.20</td>
<td>noticed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.21</td>
<td>notion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.22</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.23</td>
<td>nuance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.24</td>
<td>nuances</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.25</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.26</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.27</td>
<td>numerical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.28</td>
<td>object</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.29</td>
<td>objection</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.30</td>
<td>obligations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.31</td>
<td>observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.32</td>
<td>observations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.33</td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.34</td>
<td>occur</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.35</td>
<td>offensive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.36</td>
<td>offer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.37</td>
<td>offered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.38</td>
<td>offering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.39</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.40</td>
<td>official</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.41</td>
<td>offline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.42</td>
<td>one-sided</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.43</td>
<td>online (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.44</td>
<td>open (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.45</td>
<td>opened (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.46</td>
<td>operated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.47</td>
<td>opinion (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.48</td>
<td>opportunities (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.49</td>
<td>opportunity (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.50</td>
<td>oppose (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.51</td>
<td>opposed (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.52</td>
<td>opposite (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.53</td>
<td>opposition (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.54</td>
<td>option (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.55</td>
<td>options (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.56</td>
<td>oral (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.57</td>
<td>orange (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.58</td>
<td>orchestrated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.59</td>
<td>order (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.60</td>
<td>outcome (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.61</td>
<td>overwhelming (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.62</td>
<td>overwhelmingly (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.63</td>
<td>pair (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.64</td>
<td>paired (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.65</td>
<td>pairing (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.66</td>
<td>pairings (61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.67</td>
<td>palatable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.68</td>
<td>paper (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.69</td>
<td>parallel (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.70</td>
<td>Parks (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.71</td>
<td>part (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.72</td>
<td>partial (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.73</td>
<td>partially (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.74</td>
<td>participant (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.75</td>
<td>participants (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.76</td>
<td>participate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.77</td>
<td>participated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.78</td>
<td>participation (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.79</td>
<td>parties (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.80</td>
<td>partisan (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.81</td>
<td>parts (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.82</td>
<td>party (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.83</td>
<td>passing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.84</td>
<td>passionate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.85</td>
<td>patience (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11 Index: patiently..public

2.11.1 patiently (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12.10</td>
<td>pulls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.11</td>
<td>purple</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.12</td>
<td>purplish</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.13</td>
<td>purpose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.14</td>
<td>purposes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.15</td>
<td>push</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.16</td>
<td>pushback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.17</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.18</td>
<td>put</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.19</td>
<td>putting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.20</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.21</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.22</td>
<td>queue</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.23</td>
<td>quick</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.24</td>
<td>quickly</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.25</td>
<td>quorum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.26</td>
<td>raise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.27</td>
<td>raised</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.28</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.29</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.30</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.31</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.32</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.33</td>
<td>realize</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.34</td>
<td>realizing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.35</td>
<td>reapportionment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.36</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>recall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>received</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>reconsider</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>recording</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>redistricting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>reevaluate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>referring</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>reflected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>reflection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>reflects</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>refuse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>regard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>reiterate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>reiterated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>remain (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>remand (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>remanded (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>remember (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>remind (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>remove (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>removed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>removing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>repeating (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>report (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>represent (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>request (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>requested (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>require (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>required (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>requirements (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>requires (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>resent (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>resident (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>resolution (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>resounding (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.76</td>
<td>resoundingly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.77</td>
<td>respect (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.78</td>
<td>respectfully (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.79</td>
<td>respecting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.80</td>
<td>respond (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.81</td>
<td>responds (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.82</td>
<td>rest (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.83</td>
<td>restart (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.84</td>
<td>restate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.85</td>
<td>return (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.86</td>
<td>returned (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.87</td>
<td>returning (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.88</td>
<td>revelation (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.89</td>
<td>reverting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.90</td>
<td>review (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Index: reviewing..socioeconomic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1</td>
<td>reviewing (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.2</td>
<td>revised (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.3</td>
<td>revision (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.4</td>
<td>revisions (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.5</td>
<td>ridiculous (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.6</td>
<td>rights (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.7</td>
<td>risk (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.8</td>
<td>River (21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.9</td>
<td>River/chugiak</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.10</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.11</td>
<td>Robert's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.12</td>
<td>roll</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.13</td>
<td>room</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.14</td>
<td>roughly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.15</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.16</td>
<td>Ruedrich</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.17</td>
<td>ruled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.18</td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.19</td>
<td>ruling</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.20</td>
<td>running</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.21</td>
<td>rush</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.22</td>
<td>rushed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.23</td>
<td>rushing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.24</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.25</td>
<td>safety</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.26</td>
<td>sake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.27</td>
<td>satisfy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.28</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.29</td>
<td>scene</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.30</td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.31</td>
<td>scheduled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.32</td>
<td>schedules</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.33</td>
<td>scheduling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.34</td>
<td>screen</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.35</td>
<td>screenshots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.36</td>
<td>scrutinizing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.37</td>
<td>scrutiny</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.38</td>
<td>seats</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.39</td>
<td>seconded</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.40</td>
<td>secretly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.41</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.42</td>
<td>seeking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.43</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.44</td>
<td>Senator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.45</td>
<td>senators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.46</td>
<td>sense</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.47</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.48</td>
<td>sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.49</td>
<td>served</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.50</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.51</td>
<td>session</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.52</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.53</td>
<td>setting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.6</td>
<td>south (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.7</td>
<td>southern (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.8</td>
<td>speak (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.9</td>
<td>speaking (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.10</td>
<td>special (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.11</td>
<td>specific (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.12</td>
<td>specifically (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.13</td>
<td>Spenard (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.14</td>
<td>sphere (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.15</td>
<td>split (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.16</td>
<td>splitting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.17</td>
<td>spoke (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.18</td>
<td>spoken (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.19</td>
<td>spring (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.20</td>
<td>staff (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.21</td>
<td>stand (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.22</td>
<td>start (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.23</td>
<td>started (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.24</td>
<td>starting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.25</td>
<td>starts (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.26</td>
<td>state (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.27</td>
<td>stated (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.28</td>
<td>statement (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.29</td>
<td>statewide (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.30</td>
<td>statistics (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.31</td>
<td>status (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.32</td>
<td>stay (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.33</td>
<td>steps (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.34</td>
<td>stick (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.35</td>
<td>sticking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.36</td>
<td>sticky (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.37</td>
<td>stop (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.38</td>
<td>strange (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.39</td>
<td>strategic (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.40</td>
<td>strongly (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.41</td>
<td>strung (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.42</td>
<td>study (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.43</td>
<td>subject (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.44</td>
<td>submissions (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.45</td>
<td>submit (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.46</td>
<td>submitted (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.47</td>
<td>submitting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.48</td>
<td>substantial (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.49</td>
<td>suffer (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.50</td>
<td>sufficient (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.15.5 thought (8)
2.15.6 thoughts (3)
2.15.7 throw (1)
2.15.8 thrust (1)
2.15.9 Thursday (13)
2.15.10 tied (2)
2.15.11 tight (1)
2.15.12 time (51)
2.15.13 time-consuming (1)
2.15.14 timeline (1)
2.15.15 timelines (1)
2.15.16 timing (1)
2.15.17 today (36)
2.15.18 today's (1)
2.15.19 token (1)
2.15.20 told (2)
2.15.21 tomorrow (24)
2.15.22 tone (4)
2.15.23 top (1)
2.15.24 TORKELSON (31)
2.15.25 tossed (1)
2.15.26 totally (1)
2.15.27 track (2)
2.15.28 tremendous (1)
2.15.29 trouble (3)
2.15.30 true (3)
2.15.31 trust (1)
2.15.32 Tuesday (7)
2.15.33 turn (1)
2.15.34 Turnagain (1)
2.15.35 turned (1)
2.15.36 unavailability (1)
2.15.37 unbalanced (1)
2.15.38 unconstitutional (1)
2.15.39 uncontroversial (1)
2.15.40 undergo (3)
2.15.41 underlying (1)
2.15.42 understand (9)
2.15.43 understanding (5)
2.15.44 understands (2)
2.15.45 understood (1)
2.15.46 unfair (2)
2.15.47 unique (1)
2.15.48 unmute (3)
2.15.49 unmuted (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15.50</td>
<td>unnecessarily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.51</td>
<td>unpause</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.52</td>
<td>unpunished</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.53</td>
<td>unreasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.54</td>
<td>update</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.55</td>
<td>uplands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.56</td>
<td>upsetting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.57</td>
<td>urge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.58</td>
<td>urged</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.59</td>
<td>utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.60</td>
<td>v3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.61</td>
<td>v4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.62</td>
<td>Valdez</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.63</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.64</td>
<td>vast</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.65</td>
<td>verbal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.66</td>
<td>verification</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.67</td>
<td>verifications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.68</td>
<td>verify</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.69</td>
<td>version</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.70</td>
<td>versions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.71</td>
<td>versus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.72</td>
<td>veterans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.73</td>
<td>video</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.74</td>
<td>view</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.75</td>
<td>violated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.76</td>
<td>visible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.77</td>
<td>visual</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.78</td>
<td>vote</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.79</td>
<td>voted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.80</td>
<td>voters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Index: votes..zoom</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.1</td>
<td>votes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.2</td>
<td>voting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.3</td>
<td>wait</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.4</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.5</td>
<td>walk</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.6</td>
<td>wanted</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.7</td>
<td>wanting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.8</td>
<td>watch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.9</td>
<td>watching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.10</td>
<td>web</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.11</td>
<td>website</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.12</td>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.13</td>
<td>week</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.11</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.13</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.15</td>
<td>14th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.17</td>
<td>15/16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.18</td>
<td>15th</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.20</td>
<td>16/14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.23</td>
<td>18/19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.24</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.26</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.27</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.28</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.29</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.31</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.33</td>
<td>20/21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.34</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.35</td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.36</td>
<td>2022</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.42</td>
<td>25th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.43</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.45</td>
<td>28th</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.47</td>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.48</td>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.51</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.52</td>
<td>30-day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.54</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.55</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.56</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.57</td>
<td>49th</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.58</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.61</td>
<td>5th</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.63</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.66</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.67</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.68</td>
<td>70-year-old</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.69</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.70</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.71</td>
<td>80s</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Index: 81..Alaskans</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>8th</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>9's</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>9/10</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8</td>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.9</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.10</td>
<td>a.m.</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.11</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.12</td>
<td>abide</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.13</td>
<td>ability</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>abruptly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.15</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.16</td>
<td>absorb</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.17</td>
<td>abuse</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.18</td>
<td>abused</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.19</td>
<td>accept</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.20</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.21</td>
<td>accepted</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.22</td>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.23</td>
<td>access</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.24</td>
<td>accommodate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.25</td>
<td>accomplish</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.26</td>
<td>accomplished</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.27</td>
<td>accomplishing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.28 accomplishments (1)
2.2.29 accounted (1)
2.2.30 achieve (3)
2.2.31 achieving (1)
2.2.32 acknowledge (1)
2.2.33 acknowledging (1)
2.2.34 acrimony (1)
2.2.35 acronym (2)
2.2.36 act (3)
2.2.37 action (4)
2.2.38 actual (4)
2.2.39 add (3)
2.2.40 adding (1)
2.2.41 addition (2)
2.2.42 additional (12)
2.2.43 Additionally (1)
2.2.44 address (5)
2.2.45 addresses (1)
2.2.46 addressing (1)
2.2.47 adequate (4)
2.2.48 adhered (1)
2.2.49 adjoining (1)
2.2.50 adjourn (3)
2.2.51 adjourned (1)
2.2.52 adjust (1)
2.2.53 adjusted (2)
2.2.54 adjustments (1)
2.2.55 adopt (25)
2.2.56 adopted (13)
2.2.57 adopting (4)
2.2.58 adoption (2)
2.2.59 advance (1)
2.2.60 advanced (1)
2.2.61 advice (4)
2.2.62 advising (1)
2.2.63 advocate (1)
2.2.64 advocating (2)
2.2.65 affect (2)
2.2.66 affected (4)
2.2.67 affecting (1)
2.2.68 affects (1)
2.2.69 Affer (2)
2.2.70 affiliation (2)
2.2.71 afford (1)
2.2.72 Afr (1)
| 2.2.73  | afternoon (5) |
| 2.2.74  | agenda (19)   |
| 2.2.75  | agendas (1)   |
| 2.2.76  | agree (6)     |
| 2.2.77  | ahead (23)    |
| 2.2.78  | ahold (1)     |
| 2.2.79  | Ahtna (1)     |
| 2.2.80  | air (1)       |
| 2.2.81  | Airport (6)   |
| 2.2.82  | Airports (1)  |
| 2.2.83  | AKPIRG (1)    |
| 2.2.84  | Alaska (17)   |
| 2.2.85  | Alaskan (1)   |
| 2.2.86  | Alaskan's (1) |
| 2.2.87  | Alaskans (8)  |

2.3  Index: Alex..Bahnke

| 2.3.1   | Alex (7)  |
| 2.3.2   | aligned (4) |
| 2.3.3   | alignment (1) |
| 2.3.4   | alignments (1) |
| 2.3.5   | all-day (1) |
| 2.3.6   | allegation (1) |
| 2.3.7   | alleviate (1) |
| 2.3.8   | allowed (5) |
| 2.3.9   | allowing (2) |
| 2.3.10  | alternative (3) |
| 2.3.11  | amalgamating (1) |
| 2.3.12  | Amdur-clark (8) |
| 2.3.13  | amended (1) |
| 2.3.14  | amendment (4) |
| 2.3.15  | amount (2) |
| 2.3.16  | Ample (1) |
| 2.3.17  | analyze (1) |
| 2.3.18  | anchor (1) |
| 2.3.19  | Anchorage (121) |
| 2.3.20  | Anchorage's (1) |
| 2.3.21  | Anchorage/jber (1) |
| 2.3.22  | Anchoragites (1) |
| 2.3.23  | ANCSA (1) |
| 2.3.24  | animus (1) |
| 2.3.25  | Ann (4) |
| 2.3.26  | anymore (1) |
| 2.3.27  | apologies (2) |
| 2.3.28  | apologize (6) |
| 2.3.29  | apparatus (1) |
2.3.75 avalanche (1)
2.3.76 Avenue (2)
2.3.77 average (1)
2.3.78 avoid (2)
2.3.79 awards (1)
2.3.80 aware (6)
2.3.81 back (27)
2.3.82 backlog (1)
2.3.83 bad (1)
2.3.84 badgering (4)
2.3.85 Bahnke (109)

2.4 Index: Bahnke's..Borromeo 757
2.4.1 Bahnke's (1)
2.4.2 Bahnke-proposed (1)
2.4.3 Baker (8)
2.4.4 balanced (1)
2.4.5 balances (1)
2.4.6 Barbara (4)
2.4.7 barely (2)
2.4.8 base (3)
2.4.9 based (4)
2.4.10 baseline (1)
2.4.11 bases (1)
2.4.12 basically (4)
2.4.13 Bayshore (1)
2.4.14 Bear (1)
2.4.15 bears (1)
2.4.16 beautiful (1)
2.4.17 bedroom (1)
2.4.18 beer (1)
2.4.19 began (1)
2.4.20 begging (1)
2.4.21 Begich (12)
2.4.22 begin (1)
2.4.23 beginning (7)
2.4.24 behalf (10)
2.4.25 believes (1)
2.4.26 Bell's (1)
2.4.27 belong (2)
2.4.28 benefit (1)
2.4.29 bet (3)
2.4.30 Bethany (23)
2.4.31 Bethany's (2)
2.4.32 Bettye (1)
2.4.33 Bicentennial (1)
2.4.34 bifurcated (1)
2.4.35 big (4)
2.4.36 biggest (1)
2.4.37 bill (2)
2.4.38 Binkley (230)
2.4.39 BIPOC (2)
2.4.40 Birch (1)
2.4.41 bit (14)
2.4.42 Bittner (1)
2.4.43 Black (2)
2.4.44 Blackburn (18)
2.4.45 blanche (1)
2.4.46 blanket (1)
2.4.47 blasted (1)
2.4.48 blatantly (1)
2.4.49 blocked (1)
2.4.50 blocs (1)
2.4.51 board (113)
2.4.52 board's (3)
2.4.53 board-adopted (2)
2.4.54 boards (1)
2.4.55 bodies (1)
2.4.56 body (5)
2.4.57 border (1)
2.4.58 borders (2)
2.4.59 borough (2)
2.4.60 Borromeo (60)

2.5 Index: both-siderism..chairman 758
2.5.1 both-siderism (1)
2.5.2 Boulevard (1)
2.5.3 boundaries (8)
2.5.4 bounded (1)
2.5.5 bounds (6)
2.5.6 box (1)
2.5.7 boxed (1)
2.5.8 boxes (1)
2.5.9 Brad (1)
2.5.10 Bradley (1)
2.5.11 brand (1)
2.5.12 brazen (1)
2.5.13 break (2)
2.5.14 Brewing (1)
2.5.15 Brian (4)
2.5.16 bridge (1)
2.5.17 briefly (3)
2.5.63 caution (1)
2.5.64 cautious (1)
2.5.65 CB (1)
2.5.66 Celeste (4)
2.5.67 census (1)
2.5.68 centers (1)
2.5.69 Central (1)
2.5.70 CEO (1)
2.5.71 chair (25)
2.5.72 chaired (1)
2.5.73 chairman (270)
2.6 Index: challenge..compact
2.6.1 challenge (1)
2.6.2 challenges (1)
2.6.3 challenging (1)
2.6.4 champions (1)
2.6.5 chance (8)
2.6.6 change (10)
2.6.7 changed (9)
2.6.8 changing (3)
2.6.9 channels (1)
2.6.10 chaos (1)
2.6.11 characteristics (1)
2.6.12 characterization (1)
2.6.13 characterizations (1)
2.6.14 characterized (1)
2.6.15 charges (1)
2.6.16 charter (1)
2.6.17 check (1)
2.6.18 checked (1)
2.6.19 chest (1)
2.6.20 Chester (1)
2.6.21 Chiefs (1)
2.6.22 children (1)
2.6.23 choice (1)
2.6.24 chokehold (1)
2.6.25 choose (3)
2.6.26 choosing (1)
2.6.27 chose (1)
2.6.28 chosen (1)
2.6.29 Chris (2)
2.6.30 Christopher (4)
2.6.31 Chugach (5)
2.6.32 Chugiak (10)
2.6.33 Chugiak/eagle (7)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: compare..court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1 compare (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2 compared (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3 comparing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4 compatible (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.5 compelling (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.6 compete (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.7 complaint (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.8 complete (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.9 completed (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.10 completely (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.11 complex (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.12 complexities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.13 complicated (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.14 comply (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.15 comprehensive (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.16 compromise (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.17 computer (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.18 computers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.19 Con (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.20 concern (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.21 concerned (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22 concerns (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.23 conclude (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.24 concluded (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.25 concludes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.26 conclusion (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.27 concomitant (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.28 condition (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.29 conditions (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.30 conducted (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.31 confer (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.32 Conference (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.33 confident (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.34 configurations (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.35 conflict (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.36 confuse (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.37 confused (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.38 confusing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>digesting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dilute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diminished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>direction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>directly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discretion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discriminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disenfranchise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disenfranchised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disenfranchisement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disengaged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disliked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disproportionately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disruptive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinguish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>distinguished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doctor's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>domains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.31 Downtown (19)
2.9.32 Doyon (2)
2.9.33 dozen (1)
2.9.34 draft (1)
2.9.35 drafted (2)
2.9.36 dramatically (1)
2.9.37 drawing (1)
2.9.38 drawn (1)
2.9.39 drew (1)
2.9.40 drink (1)
2.9.41 drive (5)
2.9.42 driveways (1)
2.9.43 driving (5)
2.9.44 dropped (4)
2.9.45 drove (1)
2.9.46 due (2)
2.9.47 duties (1)
2.9.48 duty (1)
2.9.49 dying (1)
2.9.50 dynamics (1)
2.9.51 Dyson (1)
2.9.52 e-mail (11)
2.9.53 e-mails (2)
2.9.54 Eagle (77)
2.9.55 ear (1)
2.9.56 earlier (10)
2.9.57 early (2)
2.9.58 easier (2)
2.9.59 east (25)
2.9.60 easy (3)
2.9.61 echo (1)
2.9.62 economically (3)
2.9.63 economics (1)
2.9.64 Ed (1)
2.9.65 educated (1)
2.9.66 education (1)
2.9.67 effort (1)
2.9.68 Egregious (1)
2.9.69 egress (2)
2.9.70 elaborate (2)
2.9.71 elected (1)
2.9.72 election (10)
2.9.73 elections (3)
2.9.74 electricity (1)
2.9.75 electronic (1)
2.10 Index: electronically..feels
2.10.1 electronically (1)
2.10.2 Elementary (1)
2.10.3 elements (1)
2.10.4 else's (1)
2.10.5 empathizes (1)
2.10.6 employment (1)
2.10.7 empty (1)
2.10.8 encompass (1)
2.10.9 encompasses (2)
2.10.10 encourage (6)
2.10.11 encouraging (1)
2.10.12 end (22)
2.10.13 endless (1)
2.10.14 engage (1)
2.10.15 engaged (4)
2.10.16 enhanced (1)
2.10.17 enjoying (1)
2.10.18 ensure (1)
2.10.19 entered (2)
2.10.20 entire (5)
2.10.21 entities (1)
2.10.22 equal (8)
2.10.23 equally (1)
2.10.24 equating (1)
2.10.25 equipped (1)
2.10.26 equitable (3)
2.10.27 equitably (1)
2.10.28 era (1)
2.10.29 error (5)
2.10.30 errors (4)
2.10.31 essentially (3)
2.10.32 establishes (2)
2.10.33 Estates (2)
2.10.34 evening (3)
2.10.35 eventually (1)
2.10.36 evidence (1)
2.10.37 evidenced (1)
2.10.38 evidently (1)
2.10.39 exact (2)
2.10.40 exceed (1)
2.10.41 Excellent (1)
2.10.42 excluding (1)
2.10.43 excuse (4)
2.10.44 executive (1)
<p>| 2.10.45 | exercise (2) |
| 2.10.46 | exhaustive (2) |
| 2.10.47 | existed (1) |
| 2.10.48 | exists (2) |
| 2.10.49 | expediency (1) |
| 2.10.50 | expedited (2) |
| 2.10.51 | experience (1) |
| 2.10.52 | experienced (1) |
| 2.10.53 | experiences (3) |
| 2.10.54 | expert (1) |
| 2.10.55 | explain (1) |
| 2.10.56 | explanation (2) |
| 2.10.57 | expressed (1) |
| 2.10.58 | Expressway (1) |
| 2.10.59 | extend (1) |
| 2.10.60 | extension (1) |
| 2.10.61 | extent (4) |
| 2.10.62 | extra (1) |
| 2.10.63 | extremely (1) |
| 2.10.64 | extremes (1) |
| 2.10.65 | eyes (1) |
| 2.10.66 | face (6) |
| 2.10.67 | facilities (1) |
| 2.10.68 | fascinating (1) |
| 2.10.69 | fact (15) |
| 2.10.70 | factors (1) |
| 2.10.71 | facts (2) |
| 2.10.72 | faint (3) |
| 2.10.73 | fair (22) |
| 2.10.74 | Fairbanks (8) |
| 2.10.75 | Fairbanksan (1) |
| 2.10.76 | Fairclough (1) |
| 2.10.77 | fairer (1) |
| 2.10.78 | fairest (1) |
| 2.10.79 | fairly (3) |
| 2.10.80 | fairness (2) |
| 2.10.81 | false (3) |
| 2.10.82 | familiar (1) |
| 2.10.83 | families (3) |
| 2.10.84 | family (4) |
| 2.10.85 | Fantastic (1) |
| 2.10.86 | farther (1) |
| 2.10.87 | fast (1) |
| 2.10.88 | faster (2) |
| 2.10.89 | favor (11) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: fellow..Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fellow (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>felt (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifth-wheels (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fight (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>figure (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filings (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filter (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finalized (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finally (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>find (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finding (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finds (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fine (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finish (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finishing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>firm (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fischetti (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five-member (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five-year (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fix (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixed (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fixing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flows (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focus (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>focused (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>folks (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>follow-up (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foothills (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>footing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>force (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.11.38 foremost (1)
2.11.39 forgot (2)
2.11.40 form (3)
2.11.41 formal (2)
2.11.42 formally (1)
2.11.43 forms (1)
2.11.44 forum (1)
2.11.45 forward (15)
2.11.46 found (11)
2.11.47 frame (3)
2.11.48 frames (1)
2.11.49 frankly (2)
2.11.50 Fred (6)
2.11.51 free (1)
2.11.52 freedom (1)
2.11.53 frequency (1)
2.11.54 frequent (1)
2.11.55 Friday (12)
2.11.56 friendly (2)
2.11.57 friends (1)
2.11.58 front (4)
2.11.59 fruitful (1)
2.11.60 fullest (1)
2.11.61 fully (1)
2.11.62 future (1)
2.11.63 Gambell (1)
2.11.64 game (1)
2.11.65 gap (1)
2.11.66 gather (1)
2.11.67 gathering (1)
2.11.68 gave (2)
2.11.69 general (4)
2.11.70 generally (2)
2.11.71 generals (1)
2.11.72 generating (1)
2.11.73 generous (1)
2.11.74 genesis (1)
2.11.75 George (5)
2.11.76 gerrymander (4)
2.11.77 gerrymandered (1)
2.11.78 gerrymandering (14)
2.11.79 Giessel (1)
2.11.80 Girdwood (6)
2.11.81 Girdwood's (1)
2.11.82 give (23)
2.11.83  giving (2)
2.11.84  glad (1)
2.11.85  glean (1)
2.11.86  Glenn (1)
2.11.87  goal (4)
2.11.88  Goldenview (1)
2.11.89  good (43)
2.11.90  Government (4)

2.12  Index: grapefruits..hour
2.12.1  grapefruits (1)
2.12.2  graphical (1)
2.12.3  great (8)
2.12.4  greater (1)
2.12.5  Gretchen (4)
2.12.6  grievance (1)
2.12.7  grounds (1)
2.12.8  group (1)
2.12.9  groups (2)
2.12.10  grow (2)
2.12.11  Growden (4)
2.12.12  grown (1)
2.12.13  guess (13)
2.12.14  guidance (2)
2.12.15  guys (11)
2.12.16  half (3)
2.12.17  Halford (2)
2.12.18  hallmark (1)
2.12.19  HALO (1)
2.12.20  hand (22)
2.12.21  handing (2)
2.12.22  hands (1)
2.12.23  happen (4)
2.12.24  happened (6)
2.12.25  happening (7)
2.12.26  happy (11)
2.12.27  hard (14)
2.12.28  harm (1)
2.12.29  harmed (1)
2.12.30  harmful (1)
2.12.31  hate (3)
2.12.32  hazards (1)
2.12.33  head (2)
2.12.34  heads-up (1)
2.12.35  health (2)
2.12.36  healthy (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>hear</td>
<td>(30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>heard</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>hearing</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>hearings</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>heart</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>heavily</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>Heights</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>held</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>helpful</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>helps</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>heroes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>Hickel</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>hidden</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>high</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>high-income</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>high-turnout</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>highest</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>highlight</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>highlighted</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>highway</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>Hiland</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>Hill</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>hillside</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>hired</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>historic</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>historical</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>history</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>Hockema</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>Hodge</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>hold</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>holding</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>holds</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>Holly</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>home</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>homeowners</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>homes</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>honest</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.76</td>
<td>hope</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.77</td>
<td>hoped</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.78</td>
<td>hopeful</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.79</td>
<td>horizontal</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.80</td>
<td>horrible</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.81</td>
<td>Horton</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.41</td>
<td>includes (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.42</td>
<td>including (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.43</td>
<td>income (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.44</td>
<td>incorporate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.45</td>
<td>increases (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.46</td>
<td>increasing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.47</td>
<td>incredibly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.48</td>
<td>incumbent (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.49</td>
<td>indicating (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.50</td>
<td>indication (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.51</td>
<td>indiscernible (47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.52</td>
<td>individuals (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.53</td>
<td>industry (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.54</td>
<td>infer (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.55</td>
<td>infernal (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.56</td>
<td>info (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.57</td>
<td>information (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.58</td>
<td>informed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.59</td>
<td>infrastructure (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.60</td>
<td>ingress (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.61</td>
<td>initial (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.62</td>
<td>initially (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.63</td>
<td>input (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.64</td>
<td>insanely (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.65</td>
<td>insinuate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.66</td>
<td>insinuation (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.67</td>
<td>instances (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.68</td>
<td>insulting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.69</td>
<td>intact (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.70</td>
<td>integrated (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.71</td>
<td>integration (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.72</td>
<td>intelligent (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.73</td>
<td>intending (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.74</td>
<td>intent (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.75</td>
<td>intention (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.76</td>
<td>intentional (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.77</td>
<td>intentionally (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.78</td>
<td>interchanged (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.79</td>
<td>interest (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.80</td>
<td>interesting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.81</td>
<td>interests (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.82</td>
<td>interface (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.83</td>
<td>interject (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.84</td>
<td>interjecting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.85</td>
<td>interrupt (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.13.86 intertie (1)
2.13.87 intervene (1)
2.13.88 introduced (1)
2.13.89 introducing (1)
2.13.90 invited (1)
2.13.91 involved (10)

2.14 Index: involvement..living
2.14.1 involvement (2)
2.14.2 irrational (1)
2.14.3 irrelevant (1)
2.14.4 issue (14)
2.14.5 issues (8)
2.14.6 item (6)
2.14.7 items (2)
2.14.8 Jamie (5)
2.14.9 jammed (1)
2.14.10 JBER (4)
2.14.11 Joanna (3)
2.14.12 Joanne (10)
2.14.13 job (3)
2.14.14 jobs (1)
2.14.15 John (9)
2.14.16 John's (1)
2.14.17 joined (1)
2.14.18 Judge (3)
2.14.19 juncture (1)
2.14.20 June (2)
2.14.21 Juneau (3)
2.14.22 jurisdiction (1)
2.14.23 justice (1)
2.14.24 justification (3)
2.14.25 justify (1)
2.14.26 Kathy (5)
2.14.27 keeping (3)
2.14.28 Kelly (1)
2.14.29 Kenai (3)
2.14.30 Kendall (1)
2.14.31 key (1)
2.14.32 kidnapped (1)
2.14.33 kind (10)
2.14.34 Klatt (1)
2.14.35 knew (1)
2.14.36 knowing (1)
2.14.37 knowledge (1)
2.14.38 label (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.14.84</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.85</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.86</td>
<td>listened</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.87</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.88</td>
<td>literal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.89</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.90</td>
<td>litigation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.91</td>
<td>live</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.92</td>
<td>lived</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.93</td>
<td>lives</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.94</td>
<td>living</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Index: local..member</td>
<td>768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.1</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.2</td>
<td>located</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.3</td>
<td>locations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.4</td>
<td>log</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.5</td>
<td>logic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.6</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.7</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.8</td>
<td>longer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.9</td>
<td>looked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.10</td>
<td>Loop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.11</td>
<td>lose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.12</td>
<td>lost</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.13</td>
<td>lot</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.14</td>
<td>lots</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.15</td>
<td>loud</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.16</td>
<td>loudly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.17</td>
<td>low</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.18</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.19</td>
<td>lowest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.20</td>
<td>LRSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.21</td>
<td>lump</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.22</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.23</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.24</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.25</td>
<td>maintained</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.26</td>
<td>maintaining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.27</td>
<td>maintains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.28</td>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.29</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.30</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.31</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.32</td>
<td>maker</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.33</td>
<td>makes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.34</td>
<td>making</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.35</td>
<td>manage</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.36</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.37</td>
<td>map</td>
<td>(58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.38</td>
<td>map-making</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.39</td>
<td>mapping</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.40</td>
<td>maps</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.41</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.42</td>
<td>Marcum</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.43</td>
<td>marginally</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.44</td>
<td>mark</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.45</td>
<td>Martinez</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.46</td>
<td>mass</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.47</td>
<td>matched</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.48</td>
<td>matrix</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.49</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.50</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.51</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.52</td>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.53</td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.54</td>
<td>meaningfully</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.55</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.56</td>
<td>mechanism</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.57</td>
<td>mechanisms</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.58</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.59</td>
<td>medical</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.60</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.61</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.62</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.63</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>(31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.64</td>
<td>Melanie's</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.65</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>(197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td><strong>Index: members..nature</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.1</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>(45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.2</td>
<td>mentioned</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.3</td>
<td>mere</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.4</td>
<td>message</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.5</td>
<td>messages</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.6</td>
<td>metes</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.7</td>
<td>method</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.8</td>
<td>mic</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.9</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.10</td>
<td>microphone</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.11</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.12</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16.58 multitude (1)
2.16.59 municipal (8)
2.16.60 municipalities (1)
2.16.61 municipality (22)
2.16.62 municipality's (2)
2.16.63 muted (3)
2.16.64 NAACP (1)
2.16.65 names (6)
2.16.66 naming (3)
2.16.67 narrow (2)
2.16.68 narrowly (1)
2.16.69 narrows (1)
2.16.70 Native (3)
2.16.71 nature (5)

2.17 Index: nearest..order
2.17.1 nearest (1)
2.17.2 necessarily (1)
2.17.3 needed (1)
2.17.4 negative (1)
2.17.5 neighborhood (4)
2.17.6 neighborhoods (4)
2.17.7 neighboring (1)
2.17.8 neighbors (5)
2.17.9 nesters (1)
2.17.10 net (1)
2.17.11 neutral (1)
2.17.12 newly (1)
2.17.13 news (1)
2.17.14 nice (2)
2.17.15 Nicole (43)
2.17.16 Nicole's (1)
2.17.17 night (3)
2.17.18 nods (1)
2.17.19 nonpartisan (1)
2.17.20 noon (10)
2.17.21 north (28)
2.17.22 north/south (3)
2.17.23 Northeast (4)
2.17.24 northern (2)
2.17.25 note (5)
2.17.26 noted (1)
2.17.27 notes (6)
2.17.28 notice (7)
2.17.29 noticed (1)
2.17.30 November (7)
number (6)
numbering (1)
numbers (5)
Nursery (1)
O'DONOGHUE (4)
O'MALLEY (1)
objecting (1)
objection (4)
objections (1)
obligation (1)
obscured (1)
observation (3)
observed (1)
observing (2)
obviate (1)
obvious (1)
occur (1)
occurring (3)
Oceanview (5)
October (1)
off-base (1)
off-net (1)
offer (10)
offered (4)
offering (1)
office (3)
offices (1)
official (1)
officials (1)
offline (1)
Ogan (1)
oldest (1)
on-line (1)
one's (1)
one-person (4)
one-sided (1)
one-vote (4)
online (8)
open (9)
opened (1)
opening (1)
opinion (2)
opinions (1)
opportunities (3)
opportunity (19)
| 2.17.76 | oppose (7) |
| 2.17.77 | opposed (4) |
| 2.17.78 | opposing (8) |
| 2.17.79 | opposite (1) |
| 2.17.80 | opposition (8) |
| 2.17.81 | oppositions (1) |
| 2.17.82 | optimism (1) |
| 2.17.83 | option (7) |
| 2.17.84 | options (10) |
| 2.17.85 | order (10) |

<p>| 2.18 | Index: ordered..plans |
| 2.18.1 | ordered (1) |
| 2.18.2 | orders (1) |
| 2.18.3 | organization (4) |
| 2.18.4 | organizations (1) |
| 2.18.5 | organized (4) |
| 2.18.6 | original (3) |
| 2.18.7 | outlined (2) |
| 2.18.8 | overlooking (1) |
| 2.18.9 | overreach (2) |
| 2.18.10 | overwhelming (3) |
| 2.18.11 | overworked (1) |
| 2.18.12 | ownership (1) |
| 2.18.13 | packet (5) |
| 2.18.14 | pad (1) |
| 2.18.15 | pages (1) |
| 2.18.16 | pair (17) |
| 2.18.17 | paired (15) |
| 2.18.18 | pairing (53) |
| 2.18.19 | pairings (53) |
| 2.18.20 | pairs (3) |
| 2.18.21 | parameters (1) |
| 2.18.22 | Pardon (2) |
| 2.18.23 | parents (1) |
| 2.18.24 | Park (1) |
| 2.18.25 | part (20) |
| 2.18.26 | partially (1) |
| 2.18.27 | participants (2) |
| 2.18.28 | participate (3) |
| 2.18.29 | participating (2) |
| 2.18.30 | participation (9) |
| 2.18.31 | particulars (1) |
| 2.18.32 | parties (3) |
| 2.18.33 | partisan (12) |
| 2.18.34 | parts (1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.9</td>
<td>Pole</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.10</td>
<td>police</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.11</td>
<td>political</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.12</td>
<td>politically</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.13</td>
<td>politics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.14</td>
<td>poor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.15</td>
<td>poorly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.16</td>
<td>populations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.17</td>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.18</td>
<td>portal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.19</td>
<td>portion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.20</td>
<td>position</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.21</td>
<td>possibilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.22</td>
<td>possibly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.23</td>
<td>post</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.24</td>
<td>post-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.25</td>
<td>post-court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.26</td>
<td>posted</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.27</td>
<td>potential</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.28</td>
<td>potentially</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.29</td>
<td>power</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.30</td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.31</td>
<td>preclude</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.32</td>
<td>prefer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.33</td>
<td>preference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.34</td>
<td>prepared</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.35</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.36</td>
<td>presentation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.37</td>
<td>presented</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.38</td>
<td>presenting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.39</td>
<td>preservation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.40</td>
<td>president</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.41</td>
<td>pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.42</td>
<td>presumptions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.43</td>
<td>pretty</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.44</td>
<td>prevent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.45</td>
<td>previous</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.46</td>
<td>previously</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.47</td>
<td>primarily</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.48</td>
<td>primary</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.49</td>
<td>principle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.50</td>
<td>principles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.51</td>
<td>print</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.52</td>
<td>printed</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.53</td>
<td>priorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.14</td>
<td>pushed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.15</td>
<td>pushing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.16</td>
<td>put</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.17</td>
<td>puts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.18</td>
<td>putting</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.19</td>
<td>quality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.20</td>
<td>question</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.21</td>
<td>questions</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.22</td>
<td>quick</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.23</td>
<td>quickly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.24</td>
<td>quote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.25</td>
<td>quotes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.26</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.27</td>
<td>radio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.28</td>
<td>radius</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.29</td>
<td>railroad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.30</td>
<td>railroaded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.31</td>
<td>raised</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.32</td>
<td>ramrod</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.33</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.34</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.35</td>
<td>rapidly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.36</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.37</td>
<td>rationale</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.38</td>
<td>reach</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.39</td>
<td>react</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.40</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.41</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.42</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.43</td>
<td>realize</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.44</td>
<td>realized</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.45</td>
<td>realtime</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.46</td>
<td>reapportionment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.47</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.48</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.49</td>
<td>reasoning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.50</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.51</td>
<td>reassembling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.52</td>
<td>recall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.53</td>
<td>recapture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.54</td>
<td>receive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.55</td>
<td>received</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.56</td>
<td>receiving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.57</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.58</td>
<td>recently</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
recognize (1)
recognizes (1)
recommend (2)
recommendations (2)
reconvene (1)
record (25)
records (1)
rectified (1)
redevelopment (2)
redirecting (1)
redistricting (20)
redraw (1)
redrawn (2)
refer (1)
reference (3)
references (1)
referred (1)
referring (6)
refuse (1)
regional (2)
regular (3)
regularly (1)
Reinbold (1)
reinvent (1)
reject (2)
rejected (3)
relate (1)
related (3)
relates (2)
relating (2)
relationship (3)
relevant (1)
reliable (1)
relied (1)
relieved (1)
rely (2)
remainder (1)
remaining (3)
remanded (1)
marking (1)
remedy (6)
remember (2)
remind (2)
remotely (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.21.29</td>
<td>removal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.30</td>
<td>rent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.31</td>
<td>reopen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.32</td>
<td>repair</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.33</td>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.34</td>
<td>repeatedly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.35</td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.36</td>
<td>repetitive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.37</td>
<td>replace</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.38</td>
<td>replacement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.39</td>
<td>replacing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.40</td>
<td>report</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.41</td>
<td>reporting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.42</td>
<td>represent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.43</td>
<td>representation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.44</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.45</td>
<td>representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.46</td>
<td>represented</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.47</td>
<td>representing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.48</td>
<td>represents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.49</td>
<td>reputation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.50</td>
<td>request</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.51</td>
<td>requests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.52</td>
<td>require</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.53</td>
<td>required</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.54</td>
<td>requirement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.55</td>
<td>requirements</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.56</td>
<td>requires</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.57</td>
<td>research</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.58</td>
<td>resent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.59</td>
<td>resident</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.60</td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.61</td>
<td>residents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.62</td>
<td>resolution</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.63</td>
<td>resolutions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.64</td>
<td>resources</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.65</td>
<td>respect</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.66</td>
<td>respected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.67</td>
<td>respective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.68</td>
<td>respond</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.69</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.70</td>
<td>responsiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.71</td>
<td>rest</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.72</td>
<td>restate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.73</td>
<td>restaurants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ruled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>ruling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>rulings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>run</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>running</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>rush</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>rushed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Saddler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saddler's</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>safer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sample</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>satisfies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>satisfy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>scheduled</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>scheduling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>schemes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>scope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>scores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>scorned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>scratched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>screen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>scroll</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>season</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>seat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>seconded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>seconds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>secret</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>self-government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.28</td>
<td>Silvers</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.29</td>
<td>similar</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.30</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.31</td>
<td>simpler</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.32</td>
<td>simply</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.33</td>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.34</td>
<td>sincere</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.35</td>
<td>SINGER</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.36</td>
<td>single</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.37</td>
<td>sink</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.38</td>
<td>sir</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.39</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.40</td>
<td>site</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.41</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.42</td>
<td>sizes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.43</td>
<td>Skagway</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.44</td>
<td>Skagway/dyea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.45</td>
<td>slight</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.46</td>
<td>slippery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.47</td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.48</td>
<td>slopes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.49</td>
<td>slow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.50</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.51</td>
<td>smiley</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.52</td>
<td>snow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.53</td>
<td>snowy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.54</td>
<td>so-called</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.55</td>
<td>socially</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.56</td>
<td>socioeconomic</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.57</td>
<td>socioeconomically</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.58</td>
<td>solution</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.59</td>
<td>solved</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.60</td>
<td>solves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.61</td>
<td>solving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.62</td>
<td>Sonic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.63</td>
<td>sooner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.64</td>
<td>sort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.65</td>
<td>sorts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.66</td>
<td>sound</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.67</td>
<td>south</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.68</td>
<td>Southcentral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.69</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.70</td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.71</td>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.72</td>
<td>southwest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.73</td>
<td>spans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.74</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.75</td>
<td>SPEAKER</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.76</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.77</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.78</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.79</td>
<td>specifically</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.80</td>
<td>specifics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.81</td>
<td>speculation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.82</td>
<td>speed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.83</td>
<td>Spenard</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.84</td>
<td>spend</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.85</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.86</td>
<td>splits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.87</td>
<td>splitting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.88</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Index: spoken..Taku</td>
<td>777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.1</td>
<td>spoken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.2</td>
<td>staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.3</td>
<td>stage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.4</td>
<td>stalling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.5</td>
<td>stamp</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.6</td>
<td>stamps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.7</td>
<td>stand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.8</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.9</td>
<td>standing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.10</td>
<td>stands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.11</td>
<td>start</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.12</td>
<td>started</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.13</td>
<td>starting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.14</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.15</td>
<td>state's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.16</td>
<td>state-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.17</td>
<td>stated</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.18</td>
<td>statement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.19</td>
<td>states</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.20</td>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.21</td>
<td>stating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.22</td>
<td>status</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.23</td>
<td>stay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.24</td>
<td>staying</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.25</td>
<td>steamrolled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.26</td>
<td>step</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.27</td>
<td>stepped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.24.28</td>
<td>Stoddard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.27</td>
<td>testifies (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.28</td>
<td>testify (27)</td>
<td>2.25.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.30</td>
<td>testimonies (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.31</td>
<td>testimony (75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.32</td>
<td>text (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.33</td>
<td>textual (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.34</td>
<td>thankful (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.35</td>
<td>thanking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.36</td>
<td>themes (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.37</td>
<td>thing (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.38</td>
<td>things (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.39</td>
<td>thinking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.40</td>
<td>thought (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.41</td>
<td>thoughtful (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.42</td>
<td>thoughts (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.43</td>
<td>thousand (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.44</td>
<td>threatening (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.45</td>
<td>threw (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.46</td>
<td>throats (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.47</td>
<td>throughway (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.48</td>
<td>thrown (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.49</td>
<td>Thursday (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.50</td>
<td>tide (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.51</td>
<td>tides (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.52</td>
<td>tied (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.53</td>
<td>tight (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.54</td>
<td>tightly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.55</td>
<td>till (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.56</td>
<td>Tim (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.57</td>
<td>time (89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.58</td>
<td>timelines (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.59</td>
<td>timely (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.60</td>
<td>times (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.61</td>
<td>timing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.62</td>
<td>tiny (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.63</td>
<td>title (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.64</td>
<td>today (32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.65</td>
<td>toilet (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.66</td>
<td>toilets (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.67</td>
<td>told (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.68</td>
<td>Tom (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.69</td>
<td>tomorrow (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.70</td>
<td>tomorrow's (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.25.71</td>
<td>Torkelson (29)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.26 Index: total..view

2.26.1 total (2)
2.26.2 totally (1)
2.26.3 touch (1)
2.26.4 town (1)
2.26.5 track (1)
2.26.6 tracking (1)
2.26.7 traffic (2)
2.26.8 transmission (1)
2.26.9 transparency (2)
2.26.10 transportation (2)
2.26.11 travel (6)
2.26.12 traveling (1)
2.26.13 treat (1)
2.26.14 tremendous (1)
2.26.15 truncates (1)
2.26.16 trusted (1)
2.26.17 Tuesday (7)
2.26.18 tune (1)
2.26.19 Tuntutuliak (2)
2.26.20 turn (2)
2.26.21 Turnagain (7)
2.26.22 turned (1)
2.26.23 tweaks (1)
2.26.24 Tyndall (5)
2.26.25 type (1)
2.26.26 types (1)
2.26.27 typically (2)
2.26.28 U-MED (3)
2.26.29 unable (1)
2.26.30 unambiguous (1)
2.26.31 unanimous (1)
2.26.32 unavailable (4)
2.26.33 unchallenged (1)
2.26.34 unconstitutional (6)
2.26.35 unconstitutionally (1)
2.26.36 uncontiguous (1)
2.26.37 undeclared (1)
2.26.38 underlying (5)
2.26.39 understand (27)
2.26.40 understanding (6)
2.26.41 understands (2)
2.26.42 understood (2)
2.26.43 unfair (1)
2.26.44 unfairness (1)
2.26.90  vetted (1)
2.26.91  viable (1)
2.26.92  vice (2)
2.26.93  videoconferencing (1)
2.26.94  view (16)

2.27  Index: village..Zoom
2.27.1  village (1)
2.27.2  violation (7)
2.27.3  violations (1)
2.27.4  virtually (1)
2.27.5  virtue (3)
2.27.6  vision (1)
2.27.7  visual (1)
2.27.8  voice (1)
2.27.9  voices (1)
2.27.10  volunteer (1)
2.27.11  vote (4)
2.27.12  voted (1)
2.27.13  voter (3)
2.27.14  voters (5)
2.27.15  voting (1)
2.27.16  VRA (1)
2.27.17  wait (4)
2.27.18  waiting (3)
2.27.19  wanted (26)
2.27.20  wanting (1)
2.27.21  wary (1)
2.27.22  watch (1)
2.27.23  watching (1)
2.27.24  water (2)
2.27.25  ways (5)
2.27.26  weak (2)
2.27.27  wealth (1)
2.27.28  weather (3)
2.27.29  website (10)
2.27.30  Wednesday (15)
2.27.31  wee (1)
2.27.32  week (14)
2.27.33  weekday (1)
2.27.34  weekend (2)
2.27.35  weeks (1)
2.27.36  weigh (2)
2.27.37  weighed (2)
2.27.38  weight (2)
2.27.39  weird (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.27.40</td>
<td>Wells</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.41</td>
<td>west</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.42</td>
<td>whichever</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.43</td>
<td>Whittier</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.44</td>
<td>widens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.45</td>
<td>wife's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.46</td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.47</td>
<td>wildfires</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.48</td>
<td>Willis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.49</td>
<td>wind</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.50</td>
<td>Wisel</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.51</td>
<td>wishes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.52</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.53</td>
<td>wonderful</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.54</td>
<td>wondering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.55</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.56</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.57</td>
<td>worked</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.58</td>
<td>working</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.59</td>
<td>working-class</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.60</td>
<td>works</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.61</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.62</td>
<td>worse</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.63</td>
<td>wrap</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.64</td>
<td>write</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.65</td>
<td>writes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.66</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.67</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.68</td>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.69</td>
<td>wrote</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.70</td>
<td>yards</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.71</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.72</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.73</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.74</td>
<td>yellow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.75</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.76</td>
<td>yesterday's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.77</td>
<td>Yolan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.78</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.27.79</td>
<td>Zoom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Transcript Formats
3.1 ASCII/TXT

ARB2000446-000599  2022-04-06-ARB-Transcript-Full  781
1 Transcript  782
1.1 Cover  781
2 Word Index

2.1 Index: -ooo--

2.1.1 -ooo- (1)
2.1.2 1 (28)
2.1.3 10 (12)
2.1.4 10- (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.39</td>
<td>adjourned</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.40</td>
<td>adjournment</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.41</td>
<td>adjusted</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.42</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.43</td>
<td>adopt</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.44</td>
<td>adopted</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.45</td>
<td>adopting</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.46</td>
<td>adoption</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.47</td>
<td>adopts</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.48</td>
<td>advance</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.49</td>
<td>affect</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.50</td>
<td>affected</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.51</td>
<td>affects</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.52</td>
<td>AFFER</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.53</td>
<td>affirm</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.54</td>
<td>affirms</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.55</td>
<td>AFFR</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.56</td>
<td>afternoon</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.57</td>
<td>agenda</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.58</td>
<td>agendas</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.59</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.60</td>
<td>agreeable</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.61</td>
<td>agreed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.62</td>
<td>agreeing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.63</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.64</td>
<td>ahead</td>
<td>(23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.65</td>
<td>aides</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.66</td>
<td>airport</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.67</td>
<td>Airport/sand</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.68</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.69</td>
<td>Alaskan</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.70</td>
<td>Alaskans</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.71</td>
<td>align</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.72</td>
<td>aligned</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.73</td>
<td>aligns</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.74</td>
<td>all-day</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.75</td>
<td>allotted</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.76</td>
<td>allowed</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.77</td>
<td>allowing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.78</td>
<td>alternate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.79</td>
<td>alternative</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.80</td>
<td>alternatives</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.81</td>
<td>amassing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.82</td>
<td>amazed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.83</td>
<td>Amdur-clark</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.84</td>
<td>amend (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.85</td>
<td>amended (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.86</td>
<td>amending (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.87</td>
<td>amendment (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.88</td>
<td>amendments (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.89</td>
<td>amount (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.90</td>
<td>analysis (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.3 Index: Anchorage..Bethany

#### 2.3.1 Anchorage (101)
#### 2.3.2 ANCSA (2)
#### 2.3.3 Anderson (1)
#### 2.3.4 anecdotally (1)
#### 2.3.5 anticipating (1)
#### 2.3.6 anymore (2)
#### 2.3.7 apologies (1)
#### 2.3.8 apologize (6)
#### 2.3.9 apology (1)
#### 2.3.10 apparently (3)
#### 2.3.11 appears (3)
#### 2.3.12 appendage (2)
#### 2.3.13 appendages (1)
#### 2.3.14 appetite (1)
#### 2.3.15 applied (1)
#### 2.3.16 appointed (1)
#### 2.3.17 appreciated (3)
#### 2.3.18 appreciating (1)
#### 2.3.19 approach (5)
#### 2.3.20 approaching (1)
#### 2.3.21 approved (4)
#### 2.3.22 April (4)
#### 2.3.23 Arctic (5)
#### 2.3.24 area (33)
#### 2.3.25 areas (20)
#### 2.3.26 argues (1)
#### 2.3.27 argument (5)
#### 2.3.28 arguments (3)
#### 2.3.29 Arm (1)
#### 2.3.30 arms (1)
#### 2.3.31 arteries (2)
#### 2.3.32 Article (2)
#### 2.3.33 articulated (2)
#### 2.3.34 asserted (1)
#### 2.3.35 assessment (1)
#### 2.3.36 assets (2)
#### 2.3.37 assigned (2)
2.3.38 assignments (1)
2.3.39 association (3)
2.3.40 assume (4)
2.3.41 attempting (1)
2.3.42 attend (2)
2.3.43 attention (3)
2.3.44 attorney (1)
2.3.45 audience (1)
2.3.46 author's (1)
2.3.47 authority (5)
2.3.48 authorized (2)
2.3.49 automatically (1)
2.3.50 avalanche (1)
2.3.51 Avenue (1)
2.3.52 aviation (3)
2.3.53 await (1)
2.3.54 awaiting (1)
2.3.55 aware (1)
2.3.56 back (35)
2.3.57 backwards (3)
2.3.58 Bahnke (78)
2.3.59 ballot (2)
2.3.60 bare (1)
2.3.61 barely (1)
2.3.62 base (6)
2.3.63 based (1)
2.3.64 Basher (1)
2.3.65 basic (1)
2.3.66 basically (6)
2.3.67 basis (2)
2.3.68 battle (1)
2.3.69 Begich (3)
2.3.70 beginning (1)
2.3.71 begins (1)
2.3.72 behalf (2)
2.3.73 belabor (2)
2.3.74 believes (1)
2.3.75 belt (1)
2.3.76 benefit (6)
2.3.77 bent (1)
2.3.78 Bethany (34)

2.4 Index: Bethany's..carry
2.4.1 Bethany's (4)
2.4.2 Bicentennial (1)
2.4.3 bicycles (1)
2.4.4 big (3)
2.4.5 bigger (3)
2.4.6 bike (1)
2.4.7 Binkley (193)
2.4.8 Birchwood (1)
2.4.9 Bird (1)
2.4.10 birthday (4)
2.4.11 bit (9)
2.4.12 Blanch (1)
2.4.13 block (1)
2.4.14 blocks (1)
2.4.15 blog (1)
2.4.16 blown (1)
2.4.17 board (74)
2.4.18 board's (9)
2.4.19 bold (1)
2.4.20 boots (1)
2.4.21 borough (8)
2.4.22 Borromeo (65)
2.4.23 Borromeo's (1)
2.4.24 bound (1)
2.4.25 boundaries (11)
2.4.26 boundary (5)
2.4.27 bounds (2)
2.4.28 box (2)
2.4.29 Branch (2)
2.4.30 bravo (4)
2.4.31 break (1)
2.4.32 bring (4)
2.4.33 bringing (4)
2.4.34 broadly (1)
2.4.35 Bruner (4)
2.4.36 Budd (22)
2.4.37 Budd's (1)
2.4.38 buildings (3)
2.4.39 built (1)
2.4.40 bunch (1)
2.4.41 Bunde (2)
2.4.42 Burger (3)
2.4.43 burned-out (1)
2.4.44 Bush (2)
2.4.45 business (1)
2.4.46 businesses (2)
2.4.47 busy (1)
2.4.48 bye (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Index: carve-out..compact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.49</td>
<td>bystander (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.50</td>
<td>Calista's (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.51</td>
<td>call (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.52</td>
<td>called (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.53</td>
<td>calling (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.54</td>
<td>Campbell (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.55</td>
<td>Campbell's (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.56</td>
<td>cancel (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.57</td>
<td>Cantwell (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.58</td>
<td>card (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.59</td>
<td>cards (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.60</td>
<td>care (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.61</td>
<td>careful (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.62</td>
<td>Carl (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.63</td>
<td>carries (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.64</td>
<td>carry (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Index: carve-out..compact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>carve-out (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>case (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>cases (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>catch (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>Cathy (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.6</td>
<td>causing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.7</td>
<td>caution (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.8</td>
<td>census (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.9</td>
<td>centers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.10</td>
<td>certificates (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.11</td>
<td>chair (219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.12</td>
<td>chairman (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.13</td>
<td>challenges (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.14</td>
<td>challenging (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.15</td>
<td>chance (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.16</td>
<td>change (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.17</td>
<td>changed (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.18</td>
<td>changing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.19</td>
<td>characteristic (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.20</td>
<td>characteristics (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.21</td>
<td>check (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.22</td>
<td>choice (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.23</td>
<td>choices (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.24</td>
<td>choose (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.25</td>
<td>choosing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.26</td>
<td>Christine (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.27</td>
<td>Chugach (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.28</td>
<td>Chugiak (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.29 Chugiak/eagle (3)
2.5.30 circumstance (1)
2.5.31 cited (1)
2.5.32 citizen (1)
2.5.33 citizens (2)
2.5.34 city (9)
2.5.35 civil (1)
2.5.36 clarification (6)
2.5.37 clarify (5)
2.5.38 class (1)
2.5.39 clean (1)
2.5.40 clear (8)
2.5.41 clerk (1)
2.5.42 clinics (1)
2.5.43 close (8)
2.5.44 close-knit (1)
2.5.45 closed (1)
2.5.46 closely (5)
2.5.47 closer (2)
2.5.48 closing (1)
2.5.49 coastal (1)
2.5.50 code (3)
2.5.51 cohesive (2)
2.5.52 coincidence (4)
2.5.53 college (3)
2.5.54 combination (1)
2.5.55 combine (3)
2.5.56 combined (6)
2.5.57 commenced (1)
2.5.58 comment (27)
2.5.59 commentary (1)
2.5.60 commented (2)
2.5.61 commenting (1)
2.5.62 comments (15)
2.5.63 commercial (2)
2.5.64 common (11)
2.5.65 commonalities (3)
2.5.66 commonly (2)
2.5.67 communicate (1)
2.5.68 communities (11)
2.5.69 community (21)
2.5.70 commute (1)
2.5.71 compact (3)

2.6 Index: compactness..Court-required

2.6.1 compactness (2)
| 2.6.2  | company (1)                           |
| 2.6.3  | compared (2)                            |
| 2.6.4  | competing (1)                           |
| 2.6.5  | complete (1)                            |
| 2.6.6  | completed (1)                           |
| 2.6.7  | completely (5)                          |
| 2.6.8  | compliance (1)                          |
| 2.6.9  | complicated (2)                         |
| 2.6.10 | complication (1)                        |
| 2.6.11 | complied (1)                            |
| 2.6.12 | complies (1)                            |
| 2.6.13 | comply (2)                              |
| 2.6.14 | compose (1)                             |
| 2.6.15 | composed (5)                            |
| 2.6.16 | comprised (1)                           |
| 2.6.17 | compromise (1)                          |
| 2.6.18 | computer (3)                            |
| 2.6.19 | computer's (1)                          |
| 2.6.20 | Con (2)                                 |
| 2.6.21 | conceivable (1)                         |
| 2.6.22 | concept (1)                             |
| 2.6.23 | concern (3)                             |
| 2.6.24 | concerned (1)                           |
| 2.6.25 | concise (2)                             |
| 2.6.26 | concludes (2)                           |
| 2.6.27 | conclusion (1)                          |
| 2.6.28 | concur (1)                              |
| 2.6.29 | confines (1)                            |
| 2.6.30 | conflict (1)                            |
| 2.6.31 | confuse (5)                             |
| 2.6.32 | confused (3)                            |
| 2.6.33 | confusing (4)                           |
| 2.6.34 | confusion (2)                           |
| 2.6.35 | connect (4)                             |
| 2.6.36 | connected (4)                           |
| 2.6.37 | connecting (2)                          |
| 2.6.38 | connection (11)                         |
| 2.6.39 | connections (4)                         |
| 2.6.40 | conscience (1)                          |
| 2.6.41 | consensus (1)                           |
| 2.6.42 | considerable (1)                        |
| 2.6.43 | consideration (9)                       |
| 2.6.44 | considerations (1)                      |
| 2.6.45 | considered (7)                          |
| 2.6.46 | consistent (2)                          |
| 2.6.47  | consternation (1) |
| 2.6.48  | constitution (13) |
| 2.6.49  | constitutional (7) |
| 2.6.50  | constructed (1) |
| 2.6.51  | consult (1) |
| 2.6.52  | contact (5) |
| 2.6.53  | contemplated (1) |
| 2.6.54  | content (1) |
| 2.6.55  | context (3) |
| 2.6.56  | contig- (1) |
| 2.6.57  | contiguity (10) |
| 2.6.58  | contiguous (29) |
| 2.6.59  | continue (4) |
| 2.6.60  | continuity (1) |
| 2.6.61  | contract (1) |
| 2.6.62  | contractors (1) |
| 2.6.63  | contracts (1) |
| 2.6.64  | controversial (2) |
| 2.6.65  | convenient (1) |
| 2.6.66  | convention (1) |
| 2.6.67  | converting (1) |
| 2.6.68  | convince (1) |
| 2.6.69  | Cook (1) |
| 2.6.70  | core (1) |
| 2.6.71  | cornerstone (1) |
| 2.6.72  | corporation (1) |
| 2.6.73  | corporations (1) |
| 2.6.74  | correct (11) |
| 2.6.75  | corrected (1) |
| 2.6.76  | correction (8) |
| 2.6.77  | corrections (1) |
| 2.6.78  | correctly (1) |
| 2.6.79  | costs (1) |
| 2.6.80  | council (5) |
| 2.6.81  | councils (1) |
| 2.6.82  | counsel (2) |
| 2.6.83  | count (1) |
| 2.6.84  | counting (1) |
| 2.6.85  | country (2) |
| 2.6.86  | couple (6) |
| 2.6.87  | court (68) |
| 2.6.88  | Court's (8) |
| 2.6.89  | Court-required (1) |
| 2.7  | Index: courtesy..disruption |
| 2.7.1  | courtesy (2) |
| 2.7.2 | courts (4) |
| 2.7.3 | covered (2) |
| 2.7.4 | cracked (1) |
| 2.7.5 | cracking (1) |
| 2.7.6 | crafting (1) |
| 2.7.7 | Craig (10) |
| 2.7.8 | crazy (1) |
| 2.7.9 | create (6) |
| 2.7.10 | created (2) |
| 2.7.11 | creating (1) |
| 2.7.12 | Creek (8) |
| 2.7.13 | crew (1) |
| 2.7.14 | criteria (3) |
| 2.7.15 | critical (1) |
| 2.7.16 | crossed (1) |
| 2.7.17 | crux (1) |
| 2.7.18 | cultural (1) |
| 2.7.19 | Culturally (1) |
| 2.7.20 | current (11) |
| 2.7.21 | cutout (2) |
| 2.7.22 | cycle (1) |
| 2.7.23 | dates (1) |
| 2.7.24 | day (8) |
| 2.7.25 | days (7) |
| 2.7.26 | deadline (2) |
| 2.7.27 | deal (2) |
| 2.7.28 | dealing (3) |
| 2.7.29 | Debarr (1) |
| 2.7.30 | debate (19) |
| 2.7.31 | debates (1) |
| 2.7.32 | debating (3) |
| 2.7.33 | decent (1) |
| 2.7.34 | decide (1) |
| 2.7.35 | decided (3) |
| 2.7.36 | decimated (1) |
| 2.7.37 | decision (17) |
| 2.7.38 | decisions (5) |
| 2.7.39 | declare (1) |
| 2.7.40 | declaring (1) |
| 2.7.41 | deemed (2) |
| 2.7.42 | defensible (3) |
| 2.7.43 | defined (2) |
| 2.7.44 | delay (2) |
| 2.7.45 | delaying (1) |
| 2.7.46 | delegation (1) |
2.7.92 disregard (1)
2.7.93 disrupt (1)
2.7.94 disruption (3)

2.8 Index: dissimilar..entire 918

2.8.1 dissimilar (1)
2.8.2 distinct (2)
2.8.3 distinguished (1)
2.8.4 distinguishes (1)
2.8.5 distinguishing (2)
2.8.6 distracted (2)
2.8.7 district (123)
2.8.8 districts (119)
2.8.9 disturbance (1)
2.8.10 divided (1)
2.8.11 dividing (2)
2.8.12 double-sided (1)
2.8.13 Doug (5)
2.8.14 downside (2)
2.8.15 downtown (8)
2.8.16 drainage (2)
2.8.17 drainages (1)
2.8.18 drains (1)
2.8.19 draw (1)
2.8.20 drawing (2)
2.8.21 drawn (1)
2.8.22 draws (1)
2.8.23 drew (1)
2.8.24 drive (2)
2.8.25 drop (1)
2.8.26 due (4)
2.8.27 duplex (1)
2.8.28 e-mail (2)
2.8.29 Eagle (60)
2.8.30 earlier (6)
2.8.31 early (3)
2.8.32 earn (1)
2.8.33 earnest (1)
2.8.34 ears (1)
2.8.35 ease (4)
2.8.36 easier (1)
2.8.37 east (27)
2.8.38 east-west (2)
2.8.39 eastern (4)
2.8.40 easy (2)
2.8.41 economic (2)
| 2.8.42 | economy (1) |
| 2.8.43 | education (5) |
| 2.8.44 | educational (1) |
| 2.8.45 | effect (1) |
| 2.8.46 | effectively (1) |
| 2.8.47 | effort (2) |
| 2.8.48 | efforts (2) |
| 2.8.49 | Eiseneit (1) |
| 2.8.50 | Eisenell (1) |
| 2.8.51 | Eisheit (4) |
| 2.8.52 | Eklutna (3) |
| 2.8.53 | elaborate (1) |
| 2.8.54 | elected (5) |
| 2.8.55 | election (2) |
| 2.8.56 | elections (1) |
| 2.8.57 | Eledge (4) |
| 2.8.58 | elevated (1) |
| 2.8.59 | elevation (1) |
| 2.8.60 | elicit (1) |
| 2.8.61 | Elizabeth (5) |
| 2.8.62 | Elizabeth's (1) |
| 2.8.63 | Ellen (6) |
| 2.8.64 | emotional (1) |
| 2.8.65 | emotions (1) |
| 2.8.66 | employees (2) |
| 2.8.67 | enabled (1) |
| 2.8.68 | encourage (13) |
| 2.8.69 | encouraging (1) |
| 2.8.70 | end (7) |
| 2.8.71 | ended (1) |
| 2.8.72 | endorsement (1) |
| 2.8.73 | enemy (1) |
| 2.8.74 | enlightening (1) |
| 2.8.75 | enlisted (1) |
| 2.8.76 | entertaining (2) |
| 2.8.77 | entire (2) |

2.9 Index: entities...forget

<p>| 2.9.1 | entities (3) |
| 2.9.2 | entity (5) |
| 2.9.3 | equally (1) |
| 2.9.4 | equitable (2) |
| 2.9.5 | error (1) |
| 2.9.6 | errors (1) |
| 2.9.7 | escape (1) |
| 2.9.8 | escapes (1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9.9</td>
<td>essence</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.10</td>
<td>establish</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11</td>
<td>estate</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.12</td>
<td>estimation</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.13</td>
<td>European</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.14</td>
<td>evacuate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.15</td>
<td>evening</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.16</td>
<td>event</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.17</td>
<td>everybody's</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.18</td>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.19</td>
<td>examples</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.20</td>
<td>exceeded</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.21</td>
<td>exception</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.22</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.23</td>
<td>excuse</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.24</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.25</td>
<td>exempt</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.26</td>
<td>exist</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.27</td>
<td>exists</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.28</td>
<td>expected</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.29</td>
<td>expedite</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.30</td>
<td>expeditiously</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.31</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.32</td>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.33</td>
<td>experiences</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.34</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.35</td>
<td>expertise</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.36</td>
<td>explain</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.37</td>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.38</td>
<td>exploring</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.39</td>
<td>expressed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.40</td>
<td>extended</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.41</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.42</td>
<td>extent</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.43</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.44</td>
<td>eyebrows</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.45</td>
<td>eyes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.46</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.47</td>
<td>facilitate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.48</td>
<td>fact</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.49</td>
<td>factor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.50</td>
<td>factors</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.51</td>
<td>factual</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.52</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.53</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.54</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.55</td>
<td>fairest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.56</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.57</td>
<td>faith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.58</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.59</td>
<td>falls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.60</td>
<td>familiar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.61</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.62</td>
<td>fantastic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.63</td>
<td>favor</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.64</td>
<td>favoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.65</td>
<td>feature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.66</td>
<td>features</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.67</td>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.68</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.69</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.70</td>
<td>felt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.71</td>
<td>fewer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.72</td>
<td>fewest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.73</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.74</td>
<td>file</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.75</td>
<td>filed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.76</td>
<td>files</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.77</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.78</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.79</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.80</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.81</td>
<td>finished</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.82</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.83</td>
<td>fireman's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.84</td>
<td>Fischetti</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.85</td>
<td>fit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.86</td>
<td>fits</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.87</td>
<td>five-member</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.88</td>
<td>fix</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.89</td>
<td>fixing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.90</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.91</td>
<td>floor</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.92</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.93</td>
<td>focused</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.94</td>
<td>focusing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.95</td>
<td>folks</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.96</td>
<td>follow</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.97</td>
<td>follow-up</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.98</td>
<td>Foothills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.99</td>
<td>forget (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.10</th>
<th>Index: Fork..hearings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.1</td>
<td>Fork (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.2</td>
<td>form (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.3</td>
<td>formal (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.4</td>
<td>format (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.5</td>
<td>formation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.6</td>
<td>Fort (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.7</td>
<td>forward (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.8</td>
<td>found (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.9</td>
<td>four-hour (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.10</td>
<td>fourth (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.11</td>
<td>frame (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.12</td>
<td>framers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.13</td>
<td>Frank (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.14</td>
<td>frankly (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.15</td>
<td>frequent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.16</td>
<td>Friday (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.17</td>
<td>friends (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.18</td>
<td>front (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.19</td>
<td>frustrates (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.20</td>
<td>full (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.21</td>
<td>fully (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.22</td>
<td>functional (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.23</td>
<td>funny (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.24</td>
<td>further-narrowed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.25</td>
<td>future (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.26</td>
<td>gaps (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.27</td>
<td>garbage (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.28</td>
<td>general (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.29</td>
<td>genuinely (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.30</td>
<td>geographic (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.31</td>
<td>geography (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.32</td>
<td>German (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.33</td>
<td>gerrymander (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.34</td>
<td>gerrymandered (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.35</td>
<td>gerrymandering (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.36</td>
<td>gerrymanders (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.37</td>
<td>Giessel (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.38</td>
<td>Girdwood (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.39</td>
<td>give (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.40</td>
<td>giving (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.41</td>
<td>glad (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.42</td>
<td>Glenn (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.43</td>
<td>Glennallen (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3</td>
<td>heat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4</td>
<td>heavily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5</td>
<td>held</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6</td>
<td>hell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.7</td>
<td>hellbent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.8</td>
<td>helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.9</td>
<td>hey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.10</td>
<td>Hickel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.11</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.12</td>
<td>high-income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.13</td>
<td>high-rise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>highest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.15</td>
<td>highly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.16</td>
<td>highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.17</td>
<td>hiker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.18</td>
<td>Hiland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.19</td>
<td>hills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.20</td>
<td>Hillside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.21</td>
<td>Hinter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.22</td>
<td>historical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.23</td>
<td>historically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.24</td>
<td>history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.25</td>
<td>hockey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.26</td>
<td>hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.27</td>
<td>home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.28</td>
<td>home-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.29</td>
<td>Homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.30</td>
<td>Homer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.31</td>
<td>Homer's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.32</td>
<td>homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.33</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.34</td>
<td>honestly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.35</td>
<td>honor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.36</td>
<td>honored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.37</td>
<td>hope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.38</td>
<td>hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.39</td>
<td>hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.40</td>
<td>hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.41</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.42</td>
<td>household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.43</td>
<td>households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.44</td>
<td>houses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.45</td>
<td>housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.46</td>
<td>Huffman/o'malley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.47</td>
<td>huge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.11.93 initially (1)
2.11.94 Inlet (1)

2.12 Index: input..legitimate
2.12.1 input (1)
2.12.2 installation (1)
2.12.3 instance (2)
2.12.4 instructions (1)
2.12.5 insult (1)
2.12.6 insulted (1)
2.12.7 insulting (1)
2.12.8 intact (3)
2.12.9 integrated (5)
2.12.10 intend (1)
2.12.11 intent (1)
2.12.12 intentionally (2)
2.12.13 interest (5)
2.12.14 interested (4)
2.12.15 interesting (3)
2.12.16 interests (2)
2.12.17 intermittent (1)
2.12.18 interpretation (1)
2.12.19 interrupt (1)
2.12.20 intimately (1)
2.12.21 introduced (3)
2.12.22 invite (1)
2.12.23 invited (1)
2.12.24 involved (6)
2.12.25 involves (2)
2.12.26 involving (2)
2.12.27 irresponsible (1)
2.12.28 irritation (1)
2.12.29 issue (14)
2.12.30 issues (5)
2.12.31 item (3)
2.12.32 Jack (1)
2.12.33 Jaimes (8)
2.12.34 Jason (3)
2.12.35 JBER (10)
2.12.36 JBER/CHUGIAK (1)
2.12.37 job (3)
2.12.38 John (5)
2.12.39 John's (1)
2.12.40 join (2)
2.12.41 joining (2)
2.12.42 joins (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: length..Matt 923</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1 length (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.2 Leon (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.3 less-than-perfect (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.4 letting (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.5 level (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.6 leveraging (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.7 license (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.8 Lieutenant (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.9 <a href="mailto:lieutenantgovcampbell@gmail.com">lieutenantgovcampbell@gmail.com</a> (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.10 life (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.11 lifelong (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.12 light (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.13 Lights (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.14 limiter (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.15 lines (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.16 linked (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.17 linking (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.18 links (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.19 LIO (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.20 list (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.21 listen (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.22 listening (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.23 listing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.24 literally (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.25 litigate (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.26 litigation (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.27 live (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.28 lived (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.29 lives (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.30 living (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.31 local (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.32 locally (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.33 located (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.34 locked (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.35 logical (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.36 long (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.15 Index: moved..options**

<p>| 2.15.1  | moved (6) |
| 2.15.2  | moving (5) |
| 2.15.3  | Muldoon (17) |
| 2.15.4  | multiple (3) |
| 2.15.5  | muni (2) |
| 2.15.6  | municipal (3) |
| 2.15.7  | municipality (13) |
| 2.15.8  | muster (3) |
| 2.15.9  | named (1) |
| 2.15.10 | naming (3) |
| 2.15.11 | narrow (2) |
| 2.15.12 | narrowed (1) |
| 2.15.13 | narrowing (1) |
| 2.15.14 | Native-controlled (1) |
| 2.15.15 | natural (2) |
| 2.15.16 | naturally (1) |
| 2.17.81 | purpose (2) |
| 2.17.82 | purposes (1) |
| 2.17.83 | pursue (1) |
| 2.17.84 | push (3) |
| 2.18   | Index: pushed..remand |
| 2.18.1 | pushed (2) |
| 2.18.2 | pushes (1) |
| 2.18.3 | pushing (1) |
| 2.18.4 | put (41) |
| 2.18.5 | puts (1) |
| 2.18.6 | putting (9) |
| 2.18.7 | qualifier (1) |
| 2.18.8 | quality (1) |
| 2.18.9 | question (24) |
| 2.18.10 | questioner (1) |
| 2.18.11 | questions (24) |
| 2.18.12 | queue (6) |
| 2.18.13 | quick (2) |
| 2.18.14 | quicker (1) |
| 2.18.15 | quorum (1) |
| 2.18.16 | quote (2) |
| 2.18.17 | Rabbit (1) |
| 2.18.18 | race (2) |
| 2.18.19 | Rachel (4) |
| 2.18.20 | racial (1) |
| 2.18.21 | raise (2) |
| 2.18.22 | raised (1) |
| 2.18.23 | raises (1) |
| 2.18.24 | raising (2) |
| 2.18.25 | Randy (25) |
| 2.18.26 | Randy's (1) |
| 2.18.27 | ranked (1) |
| 2.18.28 | rarely (1) |
| 2.18.29 | rational (1) |
| 2.18.30 | rationale (4) |
| 2.18.31 | Ray (8) |
| 2.18.32 | re-drawing (1) |
| 2.18.33 | reach (1) |
| 2.18.34 | reached (1) |
| 2.18.35 | react (1) |
| 2.18.36 | read (6) |
| 2.18.37 | reading (2) |
| 2.18.38 | ready (6) |
| 2.18.39 | real (4) |
| 2.18.40 | reality (1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18.41</td>
<td>reams</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.42</td>
<td>reapportionment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.43</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.44</td>
<td>reasonability</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.45</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.46</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.47</td>
<td>reassigning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.48</td>
<td>receive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.49</td>
<td>received</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.50</td>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.51</td>
<td>recognizing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.52</td>
<td>recommend</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.53</td>
<td>recommendation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.54</td>
<td>reconsideration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.55</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.56</td>
<td>recorded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.57</td>
<td>recording's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.58</td>
<td>recordings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.59</td>
<td>recreational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.60</td>
<td>redistricting</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.61</td>
<td>Redistricting's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.62</td>
<td>redraw</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.63</td>
<td>reduced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.64</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.65</td>
<td>referenced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.66</td>
<td>referred</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.67</td>
<td>referring</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.68</td>
<td>reflected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.69</td>
<td>reflecting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.70</td>
<td>refrain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.71</td>
<td>regard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.72</td>
<td>regions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.73</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.74</td>
<td>reiterate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.75</td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.76</td>
<td>related</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.77</td>
<td>relates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.78</td>
<td>relied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.79</td>
<td>relying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.80</td>
<td>remain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.81</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.82</td>
<td>remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.83</td>
<td>remand</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.19 Index: remanded..screen

2.19.1 remanded (1)
2.19.2 remands (1)
2.19.3 remarks (2)
2.19.4 remember (1)
2.19.5 remind (2)
2.19.6 reminder (1)
2.19.7 remorse (1)
2.19.8 remove (1)
2.19.9 removed (1)
2.19.10 removes (1)
2.19.11 renew (1)
2.19.12 rent (1)
2.19.13 renting (1)
2.19.14 repair (1)
2.19.15 repeating (1)
2.19.16 replace (3)
2.19.17 replacement (1)
2.19.18 report (5)
2.19.19 represent (6)
2.19.20 representation (7)
2.19.21 representative (3)
2.19.22 representatives (1)
2.19.23 represented (2)
2.19.24 representing (1)
2.19.25 represents (2)
2.19.26 Republican (4)
2.19.27 request (2)
2.19.28 requested (1)
2.19.29 requests (2)
2.19.30 require (2)
2.19.31 required (1)
2.19.32 requirement (4)
2.19.33 requirements (1)
2.19.34 requiring (1)
2.19.35 reservations (4)
2.19.36 reshuffling (2)
2.19.37 resident (9)
2.19.38 residential (1)
2.19.39 residents (6)
2.19.40 resolutions (1)
2.19.41 resolved (1)
2.19.42 resource (3)
2.19.43 respect (4)
2.19.44 respond (4)
2.19.45 response (4)
2.19.46 rest (3)
2.20  Index: scroll..somebody's

2.20.1  scroll (1)
2.20.2  seat (7)
2.20.3  seats (4)
2.20.4  seconded (6)
2.20.5  section (10)
2.20.6  selected (1)
2.20.7  semantics (1)
2.20.8  semi-autonomous (1)
2.20.9  Senate (64)
2.20.10  senator (6)
2.20.11  senators (4)
2.20.12  send (3)
2.20.13  sense (11)
2.20.14  sentence (2)
2.20.15  separate (6)
2.20.16  separated (1)
2.20.17  separately (1)
2.20.18  separates (1)
2.20.19  separating (1)
2.20.20  septic (3)
2.20.21  sequence (1)
2.20.22  serve (4)
2.20.23  service (16)
2.20.24  service-area (1)
2.20.25  serving (1)
2.20.26  set (2)
2.20.27  settings (1)
2.20.28  seven-year (1)
2.20.29  Seward (2)
2.20.30  sewer (2)
2.20.31  share (16)
2.20.32  shared (3)
2.20.33  shares (1)
2.20.34  sharing (1)
2.20.35  sheep (1)
2.20.36  Ship (5)
2.20.37  shop (2)
2.20.38  short (3)
2.20.39  shortest (1)
2.20.40  shot (1)
2.20.41  show (8)
2.20.42  showing (2)
2.20.43  shows (2)
2.20.44  shuffling (1)
2.20.45 shut (1)
2.20.46 side (8)
2.20.47 sides (2)
2.20.48 sign (1)
2.20.49 signal (1)
2.20.50 signaled (2)
2.20.51 signaling (1)
2.20.52 significance (1)
2.20.53 significant (5)
2.20.54 significantly (1)
2.20.55 similar (15)
2.20.56 similarities (4)
2.20.57 simple (1)
2.20.58 simplified (1)
2.20.59 simplifying (1)
2.20.60 simply (7)
2.20.61 Simpson (30)
2.20.62 sing (1)
2.20.63 SINGER (13)
2.20.64 single (6)
2.20.65 single-family (1)
2.20.66 sir (2)
2.20.67 site (1)
2.20.68 situation (8)
2.20.69 Skagway (1)
2.20.70 ski (5)
2.20.71 skiing (2)
2.20.72 skipped (1)
2.20.73 Slajer (7)
2.20.74 slapped (1)
2.20.75 slightly (2)
2.20.76 small (2)
2.20.77 smaller (1)
2.20.78 smallest (5)
2.20.79 snow (4)
2.20.80 so-called (1)
2.20.81 socio (1)
2.20.82 socioeconomic (5)
2.20.83 socioeconomically (2)
2.20.84 solution (9)
2.20.85 solve (1)
2.20.86 somebody's (1)

2.21 Index: sort..Supreme
2.21.1 sort (2)
2.21.2 sound (5)
2.21.3 south (20)
2.21.4 South/hillside (1)
2.21.5 southeast (3)
2.21.6 southwest (1)
2.21.7 speak (17)
2.21.8 speaking (1)
2.21.9 specific (13)
2.21.10 specifically (9)
2.21.11 specifics (1)
2.21.12 spent (1)
2.21.13 split (3)
2.21.14 splitting (3)
2.21.15 spoken (5)
2.21.16 spot (1)
2.21.17 spreads (1)
2.21.18 spring (1)
2.21.19 spruce (1)
2.21.20 stand (3)
2.21.21 standard (4)
2.21.22 stands (2)
2.21.23 start (6)
2.21.24 started (2)
2.21.25 starting (6)
2.21.26 starts (1)
2.21.27 state (14)
2.21.28 State's (2)
2.21.29 State-owned (1)
2.21.30 stated (1)
2.21.31 statement (4)
2.21.32 status (6)
2.21.33 stay (2)
2.21.34 step (1)
2.21.35 Steve (6)
2.21.36 stick (1)
2.21.37 stock (1)
2.21.38 stood (1)
2.21.39 stop (1)
2.21.40 stopping (1)
2.21.41 stores (2)
2.21.42 straight (2)
2.21.43 Strait (8)
2.21.44 stranded (3)
2.21.45 streamline (1)
2.21.46 Street (1)
2.21.47 strength (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.21.48</td>
<td>stressful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.49</td>
<td>stretch</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.50</td>
<td>strife</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.51</td>
<td>strike</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.52</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.53</td>
<td>struck</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.54</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.55</td>
<td>struggling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.56</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.57</td>
<td>stuff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.58</td>
<td>style</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.59</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.60</td>
<td>submissions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.61</td>
<td>submit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.62</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.63</td>
<td>submitting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.64</td>
<td>subsequent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.65</td>
<td>substance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.66</td>
<td>substantial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.67</td>
<td>substantially</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.68</td>
<td>substantively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.69</td>
<td>success</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.70</td>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.71</td>
<td>suggest</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.72</td>
<td>suggest-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.73</td>
<td>suggested</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.74</td>
<td>suggesting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.75</td>
<td>suggestion</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.76</td>
<td>suggestions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.77</td>
<td>suggests</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.78</td>
<td>summarizes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.79</td>
<td>summer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.80</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.81</td>
<td>super</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.82</td>
<td>superior</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.83</td>
<td>supervises</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.84</td>
<td>supervisors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.85</td>
<td>supply</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.86</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.87</td>
<td>supporting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.88</td>
<td>supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.89</td>
<td>supports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.90</td>
<td>suppose</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.91</td>
<td>supposed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.92</td>
<td>Supreme</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.22 Index: surgical..trouble

2.22.1 surgical (3)
2.22.2 surround (1)
2.22.3 Susan (5)
2.22.4 suspect (1)
2.22.5 swallow (1)
2.22.6 swap (1)
2.22.7 swapping (2)
2.22.8 swaths (1)
2.22.9 system (2)
2.22.10 systems (2)
2.22.11 table (7)
2.22.12 tags (1)
2.22.13 takes (4)
2.22.14 taking (5)
2.22.15 talk (12)
2.22.16 talked (3)
2.22.17 talking (12)
2.22.18 tallying (1)
2.22.19 Tanner (1)
2.22.20 task (1)
2.22.21 teamed (1)
2.22.22 technology (1)
2.22.23 Ted (5)
2.22.24 ten (2)
2.22.25 ten-minute (1)
2.22.26 ten-year (1)
2.22.27 tenets (1)
2.22.28 terms (8)
2.22.29 testified (2)
2.22.30 testifier (3)
2.22.31 testifiers (2)
2.22.32 testify (15)
2.22.33 testifying (3)
2.22.34 testimony (69)
2.22.35 testimony’s (1)
2.22.36 that’ll (1)
2.22.37 therefrom (1)
2.22.38 thing (9)
2.22.39 things (18)
2.22.40 third-party (1)
2.22.41 thought (6)
2.22.42 thoughtful (1)
2.22.43 thoughts (4)
2.22.44 Thurman (9)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Word</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22.45</td>
<td>Thursday (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.46</td>
<td>tie (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.47</td>
<td>tight (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.48</td>
<td>time (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.49</td>
<td>time-consuming (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.50</td>
<td>times (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.51</td>
<td>timing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.52</td>
<td>tired (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.53</td>
<td>title (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.54</td>
<td>titled (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.55</td>
<td>titles (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.56</td>
<td>titling (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.57</td>
<td>today (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.58</td>
<td>toggling (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.59</td>
<td>told (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.60</td>
<td>Tom (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.61</td>
<td>tomorrow (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.62</td>
<td>tonight (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.63</td>
<td>top (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.64</td>
<td>topics (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.65</td>
<td>Torkelson (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.66</td>
<td>totally (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.67</td>
<td>tough (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.68</td>
<td>tour (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.69</td>
<td>town (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.70</td>
<td>track (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.71</td>
<td>traffic (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.72</td>
<td>trails (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.73</td>
<td>TRANSCRIBER (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.74</td>
<td>transportation (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.75</td>
<td>travel (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.76</td>
<td>traverse (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.77</td>
<td>tread (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.78</td>
<td>treat (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.79</td>
<td>trees (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.80</td>
<td>trek (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.81</td>
<td>Trends (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.82</td>
<td>trial (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.83</td>
<td>trouble (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Index: troubleshoot..whittle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.1</td>
<td>troubleshoot (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.2</td>
<td>truck (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.3</td>
<td>trucks (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.4</td>
<td>true (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.5</td>
<td>truncates (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Word Index

2.1 Index: (indiscernible)'s..adopter

2.1.1 (indiscernible)'s (1)
2.1.2 -000- (2)
2.1.3 100 (1)
2.1.4 10:00 (1)
2.1.5 11 (1)
2.1.6 11:23 (1)
2.1.7 12:00 (1)
2.1.8 16 (1)
2.1.9 17 (1)
<p>| 2.1.10 | 1977   | (1) |
| 2.1.11 | 1:30   | (1) |
| 2.1.12 | 1:42   | (1) |
| 2.1.13 | 1:59   | (1) |
| 2.1.14 | 2      | (14) |
| 2.1.15 | 20     | (2) |
| 2.1.16 | 20-    | (1) |
| 2.1.17 | 2001   | (1) |
| 2.1.18 | 2010   | (1) |
| 2.1.19 | 2012   | (1) |
| 2.1.20 | 2022   | (2) |
| 2.1.21 | 21     | (1) |
| 2.1.22 | 21-mile| (1) |
| 2.1.23 | 22     | (20) |
| 2.1.24 | 23     | (5) |
| 2.1.25 | 24     | (5) |
| 2.1.26 | 25     | (1) |
| 2.1.27 | 27     | (1) |
| 2.1.28 | 28     | (1) |
| 2.1.29 | 29     | (3) |
| 2.1.30 | 2:00   | (4) |
| 2.1.31 | 2:02   | (1) |
| 2.1.32 | 3      | (2) |
| 2.1.33 | 3,000  | (1) |
| 2.1.34 | 3.6    | (1) |
| 2.1.35 | 3/18   | (1) |
| 2.1.36 | 33     | (1) |
| 2.1.37 | 38     | (1) |
| 2.1.38 | 3B     | (40) |
| 2.1.39 | 40     | (3) |
| 2.1.40 | 465    | (1) |
| 2.1.41 | 500,000| (1) |
| 2.1.42 | 6      | (3) |
| 2.1.43 | 62-year| (1) |
| 2.1.44 | 67     | (1) |
| 2.1.45 | 78     | (1) |
| 2.1.46 | 7th    | (1) |
| 2.1.47 | 8      | (1) |
| 2.1.48 | 87     | (4) |
| 2.1.49 | 9      | (20) |
| 2.1.50 | 9's    | (2) |
| 2.1.51 | Abbott | (2) |
| 2.1.52 | ABC    | (1) |
| 2.1.53 | able-bodied | (1) |
| 2.1.54 | absence | (1) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.55</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.56</td>
<td>acceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.57</td>
<td>access</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.58</td>
<td>accomplished</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.59</td>
<td>accomplishes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.60</td>
<td>accordance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.61</td>
<td>accounted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.62</td>
<td>acres</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.63</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.64</td>
<td>actions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.65</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.66</td>
<td>adding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.67</td>
<td>additionally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.68</td>
<td>address</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.69</td>
<td>adequate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.70</td>
<td>adjoining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.71</td>
<td>adjourn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.72</td>
<td>adjourning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.73</td>
<td>adopt</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.74</td>
<td>adopted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.75</td>
<td>adopting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Index: advanced..Bethany</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>advice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>affected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>afternoon</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>agenda</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8</td>
<td>agendas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.9</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.10</td>
<td>agrees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.11</td>
<td>ahead</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.12</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.13</td>
<td>Alaskan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>Alaskans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.15</td>
<td>alerting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.16</td>
<td>align</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.17</td>
<td>aligned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.18</td>
<td>aligns</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.19</td>
<td>allowed</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.20</td>
<td>allowing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.21</td>
<td>alternative</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.22</td>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.23</td>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anymore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apologize</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arctic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>areas</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arguments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arrived</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artwork</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>asks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assembly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assume</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assured</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attrition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aware</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awesome</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backdoor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backpack</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahnke</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barely</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.69</td>
<td>basic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.70</td>
<td>basically</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.71</td>
<td>basis</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.72</td>
<td>batch</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.73</td>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.74</td>
<td>Begich</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.75</td>
<td>begin</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.76</td>
<td>beginning</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.77</td>
<td>behalf</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.78</td>
<td>belabor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.79</td>
<td>belong</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.80</td>
<td>belongs</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.81</td>
<td>benefit</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.82</td>
<td>bet</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.83</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Index: Bethany's...Chugach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>Bethany's</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>big</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>Binkley</td>
<td>(88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>Birch</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>Birchwood</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>bit</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7</td>
<td>blatantly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8</td>
<td>blocks</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.9</td>
<td>blogs</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.10</td>
<td>board</td>
<td>(220)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.11</td>
<td>Board's</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.12</td>
<td>boating</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.13</td>
<td>bogus</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>booked</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.15</td>
<td>borders</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.16</td>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.17</td>
<td>Borromeo</td>
<td>(78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.18</td>
<td>boundaries</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.19</td>
<td>boundary</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.20</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.21</td>
<td>breaking</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.22</td>
<td>bring</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.23</td>
<td>bringing</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.24</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.25</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.26</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.27</td>
<td>Budd</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.28</td>
<td>Bunde</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.29</td>
<td>Bye</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.30</td>
<td>cabin (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.31</td>
<td>calendar (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.32</td>
<td>call (19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.33</td>
<td>called (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.34</td>
<td>caller (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.35</td>
<td>caller's (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.36</td>
<td>callers (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.37</td>
<td>calling (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.38</td>
<td>calls (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.39</td>
<td>car (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.40</td>
<td>care (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.41</td>
<td>carve (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.42</td>
<td>case (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.43</td>
<td>Cathy (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.44</td>
<td>caught (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.45</td>
<td>caution (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.46</td>
<td>cautious (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.47</td>
<td>center (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.48</td>
<td>chair (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.49</td>
<td>chaired (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.50</td>
<td>chairing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.51</td>
<td>chairman (89)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.52</td>
<td>challenges (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.53</td>
<td>change (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.54</td>
<td>changed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.55</td>
<td>changing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.56</td>
<td>charge (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.57</td>
<td>chart (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.58</td>
<td>children (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.59</td>
<td>choice (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.60</td>
<td>choose (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.61</td>
<td>chosen (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.62</td>
<td>Chugach (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4  Index: Chugiak..cross  

| 2.4.1 | Chugiak (2) |
| 2.4.2 | Cindy (19) |
| 2.4.3 | circle (2) |
| 2.4.4 | cite (1) |
| 2.4.5 | citizens (1) |
| 2.4.6 | city (1) |
| 2.4.7 | civilian (1) |
| 2.4.8 | clar- (1) |
| 2.4.9 | clarification (4) |
| 2.4.10 | clarified (1) |
| 2.4.11 | clarify (9) |
2.4.12 clarifying (5)
2.4.13 clear (5)
2.4.14 cleared (1)
2.4.15 click (1)
2.4.16 close (4)
2.4.17 closely (2)
2.4.18 closer (1)
2.4.19 closing (1)
2.4.20 co-chair (1)
2.4.21 coincidence (2)
2.4.22 column (1)
2.4.23 combine (5)
2.4.24 combined (2)
2.4.25 combines (1)
2.4.26 combining (4)
2.4.27 comfortable (1)
2.4.28 comment (2)
2.4.29 commentary (2)
2.4.30 commented (2)
2.4.31 commenting (1)
2.4.32 comments (4)
2.4.33 common (6)
2.4.34 commonalities (2)
2.4.35 commonality (1)
2.4.36 communication (1)
2.4.37 communities (25)
2.4.38 community (27)
2.4.39 community’s (1)
2.4.40 compact (9)
2.4.41 compactness (2)
2.4.42 complaining (1)
2.4.43 completely (3)
2.4.44 completing (1)
2.4.45 composed (1)
2.4.46 computer (2)
2.4.47 Con (1)
2.4.48 concept (1)
2.4.49 concerns (2)
2.4.50 confused (6)
2.4.51 confusion (3)
2.4.52 congratulations (2)
2.4.53 connect (2)
2.4.54 connected (4)
2.4.55 connection (3)
2.4.56 connections (2)
connects (1)
consideration (2)
considered (3)
consistent (2)
consolidation (1)
constitution (10)
constitutional (1)
consultant (1)
context (3)
contiguity (9)
contiguous (28)
continue (4)
continues (2)
continuing (1)
continuity (1)
contractor (1)
contrast (1)
conversation (3)
conversations (2)
copies (1)
correct (7)
correction (1)
correctly (2)
council (4)
Council's (1)
councils (1)
counsel (1)
counting (1)
couple (2)
court (13)
courts (2)
COVID (2)
create (2)
creates (1)
credible (1)
Creek (13)
cross (2)
crossed (1)
crosses (1)
crossing (2)
Crow (6)
curve (1)
cut (1)
cynical (1)
2.6.55 feel (7)
2.6.56 feet (1)
2.6.57 felt (1)
2.6.58 figure (3)
2.6.59 figuring (1)
2.6.60 file (1)
2.6.61 filled (1)
2.6.62 final (6)
2.6.63 finally (2)
2.6.64 find (4)
2.6.65 fine (4)
2.6.66 finish (1)
2.6.67 fire (1)
2.6.68 firmly (1)
2.6.69 Fischetti (13)
2.6.70 fix (1)
2.6.71 fly (4)
2.6.72 folks (1)
2.6.73 follow (1)
2.6.74 follow-up (2)
2.6.75 foot (1)
2.6.76 foreseen (1)
2.6.77 form (2)
2.6.78 formulated (1)
2.6.79 Forrest (1)
2.6.80 forum (1)
2.6.81 forums (1)
2.6.82 found (2)
2.6.83 fraudulent (1)
2.6.84 freezing (2)
2.6.85 Friday (1)
2.6.86 friends (1)
2.6.87 front (1)
2.6.88 full (1)
2.6.89 funding (1)
2.6.90 future (1)
2.6.91 gate (3)
2.6.92 gated (1)
2.6.93 gates (2)
2.6.94 gave (3)
2.6.95 gavel (2)
2.6.96 geared (1)
2.6.97 geez (1)
2.6.98 generic (1)
2.6.99 gentleman (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.6.100 geographic (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Index: gerrymander..independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.1 gerrymander (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.2 gerrymandering (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.3 Giessel (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.4 Girdwood (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.5 gist (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.6 give (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.7 giving (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.8 glacier (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.9 good (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.10 Gotcha (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.11 government (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.12 Graham (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.13 grandchildren (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.14 grandma (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.15 great (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.16 group (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.17 groupings (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.18 growing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.19 grown (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.20 guess (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.21 guided (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22 guys (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.23 half (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.24 Hammermeister (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.25 hand (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.26 hands (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.27 hanging (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.28 happen (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.29 happened (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.30 happening (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.31 happiest (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.32 happy (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.33 head (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.34 hear (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.35 heard (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.36 hearing (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.37 hears (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.38 heavy (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.39 held (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.40 hide (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.41 high (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.42 higher-price (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.43 highway (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.44 meeting (12)
2.9.45 meetings (2)
2.9.46 Melanie (82)
2.9.47 member (192)
2.9.48 members (21)
2.9.49 mention (1)
2.9.50 mentioned (3)
2.9.51 messages (5)
2.9.52 mic (3)
2.9.53 mics (1)
2.9.54 Midtown (2)
2.9.55 miles (8)
2.9.56 military (10)
2.9.57 mind (8)
2.9.58 mindlink (1)
2.9.59 minutes (4)
2.9.60 missed (2)
2.9.61 misspoke (1)
2.9.62 mistake (3)
2.9.63 MLK (1)
2.9.64 mode (1)
2.9.65 moment (1)
2.9.66 month (1)
2.9.67 moose (5)
2.9.68 morning (1)

2.10 Index: motion..parameters
2.10.1 motion (6)
2.10.2 motivated (1)
2.10.3 mountain (2)
2.10.4 mountains (5)
2.10.5 move (3)
2.10.6 moved (5)
2.10.7 moving (2)
2.10.8 muffled (1)
2.10.9 Muldoon (9)
2.10.10 multiple (2)
2.10.11 municipal (3)
2.10.12 municipal's (1)
2.10.13 municipality (2)
2.10.14 municipality's (1)
2.10.15 mute (5)
2.10.16 muted (6)
2.10.17 muting (1)
2.10.18 name's (1)
2.10.19 nation (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.20</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.21</td>
<td>nature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.22</td>
<td>navigable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.23</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.24</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.25</td>
<td>negatively</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.26</td>
<td>neighborhoods</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.27</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.28</td>
<td>net</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.29</td>
<td>nickname</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.30</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.31</td>
<td>Nicole's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.32</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.33</td>
<td>NIMBYS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.34</td>
<td>no-to-few</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.35</td>
<td>nobody's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.36</td>
<td>noise</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.37</td>
<td>noon</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.38</td>
<td>North</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.39</td>
<td>northern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.40</td>
<td>note</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.41</td>
<td>notes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.42</td>
<td>notice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.43</td>
<td>noticeably</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.44</td>
<td>noticed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.45</td>
<td>notices</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.46</td>
<td>notion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.47</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.48</td>
<td>numbering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.49</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.50</td>
<td>O'MALLEY</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.51</td>
<td>objection</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.52</td>
<td>obligation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.53</td>
<td>obvious</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.54</td>
<td>odd</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.55</td>
<td>odd-shaped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.56</td>
<td>off-net</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.57</td>
<td>offend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.58</td>
<td>offended</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.59</td>
<td>office</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.60</td>
<td>older</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.61</td>
<td>online</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.62</td>
<td>onsite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.63</td>
<td>open</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.64</td>
<td>opening</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.65</td>
<td>opens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.66</td>
<td>opinion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.67</td>
<td>opinions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.68</td>
<td>opportunity</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.69</td>
<td>oppose</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.70</td>
<td>opposed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.71</td>
<td>opposition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.72</td>
<td>option</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.73</td>
<td>options</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.74</td>
<td>order</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.75</td>
<td>original</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.76</td>
<td>outer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.77</td>
<td>outlining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.78</td>
<td>owe</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.79</td>
<td>owl</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.80</td>
<td>P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.81</td>
<td>pair</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.82</td>
<td>paired</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.83</td>
<td>pairing</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.84</td>
<td>pairings</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.85</td>
<td>pairs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.86</td>
<td>papers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.87</td>
<td>parameters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>Index: paraphrased..public</td>
<td>1026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1</td>
<td>paraphrased</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.2</td>
<td>Pardon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3</td>
<td>park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4</td>
<td>parks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5</td>
<td>part</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6</td>
<td>participate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.7</td>
<td>parties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.8</td>
<td>parts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.9</td>
<td>party</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.10</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.11</td>
<td>passed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.12</td>
<td>passionate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.13</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.15</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.16</td>
<td>Pause</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.17</td>
<td>PDF</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.18</td>
<td>peek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.19</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.20</td>
<td>people's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.21</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.20</td>
<td>racist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.21</td>
<td>raised</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.22</td>
<td>range</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.23</td>
<td>Rappoport</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.24</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.25</td>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.26</td>
<td>re-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.27</td>
<td>reach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.28</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.29</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.30</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.31</td>
<td>reaffirmed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.32</td>
<td>realize</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.33</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.34</td>
<td>reasoning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.35</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.36</td>
<td>recall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>receive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>receiving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>recently</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>recommended</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>recordings</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>recover</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>rectangle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>red-handed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>redistrict</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>redistricting</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>redraw</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>reestablished</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>refer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>referenced</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>refusal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>regard</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>reiterate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>reject</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>rejected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>related</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>relates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>relatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>relying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>remain</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Count(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>remember (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>remind (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>removal (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>repeatedly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>replacing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>report (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>represent (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>representation (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>representative (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>represented (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>Republican (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.76</td>
<td>reputation (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.77</td>
<td>requested (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.78</td>
<td>require (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.79</td>
<td>requirements (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.80</td>
<td>requires (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.81</td>
<td>requiring (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.82</td>
<td>research (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.83</td>
<td>researching (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.84</td>
<td>residence (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.85</td>
<td>resident (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.86</td>
<td>residents (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.87</td>
<td>resolution (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.88</td>
<td>respect (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.89</td>
<td>respectfully (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.90</td>
<td>respond (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.91</td>
<td>responded (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>Index: responses..snow</td>
<td>1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.1</td>
<td>responses (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.2</td>
<td>responsiveness (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.3</td>
<td>rest (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.4</td>
<td>resulted (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.5</td>
<td>Returning (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.6</td>
<td>reunite (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.7</td>
<td>review (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.8</td>
<td>revise (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.9</td>
<td>rhyme (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.10</td>
<td>rid (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.11</td>
<td>ridiculous (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.12</td>
<td>rig (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.13</td>
<td>rise (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.14</td>
<td>River (87)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.15</td>
<td>River's (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.16</td>
<td>road (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.17</td>
<td>roads (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specific (1)
specifically (1)
spew (1)
split (3)
splits (1)
splitting (6)
spoken (7)
square (2)
squaring (1)
staff (1)
stand (2)
start (9)
starts (1)
state (14)
State's (1)
stated (2)
statement (2)
statement's (1)
statements (2)
states (1)
statewide (1)
stay (4)
steep (1)
step (1)
stick (2)
sticking (1)
stop (3)
stops (1)
street (2)
strong (1)
struggling (1)
stuck (2)
stuff (3)
submitted (4)
suburban (1)
sudden (1)
suggest (2)
suggested (1)
suggesting (1)
suggests (1)
summaries (1)
summarizing (1)
Superior (1)
support (21)
supported (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.14.63</td>
<td>supporting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.64</td>
<td>supposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.65</td>
<td>Supreme</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.66</td>
<td>surprised</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.67</td>
<td>surrounded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.68</td>
<td>surrounding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.69</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.70</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.71</td>
<td>swaps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.72</td>
<td>swath</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.73</td>
<td>swift</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.74</td>
<td>Syren</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.75</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.76</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.77</td>
<td>talk</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.78</td>
<td>talked</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.79</td>
<td>talking</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.80</td>
<td>task</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.81</td>
<td>tasked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.82</td>
<td>taught</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.83</td>
<td>team</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.84</td>
<td>tear</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.85</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.86</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.87</td>
<td>teleconference</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.88</td>
<td>temperatures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.89</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.90</td>
<td>tenuous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.91</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.92</td>
<td>tested</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.93</td>
<td>testified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.94</td>
<td>testifier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.95</td>
<td>testify</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.96</td>
<td>testifying</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.97</td>
<td>testimony</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Index: text..voters</td>
<td>1030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.1</td>
<td>text</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.2</td>
<td>texted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.3</td>
<td>thanking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.4</td>
<td>thing</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.5</td>
<td>things</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.6</td>
<td>thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.7</td>
<td>third-party</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.8</td>
<td>thought</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.9</td>
<td>thousands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index</td>
<td>Words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.55</td>
<td>type (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.56</td>
<td>unable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.57</td>
<td>unconstitutional (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.58</td>
<td>underlying (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.59</td>
<td>understand (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.60</td>
<td>understanding (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.61</td>
<td>understood (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.62</td>
<td>undo (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.63</td>
<td>UNIDENTIFIED (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.64</td>
<td>uninhabited (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.65</td>
<td>united (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.66</td>
<td>unmute (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.67</td>
<td>unmuted (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.68</td>
<td>unnecessary (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.69</td>
<td>unpopulated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.70</td>
<td>unrelated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.71</td>
<td>unsurmountable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.72</td>
<td>Upper (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.73</td>
<td>urbanized (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.74</td>
<td>urge (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.75</td>
<td>urging (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.76</td>
<td>utilizing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.77</td>
<td>Valdez (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.78</td>
<td>valley (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.79</td>
<td>vast (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.80</td>
<td>vastly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.81</td>
<td>verbal (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.82</td>
<td>versus (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.83</td>
<td>VI (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.84</td>
<td>video (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.85</td>
<td>view (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.86</td>
<td>violates (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.87</td>
<td>virtually (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.88</td>
<td>visible (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.89</td>
<td>visit (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.90</td>
<td>vote (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.91</td>
<td>voters (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Index: votes..Zoom 1031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.1</td>
<td>votes (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.2</td>
<td>waiting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.3</td>
<td>walk (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.4</td>
<td>walked (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.5</td>
<td>walking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.6</td>
<td>wanted (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.7</td>
<td>waste (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16.8 watched (1)
2.16.9 watching (4)
2.16.10 water (2)
2.16.11 waterway (1)
2.16.12 website (1)
2.16.13 Wednesday (1)
2.16.14 week (3)
2.16.15 weekends (1)
2.16.16 weighing (1)
2.16.17 weirdos (1)
2.16.18 Whittier (4)
2.16.19 wholeheartedly (1)
2.16.20 wilderness (1)
2.16.21 wildfires (1)
2.16.22 wildlife (1)
2.16.23 willingness (1)
2.16.24 wise (2)
2.16.25 wishing (1)
2.16.26 wondering (1)
2.16.27 words (2)
2.16.28 work (8)
2.16.29 workable (1)
2.16.30 worked (4)
2.16.31 working (4)
2.16.32 workplace (1)
2.16.33 world (1)
2.16.34 Wow (1)
2.16.35 wrestle (1)
2.16.36 written (1)
2.16.37 wrong (1)
2.16.38 Yarrow (12)
2.16.39 year (5)
2.16.40 years (9)
2.16.41 yesterday (4)
2.16.42 young (1)
2.16.43 younger (1)
2.16.44 zoo (2)
2.16.45 Zoom (10)

3 Transcript Formats
3.1 ASCII/TXT

ARB2000697-000813  2022-04-08-ARB-Transcript-Full

1 Transcript
1.1 Cover
1.2 Caption
1.3 Page 2
2 Word Index

2.1 Index: $129,000..achieved

2.1.1 $129,000 (1)
2.1.2 $129,768 (1)
2.1.3 $38,000 (2)
2.1.4 $80,000 (1)
2.1.5 -o0o- (2)
2.1.6 1 (5)
2.1.7 10 (1)
2.1.8 11 (2)
2.1.9 11:20 (1)
2.1.10 12 (4)
2.1.11 13 (2)
2.1.12 13th (1)
2.1.13 14 (1)
2.1.14 15 (2)
2.1.15 15,000 (1)
2.1.16 17 (1)
2.1.17 18 (1)
2.1.18 18,000 (1)
2.1.19 18,205 (1)
2.1.20 18,284 (2)
2.1.21 18-year-olds (1)
2.1.22 19 (3)
2.1.23 1950s (1)
2.1.24 1970 (1)
2.1.25 1992 (1)
2.1.26 2 (24)
2.1.27 20 (4)
2.1.28 2016 (2)
2.1.29 2018 (1)
2.1.30 2019 (1)
2.1.31 2021 (1)
2.1.32 2022 (1)
2.1.33 21 (3)
2.1.34 22 (17)
2.1.35 23 (4)
2.1.36 23/24 (1)
2.1.37 24 (6)
2.1.38 25 (1)
2.1.39 27 (1)
2.2.52 analysis (1)
2.2.53 Anchorage (73)
2.2.54 Andrew (7)
2.2.55 Annapolis (1)
2.2.56 annual (1)
2.2.57 anomaly (1)
2.2.58 anymore (1)
2.2.59 apologize (1)
2.2.60 apparent (1)
2.2.61 appeal (2)
2.2.62 appears (1)
2.2.63 apples (1)
2.2.64 applied (2)
2.2.65 apply (3)
2.2.66 applying (6)
2.2.67 appointed (1)
2.2.68 appreciated (1)
2.2.69 approaching (1)
2.2.70 approve (1)
2.2.71 approximately (1)
2.2.72 area (17)
2.2.73 areas (16)
2.2.74 arguably (1)
2.2.75 argue (3)
2.2.76 argued (2)
2.2.77 argument (9)
2.2.78 arguments (6)
2.2.79 Arm (5)
2.2.80 Army (1)
2.2.81 array (1)
2.2.82 Article (4)
2.2.83 articulate (1)
2.2.84 Assembly (18)
2.2.85 assessment (2)
2.2.86 Association (1)
2.2.87 assume (4)
2.2.88 assuming (1)
2.2.89 at-ease (1)
2.2.90 attacks (2)
2.2.91 attempting (1)
2.2.92 attend (1)
2.2.93 attendance (1)

2.3 Index: attendees..button 1131
2.3.1 attendees (1)
2.3.2 attention (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attorney</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attorneys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoiding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>back</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahnke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>balanced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ballots</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>base</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>based</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bashing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>began</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begich</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behalf</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>belief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bell</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ben-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefited</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bias</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bigger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biggest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binkley</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blasted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blessed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blocks</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>board</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bode</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>body</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bolster</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bootleggers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bordering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borough</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.48</td>
<td>Borromeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.49</td>
<td>bothered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.50</td>
<td>bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.51</td>
<td>boundaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.52</td>
<td>boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.53</td>
<td>brave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.54</td>
<td>break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.55</td>
<td>breaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.56</td>
<td>Briana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.57</td>
<td>bridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.58</td>
<td>bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.59</td>
<td>bringing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.60</td>
<td>broke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.61</td>
<td>brought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.62</td>
<td>Budd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.63</td>
<td>Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.64</td>
<td>bulk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.65</td>
<td>bullied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.66</td>
<td>Bunde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.67</td>
<td>burden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.68</td>
<td>Bush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.69</td>
<td>business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.70</td>
<td>busy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.71</td>
<td>button</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Index: Bye..compelling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.1</td>
<td>Bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.2</td>
<td>Bye-bye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.3</td>
<td>call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>called</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.5</td>
<td>callers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.6</td>
<td>calling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.7</td>
<td>calls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.8</td>
<td>candidate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.9</td>
<td>capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.10</td>
<td>car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.11</td>
<td>care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.12</td>
<td>careful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.13</td>
<td>caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.14</td>
<td>carpool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.15</td>
<td>case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.16</td>
<td>cast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.17</td>
<td>category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.18</td>
<td>Cathy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.19</td>
<td>caught</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.20</td>
<td>caution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.66 cochairing (1)
2.4.67 colleagues (1)
2.4.68 combination (2)
2.4.69 combine (2)
2.4.70 combined (2)
2.4.71 combining (1)
2.4.72 comfortable (2)
2.4.73 comment (1)
2.4.74 commentary (1)
2.4.75 comments (5)
2.4.76 commerce (1)
2.4.77 Committee (1)
2.4.78 common (14)
2.4.79 commonalities (1)
2.4.80 commonsense (1)
2.4.81 communication (1)
2.4.82 communities (17)
2.4.83 community (12)
2.4.84 compact (6)
2.4.85 compactness (1)
2.4.86 compare (2)
2.4.87 compared (1)
2.4.88 comparing (1)
2.4.89 compass (1)
2.4.90 compelling (1)

2.5 Index: completely..data 1133
2.5.1 completely (1)
2.5.2 complexities (1)
2.5.3 compliance (3)
2.5.4 complicated (1)
2.5.5 composed (5)
2.5.6 Con (1)
2.5.7 con- (1)
2.5.8 concern (1)
2.5.9 concerned (1)
2.5.10 conclusion (1)
2.5.11 condescending (1)
2.5.12 configuration (2)
2.5.13 confrontational (1)
2.5.14 confuse (1)
2.5.15 confused (3)
2.5.16 confusion (1)
2.5.17 Congressional (1)
2.5.18 connect (3)
2.5.19 connected (6)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.65</td>
<td>counsel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.66</td>
<td>countless</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.67</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.68</td>
<td>couple</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.69</td>
<td>court</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.70</td>
<td>Court's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.71</td>
<td>Cove</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.72</td>
<td>cracked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.73</td>
<td>create</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.74</td>
<td>created</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.75</td>
<td>creates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.76</td>
<td>creating</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.77</td>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.78</td>
<td>criteria</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.79</td>
<td>criterion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.80</td>
<td>critical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.81</td>
<td>criticize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.82</td>
<td>cross</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.83</td>
<td>cross-examine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.84</td>
<td>crossing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.85</td>
<td>Crow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.86</td>
<td>crucial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.87</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.88</td>
<td>current</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.89</td>
<td>cut</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.90</td>
<td>Dall</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.91</td>
<td>data</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Index: dates..Eagle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1</td>
<td>dates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2</td>
<td>day</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3</td>
<td>days</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4</td>
<td>debate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5</td>
<td>decades</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.6</td>
<td>decision</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.7</td>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.8</td>
<td>decisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.9</td>
<td>declared</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.10</td>
<td>decline</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.11</td>
<td>def-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.12</td>
<td>defend</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.13</td>
<td>defined</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.14</td>
<td>definition</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.15</td>
<td>degree</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.16</td>
<td>delay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.17</td>
<td>dem-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>districts</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>double</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doubt</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>downtown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainages</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drains</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drawn</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drew</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drivability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drivable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>driving</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dropping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-mail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earlier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easiest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>east</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effort</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egregiously</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eklutna</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elected</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>election</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eledge</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elevations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloquent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eloquently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>energy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engaged</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>engagement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enjoying</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enlisted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enlistments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enshrine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entire</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>entitled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equitably</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escape</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>established</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esteemed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>estimation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluating</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceptions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXECUTIVE</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exhibit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>existed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expedited</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expense</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expensive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explain</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explained</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.64</td>
<td>explanation</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.65</td>
<td>explicitly</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.66</td>
<td>extend</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.67</td>
<td>extends</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.68</td>
<td>extra</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.69</td>
<td>extremely</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.70</td>
<td>face</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.71</td>
<td>facility</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.72</td>
<td>fact</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.73</td>
<td>factoring</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.74</td>
<td>facts</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.75</td>
<td>failed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.76</td>
<td>fails</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.77</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.78</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.79</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.80</td>
<td>faith</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.81</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.82</td>
<td>falls</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.83</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.84</td>
<td>familiar</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.85</td>
<td>families</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.86</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.87</td>
<td>fan</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.88</td>
<td>Fantastic</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.89</td>
<td>far-fetched</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.90</td>
<td>farther</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.91</td>
<td>faster</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Index: faulty..guess</td>
<td>1136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.1</td>
<td>faulty</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.2</td>
<td>favor</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.3</td>
<td>favored</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.4</td>
<td>feature</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.5</td>
<td>features</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.6</td>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.7</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.8</td>
<td>feeling</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.9</td>
<td>fellow</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.10</td>
<td>ferries</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.11</td>
<td>fierce</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.12</td>
<td>fights</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.13</td>
<td>figures</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.14</td>
<td>filed</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.15</td>
<td>final</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.16</td>
<td>Finally</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.17</td>
<td>Finance (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.18</td>
<td>find (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.19</td>
<td>findings (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.20</td>
<td>fine (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.21</td>
<td>finish (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.22</td>
<td>firm (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.23</td>
<td>firmly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.24</td>
<td>firsthand (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.25</td>
<td>Fischetti (23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.26</td>
<td>flat (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.27</td>
<td>fly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.28</td>
<td>flying (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.29</td>
<td>focus (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.30</td>
<td>focused (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.31</td>
<td>folks (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.32</td>
<td>follow (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.33</td>
<td>follow-up (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.34</td>
<td>food (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.35</td>
<td>footprint (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.36</td>
<td>force (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.37</td>
<td>forced (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.38</td>
<td>forces (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.39</td>
<td>forcing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.40</td>
<td>Foreign (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.41</td>
<td>forest (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.42</td>
<td>forget (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.43</td>
<td>formative (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.44</td>
<td>Forrest (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.45</td>
<td>forward (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.46</td>
<td>fought (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.47</td>
<td>found (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.48</td>
<td>foundational (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.49</td>
<td>free (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.50</td>
<td>frequently (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.51</td>
<td>friends (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.52</td>
<td>full (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.53</td>
<td>function (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.54</td>
<td>functioning (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.55</td>
<td>functions (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.56</td>
<td>future (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.57</td>
<td>gain (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.58</td>
<td>Gambell (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.59</td>
<td>game (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.60</td>
<td>gas (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.61</td>
<td>gated (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line Number</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.62</td>
<td>gave</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.63</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.64</td>
<td>geographic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.65</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.66</td>
<td>gerrymander</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.67</td>
<td>gerrymandered</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.68</td>
<td>gerrymandering</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.69</td>
<td>gerrymanders</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.70</td>
<td>Giessel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.71</td>
<td>Girdwood</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.72</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.73</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.74</td>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.75</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.76</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.77</td>
<td>Good-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.78</td>
<td>goodbye</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.79</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.80</td>
<td>graduate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.81</td>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.82</td>
<td>Gray</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.83</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.84</td>
<td>Gretchen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.85</td>
<td>grew</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.86</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.87</td>
<td>grouped</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.88</td>
<td>grown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.89</td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.90</td>
<td>guaranteed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.91</td>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8.92</td>
<td>guess</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>Index: guidance..information</td>
<td>1137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.1</td>
<td>guidance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.2</td>
<td>guiding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.3</td>
<td>guilty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.4</td>
<td>guys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.5</td>
<td>habits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.6</td>
<td>half</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.7</td>
<td>hall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.8</td>
<td>halls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.9</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.10</td>
<td>handy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.11</td>
<td>happen</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.12</td>
<td>happened</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.13</td>
<td>happening</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.9.14 happy (12)
2.9.15 hard (4)
2.9.16 harm (3)
2.9.17 hate (1)
2.9.18 healthy (1)
2.9.19 hear (20)
2.9.20 heard (10)
2.9.21 hearing (3)
2.9.22 hearings (2)
2.9.23 heartburn (1)
2.9.24 heavy (1)
2.9.25 held (3)
2.9.26 helpful (2)
2.9.27 helps (1)
2.9.28 hesitant (1)
2.9.29 Hickel (4)
2.9.30 high-density (1)
2.9.31 high-income (1)
2.9.32 higher (5)
2.9.33 higher-income (2)
2.9.34 higher-ranking (2)
2.9.35 highest (2)
2.9.36 highway (6)
2.9.37 Hillside (38)
2.9.38 historically (2)
2.9.39 history (1)
2.9.40 hit (1)
2.9.41 hold (1)
2.9.42 holding (1)
2.9.43 holds (1)
2.9.44 home (3)
2.9.45 honest (1)
2.9.46 hope (2)
2.9.47 hot (1)
2.9.48 hots (1)
2.9.49 hour (3)
2.9.50 hours (1)
2.9.51 House (26)
2.9.52 household (2)
2.9.53 households (2)
2.9.54 houses (1)
2.9.55 housing (5)
2.9.56 how's (1)
2.9.57 Huffman/o'malley (1)
2.9.58 huge (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.58</td>
<td>Ko-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.59</td>
<td>Kosack</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.60</td>
<td>Kotzebue</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.61</td>
<td>Lafrance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.62</td>
<td>lag</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.63</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.64</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.65</td>
<td>Landowners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.66</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.67</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.68</td>
<td>largest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.69</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.70</td>
<td>lawsuit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.71</td>
<td>lawyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.72</td>
<td>laying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.73</td>
<td>leader</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.74</td>
<td>leave</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.75</td>
<td>leaves</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.76</td>
<td>leaving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.77</td>
<td>left</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.78</td>
<td>legal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.79</td>
<td>legislator</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.80</td>
<td>legislators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.81</td>
<td>length</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.82</td>
<td>Leon</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.83</td>
<td>level</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.84</td>
<td>liable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.85</td>
<td>lifelong</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.86</td>
<td>limit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.87</td>
<td>linear</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.88</td>
<td>lines</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.89</td>
<td>link</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.11  Index: link-...members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11.1</td>
<td>link-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.2</td>
<td>linkage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.3</td>
<td>linkages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.4</td>
<td>linked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.5</td>
<td>LIO</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.6</td>
<td>list</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.7</td>
<td>listen</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.8</td>
<td>listened</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.9</td>
<td>listening</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.10</td>
<td>literally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.11</td>
<td>litigated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.12</td>
<td>litigation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.13</td>
<td>live (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.14</td>
<td>lived (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.15</td>
<td>lives (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.16</td>
<td>living (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.17</td>
<td>local (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.18</td>
<td>location (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.19</td>
<td>logical (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.20</td>
<td>logistics (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.21</td>
<td>long (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.22</td>
<td>longer (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.23</td>
<td>longest (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.24</td>
<td>looked (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.25</td>
<td>Loop (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.26</td>
<td>Lora (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.27</td>
<td>lose (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.28</td>
<td>lost (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.29</td>
<td>lot (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.30</td>
<td>lots (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.31</td>
<td>lower (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.32</td>
<td>lower-cost (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.33</td>
<td>lower-income (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.34</td>
<td>lowest (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.35</td>
<td>lunch (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.36</td>
<td>made (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.37</td>
<td>main (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.38</td>
<td>maintain (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.39</td>
<td>major (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.40</td>
<td>majority (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.41</td>
<td>make (25)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.42</td>
<td>makes (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.43</td>
<td>makeup (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.44</td>
<td>making (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.45</td>
<td>Mall (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.46</td>
<td>man (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.47</td>
<td>mandate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.48</td>
<td>map (62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.49</td>
<td>mappers (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.50</td>
<td>maps (18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.51</td>
<td>Marcum (48)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.52</td>
<td>mass (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.53</td>
<td>Mat-su (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.54</td>
<td>match (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.55</td>
<td>materially (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.56</td>
<td>matter (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.57</td>
<td>matters (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.58</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.59</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.60</td>
<td>Mcdonald</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.61</td>
<td>Mcgrath</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.62</td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.63</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.64</td>
<td>median</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.65</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.66</td>
<td>meet all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.67</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.68</td>
<td>meetings</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.69</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.70</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.71</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>Memory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.1</td>
<td>memory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.2</td>
<td>Mendenhall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.3</td>
<td>mention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.4</td>
<td>mentioned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.5</td>
<td>mentions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.6</td>
<td>met</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.7</td>
<td>method</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.8</td>
<td>metric</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.9</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.10</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.11</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.12</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.13</td>
<td>military's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.14</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.15</td>
<td>minds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.16</td>
<td>mine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.17</td>
<td>minimize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.18</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.19</td>
<td>minute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.20</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.21</td>
<td>mispronounce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.22</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.23</td>
<td>mode</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.24</td>
<td>modified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.25</td>
<td>moment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.26</td>
<td>monthly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.27</td>
<td>months</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.28</td>
<td>morning</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.29</td>
<td>Moser</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.30</td>
<td>motive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.31</td>
<td>mountain</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.32</td>
<td>mountaineering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.33</td>
<td>mountains</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.34</td>
<td>mouth</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.35</td>
<td>move</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.36</td>
<td>moved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>Muldoon</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>muni</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>municipal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>municipality</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>mute</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>muted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>myopic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>nabobs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>nation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>National</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>Naval</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>necessarily</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>needed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>neighborhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>neighboring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>nervous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>night</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>nobody's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>Nolan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>non-contiguous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>non-discrimination</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>non-partisan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>non-white</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>noon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>normal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>north</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>Northway</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>note</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>noted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>notion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>nuances</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>number</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>numbers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.12.76 numerous (1)
2.12.77 object (1)
2.12.78 objection (1)
2.12.79 objective (1)
2.12.80 obligation (1)
2.12.81 observation (4)
2.12.82 obvious (2)
2.12.83 occasion (1)
2.12.84 off-net (4)
2.12.85 offensive (1)
2.12.86 offer (1)
2.12.87 offered (1)
2.12.88 offering (1)

2.13 Index: office..plan

2.13.1 office (5)
2.13.2 officers (3)
2.13.3 offices (1)
2.13.4 official (3)
2.13.5 officials (3)
2.13.6 oftentimes (1)
2.13.7 on-site (1)
2.13.8 one-dimensional (1)
2.13.9 one-sided (1)
2.13.10 online (10)
2.13.11 operate (1)
2.13.12 opinion (27)
2.13.13 opinions (3)
2.13.14 opportunity (11)
2.13.15 oppose (2)
2.13.16 opposed (2)
2.13.17 opposite (1)
2.13.18 option (26)
2.13.19 options (5)
2.13.20 oral (1)
2.13.21 oranges (1)
2.13.22 order (6)
2.13.23 ordinary (1)
2.13.24 organization (1)
2.13.25 organized (1)
2.13.26 orphaned (1)
2.13.27 ostensibly (1)
2.13.28 Otis (4)
2.13.29 outpouring (1)
2.13.30 overemphasis (1)
2.13.31 overridden (1)
| 2.13.32 | overseas (1) |
| 2.13.33 | overwhelmed (1) |
| 2.13.34 | P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S (1) |
| 2.13.35 | pack (1) |
| 2.13.36 | paid (2) |
| 2.13.37 | pair (7) |
| 2.13.38 | paired (11) |
| 2.13.39 | pairing (27) |
| 2.13.40 | pairings (16) |
| 2.13.41 | pandemic (1) |
| 2.13.42 | park (6) |
| 2.13.43 | parks (3) |
| 2.13.44 | part (15) |
| 2.13.45 | participate (2) |
| 2.13.46 | participates (1) |
| 2.13.47 | participating (1) |
| 2.13.48 | participation (3) |
| 2.13.49 | parts (4) |
| 2.13.50 | party (5) |
| 2.13.51 | pass (2) |
| 2.13.52 | passed (1) |
| 2.13.53 | passing (1) |
| 2.13.54 | past (3) |
| 2.13.55 | path (1) |
| 2.13.56 | pause (5) |
| 2.13.57 | pay (1) |
| 2.13.58 | peers (1) |
| 2.13.59 | Peninsula (1) |
| 2.13.60 | people (46) |
| 2.13.61 | percent (11) |
| 2.13.62 | perception (1) |
| 2.13.63 | perfect (1) |
| 2.13.64 | period (1) |
| 2.13.65 | person (15) |
| 2.13.66 | personal (2) |
| 2.13.67 | personally (3) |
| 2.13.68 | Peter (41) |
| 2.13.69 | Peter's (1) |
| 2.13.70 | Peters (5) |
| 2.13.71 | Phil (5) |
| 2.13.72 | philosophy (1) |
| 2.13.73 | phone (1) |
| 2.13.74 | phonetic (2) |
| 2.13.75 | phrase (1) |
| 2.13.76 | physical (3) |
physically (3)
picture (1)
place (4)
places (5)
plain (1)
plan (11)
Index: plane..racial
plane (1)
planning (2)
plea (1)
plenty (2)
point (26)
pointed (2)
points (2)
policies (2)
political (4)
poor (1)
popular (2)
populated (2)
population (15)
populations (1)
Portage (4)
portion (1)
pos- (1)
posed (1)
position (4)
positive (2)
potential (2)
potentially (2)
poverty (2)
power (3)
practicable (16)
practical (5)
precedent (1)
predispositioned (1)
prefer (1)
preference (1)
preferred (1)
prerogative (1)
present (3)
presented (4)
presently (1)
president (1)
presidential (2)
pretty (5)
previous (4)
previously (2)
primary (2)
print (1)
prior (2)
priorities (1)
private (2)
problem (6)
problems (1)
proceed (5)
process (20)
processes (2)
proclamation (4)
prominent (1)
promise (1)
proof (3)
property (1)
proposed (1)
protect (1)
protects (1)
prove (2)
provide (1)
providing (1)
proximity (2)
prudent (1)
public (19)
pull (3)
purple (1)
purported (2)
purpose (1)
purposes (3)
pursued (1)
push (1)
pushing (2)
put (7)
qualifications (1)
question (21)
questionable (1)
questioned (1)
questioning (1)
questions (31)
queue (3)
queued (1)
quick (3)
quickest (1)
2.14.84 quickly (2)  
2.14.85 quote (15)  
2.14.86 quoted (1)  
2.14.87 Rabbit (2)  
2.14.88 racial (5)  
2.15 Index: radically..risk  
2.15.1 radically (1)  
2.15.2 ramifications (1)  
2.15.3 Randy (8)  
2.15.4 range (1)  
2.15.5 rarely (1)  
2.15.6 rate (1)  
2.15.7 rational (5)  
2.15.8 re- (2)  
2.15.9 re-elected (1)  
2.15.10 re-selected (1)  
2.15.11 reach (4)  
2.15.12 reachable (3)  
2.15.13 read (3)  
2.15.14 reading (3)  
2.15.15 readings (1)  
2.15.16 reads (1)  
2.15.17 ready (2)  
2.15.18 reality (2)  
2.15.19 realize (1)  
2.15.20 reapportionment (13)  
2.15.21 reason (9)  
2.15.22 reasons (3)  
2.15.23 recall (1)  
2.15.24 recent (1)  
2.15.25 recommend (1)  
2.15.26 recommending (1)  
2.15.27 record (15)  
2.15.28 recorded (1)  
2.15.29 recording (2)  
2.15.30 recruits (2)  
2.15.31 red (2)  
2.15.32 redistrict (1)  
2.15.33 redistricting (18)  
2.15.34 reduce (3)  
2.15.35 reevaluate (1)  
2.15.36 refer (2)  
2.15.37 reference (1)  
2.15.38 referenced (1)  
2.15.39 referring (2)
2.15.85  response (2)
2.15.86  restated (1)
2.15.87  result (4)
2.15.88  revert (1)
2.15.89  review (1)
2.15.90  reviewed (1)
2.15.91  rework (1)
2.15.92  rich (2)
2.15.93  ride (2)
2.15.94  riding (1)
2.15.95  ring (3)
2.15.96  rise (1)
2.15.97  risk (1)
2.16  Index: River,.single 1144
2.16.1  River (138)
2.16.2  River's (2)
2.16.3  rivers (1)
2.16.4  road (2)
2.16.5  roads (1)
2.16.6  roadways (2)
2.16.7  roam (1)
2.16.8  Robins (8)
2.16.9  Roger (1)
2.16.10  room (3)
2.16.11  roots (1)
2.16.12  route (7)
2.16.13  routes (2)
2.16.14  rude (1)
2.16.15  Ruedrich (23)
2.16.16  ruled (1)
2.16.17  rules (1)
2.16.18  ruling (1)
2.16.19  run (2)
2.16.20  running (1)
2.16.21  rural (6)
2.16.22  Ruth (2)
2.16.23  sacrifice (1)
2.16.24  satisfaction (1)
2.16.25  save (1)
2.16.26  saves (3)
2.16.27  savvy (1)
2.16.28  scared (1)
2.16.29  schedule (4)
2.16.30  school (1)
2.16.31  schools (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17.1</td>
<td>sir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.2</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.3</td>
<td>sits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.4</td>
<td>sitting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.5</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.6</td>
<td>skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.7</td>
<td>slander</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.8</td>
<td>slippery</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.9</td>
<td>slope</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.10</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.11</td>
<td>snowing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.12</td>
<td>society</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.13</td>
<td>socio</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.14</td>
<td>socioeconomic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.15</td>
<td>socioeconomically</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.16</td>
<td>soldiers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.17</td>
<td>Soldotna</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.18</td>
<td>Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.19</td>
<td>someone's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.20</td>
<td>son</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.21</td>
<td>sounding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.22</td>
<td>south</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.23</td>
<td>Southcentral</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.24</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.25</td>
<td>southern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.26</td>
<td>sparsely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.27</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.28</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.29</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.30</td>
<td>specifically</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.31</td>
<td>speed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.32</td>
<td>spend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.33</td>
<td>spent</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.34</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.35</td>
<td>splits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.36</td>
<td>splitting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.82</td>
<td>support (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.83</td>
<td>supported (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.84</td>
<td>supporting (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.85</td>
<td>supposed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.86</td>
<td>Supreme (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.87</td>
<td>surprise (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.88</td>
<td>Susan (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.89</td>
<td>Suzanne (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.90</td>
<td>swallow (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.91</td>
<td>swallowed (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.92</td>
<td>system (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.93</td>
<td>systems (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.94</td>
<td>tackle (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.95</td>
<td>tactic (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.96</td>
<td>takes (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 2.18 | Index: taking..U.S. |
| 2.18.1 | taking (3) |
| 2.18.2 | talk (3) |
| 2.18.3 | talked (1) |
| 2.18.4 | talking (13) |
| 2.18.5 | talks (1) |
| 2.18.6 | tangible (1) |
| 2.18.7 | targeting (2) |
| 2.18.8 | targets (1) |
| 2.18.9 | task (2) |
| 2.18.10 | taxes (1) |
| 2.18.11 | Teams (1) |
| 2.18.12 | technical (1) |
| 2.18.13 | technology (1) |
| 2.18.14 | teleconference (1) |
| 2.18.15 | telling (1) |
| 2.18.16 | tells (1) |
| 2.18.17 | ten (5) |
| 2.18.18 | terms (6) |
| 2.18.19 | terrain (1) |
| 2.18.20 | territory (2) |
| 2.18.21 | test- (1) |
| 2.18.22 | testified (5) |
| 2.18.23 | testifier (3) |
| 2.18.24 | testifiers (1) |
| 2.18.25 | testify (16) |
| 2.18.26 | testifying (10) |
| 2.18.27 | testimonials (2) |
| 2.18.28 | testimonies (1) |
| 2.18.29 | testimony (40) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>treated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>trek</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>tremendous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>trend</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>trips</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>trivial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>true</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>trust</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Tuesday</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Turnagain</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>two-dimensional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Index: Uh-huh..young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Uh-huh</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unanimous</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>uncommon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unconstitutional</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>understand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>undesirable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unfamiliar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>uniqueness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>United</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unlike</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unmuted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unnecessary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>unopposed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>upheld</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>upset</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>upside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>urge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>urged</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>usable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>utmost</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>v.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>vain</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Valdez</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>validate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>veer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>vehicles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>versa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vested (1)  veterans (1)  VI (4)  vice (2)  view (6)  views (2)  villages (1)  virtual (1)  virtually (2)  voice (3)  voices (1)  vote (4)  voted (1)  voter (3)  voters (7)  voting (7)  wait (1)  walk (1)  wanted (13)  warning (1)  warnings (3)  waste (1)  water (2)  ways (1)  wealthy (3)  website (2)  Weddleton (1)  weeds (2)  week (2)  week's (1)  weeks (2)  weigh-in (1)  weighed (1)  weight (1)  well-established (1)  well-schooled (1)  whatsoever (1)  white (5)  Whittier (5)  whopping (1)  Wielechowskis (1)  wildlife (1)  willy-nilly (1)  wishes (1)  witnesses (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.76</td>
<td>Wonderful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.77</td>
<td>wondering</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.78</td>
<td>word</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.79</td>
<td>words</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.80</td>
<td>work</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.81</td>
<td>workday</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.82</td>
<td>worked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.83</td>
<td>workforce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.84</td>
<td>working</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.85</td>
<td>works</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.86</td>
<td>world</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.87</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.88</td>
<td>wrap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.89</td>
<td>writing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.90</td>
<td>written</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.91</td>
<td>wrong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.92</td>
<td>Yarrow</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.93</td>
<td>year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.94</td>
<td>years</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.95</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.96</td>
<td>Yohan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.97</td>
<td>young</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Transcript Formats

3.1 ASCII/TXT

ARB2000814-000946  2022-04-09-ARB-Transcript-Full
2 Word Index

2.1 Index: -ooo..8th

2.1.1 -ooo- (1)
2.1.2 01 (1)
2.1.3 1 (11)
2.1.4 10 (3)
2.1.5 10,832 (1)
2.1.6 100 (1)
2.1.7 11 (6)
2.1.8 12 (2)
2.1.9 12,000 (5)
2.1.10 12:06 (1)
2.1.11 13 (1)
2.1.12 13-mile (1)
2.1.13 13th (2)
2.1.14 14 (1)
2.1.15 14th (2)
2.1.16 15 (4)
2.1.17 15.10.200(b) (1)
2.1.18 16 (1)
2.1.19 16-mile (1)
2.1.20 17 (4)
2.1.21 17's (1)
2.1.22 18 (1)
2.1.23 18,000 (1)
2.1.24 18,200 (1)
2.1.25 18,205 (1)
2.1.26 18,284 (1)
2.1.27 18,335 (1)
2.1.28 18th (1)
2.1.29 19 (1)
2.1.30 1915 (2)
2.1.31 197 (2)
2.1.32 1:00 (3)
2.1.33 2 (44)
2.1.34 2,389 (1)
2.1.35 20 (2)
2.1.36 2020 (1)
2.1.37 21 (4)
2.1.38 22 (31)
2.1.39 23 (20)
2.1.40 24 (30)
2.1.41 24's (1)
2.1.42 25 (1)
2.1.43 27 (4)
2.1.44 28 (5)
2.1.45 29 (1)
2.1.46 2:00 (1)
2.1.47 2nd (1)
2.1.48 3 (6)
2.1.49 315 (1)
2.1.50 33 (1)
2.1.51 33-mile (1)
2.1.52 35 (1)
2.1.53 35-mile (1)
2.1.54 38.6 (1)
2.1.55 3B (39)
2.1.56 40 (2)
2.1.57 48-district (1)
2.1.58 4th (3)
2.1.59 5 (1)
2.1.60 51 (2)
2.1.61 52 (1)
2.1.62 56 (1)
2.1.63 59 (3)
2.1.64 5th (3)
2.1.65 6 (10)
2.1.66 7,191 (1)
2.1.67 7,200 (1)
2.1.68 7,586 (1)
2.1.69 73 (3)
2.1.70 74 (3)
2.1.71 7th (1)
2.1.72 8 (1)
2.1.73 8th (5)

2.2 Index: 9..appreciated

2.2.1 9 (32)
2.2.2 9/11 (1)
2.2.3 907 563-9085 (2)
2.2.4 9th (1)
2.2.5 9th's (1)
2.2.6 Abbott (1)
2.2.7 ability (1)
2.2.8 absence (1)
2.2.9 absolutely (9)
2.2.10 abstract (1)
2.2.11 academic (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: approach..bipartisan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3.61 Bartlett (1)
2.3.62 base (14)
2.3.63 based (10)
2.3.64 bases (2)
2.3.65 basic (5)
2.3.66 basically (6)
2.3.67 basis (1)
2.3.68 bear (1)
2.3.69 beautiful (1)
2.3.70 bed (1)
2.3.71 began (1)
2.3.72 beginning (9)
2.3.73 behalf (2)
2.3.74 behaviors (1)
2.3.75 belief (2)
2.3.76 believed (1)
2.3.77 believing (1)
2.3.78 belong (3)
2.3.79 belongs (3)
2.3.80 benefit (2)
2.3.81 Berlin (1)
2.3.82 bet (1)
2.3.83 Bethany (10)
2.3.84 big (7)
2.3.85 Binkley (104)
2.3.86 bipartisan (1)

2.4 Index: bird's-eye..Chair 1262
2.4.1 bird's-eye (1)
2.4.2 bit (7)
2.4.3 bite (1)
2.4.4 biweekly (1)
2.4.5 black (1)
2.4.6 bless (2)
2.4.7 block (11)
2.4.8 blocks (4)
2.4.9 blog (1)
2.4.10 board (69)
2.4.11 boards (1)
2.4.12 boat (1)
2.4.13 boiled (1)
2.4.14 bold (1)
2.4.15 bolster (1)
2.4.16 Bonner (4)
2.4.17 border (15)
2.4.18 Borromeo (38)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.4.19</td>
<td>bottom</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.20</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.21</td>
<td>boundaries</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.22</td>
<td>boundary</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.23</td>
<td>bounded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.24</td>
<td>bowl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.25</td>
<td>box</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.26</td>
<td>break</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.27</td>
<td>breaking</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.28</td>
<td>brevity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.29</td>
<td>briefly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.30</td>
<td>bright</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.31</td>
<td>bring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.32</td>
<td>brings</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.33</td>
<td>broad</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.34</td>
<td>broke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.35</td>
<td>broken</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.36</td>
<td>brought</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.37</td>
<td>brown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.38</td>
<td>brushes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.39</td>
<td>bucked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.40</td>
<td>Budd</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.41</td>
<td>Budd's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.42</td>
<td>build</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.43</td>
<td>building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.44</td>
<td>built</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.45</td>
<td>burden</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.46</td>
<td>Bureau's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.47</td>
<td>burled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.48</td>
<td>burying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.49</td>
<td>business</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.50</td>
<td>busy</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.51</td>
<td>bye</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.52</td>
<td>cabin</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.53</td>
<td>call</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.54</td>
<td>called</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.55</td>
<td>calling</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.56</td>
<td>calls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.57</td>
<td>camera</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.58</td>
<td>campaign</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.59</td>
<td>campaigning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.60</td>
<td>candidate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.61</td>
<td>capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.62</td>
<td>CAPSIS</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.63</td>
<td>care</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.64 carefully (1)
2.4.65 Carrs (2)
2.4.66 cars (1)
2.4.67 carve (4)
2.4.68 carved (1)
2.4.69 carving (1)
2.4.70 case (7)
2.4.71 catching (1)
2.4.72 Catherine (11)
2.4.73 Cathy (3)
2.4.74 caution (2)
2.4.75 census (12)
2.4.76 Center (1)
2.4.77 centric (1)
2.4.78 cetera (3)
2.4.79 Chaffin (4)
2.4.80 chain (2)
2.4.81 Chair (101)

2.5 Index: Chair--concrete 1263
2.5.1 Chair- (1)
2.5.2 chairman (19)
2.5.3 challenge (2)
2.5.4 challenges (3)
2.5.5 challenging (1)
2.5.6 chance (5)
2.5.7 change (3)
2.5.8 changed (3)
2.5.9 characteristic (1)
2.5.10 characteristics (1)
2.5.11 characterization (1)
2.5.12 characterizations (1)
2.5.13 characterized (2)
2.5.14 characterizing (1)
2.5.15 charge (2)
2.5.16 chat (2)
2.5.17 chatted (1)
2.5.18 check (1)
2.5.19 children (4)
2.5.20 choice (6)
2.5.21 choices (2)
2.5.22 choose (3)
2.5.23 chooses (1)
2.5.24 choosing (2)
2.5.25 chore (1)
2.5.26 chose (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.5.72</td>
<td>compared</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.73</td>
<td>comparison</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.74</td>
<td>compelled</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.75</td>
<td>compelling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.76</td>
<td>complete</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.77</td>
<td>completely</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.78</td>
<td>complexities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.79</td>
<td>complexity</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.80</td>
<td>complications</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.81</td>
<td>comport</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.82</td>
<td>composed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.83</td>
<td>comprised</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.84</td>
<td>compromise</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.85</td>
<td>con</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.86</td>
<td>concept</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.87</td>
<td>concern</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.88</td>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.89</td>
<td>concerns</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.90</td>
<td>concise</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.91</td>
<td>conciseness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.92</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Index: confused..data</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1</td>
<td>confused</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2</td>
<td>confusing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.3</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.4</td>
<td>connected</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.5</td>
<td>connecting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.6</td>
<td>connection</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.7</td>
<td>connections</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.8</td>
<td>connectivity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.9</td>
<td>consensus</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.10</td>
<td>consequence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.11</td>
<td>conservative</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.12</td>
<td>considerable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.13</td>
<td>consideration</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.14</td>
<td>considerations</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.15</td>
<td>considered</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.16</td>
<td>consistently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.17</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.18</td>
<td>consternation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.19</td>
<td>constituents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.20</td>
<td>constitute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.21</td>
<td>constitutes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.22</td>
<td>constitution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.23</td>
<td>constitutional</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.24 constitutionalist (1)
2.6.25 constrained (1)
2.6.26 contained (2)
2.6.27 contended (1)
2.6.28 content (2)
2.6.29 context (5)
2.6.30 contiguity (15)
2.6.31 contiguous (30)
2.6.32 continue (4)
2.6.33 continued (3)
2.6.34 continues (1)
2.6.35 continuing (2)
2.6.36 continuity (3)
2.6.37 continuous (1)
2.6.38 contorted (2)
2.6.39 contortions (1)
2.6.40 contractor (1)
2.6.41 contradictory (1)
2.6.42 contrast (3)
2.6.43 control (2)
2.6.44 controlling (1)
2.6.45 convene (1)
2.6.46 conversation (8)
2.6.47 copy (2)
2.6.48 Cordova (1)
2.6.49 core (2)
2.6.50 correct (11)
2.6.51 corrected (1)
2.6.52 correctly (1)
2.6.53 corrects (1)
2.6.54 corridor (1)
2.6.55 corridors (1)
2.6.56 Corwyn (3)
2.6.57 costs (1)
2.6.58 council (2)
2.6.59 councils (3)
2.6.60 counsel (1)
2.6.61 count (2)
2.6.62 country (1)
2.6.63 couple (5)
2.6.64 Court (23)
2.6.65 Court's (2)
2.6.66 Courts (3)
2.6.67 Courts' (1)
2.6.68 covered (2)
2.6.69 create (1)
2.6.70 created (1)
2.6.71 creating (1)
2.6.72 Creek (9)
2.6.73 criteria (1)
2.6.74 critical (1)
2.6.75 criticism (1)
2.6.76 cross (2)
2.6.77 cross-examination (1)
2.6.78 crossed (1)
2.6.79 crossings (1)
2.6.80 crux (1)
2.6.81 cultural (1)
2.6.82 culture (1)
2.6.83 current (1)
2.6.84 curve (2)
2.6.85 cusp (1)
2.6.86 cutting (1)
2.6.87 cycle (1)
2.6.88 cycles (1)
2.6.89 damage (1)
2.6.90 Dan (3)
2.6.91 data (7)

2.7 Index: dated..dominoes
2.7.1 dated (1)
2.7.2 day (8)
2.7.3 days (3)
2.7.4 deal (2)
2.7.5 dealt (1)
2.7.6 debate (5)
2.7.7 debating (1)
2.7.8 decade (1)
2.7.9 decades (4)
2.7.10 decided (2)
2.7.11 deciding (1)
2.7.12 decision (6)
2.7.13 decrease (1)
2.7.14 dedicated (1)
2.7.15 deemed (1)
2.7.16 deep (2)
2.7.17 default (1)
2.7.18 defense (1)
2.7.19 definition (1)
2.7.20 deliberation (1)
2.7.21 deliberations (5)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.7.22</td>
<td>demographic (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.23</td>
<td>demographically (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.24</td>
<td>demographics (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.25</td>
<td>demonstrably (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.26</td>
<td>Denny (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.27</td>
<td>dependent (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.28</td>
<td>depends (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.29</td>
<td>depth (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.30</td>
<td>detail (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.31</td>
<td>detailing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.32</td>
<td>determination (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.33</td>
<td>develop (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.34</td>
<td>development (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.35</td>
<td>developments (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.36</td>
<td>deviations (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.37</td>
<td>diagram (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.38</td>
<td>dial (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.39</td>
<td>dial-in (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.40</td>
<td>dialogue (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.41</td>
<td>died (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.42</td>
<td>difference (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.43</td>
<td>differences (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.44</td>
<td>difficult (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.45</td>
<td>digging (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.46</td>
<td>dilute (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.47</td>
<td>dilution (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.48</td>
<td>directed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.49</td>
<td>directly (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.50</td>
<td>disagree (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.51</td>
<td>disagreed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.52</td>
<td>disagreement (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.53</td>
<td>discharge (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.54</td>
<td>discontiguous (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.55</td>
<td>discounted (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.56</td>
<td>discovered (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.57</td>
<td>discuss (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.58</td>
<td>discussed (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.59</td>
<td>discussing (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.60</td>
<td>discussion (9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.61</td>
<td>discussions (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.62</td>
<td>disenfranchise (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.63</td>
<td>disenfranchised (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.64</td>
<td>disenfranchising (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.65</td>
<td>disparity (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.66</td>
<td>disproportionality (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.67</td>
<td>disproportionate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.68</td>
<td>disputing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.69</td>
<td>disqualifying (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.70</td>
<td>disrespectful (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.71</td>
<td>disrespectfully (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.72</td>
<td>distance (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.73</td>
<td>distant (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.74</td>
<td>distinction (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.75</td>
<td>district (158)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.76</td>
<td>districts (69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.77</td>
<td>divide (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.78</td>
<td>divided (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.79</td>
<td>divides (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.80</td>
<td>dividing (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.81</td>
<td>divisions (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.82</td>
<td>documented (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.83</td>
<td>DOD (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.84</td>
<td>dog (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.85</td>
<td>dollars (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7.86</td>
<td>dominoes (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.8  Index: door..expectation

| 2.8.1   | door (1)             |
| 2.8.2   | doubt (1)            |
| 2.8.3   | downtown (36)        |
| 2.8.4   | draft (4)            |
| 2.8.5   | drainage (2)         |
| 2.8.6   | drainages (2)        |
| 2.8.7   | drawing (5)          |
| 2.8.8   | drawn (2)            |
| 2.8.9   | drew (1)             |
| 2.8.10  | drive (8)            |
| 2.8.11  | driving (1)          |
| 2.8.12  | due (7)              |
| 2.8.13  | dumped (1)           |
| 2.8.14  | Dunbar (1)           |
| 2.8.15  | duplex (1)           |
| 2.8.16  | duties (1)           |
| 2.8.17  | duty (2)             |
| 2.8.18  | e-mail (1)           |
| 2.8.19  | Eagle (162)          |
| 2.8.20  | earlier (2)          |
| 2.8.21  | early (1)            |
| 2.8.22  | easier (2)           |
| 2.8.23  | easily (1)           |
| 2.8.24  | east (20)            |
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2.8.25 easy (7)
2.8.26 eat (3)
2.8.27 echo (1)
2.8.28 economic (3)
2.8.29 economy (1)
2.8.30 edge (1)
2.8.31 Edgington (4)
2.8.32 educated (1)
2.8.33 effective (1)
2.8.34 effectively (1)
2.8.35 efficient (1)
2.8.36 efforts (1)
2.8.37 Eklutna (2)
2.8.38 election (1)
2.8.39 elections (3)
2.8.40 Eledge (2)
2.8.41 elegant (1)
2.8.42 element (1)
2.8.43 elementary (2)
2.8.44 Elmendorf (3)
2.8.45 Elmore (1)
2.8.46 else’s (1)
2.8.47 embodied (1)
2.8.48 emerged (1)
2.8.49 emergency (1)
2.8.50 employee (1)
2.8.51 empty (1)
2.8.52 encompasses (3)
2.8.53 encourage (3)
2.8.54 end (10)
2.8.55 endeavor (1)
2.8.56 endeavored (1)
2.8.57 ends (2)
2.8.58 engage (1)
2.8.59 engaged (3)
2.8.60 engagement (1)
2.8.61 ensure (1)
2.8.62 entertain (1)
2.8.63 entirety (1)
2.8.64 entitled (1)
2.8.65 envisions (1)
2.8.66 equal (9)
2.8.67 equalize (1)
2.8.68 equally (3)
2.8.69 equitable (1)
2.8.70 equivalent (1)
2.8.71 Erik (5)
2.8.72 error (1)
2.8.73 essentially (2)
2.8.74 establish (1)
2.8.75 established (1)
2.8.76 ethical (1)
2.8.77 events (1)
2.8.78 evidence (2)
2.8.79 evident (1)
2.8.80 exact (4)
2.8.81 examples (2)
2.8.82 exchange (1)
2.8.83 excuse (2)
2.8.84 executive (2)
2.8.85 exercise (1)
2.8.86 exist (4)
2.8.87 Exit (1)
2.8.88 expectation (1)
2.9 Index: expense..gave 1267
2.9.1 expense (2)
2.9.2 expensive (1)
2.9.3 experience (2)
2.9.4 experiences (1)
2.9.5 expert (1)
2.9.6 experts (1)
2.9.7 explained (1)
2.9.8 explaining (2)
2.9.9 explanation (2)
2.9.10 explanations (1)
2.9.11 explicitly (1)
2.9.12 explore (1)
2.9.13 explored (1)
2.9.14 exposing (1)
2.9.15 exposure (1)
2.9.16 extends (1)
2.9.17 extent (1)
2.9.18 extra (1)
2.9.19 extremely (5)
2.9.20 eye (1)
2.9.21 face (1)
2.9.22 facilities (1)
2.9.23 fact (20)
2.9.24 factors (1)
2.9.25 factually (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9.26</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.27</td>
<td>Fairbanks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.28</td>
<td>fairest</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.29</td>
<td>fairly</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.30</td>
<td>fairness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.31</td>
<td>faith</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.32</td>
<td>fall</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.33</td>
<td>fallacies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.34</td>
<td>fallacy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.35</td>
<td>falls</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.36</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.37</td>
<td>families</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.38</td>
<td>family</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.39</td>
<td>fantastic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.40</td>
<td>favor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.41</td>
<td>favored</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.42</td>
<td>favoring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.43</td>
<td>favorite</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.44</td>
<td>feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.45</td>
<td>feeding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.46</td>
<td>feel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.47</td>
<td>fellow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.48</td>
<td>felt</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.49</td>
<td>fence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.50</td>
<td>fiction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.51</td>
<td>fighting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.52</td>
<td>find</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.53</td>
<td>finding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.54</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.55</td>
<td>finish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.56</td>
<td>fire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.57</td>
<td>fireworks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.58</td>
<td>fit</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.59</td>
<td>fix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.60</td>
<td>fixed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.61</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.62</td>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.63</td>
<td>flies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.64</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.65</td>
<td>fly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.66</td>
<td>focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.67</td>
<td>folks</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.68</td>
<td>follow</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.69</td>
<td>follow-up</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.70</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10.18 Glenn (4)
2.10.19 goats (1)
2.10.20 God (1)
2.10.21 Gonzales (4)
2.10.22 good (29)
2.10.23 Government (15)
2.10.24 government-issued (1)
2.10.25 governor (1)
2.10.26 grab (1)
2.10.27 grandfather's (1)
2.10.28 grandparents (1)
2.10.29 graphics (1)
2.10.30 great (17)
2.10.31 greatness (1)
2.10.32 green (1)
2.10.33 grid (1)
2.10.34 grilled (1)
2.10.35 grocery (1)
2.10.36 Groundhog (1)
2.10.37 group (5)
2.10.38 grow (1)
2.10.39 growing (1)
2.10.40 guards (1)
2.10.41 guess (7)
2.10.42 guidance (2)
2.10.43 guidelines (1)
2.10.44 guilty (1)
2.10.45 guy (2)
2.10.46 guys (1)
2.10.47 habits (1)
2.10.48 half (5)
2.10.49 HALL (3)
2.10.50 hallways (1)
2.10.51 HALO (1)
2.10.52 hand (2)
2.10.53 hang (3)
2.10.54 hanging (1)
2.10.55 happen (3)
2.10.56 happened (2)
2.10.57 hard (4)
2.10.58 harm (1)
2.10.59 hat (1)
2.10.60 haul (1)
2.10.61 Hawker (1)
2.10.62 hazardous (1)
2.11.19  housing (3)
2.11.20  Huffman (7)
2.11.21  huge (7)
2.11.22  humble (2)
2.11.23  hundreds (1)
2.11.24  hunt (2)
2.11.25  hunting (1)
2.11.26  hurt (3)
2.11.27  hurting (1)
2.11.28  idea (6)
2.11.29  ideas (1)
2.11.30  Iditarod (7)
2.11.31  ignore (2)
2.11.32  ignores (1)
2.11.33  ignoring (3)
2.11.34  illegal (2)
2.11.35  illogical (1)
2.11.36  image (2)
2.11.37  imagine (7)
2.11.38  imbalance (1)
2.11.39  impassable (1)
2.11.40  impermissible (1)
2.11.41  implication (1)
2.11.42  implore (2)
2.11.43  importance (2)
2.11.44  important (6)
2.11.45  impressed (1)
2.11.46  impression (1)
2.11.47  improper (1)
2.11.48  inaccurate (1)
2.11.49  inch (1)
2.11.50  incidentally (1)
2.11.51  include (4)
2.11.52  included (1)
2.11.53  includes (4)
2.11.54  including (5)
2.11.55  increase (3)
2.11.56  incredibly (1)
2.11.57  incumbent (4)
2.11.58  incumbents (3)
2.11.59  independent (1)
2.11.60  India (1)
2.11.61  Indian (2)
2.11.62  indiscernible (67)
2.11.63  individual (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12.18</td>
<td>issue</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.19</td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.20</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.21</td>
<td>iterations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.22</td>
<td>Jason</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.23</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.24</td>
<td>Jber's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.25</td>
<td>Jitters</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.26</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.27</td>
<td>job</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.28</td>
<td>Joelle</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.29</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.30</td>
<td>John's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.31</td>
<td>join</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.32</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.33</td>
<td>joining</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.34</td>
<td>joint</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.35</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.36</td>
<td>Judy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.37</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.38</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.39</td>
<td>justification</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.40</td>
<td>justifications</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.41</td>
<td>justified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.42</td>
<td>justifies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.43</td>
<td>justify</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.44</td>
<td>keeping</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.45</td>
<td>key</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>kick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>kids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>kinds</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>Klatt</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>knew</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>knocking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>lack</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>laid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>Lance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>larger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>lawsuit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.60</td>
<td>mathematically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.61</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.62</td>
<td>matters</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.63</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.64</td>
<td>maximum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.65</td>
<td>Mcdonald</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.66</td>
<td>Mcdonald's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.67</td>
<td>meaning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.68</td>
<td>meaningful</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.69</td>
<td>means</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.70</td>
<td>media</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.71</td>
<td>medical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.72</td>
<td>meet</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.73</td>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.74</td>
<td>meets</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.75</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.76</td>
<td>member</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>Index: members..noted</td>
<td>1272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.1</td>
<td>members</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.2</td>
<td>mention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.3</td>
<td>mentioned</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.4</td>
<td>method</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.5</td>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.6</td>
<td>microphone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.7</td>
<td>mid</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.8</td>
<td>middle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.9</td>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.10</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.11</td>
<td>miles</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.12</td>
<td>military</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.13</td>
<td>millions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.14</td>
<td>mind</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.15</td>
<td>minimally</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.16</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.17</td>
<td>minority</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.18</td>
<td>minute</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.19</td>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.20</td>
<td>misinterpretation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.21</td>
<td>misspoke</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.22</td>
<td>mistakes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.23</td>
<td>misunderstanding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.24</td>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.25</td>
<td>modern</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.26</td>
<td>moment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.14.27</td>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nodding (1)
noise (1)
Nome (1)
non-partisan (1)
non-populated (1)
nonpartisan (1)
nonpartisanship (1)
north (5)
northeast (3)
northern (1)
note (5)
noted (3)
notice (2)
noticed (2)
notify (1)
notion (2)
November (7)
uANCES (1)
NUMBER (14)
numbered (1)
numbers (11)
numerous (1)
Nunaka (1)
nutshell (1)
O'MALLEY (3)
objection (4)
obscurE (1)
oBSERVATION (1)
obtusely (1)
obvious (5)
occasion (1)
ocurred (1)
odd (1)
oddly (1)
off-net (5)
Offer (1)
office (7)
officers (1)
older (2)
oldest (1)
on-base (1)
one-half (1)
one-liners (1)
one-sided (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>partisan</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>parts</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>party</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>pass</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Index: passed..produce</td>
<td>1274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>passed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>passes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>passing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>passionate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>pay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>people</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>people's</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>perceived</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>percent</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>percentage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>perfect</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>performing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>perilously</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>permitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>permitting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>personnel</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>persuasive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Peter's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Pho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>phone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>photo</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>photos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>physical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>picture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>piece</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Pizza</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>place</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>places</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>plaintiffs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>plan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>planned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>plans</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>play</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>plenty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16.86 proceedings (2)
2.16.87 process (45)
2.16.88 proclamation (1)
2.16.89 produce (1)
2.17 Index: project..refuting 1275
2.17.1 project (3)
2.17.2 projects (1)
2.17.3 proof (1)
2.17.4 proper (1)
2.17.5 proposal (2)
2.17.6 proposals (2)
2.17.7 proposed (6)
2.17.8 proposing (2)
2.17.9 protection (1)
2.17.10 proud (2)
2.17.11 prove (1)
2.17.12 provide (4)
2.17.13 provided (2)
2.17.14 providing (1)
2.17.15 provisions (1)
2.17.16 proximity (2)
2.17.17 Pruitt (9)
2.17.18 public (26)
2.17.19 published (3)
2.17.20 pull (1)
2.17.21 pulling (1)
2.17.22 purely (2)
2.17.23 purports (1)
2.17.24 purposes (1)
2.17.25 push (1)
2.17.26 pushback (1)
2.17.27 pushed (1)
2.17.28 put (22)
2.17.29 puts (3)
2.17.30 putting (6)
2.17.31 PX (1)
2.17.32 Queen (2)
2.17.33 question (27)
2.17.34 questioning (1)
2.17.35 questions (10)
2.17.36 queue (3)
2.17.37 quick (6)
2.17.38 quickly (1)
2.17.39 quorum (1)
2.17.40 quote (8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17.41</td>
<td>quoted</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.42</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.43</td>
<td>racial</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.44</td>
<td>radar</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.45</td>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.46</td>
<td>raise</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.47</td>
<td>raised</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.48</td>
<td>random</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.49</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.50</td>
<td>range</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.51</td>
<td>rank</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.52</td>
<td>ranked</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.53</td>
<td>rarely</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.54</td>
<td>Raspberry</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.55</td>
<td>rate</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.56</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.57</td>
<td>rations</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.58</td>
<td>reach</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.59</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.60</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.61</td>
<td>realistic</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.62</td>
<td>realistically</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.63</td>
<td>realities</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.64</td>
<td>reality</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.65</td>
<td>realize</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.66</td>
<td>reapportionment</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.67</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.68</td>
<td>reasoning</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.69</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.70</td>
<td>rebuttal</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.71</td>
<td>recall</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.72</td>
<td>received</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.73</td>
<td>recent</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.74</td>
<td>recently</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.75</td>
<td>recognizes</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.76</td>
<td>recognizing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.77</td>
<td>recommend</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.78</td>
<td>recommending</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.79</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.80</td>
<td>recorded</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.81</td>
<td>recording</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.82</td>
<td>rectify</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.83</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.84</td>
<td>redistricting</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.85</td>
<td>refer</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.86</td>
<td>reference</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.87</td>
<td>referred</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.88</td>
<td>referring</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.89</td>
<td>reflect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.90</td>
<td>Reflection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.91</td>
<td>reflects</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.92</td>
<td>refuting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>Index: register..Ruedrich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.1</td>
<td>register</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.2</td>
<td>regret</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.3</td>
<td>regular</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.4</td>
<td>Reinbold</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.5</td>
<td>reject</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.6</td>
<td>rejection</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.7</td>
<td>related</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.8</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.9</td>
<td>relief</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.10</td>
<td>relying</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.11</td>
<td>remainder</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.12</td>
<td>remaining</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.13</td>
<td>remains</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.14</td>
<td>remand</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.15</td>
<td>remands</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.16</td>
<td>remedy</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.17</td>
<td>remediing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.18</td>
<td>remember</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.19</td>
<td>remind</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.20</td>
<td>reminder</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.21</td>
<td>removing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.22</td>
<td>renaming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.23</td>
<td>rep</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.24</td>
<td>repeat</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.25</td>
<td>repeated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.26</td>
<td>replied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.27</td>
<td>report</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.28</td>
<td>represent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.29</td>
<td>representation</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.30</td>
<td>representative</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.31</td>
<td>representatives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.32</td>
<td>representatives'</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.33</td>
<td>represented</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.34</td>
<td>representing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.35</td>
<td>represents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.36</td>
<td>reprimanded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.37</td>
<td>Republican</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.83</td>
<td>routes (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.84</td>
<td>Ruedrich (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.1</td>
<td>ruled (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.2</td>
<td>ruling (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.3</td>
<td>run (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.4</td>
<td>running (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5</td>
<td>runs (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6</td>
<td>rural (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7</td>
<td>sacrificed (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.8</td>
<td>saddened (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.9</td>
<td>Saddler (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.10</td>
<td>safety (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.11</td>
<td>salamander (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.12</td>
<td>Sand (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.13</td>
<td>Saturday (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.14</td>
<td>schedule (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.15</td>
<td>scholar (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.16</td>
<td>school (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.17</td>
<td>schools (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.18</td>
<td>scope (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.19</td>
<td>screen (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.20</td>
<td>sea (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.21</td>
<td>season (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.22</td>
<td>seat (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.23</td>
<td>seats (8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.24</td>
<td>secondary (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.25</td>
<td>seconded (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.26</td>
<td>Section (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.27</td>
<td>security (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.28</td>
<td>seeking (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.29</td>
<td>sees (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.30</td>
<td>selecting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.31</td>
<td>selection (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.32</td>
<td>semi-rural (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.33</td>
<td>Senate (47)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.34</td>
<td>senator (30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.35</td>
<td>senator's (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.36</td>
<td>senators (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.37</td>
<td>sense (16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.38</td>
<td>sentences (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.39</td>
<td>sentiment (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.40</td>
<td>separate (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.41</td>
<td>separately (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.42</td>
<td>separates (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19.43 September (1)
2.19.44 septic (2)
2.19.45 septics (1)
2.19.46 service (13)
2.19.47 services (1)
2.19.48 session (4)
2.19.49 set (3)
2.19.50 settled (1)
2.19.51 Seward (3)
2.19.52 sewer (1)
2.19.53 share (18)
2.19.54 shared (2)
2.19.55 sharing (3)
2.19.56 Shawn (1)
2.19.57 Shelley (3)
2.19.58 shift (1)
2.19.59 Ship (5)
2.19.60 shoes (2)
2.19.61 shoot (2)
2.19.62 shop (4)
2.19.63 shopping (3)
2.19.64 short (2)
2.19.65 shot (3)
2.19.66 show (3)
2.19.67 showing (1)
2.19.68 shown (1)
2.19.69 shows (2)
2.19.70 shut (1)
2.19.71 side (22)
2.19.72 sides (2)
2.19.73 sign (3)
2.19.74 signal (2)
2.19.75 signed (4)
2.19.76 significant (3)
2.19.77 significantly (1)
2.19.78 silence (1)
2.19.79 Silver (2)
2.19.80 SILVERS (2)
2.19.81 similar (20)
2.19.82 simple (4)
2.19.83 simplest (2)
2.19.84 simply (3)
2.19.85 Simpson (3)
2.19.86 single (8)
2.19.87 singly (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Index: sits..supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.88</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.89</td>
<td>sister's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.90</td>
<td>sit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>sits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.1</td>
<td>situation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.2</td>
<td>size</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.3</td>
<td>sizeable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.4</td>
<td>skillfully</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.5</td>
<td>sleights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.6</td>
<td>sliver</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.7</td>
<td>small</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.8</td>
<td>smaller</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.9</td>
<td>smells</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.10</td>
<td>social</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.11</td>
<td>socially</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.12</td>
<td>socio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.13</td>
<td>socioeconomic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.14</td>
<td>socioeconomically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.15</td>
<td>sole</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.16</td>
<td>solely</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.17</td>
<td>solution</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.18</td>
<td>someplace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.19</td>
<td>something's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.20</td>
<td>sort</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.21</td>
<td>sorts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.22</td>
<td>Sounds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.23</td>
<td>south</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.24</td>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.25</td>
<td>southern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.26</td>
<td>speak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.27</td>
<td>speaker</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.28</td>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.29</td>
<td>speaking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.30</td>
<td>speaks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.31</td>
<td>special</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.32</td>
<td>specific</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.33</td>
<td>specifically</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.34</td>
<td>spend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.35</td>
<td>spent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.36</td>
<td>spirit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.37</td>
<td>split</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.38</td>
<td>splitting</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.39</td>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.40</td>
<td>spoken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.87</td>
<td>suggested</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.88</td>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.89</td>
<td>summarized</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.90</td>
<td>summer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.91</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.92</td>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.93</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.94</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>Index: supporter..treasure</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.1</td>
<td>supporter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.2</td>
<td>supporting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.3</td>
<td>supports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.4</td>
<td>suppose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.5</td>
<td>supposed</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.6</td>
<td>Supreme</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.7</td>
<td>surprise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.8</td>
<td>surrounding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.9</td>
<td>system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.10</td>
<td>table</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.11</td>
<td>takes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.12</td>
<td>taking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.13</td>
<td>talking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.14</td>
<td>target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.15</td>
<td>task</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.16</td>
<td>teams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.17</td>
<td>technical</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.18</td>
<td>teleconference</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.19</td>
<td>telephone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.20</td>
<td>telephonically</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.21</td>
<td>tempted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.22</td>
<td>ten</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.23</td>
<td>tenants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.24</td>
<td>tent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.25</td>
<td>tenuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.26</td>
<td>term</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.27</td>
<td>terms</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.28</td>
<td>test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.29</td>
<td>testified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.30</td>
<td>testifier</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.31</td>
<td>testifiers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.32</td>
<td>testify</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.33</td>
<td>testifying</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.34</td>
<td>testimony</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.35</td>
<td>Thankfully</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.21.36</td>
<td>thankless</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.22.43  utilize (1)
2.22.44  vacant (1)
2.22.45  Valdez (3)
2.22.46  Valley (4)
2.22.47  values (1)
2.22.48  variety (2)
2.22.49  vast (2)
2.22.50  Venn (3)
2.22.51  verbal (3)
2.22.52  verbiage (1)
2.22.53  versa (3)
2.22.54  versus (6)
2.22.55  veteran (2)
2.22.56  veterans (1)
2.22.57  VI (3)
2.22.58  vice (3)
2.22.59  video (2)
2.22.60  Vietnam (1)
2.22.61  view (4)
2.22.62  violate (1)
2.22.63  violates (1)
2.22.64  violating (1)
2.22.65  vision (1)
2.22.66  voice (4)
2.22.67  voices (1)
2.22.68  volume (1)
2.22.69  volunteer-appointed (1)
2.22.70  vote (4)
2.22.71  voter (1)
2.22.72  voters (4)
2.22.73  votes (1)
2.22.74  voting (4)
2.22.75  waiting (1)
2.22.76  walk (3)
2.22.77  Wall (1)
2.22.78  wanted (18)
2.22.79  War (2)
2.22.80  Warfield (21)
2.22.81  wasting (1)
2.22.82  watch (1)
2.22.83  watched (5)
2.22.84  watching (2)
2.22.85  water (2)
2.22.86  weak (1)
2.22.87  weather (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index: well-versed..Zoom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well-versed (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wells (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>west (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>westernmost (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whichever (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whittier (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wholly (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkey (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>win (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wishes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdraw (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withdrawn (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withstand (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>withstood (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>won (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonderful (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>words (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worked (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>works (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worse (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>written (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wrong (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarrow's (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>year (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>years (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yesterday's (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoom (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Transcript Formats
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.1.1</td>
<td>-000-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.2.1</td>
<td>-000-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.4.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.5.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.6.1</td>
<td>10th</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.7.1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.9.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.10.1</td>
<td>13th</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.11.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.12.1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.13.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.14.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.15.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.16.1</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.1.17  18 (2)
2.1.18  19 (3)
2.1.19  1950s (1)
2.1.20  1:00 (1)
2.1.21  1:02 (1)
2.1.22  1st (1)
2.1.23  2 (36)
2.1.24  20 (6)
2.1.25  20-plus (1)
2.1.26  20/21 (1)
2.1.27  2001 (1)
2.1.28  2013 (1)
2.1.29  2021 (4)
2.1.30  2022 (6)
2.1.31  206 (1)
2.1.32  21 (6)
2.1.33  22 (20)
2.1.34  23 (25)
2.1.35  23,000 (1)
2.1.36  23/23 (1)
2.1.37  24 (21)
2.1.38  25 (1)
2.1.39  25th (1)
2.1.40  26 (1)
2.1.41  27 (1)
2.1.42  29 (1)
2.1.43  2nd (2)
2.1.44  3 (9)
2.1.45  30 (1)
2.1.46  300 (1)
2.1.47  34 (1)
2.1.48  35 (1)
2.1.49  35-mile (1)
2.1.50  35.8 (1)
2.1.51  36 (1)
2.1.52  36th (1)
2.1.53  37 (1)
2.1.54  37,000 (1)
2.1.55  3:00 (2)
2.1.56  3:44 (1)
2.1.57  3:50 (1)
2.1.58  3:59 (1)
2.1.59  3B (38)
2.1.60  56 (2)
2.1.61  58 (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1.62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.63</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.65</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.67</td>
<td>80s</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.68</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.69</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.71</td>
<td>Abbott</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.72</td>
<td>abides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2.2 Index: absent..approve**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>absent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2</td>
<td>absolutely</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.3</td>
<td>accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.4</td>
<td>access</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.5</td>
<td>accomplish</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.6</td>
<td>accountants</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.7</td>
<td>accused</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.8</td>
<td>achieve</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.9</td>
<td>acknowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.10</td>
<td>acknowledges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.11</td>
<td>act</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.12</td>
<td>action</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.13</td>
<td>actions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.14</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.15</td>
<td>actual</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.16</td>
<td>adamant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.17</td>
<td>added</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.18</td>
<td>addition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.19</td>
<td>additional</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.20</td>
<td>address</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.21</td>
<td>addressed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.22</td>
<td>addressing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.23</td>
<td>adjourn</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.24</td>
<td>adjourned</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.25</td>
<td>adjudicated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.26</td>
<td>adjusted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.27</td>
<td>adjustments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.28</td>
<td>administerial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.29</td>
<td>administration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.30</td>
<td>admire</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.31</td>
<td>admitted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.32</td>
<td>adopt</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.33</td>
<td>adopt-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopted</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adopting</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adoption</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advantage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFFER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afoul</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afternoon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agenda</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahead</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska's</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaskans</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleutian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amenable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amend</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analogy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analysis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage/hillside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and/or</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anomalous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answering</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticipated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticipation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anybody's</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anymore</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anyplace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anytime</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.79</td>
<td>apologize</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.80</td>
<td>apparently</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.81</td>
<td>appealed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.82</td>
<td>appearance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.83</td>
<td>appeared</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.84</td>
<td>appendage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.85</td>
<td>appendages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.86</td>
<td>applies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.87</td>
<td>apply</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.88</td>
<td>appointed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.89</td>
<td>appointee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.90</td>
<td>approaches</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.91</td>
<td>approve</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Index: approved..board's</td>
<td>1398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1</td>
<td>approved</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2</td>
<td>approximately</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4</td>
<td>archipelagos</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5</td>
<td>Arctic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6</td>
<td>area</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7</td>
<td>areas</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.8</td>
<td>arguing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.9</td>
<td>argument</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.10</td>
<td>Arm</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.11</td>
<td>Armed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.12</td>
<td>arrived</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.13</td>
<td>arteries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.14</td>
<td>article</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.15</td>
<td>articulate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.16</td>
<td>articulated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.17</td>
<td>articulately</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.18</td>
<td>arts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.19</td>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.20</td>
<td>assembly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.21</td>
<td>assertion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.22</td>
<td>assess</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.23</td>
<td>Association</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.24</td>
<td>assumed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.25</td>
<td>attached</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.26</td>
<td>attempt</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.27</td>
<td>attempted</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.28</td>
<td>attempts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.29</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.30</td>
<td>attorney's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.31</td>
<td>attorneys</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.4</td>
<td>bolstered (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.5</td>
<td>border (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.6</td>
<td>bordering (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.7</td>
<td>borough (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.8</td>
<td>Borromeo (54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.9</td>
<td>bother (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.10</td>
<td>boundaries (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.11</td>
<td>boundary (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.12</td>
<td>boundless (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.13</td>
<td>bounds (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.14</td>
<td>box (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.15</td>
<td>brave (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.16</td>
<td>bravo (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.17</td>
<td>brazen (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.18</td>
<td>break (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.19</td>
<td>briefly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.20</td>
<td>bring (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.21</td>
<td>brings (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.22</td>
<td>broad (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.23</td>
<td>brought (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.24</td>
<td>Budd (31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.25</td>
<td>Budd's (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.26</td>
<td>buildings (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.27</td>
<td>bunch (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.28</td>
<td>burn (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.29</td>
<td>burned (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.30</td>
<td>business (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.31</td>
<td>businesses (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.32</td>
<td>bust (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.33</td>
<td>calculus (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.34</td>
<td>calendaring (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.35</td>
<td>call (17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.36</td>
<td>called (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.37</td>
<td>calling (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.38</td>
<td>candidate (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.39</td>
<td>canned (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.40</td>
<td>cannibalization (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.41</td>
<td>cannon (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.42</td>
<td>Cantwell (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.43</td>
<td>capable (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.44</td>
<td>car (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.45</td>
<td>card (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.46</td>
<td>care (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.47</td>
<td>carefully (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.48</td>
<td>caring (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Reference</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.49</td>
<td>carries</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.50</td>
<td>case</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.51</td>
<td>cases</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.52</td>
<td>catch</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.53</td>
<td>caught</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.54</td>
<td>caution</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.55</td>
<td>cautious</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.56</td>
<td>cell</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.57</td>
<td>census</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.58</td>
<td>center</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.59</td>
<td>centers</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.60</td>
<td>chair</td>
<td>(145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.61</td>
<td>chairman</td>
<td>(25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.62</td>
<td>challenge</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.63</td>
<td>challenged</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.64</td>
<td>champion</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.65</td>
<td>chance</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.66</td>
<td>change</td>
<td>(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.67</td>
<td>changed</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.68</td>
<td>changing</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.69</td>
<td>characterization</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.70</td>
<td>characterize</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.71</td>
<td>charge</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.72</td>
<td>charges</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.73</td>
<td>chat</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.74</td>
<td>check</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4.75</td>
<td>checked</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Index: choice..constituents</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.1</td>
<td>choice</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.2</td>
<td>choose</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.3</td>
<td>choosing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.4</td>
<td>chop</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.5</td>
<td>chose</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.6</td>
<td>Chugach</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.7</td>
<td>Chugiak</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.8</td>
<td>circulate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.9</td>
<td>citizens</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.10</td>
<td>civilians</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.11</td>
<td>claimed</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.12</td>
<td>clarify</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.13</td>
<td>clarity's</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.14</td>
<td>class</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.15</td>
<td>clause</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.16</td>
<td>clean</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5.17</td>
<td>clear</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6.58 cut-off (3)
2.6.59 cutoff (4)
2.6.60 cutting (1)
2.6.61 cycle (1)
2.6.62 dang (1)
2.6.63 dangers (1)
2.6.64 dark (1)
2.6.65 data (18)
2.6.66 date (9)
2.6.67 dates (1)
2.6.68 daughter (1)
2.6.69 daunting (1)
2.6.70 day (8)
2.6.71 daylight (2)
2.6.72 days (7)
2.6.73 deadline (3)
2.6.74 deadlines (1)
2.6.75 deal (4)
2.6.76 dealing (1)
2.6.77 death (1)
2.6.78 Debarr (1)
2.6.79 debate (25)
2.6.80 debunked (1)
2.6.81 decide (3)
2.6.82 decision (34)
2.6.83 decisions (3)
2.6.84 decree (1)
2.7 Index: defending..Dunleavy's 1402
2.7.1 defending (1)
2.7.2 defer (2)
2.7.3 deficiencies (1)
2.7.4 defined (6)
2.7.5 defining (1)
2.7.6 definition (2)
2.7.7 defunct (1)
2.7.8 degree (1)
2.7.9 delay (3)
2.7.10 delayed (1)
2.7.11 delaying (1)
2.7.12 delete (1)
2.7.13 deliberate (1)
2.7.14 deliberation (1)
2.7.15 deliberative (1)
2.7.16 Democracy (1)
2.7.17 demographer (1)
demographically

demonstrate

Department

depending

deposed

deposition

derelict

deserves

designated

designs

desire

desk

detail

detailed

determine

determined

deterrr

deploped

diagram

difference

differences

differently

difficult

Dig

digest

diluted

diminish

direct

directed

direction

directions

directives

directly

disagree

discouraged

discrete

disccretion

discuss

discussed

discussing

discussion

discussions

disenfranchise

disenfranchising

disingenuous
2.7.63 disputed (1)
2.7.64 distanced (1)
2.7.65 distributed (1)
2.7.66 district (103)
2.7.67 districts (71)
2.7.68 divided (1)
2.7.69 document (4)
2.7.70 document.' (1)
2.7.71 dog-whistle (1)
2.7.72 dot (3)
2.7.73 downtown (15)
2.7.74 draft (2)
2.7.75 drafted (2)
2.7.76 drafters (1)
2.7.77 drag (2)
2.7.78 drainage (2)
2.7.79 drastically (1)
2.7.80 draw (5)
2.7.81 drawing (1)
2.7.82 drawn (3)
2.7.83 drew (1)
2.7.84 drive (3)
2.7.85 drives (1)
2.7.86 dropped (1)
2.7.87 drown (1)
2.7.88 due (3)
2.7.89 dumpster (1)
2.7.90 Dunleavy's (1)

2.8 Index: duties..faced

2.8.1 duties (2)
2.8.2 e-mail (2)
2.8.3 e-mailed (2)
2.8.4 Eagle (75)
2.8.5 earlier (5)
2.8.6 ease (2)
2.8.7 east (16)
2.8.8 east/west (1)
2.8.9 easy (2)
2.8.10 echo (1)
2.8.11 echos (1)
2.8.12 Efficiency (1)
2.8.13 effort (3)
2.8.14 eighth (1)
2.8.15 Eklutna (2)
2.8.16 elder (1)
2.8.17 elected (1)
2.8.18 election (7)
2.8.19 electronic (2)
2.8.20 electronically (6)
2.8.21 element (1)
2.8.22 eliminated (1)
2.8.23 email (1)
2.8.24 emailed (1)
2.8.25 employer (1)
2.8.26 employs (1)
2.8.27 encompassed (1)
2.8.28 encompasses (2)
2.8.29 encourage (5)
2.8.30 encouraged (1)
2.8.31 end (8)
2.8.32 ended (1)
2.8.33 engage (3)
2.8.34 engaged (2)
2.8.35 engaging (1)
2.8.36 enhance (1)
2.8.37 enhancement (2)
2.8.38 enlarge (1)
2.8.39 enlisted (1)
2.8.40 enormous (1)
2.8.41 ensuring (1)
2.8.42 enter (1)
2.8.43 entertain (8)
2.8.44 entertaining (1)
2.8.45 entertainment (1)
2.8.46 entire (4)
2.8.47 entitled (1)
2.8.48 equal (5)
2.8.49 erased (1)
2.8.50 Eric (5)
2.8.51 errors (1)
2.8.52 essentially (4)
2.8.53 establish (1)
2.8.54 established (1)
2.8.55 evaluate (1)
2.8.56 evidence (2)
2.8.57 evident (1)
2.8.58 exact (2)
2.8.59 examples (1)
2.8.60 exception (4)
2.8.61 exceptions (1)
2.8.62 excuse (2)
2.8.63 execute (1)
2.8.64 exercise (3)
2.8.65 exhausted (1)
2.8.66 exhausting (1)
2.8.67 exist (2)
2.8.68 existing (3)
2.8.69 expect (2)
2.8.70 expects (1)
2.8.71 expense (6)
2.8.72 expensive (1)
2.8.73 experience (5)
2.8.74 experiences (1)
2.8.75 expert (1)
2.8.76 explain (2)
2.8.77 explained (2)
2.8.78 expose (1)
2.8.79 express (3)
2.8.80 expressed (1)
2.8.81 expressing (1)
2.8.82 expression (1)
2.8.83 expressly (1)
2.8.84 extend (5)
2.8.85 extends (1)
2.8.86 extensively (1)
2.8.87 extent (1)
2.8.88 extreme (1)
2.8.89 extremely (1)
2.8.90 face (2)
2.8.91 faced (1)

2.9 Index: fact..great 1404
2.9.1 fact (10)
2.9.2 factions (2)
2.9.3 factors (2)
2.9.4 failed (1)
2.9.5 fails (1)
2.9.6 fair (8)
2.9.7 Fairbanks (1)
2.9.8 fall (1)
2.9.9 falls (1)
2.9.10 false (6)
2.9.11 familiarity (2)
2.9.12 families (1)
2.9.13 farther (1)
2.9.14 father (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.9.60</td>
<td>front</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.61</td>
<td>frustrate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.62</td>
<td>frustrating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.63</td>
<td>full</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.64</td>
<td>full-time</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.65</td>
<td>fully</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.66</td>
<td>functional</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.67</td>
<td>funds</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.68</td>
<td>futility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.69</td>
<td>future</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.70</td>
<td>game</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.71</td>
<td>gas</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.72</td>
<td>gates</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.73</td>
<td>general</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.74</td>
<td>generally</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.75</td>
<td>geographic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.76</td>
<td>geography</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.77</td>
<td>gerrymander</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.78</td>
<td>gerrymanderer</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.79</td>
<td>gerrymandering</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.80</td>
<td>Giessel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.81</td>
<td>Girdwood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.82</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.83</td>
<td>giving</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.84</td>
<td>Glenn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.85</td>
<td>goal</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.86</td>
<td>golf</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.87</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.88</td>
<td>goodness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.89</td>
<td>government</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.90</td>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.91</td>
<td>governor's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.92</td>
<td>grammatical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.93</td>
<td>granddaughter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.94</td>
<td>grant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.95</td>
<td>grateful</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9.96</td>
<td>great</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.10 Index: greatly..incumbent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.10.1</td>
<td>greatly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.2</td>
<td>greenbelts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.3</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.4</td>
<td>groups</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.5</td>
<td>guarantee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.6</td>
<td>Guard</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.10.7</td>
<td>guess</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.10.8 guilty (3)
2.10.9 Gulf (1)
2.10.10 guys (4)
2.10.11 half (2)
2.10.12 hand (16)
2.10.13 handful (1)
2.10.14 hands (1)
2.10.15 happen (2)
2.10.16 happened (2)
2.10.17 happening (1)
2.10.18 happily (1)
2.10.19 happy (6)
2.10.20 hard (7)
2.10.21 harm (4)
2.10.22 harms (1)
2.10.23 hate (1)
2.10.24 head (1)
2.10.25 hear (9)
2.10.26 heard (24)
2.10.27 hearing (9)
2.10.28 hearings (9)
2.10.29 heart (1)
2.10.30 heartening (2)
2.10.31 heavily (2)
2.10.32 held (1)
2.10.33 helped (2)
2.10.34 helpful (1)
2.10.35 helps (1)
2.10.36 Hensel (1)
2.10.37 Hickel (1)
2.10.38 high (3)
2.10.39 high-rise (1)
2.10.40 higher (2)
2.10.41 highlighted (3)
2.10.42 highlighting (1)
2.10.43 highlights (1)
2.10.44 highly (1)
2.10.45 highway (3)
2.10.46 hike (1)
2.10.47 hiking (1)
2.10.48 Hills (1)
2.10.49 Hillside (5)
2.10.50 hogtied (1)
2.10.51 hold (4)
2.10.52 holding (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.11.48</td>
<td>issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.49</td>
<td>item</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.50</td>
<td>items</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.51</td>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.52</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.53</td>
<td>jig</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.54</td>
<td>job</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.55</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.56</td>
<td>joined</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.57</td>
<td>joins</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.58</td>
<td>judge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.59</td>
<td>judge's</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.60</td>
<td>judiciary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.61</td>
<td>Juli</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.62</td>
<td>jump</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.63</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.64</td>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.65</td>
<td>jury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.66</td>
<td>justice</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.67</td>
<td>justification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.68</td>
<td>keeping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.69</td>
<td>Kellan</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.70</td>
<td>Kenai</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.71</td>
<td>key</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.72</td>
<td>kidding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.73</td>
<td>kids</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.74</td>
<td>kind</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.75</td>
<td>Knik</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.76</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.77</td>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.78</td>
<td>label</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.79</td>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.80</td>
<td>laid</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.81</td>
<td>land</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.82</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.83</td>
<td>large</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.84</td>
<td>largely</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.85</td>
<td>larger</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.86</td>
<td>law</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.87</td>
<td>lawsuit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.88</td>
<td>lead</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.89</td>
<td>leads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.90</td>
<td>learned</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.11.91</td>
<td>leave</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.12.1 leaves (3)
2.12.2 leaving (2)
2.12.3 led (1)
2.12.4 left (2)
2.12.5 left-hand (1)
2.12.6 legal (8)
2.12.7 legally (1)
2.12.8 legislator (1)
2.12.9 legitimacy (2)
2.12.10 legitimate (2)
2.12.11 legitimately (1)
2.12.12 lend (1)
2.12.13 length (1)
2.12.14 lengthy (1)
2.12.15 lens (1)
2.12.16 letter (1)
2.12.17 letters (5)
2.12.18 letting (2)
2.12.19 level (2)
2.12.20 levels (1)
2.12.21 liberal (1)
2.12.22 lied (2)
2.12.23 lies (2)
2.12.24 life (1)
2.12.25 lifetime (1)
2.12.26 light (3)
2.12.27 lightly (2)
2.12.28 Lights (1)
2.12.29 limitations (1)
2.12.30 limited (3)
2.12.31 lines (2)
2.12.32 lining (1)
2.12.33 linked (1)
2.12.34 linking (1)
2.12.35 links (1)
2.12.36 LIO (4)
2.12.37 lip (1)
2.12.38 list (1)
2.12.39 listen (1)
2.12.40 listening (1)
2.12.41 literally (2)
2.12.42 litigation (3)
2.12.43 live (5)
2.12.44 lives (1)
2.12.45 living (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.12.46</td>
<td>lo</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.47</td>
<td>loads</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.48</td>
<td>local</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.49</td>
<td>locally</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.50</td>
<td>logic</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.51</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.52</td>
<td>logically</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.53</td>
<td>long</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.54</td>
<td>long-term</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.55</td>
<td>looked</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.56</td>
<td>loose</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.57</td>
<td>Lora</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.58</td>
<td>lot</td>
<td>(22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.59</td>
<td>lots</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.60</td>
<td>loud</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.61</td>
<td>lower</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.62</td>
<td>made</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.63</td>
<td>main</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.64</td>
<td>maintain</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.65</td>
<td>maintaining</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.66</td>
<td>major</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.67</td>
<td>majority</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.68</td>
<td>make</td>
<td>(42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.69</td>
<td>makes</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.70</td>
<td>makeup</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.71</td>
<td>making</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.72</td>
<td>mandate</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.73</td>
<td>manner</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.74</td>
<td>map</td>
<td>(29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.75</td>
<td>maps</td>
<td>(13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.76</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.77</td>
<td>Marcum</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.78</td>
<td>Marcum's</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.79</td>
<td>masks</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.80</td>
<td>massive</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.81</td>
<td>match</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.82</td>
<td>material</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.83</td>
<td>math</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.84</td>
<td>matrix</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.85</td>
<td>Matt</td>
<td>(10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.86</td>
<td>matter</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.87</td>
<td>matters</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.12.88</td>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.13 Index: maximal..necessarily

2.13.1 maximal (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meaningfully</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>means</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>medical</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meet</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>member</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>members</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>memory</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentioned</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrill</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>message</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>met</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>methods</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microphone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>miles</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind-boggling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minority</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minutes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconstrued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misleading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistake</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistaken</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misunderstand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mix</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mobile</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modestly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modified</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mom</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>months</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.47</td>
<td>moot (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.48</td>
<td>motion (94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.49</td>
<td>motive (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.50</td>
<td>motives (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.51</td>
<td>mountain (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.52</td>
<td>mountains (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.53</td>
<td>mouth (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.54</td>
<td>move (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.55</td>
<td>moved (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.56</td>
<td>moves (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.57</td>
<td>muddied (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.58</td>
<td>Muldoon (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.59</td>
<td>Muldoon/east (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.60</td>
<td>multiple (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.61</td>
<td>Muni (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.62</td>
<td>municipality (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.63</td>
<td>muted (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.64</td>
<td>naked (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.65</td>
<td>names (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.66</td>
<td>narrow (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.67</td>
<td>narrowing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.68</td>
<td>nation (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.69</td>
<td>natural (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.70</td>
<td>naturally (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.71</td>
<td>Navy (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.13.72</td>
<td>necessarily (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.14 | Index: necessity..pair |
| 2.14.1 | necessity (1) |
| 2.14.2 | neglected (2) |
| 2.14.3 | neighborhoods (3) |
| 2.14.4 | net (4) |
| 2.14.5 | neutral (1) |
| 2.14.6 | Nicole (38) |
| 2.14.7 | Nicole's (1) |
| 2.14.8 | night (1) |
| 2.14.9 | nonetheless (1) |
| 2.14.10 | nonpartisan (1) |
| 2.14.11 | north (8) |
| 2.14.12 | north/south (1) |
| 2.14.13 | northeast (1) |
| 2.14.14 | Northern (1) |
| 2.14.15 | notable (1) |
| 2.14.16 | notations (1) |
| 2.14.17 | note (2) |
| 2.14.18 | noted (5) |
2.14.19  notes (1)  
2.14.20  noteworthy (1)  
2.14.21  notice (3)  
2.14.22  noticed (5)  
2.14.23  notices (1)  
2.14.24  noting (1)  
2.14.25  notion (1)  
2.14.26  November (27)  
2.14.27  number (18)  
2.14.28  numbered (1)  
2.14.29  numbering (3)  
2.14.30  numberings (1)  
2.14.31  numbers (15)  
2.14.32  numeric (1)  
2.14.33  numerous (1)  
2.14.34  object (2)  
2.14.35  objection (3)  
2.14.36  objective (1)  
2.14.37  objectively (1)  
2.14.38  observation (1)  
2.14.39  obvious (1)  
2.14.40  occurred (1)  
2.14.41  occurs (1)  
2.14.42  offer (5)  
2.14.43  offered (2)  
2.14.44  office (4)  
2.14.45  officers (1)  
2.14.46  offices (2)  
2.14.47  officials (1)  
2.14.48  on-the-map (1)  
2.14.49  ongoing (1)  
2.14.50  online (3)  
2.14.51  open (11)  
2.14.52  opening (1)  
2.14.53  opined (1)  
2.14.54  opinion (8)  
2.14.55  opinions (1)  
2.14.56  opportunities (1)  
2.14.57  opportunity (15)  
2.14.58  opposed (2)  
2.14.59  opposing (2)  
2.14.60  opposition (5)  
2.14.61  opted (1)  
2.14.62  option (1)  
2.14.62  option (69)  
2.14.63  options (20)
oral (1)
order (14)
orders (1)
original (3)
outcome (5)
outpouring (1)
outskirts (1)
overheard (3)
overlap (3)
overlapping (1)
overlooks (1)
overseas (1)
overwhelmingly (1)
Owl (1)
owned (1)
p.m. (1)
paid (2)
paint (1)
pair (12)
paired (11)
pairing (41)
pairings (37)
Park (1)
parks (2)
part (28)
participate (1)
participated (2)
parties' (1)
partisan (11)
partisanship (2)
partner (4)
parts (5)
party (1)
pass (1)
passed (2)
passing (2)
past (2)
patterns (1)
PDF (1)
people (32)
percent (14)
percentage (7)
percentages (3)
perfectly (1)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>performing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perimeter</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perjured</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perjury</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permanent</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permissible</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permissibly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>person's</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personally</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personnel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspective</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perspectives</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peters</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>picked</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pieces</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>places</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaintiff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plaintiffs</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plans</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plays</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pleasure</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plenty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plurality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poach</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>point</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pointed</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>points</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polls</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populate</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>populated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>population</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.71</td>
<td>population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.72</td>
<td>populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.73</td>
<td>portal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.74</td>
<td>portion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.75</td>
<td>portions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.76</td>
<td>position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.15.77</td>
<td>possibly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>Index: potential..quit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.1</td>
<td>potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.2</td>
<td>potentially</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.3</td>
<td>power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.4</td>
<td>powers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.5</td>
<td>practicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.6</td>
<td>precedent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.7</td>
<td>preclude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.8</td>
<td>preface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.9</td>
<td>prefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.10</td>
<td>preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.11</td>
<td>prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.12</td>
<td>prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.13</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.14</td>
<td>presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.15</td>
<td>presented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.16</td>
<td>presents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.17</td>
<td>president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.18</td>
<td>pressured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.19</td>
<td>pretty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.20</td>
<td>prevailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.21</td>
<td>prevailing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.22</td>
<td>previous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.23</td>
<td>previously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.24</td>
<td>price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.25</td>
<td>primarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.26</td>
<td>primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.27</td>
<td>print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.28</td>
<td>printed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.29</td>
<td>printouts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.30</td>
<td>prior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.31</td>
<td>priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.32</td>
<td>privilege</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.33</td>
<td>problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.34</td>
<td>problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.35</td>
<td>proc-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.36</td>
<td>procedurally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.16.37</td>
<td>procedures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.16.38 proceed (3)
2.16.39 proceedings (2)
2.16.40 process (36)
2.16.41 proclamation (46)
2.16.42 proclamations (1)
2.16.43 produce (1)
2.16.44 professional (3)
2.16.45 professionals (1)
2.16.46 proposal (13)
2.16.47 proposals (6)
2.16.48 propose (3)
2.16.49 proposed (14)
2.16.50 proposing (1)
2.16.51 protect (3)
2.16.52 protected (2)
2.16.53 protection (2)
2.16.54 proud (3)
2.16.55 provide (5)
2.16.56 provided (3)
2.16.57 proximity (1)
2.16.58 prudent (1)
2.16.59 public (96)
2.16.60 public's (1)
2.16.61 publication (1)
2.16.62 publishing (1)
2.16.63 pull (3)
2.16.64 pulled (1)
2.16.65 purpose (7)
2.16.66 purposes (1)
2.16.67 pursue (2)
2.16.68 put (20)
2.16.69 puts (1)
2.16.70 putting (4)
2.16.71 question (25)
2.16.72 questioned (1)
2.16.73 questioning (1)
2.16.74 questions (5)
2.16.75 quick (1)
2.16.76 quicker (2)
2.16.77 quickly (1)
2.16.78 quit (3)
2.17 Index: quorum..Republican
2.17.1 quorum (1)
2.17.2 quote (4)
2.17.3 railroad (2)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.17.4</td>
<td>raises</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.5</td>
<td>ran</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.6</td>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.7</td>
<td>range</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.8</td>
<td>rational</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.9</td>
<td>rationale</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.10</td>
<td>re-election</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.11</td>
<td>re-emerges</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.12</td>
<td>re-enters</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.13</td>
<td>re-pairing</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.14</td>
<td>re-run</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.15</td>
<td>reachable</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.16</td>
<td>reached</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.17</td>
<td>reaching</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.18</td>
<td>react</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.19</td>
<td>reaction</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.20</td>
<td>read</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.21</td>
<td>reading</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.22</td>
<td>ready</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.23</td>
<td>real</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.24</td>
<td>reality</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.25</td>
<td>realize</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.26</td>
<td>reapportionment</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.27</td>
<td>reason</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.28</td>
<td>reasonable</td>
<td>(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.29</td>
<td>reasons</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.30</td>
<td>recall</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.31</td>
<td>received</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.32</td>
<td>recess</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.33</td>
<td>recognize</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.34</td>
<td>recognized</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.35</td>
<td>recollection</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.36</td>
<td>recommend</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.37</td>
<td>recommended</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.38</td>
<td>reconfigure</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.39</td>
<td>reconsider</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.40</td>
<td>reconsideration</td>
<td>(3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.41</td>
<td>reconsidering</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.42</td>
<td>record</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.43</td>
<td>recording</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.44</td>
<td>recordings</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.45</td>
<td>recreational</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.46</td>
<td>redacted</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.47</td>
<td>redistrict</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.17.48</td>
<td>redistricting</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reducing (1)
refer (1)
reference (1)
referenced (1)
referred (1)
referring (2)
reflect (3)
reflected (2)
reflection (1)
refuse (1)
refused (1)
regard (1)
regional (2)
regular (1)
Reinbold (2)
reiterate (2)
reject (1)
rejected (1)
related (1)
relation (1)
relationship (1)
relative (1)
relatives (1)
released (1)
remand (9)
remanded (1)
remarks (3)
remedy (1)
remember (2)
remind (1)
remote (1)
remove (3)
removed (1)
renumbered (2)
renumbering (2)
repair (2)
repeat (1)
repeated (1)
repeatedly (1)
replace (1)
report (10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.18.41</td>
<td>ridiculous</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.42</td>
<td>rightfully</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.43</td>
<td>rights</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.44</td>
<td>riled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.45</td>
<td>River</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.46</td>
<td>River/chugiak</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.47</td>
<td>road</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.48</td>
<td>roads</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.49</td>
<td>robbing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.50</td>
<td>Roger</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.51</td>
<td>role</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.52</td>
<td>roll</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.53</td>
<td>rolling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.54</td>
<td>room</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.55</td>
<td>rotation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.56</td>
<td>round</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.57</td>
<td>row</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.58</td>
<td>Ruedrich</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.59</td>
<td>rule</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.60</td>
<td>ruling</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.61</td>
<td>run</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.62</td>
<td>running</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.63</td>
<td>runs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.64</td>
<td>rural</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.65</td>
<td>rushed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.66</td>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.67</td>
<td>sacrifices</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.68</td>
<td>sake</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.69</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.70</td>
<td>Sandberg</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.71</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.72</td>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.73</td>
<td>Saturday</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.74</td>
<td>save</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.75</td>
<td>scenarios</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.76</td>
<td>Scenic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.77</td>
<td>scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.78</td>
<td>school</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.79</td>
<td>screen</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.80</td>
<td>screens</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.81</td>
<td>scrutiny</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.82</td>
<td>sea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.83</td>
<td>seat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.84</td>
<td>seats</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.85</td>
<td>sec</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.86</td>
<td>seconded</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.87</td>
<td>seconding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.88</td>
<td>secretive</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.89</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.90</td>
<td>seek</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.91</td>
<td>sees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.18.92</td>
<td>selected</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.19  **Index: senate..southern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19.1</td>
<td>senate</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.2</td>
<td>senator</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.3</td>
<td>senators</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.4</td>
<td>send</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.5</td>
<td>sense</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.6</td>
<td>separate</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.7</td>
<td>separated</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.8</td>
<td>separately</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.9</td>
<td>separating</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.10</td>
<td>sequence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.11</td>
<td>sequential</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.12</td>
<td>sequentially</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.13</td>
<td>serve</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.14</td>
<td>served</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.15</td>
<td>service</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.16</td>
<td>services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.17</td>
<td>set</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.18</td>
<td>settled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.19</td>
<td>Seward</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.20</td>
<td>shapes</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.21</td>
<td>share</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.22</td>
<td>shared</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.23</td>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.24</td>
<td>Sharpie</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.25</td>
<td>shifted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.26</td>
<td>shine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.27</td>
<td>Ship</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.28</td>
<td>shop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.29</td>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.30</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.31</td>
<td>shortly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.32</td>
<td>show</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.33</td>
<td>showed</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.34</td>
<td>showing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.35</td>
<td>shown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.36</td>
<td>shows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.19.37</td>
<td>shuffled</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.19.38  shuffling (1)
2.19.39  sic (1)
2.19.40  side (3)
2.19.41  sides (2)
2.19.42  sign (12)
2.19.43  signal (1)
2.19.44  signaling (1)
2.19.45  signature (11)
2.19.46  signatures (3)
2.19.47  signed (3)
2.19.48  significant (2)
2.19.49  significantly (1)
2.19.50  signing (4)
2.19.51  Silvers (1)
2.19.52  similar (5)
2.19.53  similarities (2)
2.19.54  simple (1)
2.19.55  simplest (1)
2.19.56  simply (2)
2.19.57  Simpson (28)
2.19.58  SINGER (15)
2.19.59  single (4)
2.19.60  single-family (2)
2.19.61  size (1)
2.19.62  sizes (1)
2.19.63  Skagway (1)
2.19.64  skiing (1)
2.19.65  skip (1)
2.19.66  sleep (1)
2.19.67  slightly (2)
2.19.68  slow (2)
2.19.69  small (2)
2.19.70  smaller (1)
2.19.71  sniff (1)
2.19.72  snow (1)
2.19.73  so-called (1)
2.19.74  soak (1)
2.19.75  socioeconomic (4)
2.19.76  socioeconomically (4)
2.19.77  solution (4)
2.19.78  solutions (2)
2.19.79  solve (2)
2.19.80  someplace (1)
2.19.81  son (1)
2.19.82  sort (3)
2.19.83 sorts (3)
2.19.84 sought (1)
2.19.85 sound (1)
2.19.86 sounded (1)
2.19.87 sounds (1)
2.19.88 south (7)
2.19.89 Southeast (4)
2.19.90 southern (1)

2.20 Index: speak..tape 1415
2.20.1 speak (4)
2.20.2 speaker (1)
2.20.3 speaking (1)
2.20.4 special (2)
2.20.5 specific (3)
2.20.6 specifically (3)
2.20.7 speed (2)
2.20.8 spent (2)
2.20.9 spirit (1)
2.20.10 split (7)
2.20.11 splits (2)
2.20.12 splitting (14)
2.20.13 spoke (1)
2.20.14 spoken (1)
2.20.15 squares (1)
2.20.16 staff (2)
2.20.17 stage (1)
2.20.18 stamina (1)
2.20.19 stand (9)
2.20.20 standard (4)
2.20.21 Star (1)
2.20.22 start (4)
2.20.23 started (1)
2.20.24 starts (1)
2.20.25 state (14)
2.20.26 state's (2)
2.20.27 stated (5)
2.20.28 statement (4)
2.20.29 statesperson's (1)
2.20.30 stating (1)
2.20.31 statistics (1)
2.20.32 status (1)
2.20.33 statutory (1)
2.20.34 stay (5)
2.20.35 stays (2)
2.20.36 step (4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.20.37</td>
<td>steward</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.38</td>
<td>stick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.39</td>
<td>sticking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.40</td>
<td>stop</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.41</td>
<td>stoppage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.42</td>
<td>stopping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.43</td>
<td>stores</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.44</td>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.45</td>
<td>stranded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.46</td>
<td>street</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.47</td>
<td>strength</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.48</td>
<td>strict</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.49</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.50</td>
<td>strongly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.51</td>
<td>struck</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.52</td>
<td>stuck</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.53</td>
<td>study</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.54</td>
<td>stuff</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.55</td>
<td>subject</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.56</td>
<td>submit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.57</td>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.58</td>
<td>subsequently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.59</td>
<td>substance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.60</td>
<td>subtract</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.61</td>
<td>succeeded</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.62</td>
<td>sudden</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.63</td>
<td>sued</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.64</td>
<td>sufficient</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.65</td>
<td>sufficiently</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.66</td>
<td>suggest</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.67</td>
<td>suggested</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.68</td>
<td>suggesting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.69</td>
<td>suggestion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.70</td>
<td>summarize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.71</td>
<td>summary</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.72</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.73</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.74</td>
<td>supplied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.75</td>
<td>support</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.76</td>
<td>supported</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.77</td>
<td>supporting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.78</td>
<td>supportive</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.79</td>
<td>supports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.80</td>
<td>supposedly</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.81</td>
<td>Supreme</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.82</td>
<td>surprise (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.83</td>
<td>surprising (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.84</td>
<td>swift (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.85</td>
<td>swiftly (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.86</td>
<td>swing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.87</td>
<td>switch (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.88</td>
<td>systematically (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.89</td>
<td>table (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.90</td>
<td>tacit (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.91</td>
<td>takes (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.92</td>
<td>taking (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.93</td>
<td>talk (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.94</td>
<td>talked (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.95</td>
<td>talking (11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.96</td>
<td>talks (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.20.97</td>
<td>tape (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 2.21 | Index: task...understanding |
| 2.21.1 | task (1) |
| 2.21.2 | tasked (1) |
| 2.21.3 | tasks (1) |
| 2.21.4 | team (2) |
| 2.21.5 | technical (2) |
| 2.21.6 | tee (1) |
| 2.21.7 | tempted (1) |
| 2.21.8 | ten (2) |
| 2.21.9 | tend (1) |
| 2.21.10 | terms (16) |
| 2.21.11 | territory (3) |
| 2.21.12 | test (1) |
| 2.21.13 | testified (8) |
| 2.21.14 | testifiers (1) |
| 2.21.15 | testify (5) |
| 2.21.16 | testifying (2) |
| 2.21.17 | testimony (67) |
| 2.21.18 | thankful (1) |
| 2.21.19 | thankfully (1) |
| 2.21.20 | thanking (1) |
| 2.21.21 | that'll (1) |
| 2.21.22 | thin (1) |
| 2.21.23 | thing (11) |
| 2.21.24 | things (14) |
| 2.21.25 | thinking (2) |
| 2.21.26 | thinks (2) |
| 2.21.27 | thought (14) |
| 2.21.28 | thousands (1) |
uncomfortable (1)
unconstitutional (1)
underlying (2)
understand (12)
understanding (5)

understands (1)
undertaking (1)
undisputed (1)
unfortunate (1)
uniform (1)
unique (1)
united (1)
unites (2)
unpack (1)
unpopulated (2)
unredacted (1)
untruthful (1)
Upper (2)
upshot (1)
urban (1)
urged (1)
utmost (1)
valid (4)
validity (1)
Valley (3)
valued (1)
vehemently (1)
Venn (1)
verbally (1)
versa (2)
version (6)
versions (3)
versus (3)
vertically (1)
vet (1)
veteran (2)
veterans (1)
VI (5)
vice (2)
video (7)
Vietnam (2)
viewed (2)
viewing (1)
views (3)
vigilant
violate
virtual
visit
visual
visually
voice
Voila
vote
voted
voter
voters
votes
voting
wait
walk
walking
wanted
War
warrants
waste
watch
watching
water
waters'
waterway
ways
Web
website
week
weeks
weigh
weighed
weight
west
whatsoever
whichever
white
Whittier
wide
wife
wilderness
wildfire
wildlife
Wilson
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.22.85</td>
<td>winds (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.86</td>
<td>wishes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.87</td>
<td>word (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.88</td>
<td>words (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.89</td>
<td>work (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.90</td>
<td>working (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.91</td>
<td>works (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.92</td>
<td>wrap (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.93</td>
<td>write (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.94</td>
<td>written (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.22.95</td>
<td>wrong (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Index: yada..zoom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.1</td>
<td>yada (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.2</td>
<td>Yarrow (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.3</td>
<td>year (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.4</td>
<td>years (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.5</td>
<td>zone (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.23.6</td>
<td>zoom (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transcript Formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>ASCII/TXT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001039</td>
<td>activematrix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thumbnail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001084-001085</td>
<td>Alaska Redistricting Audio-Video Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alaska Redistricting Video &amp; Audio Links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>April 13, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>April 9, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>April 8, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>April 7, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>April 6, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>April 5, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>April 4, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001086</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001087</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001088</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001089</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001090</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001091</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001092</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001093</td>
<td>Placeholder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001094-001226</td>
<td>Apr-2-Apr-9-Verbal-Testimony-Summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001227-001294</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Mar27-Apr2@1900-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001295-001357</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr-3@1900-Apr4@2100-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001358-001481</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr-4@2100-Apr-5@2200-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001482-001551</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr5@2200-Apr6@2200-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001552-001642</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr6@2200-Apr7@2300-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001643-001684</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr7@2300-Apr8@1925-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001685-001753</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr8@1925-Apr9@2100-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001754-001783</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr9@2100-Apr11@2230-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001784-001791</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr11@2230-Apr12@2300-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001792-001798</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr12@2300-Apr13@1115-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001799-001824</td>
<td>Public-Testimony-Apr13@1115-Apr13@2130-REDACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001825</td>
<td>2022-April-Home-Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001826</td>
<td>2022-Proclamation-Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001827</td>
<td>2022-April-Proclamation-Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001828</td>
<td>2022-Proposed-Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001829</td>
<td>Board-Minutes-Audio-Packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001830</td>
<td>Public-Comment-Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001831</td>
<td>Announcements-of-events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB2001832</td>
<td>Announcements-page-without-events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHEREAS, Article VI of the Alaska Constitution requires the Alaska Redistricting Board to reapportion the House of Representatives and the Senate immediately following the official reporting of each decennial census of the United States; and

WHEREAS, the United States Bureau of the Census conducted a census of the United States on April 1, 2020 and reported the results of the census to the State of Alaska on August 12, 2021; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board was duly constituted in August 2020 and undertook its constitutional responsibilities for preparing a redistricting plan for the State of Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted draft redistricting plans on September 9, 2021, in conformity with Article VI, section 10 of the Alaska Constitution, requiring that the Board adopt a draft plan or plans within 30 days of the reporting of the Census results for Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board held numerous public hearings throughout the state in conformity with Article VI, section 10 of the Alaska Constitution; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board strictly adhered to the requirements of Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution and the “Hickel process” outlined by the Alaska Supreme Court to draw districts consisting of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable relatively integrated socio-economic areas and a population as near as practicable to 18,335; and

WHEREAS, adhering to Article VI, Section 3 of the Alaska Constitution, the Board did not adjust, alter or modify the Census enumerated population or Census block geography; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted its 2021 Plan and Proclamation of Redistricting on November 10, 2021 in conformity with the constitutional requirement that it do so within 90 days of the reporting of the Census results for Alaska; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Supreme Court and Alaska Superior Court directed that the Alaska Redistricting Board remove Cantwell from District 36 and address errors with Senate District K, and make other necessary adjustments to the 2021 Proclamation Plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD, hereby does PROCLAIM, ON THIS DAY APRIL 13, 2022

First, that the state house election districts described in this Redistricting Proclamation and in the report accompanying this Redistricting Proclamation, shall be implemented for legislative elections in the year 2022, and thereafter, until a valid Redistricting Proclamation has been adopted following the next decennial census; and
Second, that the terms of Senate incumbents B, D, F, H, J, L and N under the 2013 Redistricting Proclamation labeling system are hereby truncated because those Senate Districts have been substantially changed by this Redistricting Proclamation, and that the term of the incumbent of Senate District T, not be truncated because that Senate District is substantially unchanged; and

Third, that Senate districts be assigned to election cycles according to the following schedule, using the Senate District designations in this Redistricting Proclamation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elected in 2022, 2026, 2030</th>
<th>Elected in 2024, 2028, 2032</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourth, that the metes and bounds district descriptions appended to this Redistricting Proclamation may be used to resolve inconsistencies between district boundaries and topographic features.

Dated this 13 day of April, 2022 at Anchorage Alaska.

John Binkley of Fairbanks, Chair
Bethany Marcum, of Anchorage
E. Budd Simpson, of Juneau
Nicole Borromeo, of Anchorage
Melanie Bahnke, of Nome
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Supplemental Redistricting Process Report
April 13, 2022

On November 10, 2021, the Alaska Redistricting Board issued its Final Plan and Proclamation of Redistricting in accordance with the provisions of Article VI of the Alaska Constitution. This report describes the supplemental work of the Redistricting Board in response to orders from the Alaska Supreme Court on March 25, 2022 and the Superior Court on March 30, 2022. In his March 30 order, Superior Court Judge Matthews required that the Board provide a status update to the Court on April 15, 2022.

Board Response

The Board re-opened its website and public portal for written testimony on Wednesday, March 30 and announced to email subscribers that it was inviting public comment regarding the changes required by the courts’ remand orders.

The Board met on April 2, 2022 in Anchorage and virtually via Zoom to receive a report from its Legal Counsel on the directions from the Court. The Board then heard public testimony both in-person and via teleconference.

The Board discussed how to proceed and opted for an accelerated public hearing schedule with the goal to make needed plan corrections prior to April 15. Public hearings were planned for Monday, April 4 and Tuesday, April 5. The Board announced a deadline that any third parties, or Board members, who wished to bring forward revised Anchorage Senate pairing plans for consideration should present them by the end of the public hearing scheduled for April 6.

Meeting on Wednesday, April 6 the Board took extensive public testimony and then unanimously adopted two plans for consideration moving forward. These were labelled Option #2, and Option #3B. Option #1, which had been proposed at an earlier meeting, was withdrawn by unanimous consent. Option #3, which had been offered earlier in the week, was modified and replaced at the request of its sponsor and with unanimous consent of the Board. This was named “3B” to prevent confusion with the original concept.

An Option #4 was proposed by a member of the public and debated by the Board. After deliberation, the move to adopt Option #4 failed on a 2-3 vote because maintaining contiguity of its proposed Senate districts would have required a change to the underlying house district geography. A majority of Board members expressed concern about making alterations to the prior proclamation plan which were not directly required by the courts’ remand orders.

The Board scheduled additional public hearings for the purposes of receiving public testimony on Anchorage Senate Options #2 and #3B and heard testimony on Thursday, April 7, Friday, April 8 and Saturday, April 9.
By the close of the April 9 hearing, over 100 testifiers had presented to the Board in-person or telephonically, and the Board had received over 300 written testimony submissions. The Board’s staff compiled written testimony each night, emailed it to Board members and then posted the testimony the following day to the website with personal contact details redacted. Audio recordings and links to live stream video recordings of the April Board meetings were posted to the Board’s website as they became available.

After taking public testimony for 7 of the previous 8 days, the Board adjourned the April 9 hearing and scheduled deliberative meetings for Wednesday, April 13 and Thursday, April 14, if needed.

On April 13, 2022, the Board adopted Option 3B as new Anchorage Senate Pairings Plan. Staff ran a new Senate Core Constituency report, which appears as an appendix below. Using the 16.3% truncation cutoff unanimously adopted in November, there were no Senate seat truncation changes from the 2021 Proclamation Plan.

Staff and Legal Counsel then prepared a 2022 Proclamation Plan for signature by the Board, which was signed and became effective as of the 13th day of April, 2022.
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2-A
Gustavus

3-B
Skagway

Haines

Mud Bay

Mosquito Lake

Klukwan

Covenant Life

Excursion Inlet

4-B
Juneau

4-B

Riverside Dr

Glacier Hwy

Ged St

Mendenhall Loop Rd

Yandukin Dr

Anthony Dr

Engineers Cutoff Rd

Toyninston Blvd

Crazy Horse Dr

Benedict Ave

Berners Ave

Benwood Pl

Ka-Se-An Dr

Braney Ln

Park Pl

Vienna Blvd

Mallard St

Cub St

Rivercourt Way

Trot St

Clinton Dr
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Description of April 2022 Proclamation Plan House and Senate Districts
Prepared by the Alaska Redistricting Board – April 13, 2022

House District 1 – Senate District A – Ketchikan/Wrangell/Metlakatla

House District 1 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the northwestern-most point of the City and Borough of Wrangell, northeast to the Canadian Border, southeast then southwest to the maritime border in the Dixon Entrance, west to the southwestern-most point of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough, north then east the centerline of Clarence Strait west of Annette Island, north to the boundary of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough, north then east to the boundary of the City and Borough of Wrangell, north to a point due east of Eagle Creek, west along a non-visible line to the mouth of Eagle Creek, north along the shoreline to the boundary of the City of Coffman Cove, west then north to the shoreline of Lake Bay, southwest to the entrance of Barnes Lake, west along a non-visible line to Stevenson Island, west along the shoreline to Indian Creek, west along a non-visible line to the western shoreline of Indian Creek, north to the southern shoreline of Whale Passage, north then west to the boundary of the City of Whale Pass, west then north then east to Exchange Cove Road, north to Exchange Creek, north to the western shoreline of Exchange Cove, north to the shoreline of Clarence Strait, northwest to the entrance of an unnamed bay near Lava Creek, north across the entrance to the shoreline of Clarence Strait, north to the entrance of Salmon Bay, north across the entrance to the shoreline of Clarence Strait, north along the shoreline to a non-visible line near Point Colpoys, northeast to the boundary of the City and Borough of Wrangell, northwest to the point of beginning.

House District 2 – Senate District A – Sitka/Petersburg/Yakutat

House District 2 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the western-most point of Yakutat Borough, northeast then east to the Canadian Border, southeast then northeast to the Pacific Glacier Drainage, east to Tarr Inlet, southeast along the southern shoreline to Glacier Bay, south along the shoreline to the entrance of John Hopkins Inlet, southeast across the entrance to the shoreline of Glacier Bay, east to the entrance of Reid Inlet, east across the entrance to the shoreline of Glacier Bay, east then southeast along the shoreline to the entrance of Blue Mouse Cove, southeast across the entrance to an unnamed island, southeast then west along the shoreline to the entrance of Hugh Miller Inlet, south across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Geikie Inlet, southeast across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Fingers Bay, southeast to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Berg Bay, south across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, south to the entrance of Glacier Bay, east across the entrance to the eastern shoreline of Glacier Bay, east along the shoreline to the boundary of the City of Gustavus, south then east to the shoreline of Pleasant Island, northeast then southeast to the eastern entrance to Icy Passage, northeast to the boundary of Glacier Bay National Park, east to the boundary of Haines Borough, southeast then north to the boundary of the City and Borough of Juneau, southeast then south then northeast then southeast then northeast along the...
boundary to the Canadian Border, southwest then southeast to a non-visible line across Clarence Strait from Point Colpoys, west along a non-visible line to the shoreline near Point Colpoys, southeast to entrance of Salmon Bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline of Clarence Strait, south to the entrance of an unnamed bay near Lava Creek, south across the entrance to the shoreline of Clarence Strait, southeast to Exchange Cove, south along the western shoreline to Exchange Creek, south to Exchange Cove Road, south to the boundary of the City of Whale Pass, west then south then east to the southern shoreline of Whale Passage, east then south to the western shoreline of Indian Creek, south to Barnes Lake, east along a non-visible line to Stevenson Island, east then north along the shoreline to Lake Bay, east across a non-visible line to the eastern shoreline of Lake Bay, northeast to the boundary of the City of Coffman Cove, south then east to the western shoreline of Clarence Strait, south to the mouth of Eagle Creek, northeast along a non-visible line to the boundary of the City and Borough of Wrangell, southeast to the boundary of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough, south to the centerline of Clarence Strait west of Annette Island, south to the boundary of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough, south to the maritime border in the Dixon Entrance, west to the 3-mile limit in the Pacific Ocean near Forrester Island, north along the 3-mile limit to the boundary of the City and Borough of Sitka, northwest along the boundary to the 3-mile limit in the Pacific Ocean near Yakutat Borough, northwest along the 3-mile limit to the boundary of Yakutat Borough, northwest to the point of beginning.

House District 3 – Senate District B – Mendenhall Valley/Haines/Skagway/Gustavus

House District 3 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the northern edge of the Juneau Icefield and the Canadian Border, northwest then southwest along the border to the Pacific Glacier Drainage, east to Tarr Inlet, southeast along the southern shoreline to Glacier Bay, south along the shoreline to the entrance of John Hopkins Inlet, southeast across the entrance to the shoreline of Glacier Bay, east to the entrance of Reid Inlet, east across the entrance to the shoreline of Glacier Bay, east then northeast along the shoreline to the entrance of Blue Mouse Cove, southeast across the entrance to an unnamed island, southeast then west along the shoreline to the entrance of Hugh Miller Inlet, south across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Geikie Inlet, southeast across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Fingers Bay, southeast to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, southeast to the entrance of Berg Bay, southeast across the entrance to the western shoreline of Glacier Bay, east to the entrance of Glacier Bay, east across the entrance to the eastern shoreline of Glacier Bay, east along the shoreline to the boundary of the City of Gustavus, south then east to the shoreline of Pleasant Island, northeast then southeast to the eastern entrance to Icy Passage, northeast to the boundary of Glacier Bay National Park, east to the boundary of Haines Borough, southeast then north to the boundary of the City and Borough of Juneau, south to a non-visible line extending southwest from the centerline of Fritz Cove, northeast to the centerline of Fritz Cove, northeast to the entrance of Gastineau Channel, north to the mouth of the Mendenhall River, north along the eastern bank of the Mendenhall River to the mouth of Duck Creek, east to Mendenhall Refuge Access Road, north to Radcliffe Road, north to the Glacier Highway, west to Vintage Boulevard, north then east to Riverside Drive, north to Stephen Richards Memorial Drive, east to Haloff Way, east to Tongass Boulevard, south to Jennifer Drive, east to the end of Jennifer Drive, south along a non-visible line to the Jorden Creek Tributary, northeast then southeast to Heintzeleman Ridge, northeast to a non-visible line near the headwaters of Steep Creek, northeast to the headwaters of Steep Creek, northwest to Glacier Spur Road, northwest to a non-visible line near Mendenhall Lake, northwest to the shoreline of Mendenhall Lake, north then south then west to Mendenhall Glacier, west then north along the western edge of
Mendenhall Glacier to the Juneau Icefield, west then north along the northern edge of the Juneau Icefield to the point of beginning.

**House District 4 – Senate District B – Downtown Juneau/Douglas/Juneau Airport**

House District 4 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Canadian Border and the southern boundary of the City and Borough of Juneau, southwest then northwest then southeast then southwest then northwest then north to a non-visible line extending southwest from the centerline of Fritz Cove, northeast to the centerline of Fritz Cove, northwest to the entrance of Gastineau Channel, north to the mouth of the Mendenhall River, northwest then along the eastern bank of the Mendenhall River to the mouth of Duck Creek, east to Mendenhall Refuge Access Road, north to Radcliffe Road, north to the Glacier Highway, west to Vintage Boulevard, north then east to Riverside Drive, north to Stephen Richards Memorial Drive, east to Haloff Way, east to Tongass Boulevard, south to Jennifer Drive, east to the end of Jennifer Drive, south along a non-visible line to the Jorden Creek Tributary, northeast then southeast to Heintzeleman Ridge, northeast to a non-visible line near the headwaters of Steep Creek, northeast to the headwaters of Steep Creek, northeast to Glacier Spur Road, northwest to a non-visible line near Mendenhall Lake, north then south then west to Mendenhall Glacier, west then north along the western edge of Mendenhall Glacier to the Juneau Icefield, west then north along the northern edge of the Juneau Icefield to the Canadian Border, than southeast to the point of beginning.

**House District 5 – Senate District C – Kodiak/Seward/Cordova**

House District 5 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Chugach ANRC boundary and the western boundary of the Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, south along the park boundary to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, west to a non-visible line extending east from the headwaters of the Lowe River, west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of the Lowe River, west to a non-visible line extending south from the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, east of the boundary of the City of Valdez, north along a non-visible line to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, west to boundary of the City of Valdez, northwest then north to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest on the northern shoreline of Valdez Arm, west to the entrance of Sawmill Bay, west across the entrance to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, southwest then west to the entrance of Columbia Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay east of Long Point, west across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, west to the entrance of Long Channel, west across the entrance to the shoreline near Buyers Cove, southwest to a non-visible line extending northwest from Glacier Island, southeast along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Glacier Island, east along a non-visible line extending west from the northern-most point of Growler Island, east to Growler Island, east along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Glacier Island, south then west to the western-most point of Glacier Island, west to a peninsula of Land near Fairmount Bay, southwest to the entrance of a small bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, southwest then north then northwest to the entrance of a small unnamed bay east of Fairmount Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Fairmount Bay, west across the entrance to a non-visible line extending north from Fairmount Island, south along a non-visible line to Fairmount Island, southeast then south then west then north to a non-visible line extending south from Fairmount Point, then north to the shoreline near Fairmount Point, north to the entrance of Wells Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline near...
Unakwik Point, south then west to the entrance of Unakwik Inlet, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline north of Olsen Cove, south to a non-visible line extending west from Olsen Island, east to the shoreline of Olsen Island, northeast then southeast then south then west to a non-visible line extending east from a point south of Olsen Cove, west to the shoreline south of Olsen Cove, south then west to a small bay north of Kiniklik Island, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small bay northwest of Kiniklik Island, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Eaglek Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of an island west of Eaglek Island, southwest then west to the western entrance of Eaglek Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, southwest then west to the entrance of a small cove east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, northwest to the entrance of Squaw Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, south then southwest to the entrance of Esther Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline, southwest then west to the entrance of Quillian Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Lake Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the eastern shoreline of Port Wells, west along a non-visible line to the western shoreline of Port Wells east of Entry Cove, west to the entrance of Entry Cove, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Passage Canal, west across the entrance to the shoreline, south then west to the boundary of the City of Whittier, south then west to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, south to the boundary of the Kenai Peninsula Borough, east then south to the southern boundary of the Chugach National Forest, west then south then southwest then west to the boundary of the City of Seward, north then northwest then south to Lowell Creek, west to the headwaters of Lowell Creek, north along a non-visible line to the boundary of Kenai Fjords National Park, northwest to the Chugach ANRC boundary, south to the boundary of Kenai Fjords National Park, southwest then east then south to the shoreline of Nuka Passage, southwest to the entrance of Tonsina Bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline of Nuka Passage, south to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, south the entrance of an unnamed bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline near Gore Point, west to the entrance of Port Dick, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of Touglaalek Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of Qikutulig Bay, west across the entrance to the entrance of Rocky Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, southwest to the entrance of Chugach Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Chugach Passage, west then north to the entrance of Port Chatham, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Chugach Passage, northwest to the entrance of Koyuktoklik Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Kennedy Entrance, northwest along the shoreline to the western edge of Kennedy Entrance, south along the western edge of Kennedy Entrance to the 3-mile limit south of Elizabeth Island, southwest then southeast then northeast around all of the Barren Islands and Afognak Island and Kodiak Island and the Trinity Islands to the southern boundary of the Kenai Peninsula Borough near East Chugach Island, northeast along the southern boundary to the 3-mile limit of the Pacific Ocean south of Whidbey Bay, east along the 3-mile limit of the Pacific Ocean including Middleton Island to the boundary of Yakutat Borough, north then northeast then east to the Chugach ANRC boundary, northwest to the point of beginning.
House District 6 – Senate District C – Kachemak Bay/Ninilchik/Kasilof

House District 6 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Slikok Creek and the Sterling Highway, south along the highway to Wolverine Avenue, east then south to the end of Wolverine Avenue, south along an unnamed path to Heavy Down Drive, south to the western branch of Coal Creek, southwest to the confluence with the eastern branch of Coal Creek, east to a non-visible line extending north from the western boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, south to the boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, south then west to the northern bank of the Kasilof River, southeast along the northern bank to Tustumena Lake, northeast then southeast to Glacier Creek, southeast to Tustumena Glacier, east along the northern edge of the glacier to the Harding Icefield, south to a non-visible line extending northwest from the Chugach ANRC boundary, southeast to the Chugach ANRC boundary, south to the boundary of Kenai Fjords National Park, southwest then east then south to shoreline of Nuka Passage, southwest to the entrance of Tonsina Bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline of Nuka Passage, south to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, south to the entrance of an unnamed bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline near Gore Point, west to the entrance of Port Dick, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of Touglaalek Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of Qikutulig Bay, west across the entrance to the entrance of Rocky Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of the Gulf of Alaska, southwest to the entrance of Chugach Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Chugach Passage, west then north to the entrance of Port Chatham, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Chugach Passage, northwest to the entrance of Koyuktolik Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Kennedy Entrance, northwest to the shoreline of Cook Inlet, north to an unnamed creek north of Point Bede, east to the headwaters of an unnamed creek, south along a non-visible line to the Mount Bede Ridgeline, southeast to an unnamed creek, northeast to an unnamed lake along the English Bay River, north to the outlet of the lake, east to an unnamed creek, north to the shoreline of Port Graham, east then north then northwest to the shoreline of Cook Inlet, north the entrance of Kachemak Bay, north across the entrance to a non-visible line extending east from the centerline of Cook Inlet, west to the centerline of Cook Inlet, north to a non-visible line extending west from the shoreline near Oil Company Haul Road, east to the shoreline of Cook Inlet, east along a non-visible line to Oil Company Haul Road, south to the end of Oil Company Haul Road, southeast along a non-visible line to Gas Well Road, east then northeast to a non-visible line extending west from Harmony Avenue, east to Harmony Avenue, northeast to Echo Lake Road, south to Evelyn Lane, east to the end of Evelyn Lane, east along a non-visible line to Slikok Creek, southeast to the point of beginning.

House District 7 – Senate District D – Kenai/Soldotna

House District 7 is bounded by a line beginning at the northwestern most point of the City of Kenai, east then south to the Kenai Spur Highway, south to Sports Lake Road, east to Moser Street, south to the end of Moser Street, south along a non-visible line to Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline ROW, east to a non-visible line extending north from the boundary of the City of Soldotna, south to the boundary of the City of Soldotna, east then south to the northern bank of the Kenai River, southeast to the boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, west to the boundary of the City of Soldotna near the Sterling Highway, west along the boundary to Gas Well Road, west to Echo Lake Road, south to Harmony Avenue, southwest to the end of Harmony Avenue, west along a non-visible line to Gas Well Road, southwest then west to the end of Gas Well Road, northwest along a non-visible line to Oil Company Haul Road, northwest to a non-visible line near Kalifornsky Beach Road, west along the non-visible line to the
shoreline of Cook Inlet, west along a non-visible line to the centerline of Cook Inlet, north to a non-
visible line extending west from the northern boundary of the City of Kenai, east to the point of
beginning.

**House District 8 – Senate District D – Northern Kenai Peninsula**

House District 8 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Kenai Peninsula Borough with
both the Matanuska-Susitna Borough and the Municipality of Anchorage, southwest along the Kenai
Peninsula Borough boundary to the centerline of Cook Inlet, southwest then south to a non-visible line
extending west from the northern boundary of the City of Kenai, east to the boundary of the City of
Kenai, east then south to the Kenai Spur Highway, south to Sports Lake Road, east to Moser Street,
south to the end of Moser Street, south along a non-visible line to Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline ROW,
east to a non-visible line extending north from the boundary of the City of Soldotna, south to the
boundary of the City of Soldotna, east then south to the northern bank of the Kenai River, southeast to
the boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, west to the boundary of the City of Soldotna near
the Sterling Highway, west along the boundary to Gas Well Road, west to Echo Lake Road, south to
Evelyn Lane, east to the end of Evelyn Lane, east along a non-visible line to Slikok Creek, southeast to
the Sterling Highway, south along the highway to Wolverine Avenue, east then south to the end of
Wolverine Avenue, south along an unnamed path to Heavy Down Drive, south to the western branch of
Coal Creek, southwest to the confluence with the eastern branch of Coal Creek, east to a non-visible line
extending north from the western boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, south to the
boundary of the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge, south then west to the northern bank of the Kaslof
River, southeast along the northern bank of the Kaslof River, to Tustumena Lake, northeast then
southeast to Glacier Creek, southeast to Tustumena Glacier, east along the northern edge of the glacier
to the Harding Icefield, north to a non-visible line extending northwest from the Chugach ANRC
boundary, east then north then northwest to the Chugach ANRC boundary, northeast to the boundary
of Kenai Fjords National Park along the Resurrection River, southeast to the eastern boundary of the
park, south along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Lowell Creek, east to the boundary of the City
of Seward, north then east then south to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, east then
northeast then east to the boundary of the Kenai Peninsula Borough, north then northwest to the point
of beginning.

**House District 9 – Senate District E – South Anchorage/Turnagain Arm/Whittier**

House District 9 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the New Seward Highway and
Huffman Road, east on Huffman Road to Birch Road, northeast then south to Huffman Road, east to
Upper Huffman Road, east to Sultana Drive, northeast then east to the boundary of Chugach State Park,
north to Basher Drive, southwest to the boundary of Far North Bicentennial Park, north to the boundary
of Fort Richardson, east to the boundary of Chugach State Park, east then southeast to a non-visible line
extending north from the powerlines near the headwaters of the south fork of Campbell Creek, south
along the non-visible line to the powerlines, east along a non-visible line to Ship Creek, east then
northeast to the headwaters of Ship Creek, southeast along a non-visible line to the ridgeline between
Bird Creek and Raven Creek, southeast to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, north then east
to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, south then west then south to the northern boundary
of the City of Whittier, east then south then west along the city boundary to the boundary of the
Municipality of Anchorage, south then west then north then northwest to a non-visible line extending
south from the mouth of Little Rabbit Creek, north to the mouth of Little Rabbit Creek, east to the New Seward Highway, north to the point of beginning.

House District 10 – Senate District E – Eagle River Valley

House District 10 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Eagle River Loop Road and Lazy Street, south on Lazy Street to Easy Street, west to the Old Glenn Highway, south then west to Mauzel Street, then north to Artillery Road, west then north then west to the boundary of Fort Richardson, south to the Glenn Highway, southwest to the western boundary of Fort Richardson, south then west to a non-visible line extending northeast from the end of Peck Avenue, southwest to Peck Avenue, southwest then west to the boundary of Fort Richardson, south then east to the boundary of Chugach State Park, east then southeast to a non-visible line extending north from the powerlines near the headwaters of the south fork of Campbell Creek, north along the non-visible line to the powerlines, east along a non-visible line to Ship Creek, east then northeast to the headwaters of Ship Creek, southeast along a non-visible line to the ridgeline between Bird Creek and Raven Creek, southeast to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, north then east to the ridgeline between Eagle River and Peters Creek, northwest along the ridgeline to a non-visible line extending east from the headwaters of Meadow Creek, west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Meadow Creek, northwest to a non-visible line extending north from the boundary of Chugach State Park, south along a non-visible line to the boundary of Chugach State Park, west to Steeple Drive, southwest to Eagle River Lane, south to War Admiral Road, northwest then west to Sun Beau Drive, southwest to Eagle River Loop Road, north then northwest to the point of beginning.

House District 11 – Senate District F – Lower Hillside

House District 11 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the New Seward Highway and Huffman Road, east on Huffman Road to Birch Road, northeast then south to Huffman Road, east to Upper Huffman Road, east to Sultana Drive, northeast then east to the boundary of Chugach State Park, north to the boundary of Far North Bicentennial Park, west to the boundary of Hillside Park, west to Abbott Road, east then northwest to Vanguard Drive, southwest then south to Academy Drive, west to the end of Academy Drive, west along a non-visible line to the New Seward Highway, south to the point of beginning.

House District 12 – Senate District F – Far North Bicentennial Park

House District 12 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Elmore Road and Tudor Road, east on Tudor Road to the boundary of Far North Bicentennial Park, east then south then west to the boundary of Hillside Park, west to Abbott Road, west then northwest to Vanguard Drive, southwest then south to Academy Drive, west to the end of Academy Drive, west along a non-visible line to the New Seward Highway, north to E Dowling Road, east to Elmore Road, north to the point of beginning.

House District 13 – Senate District G – Oceanview/Klatt

House District 13 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the New Seward Highway and Dimond Boulevard, west on Dimond Boulevard to Victor Road, south to Southport Drive, south to Diligence Circle, south to Crow’s Nest Circle, west to the end of Crow’s Nest Circle, west along a non-
visible line to the shoreline of Turnagain Arm, southwest then south along a non-visible line to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, southeast to a non-visible line extending south from the mouth of Little Rabbit Creek, north to the mouth of Little Rabbit Creek, east to the New Seward Highway, north to the point of beginning.

**House District 14 – Senate District G – Campbell**

House District 14 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Dowling Road and the New Seward Highway, south on the New Seward Highway to Dimond Boulevard, west then southwest to Northwood Street, north to Raspberry Road, east to Minnesota Drive, north to International Airport Road, east to C Street, north to Tudor Road, east to Lake Otis Parkway, south to Dowling Road, west to the point of beginning.

**House District 15 – Senate District H – Sand Lake/Campbell Lake**

House District 15 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Strawberry Road and Northwood Street, south on Northwood Street to Victor Road, south to Southport Drive, south to Diligence Circle, south to Crow’s Nest Circle, west to the end of Crow’s Nest Circle, west along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Turnagain Arm, southwest then south along a non-visible line to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, north to a non-visible line extending south from the eastern boundary of Kincaid Park, north along a non-visible line to the boundary of Kincaid Park, north to Jodhpur Street, north to Kincaid Road, east to Sand Lake Road, north to Wandering Drive, southeast then east then south to Kincaid Road, east to Sportsman Drive, east to Sandy Beach Drive, northeast to Silver Birch Drive, north to Caravelle Drive, east to Jewel Lake Road, south to Strawberry Road, east to the point of beginning.

**House District 16 – Senate District H – Anchorage Airport**

House District 16 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Minnesota Drive and International Airport Road, west on International Airport Road to Northwood Drive, north to Iowa Drive, north to McRae Road, northwest to Turnagain Street, north to W 34th Avenue, east to Turnagain Street, north to W 30th Avenue, east to Fish Creek, north then east to the Alaska Railroad, north then northeast to a non-visible line extending east near W 2nd Avenue, west on the non-visible line to the shoreline of Knik Arm, west then northwest along a non-visible line to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, south then south then southeast to a non-visible line extending south from the eastern boundary of Kincaid Park, north along a non-visible line to the boundary of Kincaid Park, north to Jodhpur Street, north to Kincaid Road, east to Sand Lake Road, north to Wandering Drive, southeast then east then south to Kincaid Road, east to Sportsman Drive, east to Sandy Beach Drive, northeast to Silver Birch Drive, north to Caravelle Drive, east to Jewel Lake Road, south to Strawberry Road, east to the point of beginning.

**House District 17 – Senate District I – Spenard**

House District 17 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Tudor Road and C Street, south on C Street to International Airport Road, west on International Airport Road to Northwood Drive, north to
Iowa Drive, north to McRae Road, northwest to Turnagain Street, north to W 34th Avenue, east to Turnagain Street, north to W 30th Avenue, east to Fish Creek, north then east to the Alaska Railroad, northwest to Northern Lights Boulevard, east to Minnesota Drive, north to W 26th Avenue, east to Spenard Road, north to W 25th Avenue, east to Arctic Boulevard, north to Fireweed Lane, east to the New Seward Highway, north to Chester Creek, east to the north fork of Chester Creek, north to E 20th Avenue, east to Lake Otis Parkway, south to Tudor Road, west to the point of beginning.

House District 18 – Senate District I – U-Med

House District 18 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Lake Otis Parkway and Northern Lights Boulevard, east on Northern Lights Boulevard to Nichols Street, north to E 20th Avenue, east to Bragaw Street, north to Reka Drive, east to the powerlines extending south from Pine Street, north to Pine Street, north to Debarr Road, east to Boniface Parkway, south to a non-visible line extending west from E 20th Avenue, east to E 20th Avenue, east to Penn Circle, north to Craig Drive, east to the end of Craig Drive, southeast along a non-visible line to the southern boundary of Nunaka Valley Park, east to Beaver Place, south to Baxter Road, south to Tudor Road, west to Elmore Road, south to Dowling Road, west to Lake Otis Parkway, north to the point of beginning.

House District 19 – Senate District J – Downtown Anchorage

House District 19 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of E 4th Avenue and Juneau Street, south on Juneau Street to E 5th Avenue, east to Airport Heights Drive, south to Debarr Road, west to Lake Otis Parkway, south to E 20th Avenue, west to the north fork of Chester Creek, south to Chester Creek, west to the New Seward Highway, south to Fireweed Lane, west to Arctic Boulevard, south to W 25th Avenue, west to Spenard Road, south to W 26th Avenue, west to Minnesota Drive, south to Northern Lights Boulevard, west to the Alaska Railroad, north then northeast to a non-visible line extending north from the end of L Street, south to L Street, south to W 4th Avenue, east to the point of beginning.

House District 20 – Senate District J – Mountainview/Airport Heights

House District 20 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Lake Otis Parkway and E Northern Lights Boulevard, east on E Northern Lights Boulevard to Nichols Street, north to E 20th Avenue, east to Bragaw Street, north to Reka Drive, east to the powerlines extending south from Pine Street, north to Pine Street, north to McCarrey Street, north to Mountainview Drive, west to N Pine Street, north to McPhee Avenue, west to the boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, southwest then south to Taylor Street, south to Thompson Avenue, west to the boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, west to Reeve Boulevard, south to E 5th Avenue, east to Airport Heights Drive, south to Debarr Road, west to Lake Otis Parkway, south to the point of beginning.

House District 21 – Senate District K – South Muldoon

House District 21 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Debarr Road and Boniface Parkway, south on Boniface Parkway to a non-visible line extending west from E 20th Avenue, east to E 20th Avenue, east to Penn Circle, north to Craig Drive, east to the end of Craig Drive, southeast along a non-visible line to the southern boundary of Nunaka Valley Park, east to Beaver Place, south to Baxter
House District 22 – Senate District K – North Muldoon

House District 22 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Debarr Road and Pine Street, north on Pine Street to McCarrey Street, north to the Glenn Highway, east to a non-visible line extending north from Boundary Avenue near Patterson Street, south along a non-visible line to Boundary Avenue, east to Muldoon Road, south to Duben Avenue, east to the boundary of Fort Richardson, south to a non-visible line extending east from the end of Debarr Road, west along a non-visible line to Debarr Road, west to a non-visible line extending east from Debarr Road and Muldoon Road, west along a non-visible line to Debarr Road, west to the point of beginning.

House District 23 – Senate District L – Government Hill/JBER/Northeast Anchorage

House District 23 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Glenn Highway and McCarrey Street, north on McCarrey Street to Mountainview Drive, west to Pine Street, north to McPhee Avenue, west to the boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, west then south to Taylor Street, south to Thompson Avenue, west to the boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, west to Reeve Boulevard, south to E 5th Avenue, west to Juneau Street, north to E 4th Avenue, west to L Street, north to the end of L Street, north along a non-visible line to the Alaska Railroad, northeast to a non-visible line extending east near W 2nd Avenue, west on the non-visible line to the shoreline of Knik Arm, west then northwest along a non-visible line to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, north to the northern boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, southeast then south then east then south to Loop Road, east to the Alaska Railroad, east then northeast to Fossil Creek, east then northeast to the boundary of Fort Richardson, north then east to the Glenn Highway, southwest to the western boundary of Fort Richardson, south then west to a non-visible line extending northeast from the end of Peck Avenue, southwest to Peck Avenue, southwest then west to the boundary of Fort Richardson, south to Duben Avenue, west to Muldoon Road, north to Boundary Avenue, west to a non-visible line extending north from Patterson Street, north along a non-visible line to the Glenn Highway, west to the point of beginning.

House District 24 – Senate District L – North Eagle River/Chugiak

House District 24 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Sun Beau Drive and Eagle River Loop Road, north then northwest on Eagle River Loop Road to Lazy Street, south to Easy Street, west to the Old Glenn Highway, south then west to Mausel Street, then north to Artillery Road, west then north then west to the boundary of Fort Richardson, south then west then southwest along the boundary of Fort Richardson to Fossil Creek, west to the Alaska Railroad, west then southwest to Loop Road, north then northwest then west to the boundary of Elmendorf Air Force Base, north then west then north then west to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, northeast then east then south then east then south to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, west to the ridgeline between Eagle River and Peters Creek, northwest along the ridgeline to a non-visible line extending east from the headwaters of Meadow Creek, west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Meadow Creek,
northwest to a non-visible line extending north from the boundary of Chugach State Park, south along a non-visible line to the boundary of Chugach State Park, west to Steeple Drive, southwest to Eagle River Lane, south to War Admiral Road, northwest then west to Sun Beau Drive, southwest to the point of beginning.

House District 25 – Senate District M – Palmer/Butte

House District 25 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Glenn Highway and the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, east then southeast then east to Glacier Fork, northwest to Metal Creek, southwest to the Knik River, west along the northern bank of the Knik River to the confluence with Jim Creek, northeast then east then south then north then south then west around the headwaters of Jim Creek to the confluence with McRoberts Creek, northwest to a small stream near Jim Lake, northeast to the shoreline of Jim Lake, south then east then north to an unnamed creek on the northeast side of the lake, northeast to the headwaters, northeast along a non-visible line to the ridgeline, northeast to a non-visible line extending southeast from a tributary of Wolverine Creek, northwest to a tributary of Wolverine Creek, northeast to its confluence with Wolverine Creek, northeast along a non-visible line to headwaters of an unnamed creek, northwest to the Matanuska River, west along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Matanuska River east of Eska Creek, southwest to a non-visible line east of E Collier Road, west along a non-visible line to the Glenn Highway, south to N Farm Loop Road, west then south to Fence Line Drive, southeast to Monte Carlo Lane, south to E Biscane Drive, west to N Ryder Drive, south to N Palmer-Fishhook Road, west then northwest to N Trunk Road, southwest to E Bogard Road, east to 49th Street, south to E Palmer-Wasilla Highway, east to a non-visible line east of Loma Prieta Drive, south along a non-visible line to Grandview Drive, southeast then southwest to a non-visible line north of Rabbit Slough, southeast to the western bank of the Matanuska River, south along the western bank to the Glenn Highway, south to the point of beginning.

House District 26 – Senate District M – Goose Bay/Gateway

House District 26 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the eastern boundary of the City of Wasilla and the Parks Highway, east along the Parks Highway to S Trunk Road, north to N Old Trunk Road, north to E Palmer-Wasilla Highway, east to a non-visible line east of Loma Prieta Drive, south along a non-visible line to Grandview Drive, southeast then southwest to a non-visible line north of Rabbit Slough, southeast to the western bank of the Matanuska River, south along the western bank to the Glenn Highway, south to the boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, south then southwest to a non-visible line extending south from the mouth of Crocker Creek, north to the mouth of Crocker Creek, northeast to Settlers Bay Drive, northwest to Crocker Creek, west then north to S Settlers Bay Drive, northeast then northwest to S Knik-Goose Bay Road, southwest to Carmel Road, west to S Aurora Drive, south then west to S Northern Lights Drive, south to Shearwater Street, west to Hallie Drive, north to W Carmel Road, west to the end of W Carmel Road, west along a non-visible line to an unnamed creek north of Threemile Lake, northeast to a non-visible line extending south from S Pond Lily Lane, north to S Pond Lily Lane, north to a non-visible line extending south from Whale Lake, north along a non-visible line to Whale Lake, west then northeast along the shoreline to a non-visible line extending north to an unnamed lake, north along a non-visible line to an unnamed lake, east then north then west to a non-visible line extending south from Lucille Creek, north along a non-visible line to Lucille Creek, east to a non-visible line extending south from the boundary of the City of Houston east of W Eastwind Circle,
north along a non-visible line to the boundary of the City of Houston, east then north to the Parks Highway, east to W Buttercup Drive, east to Sylvan Road, south to W Dun Fussin Road, east to a non-visible line east of Sylvan Road, south along a non-visible line to an unnamed lake north of Lucille Creek, west then south then east to a non-visible line extending north from Lucille Creek, south along a non-visible line to Lucille Creek, east to Vine Road, south to Bonaparte Avenue, east to S Rue de la Paix Loop, north to W Montclaire Avenue, east to W Lollybrock Drive, north then east to Foothills Boulevard, south to W Ronnies Circle, east then south to Overby Street, east then northeast to Saindon Street, east to Donovan Drive, northeast to S Clapp Street, south to Knik-Goose Bay Road, northeast to the boundary of the City of Wasilla, east then north along the city boundary to the point of beginning.

House District 27 – Senate District N – Wasilla/Meadow Lakes

House District 27 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the City of Houston and the Parks Highway, east to W Buttercup Drive, east to Sylvan Road, south to W Dun Fussin Road, east to a non-visible line east of Sylvan Road, south along a non-visible line to an unnamed lake north of Lucille Creek, west then south then east to a non-visible line extending north from Lucille Creek, south along a non-visible line to Lucille Creek, east to Vine Road, south to Bonaparte Avenue, east to S Rue de la Paix Loop, north to W Montclaire Avenue, east to W Lollybrock Drive, north then east to Foothills Boulevard, south to W Ronnies Circle, east then south to Overby Street, east then northeast to Saindon Street, east to Donovan Drive, northeast to S Clapp Street, south to Knik-Goose Bay Road, northeast to the boundary of the City of Wasilla, east then north then west then south then northwest then north then east then north then east around the city boundaries to Church Road, north to Shampine Avenue, east to N Sandhill Crane Street, north to W Trumpeter Swan Avenue, east then north to W Woodpecker Circle, east to N Infinite Road, north to the intersection with W Schrock Road, north along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Little Susitna River, west along the northern bank to the boundary of the City of Houston, south to the point of beginning.

House District 28 – Senate District N – Tanaina/Lakes

House District 28 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of N Trunk Road and E Bogard Road, to E Seldon Road, then west along E Bogard Road to Wasilla-Fishhook Road, northeast to a non-visible line extending from near E Polar Bear Drive, north then west then south along a non-visible line to the eastern end of Burlwood Drive, west to E Schrock Road, north then southwest to N Infinite Road, south to W Woodpecker Circle, west to W Trumpeter Swan Avenue, south then west to N Sandhill Crane Street, south to Shampine Avenue, west to Church Road, south to the boundary of the City of Wasilla, east then south then east then south then southeast then north then east then south to the Parks Highway, east to S Trunk Road, north to N Old Trunk Road, north to E Palmer-Wasilla Highway, east to 49th Street, north to E Bogard Road, west to the point of beginning.

House District 29 – Senate District O – Eastern Mat-Su/Valdez

House District 29 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the northeastern-most corner of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, south then west then south along the borough boundary to the Nelchina River, east to the shoreline of Tazlina Lake, northeast along the western shoreline to the Tazlina River, east along the northern bank of the Tazlina River to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, south to the Chugach ANRC boundary, east to the boundary of the Wrangell-Saint Elias National Park, south along
the park boundary to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest, west to a non-visible line extending east from the headwaters of the Lowe River, west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of the Lowe River, west to a non-visible line extending south from the Trans-Alaska Pipeline east of the boundary of the City of Valdez, north along a non-visible line to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, west to boundary of the City of Valdez, south then west then north to the boundary of the Chugach National Forest on the northern shoreline of Valdez Arm, west to the entrance of Sawmill Bay, west across the entrance to boundary of the Chugach National Forest, southwest then west to the entrance of Columbia Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay east of Long Point, west across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, west to the entrance of Long Channel, west across the entrance to the shoreline near Buyers Cove, southwest to a non-visible line extending northwest from Glacier Island, southeast along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Glacier Island, east along the shoreline to a non-visible line extending west from the northern-most point of Growler Island, east to Growler Island, east along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Glacier Island, south then west to the western-most point of Glacier Island, west to a peninsula of Land near Fairmount Bay, southwest to the entrance of a small bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of Prince William Sound, southwest then north then northwest to the entrance of a small unnamed bay east of Fairmount Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Fairmount Bay, west across the entrance to a non-visible line extending north from Fairmount Island, south along a non-visible line to Fairmount Island, southeast then south then west then north to a non-visible line extending south from Fairmount Point, then north to the shoreline near Fairmount Point, north to the entrance of Wells Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline near Unakwik Point, south then west to the entrance of Unakwik Inlet, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline north of Olsen Cove, south to a non-visible line extending west from Olsen Island, east to the shoreline of Olsen Island, northeast then southeast then south then west to a non-visible line extending east from a point south of Olsen Cove, west to the shoreline south of Olsen Cove, south then west to a small bay north of Kiniklik Island, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small bay northwest of Kiniklik Island, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Eaglek Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline of an island west of Eaglek Island, southwest then west to the western entrance of Eaglek Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, southwest then west to the entrance of a small cove east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of an unnamed bay east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Squaw Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, northwest to the entrance of Squaw Bay, northwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of a small cove east of Esther Passage, west across the entrance to the shoreline, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline, southwest then west to the entrance of Quillian Bay, southwest across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Lake Bay, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the eastern shoreline of Port Wells, west along a non-visible line to the western shoreline of Port Wells east of Entry Cove, west to the entrance of Entry Cove, west across the entrance to the shoreline, west to the entrance of Passage Canal, west across the entrance to the shoreline, south then west to the boundary of the City of Whittier, north then west to the boundary of the Municipality of Anchorage, north then east then north then west to Glacier Fork, northwest to Metal Creek, southwest to the Knik River, west along the northern bank of the Knik River to the confluence with Jim Creek, northeast then east then south then north then south then west around the headwaters of Jim Creek to the confluence with McRoberts Creek, northwest to a small stream near Jim Lake, northeast to the shoreline of Jim Lake, south then east then north to an unnamed creek on the
northeast side of the lake, northeast to the headwaters, northeast along a non-visible line to the ridgeline, northeast to a non-visible line extending southeast from a tributary of Wolverine Creek, northwest to a tributary of Wolverine Creek, northeast to its confluence with Wolverine Creek, northeast along a non-visible line to headwaters of an unnamed creek, northwest to the Matanuska River, west along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Matanuska River east of Eska Creek, southwest to a non-visible line east of E Collier Road, west along a non-visible line to the Glenn Highway, south to N Farm Loop Road, west then south to Fence Line Drive, southeast to Monte Carlo Lane, south to E Biscane Drive, west to N Ryder Drive, south to N Palmer-Fishhook Road, west then northwest to N Trunk Road, southwest to E Bogard Road, to E Seldon Road, west to Wasilla-Fishhook Road, northeast to a non-visible line extending south from near E Polar Bear Drive, north then west then south along a non-visible line to the eastern end of Burlwood Drive, west to E Schrock Road, north then southwest to the intersection with N Infinite Road, north along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Little Susitna River, northeast to N Sushana Drive, west then east to Schwald Road, east to Moose Meadows Road, northeast to an unnamed creek, northwest to a non-visible line extending west from an unnamed creek, east along a non-visible line to an unnamed creek, north to a non-visible line extending south from the Bald Mountain Ridgeline, north along a non-visible line to the Bald Mountain Ridgeline, north to the Talkeetna Mountains Ridgeline, northeast to a non-visible line extending south from the headwaters of Bartholf Creek, north to Bartholf Creek, north to the confluence with the Kashwitna River, north along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Sheep Creek, northwest to the Iron Creek Trail, north to the Sheep River, west to the Talkeetna River, north to a non-visible line extending southeast from Cache Lake, northeast along a non-visible line to Cache Lake, northeast along a non-visible line to a tributary of Disappointment Creek, northwest to a non-visible line extending east from a tributary of Chunilna Creek, west to a tributary of Chunilna Creek, west to the confluence with Chunilna Creek, north to the Philips Lake Trail, northwest to Deadhorse Creek, northwest to the eastern bank of the Susitna River, north to the Alaska Railroad, north then west to the Parks Highway, north to the boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, east then north then east to the point of beginning.

**House District 30 – Senate District O – Houston/Big Lake/Parks Highway**

House District 30 is bounded by a line beginning at northeastern-most corner of the Denali Borough, west then southwest then south to the boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, south then east then southeast then northeast along the borough boundary to a non-visible line extending south from the mouth of Crocker Creek, north to the mouth of Crocker Creek, northeast to Settlers Bay Drive, northwest to Crocker Creek, west then north to S Settlers Bay Drive, northeast then northwest to S Knik-Goose Bay Road, southwest to Carmel Road, west to S Aurora Drive, south then west to S Northern Lights Drive, south to Shearwater Street, west to Hallie Drive, north to W Carmel Road, west to the end of W Carmel Road, west along a non-visible line to an unnamed creek north of Threemile Lake, northeast to a non-visible line extending south from S Pond Lily Lane, north to S Pond Lily Lane, north to non-visible line extending south from Whale Lake, north along a non-visible line to Whale Lake, west then northeast along the shoreline to a non-visible line extending north to an unnamed lake, north along a non-visible line to an unnamed lake, east then north then west to a non-visible line extending south from Lucille Creek, north along a non-visible line to Lucille Creek, east to a non-visible line extending south from the boundary of the City of Houston east of W Eastwind Circle, north along a non-visible line to the boundary of the City of Houston, east then north along the city boundary to the northern bank of the Little Susitna River, east then northeast along the northern bank to N Sushana Drive, west then east to Schwald Road, east to Moose Meadows Road, northeast to an unnamed creek, northwest to a non-visible line extending west from an unnamed creek, east along a non-visible line to an unnamed creek,
north to a non-visible line extending south from the Bald Mountain Ridgeline, north along a non-visible line to the Bald Mountain Ridgeline, north to the Talkeetna Mountains Ridgeline, northeast to a non-visible line extending south from the headwaters of Bartholf Creek, north to Bartholf Creek, north to the confluence with the Kashwitna River, north along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Sheep Creek, northwest to the Iron Creek Trail, north to the Sheep River, west to the Talkeetna River, north to a non-visible line extending southeast from Cache Lake, northwest along a non-visible line to Cache Lake, northeast along a non-visible line to a tributary of Disappointment Creek, northwest to a non-visible line extending east from a tributary of Chunilna Creek, west to a tributary of Chunilna Creek, west to the confluence with Chunilna Creek, north to the Philips Lake Trail, northwest to Deadhorse Creek, northwest to the eastern bank of the Susitna River, north to the Alaska Railroad, north then west to the Parks Highway, north to the boundary of Denali Borough, east then north to the point of beginning.

House District 31 – Senate District P – Downtown Fairbanks

House District 31 is bounded by a line beginning at intersection of the Old Richardson Highway and Easy Street, south on Easy Street to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, south then west then north then west then north then west then north then west then north then east then north then east along the city boundary to the confluence of the Chena River with Noyes Slough, north along a non-visible line to the southern bank of Noyes Slough, northeast to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, north then east then south then east then north then east to Farmers Loop Road Extended, southeast to a non-visible line extending west from the New Steese Highway, east along a non-visible line to the New Steese Highway, south to the New Richardson Highway, south to a ramp to S Cushman Street, south to the Mitchell Expressway, west to S Cushman Street, south to the Old Richardson Highway, east to the point of beginning.

House District 32 – Senate District P – East Fairbanks/Fort Wainwright

House District 32 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Ownby Road and Benn Lane, north on Benn Lane to Bradway Road, east to Burgess Airstrip Road, north to Badger Road, north then northwest to Endecott Avenue, west to Mattie Street, north to Bobanna Lane, west to a jeep trail, north to Badger Road, west to Joy Drive, north to Canono Road, north to Micheal Lane, west to the end of Michael Lane, west along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Chena River, north along the southern bank to a non-visible line south of Homestead Road, north along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Chena River, west then southwest to an unnamed creek extended southeast of Homestead Road N, northwest to Homestead Road N, north to a jeep trail, northwest to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, north then west then south then west to Farmers Loop Road Extended, southeast to a non-visible line extending west from the New Steese Highway, east along a non-visible line to the New Steese Highway, south to the New Richardson Highway, south to a ramp to S Cushman Street, south to the Mitchell Expressway, west to S Cushman Street, south to the Old Richardson Highway, east to Easy Street, south to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, east then south to the northern bank of the Tanana River, east to an unnamed creek near Levee Way, north to the Richardson Highway, east to the boundary of the City of North Pole, northwest then north then east to an unnamed creek west of Boulder Avenue, northeast to a non-visible line west of Lions Road, northeast along a non-visible line to Badger Road, north to Marigold Road, west to Woll Road, south to Ownby Road, west to the point of beginning.
House District 33 - Senate District Q - North Pole/Badger

House District 33 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Ownby Road and Benn Lane, north on Benn Lane to Bradway Road, east to Burgess Airstrip Road, north to Badger Road, north then northwest to Endecott Avenue, west to Mattie Street, north to Bobanna Lane, west to a jeep trail, north to Badger Road, west to Joy Drive, north to Canono Road, north to Micheal Lane, west to the end of Michael Lane, west along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Chena River, north along the southern bank to a non-visible line south of Homestead Road, north along a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Chena River, west then southwest to an unnamed creek extended southeast of Homestead Road N, northwest to Homestead Road N, north to a jeep trail, northwest to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, east then north then west along the city boundary to a non-visible line extending southeast from the end of Falcon View Street, northwest to the end of Falcon View Street, east then north to Chena Hot Springs Road, east to Hopper Creek, southeast to a winter trail east of Severns Road, east to the Little Chena River, east along the northern bank to a non-visible line just north of a Sled Road, east along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Little Chena River, south to a Sled Road, east to a non-visible line extending north from Mullen Slough, south along a non-visible line to Mullen Slough, southeast to the confluence with the Chena River, southwest along the northern bank to a non-visible line just west of the boundary of Eielson Air Force Base, west then south along a non-visible line to the boundary of Eielson Air Force Base, south then west to the Richardson Highway, northwest to the Moose Creek Dam Levee, southwest to the Alaska Railroad, southwest to Dyke Road, south to Piledriver Slough, south across a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Tanana River, northwest along the northern bank to an unnamed creek near Levee Way, north to the Richardson Highway, east to the boundary of the City of North Pole, northwest then north then east to an unnamed creek west of Boulder Avenue, northeast to an non-visible line west of Lions Road, northeast along a non-visible line to Badger Road, north to Marigold Road, west to Woll Road, south to Ownby Road, west to the point of beginning.

House District 34 – Senate District Q – Steele Creek/Two Rivers/Eielson/Salcha

House District 34 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of Farmers Loop Road and Iniauk Avenue, east on Iniauk Avenue to Henrik Court, south then southeast to the end of Henrik Court, southeast then east along a non-visible line to RJ Loop, north then east then south to a non-visible line extending west from the intersection of College Road and Alaska Way, east along a non-visible line to College Road, east to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, east then south then northeast then north then east then north then north along the city boundary to a non-visible line extending southeast from the end of Falcon View Street, northwest to the end of Falcon View Street, east then north to Chena Hot Springs Road, east to Hopper Creek, southeast to a winter trail east of Severns Road, east to the Little Chena River, east along the northern bank to a non-visible line just north of a Sled Road, east along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Little Chena River, south to a Sled Road, east to a non-visible line extending north from Mullen Slough, south along a non-visible line to Mullen Slough, southeast to the confluence with the Chena River, southwest along the northern bank to a non-visible line just west of the boundary of Eielson Air Force Base, west then south along a non-visible line to the boundary of Eielson Air Force Base, south then west to the Richardson Highway, northwest to the Moose Creek Dam Levee, southwest to the Alaska Railroad, southwest to Dyke Road, south to Piledriver Slough, south across a non-visible line to the northern bank of the Tanana River, southeast along the northern bank to a non-visible line south of Loon Song Lane, southwest along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Tanana River, southeast to the boundary of the Fairbanks North Star Borough,
northeast then north then west along the borough boundary to a non-visible line extending east from the
headwaters of Boulder Creek, west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Boulder Creek,
south to the confluence with the north fork of the Chena River, southwest to Chena Hot Springs Road,
west to a trail north of Chena Hot Springs Road, west to W Fork Road, northwest to Trapper Loop,
southwest then southeast to a trail north of Chena Hot Springs Road, southwest to Chena Hot Springs
Road, south to a 4WD road west of Chena Hot Springs Road, south to Angel Creek, west to a non-visible
line extending south from the headwaters of Chena Dome Runoff Creek, north then west along a non-
visible line to the headwaters of Chena Dome Runoff Creek, west to the little Chena River, southwest to
the confluence with Miller Creek, north to Fish Creek, west to Fairbanks Creek Road, north to a small
tributary of Fairbanks Creek, south to Fairbanks Creek, west to a non-visible line extending south from
an unnamed road, north along a non-visible line to the unnamed road, east to a non-visible line
extending north from Fairbanks Creek, south along a non-visible line to Fairbanks Creek, west to
Fairbanks Creek Road, west then southwest then northwest to Skiland Road, southwest to Pedro Dome
Road, west then southwest to an unnamed road, west to a non-visible line extending north from the end
of Silver Fox Road, south along a non-visible line to Silver Fox Road, west then southwest to Old Murphy
Dome Road, southwest to a trail near the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, south to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline,
south to a non-visible line north of Goldstream Creek, west along a non-visible line to Goldstream Creek,
southwest to an unnamed lake, southwest along the southern shoreline to Goldstream Creek, west to a
non-visible line extending northeast from Ballaine Road, southwest along a non-visible line to Ballaine
Road, south to Farmers Loop Road, south to the point of beginning.

House District 35 – Senate District R – College/Ester/Chena Ridge

House District 35 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the boundary of the Fairbanks
North Star Borough and the Alaska Railroad, northeast then east then southeast along the railroad to
Sheep Creek Road, north to Goldstream Creek, southeast then east to a non-visible line extending north
from Miller Hill Road, south along a non-visible line to Miller Hill Road, south to a non-visible line north
of Railroad Drive, northeast along a non-visible line to Ballaine Road, south to Farmers Loop Road, south
to Iniauk Avenue, east to Henrik Court, south then southeast to the end of Henrik Court, southeast
then east along a non-visible line to RJ Loop, north then east then south to a non-visible line extending
west from the intersection of College Road and Alaska Way, east along a non-visible line to College
Road, east to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, southwest along the city boundary to the southern
bank of Noyes Slough, south along the southern bank of Noyes Slough to the Chena River, south along a
non-visible line to the boundary of the City of Fairbanks, south then west then southeast then east then
south then east then north then east then south along the city boundary to the northern bank of the
Tanana River, southeast along the northern bank to a non-visible line south of Loon Song Lane,
southwest along a non-visible line to the southern bank of the Tanana River, southeast to the boundary
of the Fairbanks North Star Borough, west then northwest then north to the point of beginning.

House District 36- Senate District R – Copper River Basin/Delta/Tok/Yukon Drainage

House District 36 is bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the southern boundary of the
North Slope Borough and the Canadian Border, south along the border to the Chugach ANRC boundary,
northwest then west to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, north to the northern bank of the Tazlina River, west
to Tazlina Lake, southwest along the northern shoreline to the Nelchina River, west to the boundary of
the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, north then east then north then west to the boundary of the Denali
Borough, north to the boundary of the Fairbanks North Star Borough, east then northeast then north then west along the borough boundary to a non-visible line extending east from the headwaters of Boulder Creek, west to the headwaters of Boulder Creek, south to the confluence with the north fork of the Chena River, southwest to Chena Hot Springs Road, west to a trail north of Chena Hot Springs Road, west to W Fork Road, northwest to Trapper Loop, southwest then southeast to a trail north of Chena Hot Springs Road, southwest to Chena Hot Springs Road, south to a 4WD road west of Chena Hot Springs Road, south to Angel Creek, west to a non-visible line extending south from the headwaters of Chena Dome Runoff Creek, north then west along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Chena Dome Runoff Creek, west to the little Chena River, southwest to the confluence with Miller Creek, north to Fish Creek, west to Fairbanks Creek Road, north to a small tributary of Fairbanks Creek, south to Fairbanks Creek, west to a non-visible line extending south from an unnamed road, north along a non-visible line to the unnamed road, east to a non-visible line extending north from Fairbanks Creek, south along a non-visible line to Fairbanks Creek, west to Fairbanks Creek Road, west then southwest then northwest to Skiland Road, southwest to Pedro Dome Road, west then southwest to an unnamed road, west to a non-visible line extending north from the end of Silver Fox Road, south along a non-visible line to Silver Fox Road, west then southwest to Old Murphy Dome Road, southwest to a trail near the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, south to the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, south to a non-visible line north of Goldstream Creek, west along a non-visible line to Goldstream Creek, southwest to an unnamed lake, southwest along the southern shoreline to Goldstream Creek, west to a non-visible line extending northeast from Ballaine Road, southwest along a non-visible line to Ballaine Road, southwest along a non-visible line to Miller Hill Road north of Railroad Drive, north to the end of Miller Hill Road, north along a non-visible line to Goldstream Creek, west then northwest to Sheep Creek Road, south to the Alaska Railroad, north then west then southwest then northwest to the boundary of the Fairbanks North Star Borough, south then southeast to the boundary of the Denali Borough, west then southwest then south to the boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, south to the boundary of the Doyon ANRC, west then north then northeast then north to the boundary of the North Slope Borough, east then north then east to the point of beginning.

House District 37 – Senate District S – Bristol Bay/Aleutians/Kuskuk

House District 37 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the intersection of the Doyon ANRC boundary and the western boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, south then east then southeast along the borough boundary to the centerline of Cook Inlet, southwest then south to a non-visible line west of Diamond Creek, east along a non-visible line to the entrance of Kachemak Bay, south across the entrance to the shoreline near Point Pogibshi, south along the shoreline to the entrance of Port Graham, southeast then southwest then northwest along the northern shoreline of Port Graham to an unnamed creek, southwest to a non-visible line extending east from an unnamed lake on the English Bay River, east along a non-visible line to an unnamed lake, south along the western shoreline to an unnamed creek, west then south to the Mount Bede Ridgeline, northwest to a non-visible line extending southeast from an unnamed creek north of Point Bede, northwest to an unnamed creek, west to the shoreline of Cook Inlet, south to the entrance of Kennedy Entrance, south across the entrance to the boundary of the Kenai Peninsula Borough, west then southwest to the 3-mile limit of the Pacific Ocean near Sukoi Bay, southwest along the 3-mile limit to the boundary of the Lake and Peninsula Borough, southwest to the boundary of the Aleutians East Borough including Chirikof and the Semedi Islands, southwest then northwest then east around the entire Aleutian Island Chain and the Pribilof Islands to the western Bristol Bay ANRC boundary south of Port Heiden, northeast then north then west to the Calista ANRC boundary, west then north to a non-visible line north of the Indian River, east then southeast along a non-visible line to the shoreline of the Carter Bay north of the Indian River,
south to the mouth of the Indian River, east to the confluence with the north fork of the Indian River, east to the headwaters of the headwaters of the north fork of the Indian River, southeast along a non-visible line to the headwaters of Camp Creek, east to the confluence with Barnum Creek, southeast to the confluence with Native Creek, south to the confluence with the Goodnews River, northeast to Goodnews Lake, northeast along the southern shoreline to Igniumanik Creek, northeast to the Bristol Bay ANRC boundary, northeast to the boundary of the Kuspuk School District, northwest then north to the Doyon ANRC boundary, east to the point of beginning.

**House District 38 – Senate District S – Lower Kuskokwim**

House District 38 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the boundary of the Kuspuk School District and the southern boundary of the Kusilvak Census Area, southwest along the census area boundary to a non-visible line extending south from the headwaters of the Pitmik River, north along a non-visible line to the Pitmik River, north then west along the southern bank to the confluence with the Kashunuk River, west along the northern bank to the confluence with the Kokechik River, west along the southern bank to the confluence with Komoiarak Slough, northwest then southwest along a non-visible line to the eastern boundary of the City of Hooper Bay, south to the shoreline of Hooper Bay, east to the non-visible line extending out east and north from south of the City of Hooper Bay, south then west along a non-visible line to the 3-mile limit of the Bering Sea, south then southwest to a non-visible line north of the Indian River including Saint Matthew and Nunivak Islands, east then southeast along a non-visible line to the shoreline of Carter Bay north of the Indian River, south to the mouth of the Indian River, east to the confluence with Barnum Creek, southeast to the confluence with Native Creek, northeast to Goodnews Lake, northeast along the southern shoreline to Igniumanik Creek, northeast to the Bristol Bay ANRC boundary, northeast to the boundary of the Kuspuk School District, northwest then north to the point of beginning.

**House District 39 – Senate District T – Bering Straits/Yukon Delta**

House District 39 includes all uplands and islands bounded by a line beginning at the northern-most point for the Bering Straits ANRC boundary, south then east to the Doyon ANRC boundary, south to the boundary of the Kuspuk School District, south to the boundary of the Kusilvak Census Area, southwest along the census area boundary to a non-visible line extending south from the headwaters of the Pitmik River, north along a non-visible line to the Pitmik River, north then west along the southern bank to the confluence with the Kashunuk River, west along the northern bank to the confluence with the Kokechik River, west along the southern bank to the confluence with Komoiarak Slough, southwest along a non-visible line to the eastern boundary of the City of Hooper Bay, south to the shoreline of Hooper Bay, east to the non-visible line extending out east and north from south of the City of Hooper Bay, south then west along a non-visible line to the 3-mile limit of the Bering Sea, north along the 3-mile limit to the Bering Straits ANRC boundary, northeast then west then north including Saint Lawrence and Little Diomede Islands to the point of beginning.
House District 40 – Senate District T – Arctic
House District 40 includes all uplands and islands within the Northwest Arctic Borough and the North Slope Borough.
## April 2022 Senate Term Allocation Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Senate District</th>
<th>Previous 2013 Senate District (election year)</th>
<th>Largest Remaining Constituency</th>
<th>Percentage of Constituency Change</th>
<th>Election years</th>
<th>Truncated due to (1) population change or (2) election term assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ketchikan, Sitka</td>
<td>A R (2020)</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau</td>
<td>B Q (2018)</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak, Homer</td>
<td>C P (2020)</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai/Soldotna/Nikiski</td>
<td>D O (2018)</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>E G (2018)</td>
<td>49.9%</td>
<td>50.1%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>no truncation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>F M (2018)</td>
<td>95.0%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>G L (2020)</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>H K (2018)</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>I I (2018)</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>no truncation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>J J (2020)</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>K H (2020)</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage</td>
<td>L G (2018)</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsu</td>
<td>M F (2020)</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsu</td>
<td>N D (2020)</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsu</td>
<td>O E (2018)</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>no truncation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks, City</td>
<td>P A (2018)</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, 2nd term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Pole/FNSB</td>
<td>Q B (2020)</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>yes, population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior/Ester</td>
<td>R C (2018)</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>2022, 2024, 2028</td>
<td>yes, both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Bay/Bethel</td>
<td>S S (2018)</td>
<td>95.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>2022, 2026, 2030</td>
<td>no truncation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Arctic/North Slope</td>
<td>T T (2020)</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2024, 2028</td>
<td>no truncation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Previous 2013 Senate Seat N was divided among new seats K (47.3%), E (46.9%) and F (5%) and did not constitute a plurality of any new seat*
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T |
| 36206 | 0 | 28869 | 6271 | 0 | 610 | 8013 | 22271 |
| 9407 | 25054 | 9325 | 454 | 8193 | 5293 | 3 |
| 1619 | 7739 | 27768 | 4345 |
| 19347 | 274 | 23453 | 5866 |
| 16955 | 0 | 206 | 30507 |
| 4802 | 434 | 73 |
| 2447 | 32098 | 434 | 3059 |
| 28064 | 3978 | 1825 |
| 17109 | 1827 | 17352 |

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T |
| 0 | 12 | 36317 | 0 | 623 |
| 2796 | 35090 | 34345 | 1846 |

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N | O | P | Q | R | S | T |
| 1811 | 961 | 35358 | 1072 | 34495 | 919 |

2022 April Proclamation

2013 Amended Proclamation

2013 Amended Proclamation
Date: Saturday April 2, 2022
Time: New time: **2:00pm**
Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85829474438?pwd=S1dhcUJiOUp0U1FaWi9HZHkzOWvdz09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

*Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers: Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085*

### Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Adoption of Minutes from February 16, 2022 meeting
4. Public Testimony
5. Review of Supreme Court Decision, Matt Singer, Schwabe
6. Adjournment
Date:   Monday April 4, 2022
Time:   8:00am
Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor
       1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.
       https://us06web.zoom.us/j/92791054072?pwd=N05PUUNWQzLEQ29sUTcxdC9RWXBxUT09
       
       Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference
       
       Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers:
       Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

   Agenda

   1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum
   2. Adoption of Agenda
   3. Public Testimony
   4. Discussion: Process
   5. Public Testimony
   6. Adjournment
Date: Tuesday April 5, 2022

Time: 10:00am

Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81181793309?pwd=dndjOE1IRe1rclhQTVGK2JrWV5QT09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers:
Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum

2. Adoption of Agenda

3. Public Testimony

4. Board Member Comments

5. Adjournment
Date:   Wednesday April 6, 2022
Time:   10:00am
Place:    Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor
1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/81645951458?pwd=ejlodmVHMTlzYUY1WU93UGNnMkh2QT09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers:
Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Public Testimony Specific to District 29, 30 and 36
4. Possible Adoption of revised District 29, 30 and 36
5. Public Testimony, All topics
6. Consideration of alternative pairings proposals
7. Adjournment
Date: April 7, 2022

Time: Thursday, April 7: 12:00pm (noon)

Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor
1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/89928032095?pwd=aHVxTXdNVEhNNTNvL0xMeVhkaXc3QT09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers:
Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum

2. Adoption of Agenda

3. Public Testimony

4. Adjournment
Date: April 8, 2022

Time: Friday, April 8: 10:00am

Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom. 
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/84824044220?pwd=L2JuNm9GeEQzeGdUemVTZ3pZnBsdz09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers: Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum

2. Adoption of Agenda

3. Public Testimony

4. Adjournment
Date: April 9, 2022

Time: Saturday, April 9: 12:00pm (noon)

Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.

https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85100763957?pwd=YUZUL01xb2NNU0xjUGIxUnRmbU5PZz09

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers: Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum

2. Adoption of Agenda

3. Public Testimony

4. Adjournment
Date: April 13, 2022
Time: Wednesday, April 13: 1:00pm
Place: Anchorage Legislative Information Office, Denali Conference Room, 1st Floor
1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage 99503 and Zoom.
https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88213358324

Public Testimony in Person at LIO or via Dial-in Teleconference

Teleconference public listen-in and testimony phone numbers:
Anchorage 563-9085, Juneau 586-9085, Other 844-586-9085

Agenda

1. Call to Order and Establish Quorum
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Discussion of proposed Anchorage Senate Pairings
4. Possible Adoption of Anchorage Senate Pairings
5. Possible Adoption of Revised Proclamation
6. Adjournment
In the Matter Of:

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

April 02, 2022

PACIFIC RIM REPORTING
STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTERS
711 M STREET, SUITE 4
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
907-272-4383
www.courtreportersalaska.com
Members Present:

John Binkley, Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke, Board Member
Bethany Marcum, Board Member
Nicole Borromeo, Board Member
Peter Torkelson, Executive Director
Matt Singer, Legal Counsel
PROCEEDINGS

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Well, we're going to call the meeting of the Alaska Redistricting Board to order. It's April 2nd, at 2 p.m.

Mr. Executive director, if you could please call the roll to establish a quorum is present.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

Member Borromeo.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum.

MEMBER MARCUM: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Bahnke.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm here.

MR. TORKELSON: And Member Binkley.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I am here.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay. We have four members present and accounted for. We have a quorum.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We might also mention that Member Simpson, due to a death in the family, was not able to participate today, and we've excused his absence here. But he does plan to be here on Monday when we resume.
What I would like to do is, since I'm not able to be on videoconference, I would like to turn it over to Member Borromeo, who is there in the meeting, to chair the meeting if you would, Member Borromeo.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Happy to, John. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'd like to ask those online, if you're not speaking, to please mute your phone. We are getting a lot of background noise here, and we're going to have a review of the Supreme Court decision from the board's attorney coming up, and I'm sure everyone is going to want to be able to hear that loud and clear.

So moving on to agenda item No. 2 is the adoption of the agenda. I'd like to entertain a motion and a second.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So moved to adopt the agenda.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Madam Chairwoman, I second.

And, Peter, I have a request for you. Are you able to pull up the documents that we're reviewing onto the screen as we review them, like the agenda?
MR. TORKELSON: Well, I may be able to do that, yes. Let me take a moment to shift gears, but yes, I think I can do that.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. While Peter's doing that, there's a motion and a second to adopt the agenda. Is there any opposition?

Hearing none, the agenda is adopted. Agenda item No. 3 is the adoption of minutes from February 16th, 2022. I'd like to entertain a motion and a second to adopt those, as well.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Madam Chair, I would move for adoption of the minutes (indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

MEMBER MARCUM: Seconded.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Oh, okay.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I believe that was Melanie. So a motion and a second to adopt the February 16th minutes. Any objection?

Hearing none, those are also unanimously adopted.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Madam Chair, (indiscernible) Bethany who seconded.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Oh, that was Bethany. Thank you for that correction. We'll go ahead and make sure that that's noted.
Agenda item No. 4, we are cruising right along here, is public testimony.

The redistricting board has been faithful about opening our meetings and ending them with public testimony, so we'd like to (indiscernible) --

(Video recording begins playing.)

MR. TORKELSON: I think we're back.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. We're back now.

Mr. Zuckerberg is having a barbecue, and we are here in Anchorage, Alaska, ready to take public testimony on the Alaska Redistricting Board's maps and Senate pairings.

So we'd like to open the floor right now to public testimony. We do have a number of Alaskans in the room and online. We have 14 individuals online, I see here.

So I think what we'll do, in the interest of time, is just get straight to it. And we'll go to the folks online, if that's okay with those in the room.

We're going to start with --

(Audio feedback.)

MR. TORKELSON: I got that (indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Anna Brawley.

If we can unmute Anna, we'll take her public
testimony first.

MS. BRAWLEY: Yes, Chair. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can. Good morning -- or good afternoon, Anna.

MS. BRAWLEY: Thank you. For the record, my name is Anna Brawley, and I'm an Anchorage resident, and specifically in the neighborhood of Turnagain.

So I'm calling today just to -- so I understand that the -- the Court rulings had to do with East Anchorage and not our area in West Anchorage, but I was just calling in to provide testimony that if you are considering changing of the pairing of the House districts and Senate districts, that I would support pairing House Districts 14 and 16 together instead of what's being proposed or has already been done.

And the reason is because in West Anchorage and Midtown, there is a fair amount of continuity. You know, we have a residential area. We also have the airport on the far west side.

And then -- and then we have the connection of Northern Lights Boulevard, which is -- kind of transitions from residential into commercial in Midtown. So, you know, we in Turnagain, and then folks in Spenard, you know, we are very similar
neighborhoods. I actually live in the part of
Turnagain that people think it's Spenard usually, and
just a lot of established neighborhoods, similar
interests.

And then a lot of -- you know, a lot of
guys use the Midtown Northern Lights commercial area
all the way to Rogers Park for our shopping and other
needs.

So anyway, just encouraging that if you are
considering other pairings, that you pair House
District 14 and 16 together. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Anna. We
appreciate your time today.

Next in the queue is Casey Kasort, Casey
from Fairbanks.

MS. KASORT: Hi. Thank you for sharing
testimony today.

My name is Casey Kasort, and I'm calling and
representing myself.

I have to say, I'm not at all surprised by
the Alaska Supreme Court decision overturning the
gerrymandered map, since myself and so many other
Alaskans called in so many times, waited hours and
hours on hold to testify, and specifically identified
the areas that would be unconstitutional. And you
ignored public input for partisan maps that were, indeed, unconstitutional.

I'm also a little dismayed that you're hearing new public testimony now rather than simply looking at that enormous body of testimony that you already have but decided to ignore last year.

But since we are here, I will urge you to act immediately to wrap up this confusing process by adopting a map that has already been vetted through the whole public process, which would mean adopting the Senate pairings that were proposed by Board Member Melanie Bahnke.

In conclusion, I'd really like to see redistricting wrapped up quickly and constitutionally this time so that we can focus on navigating the upcoming special election and our first election cycle with ranked-choice voting.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Casey.

Next in the queue is Senator Begich.

SENATOR BEGICH: I'm not on to testify. I'm just here to listen.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Oh, you're just here to listen. Thank you, Senator.

Nicky Eiseman from Ester.
MS. EISEMAN: (Indiscernible.)

MEMBER BORROMEO: Good afternoon, Nicky.

MS. EISEMAN: Hi. Okay. Nicky Eiseman calling in from Ester. And just like Casey, I, too, am urging the board to adopt the Senate pairings suggested by Member Melanie Bahnke. And yes, would love to get this process done as soon as possible.

As a Fairbanksan, I also wanted to speak once again about the error of including residents of Goldstream Valley in its current district, which is largely rural. Residents of Goldstream are largely urban in nature and definitely drive to work to Fairbanks every day. They work and play in Fairbanks. And any other characterization of that is false.

All testimony regarding Goldstream Valley supported inclusion of Goldstream Valley residents into a Fairbanks district. And it was particularly galling to me to see the chairman, who is from Fairbanks, suggest otherwise, because he was a Fairbanks expert and so everybody looked to him, and seemed to really ignore all the testimony which talked about Fairbanks being part of -- of Goldstream Valley being part of the university community, being part of the Fairbanks community.
Given the focus on public testimony in this whole redistricting process, I want to take a moment to just revisit the evening at the Carlson Center when there was testimony. And I'm bringing this up now because I always think there's a possibility to do something better in the future.

I went in. I was planning to testify, and I watched person after person being, what I'm going to call, grilled.

You know, when you testify, you're giving your opinion, and you're stating why it's important to you. But you're not there to allow the chair to make a point, to be the expert. You're there just to state your opinion.

And after watching three or four people being in what felt like very intimidating situations by the questions they were asked by the chair, I decided not to testify.

So I just -- I just want to say that, to speak to the importance of accepting testimony for what it is and not using the chair -- the voice of the chair to try and turn it into something other than testimony.

So thank you for hearing me.

MEMBER BORROMEO: You're welcome. Thank you
for calling in, Nicky.

Also from Fairbanks, next is Luke Hopkins.


MEMBER BORROMEO: We can hear you loud and clear. Go ahead.

MR. HOPKINS: Thank you very much. I --

AUTOMATED VOICE: The host would like you to unmute your microphone. You can press star 6 to unmute.

MR. HOPKINS: Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can hear you, Luke. Go ahead, please.

Okay. There seems to be a little bit of technical difficulty with Luke.

So what we'll do is we'll move on next to Carolyn Cliff (phonetic) in Anchorage, and then hopefully we can get the problem with Luke figured out.

Carolyn?

MR. HOPKINS: Am I there?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes. Can you -- can you hear me, Luke? Luke, can you hear me?

Sorry. I had to. Too easy. Too easy.

MR. HOPKINS: Can you hear me?
MEMBER BORROMEO: You cannot hear me. Luke, can --

Can you (indiscernible), Luke, and we'll go to Carolyn, and then Peter will try and get ahold of Luke.

Carolyn? Carolyn Cliff?

MS. CLIFF: Can you hear me? This is Carolyn.

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can hear you. Can you hear us?

MS. CLIFF: Okay. Good. You know, I can hear Luke, by the way. Yeah, that was pretty confusing.

So I live in District 21, the new District 21, which is bordering to District 20-J. It's bordering to District 19-J, and it's bordering to District 12-F.

And we actually used to have the Basher people in our district, but they are now in 9-E. And you have us grouped up with 22-K. And I'm looking at map No. 1, and I can't even see a population area next to our district because it is all on the Base. And there's no way to get from our district to Eagle River without going through two other districts. I just thought I'd point that out. It is not
contiguous. It is not socioeconomic the same at all.

I heard something about shopping. There is no shopping in South Muldoon that they don't already have in Eagle River. So there -- there's absolutely no -- no connection between our district and Eagle River. So I'd like to point that out.

And I also believe that Melanie Bahnke had some nice -- had a nice plan, and I would support that.

So I don't know if you have any questions for me, but I am very aware of how difficult it was to have our district end last session, which went all the way down past Girdwood to Portage. And from my House in East Anchorage, to have to drive all the way down to -- I -- actually, Girdwood was as far as I ever went down to -- to meet people in my own Senate district. That was quite the trip, and totally had to go through two other districts to get there.

So this should not happen, and I wanted to point that out, that the districts need to be contiguous as far as transportation, as well as the land going through the Base to touch our land.

So thank you very much.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much,

Carolyn.
We're going to go ahead and stand at ease.

We understand that there is no sound being broadcast over the Zoom for those that are online right now.

So if everyone can just hang tight while we try and figure this out.

(At ease.)

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. We are back on the record. It is 2:25.

We're going to ask those members on the telephone line, we've got one, two, three, four, five, six, just please adhere to the two-minute testimony limit, if nothing else, just so we can get all of your input on record before anything else happens.

So we're going to go back to Fairbanks, to Luke Hopkins.

Luke, can you hear us?

MR. HOPKINS: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can hear you. Please proceed.

MR. HOPKINS: Thank you. Just bear with me a moment. I'm going to mute this for a moment.

Thank you.

Again, my name is Luke Hopkins, resident of the Fairbanks North Star Borough for 55 years.
And in the current District 4 -- I have testified before, and I am quite disappointed in the amount of public testimony that was given for certain actions for the redistricting areas in the Fairbanks North Star Borough and around the associated geographical areas, and I hope (indiscernible) speak to these same issues.

So I watched as this District 4 changed shape through past redistricting actions. The last decade, the board's decision to put the western area of the Fairbanks North Star Borough all the way out to almost western coast of Alaska, as previous District 38.

And as I -- as the Fairbanks North Star Borough at that time of the last redistricting process, which I was the mayor, I know there was objections to those board decisions on District 38 boundaries, and we participated in court actions that found those boundaries did not meet the constitutional requirements that the district be contiguous, compact, and contain relatively integrated socioeconomic areas.

So today I still object to the board's repeated actions to place this Goldstream population of the Fairbanks North Star Borough in a
non-contiguous, non-compact, and very limited to or
no integration of socioeconomic relationships with
the 45 other Alaskan communities in what is now
proposed to be House District 36.

I've raised these issues in my previous
testimony, as to where the vast majority of
Goldstream residents report back to local government,
where that is, where our schools are, where our
libraries and our churches are.

And while over the past many years
Goldstream has been contiguous with the Fairbanks
North Star Borough area, now if I do visit other
communities in the current HD 36 that's being
proposed, many of which I can only reach by plane.

So following the recent Alaska Supreme Court
decision that calls for the removing of District 36
Cantwell appendage, I hope this time around the board
can arrive at a redistricting configuration for
district -- to District 36 for the Fairbanks area
that avoids the problems I've addressed again here
today.

Thank you very much.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Mr. Hopkins.

Moving on to Elyse Guttenberg from
Fairbanks. Elyse?
MS. GUTTENBERG: Hi. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can.

MS. GUTTENBERG: Hi. Well, thanks. My name is Elyse Guttenberg, and I am representing myself. And thanks for the opportunity.

And my primary concern is with Fairbanks and Goldstream in the new District 36. And you are including this urban/suburban neighborhood with deep ties to Fairbanks in a rural district, as some of the previous speakers just said.

I've lived here for nearly 50 years, and I moved here specifically to attend the university as a freshman. The university is a short, like, ten-minute drive from my home and hundreds of my neighbors' homes, other people who live in Goldstream. We work at the university, we work in the city, and we work in the borough of Fairbanks. We raise our families here, we attend school here, we shop there. Most important, we vote here for local and statewide government.

The Supreme Court was correct to call you out on -- and I'm going to call it illegally gerrymandered Senate pairings in Eagle River and Anchorage, and that is what the Supreme Court also called it. And that little Cantwell appendage that,
with no justification, created a non-compact
district, in direct opposition to our constitution.
And I thank the Supreme Court for that decision.
I also understand you are directed not only
to take care of the Senate pairings, but that little
finger of Cantwell that brings District 36 into line
with the constitution. And that's what your emphasis
in the work in front of you today is going to be.
But I live here. And even if they did not
mention Goldstream, I care deeply about the
representation we are all supposed to have in Juneau,
and it's important for me to put it on the public
record yet again. I've written to you at least twice
on this subject. I've appeared in public, and as
have many, many of our neighbors.
And our testimony, and I'll say it again,
because it's been said, has been disregarded. I want
to put it on the record that, like Cantwell,
Goldstream was gerrymandered. It's not
socioeconomically integrated with the rural voters in
the new 36, where we were placed.
And I think it's to serve particular
partisanship. Without Cantwell, District 36 might be
compact; we do share a border. It might be
contiguous, but it is certainly -- Goldstream is
certainly not socioeconomically aligned.

I also want to say that while there was a number of public testimony over, you know, the past few months, you would have heard even more. But when it came to that meeting in -- in the Carlson Center, that I believe one of the speakers earlier just referred to, other people would have spoken more, but we felt that the -- the continued debating that the chair, Mr. Binkley, put people through, really turned people off, and they did not speak out because they were questioned about their understanding, their motives were put on public display, and it was inappropriate at the time, and it's been inappropriate on many calls until now.

I hope you'll adopt a map that's already been through the public process and that meets the constitutional requirements. But I mostly hope that in the future our state can find a better method to build a truly non-partisan map than this very partisan method. And I know that it's possible.

So thank you for allowing me to speak.

That's all.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Elyse.

Appreciate your time today.

The final testifier online from Fairbanks is
Bernie Hoffman. Bernie?

MS. HOFFMAN: All right. Good afternoon.

This is Bernie Hoffman from Fairbanks. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you so much. Thank you for this opportunity to testify about the Alaska Redistricting Board's proposed maps.

I, like a few of the other people that just testified, I'm calling to testify against the inclusion of the Goldstream area into the rural district area, as proposed. This area is being treated like the Cantwell area situation, and from what I understand, you know, the -- there's been -- the Supreme Court has made some rulings about this not being done properly.

I -- I don't know all the -- the language that's involved in this, but I just know that it does not seem right, does not seem fair, and I would ask the board to please think about Goldstream and also to -- hold on a second -- and -- and keep the recommendations of the Board Member Bahnke and try to come up with, you know, the new pairings, okay?

And if you could do it as quickly as possible, that would be great so we can get things
rolling with this new election, this new type of
election that we're going to be doing.

All right. And once again, thank you for
your time. And I will conclude. Have a great one.
Take care.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Bernie.

(Indiscernible) Girdwood, Mike Eddington.

Mike, you're next.

MR. EDDINGTON: Hi. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can.

MR. EDDINGTON: Okay. My name is Mike
Eddington. I'm both a resident of Girdwood and an
elected official for my community.

The 2021 proclamation placed Girdwood,
Whittier to the east, and other Turnagin Arm
communities together in House District 9. Firstly,
I'd like to thank you for creating a coherent
District 9.

But today I want to speak to the Senate
pairings in what's really the first opportunity to
discuss them in a public hearing.

As you consider the Superior and Supreme
Court rulings about Senate District K and the
potential ripple effects in other Anchorage Senate
districts, I'd like to speak to my perspective from
the southern part of Anchorage. Like many others, I followed the series of November redistricting board meetings closely. During the latter part of the November the 8th meeting, a set of Anchorage district pairings was suggested by Board Member Bahnke, discussed at some length, and appeared to have consensus support.

That proposal paired House District 9, which I'm in, and 11, the southeastern part of Anchorage and Turnagain Arm, together. I discussed that pairing with many others in my community that evening, and it had widespread support locally.

So I was extremely surprised the following morning to see an entirely new set of pairings voted in, with no discussion, by three members of the board. The outcome of that confusing presentation and vote and the House District 9, a relatively rural district with many gravel roads, limited infrastructure, was paired with House District 10, the mostly fully developed suburban areas of ocean shore -- Oceanview and Bayshore in Anchorage.

I strongly recommend that the more natural preferential pairing is between House Districts 9 and 11, immediately to the north. This would produce a more natural combination of the Rabbit Creek, Bear
Valley, Glenn Alps, and southern parts of the Hillside communities with Turnagain Arm and go to Whittier.

I'd also like to preemptively state strong opposition to any attempt to pair House District 9, Turnagain Arm, with Eagle River's House District 22. In no practical sense are these districts contiguous, being split by the width of the unpopulated Chugach Mountains and requiring a drive through eight other house districts to get from one set of communities to the other.

So to summarize, House District 22 and 24 belong together with a the Senate district for Eagle River, as do House Districts 9 and 11 for South Anchorage, Turnagain Arm, and Whittier. Settling on those Senate pairings to the north and the south of Anchorage then allows the original Senate pairings proposed by Board Member Bahnke, which I think makes perfect, natural sense.

Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Mike.

From Anchorage, next is David Guttenberg.

David, can you hear us?

MR. GUTTENBERG: Hello.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Oh, sorry. It just
changed to Fairbanks. I was wondering about that.

We can hear you. Can you hear us?

MR. GUTTENBERG: Yes. Thank you. And thank

God for modern technology. It gives us a joke every

once in a while.

So I want to testify on my behalf, and I

want to bring up an issue that came up before in

hearings and today.

I'm David Guttenberg. I served 16 years in

the legislature. In the 2012 redistricting, they put

Goldstream into a giant rural district that went from

Goldstream out to the coast. That was declared

unconstitutional and that had changed. And I had

to -- I served one term with that district before it

was changed.

Now the board has placed Goldstream in a

wide-ranging Interior district, contrary to the

resolution that was adopted by the Fairbanks North

Star Borough assembly that I sit on now that -- but I

didn't sit on when this resolution was passed. And

the board -- the resolution was misrepresented to the

board, and I just wanted to give you one of the

whereases.

And some draft plans contain borough

districts which combine geographical areas of the
borough that are not reachable without crossing
district boundaries and will require driving through
three other districts to reach another part of the
district.

That's what you've done to Goldstream.

Goldstream is not rural, part of urban Alaska. It
has a strong affinity for it, but it is not part of
it. And it was represented both as what the district
was and what Goldstream was and what the -- the
Fairbanks North Star Borough resolution said. And
I -- and I urge you to fix this problem. It's not
that hard. You don't have to create a domino effect
and go -- go around the state. You can just do it in
the Interior. And I urge you to fix that -- that
mistake that you did.

I just want to say one other thing, and this
is my opinion about what the Supreme Court did. I
think the Supreme Court gave you an out. I don't
think that they wanted to have problems like they had
in 2012, where there was a one -- a one-session
unconstitutional district. And I think they gave
you -- I don't think they wanted to do that, and I
think they gave -- they settled for something -- for
a map that I don't think serves the people of the
state of Alaska.
I just want to urge you again to fix Goldstream. It's not part of a giant rural Interior district. All of the roads from Goldstream lead into -- right past the university. It's very much a university district. Goldstream community, according to the Department of Labor, has the highest education level in the state for communities over -- I think it's about 20. That's because -- because the university is -- in many ways is a breakfast community for the university and has -- doesn't have that much in common with the rest of the district.

So I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you very much, David.

Wrapping up the online testimony, we have a caller from Anchorage, Jamie Rodriguez. Jamie.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. Can you hear me all right?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you. My name is Jamie Rodriguez.

And I'm testifying from Anchorage, as you said, about the Anchorage Senate pairings, because I believe in fair maps and honest work on behalf of all Alaskans. So no matter what the political
affiliations, the maps should be good for everybody.

I strongly support going back to the second-to-the-last Senate pairings. Those are the pairings presented by Ms. Bahnke.

And these pairings have already been considered on the record. They considered all of our public testimony, which I'm kind of hearing all repeated here today. They don't change the underlying deviation of the districts. They uphold that one-person/one-vote idea.

And they're the most common sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings. They keep Muldoon together; they keep West Anchorage together, or they will when it gets changed back, and Eagle River together. And if we get to go back, then our Hillside areas will also be together.

And as one of the previous callers said, it makes so much more sense. We have so much in common that would be really nice to have that representation together.

Anyway, the Bahnke -- Bahnke pairings make the absolute most sense, and they follow the law.

They are not illegal.

The redistricting board needs now -- at this point, after waiting so long, needs to act
immediately to comply with the Court's requirements
to make our maps legal and to minimize time and
costs -- cost is an issue here in Alaska -- and the
confusion that's going to result if this process is
dragged out any longer. It's in the public interest
to adopt legal maps with final Senate pairings that
check every single box outlined in the law, and the
Bahnke pairings do exactly that. They were gone
through. Every -- every single choice that was made
was explained. It all is just as it should be.

As public officials, the redistricting board
really has a sacred obligation to the public to
resolve this quickly, fairly, and lawfully. Please,
no more delays, no more games. Just abide by the law
and we can get this done quickly and properly.

Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Jamie.

That concludes our online testimony. We do
have a number of individuals in the room here in
Anchorage that want to testify. I do see that George
Martinez just popped up right now, but we are going
to transition to Anchorage in-person testimony.

We'll start first with Karen Williams. Next
will be Rich Curtner, Kay Brown, and then about
halfway through this list, there are 14, we'll switch
back to the folks on the phone who continue to call in.

So Karen Williams, Rich Curtner, Kay Brown, Benny Wells, Yarrow Silvers, those will be the first five. If you can be on deck when the person in front of you is done, that'll make things move a little bit quicker here.

Hi, Karen. Please put yourself on the record, and name, if you're testifying on behalf of someone or just yourself and -- okay. Thank you.

MS. WILLIAMS: Hi. Thanks for this opportunity. I'm Karen Williams, and I've lived in Anchorage for 36 years, specifically on the East side, the best side, for the last 13 years, in the Scenic Foothills neighborhood.

My family and I love the East side. It is, like I said, the best side. And this area is a unique part of our city. I did not testify before, but after what happened, I felt compelled to come in today to say something.

This side of our city contains the most diverse neighborhoods and schools in the country. I taught at East side for a long time, go Thunderbirds. And we are diverse. By caring -- our neighborhoods, East Anchorage district (indiscernible) Anchorage or
Eagle River district is completely unfair, and that would be denying our diverse communities our right to be fairly represented. We're a safe neighborhood, and we have significantly different needs than South Anchorage or Eagle River, and we deserve to be able to elect a senator who understands those needs of our community. So I'm asking you to quickly pass to adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke. And those were obviously supported heavily by public testimony and truly honors the one-person/one-vote principle. It's fair, and I hope that you would adopt that. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Karen. I hope the East side is recovering from that heartbreaking loss in the state finals.

Rich?

And Kay Brown, you're next, and then Benny Wells.

MR. CURTNER: Hello. My name is Rich Curtner. I'm here -- I'm an Anchorage resident. I'm here on behalf of the Alaska Black Caucus. The Alaska Black Caucus supports the pairings of House District 20, North Muldoon, and House District 21, South Muldoon, and Senate
I think when we last were here for testimony before the weekend, where things changed, this was the Bahnke pairings. And we think that, given the Supreme Court decision, this is the simplest and best solution to address that opinion, and that it should be done as soon as possible.

So thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Rich.

We appreciate your time today.

Kay Brown?

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm Kay Brown. I'm representing myself.

And I want to encourage the board to follow the Court's direction as expeditiously as possible and not open a new round of controversy and consideration.

I think what the Court has suggested and directed is very straightforward and can be done very expeditiously, and that you should base that decision on the extensive record that's already been put together and the Senate pairings that were discussed in the record, and that make very good sense. I do support the Bahnke pairings. They are logical. They are socioeconomically integrated, and they have
already been aired and discussed. Procedurally, how is this going to work if, next week, there is yet another new configuration that no one has seen? And where will the opportunities be for consideration of that? So I just commend this process, which has already drug on and on, that we need to wrap this up, because it's quite difficult for people who are considering running for office, for all the people involved with the elections, when we don't know where the districts are. And, of course, the clock is ticking, and we're getting quite close to the filing deadline. And there's still a lot of uncertainty out there because of what has happened here with our redistricting process. So I know in past redistrictings, the board has not always followed the Court direction, but I urge you to do that, and just make a simple and straightforward solution, which I think is right before you in both of the instances that it's been directed to be addressed. And thank you for hearing my comments today.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Thank you for your testimony.
Benny Wells, Yarrow Silvers, Chris Sturm
will follow.

MR. WELLS: Hello. My name is Benny Wells, from here in Anchorage and here representing myself. I was born here in Anchorage, grew up in Fairbanks. I've lived in Denali, and live here in Anchorage now for -- for 22, 23 years now. And when I first looked at the map, the things that jumped out to me was the Goldstream -- the Goldstream pairing has been discussed (indiscernible) Fairbanks, which is kind of mind boggling, and the Cantwell finger, which the Court called out, and the Senate pairings in Anchorage, and in particular the Senate pairings of Eagle River and Muldoon.

Recently I also participated in helping to draft the maps for the Anchorage -- Anchorage Municipal Assembly reapportionment. And so I understand -- I -- the final map that they adopted was an amended version of a map that I drew. And I -- I understand, from having done that, how difficult it is to balance -- balance population, to use the census tracts that are insane shapes and in crazy places. It's really, really hard, and I really, really appreciate the work you...
guys have done.

And -- and I -- I guess (indiscernible) from my work, realizing that -- that there are probably dozens of rational, coherent ways that you could draft the maps, and all of them will have some compromise somewhere. And I really appreciate that. And I feel like I might (indiscernible) somewhere or left out some detail somewhere in the -- in the map -- you know, the House districts within Anchorage, but I feel like they're pretty rational.

But the Senate pairings really are not. And not only is it the Eagle River pairing, but also the pairing of North Muldoon with U-Med. There are just several others that aren't very rational.

And I would encourage you to use the pairings that Melanie Bahnke put forward. They are very consistent with the testimony that we've heard in reapportioning the Anchorage Municipal Assembly District. There were maps early in our process that included some pairing of Eagle River with Hillside, and there were -- there were mountains of public testimony from both Eagle River and from Hillside and East Anchorage saying: Please don't pair us. We don't -- like (indiscernible) all around that, we don't -- we don't belong together.
Hillside really wanted to be together. Pairing 9 and 11 makes a lot of sense. We had a request from the Spenard Community Council to stay together, that we were not in the end able to honor in the Anchorage map. But pairing District 14 and 16 would be a great way to honor that in the State Senate, keeping Southport together with 15 and 10, like the -- there are instances all over in the Melanie Bahnke pairing, keeping downtown together, Muldoon together, that are just very, very consistent with the testimony that we heard in reapportioning Anchorage.

And I would encourage you to adopt her Senate pairings and to follow the Supreme Court's directions elsewhere in the state, as well. Thank you very much.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Benny. From one mapper to another, appreciate your time in the Anchorage redistricting process, too.

Yarrow Silvers, Chris Sturm, Candace Oxford, and then we'll go to our online testifiers at that point.

MS. SILVERS: Hi. My name is Yarrow Silvers.

It's not too late to place the Alaskan
people and one-person/one-vote principles above partisan maneuvering. Please redo the Senate pairings without delay so that Alaskans can vote using a fully constitutional map for the full ten years, that's avoiding the confusion and disenfranchisement that a constantly changing map creates. Considering how past maps have changed over several elections, this would be an amazing accomplishment for the board and something to be proud of.

I want to advocate for the adoption of the pairings that Melanie Bahnke put forward during the redistricting process as necessary to fix the constitutional errors. These pairings have been introduced to the public and enjoyed broad support because of the way they respect communities, instead of breaking them apart for political partisan purposes.

Specifically the four pairings of interest, to keep Eagle River as one community, Muldoon as one community, connect the U-Med/Airport Heights area, and reconnect the north and south sides of 4th Avenue downtown.

Please develop a system for truncation that is transparent and random. The actions of this board
around truncation, voting down a random coin toss
while stating that board members didn't know the
incumbent information, when at least two members
looked at and discussed this information on camera
before the series of votes, broke public trust, even
amongst those that don't have a full understanding of
t truncation.

Also breaking trust was the action taken
around the South Anchorage pairing, which initially
enjoyed board consensus but was inexplicably split
apart at the last minute with no discussion or
reasoning. It seems likely that someone looked at
political data over the weekend and decided that the
new pairing gave a partisan advantage while splitting
this community apart.

These were egregious actions, and I ask that
in fixing the errors, you follow our Alaska State
Constitution, which does not allow for politically
based mapping. These are people that you silenced
with your actions, not tools in a partisan toolbox.

The public and the courts have seen and
recognized the gerrymander and the truncation fix,
both carried out dishonestly and unethically. Still,
it is not too late to do the right thing and embrace
the positive accomplishments of the board while
rejecting the actions taken that were unconstitutional and of questionable ethic.

I also just want to say that it would be really nice if the board members that are online turned on their cameras -- and thank you, Melanie. I do see you -- so that people can see that you are here and not off barbecuing meat with Zuckerberg. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Yarrow.

Chris Strum, or Sturm. Sorry, Chris.

MR. STURM: It's going to be (indiscernible). My name is John Sturm. I go by Chris, though, and I'm here representing myself. I've been a long-time East Anchorage resident, any bias out there that might have. But I'm here to basically try and speak to the idea of simplicity. I think the other people have mentioned grouping based on community.

I feel like those are the relevant data points, really, for us to look like -- look at throughout this process here. I'm a behavior analyst. I use science pretty much every day in my work, and I use the idea of parsimony. The simpler solution is usually the better one for looking at the data, the right type of data.
And it seems as though in this process, for some of the board members, they looked at political data, as Yarrow mentioned, rather than some of the community data that is important. As an East side member, I feel like that issue around community is much more important than any other kind of political grouping or political gain that can come from what happened so far.

I -- I really urge swift and speedy adoption of a new map -- not a new map actually, but Melanie Bahnke's, that she has put forward. I don't think there is a need to reinvent the wheel and come up with another one. That would just be a ploy to slow down the process, which I would hate to see the microcosm theory here, which is happening around the United States, where this redistricting issue becomes a way to stall the process and to alienate people from their one-vote privilege. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Mr. Sturm.

Candace Oxford.

MS. OXFORD: Hello. My name is Candace Oxford (phonetic), and I am representing myself. I am of voting age this fall. I'm a 17-year-old. I was born in Anchorage on the East
side and have been a South Muldoon resident my entire life.

Like the majority of Muldoon residents, I oppose the redistricting of my community to be paired with an Eagle River district. You take power away from the community's voice. As Bethany Marcum said, to give more representation to Eagle River is flatly undemocratic.

If the redistricting committee is more concerned with giving a majority white community with a higher average tax bracket more representation, then there is no way at all that this process is fair to Muldoon residents and my community. This redistricting is gerrymandering, a policy which goes against the foundations of U.S. democracy and our own Alaskan constitution.

The ultimate -- this ultimately treats my community as not uniquely important. My community is important. My community deserves equal representation in state government, and I implore you to act immediately to adopt Melanie Bahnke -- Melanie Bahnke's map before this next election.

Thank you for your time.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Candace. That was very impressive from a 17-year-old, soon to be
18-year-old voter. Please stay engaged in the process. I'm looking forward to seeing what you do for the state of Alaska in the next couple of decades, because you're special.

Joelle Hall.

MS. HALL: Good afternoon, members of the board. My name is Joelle Hall. I'm here representing myself today, although I think you see I'm with friends. I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify.

I'd like to echo the remarks made (indiscernible) paper by Mr. Torkelson. This board has produced a map that has largely been successful in meeting the constitutional standard. As it is with every map, not everyone likes the outcome, but the manner which the board approached the House districts resulted in a fair map. I do know we supported the House map and only had issues with the legality of the Senate pairings.

And now the Supreme Court has ruled. You have a chance to do what no board in the last 20 years has been able to do: pass a map that doesn't need to change again for the next ten years. I think that's even 30 years. I think it's been since the '80s that a board's been able to produce a map that
we were able to run on for ten straight years.
This is an important opportunity to remove
confusion from the already confusing election cycle,
in a new electoral system in a special election. A
quick meeting to repair the four Senate pairings, and
you will have discharged your duties to the people of
Alaska. Of course, you need to take care of the
Cantwell finger, but the four Senate pairings are
what I'm speaking about mostly today.

I want to speak in connection with Kay
Brown. There is no reason to belabor this process.
There is no rationale for introducing any new options
into this record and to debate any new options. You
have legal maps on the record. You have the Bahnke
map on the record. You have the current House map,
with simply addressing the four pairings. You have
two legal options already addressed, already vetted
to the public, and you have the ability to meet the
time (indiscernible) that we need in order to run one
election and to get down to business. And I would
just urge you to do that.

I just want to take one moment to say,
finally, we commented on the record -- I commented on
the record, as well as inside conversations with many
members, about our concern with the board's decision
to present final maps for public consideration that
did not include Senate pairings until the final week
of the process.

We are grateful to Judge Matthews for
calling up this specifically, and note that all the
third parties were appropriately asked -- were to
(indiscernible) -- to prepare Senate pairings with
their proposals from the get-go. It should have
never been the position of this board or any future
redistricting board that Senate pairings are optional
in a final map. I'm grateful for the judge, if this
was somehow unclear and that common sense could not
possibly prevail, but that is what a board map means.
I am glad we have definitive action in this intricate
process of case law upon case law.

This was -- this meeting right now, this is
an avoidable meeting. We could have had lots of
public testimony on the map, and you could have heard
a long time ago how people felt about their Senate
pairings.

So since this was avoidable, since the
pairings are unconstitutional, and since it is --
well, for a -- a few of them are, I urge you to vote
quickly. I urge you to meet in one of the many
meetings you have scheduled for next week, to simply
meet, correct this error on one of your two existing maps, and let the people of Alaska get down to the business of getting ready to elect apparently a whole slew of human beings. We would really appreciate a head start on that. Thanks.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Joelle.

We're going to return to the phone lines now. We have one caller in the queue, George Martinez.

MR. MARTINEZ: Hello. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can.

MR. MARTINEZ: Excellent. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you all today. I apologize for not being in person. My name is George Martinez. I am an East side resident. And I also want to identify, I'm speaking on behalf of myself, but I am one of the plaintiffs in the East Anchorage lawsuit. And I wanted to acknowledge that written testimony has been submitted on behalf of myself and the other plaintiffs in the form of written testimony to the board. So I hope that you will take that testimony into consideration, as it is very detailed with our request.

But I wanted to just highlight that as a matter of fairness, for the diverse interests of East
Anchorage, for my community, I stepped up. I applaud the Supreme Court, the Superior Court for their lawful and specific rulings in favor of fairness and constitutionality. I wanted to have my voice heard today because I think it's important to make sure that at every opportunity to speak to the issues and the interests of our community, we take those chances. So I thank the board for this.

But now I urge the board to move expeditiously and effectively in accordance with the guidance provided by the courts. The error was clear; the remedies are also clear.

And I also encourage folks to consider the continued cost to the taxpayers and the erosion of the public trust. Fairness and representation in the spirit of the constitution is on my mind. But I hope that you recognize, board, that we're so close to this remedy, we can just get on with restoring the public trust and getting back to the business of representing our interests in our community.

Thank you all for the opportunity, and I thank you for all the other folks who have showed up today to continue to speak truth to power and on behalf of the residents of East Anchorage. Thank you very much.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, George. We appreciate your time.

Coming back to the Anchorage LIO, Bruce Farnsworth, Representative Matt Claman, Barry Suho (phonetic), Chris Constant, Cliff Groh, Celeste Hodge-Growden is the next order.

MR. FARNSWORTH: Thank you for the opportunity to testify again on this issue. My name is Bruce Farnsworth. I'm here representing myself.

I've lived in the same house in the same East side neighborhood of Anchorage for 24 years.

And I can tell you that the pairings the board adopted and that the Court found deeply flawed could only make sense if the goal was to water down the votes of East side Anchorage residents. All you have to do is drive the length of Muldoon from one end to the other to see the socioeconomic similarities and debit them to the integration of these neighborhoods.

Just drive a block off of Muldoon in either direction and circle back onto Muldoon, and do that as you parade your way up the -- or down the -- the street, and you'll see that there's not really any big significant change. Yes, there are single-family residences mixed in with multi-family residences, but by and large, this is a work -- a long working-class
neighborhood, very, very different from the Eagle River neighborhood that the -- the flawed Senate -- adopted Senate pairings, including the -- including Eagle River, would create.

We go to the same -- we go to movies at the Totem, we shop at Carrs Muldoon and Fred Meyer on DeBarr, we gather at the Cabin Tavern, we worship at one of the handful of churches along Muldoon, we recreate at Chanshtnu Park, and I can tell you we never run into anybody from Eagle River at any of those places.

I encourage the board to adopt the Melanie Bahnke map. It -- I don't know that much about all of these other pairings. I know this one quite intimately and well, however. And if the others are as flawed and the solution's as obvious, then it should be easy to just get this done in a timely fashion and stop wasting our time, please.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Bruce.

Representative Claman?

REPRESENTATIVE CLAMAN: Thank you. And thank you for hearing my testimony, Madam Chair. I'm Representative Matt Claman, but I am only testifying on my own behalf today.

I want to make just a couple of comments.
First, is that the trial court was very specific about criticizing the board for not announcing the Senate pairings that were under consideration. I think now what you have before you are two maps that were discussed previously but didn't have much testimony, what we'll call the Melanie Bahnke map, and then the second map is the one that was adopted. And if those are the only two choices, we know one thing with certainty, which is the one that was adopted is an unconstitutional gerrymander. So you're left with one choice.

To the extent the board is considering other choices, I think the Court's opinion makes it abundantly clear that the board needs to publicly say what the other consider- -- what else is being considered, and they need to announce that in a manner in which the public has time to comment on that, and they have to comment on that and do that all in time that -- the Courts ordered that it goes back to the Court by April 15th. So the window of time to actually propose something different than the Bahnke map and have public comment on that is, indeed, quite limited.

I think, fortunately for the board's process, the House districts are fixed. There's no
basis to change any of the House districts in Anchorage, because those have been approved.

And I note also that the third-party maps had different house districts, so what the third-party maps had for Senate pairings really doesn't help you in the current process.

The other thing I would strongly recommend to the -- to the board to take a careful look at is the Court looked carefully at the affidavit presented by the expert witness Chase Hensel, who testified on behalf of the -- the East Anchorage plaintiffs. And that's a 20-page affidavit that really does a pretty detailed process of showing how North Muldoon and South Muldoon are a single community of interest, and how the Eagle River Valley and Eagle River/Chugiak are a single community of interest.

So if you start with the pairings -- and that, of course, is in the Bahnke pairings map that has Eagle River as a single district and North and South Muldoon as a single Senate district, which makes sense. There's only six -- six pairings left, and there's nothing else on the table except the Bahnke proposal.

But I just want to note that, detailed as the Hensel proposal is, there's three things that are
actually really noteworthy about Eagle River that reflect the fact that Eagle River really is a single community of interest.

The first is that Chugiak/Eagle River is the only place in Anchorage, in the municipality, that has their own volunteer fire department. And as a result, the fire services treat it differently for Chugiak/Eagle River than for the rest of Anchorage because of the presence of that volunteer fire department. That reflects their single community of interest.

The second is that the -- the municipal parks are managed differently and the funding for them are managed differently in Chugiak/Eagle River than for the rest of the municipality.

Another factor that shows that Eagle River is a single community of interest, and third, most interestingly, periodically you see these proposals that come up in recent years that Chugiak/Eagle River secede from the municipality. And although those -- those efforts haven't gone anywhere, that's actually another reflection that there's many in Chugiak/Eagle River that see them as a very unified community but as kind of separate from the rest of Anchorage.

So for all those reasons, I think it's --
that there's only one Senate pairing for Eagle River, and that's a single Senate district. And that's consistent with the Court's opinion, the Superior Court opinion confirmed by the Supreme Court.

So I would -- I strongly advocate using the Bahnke map. But to the extent that this board believes that they want to consider anything else, I think it is -- is abundantly incumbent on this board to publicly announce what the other alternative is and give the public a chance to comment on that before the deadline the Court has set to have a proposal back to the Court, by the 15th of April.

Unless the board has questions, that's all I have.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Matt. I'll call you by your first name since you're testifying in an individual capacity today. We appreciate your time.

Mary (indiscernible).

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi. Good afternoon. For the record, my name is Mary Desubaro (phonetic), and I'm speaking in a personal capacity today, but have been to several of the redistricting board meetings and am glad to see that this process is happening right now to hopefully quickly correct
Senate pairings and move on to the rest of actual democracy.

So I am a resident of House District 17, the new house district, and want to make a case just for the pairing of House District 23 and 17.

I drive to work every day. In the summer I walk or bike. It's about a 30-minute walk, 15-minute bike. And I work in District 23. And so when I go to work from my house, there is not a lot of change besides passing the Park Strip. And those two, to me, are very logical pairings, because 49th State and Crush Bistro are on the same street and now in completely different house districts. So I would really recommend pairing those, just for my personal experience.

And I would also say that what seems most important is that the board act immediately to comply with the Court's requirements, to minimize confusion, and it's in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final Senate pairings so voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, voting locations, on top of the new election system with ranked-choice voting and an unprecedented special election.

So it is -- would be helpful for everyone to
resolve this quickly and to do so in a legal way by
adopting Member Bahnke's pairings.

Thank you very much for your time.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Mary.

Christopher Constant, then Cliff Groh.

MR. CONSTANT: Good afternoon. My name is
Christopher Constant, and I am here to speak mostly
on my personal capacity as a resident and neighbor of
the new House District 23, and I'll end in a
moment -- or half a moment on a professional capacity
as a representative on the Anchorage Assembly.

And I'm going to speak like a laser about
the District 23 and 17 and District 24 issue I see.

If you look closely at the map, there is a very small
residential section on the west southern portion of
House District 23. A couple of thousand people live
there.

Then if you look at the far east southern
corner of the same district, which is a tiny
neighborhood on Muldoon, you have a few hundred,
maybe a little bit more, residents. Those are the
population that live south and outside of the border
of JBER. Those residents are suddenly South Eklutna.
The map that has been drafted for the Senate pairings
makes them South Chugiak/Eklutna. Powder Ridge, the
next residential base, which is at Fred Meyer in Eagle River, that's 20 miles away, half an hour. To get from one end of the southern portion of the district you have to pass through three House Districts and currently three Senate districts to get there.

It is a very harmful division to separate the people who have long held they are part of the downtown, or North Anchorage as we're now calling that district. The North Anchorage District, through our reapportionment process, spans 17, 18, 20, and 23. It's natural, because these are where our people live together. They go to Clark Middle School from all across that boundary. So the house districts did actually work out really well for us.

But I'm asking you to think about how the very narrow population of individuals in those two corners of that district in any way associate with the folks who live out in Eklutna, Chugiak, Eagle River, Powder Ridge. Our neighborhoods are all small-lot configuration. They are all on City sewer and water. They all have ARDSA, which is a road district that's citywide. We all pay our bills the same way. We shop in the same places.

So my request is that you, like a laser,
connect House District 23 to House District 17.

Now I'll speak briefly in my capacity as assembly member. I chaired our own reapportionment process that we just went through. And I want to thank you for your hard work at getting these maps right, because, as has been testified, and I concur, a vast majority of this work has proven valid and vital and accurate.

And so with just a little bit of correction it can be pulled into constitutional, and it can actually meet the needs of the residents of our communities.

So to you, Member Borromeo, and to you, Member Bahnke, I say thank you for speaking for the minority population. And I speak of minority of a tiny sliver of people who are somehow now South Eklutna who didn't have a voice, except for you spoke for them.

And to you, Chair Binkley, I ask for you to be the statesman that we know that you can be and make the right decision that creates harmony across these neighborhoods. That's the decision that we need from you.

With that, I thank you for this opportunity.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much,
Assemblyman. We appreciate your time.

Cliff Groh.

MR. GROH: Thanks. I'm Cliff Groh, speaking in my personal capacity. I have very little to say. I think that the board has heard some very decisive, well-thought-out comments this afternoon. I associate myself with them, and chiefly (indiscernible) myself with the comments as made by Chris Constant (indiscernible). I do think that the board's task at this point is short and simple and (indiscernible).

Thank you very much.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Cliff.

Two more testifiers here in Anchorage, and then we do have one more individual that has joined the line.

We see La quen naay Elizabeth Medicine Crow. She is on the line, but we have two more here in Anchorage. Celeste Hodge Growden first.

MS. GROWDEN: Hello. My name is Celeste Hodge Growden, and I am the president and CEO of the Alaska Black Caucus. We are a non-profit organization that champions the lives of black people in BIPOC communities in four core areas: health,
economics, education, and justice.

First, I echo the comments that were shared earlier by attorney Rich Curtner, who, as he shared, is the Alaska -- the Alaska Black Caucus's co-chair of our justice committee.

So the Alaska Black Caucus, we don't have permanent friends and we don't have permanent enemies. What we do have, though, is permanent interests. And our main interest is championing the lives of black and BIPOC communities.

At every turn -- at every turn, unfortunately, we have to fight for justice. And as I shared our four core areas, you know, we fight for justice in economics, we fight for justice in education, we fight for justice in health, and we fight for justice in economics.

And now, unfortunately, we are fighting for justice in redistricting. It's exhausting, it's tiring, it's old, and it's got to stop. It's time -- it's past time to do the right thing, and that is following the Court's direction, not tomorrow, not several days from now, but now.

Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much,

Ms. Growden.
Our final testifier in Anchorage is David Dunsmore.

MR. DUNSMORE: Good afternoon, Madam Chair, members of the board. My name is David Dunsmore. I'm with Alaskans for Fair Redistricting, and I just wanted to briefly walk through some of the Senate pairings.

Our coalition met and reviewed the Superior Court and Supreme Court decisions, and having followed through the process, we determined that the pairings proposed by Member Bahnke are the fairest pairings that address the concerns raised by the Supreme Court, and we believe that the board has the opportunity today to quickly make this change, as well as quickly moving the portions of the Denali Borough and Mat-Su from District 36 to 30, and today you can give finality to Alaskans about what their electoral districts are going to be.

But just to briefly walk through the pairings that Ms. Bahnke had made and why we believe they're appropriate. Starting in Eagle River, the pairing of the two Eagle River districts is very logical and keeps those communities.

And then moving into East Anchorage -- so these are Districts 22 and 24. Moving into East
Anchorage, the record has been clear, both in testimony throughout the board process and in the evidence presented in court, that the Muldoon area is an integrated community of interest and should be kept together as a Senate district, and that is Districts 20 and 21.

To the east of that, the Bahnke pairings would create a second East Anchorage Senate district, with 18 and 19, which would keep two Senate districts within East Anchorage rather than dividing East Anchorage between multiple Senate districts.

Pairing districts 23 and 17 will keep the historic neighborhoods of Downtown and Government Hill and South Addition all within the same Senate district. And Mr. Constant just spoke quite eloquently about the connections across that district.

Pairing District 16 and 14 would keep the neighborhoods of Spenard and Turnagain in the same Senate district. This is an area that often people refer to as Spenardagain because it is often thought of as one community, and this would put them in the same district rather than be divided.

Pairing Districts 13 and 12 will create a Midtown residential core district, rather than...
splitting some of those communities into South Anchorage and some of them into West or East Anchorage. Pairing Districts 15 and 10 will keep the South Anchorage flatlands, Southport, Bayshore/Klatt all in one district, and allow the pairing of 10 and 9, which the board had reached consensus on at one point in the process, to keep the Hillside all in one district.

And I thank you for your consideration. We hope the board will take immediate action to have a map that gives Alaskans finality.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I just have one question, because I think I heard you say 10 twice. Are you advocating for 15 and 10 or 9 and 10?

MR. DUNSMORE: I'm -- Madam Chair, I'm sorry. I've had so many different versions of these numbers in my head. It would be 15 and 10.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. So then the other --

MR. DUNSMORE: Nine and 11.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate your time today. And finally, to wrap up our public testimony, we're going to go back to the phone lines.
La quen naay Medicine Crow is on the line from First Alaskans Institute.

Can you hear us?

MS. MEDICINE CROW: Yes. (Speaking Native language.) I can hear you. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I can hear you.

MS. MEDICINE CROW: Wonderful. (Speaking Native language.) My name is La quen naay Liz Medicine Crow. I am Tlingit and Haida, come from Keex Kwaan, which is where I'm calling in from today. I'm the president/CEO of First Alaskans Institute, and I'm calling to just make a brief comment.

I appreciated what I heard Rich Curtner sharing, as well as Celeste Hodge Growden. And I wanted to call in to testify today to encourage the redistricting board to follow the Court's decision immediately. Don't delay justice. Don't delay the vote. Don't confuse Alaskan voters. A decision has been made, and it's time to follow it.

And in terms of the Senate pairings, in East Anchorage, I also want to support the Bahnke pairings that have already been vetted and that do not diminish the population over the deviations that have already been outlined.

And it's critical not to delay this process.
It's already a lot happening for Alaskans with the special election, with ranked-choice voting, and adding redistricting on top of it to delay, confuse, and deny the (indiscernible) that the Court found lacking in the current map is to fail at doing the job that you were entrusted to do for Alaskans. So I called today to ask you to address this today during your meeting and apply the Bahnke pairings.

I also want to say (speaking Native language) to Melanie Bahnke and Nicole Borromeo for making a stand. I know it wasn't easy, and I want to thank you and give you gratitude for making that stand for all of Alaska. (Speaking Native language.)

I thank you for hearing my testimony.

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Speaking Native language).

We do have a final caller, it looks like, that's been added online from Eagle River, Susan Fischetti.

MS. FISCHETTI: Yes. I'm Susan Fischetti.

I've lived in Eagle River for 40 years.

Since moving to Eagle River, the population has more than doubled and has always been represented by two senators.
In the '80s and '90s, we had Rick Halford and Randy Phillips. Randy Phillips represented Muldoon and Eagle River, and it worked fine. He did a great job working for the Muldooners. He attended community council meetings. He supported the schools and the businesses and the people of East Anchorage.

In 2000 or so we were paired with the Hillside all the way to Hope, and it was a geographical nightmare. We had Con Bunde and Cathy Giessel both try to represent Eagle River, but never really connected with what was important to the community out here.

Recently we've gone back to a senator for Eagle River and one for Chugiak, and there's been no complaints. Eagle River is adjacent to JBER, and many residents of Chugiak/Eagle River are military, so that makes sense for us, as well.

I appreciate your time. Thank you.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Susan.

And that concludes our public testimony. We appreciate everyone in the room for their patience, and those online, too, especially as we dealt with some early technological -- technologic -- I don't know. Whatever. It was a mess.

But moving on with the agenda here, we are
now going to review the Alaska Supreme Court decision.

We have the board's attorney, Matt Singer, who is going to come up on screen. There he is. And he'll unmute himself and go over what the Court has ruled a week early.

Hi, Matt. Can you hear us?

MR. SINGER: Hello, Chair Borromeo. Can you hear me?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We can hear you, and we can see you, too. Just give Peter one second. There he is. He's -- now you're front and center.

MR. SINGER: Thank you. What I thought, just so we have a clear record and for members of the public who may not have followed this as closely as others, I'll just provide a brief summary of the litigation phase of the redistricting process that's led us back together today.

So the board adopted its proclamation plan in November. There were five lawsuits filed by the constitutional deadline for legal challenges on December 10th. Those lawsuits were filed by the Matanuska-Susitna Borough and borough manager, the City of Valdez, City of Skagway, the Calista Corporation, and several individuals from East
Anchorage.

The Mat-Su Borough challenged the population of the Mat-Su Borough districts, and also the combination of Valdez and -- and Mat-Su communities in District 29.

Valdez also challenged District 29 and indicated a preference for a Richardson Highway House District.

The City of Skagway indicated a preference to be with downtown Juneau instead of the north end of Juneau.

Calista's lawsuit was primarily about where Hooper Bay and Scammon Bay would be districted, and more generally was about representation for the Calista shareholders and the residents of Southwest Alaska.

And the East Anchorage plaintiffs challenged -- primarily focused on Senate District K.

The trial court, there was a very expedited -- unusually expedited process that -- the U.S. Census was delayed this time around, and so instead of finishing this work early in the summer, as we would have had the census been timely, we finished in November, and that left a very compressed time for litigation.
The Superior Court, Judge Matthews, was very active in managing the litigation and moving it along in an efficient manner. There was -- an expedited trial began on January 21st and concluded in early February. The trial court issued a 171-page decision on -- early in the morning on February 16th.

The trial court directed the board to redo House Districts 3 and 4 in Southeast Alaska and Senate District K, and otherwise found that the plan was constitutional.

There were, let's see, four petitions for review to the Supreme Court that were filed later in the same week, in February. Those were argued to the state Supreme Court on March 18th, and then the Supreme Court issued an order a week later, on March 25th.

In expedited cases, especially expedited election cases, it's common for the Alaska Supreme Court to issue a preliminary order to give -- kind of give instructions, essentially, to the litigants, and then it will later -- we expect will write a detailed opinion.

So that's what we have at this point. We have a short order from the Supreme Court with, you know, kind of basic directions. And then I expect
we'll see a more fulsome explanation of its reasoning and analysis once the Court has time to write up a full opinion. That could be several months from now. That's not something that we will -- we will not have the benefit of that explanation while we -- while we act, you know, in the coming week on the -- on the task that we have today.

The Supreme Court decision -- let's see. Starting in Southeast, it reversed the trial court and agreed with the board that House Districts 3 and 4 were constitutional. There's no more work that needs to be done with regard to the Southeast Alaska districts.

The Supreme Court also generally ruled against Valdez and Mat-Su in their appeals, finding that District 29, for example, was compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated, and that Valdez could be in a house district with its neighbors to -- to the west and Mat-Su.

The Court found that House District 36 is not compact due to the addition of Cantwell and what it called the Cantwell appendage, and so it provided -- specifically directed that the Cantwell appendage should be returned to District 30 within the Denali Borough.
And that's the -- that's the only deficiency in the House plan. It's a deficiency that involves about 200 people. And so one of the board's tasks will be -- I'll get into the remand instructions, but one of the board's tasks will be to adjust the boundary of District 36 and District 30 to address the -- where Cantwell is districted.

And then finally, the Court found what most of the testimony was before you today. The Court found that Senate District K was invalid and violated the Alaska equal protection clause. So that -- that district, as drawn, needs to be replaced.

And so the Supreme Court remanded the case to the Superior Court for further proceedings, and so that transferred the jurisdiction and dispute away from the Supreme Court and back to the trial court.

And then on March 30th, Judge Matthews remanded the matter back to the board. And that's all consistent with the process that's set forth in our constitution, at Article VI, Section 11, which says, "Upon a final judicial decision that a plan is invalid, the matter shall be returned to the board for correction and development of a new plan."

So that's -- we're here to make corrections at this point. And -- and those corrections are
spelled out by Judge Matthews in the remand order. He said, consistent -- let's see -- consistent with the Supreme Court, what he directed was that the board is to -- is to do the following: Remove the Cantwell appendage from District 36, and then address the constitutional deficiency in Senate District K.

And then recognizing that those changes will impact -- they'll have some ripple effects, Judge Matthews also said the board shall make other changes resulting or related to the Cantwell or Senate District K changes.

So, for example, if you take Cantwell out of District 36, you necessarily have to adjust the border of District 30. And so that's what -- that's what I think the judge meant with his make other changes resulting or related to the -- you know, to the other actions.

So the -- those are the two specific tasks now before the board: to address Cantwell and -- and replace Senate District K.

My recommendation to the board is -- is to specifically invite the public to offer solutions to the Senate District K.

I then recommended that the board should present its ideas for solutions in a public meeting,
should discuss its ideas.

After that, the public should get a chance to give feedback about the solutions the board is considering, and then the board should adopt a final plan.

As to timing, Judge Matthews directed that the board is to provide the trial court with a status report on its work by February 15th. That's not -- the judge did not set February 15th as a deadline, but I would encourage the board to treat that as a deadline and to finish this work in advance of February 15th, so that on that day we can report to Judge Matthews that the board has finished its task and has adopted a revised final proclamation plan.

So I would look at moving -- moving this along efficiently to -- to get to a revised plan addressing the two deficiencies that have been identified by the courts.

So that's my report. I'll look forward to working with the board. My understanding is the board will meet at 8 a.m. Monday morning to -- to adopt its process and get going on this, and I'll look forward to working with each of you.

Madam Chair, that's -- that concludes my report.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Matt.

Are there any questions from the board on our attorney's report?

Okay. Hearing no questions, we have reached the end of our business.

Are there any other comments at this point from the board before Monday's meeting?

Okay. Seeing -- Bethany has --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Madam Chairwoman?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Let's go to Bethany, and then we'll hear Melanie.

Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I apologize. I was not able to unmute myself just now.

And I also want -- just wanted to go on the record to clearly state that both my audio and my video were turned off by the meeting moderator during the public testimony in an effort to limit the possibility of Zoom bombing by non-participants, so I wanted to make sure that the public understood that was why (indiscernible) and why just now I was waving, because I didn't have the ability to turn off my own audio or also my video.

Thank you.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Bethany. We'll make a note of that.

Just for purposes of catching you up, since you were not able to hear the testimony, we did have 29 testifiers --

MEMBER MARCUM: No, I could hear. My audio, I was not able to speak or be seen, to turn off my audio or video.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Got it. Okay. So you heard everything; we just couldn't see or hear you?

MEMBER MARCUM: Correct.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Noted.

Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'd like to comment on what Matt just said, in terms of a suggested process moving forward. My understanding is that we will be discussing that on Monday morning with all members present. Budd had suggested something, but he's not here.

So I'd appreciate if we not talk about process really until Monday, because no decisions have been made by the board in terms of what the process going forward is going to be.

So I'd like the public to be aware that
Monday morning is when we are scheduled to discuss
the process going forward.

I also want to let you know that the people
on Zoom weren't able to hear the first folks who
testified. The first person that I was able to hear
testify was Luke Hopkins.

So, Peter, if you could summarize in writing
the people who testified before Luke quickly and
e-mail that to me, I would appreciate it. Because I
want to make sure that everybody was heard by me and
that I have the public's input.

I want to thank the public for showing up in
force today.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Madam Chairman. (Audio
feedback.) That was my fault.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: So two things. We are going
to have this meeting transcribed by Pacific Rim
transcribing, so we will have not just a summary but
a full write-up of everything that was testified in
writing, and we will get that as quick as they can
get it to us, so we'll have everything in writing for
anyone who's interested. And we'll, of course, post
that to the Web site, as well.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.
If there are no other comments from the board, I want to remind the public of our schedule going forward.

The redistricting board will meet Monday at 8 a.m., Tuesday at 10 a.m., Wednesday at 10 a.m. More meetings, I'm sure, will be scheduled after our Monday meeting, but that's when we're going to be, as Melanie was talking about, deciding on what our process is going forward.

And I want to echo the sentiments of the board and our staff, that we do appreciate the public's participation, and we expect this to be a very engaged process as we get -- get the ball over the goal line, so to speak.

I'm going to turn the chairing back over to John at this point as the chairman to close this out, if he's still on.

Looks like John may be having some difficulty coming off of mute, so I'm going to go ahead on his behalf and adjourn the Alaska Redistricting Board meeting at 3:42.

(Proceedings adjourned at 3:42 p.m.)
TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Jeanette Starr, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 74 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of the Alaska Redistricting Board meeting held April 2, 2022, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic sound recording, to the best of my knowledge and ability.

Dated this the 20th day of April 2020.

Jeanette Starr, Transcriber
adding 62:3
addition 59:14 67:21
address 31:6 58:12 62:7 68:6 69:5,19
addressed 16:20 32:22 42:17
addressing 42:16 70:17
adhere 14:11
adjacent 63:15
adjourn 74:20
adjourned 74:22
adjust 68:5 69:13
adopting 8:9,10 53:2
adoption 3:17 4:8,12 36:11 39:9
advance 70:11
advantage 37:14
advocate 36:11 51:5
advocating 60:15
affidavit 49:9,12
affiliations 27:1
affinity 25:7
age 39:24
agenda 3:16,17,20,25 4:6,7,8 5:1 63:25
agreed 67:10
ahead 4:24 11:6,13 14:1 74:20
ahold 12:4
aired 32:1
airport 6:20
Alaskan 16:3 35:25 40:16 61:18
Alaskans 5:14 7:23 26:25 36:3 58:5,17 60:12 61:2,11 62:1,6
alienate 39:17
aligned 19:1
allowing 19:21
Alps 23:1
alternative 51:9
amazing 36:8
amended 33:20
amount 6:16 15:3
analysis 67:2
analyst 38:22
Anna 5:24,25 6:4,6 7:12
announce 48:16 51:9
announcing 48:2
apologize 44:14 71:14
apparently 44:3
appeals 67:15
appeared 18:14 22:6
appendage 16:17 17:25 67:22, 24 69:5
appraisal 45:1
apply 62:8
appreciated 61:13
approached 41:16
appropriately 43:6
approved 49:2
April 2:6 48:20 51:12
ARDSA 54:22
argued 66:13
Arm 21:15 22:10 23:2,6,15
arrive 16:18
Article 68:20
assembly 24:19 33:18 34:18 53:11 55:3
Assemblyman 56:1
associate 54:18 56:7
attempt 23:5
attend 17:12,18
attended 63:4
attorney 3:13 57:3 64:3
attorney's 71:3
audio 5:22 71:17,24 72:6,8 73:14
AUTOMATED 11:8
Avenue 36:22
average 40:11
avoidable 43:17,21
avoiding 36:5
avoids 16:20
aware 13:11 72:25

B
background 3:11
Bahnke's 39:11 40:22 53:2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>careful</td>
<td>49:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carefully</td>
<td>49:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>caring</td>
<td>29:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlson</td>
<td>10:3 19:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolyn</td>
<td>11:17,20 12:4,6,8 13:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carried</td>
<td>37:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrs</td>
<td>47:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td>43:15 52:4 68:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cases</td>
<td>66:17,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casey</td>
<td>7:14,18 8:19 9:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catching</td>
<td>72:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cathy</td>
<td>63:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucus</td>
<td>30:22,23 56:23 57:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucus's</td>
<td>57:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celeste</td>
<td>46:5 56:20,21 61:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>census</td>
<td>33:23 65:21,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>center</td>
<td>10:3 19:5 64:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>56:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certainty</td>
<td>48:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaired</td>
<td>55:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairing</td>
<td>74:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chairman</td>
<td>2:10 9:19 71:13 73:14 74:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairwoman</td>
<td>3:21 71:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenged</td>
<td>65:2,6,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenges</td>
<td>64:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>championing</td>
<td>57:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>champions</td>
<td>56:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chance</td>
<td>41:21 51:10 70:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chances</td>
<td>45:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changed</td>
<td>15:8 24:1,13,15 27:14 31:3 36:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changing</td>
<td>6:12 36:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chanshtnu</td>
<td>47:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterization</td>
<td>9:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase</td>
<td>49:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>check</td>
<td>28:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chiefly</td>
<td>56:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice</td>
<td>28:9 48:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choices</td>
<td>48:8,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>33:1 35:20 38:10,13 46:5 56:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher</td>
<td>53:5,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugach</td>
<td>2:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugak</td>
<td>54:19 63:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugak/eagle</td>
<td>50:4,8,14,19,22 63:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chugak/ekluta</td>
<td>53:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>churches</td>
<td>16:9 47:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circle</td>
<td>46:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city</td>
<td>17:17 29:18,21 54:21 64:24 65:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citywide</td>
<td>54:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claman</td>
<td>46:4 47:20,21,23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>60:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>54:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clause</td>
<td>58:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff</td>
<td>11:17 12:6,7,11 46:5 53:5 56:2,3,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clock</td>
<td>32:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close</td>
<td>32:13 45:17 74:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closely</td>
<td>22:3 53:14 64:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-chair</td>
<td>57:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalition</td>
<td>58:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coast</td>
<td>15:12 24:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherent</td>
<td>21:17 34:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coin</td>
<td>37:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination</td>
<td>22:25 65:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combine</td>
<td>24:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commend</td>
<td>32:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comment</td>
<td>48:17,18,22 51:10 61:12 72:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commented</td>
<td>42:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments</td>
<td>32:23 47:25 56:6,8 57:2 71:6 74:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commercial</td>
<td>6:23 7:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>committee</td>
<td>40:9 57:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>26:11 27:11,18 43:12 66:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community's</td>
<td>40:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compact</td>
<td>15:21 18:24 67:16,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compelled</td>
<td>29:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complaints</td>
<td>63:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completely</td>
<td>30:1 52:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comply</td>
<td>28:1 52:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compressed</td>
<td>65:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compromise</td>
<td>34:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Con</td>
<td>63:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concern</td>
<td>17:6 42:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerned</td>
<td>40:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concerns</td>
<td>58:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclude</td>
<td>21:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concluded</td>
<td>66:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concludes</td>
<td>28:18 63:20 70:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conclusion</td>
<td>8:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>concur</td>
<td>55:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>configuration</td>
<td>16:18 32:3 54:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confirmed</td>
<td>51:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confuse</td>
<td>61:18 62:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confusing</td>
<td>8:8 12:13 22:16 42:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>28:4 36:5 42:3 52:18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
deviation 27.9
deviations 61.23
differently 50.7, 13.14
difficult 13.11 32.8 33.22
difficulty 11.15 74.19
diminish 61.23
direct 18.2
directed 18.4 31.19 32.22 66.7
67.23 69.3 70.6
direction 31.15 32.18 46.19
57.21
directions 35.15 66.25
director 2.7
disappointed 15.2
discharged 42.6
discuss 21.21 70.1 73.1
discussed 22.6 10 31.22 32.1
33.10 37.4 48.5
discussing 72.18
discussion 22.15 37.11
disenfranchisement 36.6
dishonestly 37.23
dismayed 8.3
display 19.12
dispute 68.15
disregarded 18.17
district 7.11 9.10 18 12.14 15.16,
17.19, 22.23 13.5, 12.17 15.1, 8.13,
17.20 16.4 16.19 17.7, 9 18.2, 6.23
20.12 21.16, 18.23 22.4, 8, 17, 18,
19.23.5, 6, 12, 13 24.11, 14, 17 25.2,
4, 8, 21 26.3, 5, 11 29.25 30.1, 24.25,
31.1 34.19 35.5 40.5 49.19, 20
51.2 52.3, 4, 5, 8 53.9, 13, 16, 19
54.4, 10, 18, 23 55.1 58.1 59.5, 8,
15.17, 18, 20, 23, 25 60.6, 9 65.5, 6,
8.18 66.9 67.16, 18, 20, 24 68.8, 10,
12 69.5, 6, 11, 13, 14, 20, 23
districted 65.13 68.7
districts 6.3, 14 12.24 13.18, 20
21.25 22.23 23.7, 10, 14 24.25
25.3 27.9 32.11 34.9 41.17 48.25
49.1, 4 52.13, 21 54.5, 14 58.18, 22,
50, 19.45, 10
dozens 34.4
draft 24.24 33.17 34.5
drafted 53.24
dragged 28.5
drawn 68.12
drew 33.20
drive 9.12 13.14 17.14 23.9
46.16, 195.26
driving 25.2
drug 32.7
due 2.22 67.21
Dunsmore 58.2, 3, 4 60.16, 21
duties 42.6

e-mail 73.9
Eagle 12.23 13.4, 5 17.23 23.6, 13
27.14 30.1, 6 33.14 34.12, 20, 22
36.20 40.5, 7 47.1, 4, 10 49.15, 19
50.1, 2, 16, 51.1 54.2, 19 58.21, 22
62.19, 22, 23 63.3, 10, 14, 15
earlier 19.5 57.3
early 34.19 63.23 64.6 65.22
66.4, 6
ease 14.1, 6
east 6.10 13.14 21.15 29.13, 16,
23.25 30.15 34.23 38.14 39.4, 25
44.15, 18, 25 45.24 46.11, 15 49.11
53.18 58.24, 25 59.7, 8, 10 60.2
61.20 63.6 64.25 65.17
easy 11.24 47.17 62.12
echo 41.11 57.2 74.10
economics 57.1, 14, 16
Eddington 21.7, 9, 11, 12
education 26.6 57.1, 15
effect 25.12
effectively 45.10
effects 21.24 69.8
efficient 66.3
efficiently 70.16
effort 71.19
efforts 50.21
egregious 37.16
Elsiman 8.25 9.1, 3
Eklutna 53.23 54.19 55.17
elect 30.6 44.3
elected 21.13
election 8.16 21.1, 2 40.22 42.3,
4, 20 52.23, 24 62.2 66.18
elections 32.10 36.8
electoral 42.4 58.18
Elizabeth 56.18
eloquent 59.16
Elyse 16.24, 25 17.4 19.23
embrace 37.24
emphasis 18.7
encourage 31.14 34.15 35.13
45.13 47.12 61.15 70.10
encouraging 7.9
der 13.12 35.4 46.16 53.9 54.3
65.10 71.5
ending 5.4
enemies 57.8
engaged 41.1 74.13
enjoyed 36.15 37.10
enormous 8.5
entertain 3.17 4.9
entire 40.1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>remanded</th>
<th>68:13,18</th>
<th>resulted</th>
<th>41:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>remarks</td>
<td>41:11</td>
<td>resulting</td>
<td>69:10,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remedies</td>
<td>45:12</td>
<td>resume</td>
<td>2:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remedy</td>
<td>45:18</td>
<td>return</td>
<td>44:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remind</td>
<td>74:2</td>
<td>returned</td>
<td>67:24 68:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remove</td>
<td>42:2 69:4</td>
<td>reversed</td>
<td>67:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>removing</td>
<td>16:16</td>
<td>review</td>
<td>3:12,24 64:1 66:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repair</td>
<td>42:5</td>
<td>reviewed</td>
<td>58:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repeated</td>
<td>15:24 27:8</td>
<td>revising</td>
<td>3:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replace</td>
<td>69:20</td>
<td>revisited</td>
<td>70:14,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>replaced</td>
<td>68:12</td>
<td>revisit</td>
<td>10:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report</td>
<td>16:7 70:8,12,19,25 71:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representation</td>
<td>18:11 27:19</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>65:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40:7,11,20 45:15 65:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>representative</td>
<td>46:4 47:20,21,23 53:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented</td>
<td>25:8 30:3 62:24 63:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>request</td>
<td>3:22 35:3 44:23 54:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>require</td>
<td>25:2</td>
<td>Ripple</td>
<td>21:24 69:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirements</td>
<td>15:20 19:17 28:1 52:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residences</td>
<td>46:24</td>
<td>Rodriguez</td>
<td>26:16,17,20,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resident</td>
<td>6:6 14:24 21:12 30:21 38:15 40:1 44:15 52:3 53:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>residential</td>
<td>6:19,23 53:15 54:1 59:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolution</td>
<td>24:18,20,21 25:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resolve</td>
<td>28:13 53:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>respect</td>
<td>36:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rest</td>
<td>26:11 50:8,15,24 52:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>restoring</td>
<td>45:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>result</td>
<td>28:4 50:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>schedule</td>
<td>74:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>science</td>
<td>38:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>screen</td>
<td>3:24 64:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>secede</td>
<td>50:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>second-to-the-last</td>
<td>27:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seconded</td>
<td>4:14,22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>section</td>
<td>53:15 68:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senator</td>
<td>8:20,21,24 30:7 63:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>senators</td>
<td>62:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sentiments</td>
<td>74:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>separate</td>
<td>50:24 54:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>series</td>
<td>22:2 37:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serve</td>
<td>18:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>served</td>
<td>24:9,14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serves</td>
<td>25:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>services</td>
<td>50:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>session</td>
<td>13:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>set</td>
<td>22:4,14 23:10 51:11 68:19 70:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>settled</td>
<td>25:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settling</td>
<td>23:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sewer</td>
<td>54:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shape</td>
<td>15:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shapes</td>
<td>33:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>share</td>
<td>18:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shared</td>
<td>57:2,3,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shareholders</td>
<td>65:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>7:16 61:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shift</td>
<td>4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shop</td>
<td>17:19 47:6 54:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shopping</td>
<td>7:7 13:2,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shore</td>
<td>22:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>17:13 56:10 66:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showed</td>
<td>45:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showing</td>
<td>49:13 73:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shows</td>
<td>50:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sides</td>
<td>36:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant</td>
<td>46:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significantly</td>
<td>30:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silenced</td>
<td>37:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvers</td>
<td>29:4 33:1 35:20,23,24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar</td>
<td>6:25 7:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similarities</td>
<td>46:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simple</td>
<td>32:19 56:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simpler</td>
<td>38:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplest</td>
<td>31:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simplicity</td>
<td>38:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>simply</td>
<td>8:4 42:16 43:25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpson</td>
<td>2:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singer</td>
<td>64:3,8,13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single</td>
<td>28:7,9 49:14,16,19,20 50:2,10,17 51:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single-family</td>
<td>46:23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sit</td>
<td>24:19,20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>site</td>
<td>73:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situation</td>
<td>20:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>situations</td>
<td>10:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagway</td>
<td>64:24 65:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slew</td>
<td>44:4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silver</td>
<td>55:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slow</td>
<td>39:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small</td>
<td>53:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small-lot</td>
<td>54:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>socioeconomically</td>
<td>31:25 67:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution</td>
<td>31:6 32:20 38:24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solution's</td>
<td>47:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solutions</td>
<td>69:22,25 70:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound</td>
<td>14:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>66:8 67:9,12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southeastern</td>
<td>22:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>southern</td>
<td>22:1 23:1 53:15,18 54:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southport</td>
<td>35:7 60:5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>65:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spans</td>
<td>54:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speakers</td>
<td>17:10 19:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special</td>
<td>8:16 41:4 42:4 52:24 62:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>45:3 48:1 69:18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speedy</td>
<td>39:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spelled</td>
<td>69:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spenard</td>
<td>6:25 7:2 35:3 59:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spenardagain</td>
<td>59:21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spirit</td>
<td>45:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>split</td>
<td>23:8 37:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>splitting</td>
<td>37:14 60:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoke</td>
<td>55:17 59:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spoken</td>
<td>19:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>staff</td>
<td>74:11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stall</td>
<td>39:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stand</td>
<td>14:1 62:12,14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standard</td>
<td>41:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>start</td>
<td>5:21 28:23 44:5 49:17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting</td>
<td>58:21 67:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>39:16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statesman</td>
<td>55:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>statewide</td>
<td>17:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stating</td>
<td>10:11 37:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>status</td>
<td>70:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stay</td>
<td>35:3 41:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stepped</td>
<td>45:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stop</td>
<td>47:18 57:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straight</td>
<td>5:18 42:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>straightforward</td>
<td>31:19 32:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>street</td>
<td>46:21 52:12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strip</td>
<td>52:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>23:4 25:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strum</td>
<td>38:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sturm</td>
<td>33:1 35:20 38:10,11,12 39:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject</td>
<td>18:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>submitted</td>
<td>44:19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suburban</td>
<td>22:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>successful</td>
<td>41:13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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00:00:00

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. It's 8:00 on April 4th. We're going to call the meeting of the Alaska Redistricting Board to order. Peter, could you please call the roll to establish that a quorum is present?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Member Simpson?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Ms. Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEEO: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm here.

Peter, for consistency sake, can you go alphabetically next time, please?

MR. TORKELSON: Sure. Yeah. I just went opposite this time for a shakeup, but we can do that.

Mr. Chairman, all members -- oh,

Mr. Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: All members are present and
accounted for.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

We have a draft agenda before us. And I realize that this may be a little bit of a dynamic meeting, and so I think if we need to make adjustments to the agenda once we get into it, we'll see where the discussions go and what the sense of the board is.

We may need to make some adjustments, but, for now, there is a draft agenda out there. And I'd ask for any comments on that, or if there aren't, then we can have a motion to adopt it as it's presented, and then get started.

MEMBER BORROMEO: This is Nicole. I'll move the agenda as adopted -- I mean, as presented.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie, I don't know -- I think -- you know, once -- if you hit mute, Melanie, I think it blocks you out. We all have to stay off of mute. If any of us hit mute it won't allow us back in.

So I think there's a procedure that Peter can use to get you back online. And we'll just pause while you get back connected.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. Can -- Peter, can you please pull up the agenda so it's on the screen?
MR. TORKELSON: Oh, yeah. Yeah. Let me --
MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah, I'd appreciate that, too.
MEMBER MARCUM: While he's pulling that up, I'll just say that the risk for having this off mute all the time is that when my dog starts barking, when somebody knocks on the door, you guys are going to be subject to all of that because I can't mute myself to not have that happen. So just be aware, I guess, if that's the way we're going to do this.
MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm in the same boat, Bethany. I've got dogs.
MR. TORKELSON: It's less than ideal. I just went through a couple of revisions.
MEMBER BAHNKE: I would have been there in person, but it's my board's strategic planning week. Every five years we do strategic planning. It's been put on hold for the last two years, so this is the week.
MR. TORKELSON: Do you guys see -- see the agenda here?
MEMBER BAHNKE: No. I see --
MR. SINGER: No. It's the online public notice page.
CHAIR BINKLEY: I can read it off. I've got
it here, I think, if that helps.

MR. TORKELSON: No. I'll have it here shortly.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: So are you seeing --

MR. SINGER: We're seeing -- the online public notice web page, is what I'm seeing.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Peter, while you're pulling that up, I'd also appreciate, after you're able to pull that up, if you could pull up the map I had proposed in November, not as part of the meeting, but have it handy.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay. So this is -- this is a slight modification, where I detailed out the discussion process. So I think that's what we're planning to do today. But as the chairman acknowledged, it can be a --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Can everybody see that okay?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There is a motion before us. I'm not sure that we got a second on it, though, to adopt the agenda as drafted.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Motion before us and seconded to adopt the draft agenda as presented.

Is there discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, the agenda is adopted.

The first item on the agenda is public testimony. Is there anybody on the line or in the LIO office there locally that wishes to testify before the board this morning?

MR. TORKELSON: I'm just checking with folks in the room, and it does not appear there is anyone here that wishes to testify at this time.

Denaya (phonetic), is there anyone online?

MEMBER BORROMEO: There's no one on the line either, John.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Great. Let's -- I'm just adjusting my screen. Let's move on to the discussion of the board on process on how we proceed from this point.

And I'll just open up the floor for discussions. So you can raise your hand or otherwise signal me, and then I'll call on you.

I see both Budd and Nicole have their hands up.

Budd, what are your thoughts on this?
MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I had sent a short memo around maybe, I don't know, a week or several days ago just suggesting process and kind of timing for this. That -- that would be my suggestion, that today I was hoping we would get some more public testimony, but we already have some on record. I'd like to get more. I would like an opportunity to hear from the public on possible alternative pairings and any other plan that someone wants to comment on.

I'd like to have a couple of days for folks to do that, think about it, and then we could meet and hear public testimony on plans that are before -- before the public.

I know there's some sense on some members to kind of move things along, but there's -- I think there's one plan that's -- that's been put out there, and I would just like to see if there's any others.

I personally do not have one at this point that I'm pushing or promoting, but I feel like just having one before us doesn't really fulfill our obligations to look at different options.

So a couple of days to see if people come up with other suggestions, couple days to kind of soak those and meet again to hear comment on any other
suggestions that have been submitted, and then a
couple days more to assimilate that, and then us
meet, and then vote on it.

You know, we'll always have an issue with
people's conflicting schedule things. For myself, I
was tied up with other matters until now, but for the
next couple of weeks I'm available except on the
11th, because I have a hard unavailability that day.
Otherwise, I'm available day or night.

And the main point being that the judge who
now has control of this process has given us until
the 15th to provide a status report. I -- I am
hoping that that status report is, "Here's a new
Senate pairing."

And as I also -- so I'm -- I'd like to move
this along, but not in a way that I'm feeling rushed
or like I don't have a chance to -- to think about
these things, or that -- or that cuts anybody out who
may want to testify or offer a different suggestion
or whatever.

So my -- my goal would be to finish this
process before the 15th so that we can provide a
report to the Court on the 15th saying that, you
know, "We're done. What do you think about this?"

So I haven't put specific dates in there,
subject to hearing what other people's scheduling and
conflicts may be, but that's -- that's the thrust of
what I would like to do and what I put in that memo
last week.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Budd.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I'm going to
be a little bit more definitive when it comes to
timelines here.

What I would like to see moving forward from
the board is today we deal with Cantwell. I said
back in December that I believe this whole process
can be wrapped up in 15 minutes.

Respecting what Budd has said and asking for
a few more days, though, I'm willing to deal with
Cantwell today. I'm going to be at some point moving
my last version of that map.

I would like to introduce alternative
pairings for Anchorage today, have them sit out
today, tomorrow, and have the board act on those
final pairings on Wednesday.

I take a different position from Budd on how
long the public has had to engage in this process.

It's been a full five months since November. They've
had five months to consider the Senate pairings, to follow the redistricting litigation. They've been weighing in.

There was a slew of public testimony that came in over the weekend. There was even more here in the Anchorage office at the LIO and more on the line. The message has been a resounding, loud and clear, that they'd like to see the Bahnke pairings and they'd like to get this done as soon as possible from the board's position and not to delay the matters any more. Thank you.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Let's see. Go ahead, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. Just one thing. I certainly wouldn't object to trying to deal with the Cantwell appendage today. As I had said in my memo, I am hoping, I believe, that that won't be controversial. I think that was something that was not controversial at the time it was adopted, and we have a pretty clear directive from the court on that. So I -- you know, I don't object to moving that forward.

And that takes one thing off the list, very much narrows what we have to do with the -- the rest of our time.
I would object to simply scheduling a vote on Wednesday, before we've had a chance to let other people weigh in on possible other pairings. I understand that there was an alternative submitted way last November, but it isn't really the case that people have had five months to weigh in on it because that was not the one we adopted, and it wasn't known until a couple of weeks ago that that wouldn't be the one that would move forward.

So people really haven't had a full opportunity to comment on other options, besides that.

I -- I'm sympathetic to the desire to move forward. I'd like to do that, but under a little bit more controlled circumstances where people have a full and complete opportunity to weigh in on other specific plans which are not before us right now.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Follow-up?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?

MEMBER BAHNKE: John, I don't know if you can see, but my hand's been up for a while.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Oh, I'm sorry. I did not see it. I'm sorry, Melanie. Yep, I see it now. Go ahead, please.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. First of all --
MEMBER BORROMEO: Mr. Chair, I just have a follow-up, as Budd had a follow-up to me, and then I'll throw it to Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: That's fine.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yep, go ahead, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

I'm willing to push this out as far as Thursday. At that point, though, I don't see any benefit to dragging this out any longer.

I would also respectfully request that if there's going to be alternative pairings from this board, that you put them on the record. I've already said that I'm going to support the Bahnke pairings, and that's going to be my position coming out of the meeting today. So I'd like to know what other options there are from the board, if you have any other options.

And I know you were tied up this weekend unfortunately, Budd. I'm very sorry for your loss. But if you haven't had a chance to watch the hearing or read the testimony, that would be a good place to start.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Budd, first of all, my condolences to your family. I wish you had been at the meeting on Saturday, because we resoundingly heard that we must move quickly and not belabor this process any further. Overwhelmingly, written and verbal testimony was to adopt certain Senate pairings, actually pairings that you and I had worked on together in a side meeting when we were considering Senate pairings.

And although everybody keeps calling it the Bahnke pairings, it should really be called the Bahnke/Simpson pairings, because you and I did work on that together.

Member Simpson: You're saying no? You don't remember going into that side room with me when we were trying to figure out what to pair with Anchorage?

Member Bahnke: No, we didn't vote on that, but that's -- I had asked you to come and join me because you and I both don't live in Anchorage and I thought we would be impartial.

Reading the room, so to say, reading the state, overwhelmingly the public testimony is for us...
not to delay. The Court's been very specific in its remand and instructed us to fix only two specific parts of our proclamation, the Cantwell House district and Senate District K.

And I don't see why we need to belabor this any further. I appreciate that you're wanting to have public testimony. Public testimony weighed in on Saturday. They said no more delays.

So I'm prepared to introduce Senate pairings today to at least get them on the record for people to consider. I'm not expecting a vote today, but I think we need to move this -- move this along.

We've had since November for the public to consider the two maps that were put on the record, so there has been at least one map that's been out there that wasn't voted on since November. December, January, February, March, April, five months now.

So I am prepared to at least get those on the record so that the public can start commenting on those today. And I would appreciate if you would (indiscernible) through that so they're formally on the record as being considered.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I see Matt has had his hand up. Matt, go ahead.

MR. SINGER: Yes, with regard to Cantwell as
a start, it sounds like Member Borromeo may have a map -- you know, a solution to put up and show the board.

I would encourage the board to follow the basic steps that are in Section 10 of the constitution.

So when you're talking about Cantwell, if -- if the board -- if a board member has a proposal for what District 36 and District 30 should look like after correction, if the board could adopt that as a proposed or a considered solution today, and then post it to the website, just give the public an opportunity to comment on it, have a public hearing on that, and then return at your next meeting, as soon as you've shared it with the public, and adopt that solution at your final.

But I think that those steps -- and I know everybody's motivated to get this done, but those steps are important. There was litigation ten years ago when the board acted on remand and did not -- did not then have a hearing on its solutions, and the Superior Court said: No, you need to go back and have a hearing.

So just -- just to take, you know, sort of the dance steps here that we need to take. So I
would encourage -- Member Borromeo, I agree, this is really a technical edit. I agree with the comments that it's very likely to be -- it's likely to be uncontroversial. But, you know, every now and again we make -- we miss a census block that we thought we clicked or we make another little error and somebody -- we benefit from public testimony. We benefit from hearing from people.

So I would encourage, again, see if there's an agreement to adopt a revised District 36 and District 30, post those to the website and invite comments -- specifically invite comments about them, and then after hearing testimony adopt a final solution to District 36 and 30.

And those are the same steps that I encourage for the Senate -- for you all to decide on your schedule. But those are the steps that -- that should come for addressing the Senate District K, as well.

That's all I had. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

Budd, and then Nicole.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yeah, I -- I am on board with what Matt just said.

I -- I like the idea of going ahead and putting the
Cantwell -- Member Borromeo's Cantwell solution, I would like to see that.

As I said, I don't think it's going to be controversial, but I think Matt is giving good advice that we could give it a couple of days before we vote and see if there is any public feedback on that.

Same with Member Bahnke's suggested Senate pairings. I have no objection whatsoever and would encourage her to put it on -- just, you know, move it today, and that simply extends the amount of time people will have to look at it. I know they've said it's been sort of on the table for a while, but I think moving it now would clarify for everybody exactly what those pairings are, so if they want to support or oppose them they know what they're talking about, so we're all on the same page.

So I would encourage that. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Budd.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Peter's going to pull up my Cantwell from v4. And I'd like to move that the board adopt this solution for the remand from our court system.

It would be returning Cantwell to the Denali Borough. That's the motion I'm making. I'm not
expecting a vote today, Mr. Chairman. I want to be clear, but I would like that vote to come on Wednesday.

I'd also like special notice to go out to the Doyon Coalition so that they know, since they would have an interest in this, and that would help satisfy the public process, as well.

So to be clear, my motion is I would like my v4 with the Cantwell appendage removed. That community would be returned to the Denali Borough. The board would vote on this two days from now, on Wednesday, and special notice would go to the Doyon Coalition. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I heard quite a bit. I don't know if that was a full motion, everything that you said in that, including a final decision on Wednesday. Was that your motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible) a final decision today, but it sounds like we -- we're going to drag this out. So if -- if the board is not willing to vote today, I want a time certain to vote. And my second option is going to be Wednesday. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So the motion as I understand it is to adopt v4 version. And we need to
see what that means, because there was, I think, a lot of different things in v4, as I recall, but the v4 version, which I think was the same as v3 with regards to Cantwell and District 36 and the Denali Borough. So we'll need to be more specific on that probably.

And then the motion also says to make a final decision by Wednesday. So that's the motion, as I understand it, before us. And if that's not the motion, let me know, and then I'll see if there's a second to that motion.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I'd like to wait until Peter pulls up Nicole's proposed action in terms of it being on an actual map.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think just technically -- and I hate to be too technical here, but there's a motion made. And if there's going to be discussion on the motion we need to have a second for it to be actually on the board before us. Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER MARCUM: That's my understanding of Robert's Rules.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah, I'll second it for
purposes of discussion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion before us and seconded. Now discussion.

Peter, Melanie had asked to bring version 3 and version 4 up to -- whichever version. They're both the same with regards to Cantwell. But if you could bring those up, please, and we can see what that looks like, that would be helpful for purposes of discussion.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. So I'm actually not in autoBound on the host computer. I have prepared for this with some screenshots to walk members through the differences, so we can shift gears to autoBound if we really want to drill into the block level. But as a starting point, if I may just walk through sort of the big picture, if that's okay, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Sure, please.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay. So what you see here is -- thanks. The purple line is the plan that the board adopted. So you see the Cantwell carve -- the Cantwell sort of appendage towards the center of the screen here. I'll highlight that with my cursor, the purple.

And then the red is the District 25 boundary
just prior to us making that decision. You'll notice that it follows the highway up here, and then it -- in the previous version, which Member Borromeo is referring to as her before, District 25 northern boundary is bounded by the southern boundary of the Denali Borough and the northern boundary of the Mat-Su -- Susitna Borough.

And then as you move to the east side, the northern boundary of District 25 is bounded by the eastern boundary of the Matanuska-Susitna Borough.

You'll see that there's actually three districts (indiscernible). And I'll zoom in a little bit now and remove the red line so you can see this more clearly.

The dashed lines are in the borough boundary. To the north is the Denali Borough, the south is the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, and the line here is the -- and to the north is the Matanuska-Susitna Borough boundary.

So my understanding of before, what I found in autoBound would be to return that boundary to -- 25 would be -- as you see here in the color coding now, the light orange is to District 30, the southern yellow tone would be the new District 25. The purplish tone over here -- there's one with the
numbers. The purplish tone on the right would be the new 36.

So there's three district changes, using the borough boundary as a divider where 30 and 25 meet, and then using the Matanuska-Susitna Borough as a boundary where 25 and 36 (indiscernible).

MEMBER SIMPSON: Peter, can you show us where Cantwell is, just make a dot or put the cursor there?

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. It's -- it's -- here, let me zoom in. Maybe it's here, but it's very small. So let's see. See Cantwell's label right there?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: Is that visible?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. I couldn't see it on the other version.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. It -- yeah, autoBound is printed so small, so Cantwell is in this sort of -- the tone is fairly similar, but it's a slightly grayer version just to the east of the highway. This is the Parks Highway to Fairbanks, and this area here --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, this is Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can I -- Nicole said wait until Wednesday to have a vote on this motion. I don't know how that works in terms of other motions that are going to be coming forward, how we close out this motion if it's already on the table. Can you -- with your vast experience in Robert's Rules of Order, how do we do this?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, there's a legitimate motion on the table. We are on discussion now, and then we'll vote on two options.

One, the maker of the motion could withdraw the motion or the maker of the motion could ask to amend the motion. There could be an amendment from another member to amend the motion, or a member could move to table the motion, which does not have any debate, and you immediately vote on tabling that motion. So those are kind of the options, as I see them.

But, Matt, I see you've got your hand up, so a question to process on this?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Just a follow-up to that real quickly, though. Could we vote on this today, and then if we hear kind of public input against what we did we could reconsider on Thursday?

(Indiscernible) of this? Is that an option?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, the motion was to have it finalized on Wednesday. We can -- you know, anytime we are in session we can change whatever the intent or the outcome of the motion was, so even later in the evening we could change our mind up there.

Maybe I'll go to Matt to see if there was further clarification on that.

MR. SINGER: I would really encourage the board to follow the process set forth in Section 10. So -- and that would involve today's motion being a motion to adopt this revision as a proposed correction to the proclamation plan. And so then the board could adopt a proposed correction to the -- and it could end up one or more proposed corrections.

And then publish that to the public, and then come back and adopt a final proclamation plan, a final correction. So I -- I think that rather than adopt the correction -- or adopt a correction but vote on it Wednesday, take -- I would break it down. Adopt it as a proposed plan, publish it, adopt it as a final plan. That's the -- I encourage, that's the process contemplated under Section 10 generally.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany, I think you had your hand up for a while. Sorry.
MEMBER MARCUM: I have had, yes. Thank you.

So before we saw the map, I also worked on a Cantwell solution on the map. And I want to -- I'd like to -- I just would like to be able to compare in autoBound what I worked on with what is being proposed here today.

So either we could take the time to do that today during the meeting or we could do that this evening. But one way or another, I want to have time to compare the solution that I've worked on to what has been proposed. I'm not prepared to vote on even adopting a proposed correction until I've had a chance to do that.

It shouldn't take long. I just want to be able to compare the populations in the districts that I see after the corrections, make sure they match up with what has been proposed here. But I'm not prepared to vote unless I am able to have the chance to do that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I understand.

Budd, and then Nicole.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I'm interested in seeing what Member Marcum has as an alternative, but in my mind that doesn't prevent us from adopting a proposed version that
Member Borromeo has and then looking at it again on Wednesday.

By scheduling it for a vote on Wednesday, I don't see any real downside to that either. If we get between now and then another suggested solution from Member Marcum, we can look at that, as well. We can take into account any public testimony on the Cantwell issue between now and then.

And all of that just works toward better process, I think, and since process was an issue in the litigation, I -- I'm all in favor of trying to fix any problems we had with that for this round.

So I'm in favor of adopting Member Borromeo's version to put it on the table. I'm in favor of anybody else that has a different idea, putting that on the table, and then getting comments and looking at it again on Wednesday. Even though we put it up for a vote on Wednesday to kind of move things along, I'm good with that, too.

But, you know, if we get a whole bunch of other alternatives that look like they might somehow be more elegant or in some way better, which I'm not really expecting, we don't have to vote for it. So I'm good with what's been suggested by counsel here.

Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Just to clarify that, the motion as I heard it was to adopt it on Wednesday. But what you're suggesting, Budd, is that we vote on it on Wednesday? I think there's a little -- maybe it's a nuance, but I think there's a difference. The implication by the motion as I understand it is that we will be adopting it on Wednesday, not that we'll look at it on Wednesday and decide whether to adopt it. So I --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I -- I understood that we'd be voting on it on Wednesday, not that it's, like, automatically adopted today but not effective until Wednesday. So I thought we're going to take testimony and then decide on Wednesday.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So it would be -- that would, I think, require a slight change in the motion to bring it before the board on Wednesday for potential final adoption. So maybe that's just a nuance that isn't too critical.

Okay. I've got Nicole, then Bethany, then Melanie.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I know it's early, and perhaps folks still haven't had their coffee, but this is getting way more complicated than it needs to be for the Cantwell carve-out.
My motion, again, is to return to v4 best for Cantwell. All of those deviations were in the constitutional limits. All of the lines met the big three that we talked about versus being compact. That is the proposed solution that I am suggesting today.

I would also like to amend my motion to potentially vote on that proposed solution today, because I don't believe it's controversial. We haven't received a single public comment regarding this deficiency since the Court ruling.

I understand, though, that it may appear as though we're rushing, unnecessarily so, but I do want a time certain date that we know as a board that we're going to wrap this up. I do not want it dragging out forever.

And I also want to second Bethany's request. If she needs ten minutes to look at deviations and draw, please, let's give that to her and stand at ease so she can do her mapping. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany, and then Melanie.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

I've already done the mapping, so it should be very fast. And I think there's a 90 percent
chance that what Member Borromeo and Peter worked on
is the same, but because it wasn't presented in
autoBound I can't be sure. So that's all I'm asking
is to be able to compare the autoBound amount --
autoBound populations that I have on my computer here
with what was presented there, since I couldn't see
that part of the thing.

So, you know, at the most, ten minutes. So,
yes, that's all I'm asking.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And thank you,

Bethany.

Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I was just going to comment
in support of allowing Bethany to have five or ten
minutes that she needs to compare what Peter put up
on the screen with her actual autoBound.

Knowing her mapping expertise, I'd like her
to feel comfortable with her vote today. And if she
needs to double-check, can we take a five-minute at
ease before we vote on this motion, or ten minutes,
however much time she needs to compare?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, we can certainly take
an at ease to allow that to occur.

I'm just going to mention that my concern --
I've been a little concerned. I was disappointed
with the Supreme Court's ruling that Cantwell should not be within the District 36. To me, there was overwhelming testimony. The only testimony we received was from those people affected in that area to be included in District 36.

I thought there was compelling testimony at the Supreme Court through the -- Calista, in talking about respecting ANCSA boundaries. That really was the purpose of why we looked at including Cantwell with District 36, so that we could respect the boundaries of Ahtna, which they had requested, which people from that district had requested.

People from the Denali Borough did not oppose this, moving -- allowing Ahtna to have their shareholders all in one district. People in Cantwell did not oppose it.

The only people that opposed it were the Mat-Su Borough and the City of Valdez, which really were not affected by this. And so it was upsetting to me. I thought the Superior Court got it right that the people in Cantwell deserved to be with people who they socioeconomically integrate with, even though they might be in a different borough, and I -- and I'm waiting. I'm hoping that the request by Calista that the courts make -- or give respect to
the ANCSA boundaries is important.

And I'm hopeful in the final ruling of the Supreme Court that they address that issue. They ignored it in their initial ruling.

And I don't know if there's a way -- maybe not. But the distribution -- I guess the Supreme Court ruling was pretty clear, but maybe a question for Matt.

Is there any way that -- I guess it would be difficult, but if we knew where Ahtna shareholders were in the Cantwell area, to be able to bifurcate that, put some of it back in the Denali Borough and apportion the -- so the Ahtna shareholders could be together?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I'm just going to interject here. As much as I appreciate your concern for ANCSA shareholders, the Court's been clear. They told us to fix the Cantwell cutout.

We can't bifurcate a community in itself and divide it into Native and non-Native or shareholders and non-shareholders. I think that will get litigated.

We have two tasks before us: fix Cantwell and fix Senate District K. And I don't care to entertain bifurcating Cantwell, because that's just
going to encourage and invite more litigation. We need to listen to what the Supreme Court said.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Melanie. I appreciate your commentary on that.

Matt?

MR. SINGER: Mr. Chair, I think the Supreme Court's -- from the questioning at the oral argument, I think its thinking is that everyone within the Denali Borough is socioeconomically integrated as a matter of law, and so therefore you can't legally improve Cantwell socioeconomic integration by putting it with Ahtna communities.

And so the -- I think the clear direction of the court is that in that instance the board needs to honor the borough boundaries. And so I don't -- well, I certainly appreciate and agree that there was, you know, the -- I would call this a -- to me, if the Court found an error, I would call it an error of enthusiasm.

I mean, the board was -- the board was seeking -- it's 200 people. The board heard compelling testimony. It was seeking a district that served the interests of the people who -- who you heard from. That's what you tried to do throughout the state.
So I -- but I think at this point there's not much room for creativity. The -- the -- you really should adopt a new District 36 and a new District 30 that do not have an appendage, a visual appendage, and that do not break into the -- either the Denali Borough, or we slightly broke into the Mat-Su Borough in that location near Cantwell, and we should avoid that, as well.

I just don't see any other solution that would be -- that I would -- in my guess would be palatable to the Court if there were a second round of challenge.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Okay. That answers my question on that.

Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. It's been a minute, but I for once did agree with Matt here, so I'm going to lower my hand and just second what he said, and also put in the queue that Bethany needs mapping time.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. That's it?

Budd, you had your hand up.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. Thank you,

Mr. Chair.

I just wanted to thank you for articulating,
you know, some of what was on our mind at the -- at the time we did adopt that appendage for Cantwell. I put it in the category of no good turn goes unpunished. We were simply trying to accommodate what the people that live there had asked for, and I think at the time we knew that it made a strange appendage but decided to do it anyway.

But I -- I also agree with Melanie that the instructions from the Supreme Court are clear, and, you know, I don't think we have a lot of discretion on what to do about that at this point. I'm still interested to see if there is something from Bethany that, you know, is just a different approach. It sounds like there really won't be, so let's get Bethany her few minutes, and then look at any comparison there is.

And then I -- I would still support putting this on the agenda to vote on in a couple of days.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, Matt?

MR. SINGER: Just -- again, just to reiterate, I mean, I really -- just to take care with the process so we're not -- so there's not criticism about the process, I would strongly encourage the board to consider the motion to be we adopt this as
our -- as our proposed revised proclamation plan for
Districts 36 and 30. So --

MEMBER MARCUM: And --

MR. SINGER: -- just adopt -- use the
word --

MEMBER MARCUM: And 29, too, I believe,
right? To be clear, there's three districts.

MR. SINGER: Yeah, and 29. So proposed --
you know, proposed correction. Use those words in
your motion. Publish it to the public and to your
website as a proposed correction.

Then have public hearings on it. You can
invite hearing even today, after you adopt, and then
again whether we meet tomorrow or Wednesday, and then
adopt it as your final.

I really strongly encourage the board to use
the words that are contemplated in Section 10. So
adopt or at least publish a proposed plan, and then
hear from the public, and then adopt a final plan.

So I -- I don't get to make amendments to
motions, but I would really strongly encourage the
board to consider clarifying this motion to adopt a
proposed plan.

And I would counsel you that it's -- in my
view, we risk the Court saying we have violated
1 Section 10 if we don't adopt a proposed plan, tell
2 the public this is our correction, and then adopt it
3 as final. That's -- those -- that's the steps that
4 the board needs to take. Thank you.
5
6 CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?
7
8 MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I'm going to
9 withdraw my previous motion. I have a new motion.
10 I would like to propose a correction to
11 Section 10 that would fix our Districts 36, 30, and
12 29 by reverting to my last version of v4 best. In
13 simple terms it would return Cantwell to the Denali
14 Borough. It would remain within the constitutionally
15 permitted deviations. All three districts would be
16 more compact, and that's what I'm going to propose as
17 a correction.
18
19 CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. The second to the
20 motion I believe was Budd?
21
22 MEMBER SIMPSON: It was. And I -- I concur
23 with the withdrawal and the new motion, with the
24 understanding that it -- it is published at this
25 point, adopted as a proposed correction, and will be
26 subject to a final vote on Wednesday.
27
28 CHAIR BINKLEY: And okay. I've got a quick
29 question.
30
31 Peter, I know Nicole keeps referring to her
v4 best. Was there -- is that clear to you what she's talking about there? I know that we adopted -- had a version that we had worked on. Is that the description of -- I think v3 was the same. I think the final -- I can't remember the sequencing, but I just want to make sure that you're clear in what it is that we're proposing here.

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yeah, I believe I'm clear on it. It's clear to me what I think needs to be done, and I think by comparing it with Member Marcum's independent work on this matter, we'll have -- in a way check each other to be sure that we're on the same page and that the population statistics, the block counts and so forth, will help verify that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. If there's no objection then, that motion is before us. But we're going to take an at ease, say for -- let's see. Why don't we come back at 9:00 sharp. And that will give --

Bethany, will that give you enough time to go through in autoBound and make the clarifications or the verifications of what you're concerned about?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah. I'll just call Peter offline and we can do a population comparison. It
should be very fast.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MEMBER MARCUM: I've already got it done, so --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And, Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. Peter, while we're at the at ease, can you please have that map ready with the Senate pairings from November? I intend to do the same thing with that, not rush for a vote today, but to introduce it as a proposed correction after we deal with this.

So, Peter, have that ready to go, please.

MR. TORKELSON: Sure. And, Member Bahnke, you're referring to the graphics that you and I have been working on, is that --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Peter, technically, could you tell us what we do here for the next ten minutes? Do we all stay on, not talk?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. Yes, please stay on your Zoom call. Don't disconnect in any way. We're just simply going to pause the recording, and I'm going to ask Denaya to pause the LAA teleconference
audio, just so it's on pause, and then we'll break.
And we'll just unpause and restart recording to start
the meeting again at 9:00.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So we should not shut off
our video or our audio during the next ten minutes?

MR. TORKELSON: No. If -- if you would like
to mute yourself, you can, and I'll unmute you when
we come back in. But do please leave your video on.
Just put a sticky over your camera if you'd like some
privacy.

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can mute the audio.

We're going to stand at ease until 9:00. Thank you.
(Off record.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. It looks like we're
back on. Matt and Bethany, it doesn't look like
you're unmuted. I don't know what the window of
opportunity is here to unmute. So you might --
Bethany's unmuted.

Matt, you might give it a try to unmute.

MEMBER MARCUM: John, just so you know,
Peter was having trouble with his computer, so we
have not been able to complete the task yet. He's
having to restart his computer in order to be able to
get to the numbers for us to compare.

Can you hear me?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yep, we can hear you.
MEMBER MARCUM: Okay.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Let's -- that's why I see he's away from the desk right now, so let's give a moment for Peter to get back to the desk.
MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Go ahead, Peter.
MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. We -- the same laptop I drew this on is also doing the Zoom public desk, and apparently they don't play well together. So I had a couple of crashes, and we don't actually have the verification we were hoping to have. It shouldn't be very long, but Bethany didn't have a chance to -- we didn't have a chance to compare all -- everything we wanted to compare.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. What are your thoughts, Peter? Is this something you think you can get fixed fairly quickly, or is this going to just be symptomatic of -- because of the fact you've got two different things going on on the computer?
MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. I -- I think it'll work. Perhaps if the board has additional conversations they'd like to continue on with, I can work, you know, in parallel to try to get this thing up and going and hopefully come back with some
resolution. I mean, if that's amiable to the board.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Budd, I see you have your hand up, and then Nicole.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Did you say me, Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: My -- my suggestion would be that we adopt this just for publication and as a proposed solution, and let Bethany and Peter get together, you know, after the meeting and look at it. And if -- if Bethany has any issues before Wednesday, she can report on those. And if -- if not, she can tell us that, too, and we can move forward without further delay on that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So if I'm understanding that -- and, Nicole, I'll grab you next.

So adopt it, and the language of Nicole's latest motion, proposed correction, but subject to verification of all the members comporting? Is that what you're saying?

MEMBER SIMPSON: That's right. And the reason we're putting it off until Wednesday anyway is in case there's any other public comment or, you know, observations, whatever. So it's -- it's open -- it's an open question until Wednesday anyway.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. And, Nicole, I know
you've got your hand up next. And I just want to verify that Wednesday -- we really haven't settled on schedules yet, but I know you had said Wednesday or Thursday in your desire to move things along quickly with regard to this and the other Senate pairings, but I'm not sure if Wednesday was specific in your motion. And maybe at some point we need to talk about the schedules, whether it's Wednesday or Thursday that we come back.

Go ahead, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible) just echo what Budd said, that we should move this forward as a proposed correction, just like my motion said, act on it Wednesday. That'll give Bethany sufficient time, as well as the public, to weigh in on other proposed corrections to District 36, 30, and 29. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think that works, too. It is proposed, so we could come back. Even if there were some slight differences in some of the census blocks, we could come back on Wednesday, if that is the day that we decided to meet, and make the corrections at that time. And I would imagine they would be minor.

So even though the district that we would have proposed today -- the public would have had time
to weigh in on that by Wednesday, presumably. And if we do decide to take action, we could make minor changes, and that probably would be just fine, I would imagine.

Okay. I don't know if Peter's back yet or with us, but, otherwise, is there further discussion on Nicole's motion?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'd call for the question, Mr. Chairman.

Oh, I'll defer to Budd. He has his hand up.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I was only going to say I thought Matt had his hand up a minute ago, if he had something else to add. If not, I'm ready to go ahead.

MR. SINGER: Just I think board members have made the point that I was going to make, which is that adopting a proposed solution is -- you know, a board member taking time to study a proposed solution and look at the data is exactly why you make a proposed solution and publish it is you're going to be doing the same thing the public will be doing is scrutinizing is this the best -- is this the best solution? Did we make any inadvertent errors?

So you're not foreclosing Member Marcum from taking a really careful look, and I would encourage
taking a careful look.

So that was my point, is just you're on the right track.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Well, Peter's not back, but I don't know that there's going to be any opposition to this motion. And if we don't need a roll call vote then we won't need Peter at the desk.

So at this point I'm going to close discussion and ask if there's any -- well, first make sure everybody understands the motion. If everybody understands the motion, is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, the motion carries.

Okay. So let's move on. We're still actually in the agenda. We're talking about process, but let's keep moving forward.

Nicole, you have your hand up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I'd like to propose a correction to Senate District K. I would like to move the commonly termed Bahnke pairings, which are Districts 22 and 24, 20 and 21, 18 and 19 --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole --

MEMBER BORROMEO: -- 23 and 17, 16 and 14, 13 and 12, 15 and 10, 11 and 9. These would be a
proposed correction to Section 10 in the order.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Say, Nicole, I wasn't quite quick enough to write all those down. Would you mind repeating that just a little bit slower so I can take notes on that?

MEMBER SIMPSON: And you were cutting out a little bit, too.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Sure, I'm happy to. Okay. I'm moving the so-called Bahnke pairings, House Districts 22 and 24, 20 and 21, 18 and 19, 23 and 17, 16 and 14, 13 and 12, 15 and 10, 11 and 9.

MEMBER BAHNKE: And I seconded that motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And just to make sure I understand the motion, it's in the -- it's consistent with the other motion that you had made, Nicole, adopting this as a proposed correction to the Senate pairings in Anchorage?

MEMBER BORROMEO: That is correct. This is a proposed correction. It will sit out in the public sphere for a few days for comment.

I would intend to move this Wednesday with the Cantwell carve-out proposed correction that we just talked about. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So the motion is before us with those numbers as -- as read out by
Nicole. Let's have discussion on the motion.

Let's see. Peter, you've got a map up here for us. These are the underlying House districts.

MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to -- I want to confirm with the maker of the motion that this map graphically reflects the numerical numbers that she just gave us. I believe that it does.

So the numbers are here as she stated them, but then they're colored -- for example, 18 and 19 here in a light tan color, 15 and 10 in orange, 11 and 9 in pink, and so forth, to indicate which House districts would go together in this proposal.

So I would like the maker of the motion, if possible, (indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: That is accurate. I'm happy to speak to the pairing, too, under purposes of discussion as to why this makes the most logical sense and complies with our constitution.

Thank you, Peter.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I can't see members now. I can only see the map, so I don't know if people have their hands up or where we are on any of this. Maybe there's a split screen coming up now. I see one member on it. Oh, now I can see all the
MEMBER BAHNKE: I was going to say, Mr. Chair, you can -- under your view, up on the top right, if you choose, there's a side by side when there's a map up or whatever, but now it's on gallery.

I'd also like to speak to the motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie, was that you?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Since it's the Bahnke plan, maybe we should have you lead off with explanation of your plan.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Well, I mean, you can call it that. How about we call it the plan for all Alaskans?

I introduced this map back in November. It's been out there. We received a lot of public testimony in favor of these Senate pairings as soon as a portal was open for public comment.

I didn't make these pairings lightly. I don't live in Anchorage. I don't have some kind of advantage to gain here. This was the Senate pairings that I felt most reflected what the constitution requires of us.

I know we don't have to apply the same
criteria to Senate pairings as we do when determining House boundaries, but I do feel like the pairings are socioeconomically integrated, they're compact, they're contiguous. They meet all of the constitutional criteria.

Since this map has been out since November, it's had a chance to undergo public scrutiny. And I would also ask that we vote on this on Wednesday, along with the Cantwell cutout, and move forward so that the state has some certainty under which maps they will be voting for and that the maps are constitutional and fair.

Those are my comments.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Other comments from board members? And I'm not certain that -- I think in the motion, and I'm not certain about this, but is it really consider this at our next meeting? I mean, I'm not certain we're -- it's going to actually be Wednesday. It could be Thursday. But our next meeting.

Bethany, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to say I heard -- I heard Wednesday mentioned later, after the motion. So I
wanted to also get clarification what you were just
mentioning as to whether or not Wednesday is part of
the motion or if that is just a suggestion.

I wanted to personally say that I won't be
prepared to vote on Wednesday. I'm happy to adopt
this as a potential correction for the purpose of
discussion, but I do want there to be an opportunity
for more discussion.

I personally have heard from multiple
members of the community asking about possible
pairings and what can and can't be done, and so
through those conversations I'm under the impression
that others are also working on pairings, as have I
been.

And so I would like to see what -- what
members of the community come up with. I think it is
incumbent upon us to allow the community
opportunities -- multiple opportunities to give us
their thoughts.

You know, this particular pairing was
introduced last fall, but that was before the
judiciary weighed in on several changes that they
required. And so now that the judiciary has given
that -- and just yesterday for the first time our
attorney went on record to give the interpretation of
what that means. And so only since that interpretation was provided by counsel yesterday to the public has the public really been able to incorporate that into any pairings they might be working on.

So I think it's important that we give the opportunity for the public to present alternative pairings and for us to consider adopting those in the coming days. I agree with what Member Simpson presented earlier in the meeting in terms of the timeline. I think it's important that we take the time to do this right, to hear from members of the public regarding potential pairings, as well as their input on pairings that we put on the record. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

Nicole, and then Melanie.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

Contrary to what Bethany just spoke to, the public has weighed in. We had roughly 30 Alaskans provide testimony before our Saturday meeting. We had roughly 30 Alaskans that were in the room or on the line that also provided testimony.

Every single Alaskan that has weighed in on this particular issue has said two things: One,
1 adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke;
2 and, two, do it fast.
3 So the notion that the public has not
4 weighed in or that they have not presented plans is
5 just completely ludicrous. I'm sorry, but there's
6 really no other word for it because it is
7 black-and-white facts here.
8 Now, what I'm asking the board to do is put
9 their plans forward. So, Bethany, if you have other
10 plans, by all means, you had since November to be
11 putting them together so we could roll them out
12 today. Please put pen to paper, tell us what
13 pairings you would like so we can debate them in an
14 open forum. Thank you.
15 CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie, and then Bethany.
16 MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I appreciate that
17 only yesterday our attorney gave the interpretation
18 of the Supreme Court ruling. I'm not an attorney,
19 but I didn't find it hard to understand. It's been
20 out since March 25th. We could have met earlier, but
21 we decided to abide by the publicly noticed meeting
22 dates.
23 The Supreme Court ruled a week earlier than
24 they had to so that Alaskans can move along and have
25 an election and have some certainty about what maps
they're going to be voting under.

So with all due respect, Bethany, if you've got other maps that you're cooking up, get them out there so we can debate them. My map's been out since November. Your map was deemed unconstitutional.

I'd like us to dispose of all of this business this week.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to correct a statement that was made by Member Borromeo that every single Alaskan has said the same two things. I listened very closely and took notes of the public testimony that we had. I've read all of the written public testimony, and that is absolutely not the case. There have been some other ideas put forward. I respect that. And that's what I am going to be watching for is other ideas being put forward.

As I mentioned, I've had inquiries from folks who listened to counsel's explanation of the Supreme Court's remand to Judge Matthews, and Judge Matthews' remand to us. So those folks have asked for information about that, and I'm looking forward to seeing what members of the public have to say about this. I think it's important that we take that
into consideration.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I also agree that it's important that we take it into consideration and not just pay lip service to what the public is asking us to do, but to actually act on it.

And I stand by my earlier observation that every Alaskan who has weighed in and put forward a plan, an actual plan, has supported the Bahnke pairings. Thank you.

MEMBER MARCUM: That's not true.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: I was just saying that's not true. I'd be happy to bring up some examples in the public testimony record, but that's -- there's no point in doing that, but it's absolutely not true. I've got -- I've got the testimony of one in front of me.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, point of order.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think -- I think we need to stick to debating the motion that's in front of us. I think, you know, there's some nuances there, but certainly I would agree that overwhelmingly the testimony was very consistent, support the Bahnke
plan, do it quickly. I got that sense, although
there were some other bits of testimony, and I would
certainly concede that.

I think we'll look for any other discussion
on the motion.

I might just comment on the motion. I think
that with regard to the Supreme Court's ruling and
remand back to the Superior Court, I think there are
two things that I took away from the Superior
Court -- Superior Court's instruction on remand back
to the board.

Number one is don't act too quickly, and,
number two, when you do have a plan, allow the public
to engage and look at that plan.

I think the only date that we have from the
Court is April 15th. And I appreciate the
public's -- at least the overwhelming number of
public testimony and the people that have testified
so far want it done quickly, but I think we have to
give deference to the Court.

The Court put a specific date, which is
April 15th, to give a status update. They didn't say
have a decision by April 15th. They said get back to
us on April 15th and give us the status of where
you're at with this.
I agree with many members of the public, also with Member Borromeo and Member Bahnke, that we can do this by -- in relatively short order.

But I think we also have to be careful to listen to the Court, the Supreme Court and the Superior Court, in making sure that we don't rush this. That was our mistake and -- when we adopted the existing proclamation in November, I believe, and it was articulated by both courts, and I don't think we should make that same mistake.

So I don't think there's any problem in allowing the public to weigh in. More choices, more observations, more ideas about how we can do this better, and in fairness for Alaskans I think are a good thing for the process, and I think we should allow the time for the public to weigh in.

There's a lot that's been going on in the last two weeks since we got the ruling, or a little less than two weeks, from the Supreme Court. A tremendous amount on the political scene.

We're in the midst of a massive and very expensive and coordinated group of campaigns at the municipal level right now in the Municipality of Anchorage, where these Senate pairings are directly affected. I think the voters in Anchorage go to the
polls tomorrow, so I hate to say they've maybe been
distracted but there's been a lot going on.
And certainly the statewide level, as well,
with the passing of Congressman Young and all the
attention that's been given to the special elections
and how that's going to go forward. There's been a
lot since that ruling, so it doesn't -- I think it --
we're well served by allowing the public to weigh in,
to look at different ideas on Senate pairings.
This was a lot, and these are eight
different pairings in the Bahnke plan. And maybe
there's a way to do it by narrowing down just closer
to Senate District K and making as few changes as
possible. I don't know.
But I'm inclined not to support this
necessarily in terms of it being what our plan is,
but I don't mind that this is a proposal that comes
forward for us to -- us to consider, to put out there
to the public so that they can actually see it, and
it's an idea that's out there. The public can
comment on it then, and it's specific. It's not just
called the Bahnke -- the Bahnke proposal. It's
definitive.
So I don't mind that at all. It's just that
I don't think we should be limited to -- to this. So
those are my comments.

Melanie, I see you have your hand up, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. The pairings that Nicole introduced on her motion actually preserve four of the Senate pairings under the Marcum map. They're minimal in terms of -- you know, we're not just totally coming up with a whole new map. We follow the Court's order. We fix Senate -- Senate District K.

And while I appreciate this notion that we have to get as much public testimony as possible, I don't want to use that as an excuse to drag this out. The Supreme Court ruled a week earlier than their own deadline. March 25th is when they came out with their ruling. And I don't see why we can't come up with a final proclamation corrected by the end of this week. I don't see the need to drag this out much further.

So I -- you know, this motion is to adopt a proposed correction. Give it a day or two for the public to weigh in. I'm not willing to, you know, get real creative and consider entirely new maps and what have been out there in November. I think that would be a disservice to the public, even if we gave
them a week compared to the five months that the map
that I proposed has been out there for to undergo
scrutiny, to undergo, you know, all kinds of
criticisms, and yet testimony overwhelmingly is in
support of that map.

So any tactics to delay here are going to be
met by the public. We need to be careful about delay
or -- you know, we just need to get this done with.
I'm not sure what you guys are trying to accomplish
by dragging this out. Overwhelmingly, the public has
spoken.

The Superior Court chastised us basically
for not listening to public testimony, and we're
doing it again if we ignore the public testimony from
this weekend by not moving quickly. We're doing the
exact opposite of what the Superior Court told us to
do, which is to take into consideration public
testimony.

The vast majority of public testimony that
we've received since we opened up the portal and gave
the public an opportunity to comment is to move
quickly, not to delay and to use them as an excuse to
delay.

Let's vote on this motion and move forward.
And I'd like us to come up with a final map this
week, if possible. This is ridiculous.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I have a question for the board. I put a proposed solution on the table, and I've heard from Bethany that she's not able today to put any of her proposed solutions on the table.

When -- when are those going to come? You know, because we have to have all the proposed corrections before we vote on them. So at some point there does have to be a cutoff for proposed corrections for the board to reconsider.

I continue to show up, do my homework, come prepared to these meetings. I would ask that of everybody so we can get this over the line.

Bethany, I'm seriously asking and hoping that you will have some proposed corrections ready to go tomorrow at 10 a.m., which is our next board meeting. You've got a lot of time invested in this.

I know you have other options, but we can't spring it on the public at the last minute and then hold submitted public testimony.

Most of the public testimony, again, has been asking us to do two things: adopt the Bahnke pairings and move quickly. So nothing I'm hearing
right now is at least getting us to the move quickly part.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Budd, I know you're next. Do you mind if Bethany just responds to that question from Nicole?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I don't mind.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have multiple plans that I have worked on. But based upon the guidance from the Court, I want to see what plans the public comes up with. I think it's more important for us to hear from and respond to the plans that the public presents than to be the almighty powerful that are presenting our own plans. I have mine, but I think it's important. That's part of what the Court said is that we need to give -- give the public their due.

And so I want to have time to do that now that our counsel has given the information about what the Supreme Court ruling means. That's what I would like to -- that's how I would like to move forward. I have no problem with perhaps choosing a future date and time by which plans have to be submitted, in the same way that we did that during the regular process, but I personally would like to
see what the public has as far as plans that they
come forward with, as opposed to presenting mine and
feeling like I'm the one that's in full power. Thank
you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Budd, and then
Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Just a quick follow-up,
and then hopefully we can close this out.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. She didn't really
have a question, but go ahead, quickly.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Let her go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible) put her
proposed correction on there. And also, this whole
notion about the public, read the testimony. Listen
to the Zoom again. They have offered what they want:
the Bahnke pairings.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Just a clarification on
that. The Bahnke pairings, I heard that over and
over and over again: do it quickly, the Bahnke
pairings, Bahnke pairings, Bahnke pairings.

What I'm just getting now, and I didn't
realize that even writing these numbers down, that
that's not the Bahnke pairings, that that's actually
a part of what the board adopted and part of what the
Bahnke pairings were.
When I think of in my mind the Bahnke pairings, it was the full plan that Member Bahnke presented to us. But I -- I just got the impression a few minutes earlier that it's a hybrid between that and what we now have. So even that is just a revelation at this point to me.

So we're going to go on to Budd, and then Melanie.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I -- I have the board proclamation map in front of me. And I just tried to go through the pairings that Ms. Bahnke read to us, and I -- it appears to me that they're all different from the existing one, which may -- maybe on reflection that's not right, but that's what it looked like to me, and just a reason why it may take some time to assimilate this.

I object to and resent the implication that anybody is trying to slow roll anything. I am on record desiring this proceed expeditiously. There may be some difference of opinion on how expeditious is fast or not, but I refuse to be badgered into a decision made on partial information before I'm ready to do it.

And so, you know, if there's -- if it takes
three votes to do something, I am in favor of having due deliberation before doing it. We got in trouble for kind of leaving something to the last minute on the last round. I don't want to be in the same trouble again. I want to meaningfully implement the findings of the Supreme Court and have enough time to assimilate that information and any other information that comes in.

The concept that 30 Alaskans have weighed in on this and so that's all we need to know is -- maybe it's silly. I don't -- I don't want to be offensive back to anybody, but that is honestly a ridiculous position to take. We have time here to hear from other people. I intend to do that, and I'm not voting on anything until we do.

Now, I favor putting the plan that was just moved -- in favor of publishing that, getting it on the record, letting people comment on it until such time as -- as we decide. I believe my suggestion had been Wednesday. That's -- to me, that's an adequate amount of time, if anybody else in the public has something else they want to suggest, whether it's Bethany or any other member or -- or a third party in the public.

But I do -- I agree, we should have a hard
deadline for that so this thing doesn't get strung out indefinitely, and I favor moving expeditiously but not precipitously.

Those are my comments, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Matt, I know that you had your hand up, as well as Melanie. I don't know if it's a pertinent legal point you want to bring up in this?

MR. SINGER: I think there are two -- two legal process issues for the board to consider. One is I think there may be some confusion about the motion. And so -- and there was some -- and I think there's some different -- difference of opinion in the public testimony the board's received thus far as to whether public -- some members of the public seem to be advocating for the board to adopt eight new Senate districts in Anchorage.

And other members of the public were asking -- were suggesting specifically adoption of four of -- of the eight Senate districts that Member Bahnke had proposed back in November. And not -- it wasn't clear to me which of those alternatives was presented. I didn't write it down quickly enough. I apologize.

And then I -- I suffer from color blindness,
and so Peter's map wasn't informative to me, so --
but I think there's just -- I would really encourage
to make sure Member Borromeo is clear with her motion
as to how many districts she's proposing to change,
and then make sure that that's consistent with what
Member Bahnke intended when she seconded the motion.

And then the second suggestion I have is
that the board consider picking a day on which no
later than which both the members and -- both the
board and the public will share any proposed plans
they have, as you did previously, whether that's
tomorrow or Wednesday. But just pick a day, and then
any member who has alternatives will share those.

But put all the cards on the table. Put
them on your website, you know, and let's do that
whether that's tomorrow or the next day. I would
encourage telling the public this is the day on which
we're going to act, because, again, then nobody's
going to come back and say: You moved so quickly I
didn't get a chance to share my alternative with you.

So those are my two suggestions, just to
clarify it, both the record as to what we just did
and the record going forward. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Matt.
Melanie?
MEMBER BAHNKE: Matt, get a pen handy. I'm going to read the pairings again. Nicole and I didn't (indiscernible) something together. But these are what she introduced, and they are consistent with what I mapped in November. 9 and 11, 10 and 15, 12 and 13, 14 and 16, 18 and 19, 23 and 17, 20 and 21, 22 and 24.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And just to make sure I'm clear, Melanie, that's the same proposals you made in November, then, at our board meeting?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes.

MR. SINGER: Okay. And so I'm not -- MEMBER BAHNKE: (Indiscernible) just pulled up earlier.

MR. SINGER: And that's -- those would be eight different districts than are contained in the current proclamation plan?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't -- I haven't compared them against the illegal pairings, but if that's what you're asking.

MR. SINGER: There's what the Court has remanded to address Senate District K.

MEMBER BAHNKE: And this is my proposed fix to do that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Does that -- does that
change all eight districts, Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't know. Like I said, I haven't gone back to look at the map that was tossed out.

CHAIR BINKLEY: You mean the map that the board adopted and --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Peter, do you want to do a side by side?

MR. TORKELSON: Let me think about the side by side. (Indiscernible) them into two -- I can certainly pull up the existing Anchorage, and then we can work through the number list.

I did write down your number list, Member Bahnke, and so if I pull up the Anchorage -- the existing Anchorage map with its --

MEMBER BAHNKE: It's not existing. It's dead. But pull it up.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Just a note, also, we've got a hard stop at 10. I know Member Bahnke has to catch a flight, and we're now 20 minutes until 10. And we would like to take public testimony, to be consistent with how we've operated our meetings.

So I might suggest that we wrap this up and be prepared to vote on a motion in the next five minutes, and that, at least, although it's short,
allows 15 minutes for the public testimony at the end
of the meeting.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: This is Budd.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, Budd. Go ahead.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I don't think we need to do
the side by side right now. When I just glanced at
it quickly, it appeared to me they were all different
from the proclamation one.

But the reason I'm suggesting that we take a
couple of days is so people have time to look at it.
And if they like that, they want to change the whole
thing out, then that's something that we'll hear
about.

I have a general preference to do a more
surgical version of it and -- and, you know, fix the
21/22-K problem. And that obviously implicates the
surrounding districts as well, but to find a more
concise, limited solution to that that also complies
with the constitutional requirements, obviously.

So anyway, I don't think we need to take the
time right now. If there are public -- well, I think
we should vote on putting this on the table for
public process right -- right now, with the
understanding that we're not voting to -- you know, as a final adoption of this version. It's just going out for review, and then let's do that.

And then as a separate question, let's look at a deadline for members and third parties to put in alternative versions, if -- if they have them. And I'm probably going to suggest Wednesday for that.

That's it.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We've got a motion before us. As -- as I --

Nicole, do you want to restate the motion just so we're clear on it, or -- I --

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'd be happy to.

CHAIR BINKLEY: That would be helpful, I think.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.

I move that we consider, for a proposed correction to Section 10 of the court order, the Bahnke pairings, which are Districts 22 and 24, Eagle River; 20 and 21, Muldoon; 18 and 19, which is Mountain View and Russian Jack; 23 and -- 23 and 17, which is JBER, Government Hill, and part of downtown; 16 and 14, Turnagain and Spenard; 13 and 12, Midtown; 15 and 10, which is the Blocks 11 and 9, Hillside.

Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I think that's -- I think I can certainly support that -- that motion.

And hopefully, I think, as Member Marcum, Member Simpson indicated that there will be more coming from the public, or other board members, as well, that we'll have an opportunity to consider.

Is there any further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, it's adopted.

Okay. I would suggest we quickly discuss the time and date of our next meeting, and then we'll go to public testimony.

Budd, I know you suggested Wednesday.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I suggested Wednesday as a deadline for any alternative plans. I didn't really address whether we should have a meeting tomorrow. I don't know if we need it.

The purpose of one tomorrow would just be to open -- open ourselves up for more public testimony, which I'm fine with. But by the same token, people can put in written submissions anytime they want, you know, without us having to make it a specific time.

So I am -- I don't really have an opinion about meeting tomorrow, but I would like to meet Wednesday and have that whatever -- whatever time the
meeting is be the deadline for submitting alternative pairings.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So as I understand it, by Wednesday, then, third parties would have an opportunity to submit and maybe present to the board what their ideas are for Senate pairings to comply with the Court order?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Correct. Third parties and board members, anybody with another idea for a pairing by board meeting time on Wednesday.

And I should point out that any that come in, like, right at that deadline, we won't have had an opportunity to review them or assimilate it, but it would be an opportunity to -- well, it's a deadline, so we move forward. And it's at least an opportunity for a first look.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'd like to support Budd's suggestion of a Wednesday deadline for any alternative maps to what is now on the record as something that we're considering as a correction.

The one scheduling conflict I do have is Friday afternoon I can't meet at all. I'll be in the air returning to Nome.
I wonder if we shouldn't keep a Tuesday meeting just as a placeholder to allow for public comment. Some people don't necessarily have internet access or able to call in.

That way, since we're wanting to get as much public testimony and afford the public as much time as possible, even if we gavel in, nobody calls in, we'll have made an attempt.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, I think -- Matt, go ahead if you want to comment.

MR. SINGER: Under -- under Section 9, while you need three votes to take action, the board can hold a public hearing with fewer members. And so even if not everybody's available for a Tuesday hearing, but if some members want to, certainly the constitution would allow -- would allow that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I was just going to raise that point. And I'm available tomorrow for that Tuesday public hearing. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I think Budd had mentioned, of course, the written testimony, all we would really have before us in the public would be this proposal, the Bahnke proposal.

It may be more productive to wait until we
have -- who knows, maybe this is the only plan that
comes forward, or maybe there's one other one, maybe
there's a dozen others that come forward on
Wednesday.

But it would at least give the public then,
once they had seen those, an opportunity to make
meaningful comment on the differences, why they might
support one or may oppose another. Just a thought.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. The board had
been, I thought, on the right track earlier on when
we had talked about having maximum public
participation. So I don't favor removing a Tuesday
hearing with less than almost 24 hours' notice. I
think we should continue on with that Tuesday
hearing.

I plan to be here at the LIO, even if it's
just me to hear the testimony. It provides one more
opportunity to get this right and open this up to
definitely less criticism, hopefully.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, I appreciate that.

And I think Member Marcum made that observation
earlier, too. We should maximize the public's
opportunity to comment on these various Senate
pairings, and even the proposed House district
change, until we're required to get back to the Superior Court.

Budd?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I can attend by Zoom tomorrow. What -- can someone remind me what time it is tomorrow?

MEMBER BAHNKE: 10 a.m.

MEMBER MARCUM: 10 a.m.

CHAIR BINKLEY: 10 a.m., yeah.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Okay. So yeah, I can do that.

And I'm on board with just listening. If -- if a bunch of people show up, we'll listen to them. And if -- if they don't, it'll be a short meeting.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Yeah. And I'm fine with that, too. (Indiscernible.) We'll show up at 9:00.

Let's now get -- we've only got ten minutes left, so I don't think there's any -- does anybody object to sticking with our schedule for public hearings tomorrow morning?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't, Mr. Chair. I was going to suggest that we actually stick to what we've publicly noticed, which is, I think, meetings Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday of this week, isn't it?
CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't believe we've scheduled a meeting for Thursday.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So let's --

MEMBER SIMPSON: So what time for Wednesday?

MEMBER MARCUM: 10 a.m.

MEMBER BAHNKE: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: The same -- same time, 10:00.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can we schedule one for Thursday, since we're kind of setting a deadline of Wednesday for maps to come forward? Let's go ahead and notice a meeting on Thursday, please.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't think we should. I think we should wait and give the public time to really absorb that and look at what the different proposals are.

And maybe Wednesday, who knows? Maybe we only have your proposal, the Bahnke plan, and everybody's in agreement. We can come back and adopt it.

So I think let's wait and see what we have on Wednesday, what comes forward, and then go from there.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't see how having a
hearing on Thursday is going to cause any harm.

There might be people who are willing to comment on Thursday, so let's --

CHAIR BINKLEY: I appreciate that, but --

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- so let's (indiscernible) participation, like you said, and schedule a meeting for Thursday.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, we can schedule a meeting every day between now and the 15th, if you'd like. That would give maximum --

MEMBER MARCUM: Let's do one Friday. I'm good for Friday, too, if we want to do one every day.

MEMBER BAHNKE: (Indiscernible) take that long to get it figured out.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, I think what we're going to do -- we need to get to speaking of the public, public participation.

MEMBER BORROMEO: John, can you hear us?

CHAIR BINKLEY: The public -- the public has been waiting --

MEMBER BORROMEO: We lost audio at the LIO.

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- patiently, and we have a hard deadline at 10:00.

MEMBER MARCUM: Hey, John. John. John, I think we've lost audio at the LIO. So do you want
to -- I'd ask you to stop for a second.

MR. TORKELSON: We're back.

MEMBER MARCUM: Peter, can you confirm?

You're back now? Okay. Sorry.

They lost you for a few minutes there, John.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Again, you know,
speaking of public comment, we've got people who want
to comment. We always set aside time at the ends of
the meeting.

We've got a hard deadline of 10:00. And so
I think we should stick with the schedule we've got
for Tuesday and Wednesday, and then we can go from
there on further -- scheduling further meetings. And
we need to wrap up and get public comment. Okay.

With that, we're going to move into public comment.

Peter, I can't tell if there's anybody in
the office. I've got the redistricting board on
line -- or no, one is LIO -- okay. I see the
difference now.

So we've got one in-house in Anchorage, it
looks like. If you could come forward to testify.

It looks like Randy Ruedrich from AFFER is in the LIO
office.

If you want to come forward and testify,

Mr. Ruedrich, please. And we appreciate your
And I apologize. If you could keep your testimony short, if you could try to keep it to two minutes, we would appreciate it. I know that's tight, but we're running out of time.

MR. RUEDRICH: How many minutes, sir?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Could you keep it to under two, please? That would be helpful. I see there's -- I show three people (indiscernible).

MR. RUEDRICH: (Indiscernible) minutes. I will return tomorrow to complete.

I will be offering an alternative Senate district pairing map. We are preserving three of the existing districts in the map that we're offering: Senate District F, 11 and 12; Senate District H, 13 -- I'm sorry -- Senate District H, 15 and 16; and Senate District L, 23 and 24 will be preserved.

The major change that we're making is in Senate District E. We're combining Senate District E's components to House District 9 and 22, (indiscernible) are the uplands of the city of Anchorage. They are the lands of road service areas, snow management, and avalanches.

In the 2001 map, the population of this
portion of Anchorage was much smaller. It consist-- it was put into the official final proclamation as House District 18. So this district is a highly compatible, previously existing district. And if I have time, I'll talk about other things.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Maybe as -- as a suggestion, Mr. Ruedrich -- and, again, my apologies that we went so long without having public testimony. But if you are willing to come back tomorrow morning at 10, we're going to open with public testimony, and it will -- we will allow you to more fully provide the details of the proposal that you've got laid out.

MR. RUEDRICH: Okay. Obviously if you move one, you have to move several. I am definitely only -- I'm preserving three, and I'd like everybody to walk away today realizing that we're looking at a highlands district for Anchorage east side.

I'll be back tomorrow morning. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Next we have online Suzanne Fischetti [as spoken].

MS. FISCHETTI: Yes.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Suzanne, can you hear us okay?
MS. FISCHETTI: Yes, I can hear you fine.

I'm trying to get my computer pulled up here.

CHAIR BINKLEY: No problem.

MS. FISCHETTI: I am Susan Fischetti, and I did listen and testify on Saturday, and I'm back again today learning more of what's going on.

I agree with Mr. Simpson, that the board should allow more time to do this right since the judge's decision was only a few weeks ago. I was on the call Saturday and remember hearing one person say that they urged to end the process quickly, which is not a resounding testimony to me. Maybe other people said it, but I only remember hearing Celeste Graham-Hodge [sic] say it.

On Saturday it became obvious to me that the so-called Bahnke pairings are partisan gerrymandering which erode public trust and should not be adopted. The one-sided testimony on Saturday makes it clear that the Bahnke pairings have been secretly orchestrated.

I've been a resident of Eagle River Valley for four years -- 40 years and testified prior that the pairing of Eagle River with East Anchorage, we had Senator Randy Phillips, should be approved because it has been done before.
Now that the judge has taken that option off the table, in an effort to finalize a plan I strongly urge you to pair Eagle River Valley with South Hillside, like when we had Con Bunde and Cathy Giessel. Also been done previously.

We share several socioeconomic profiles regarding local road service areas, wildfire and wildlife issues, avalanche and public safety concerns.

Also, since you can't get to Chugiak/Eagle River without driving through JBER and many active duty military and veterans live in Chugiak/Eagle River, it only makes sense that they be paired together.

I respectfully ask you to do the right thing for all Anchorage, Chugiak, Eagle River interests and not special interests. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Ms. Fischetti.

I also have Jamie Allard. Are you online, Ms. Allard?

MS. ALLARD: Yes, I am. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

MS. ALLARD: Thank you. My name is Jamie Allard. I'm a resident of Eagle River.
The Bahnke plan should not be adopted. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan in its current form, is politically unbalanced, politically unfair, and does not accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River.

The board should reevaluate the time frame, incorporate enough time and public input to produce a plan that reflects the nonpartisan efforts that incorporates the constituent -- what constituents want, not what political parties want of the communities involved.

When rushing a political process driven by board members' political beliefs instead of community wants produces a sloppy product such as the Bahnke plan.

In order to (indiscernible) a fair and just plan, the process should slow its tempo so community involvement can be used in the development of a plan. By rushing the process, you are denying the rights of (indiscernible) and government. This process needs to be fair to all, not just a small group of individuals.

As a resident of Eagle River, our community deserves to be heard, our comments incorporated into the plan. There is no reason to rush this, with our
current elections. And everybody is voting tomorrow in person or by mail. This is time-consuming. This push is unfair and not equitable to the process.

The word needs to be put out, voting tomorrow, and the due process is very important.

I would also like to add that Saturday, 140 individuals were not able to testify due to the emergency declaration in our state with the Hiland avalanche. Those individuals just got their utilities and phones and everything else turned on Friday and Thursday.

So to push this and not hear from over 140 families is unreasonable. I beg of you to please slow the process down. It doesn't hurt anything. And by pushing this through for tomorrow in days, instead of pushing it out until after the election, it's clear gerrymandering.

Thank you, Chair. I appreciate you allowing me to testify.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Next in the queue is David Dunsmore from Alaskans for Fair Redistricting. David?

MR. DUNSMORE: Hi. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the board. For the record, I'm David Dunsmore with Alaskans for Fair
Redistricting.

I was not planning on testifying today, but the conversation in the meeting so far, I just had a couple of things that I wanted to bring up and put on the record.

One, in reviewing the Court decision, you know, the Court spoke -- obviously spoke to the level of process that was given on public testimony, but also to the public testimony that it received.

And I believe -- I don't have the decision in front of me, but I believe that the phrase the Court used with regards to the Bahnke pairing was loud and clear. The public testimony was loud and clear that Member Bahnke's pairings were the ones that had the loud and clear public support.

So I think the board needs to take that into consideration in that you've already heard from the public. You've heard it loud and clear. The Court has acknowledged that you heard it loud and clear, and we need to give finality to the public.

I would also just like on the record to discuss and thank (indiscernible), Assemblywoman Allard just called in.

Alaskans for Fair Redistricting also participated in the municipal election process. And
one of the -- the municipal redistricting process. And one of the issues that came up was the fact that Chugiak/Eagle River did not have the population to meet a full ideal assembly district.

And in reviewing, we had actually put on the table a proposal that would have put portions of the Hillside into a district with Chugiak/Eagle River, but there was substantial pushback from the community.

And I believe Assemblywoman Allard was really passionate and really eloquent about how Eagle River/Chugiak had unique needs that had to remain within the same district. So I would just for the record, you know, thank Assemblywoman Allard for, you know, her advocacy for keeping her community whole and intact.

And, you know, there is a proposal that the board has just adopted as to proposed Senate pairings that does that not only at the municipal level, but at the State Senate level, and those are Member Bahnke's pairings.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, David.

The next one I see in the queue is Yarrow
Silver. Good morning, Yarrow.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I just want to bring to Budd's attention that his hand has been raised. I think he just forgot to put it down.
MEMBER SIMPSON: Thanks.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Good morning, Yarrow.

Apologize for the short time frame allowed here, but if you could try and hold it to two minutes, we'd appreciate it.
MS. SILVERS: I hadn't planned to speak today either, but I just needed to respond to a few things that I've heard. I will be back tomorrow with a proposal.

It is not gerrymandering to keep communities together. When you're splitting communities apart for political purposes, that is gerrymandering.

I wanted to encourage the board to have a look at the testimony for the recent reapportionment and have a look at what happened and all the testimony that came in when the municipality tried to pair Eagle River and South Anchorage.

Eagle River belongs together. It was spoken loud and clear when they tried to pair South Anchorage with Eagle River. And Jamie Allard herself, who called in a few minutes ago, stated that
on the record.

So I don't know what you guys are trying to do here, but you're making something political that should not be. We should be keeping communities together, not splitting them apart for political purposes. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Next one on the list is Denny Wells.

Good morning, Denny. I see you had signed up at 10:00, so that's probably the deadline to be our last participant, and then we'll adjourn and start with public testimony tomorrow morning at 10.

Go ahead.

MR. WELLS: As with the -- my name's Denny Wells. I'm from Anchorage.

As with the previous couple of comments, I had not planned on speaking today, but I did want to specifically respond to a couple of things I have heard this morning, and also at the very end on Saturday.

And to reiterate what you just heard from -- from Yarrow, that the Anchorage reapportionment process, we had substantial testimony from both Anchorage Hillside and also from Eagle River that a pairing between Anchorage Hillside and Eagle River
was not a good pairing. And keeping Eagle River and Chugiak together was the appropriate approach to take here locally.

And I did want to specifically respond to a comment that I heard on Saturday, that I believe was partially reiterated today, encouraging that Eagle River should have two senators.

And I would just like to point out that there -- there's no other place in the state where a single community whose size is only sufficient for two or fewer House seats also has two Senate seats. We have not given Juneau two Senate seats. We did not give Nome or Barrow two Senate seats, and it is irrational to split up Eagle River to give it two Senate seats, as well, rather than keeping Eagle River and Chugiak together. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Denny.

Okay. That's going to conclude our public testimony. The public will have an opportunity tomorrow morning at 10:00. We'll open the meeting with public testimony, and we invite people both online and in person in the LIO office to participate.

And with that, if there's not anything further from board members or from staff -- Peter, go
MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

I just -- from time to time we have Zoom participants raise their hands. We're not taking public testimony through Zoom, but through dial-in. So the dial-in number in Anchorage is (907)563-9085. And we'll be convening tomorrow at 10 a.m., so if you missed today, we'll hear from you tomorrow.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Great. Thank you. Is there a motion for adjournment?

MEMBER SIMPSON: So moved.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Second (indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'll second that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. A motion made by Budd and seconded by Nicole for adjournment. Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing none, we are adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)
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Chairman Binkley: Present.

Mr. Torkelson: Good morning, Mr. Chair. Yes.

Member Bahnke.

Member Bahnke: Present.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Borromeo.

Member Borromeo: Present.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Simpson.

Member Simpson: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Marcum.

Member Marcum: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Binkley.

Chairman Binkley: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Are all members present and accounted for, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Binkley: Okay. Thank you. I think -- I'm not sure if we -- we actually did adjourn yesterday, didn't we, so we're back in order. I don't know if we have a formal agenda, but the purpose really is just to take public testimony. So did you send out an agenda for this, Peter?

Mr. Torkelson: Yes. We do have an agenda.

It's -- I can bring it here up on the screen in just a
moment.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: Go to that screen.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Can you scroll down just a wee bit, please?

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. I'm going to get the right agenda first. How's that?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. That would be helpful. That's yesterday's, it looks like.

MR. TORKELSON: (Indiscernible)

MEMBER BAHNKE: Peter's sound got really diminished for some reason here. I think you need to get closer to the mic or whatever you're using for sound.

MR. TORKELSON: All right. There you go.

Here's the agenda for today, Tuesday, April 5th.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. I see that there's item 4, possible adoption of proposed plan revision. My understanding of our discussion yesterday was that we were not going to be adopting proposed plans, but I'm open to discussion on that before we adopt the agenda. My understanding was we were just going to be taking public testimony today.

MEMBER MARCUM: That was my understanding as well, Mr. Chairman.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I think these draft
agendas were developed like last week or something and probably didn't get updated, is my guess. But Peter can talk to that maybe. But that is also my understanding, is that we wouldn't be adopting any plans today.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah, that's correct. The agenda was published with the meeting notice.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Peter, you're barely audible.

MR. TORKELSON: Is this better?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Not much.

MR. TORKELSON: The public notice was -- I may have to...

MS. BORROMEO: Can you guys hear him or is he just really faint?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Really faint.

MR. SINGER: Yeah, poor quality.

MEMBER MARCUM: Faint and muffled. You're much more clear, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. I'll go ahead and speak for Peter then. Peter says the agenda was published last week in the interest of time, but we have since changed course and we're not going to be adopting a proposed plan revision today.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. So we'd like for a motion to adopt agenda minus -- it's off of there now, but I think item 4.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair --

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'll make that motion,

Mr. Chairman, to adopt the agenda as modified
(indiscernible) 4.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can we add board member comments following public testimony?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Sure. You bet.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'd like the opportunity to ask questions when they testify, if I have any, but also to offer up some comments if I feel the need to.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: After each person testifies?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I might have some comments when they're testifying, clarification questions if they're advocating for something. But at the end I'd also like to make comment.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Maybe just to make sure I'm clear, as each person testifies, why don't I, at the end of their testimony, ask if there are any board comments or questions?

MEMBER BAHNKE: That seemed to work really well previously, so yes, that would be great.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah, that did work well. I know in Fairbanks, though, there was some concern about -- you know, I guess directed at me -- about making comments or asking people who testified questions afterwards. So
we'll be cautious about that and -- but with that, we'll
make that available to members after each person
testifies.

So there's a motion before us made by Melanie --
or excuse me -- Nicole, and I'm not sure if anybody
seconded it. And I guess we have modified it a bit by
adding item 4 back in, which is now board member comments.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. And Nicole, are you
okay with that amendment of putting item 4, board member
comments, in?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I am. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. We have a motion
before us and seconded to adopt the agenda as it's now
showed on our screen with five items, and I'll ask for any
discussion on the motion. Is there any objection to the
motion? Hearing none, the agenda is adopted.

And that moves us right into public testimony.

I --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, before we
do that, Bethany, I just thought I'd let you know your
screen is partially obscured.

MEMBER MARCUM: Sorry. I'll move my -- is that
better?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes.
MEMBER MARCUM: Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. We have -- let's see.

I'm looking at my list, and I'm assuming that these are off net. I'm not sure if these are ones that have called in, Peter, the ones that I'm looking at or people that are in the audience there.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. You're looking at the call-in list. I'm going to provide the in-audience list to the moderator right now.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Why don't we -- why don't we start with on-line, and I want to make certain I've got this. We have somebody from Juneau. It says unavailable. Do you see the same list, Peter? Oh, no. This is not it. This can't be it. Something is off here. The list I'm looking at, Peter, must be different. Let me -- let me log back in to this. Okay. Yeah, I was looking at the wrong thing. Okay. Stand by. Bear with me. Okay. Here we have it.

Okay. Let's start on the phone with Carolyn Clift from Anchorage.

Carolyn, are you on and can you hear us?

MS. CLIFT: Good morning. Yes. I'm representing myself. I'm Carolyn, also known as Care Clift, and I live in the South Muldoon area that is now District -- House District 21. And I want to thank
you for presenting the new map which links the North and South Muldoon area in one Senate district, District K.

As I pointed out before, there is no contiguous transportation between South Muldoon and Eagle River, and there is no socioeconomic link between South Muldoon and Eagle River. Many Eagle River folks probably travel through south Muldoon to get to their jobs that are in other districts, like the school district and the university district and the medical district, because, you know, they are close, but they're not part of our district. So -- and so there's no reason for them to even stop in our district.

But I also wanted to -- so I want to urge you to adopt the new map version that links us with our neighbors in North Muldoon. And that is all I wanted to say. I really appreciate you guys working on this today. And have a great snowy day.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Carolyn.

Questions or comments from board members? Okay.

We'll move -- and now I can see both the Anchorage LIO participants and the off-net participants and there really has a time stamp on this, so I'm going to go just by the time that they signed up, at least according to my list.

Next is Barbara Tyndall from North Pole.
Good morning, Barbara. Are you still on?

MS. TYNDALL: Yes, I am. Yes, my name is Tyndall. I live in North Pole, Alaska. I actually am calling opposing the Senate's minority plan called the Bahnke ruling, and I said I think we need something of similar, more socioeconomic profile and equitable Senate seat alignment. It just seems that this is a -- seems to be a political move to change some senate seats, and I would be in opposition to that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Questions or comments from board members for Barbara?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, this is Melanie Bahnke.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Go ahead, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: What specific part about the map are you opposed to?

MS. TYNDALL: I -- all I know about -- I've just learned about this and I haven't had time to research it entirely, but it's called the Bahnke plan, and it's the Senate minority plan, and that is what I'm opposing today.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Is there a reason you're opposed to it?

MS. TYNDALL: Yes. I feel like it's politically motivated, not -- not really pulling our state together the way it should be.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you again, Barbara.

Next in my cue shows Christopher Constant there in Anchorage. Assembly Member Constant, are you in the -- oh, there you are. I see you there now. Good morning.

MR. CONSTANT: Good morning. I submitted my comments to you in writing this morning. I hope that they've been communicated to you and are part of the record. My name is Christopher Constant, Anchorage Assembly. I recently chaired the reapportionment process for the Municipality of Anchorage.

I submitted my comments in writing, so I won't go through it in -- verbatim, but the general point is thank you for your hard work in generating maps that are broadly acceptable to members of the communities across the state of Alaska, to the courts, to everybody, but that there are still some concerns with, for me at least, one pairing that I spoke about before, and that's the pairing of Districts 23 and 24, that, for me, where I live in that tiny pocket at the corner of the southwest of House District 23, in order to get to the main body of my district, I have to drive 25 to 30 miles and go through multiple communities, several House Districts, and that's the same for all of the couple of thousand people who are my neighbors.
(Indiscernible) wasn't found in the filings to the court probably should have been because I believe this (indiscernible) up in the north is not fair. But this unfairness can be rectified by pairing the District 23 with District 17, because that unites us with our neighbors who literally live across the street, whose homes we can see from our front yards instead of having to drive some 30 miles.

I recognize that there's broad interest in opening up the maps and shifting the pairings across a number of domains, and I believe the fairest approach is the Bahnke map, but if that is not something that's acceptable, I understand, and I think that the board is bounded by two parameters in its decision-making that either they adopt the map previously presented or act as narrowly as possible in achieving fixing the constitutional problems of the Senate Pairings that the Court found.

(Indiscernible) order Judge Matthews maintains jurisdiction in this case and as a matter, because of that, all parties should exercise caution and restraint in the final stage of this process only making the minimal levels of changes necessary to achieve the constitutional goal, which means only changing these boundaries that are letting the District pairing that was found to be
unconstitutional to achieve the goal with as minimal
changes as possible, because the public has in fact seen
these maps.

I ask you to be the heroes in this process, to
step up and make the difference to protecting my small
neighborhood and finishing this process in a manner that
is constitutional and supportable by a broad array of
Alaskans.

Now I want to move briefly to talk about the
Anchorage reapportionment process. The Municipality of
Anchorage is a subdivision of the state of Alaska,
organized the first class municipality and exercise home
rule, the maximum level of self-government allowed. As
such, the municipality began its charter required
reapportionment mere days after the publication by this
body of the state's final plan map on November 10th, 2021.

We ran a robust public process with more than 20
opportunities for the public to be heard. We also had a
public comment portal and received many e-mails
(indiscernible) regular method of receiving public
comment. We also hired a contractor who proposed several
maps and opened the map-making process up to the public
for whom we received several viable maps, and in fact, the
final map adopted was one submitted by a member of the
public.
Our process was very open. One of the maps drafted by the contractor and an additional map submitted by a member of the public paired Chugiak and Eagle River with Hillside and South Anchorage. This pairing was a lightning rod, causing scores and scores of comments in opposition from the public. The comments came in through all channels: phone calls to members, e-mails through our regular e-mail system, comments posted to the portal, and substantial in-person testimony in opposition. The opposition was overwhelming that the pairing of Eagle River and Hillside is inappropriate and shouldn't be promulgated. The assembly listened. Now I hope you do.

It is my hope that the Redistricting Board will incorporate the comments of members of the public and community councils newly submitted to a subdivision of the state of Alaska under a substantially similar and coordinated process by including a sample of comments received by e-mail, a near complete table of comments submitted by the portal, and the community council resolutions passed relating to the pairing of Eagle River and Hillside, the Redistricting Board will have substantive record of concerns and overwhelming oppositions from the public to an irrational pairing of Chugiak, Eagle River, and South Anchorage Hillside.

Comments opposing the pairing are highlighted in
yellow in the records that I submitted to you, 81 pages of them, more than -- or roughly half of the comments that we received were in opposition to the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing. The other half were on any number of different subjects. So a vast majority. And that's just the comments that came in there you the portal, not the comments we received by e-mail, not the comments we had from people in public (indiscernible).

I would like to point to one comment that stood out by e-mail in particular, somebody who has testified in the last two days twice before this body, just the opposite, on the 28th of February they stated, their own words, Chugiak/Eagle River is not contiguous with South Anchorage or Downtown Anchorage.

Please do not disenfranchise the 30,000 residents that live and pay property taxes in Chugiak/Eagle River. Chugiak/Eagle River is separated from the other districts by the Chugach mountains and is ten miles from the nearest East Anchorage/JBER district. (Indiscernible) common sense that Chugiak/Eagle River is contiguous with East Anchorage -- not contiguous with East Anchorage. Also, the people from South Anchorage and Downtown don't have any interest in being involved in Chugiak/Eagle River issues.

Please listen to the people and do not
gerrymander Chugiak/Eagle River with South Anchorage or Downtown. And that comment was from Susan Fischetti entered into the municipality’s record on February the 28th.

And finally, I have community council resolutions from Northeast Community Council opposing the pairing. From HALO, which is a land-owning organization of the Upper Hillside asking for us to defend the reputation of the Hillside. From Hillside Community Council opposing the pairing of Eagle River and Chugiak to Hillside. And then the Huffman/O’Malley Community Council, a resolution supporting South Anchorage and Hillside community by opposing the pairing to Eagle River.

And then finally, the Rabbit Creek Community Council has spoken by resolution (indiscernible) please do not pair us with Eagle River.

And so I have entered into your record public comments submitted to a subdivision of the State of Alaska in which the public has broadly stated, do not link Eagle River, Hillside, and South Anchorage.

Finally, you will hear from a number of members of the other side who have come up with a really broad array of creative maps. But compare the commentary from the person whose comments that I provided to you in writing to what they said yesterday and you’ll know the
Chairman Binkley: Thank you, Chris. I guess you are maybe submitting -- there you go.

Mr. Constant: Thank you. I'm handing my comments (indiscernible).

Chairman Binkley: Are you available for some questions or comments from board members?

Mr. Constant: (Nods head)

Chairman Binkley: Okay. Any questions or comments from board members? Just one question that I've got, Chris. And I appreciate that, the municipality going through the same process that we've been going through, and I think you can understand the difficulties and complexities of pulling this all together, not just for the Municipality of Anchorage but around the state. So I appreciate that you understand that. You know, and our task may be a little bit different than what the municipalities are, but I appreciate your testimony and your perspective on it.

One quick question. It seemed to me you had two things that might be weighed differently, one is to minimize the disruption, so to speak, or the amount of changes in the various Senate districts to narrow the decision down to Senate District K versus your concern about the specific districts -- I think it was 23 and 17,
combine 23 and 17. But it may be that there's a solution
that requires less changes but doesn't affect 23 and 17.
So in that case, which would you confer, which would you
think would be fairer to make an additional change to
people in 23 and 17 or go with minimal disruption just
affecting K?

MR. CONSTANT: Thank you. So 23 is directly
connected to the district that is under the order from the
Court, which is the Muldoon district that directly
connected it. So there is logic to solving both problems
in one move. I don't think that there's a simpler way to
do it than to simply correct this pairing with Eagle River
and the Downtown and the Downtown which now is the North
Anchorage District really because it spans from the north
of Downtown, across JBER, and over to Muldoon. That's
really now not Downtown anymore. It's the North Anchorage
District. So that's literally contiguous with the Muldoon
District.

So I would offer that it is one of the moves
that really is required by this process to achieve the
constitutional requirements. If there are other ways, I
understand that the board will have to contemplate them.
(indiscernible) harm is being done to a couple thousand
people who are stranded from representation under
(indiscernible).
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. CONSTANT: (Indiscernible) commend you. It's hard work you've done.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you.

Next person on the list that I show is -- came in at 10:00 a.m., Susan Fischetti from Eagle River.

Susan, are you here this morning?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, before we let her go, can I just ask, Peter, did you receive the documents that Christopher said he submitted?

MR. TORKELSON: I see them in the testimony e-mail box from this morning, so they'll be sent out with the next public testimony packet probably (indiscernible).

MEMBER BAHNKE: When will they be sent out to us?

MR. TORKELSON: I can send it to you any time you want, but we -- the practice is to collate all the testimony from the day and send it -- I sent it last time about 9:30. So I'll send -- I would send another packet again this evening, but I can forward it to you right now if you'd like it.

MEMBER BAHNKE: That's fine. Send it when you normally send it. I just wanted to make sure it was received.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. We'll go on with Susan Fischetti. Good morning, Susan. Can you hear us okay?

MS. FISCHETTI: Yes, I can. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to testify via teleconference. I had hoped to be there in person, but because of the weather today, I decided to call in again.

I'd like to remind the board of some facts. The Court decision (indiscernible) March 25th, 2022, which was about ten days ago. So there is no rush to force a decision to adopt the Bahnke pairings or anything else at this moment. We've only had a few days to even realize what's happening.

Because of the Court decision recently, my testimony has changed from February 28th. I hope that, you know, other people in the audience there can understand that, you know, we supported one plan and now the Judge has ruled unconstitutional, which I disagree with anyway, but -- so of course our testimony is going to change.

It seems like some people are using this process to promote themselves and their special interests and make their mark on this process instead of allowing the people to have the time to review it and do what's best for our state.
Since 1974 Chugiak/Eagle River has had the opportunity to be paired with the north of our district and the south. We've been paired with East Anchorage, we've been paired with the Valley, and we've been paired with the Hillside. So to insinuate that, you know, this is something new and out of the question is ridiculous.

Chugiak/Eagle River has been represented by two members in the Senate since 1974. We had Ed Willis, a Democrat from Eagle River, and Brad Bradley from East Anchorage. We had Rick Halford and Tim Kelly from East Anchorage. We had Halford and Sam Cotton. We've had Con Bunde and Ogan, Giessel and Huggins, Fairclough and Dyson, Reinbold, and Hughes. We've had Bill Stoltz in there.

I don't understand why we have to be, you know, railroaded at this point to come up with a plan in ten days. The Judge said Senate District K is what he wants to work on. The Bahnke plan I think changes every district in Anchorage. I don't think we need to go that far. But there are some boundaries that could be adjusted.

So I just hope that we will take the time and not because somebody has called in 18 times to testify on the same message, that that holds more weight than the facts of the matter. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Susan. Questions for Susan for board members?

Nicole, I see you've got your hand up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much. I've got three questions for the caller.

You mentioned that certain people are using this process to promote themselves. Can you be more specific who is promoting themselves through the process?

MS. FISCHETTI: I feel like there are -- I don't want to use names. My name was used. I don't really appreciate it. I'm not going to use other names. But there are some people on the board and there are some other so-called, you know, testifiers that have been on, and I just know that they're politically motivated, that this is a gerrymandering move, in my opinion.

MEMBER BORROMEO: It would be helpful as a board member to know who on the board is promoting themselves so I can have a conversation with that person and ask them to get back to the best interests of the state and wrap up our constitutional duties. Perhaps you'll share those names in the future.

Second question is, you said that the Bahnke plan has gone too far. What is your proposed solution then? Do you have a correction that the board can weigh?
MS. FISCHETTI: I believe that since we've now been told that we can't be paired with East Anchorage, which we've done many times in the past, that the options are to pair the Eagle River Valley with the South Hillside area, pair Chugiak with JBER. Whatever has to be done to fix those lines and numbers, that's what we need to focus on. We don't need to, you know, reinvent the entire map. It's just those areas.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you. Following up from your previous testimony -- and I realize that you have since changed your mind before you -- from the time that you weighed in in the municipality's apportionment process -- but I'm having a hard time understanding, and perhaps you can explain that, why you didn't feel Chugiak and Eagle River was contiguous with South Anchorage but now you're advocating for that position.

MS. FISCHETTI: Okay. I've lived here for 40 years. Some of the members on the board are not from Anchorage or Eagle River. So I do feel like I can speak a little bit more to the subject because I've actually been here, and I've been involved the entire time.

When we were paired with Anchorage the few times, it was difficult for us to meet sometimes because you'd have to, you know, drive a distance or whatever, but at this point in time, you know, we don't have an option.
I don't see anything else that we can do. We do have a lot in common with them. We do have our own road service area. We do live across the mountain from one another. And we can communicate now with Zoom and teleconferences, which we really didn't do back then.

So I have no problem with it now, you know. My first choice would be something else, but I'm not left with anything else to choose from at this point.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. One follow-up question and then I'll go to my final question --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's see. You -- you had two. You've got some more, Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. Just -- just one more, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Your testimony also asked us to take the time. What is the time? Is there a date certain that you'd like to put on the record?

MS. FISCHETTI: I realize that, you know, timing is important because we do have an election year that we're dealing with. I really don't like to put a time limit on anything. I've had other issues go on in my life where somebody says, I'm going to get back to you on Sunday and never hear back from them. Going to get back to you on Monday, don't hear back. I don't want to put a
specific time, but it's been ten days. You know, if it's a 30-day period, something that, you know, is reasonable to give people a chance to understand.

Today everybody that I know is at work. They can't even call in or testify. They don't even realize what's happened. I know it's been in the news, but it's very difficult for the average working person to understand what you're even talking about unless they tune in every day and listen and get educated on it. So I don't know what the exact time is, but ten days or, you know, two weeks is really a short time frame, because I think it's your responsibility as a board to look at those -- that Senate District K and come up with a different solution. But the solution of the Bahnke plan is not the solution.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Susan. Thank you, Nicole. Bethany, I see your hand up.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I wanted to apologize to Ms. Fischetti. I feel like the comment that was made to you about changing your mind was a bit insulting and so I want to apologize. I understood your explanation, the fact that why your testimony had changed once the Court had ruled in a way that was not compatible with what your first options were, so I wanted to apologize for the fact that I felt like
that was insulting to you.

But mostly I want to say thank you for the historical perspective that you provided regarding the different pairings that Eagle River has had in the past. That is very important and valuable information for us as a board. So I want to thank you for taking the time to share that today.

MS. FISCHETTI: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And I might add my thanks, too, Susan, because that was very interesting. I had an opportunity to serve in the Senate with some of these individuals back in the '80s, and it was interesting. You know, you don't even think about the specifics of their district when you're in the legislature, but it's fascinating to hear that now. So thank you for that historical perspective as well.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair?


MEMBER BAHNKE: I'd also like to comment since there seems to be speculation about the plan that is being called the Bahnke plan. For some historical perspective, I actually mentioned yesterday that I worked on this plan with Budd during a work session, and it's a plan that I listened to the advice of our VRA expert and our attorney, took their advice into consideration when I made that
I did not work with Scott Kendall or Tom Begich or even Nicole on this map. I asked the Chairman if I would have support for this map and was told yes, and that is why I was completely surprised when we adopted Bethany's map instead. I did not look at incumbent information and I did not have partisan, political motivations when I worked with Budd on this map.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I just have to comment that I'm not sure what you're talking about, Melanie, but if you somehow thought that I supported your Senate pairings, you were completely mistaken. I did not --

MEMBER BAHNKE: That was the -- that was the impression I had. So we can disagree about that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: We certainly can. Okay.

Let's move on.

Let's see, the next one it looks like that's signed up is Patty Wisel for Fairbanks. Patty, are you still in the room?

MS. WISEL: Yes, I am. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yes, we can, Patty. Go ahead.

MS. WISEL: Okay. Thank you. Yes, this is Patty Wisel, along with my husband John, from Fairbanks, and we are calling to oppose the Senate minority plan
called the Bahnke plan and request the board to consider a plan more representative of similar socioeconomic profiles and equal Senate seat alignments. Again, we oppose the Bahnke plan from the Senate minority. And I am new to this, so I'm probably not going to be able to answer the questions, but we want to go on record as opposing this plan.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Nicole, I see you have a question.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much, Patty. And hello to your husband John as well. If you feel comfortable at this point, I would like to hear what you and John would propose for a correction to the Anchorage unconstitutional gerrymandering in Senate District K.

MS. WISEL: Yes. Like I said, we're -- we're new to this. I'm learn being this. But we just want to go on record as opposing this Bahnke plan.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Follow-up question.


MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Patty and John, are you familiar with the Municipality of Anchorage, its neighborhoods, churches, schools, shopping centers, private industry?

MS. WISEL: Yes, we have property there. Just
1 don't live there.

2 MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Fantastic. I'm just
3 trying to glean from you, if you will be so generous to
4 share, what specific objections you have to the plan that
5 is being termed the Bahnke pairings as it relates to
6 gerrymandering.

7 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Just if I could interject
8 here, I think -- I think that she indicated, Nicole, that
9 she didn't know all the specifics. She is just getting up
10 to speed on this and probably couldn't answer specific
11 questions about that. So I think that was in your first
12 question about why do you oppose the Bahnke plan. And so
13 I think she's already answered that question.

14 MEMBER BORROMEO: And that's fine, Mr. Chairman.
15 I appreciate you interjecting on her behalf. She did call
16 in to testify today publicly, and I believe it's my duty
17 as a board member to help understand what she's testifying
18 to. I don't understand a blanket statement that pairings
19 are gerrymandered if they're not supported. So thank you
20 very much, Patty and John, for taking time out of your day
21 to call in and provide testimony.

22 MS. WISEL: Yes, thank you.

23 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you. Bethany, you've
24 got your hand up.

25 MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. My question is not for the
caller. I just wanted to make an observation that, Chairman Binkley, whenever you made questions of the testifiers in Fairbanks, you were kind of called out for that, for kind of badgering the testifiers. You mentioned that earlier when we started this meeting, that, you know, there was insinuation that you shouldn't be able to ask these sorts of detailed questions of the testifiers.

And now the same thing is happening today with folks. And so, you know -- and I know that you felt like that was a fair thing to do, which I do as well. But I just wanted to point out that the others on the board seem to have taken a different view when you were asking questions of testifiers than when we're choosing to ask those same questions of testifiers today. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. And thank you, Patty and John. And we're going to move on. Let's see. The next one signed up is in the Anchorage LAO. Robert Hockema. Robert, are you there? Good morning.

MR. HOCKEMA: Good morning. Can I be heard well?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: It's a little weak. If you could speak right into the microphone, Robert, that would really help us. I hate to have my ear to my computer and my camera looking --

MR. HOCKEMA: (Indiscernible). Is this better?
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Say again.

Mr. Hockema: Am I close enough?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: That's helpful. Yes, please proceed.

MR. HOCKEMA: May I begin?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Please.

MR. HOCKEMA: This is Robert Hockema, and I am representing myself. I've been involved in the state-level redistricting process since the beginning and was heavily involved with the Anchorage reapportionment process. I even drew a couple of the maps and was heavily involved.

I'm here today to encourage the board to adopt Melanie Bahnke's proposed Senate pairings. These pairings connect communities of interest that would reasonably represent the interests of Alaskans, especially Anchagites. First and foremost, they connect North and South Muldoon in 20 and 21. This is the best contiguous pairing that's available. It's superior to the U-Med connect to the west, which is far less socially, economically connected, and superior to the alternative Abbott Loop District, which contains completely different sets of school districts, community councils, and community priorities.

I'd like to take a minute to say that just
because Muldoon has been compared with Eagle River in the past doesn't mean that those pairings were ever just or fair in the first place. Right? It keeps happening because Muldoon has been consistently steamrolled and disenfranchised by state and local official prophesies.

Highly engaged, high-income, high-turnout communities like Eagle River and Chugiak will always have more sway than folks who live in the working-class communities who are too busy living paycheck-to-paycheck to come listen to folks justify why they deserve to get steamrolled again.

Second, I support the pairing because it keeps important communities together. These are communities that have repeatedly asked to stay together during both state and municipal reapportionment testimony. This includes Spenard and Turnagain being kept together in 14 and 16. Airports Heights and Midtown in 18 and 19. Hillside and Southside in 9 and 11, as Christopher Constant mentioned earlier. And the Southport and Klatt communities in Oceanview in 10 and 15.

And lastly, (indiscernible) it shares JBER with Anchorage as opposed to handing it over to Eagle River by default, as other previous redistricting and reapportionment processes have done thus far.

The majority members of the board rushed through and unconstitutionally politically gerrymander and refuse
to consider these pairings that are on the table proposed right now. They make sense, they're defensible in court, they have broad support, and they deserve to be discussed by the board. Right now there is no discussion or proposals from any other board member but Melanie.

I think it's incumbent on the remaining board members, particularly those who are objecting to these proposed pairings without any stated grievance to stop holding their cards close to their chest and be honest about the pairings that they prefer. They need to be honest with Alaskans and stop waiting until the very last minute just to say that they oppose Melanie's pairings for X, Y, and Z stated reasons. There needs to be transparency, unlike the last set of processes, which is exactly why this pairing went to court.

I'd also like to use my time to advocate against stalling this process. The filing deadline is less than two months away for candidates. That's 60 days. Voters deserve to know who their incumbent representatives are and who they're going to be voting for. This election cycle will be crazier than usual with 59 legislative seats, multiple statewide seats, and a brand new set of special elections to (indiscernible) Don Young. Right? And the more clarity voters have, the better equipped we are to hold a fair, trusted, and credible election process.
I implore the board to consider these pairings and at the very least avoid trying to pair South Muldoon with an uncontiguous and unsocioeconomically connected district. I think the North and South Muldoon pairings are the baseline for what should be done to correct this process.

Thank you guys for your time and thank you for your involvement in this process. It is a great service to the state and it's incredibly helpful. I'm very happy to be participating. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Robert.

Questions or comments for Robert? Okay. Let's move on to Randy Ruedrich in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Good morning, Mr. Ruedrich.

MR. RUEDRICH: Good morning. I'm Randy Ruedrich with Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting. I made a brief presentation yesterday and to avoid confusion, I think the best thing for me to do is to assume those comments were not made and start over since they were boxed very tightly.

I appreciate the work of the board in assembling the proclamation which had defects, accomplishments, and generally a map that not everybody liked very well. That is a huge indication that it's pretty good. If you -- if
every -- if a few people liked it a lot and a few people
disliked it a lot, the Court would have given us many more
opportunities to fix things. There's been a map that has
had 27 House Districts redrawn because it was just poorly
done. So you're to be commended for getting close.

I'm going to focus this morning on the Anchorage
Senate District 6. In looking at East Anchorage and its
neighboring northern area Eagle River and Chugiak, they
have been paired in various ways for various reasons
primarily because it's a numbers game. And the numbers
are different when you're looking at the House and two
House seats for a Senate seat versus Anchorage assembly
seats. So what someone would like to have for a House
seat not only doesn't relate very well to what they want
for an Anchorage assembly seat --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Randy, I hate to interrupt.

Is there -- is there any chance you could pull that
microphone a little bit closer?

MR. RUEDRICH: I'm sorry. I thought I was close
enough.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, it's really the sound
is fairly poor, and the closer you can get it, the more
helpful it will be for us.

MR. RUEDRICH: Okay. In the last decade it took
three Anchorage House seats to create an assembly seat.
Look at one set of testimonies versus another is comparing apples and grapefruits. We're here today to talk about House Districts that have been accepted, reassembling them to the extent necessary to create one repair as directed by the Court with a minimum impact on the map.

I appreciate the fact that some people believe they're running for office already and if we change their districts, their world gets truly turned upside down. In view of that consideration, I have presented a map which the board received yesterday about 4 o'clock, 3 o'clock, something like that, which represents the Anchorage eight Senate seats, three of which will be Senate seat F, Districts 11 and 12; South Anchorage is not changed; Senate seat H in West Anchorage, Districts 15 and 16 is not changed; and Senate seat L, 23 and 24 the northern districts of the municipality are not changed. So that says we're working within a ten House seat remainder.

As I testified months ago, in November, South Eagle River could be paired with District 20, 21, or 9 in the current map. If you pair with 9, you're putting all the significant municipal uplands together. These are the road service areas, fire service areas that are in many cases mostly road service and snow removal issues are the common challenges in our uplands. This is not the first time this has been done.
It was done in 2001 by combining parts of this Senate district when the populations were lower in a single House seat while everything in Anchorage, the municipality, is socioeconomically integrated. Folks like to talk about better than, which I don't think exists, but House District in 2001 survived unchallenged after being redrawn post-court action. So we have the Eagle River Valley and related area combined with South Anchorage now in a Senate seat since they've grown big enough to each be a House seat.

This area will serve us well. And you make this change, House District 10 and 13 in South Anchorage forms Senate District G. This is the area that would be bifurcated essentially by Dimond Boulevard and is a (indiscernible) recapture of the Senate seat that exists today. At least 70 percent are the same folks.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Would you clarify which district you're talking about again? I'm sorry. Which district are you talking about there again?

MR. RUEDRICH: I was -- District 10, Oceanview, and District 13, Taku/Campbell for the most part. Okay?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.

MR. RUEDRICH: If we go immediately north of there, since we've taken 13, we cannot pair with 14 any longer, Senate District I pairs 14 with 17 in Central
Anchorage. These two districts were the historical
residential development of the City of Anchorage and
redevelopment has been a major recent consideration.
There have been a number of new homes built on lots within
hundreds of yards of my house replacing 70-year-old homes.
So redevelopment is a key part of what we live with, and
there is the benefit of sharing a senator with Spenard and
if it goes over, into Midtown with the now north of --
south and north of Chester Creek up into the South
Addition.

We then get to a district that, as you put it
together, has a very unique situation. Many of us have
talked about 18 as the U-Med district and has always
ignored the fact that 19 is also a Med district. 19 is
the home of the entire Regional Hospital complex. 18 is
the Alaska Native Hospital and Providence. So we create
Senate District J, 18 and 19, as an enhanced medical
community with a lot of folks living around it that work
for it and many people that live there have moved there to
be closer to those health care facilities.

And finally, we have proposed to put House
District 20 and 21 that lie along either side of Muldoon
Road into Senate K. Already site Anchorage district
combined the North Muldoon/Northeast Community Council
area with area south of it.
I urge you to look at this. This only impacts five senators, not eight, and allows us to fix the problem that the Supreme Court has raised. I thank you for your time.

MEMBER BAHNKE: John, you're muted. You're still muted, Mr. Chairman. We can't hear you.

MR. SINGER: John, you're muted. Mr. Binkley.

MEMBER MARCUM: Peter probably has to unmute him.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Don't know how that happened. Apologies. Okay. Melanie and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Randy, for your testimony. I do have a question. One of the things that I read in the Court's decision was as far as Senate District K goes, the problem was with cracking Eagle River, and I don't know that your map solves that -- solution.

My question to you --

MR. RUEDRICH: I'm sorry. You're -- I'm sorry, Melanie. I cannot understand you. You're speaking a little bit too fast for the quality of transmission.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. I'll try to slow it down. I was thanking you for offering your public testimony. One of the things I noted in the Court's ruling was the problem with District K, part of the problem is the
cracking of Eagle River, and I don't know how your map addresses that. I don't -- I don't want an explanation from you right now, but that's one issue I see.

The question I have for you is, what is the opposition to pairing Eagle River with Eagle River from your perspective? Why is that not a good pairing?

MR. RUEDRICH: I view the primary situation here to pair 23 with 24 to keep the historic Eagle River military significance, because without the military, Eagle River would never have existed. Eagle River was organized as a bedroom community for the military, for off-base housing, and the intertie I think is extremely important, and for that reason, I have not engaged in any change in the pairing of 23 and 24.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Do you -- Mr. Chairman, may I ask one more follow-up question?


MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. I just wanted to ask you if you did read the Court's ruling that mentioned cracking of Eagle River being problematic and we have to correct that? Did you read that part of the ruling?

MR. RUEDRICH: Yes. And I didn't reach that same conclusion.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's see. Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. And thank you,
Randy, for continuing to stay engaged in the process. I learn something new every time you testify.

Can you repeat, to make sure that I'm tracking correctly, what suggestions that you are making? From my notes, you would like 22 with 9, 23 with 24, 18 with 19, and 20 with 21?

MR. RUEDRICH: Yes.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Well, I'm going to go out on a limb here and say I agree with you on at least half of (indiscernible). So progress is -- progress is being made.

MR. RUEDRICH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Nicole. And also the -- it came in a packet last night, both the map that Randy was referring to, as well as the text as well laying out what the districts are, which was helpful. Thank you. I guess that's it, Randy. Thank you.

Next is Yarrow Silvers from there in the Anchorage LAO office.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, can I just bring to Nicole's attention her hand is still raised.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thanks, Melanie.

Good morning, Yarrow. Welcome back.

MS. SILVER: Good morning. Thank you.
Hi. My name is Yarrow Silvers. I am speaking for myself. However, the proposal that I am introducing is on behalf of the East Anchorage plaintiffs.

The Bahnke pairings respect communities and socioeconomic integration. They are not based on partisan data and they are informed by public testimony, as evidenced by their compact shapes, large areas of continuity, and robust, thoughtful public support they received, all of which have not been seen in the more partisan proposals which have relied on tiny sections of continuity, weird shapes, illogical or no justification, weak or one-sided socioeconomic considerations, and which have ignited strong, detailed public opposition from the people harmed by these pairings.

It is unfortunate that the Bahnke pairings were not chosen initially and that the board chose to ignore public testimony and rational logic to gerrymander the map instead. However, at this juncture, the Supreme Court has ordered that the board correct the constitutional errors and make other revisions to the proclamating plan resulting from or related to those changes.

In order to most closely follow the direction of the Court, I, along with the other East Anchorage plaintiffs, propose the following maximum preservation pairings which include four of the original pairings
adopted by Bethany Marcum as well as four (indiscernible) initially proposed by Melanie Bahnke in order to fix the constitutional errors. Here is the maximum preservation proposal. Senate District B will be the board-adopted Marcum pairing, House District 9 and 10. Senate District F, board-adopted Marcum pairing, which would be Lower Hillside, District 11 and Far North Bicentennial Park, House District 12. Senate District G would be the original Marcum pairing, pairing 13 and 14, Gambell and Spenard. Senate District H would be the Marcum pairing, which would combine House District 15 and 16, Sand Lake, Campbell Lake, and the Anchorage Airport. The pairings that would need to be adjusted in order to fix the constitutional errors that came from splitting Eagle River, from splitting Muldoon would be as follows. Senate District I, the Bahnke proposed pairing, which pairs House District 17 and House District 23. Senate District J, which would be the Bahnke-proposed pairing, which would combine House District 18 and 19, Mountain View, Airport Heights, and U-Med. Senate District K, which would pair House District 20 and 21 with North and South Muldoon. Senate District L, which would pair House District 22 and 24, Eagle River Valley and North Eagle River/Chugiak.
Thank you for considering this proposed plan which contains the minimum changes necessary to fix the constitutional errors and are logical, respect communities, and use changes which were introduced during the initial Senate Pairing process, enjoying broad public support. I sent this proposal with additional details in an e-mail on behalf of the East Anchorage plaintiffs. Thank you again for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yarrow. Bethany, you had your hand up. And then Nicole.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Chairman. I just would like to ask the public and others not to refer to the plans as the Marcum pairings or the Marcum plan. I put them out as proposals. They were voted on by a majority of the board. They're certainly not mine. I don't have any ownership of them any more than anyone else who supported those. So I would just ask that my name not be associated with those because they're -- as you remember, I had five different possible -- possibilities. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Bethany. Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Yarrow, again I appreciate you, just like Randy, for staying engaged in the entire process. I have read your letter of April 1 from your law firm, Birch, Horton, Bittner, with great
interest. And is it your position that the board does not
have any authority beyond what you're suggesting as the
maximum preservation plan?

MS. SILVERS: It -- I think it's a really
slippery slope. I think if we go in and start trying to
change too much, that, yes, I think that it does exceed
the authority.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Any -- let's see. One
quick question, Yarrow. Just -- we had the presentation
from Mr. Ruedrich and AFFER that actually pairs North and
South Muldoon, House District 20 and 21 into one Senate
District. Is that -- I know that that was really the --
seemed to be the crux of the complaint that was filed on
your behalf and others by Attorney Holly Wells. Does that
seem to satisfy that aspect of it?

MS. SILVERS: District 17 includes 2,000
residents of North Muldoon. It includes some of the
lowest income and highest diversity census blocs in
Anchorage, and I believe that, in looking at Muldoon, that
pairing that section of Muldoon with Chugiak/North Eagle
River, I -- I don't think it makes any sense, and I think
it's harmful to the people that live there.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I guess I'm confused, because
I thought North Muldoon was District 20. Does that not
encompass all of North Muldoon?
MS. SILVERS: No. There is the section right there --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I see. So --

MS. SILVERS: -- and that's (indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: -- you would suggest --

MS. SILVERS: -- in Anchorage. It has some of the highest diversity. And then you also have, you know, Downtown and Government Hill.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: But I was thinking specific to your litigation. But you're not suggesting we change the House underlying plan to accommodate that portion of Muldoon that's now in 23 with --

MS. SILVERS: No.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: -- House District 20?

MS. SILVERS: I believe what the Court was quite clear that the House Districts are constitutional.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. So just to make -- so I'm clear, if the House Districts 20 and 21 were combined into one Senate District, that satisfies your concern about North and South Muldoon, given the -- you know, where we're at with the underlying House Districts?

MS. SILVERS: That would satisfy the concern about Districts 20 and 21. It would not satisfy the concern about Districts 22 and 24, Eagle River, which also needs to be combined as one.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. I think I get it, but I thought the litigation was specific to 20 and 21. But I see what you're saying. It wasn't -- it also included 23 and 22, that -- those two areas. Okay.

Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes, I was going to follow along the same line of your question, Mr. Binkley, was in terms of the crux of the litigation, if we simply pair Muldoon with Muldoon, do you think that satisfies it, or do you feel like there was -- I think it was in the Court order that cracking of Muldoon was part of the (indiscernible) Senate District K. But I wanted to hear if you had any issues with cracking Muldoon.

MS. SILVERS: Well, Muldoon was cracked --

MEMBER BAHNKE: I mean cracking Eagle River.

I'm sorry.

MS. SILVERS: Oh. Yes. I think that cracking Eagle River was a part of the issue, and the cracking of Eagle River, that was done to give Eagle River more representation. That was stated during the process. So when you're cracking a community to give it more representation, then it stands to reason that the communities that you're pairing it with are going to have less representation, and what we are going for here is equal representation. We're going for one-person,
one-vote principles.

And when you're cracking communities and you're gerrymandering and you're pairing them in a way that increases the representation of one community, that is not one-person, one-vote principles.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would just like to point out that the testifier has implied intent and she was directing that to me, and so I appreciate the opportunity to respond to that. That may have been the result that Eagle River would have had -- would have had two senators, but what has been left unsaid by many testifiers and by even folks on the board is that the same result that came about from the previous map would have allowed Eagle River to possibly have two senators would have allowed Muldoon to have possibly three senators.

As was just pointed out by the testifier on the map, Muldoon encompasses three separate districts, and the configurations of the Senate pairings would have allowed Muldoon to have three senators. Three voices in the senate as opposed to Eagle River having two. So I think that it's important to keep in mind a difference between intent and results. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you. Nicole.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much. Question to Yarrow that comes about really from Bethany's observation that Muldoon will potentially have three senators. Does Muldoon want three senators or does Muldoon want one senator and could be united into one Senate District?

MS. SILVERS: Muldoon wants one senator that can work for Muldoon, not three senators whose interests lie elsewhere.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Just to make sure I'm clear, Yarrow. Part of Muldoon is in District 23, so regardless of -- it's not going to be -- if it's not combined -- if 20 and 21 are combined, then part of Muldoon is going to be in another district by virtue of the underlying House districts. Do I have that right?

MS. SILVERS: Sorry. I didn't hear you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah.

MS. SILVERS: I don't know if it's possible to turn that up, because I'm having a hard time hearing the comments.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. Looking at -- if we combine 20 and 21 into one Senate District, because of the underlying House districts, all of Muldoon is not going to be together in the same Senate District; is that correct?

MS. SILVERS: That's correct. It splits it into
two rather than three. However, it is -- would be well represented in a North Anchorage District.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Okay. Any other questions or comments by board members? Let's move on.

And next is Tanner Amdur-Clark.

Tanner, good morning. Are you still with us?

MR. AMDUR-CLARK: Mr. Chairman, members of the board, can you -- can you guys all hear me?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: We can. Thank you.

MR. AMDUR-CLARK: Excellent. This is Tanner Amdur-Clark on behalf of the coalition of Doyon v. Alaska, Ahtna, Fairbanks Native Association, and the Tanana Chiefs Conference. And I want to be brief today.

First, I would just like to thank you all for your continued diligence and the hard work that you've put forward. Mr. Ruedrich, I think, said something very neutral on an historical sense. When you compare what this board has done with past -- past experiences, the fact that you were able to put together a House map that was -- that held as constitutional by the Court with one small and, from our perspective, unfortunate detail in Cantwell is really a testament to work that you did as a board and I really want to thank you for that.

There's been some talk about the proposal for, you know, fixing or changing and putting Cantwell into
District 30 instead of into District 36. We've had a chance to review the proposal that was put forward at the last meeting, and that proposal is fine from our perspective, just putting the district borders back along the -- contiguous with the borough boundaries (indiscernible) just fine.

We would urge you to make, especially on the House side, to make the minimal changes necessary to comply with the Court. The Court's decision, any additional changes made outside of that very small mapping task would open the board up to additional litigation, and you all have just experienced what that's like and I'd just urge the board not to go down that path.

So thank you very much. Happy to answer any questions that you might have.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Tanner. Any questions, Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Not a question for Tanner, but I recall that we had wanted to give Bethany a chance to compare her Cantwell solution to what we developed, and I have a question for Bethany.

Have you been able to compare that?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. So I'm not sure if Peter is on the line or not, but we worked together yesterday and what I had put together was identical in terms of the
actual borders and boundaries. Peter's deviations and 
populations were not correct because his matrix was not 
working. So we got that fixed. And once we did, the 
populations and deviations on the map that I had made 
changes to matched up with what Peter had done. And so 
that -- what you saw was the -- what resulted was the map 
that Peter sent to you last night that he and I had both 
put together and worked on to show those.

MEMBER BAHNKE: All right. Thank you. I just 
wanted to make sure you'd had an opportunity to do that, 
and thanks for your due diligence.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Any questions for Tanner 
Amdur-Clark?

Tanner, thank you very much, and again, our 
thanks to you and to your coalition for your involvement. 
Much appreciated. I think it was tremendous work, helpful 
to the board, and we appreciate your commentary that, 
despite a couple of adjustments we need to make, overall, 
I couldn't be more proud of this board and what we were 
able to accomplish as well. And it's a shame it gets kind 
of lost in some of the acrimony of what are really a 
couple of small changes in the overall perspective of what 
we were able to accomplish, particularly from me 
personally being able to respect the ANCSA boundaries. 
That's, I think, something that there's going to be a
hallmark in the long run of this board, what we were able
to do. And again, I thank you and all your coalition
members for your participation in the process.

Nicole, I see your hand up. Did you have a
question for Tanner?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Just a -- just a short
follow-up if I could, and I -- I agree with John's
comments on your participation in the process on behalf of
your clients.

Does the Doyon coalition have a position on
splitting the two House districts from Eagle River into
two Senates -- two separate Senate Pairings, or is it your
position that 22 should be united with 24?

MR. AMDUR-CLARK: Our coalition has not -- not
taken a position on the Senate -- on how to fix the --
what the Court has decided on the Senate side. And we
didn't intervene in that case. I think we are -- we are
staying out of any commentary on the Senate side of
(indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. AMDUR-CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's go on there in
Anchorage to Celeste Hodge Growden.

MS. HODGE GROWDEN: Good morning.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Good morning, Celeste.

MS. HODGE GROWDEN: So unfortunately, I'm going to have to rush and not be available for questions. I am late for a meeting. I did not think it would take over an hour to provide testimony. But yes, I'm Celeste Hodge Growden, president and CEO of the Alaska Black Caucus, an organization that champions the lives of Black people in the BIPOC community in the areas of health, economics, education, and justice.

I'm also here today representing the NAACP, the largest and oldest civil rights organization in the world, as the former president and now current vice president of this organization. Unfortunately, yes, I'm having to testify yet again.

First let me say I totally agree with the observation made earlier of badgering testifiers. I'm not sure what that's about, but it really needs to stop. We call in to get our comments on the record. To have to hear the debates between the board or debating callers isn't right, and it causes callers to have to wait.

Today I'm calling to support the pairing of House Districts 20 and House District 21 in Senate District K. I'm not even sure how this current pairing occurred, but one thing I am sure of, it's been far too long where there has been a history of federal, state, and
local officials using the redistricting process as a mechanism for excluding voters of color.

We saw this unjust pairing happen with the late Senator Bettye Davis. It was incredibly challenging to manage for many reasons. It was wrong then and it's wrong now. These schemes most often occur when legislative bodies or redistricting commissions believe they can ignore the interests of voters of color when communities of color and the groups that represent them are not involved in the redistricting process.

Unfortunately, as an earlier caller shared, for many reasons groups of color, they aren't able to testify at 10:00 a.m. on a weekday because they can't take time off from work. They can't break away on a Saturday because they must attend to the needs of their families. However, I'm a different story. Retired and spend my time standing in the gap, utilizing my voice for our BIPOC community.

I urge you today to do the right thing. Correct the error of Senate Pairing for District K by pairing House Districts 20 and 21. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Celeste.

Questions or comments? Okay.

Moving to George Martinez. Are you still with us, George?
MR. MARTINEZ: Yes. Yes, good morning. Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Good morning.

MR. MARTINEZ: Almost. All right. My name is George Martinez. I am one of the East Anchorage plaintiffs and speaking on behalf of myself, and I want to acknowledge the written proposal that was submitted for maximum preservation and straightforward remedy.

But today I wanted to speak -- and I highlight that in my previous testimony I offered calls for expediency, fairness, and responsiveness to the Court's decision in favor of doing the right thing. But I forgot to offer my congratulations as well. We made history.

Now, people offered a historical perspective, and I also have heard many references to fixing the error that was identified by the Supreme Court. But that error is significant and it's historic. That error is the result of partisan gerrymandering, political gerrymandering that is already happening for what I believe has been the first time in Alaskan history that the Supreme Court found unconstitutional political gerrymandering, a direct violation of equal protection, the principle of one-person, one-vote, the right to political representation under the law for East Anchorage residents.
The Court further ruled that that violation was intentional to dilute East Anchorage representation in favor of disproportionately increasing representation for Eagle River. This was the categorization of the Superior Court. So despite the characterizations of a remedy being political gerrymandering, the gerrymander has happened and now we're here to fix that violation and unconstitutional action.

So moving forward, I want to be real clear, we will continue to be here, because that violation of the equal protection of our rights under the Alaska Constitution is a historic ruling. Your remedy should be aligned to those values first. I want to hear first how do we remedy the equal protection violation for the minority majority district of East Anchorage?

I've listened to discussions and I haven't heard that clarity come out from the majority on the board and even from counsel. Ample time has been given to talk about the public participation, the secret nature of the process that was also identified. But those things related to due process and the public meetings requirements were part of the design to dilute the representation. So the equal representation of East Anchorage is what is most important to my family, to my neighbors, and to our community.
So I just want to leave with this. It was an unambiguous ruling to fix plain and simply the violations for East Anchorage and then the necessary additional things that need to happen to make that core change happen. So as a nonpartisan in this process, I remind, political gerrymandering was already found. The time for the gerrymandering has to stop now and let's do the right thing for East Anchorage.

I support what we submitted in writing, but I'm -- verbally will say 20 and 21 makes sense what -- for Anchorage and for East Anchorage. Muldoon deserves representation, equal representation, and let's get back to the business, let's move forward, and let's keep the limited scope of what the -- of what the constitution requires as identified by the Supreme Court as the remedy to fix the equal protection violation of a minority majority vision. Thank you.


Next is Michael Ryan from North Pole.

MR. RYAN: Hi. This is Mike Ryan. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yes, we can, Mike. Go ahead.

MR. RYAN: Yeah. I just wanted to go on record that I oppose the Senate minority plan for the Bahnke map.
1 I just believe that it's politically motivated and would
2 lose two Senate seats because of it. Thank you so much
3 for your time.
4 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Mike.
5 Questions for Mike? Nicole, it looks like
6 you've got a question.
7 MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Mike, which two
8 Senate seats are going to be lost under the Bahnke
9 pairings? Is he still on, Yolan (ph)?
10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He may have dropped off.
11 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: It looks like he's dropped
12 off, Nicole.
13 Let's go on to Senator Begich in Anchorage.
14 MR. BEGICH: Hello and --
15 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Good morning, Senator.
16 MR. BEGICH: Good morning. How are you?
17 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I'll well. Thanks.
18 MR. BEGICH: I want to thank the board for the
19 opportunity to testify, and also thank you for addressing
20 these issues in a timely manner.
21 I want to first correct what I keep hearing, and
22 I want to point out that, based on some of the comments
23 that have been made, there's some relationship being made
24 probably in the kind of a mass e-mail or something to that
25 nature that is equating the Senate minority map, which was
a map that the board approved and adopted and no -- and
then didn’t really provide much more consideration to, and
the final map that’s been referred to as the Bahnke map.
These maps are not connected. They have underlying
differences in House.

And I want to be really clear with you,
Mr. Chairman and members of the board, I've had no
communication directly with Member Bahnke throughout this
process, in particular not about her map, despite
assertions to the contrary. I personally resent it. The
map that I developed with members of not just the Senate
minority but the Senate majority was the map that we hoped
would have further consideration and didn’t, nor am I
asking for its consideration now.

I want to get right to the point of the matter,
which is what the Court found, which is that the Hickel
process and other processes were designed to prevent
gerrymandering, but as George Martinez just mentioned, the
fact of the matter is, the Court -- the Court recognizes
that in fact there is a standard for political
gerrymandering now, and that that standard should be
adhered to in the least -- and you should repair the maps
in the least disruptive way possible.

I just want to quote a little bit from the
Superior Court's decision, but the Supreme Court has
remanded to the Superior Court, and I think it's important for you as a board to look at the Superior Court's decision. They have upheld the -- the Supreme Court has upheld that decision and that's what you should be focused on. The Supreme Court, at page 65, indicated that overwhelming public testimony was against splitting and combining Eagle River and Muldoon. Itself cites that. Further, it is clear that the -- to the Court that the vast majority of public comments were in favor of keeping Eagle River and Muldoon, both communities of interest, together in their own respective Senate seats. I think it's important for you to hear that. Because that implies that 22 and 24, the two Eagle River-located House districts, regardless of the comment of Mr. Ruedrich earlier and an additional map that's been provided, those two House seats should be combined in a Senate seat, and the two Muldoon seats should be combined in a Senate seat. Those two corrections to the map will complete your work in terms of what the Supreme Court has seen and reverse the clear political gerrymandering that has occurred in this process.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just -- and members of the board, I would cite also the Superior Court point -- I'd point at page 70 where they say the Court finds that the board intentionally discriminated against residents of
East Anchorage in favor of Eagle River further
acknowledging the two separate entities that must be
combined as to remedy this issue.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'm available to
answer questions. I'm a little ill today, so unable to be
perhaps as clear as I'd like to be. But happy to answer
questions. I certainly would ask that you all take into
consideration any more verbal or written comments that
start with the same identical phrase that somehow the
Senate minority and the Bahnke map are the same thing.
They are not. And if you're hearing that, likely that is
political processes going forward and you should be
wary of them given the direction that the Court has
provided you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Senator
Begich.

Questions from board members? Just a quick
comment, Senator Begich. It may be that -- and I agree
with you. A lot of these comments I think on both sides
are, you know, typically blasted out to a large audience,
and sometimes they're taken -- copied and pasted and put
in messages, and it's hard to distinguish which are
thoughtful and come by the process or otherwise. But
they're all important to us, and I think we have to treat
them as such, even if they say the same thing over and
over again on whichever side of the issue it is. So from
my perspective, I still pay attention to those.

And the confusion may have come -- I know you're
aware that during the discovery process in court, text
messages that went between yourself and Member Borromeo
during our deliberations when you were suggesting Senate
pairings may be the genesis for the confusion between the
minority -- Senate minority plan, in quotes, and the
Bahnke plan. So that's just speculation, but that may be
where it came from.

MR. BEGICH: Well, Mr. Chairman, thank you
for giving me the opportunity to address that as well by
bringing it up.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: (Indiscernible)

MR. BEGICH: Let me be clear about one thing.
The suggestions and in the text messages that were
presented in court are quite clear that the suggestions I
made for planning -- for various types of pairings were
actually rejected by Ms. Bahnke and -- I assume Ms. Bahnke
and Ms. Borromeo. They were not actually accepted, nor
were virtually any recommendations I ever made in any of
those text messages.

Unlike other members of the board, I was
appreciative that Ms. Borromeo maintained her text
messages so that they could be reviewed. My first contact
with Ms. Borromeo outside of public testimony in this process occurred after publicly testifying in late October. So any assertions to the contrary are false.

And I would just call your attention to the both-siderism, Mr. Chairman, of saying that comments about -- that Saturday by comparing the Senate minority map with the Bahnke map when, A, in the court record itself it shows that those suggestions made by the Senate minority were rejected eventually in whatever form the Bahnke map took; and B, that are false on their face, should be ignored by this board because they are in fact false comments. So I'm -- I would encourage you -- and I may sound a bit passionate about this because I frankly -- I despise being abused by this process. So thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Senator Begich.

We appreciate your participation throughout this. And it's going to have the opportunity to clear the air on that sort of thing, so I'm glad you gave us that perspective.

Melanie, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I have a request. This is the second time that I can recall that this is happening where somehow Nicole and I are being interchanged or considered one in the same. I don't see
how text messages that were directed to Nicole have anything to do with me. There was another time previously during the meeting where a comment that Nicole had made was attributed to me, and although we're both Alaska Native and undeclared, we're not one in the same. We're board members in our own right. So please don't infer any -- don't try to lump us together, Mr. Chair.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, no, I appreciate that, Melanie. And I certainly wasn't. I think Senator Begich was referring to other people who were testifying that were combining the Senate minority or confusing the Senate minority plan with the Bahnke plan. So that's all that I was referring to. But I certainly don't -- I know you're two intelligent, bright, and articulate women and separate in your thought processes and where you come down on issues. So I respect that, and I appreciate that.

Okay. Next person is Ann Brown. Oh, it says unavailable now. I don't know if they've dropped offline. Would that be the indication, I guess, Peter? It looks like the next two are dropped off line.

The next one I see that is still on is Mike Robbins. Mike, are you still with us?

MR. ROBBINS: I am, sir. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the board. My name is Mike Robbins and I'm representing myself this
morning. I would like to testify in support of a revised redistricting plan that supports districts with similar socioeconomic profiles, bringing together neighborhoods that share the most common values and demographics. Under the plan I ask you to consider these items.

First of all, District 10 and 13, Bayshore and Taku, should be aligned into a single Senate District which is very similar to the way the area is aligned now. Districts 11 and 12, O'Malley and Abbott Loop, should be combined, as was declared by the board in November. Districts 14 and 17, Midtown, Spenard, and Downtown, should be combined, as they are similar in their business characteristics with restaurants and offices and the evidence -- the residents of the area that support those. Districts 15 and 18, Sand Lake and Airport, should be combined. This was declared by the board in November as well and it should be kept.

Districts 18 and 19, Mountain View and Airport Heights, should be paired as the areas are shared diversity and socioeconomic linkages. I'd also like to recommend for Districts 20 and 21, North and South Muldoon, they're aligned on the same roadway. They share common byway, neighborhoods, dynamics, and they should be combined into one Senate seat.

Districts 22 and 9, Eagle River and South
Hillside, they've previously been combined to make a single senate seat. These two areas share similar voter demographics and should also be combined. For Districts 23 and 24, JBER and Chugiak, being combined because of the high number of military members who choose to live along the Glenn Highway closer to the bases and North Anchorage, creating a strong socioeconomic relationship within the district.

In closing, I just want to say that I request that the board not adopt the Bahnke plan. It's not balanced and fair but blatantly partisan by design. I ask that you take my recommendations and create a redirecting plan that establishes a fair Senate pairing for Anchorage. Thank you for your time and listening to my testimony.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Mike. I appreciate that. I missed one. I was taking notes on your pairings. After House District 15 being paired 6 -- with 18, excuse me, what was the next one that you had mentioned?

MR. ROBBINS: I had mentioned 15 and 16 being paired.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: 15 and 16.

MEMBER MARCUM: That's what I had.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And what was the next one?

MR. ROBBINS: Sand Lake and Airport. Districts
18 and 19, Mountain View and Airport Heights.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Got that. And then 20 and 21?

MR. ROBBINS: 20/21; 22 and 9; and 23 and 24.


Questions, comments from board members?

Nicole, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I do. Thank you. And Mike, thanks for calling in. Your justification for pairing District 22 and 29 is similar voter demographics. Can you elaborate on that, please?

MR. ROBBINS: 22 and 29? I don't believe I said --

MEMBER BORROMEO: 22 and 9. 22 and 9 you said have similar voter demographics.

MR. ROBBINS: Sure. I can elaborate by saying that the voters in those districts have similar income levels, similar employment levels, similar family sizes, and so their interests and the things that their families do and the things that they care about are very similar in nature. It would be wrong to pair people who have five members in their family with single people. So I think that the demographics of those two areas mirror each other and that they should be combined.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Alex Baker.

MR. BAKER: Can you hear me okay?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yep, we can hear you, Alex.

Go ahead, please.

MR. BAKER: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Alex Baker. I'm calling in from Anchorage. I'm a resident of Downtown (indiscernible). I'm calling in support of the pairing between District (indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Alex, I hate to interrupt you, but I'm having a difficult time hearing you. If you could speak up a bit, that would be helpful.

MR. BAKER: Is this better?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yes, much better. Thank you.

MR. BAKER: I'll start from the beginning real quick. I'm a resident of Downtown. That's new House District 17. I'm calling in support of the Senate Pairing between House District 17 and House District 23.

Government Hill and Downtown share the same Anchorage assembly member, soon to be two members. As a resident of Downtown, I go to Government Hill a couple times a week, usually for the Anchorage Curling Club. Quick plug there.

When I'm there, I curl and drink beer. Some people come from base all the time. Sometimes they'll stop and pick up some food from one of the businesses in
Downtown, Government Hill -- and I'll run into people from base -- those neighborhoods are pretty integrated. A lot of people come from base over the bridge into Downtown.

So I would just urge you to think of 23 and 17 as really a continuation of the same neighborhood. You know, when you look at the border between 17 and 23 in Downtown, it is somewhat arbitrary to split Downtown in such a way to send 49th State Brewing all the way up to Chugiak if you were to pair the other way. So to summarize, 17 and 23 make the most sense, in my eyes.

I also want to testify on one process concern, and that is the frequency of updates to written testimony. I went to go check what my neighbors and fellow community members were putting on the written record, and it hasn't been updated, it looked like, since April 2nd. To your credit, you have done a lot of good work in the last couple days. But the public testimony, you know, hasn't been updated in a few days, so, you know, there is not that transparency for myself and others to see what's out there.

I know you're considering a few things in Eagle River and South Anchorage, and, you know, I think it is in the public interest to know what is out there on the public record. So I would just urge you all -- I know Mr. Torkelson is doing the work of multiple people -- put
the updates at the end of every day so that, as you move forward in this process, everyone knows what's out there and the public is in a position where they can call and testify in an up-to-date manner. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Alex. And just to that, with your last point, Peter just put up on the screen, it looks like the website has the testimony received through last evening, April 4, on the website. I don't know if you can see this since you're on Zoom. But it shows April 3rd testimony and then April 4th testimony, I believe. Is that what's showing on the screen, Peter?

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. Just so we have a meeting info tab on the website, and that does get updated as I can get to it. But the public notice system has the packet for the coming down, and that's going to have the most pertinent information that meeting -- about that meeting. So there's more information on the public notice system faster, but we will try and keep that public -- the (indiscernible) website is usually about a day behind you.

MR. BAKER: Okay. Thank you very much. I appreciate all the work you're doing, Mr. Torkelson. I know you're doing the work of a few people. So thank you.

MR. TORKELSON: No problem. Yeah, it's out there. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And Melanie, go ahead.
You've got a question?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Not a question for the testifier, but for you, Mr. Chairman. How many more testifiers do we have to go? I'm wondering if we can take a short break if we have a lot more left.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: We don't. We have -- I see one, two, three, four, five, six, seven. So I think we should power through and try and get it done if you can to hold off for a few minutes.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yep.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. And just -- I thank you Alex for that plug on curling, too, as a Fairbanksan and my wife's family, Persingers, and they're involved in curling in Fairbanks as well. So I understand your comments.

Fred Brown from Anchorage. Fred, are you online?

MR. BROWN: Yeah. This is Fred Brown, Mr. Chairman. Can you hear me all right?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yes, we can. Go ahead, Fred.

MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, since moving to Anchorage about four years ago, I have been elected the chair of my local homeowners association in Far View Place in South Anchorage in District 9, and I'll focus my comments today specifically to the far east side
of Anchorage, the pairing of Districts 22 and 9, and this is in part to follow up on some of the questions that were discussed earlier.

First, however, I want to congratulate you all again for such a high level of success in getting so much of your regional work adopted. And if there are tweaks that need to be accomplished, I would recommend that pairing of 22 and 9 be adopted. Additional reasons that could be provided beyond those that were earlier cited are the fact that we do supply and support our own road service areas throughout that far east side of Anchorage up in the foothills and the slopes of the Chugach mountain.

Additionally, we share in common the risk of fire and the need for fire protection. And I say this because, even in my neighborhood, although I'm speaking as a personal representative and not on behalf of the homeowners association, our homeowners association has been concerned about the fact that we have one access road, ingress and egress into our area, and the area continues to grow. There are 28 more lots being subdivided. So we will have at least 100 or so lots using that one road for access, and so, again, we share not only a concern about road maintenance but also the concern about fire protection during fire season.
So with that, Mr. Chairman, I'll just conclude by remarking that, from our point of view, the maps that were described by Mr. Ruedrich would satisfy our concerns to the fullest extent there are options available.

Thank you for allowing me to testify.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Fred. Questions from board members? Okay.

Next is Jamie Rodriguez? Sorry. I don't --

MEMBER BORROMEO: I have my hand up. So I --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I didn't see it for some reason. Go ahead, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Fred, you mentioned you both have your own road service areas, and I appreciate that commonality. Is there an actual road that connects Districts 22 and 9?

MR. BROWN: From my area there is not. Again, I moved down from Fairbanks about four years ago, but to my knowledge, there is not a road directly connecting the two, but what we do have in common is the need to maintain our own roads and again, maintain our roads through our service areas and also maintain our fire protection capabilities.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.


MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
I wanted to ask about the -- I've heard quite a few people reference the having to pass through or is there a direct road through, and I guess I'm a little confused about that argument. It's not particularly compelling to me, and so I wanted to ask Mr. Brown about, when you need to contact your legislator, you know, do you feel like most members of the public know how to get ahold of their legislator? Do they feel like they need to drive to another district to get to their Senator or how do you go about contacting your legislators?

MR. BROWN: Through the Chair, in this post-COVID era in which we've all learned to use Zoom and engage in Teams meetings more often than not, as you all know, not only do we use telephones, we also are able to contact through videoconferencing, and we all have a long experience of contacting our legislators while they're in Juneau. So to your point, I believe it's not difficult to contact our legislator, or they don't come (indiscernible) an office very long.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Nicole, your hand is still up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Just for the purpose of correcting the record, my question was relating to if they shared a common road since road service was a
primary justification for linking the two. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you. Moving along.

Jamie Rodriguez.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good morning. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yes, we can, Jamie. Go ahead.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you. Just real quick before I start, there is no road between 9 and 22, other than the main roads, and lots of us are dying to get out and meet.

So anyway, I am calling to say no to 9 and 22 pairing. Number one, under obvious -- under Alaska law there are requirements that districts be continuous -- contiguous, I mean, connect relatively socially, economically integrated, and as near as possible to the ideal possible, unquote.

The Northeast Anchorage pairing was rejected by the courts as being a wild overreach. Of those requirements the board then listened to a proposed replacement later in the day yesterday, which, if adopted, would repeat the very same overreach, only worse (indiscernible) members. The replacement proposal which would attach Southeast Anchorage's House District 9 to Eagle River's House District 22, essentially accomplishing that same goal of capturing also politically -- it makes
it political during (indiscernible) capturing another
Senate seat for Eagle River to replace the Northeast Anchorage plan. Egregious? Yes. But even more so.
And it's ridiculous. And here's why. Let's talk numbers as they affect the two districts. The
driving distance between Eagle River and Southeast Anchorage is 27 miles. This is -- this is approximate but very close. I rounded up or down as needed. It's very close. The driving distance between Eagle River and House District 9's Girdwood is 67 miles. The driving distance between Eagle River and House District 9's Portage is 78 miles, an insanely long distance to get to the other end. (Indiscernible) urban House District? Yes, yes.
The driving distance between Eagle River and House District 9's Whittier is 87 miles. That includes scheduling one's time to get through the terminal.
87 miles. Let that sink in for a moment. That will be a record. We're an urban area. Even down to Girdwood we're urban. And that is ridiculous. We can understand it up on the North Slope all over the place where people live far apart and so forth, but not in town.
So depending on the route taken, also one must cross through five to six unrelated House Districts to get from Eagle River to Southeast Anchorage, and that's again depending on the road taken. If the pairing in Northeast
Anchorage was found to be unfair and in violation of the state redistricting rules, which have been thrown out, which got that thrown out -- the Court threw it out -- in how it would -- and then how it would be fair to pair Eagle River with Southeast Anchorage with even greater driving distances, in this case through busy city traffic streets, it's not fair.

This is a brazen assault to the people of both House District 22 and House District 9. This is not -- somebody said it yesterday. This is not about politics -- the politics of those testifying. This is about fairness in a fight against gerrymandering and a potential disenfranchisement of people who get caught in that.

This is a demand to respect election law. Alaskan's election laws are respected as amongst the most fair in the country. So they should not be under assault. I urge the Redistricting Board to do its job fairly and correctly as outlined by law and fairly for all of the people of Alaska, no matter what or if they have a political affiliation.

Please, please, please, you guys being fair can stop this horrible stuff that's happening in a wonderful, beautiful state where, up until a few years ago, everybody got along. And this has to stop. And you know what? Right now it's in your hands, and it's an opportunity for
you guys to stop it. And there may be just a little give
and take in all of that. You’re not going to get the
exact map you want, but we need to make it fair and then
it will be really close. So it should be equally fair, no
matter what district you’re living in and no matter what
party affiliation you are. So please --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Jamie. I think
you’ll find unanimous consent on the board members on
that.

Questions for Jamie?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. We’re going to move on
to Dan Saddler. Dan, are you still on the line?
MR. SADDLER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am. I assume
you can hear me okay.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: We can. Go ahead.

MR. SADDLER: Very good. This is Dan Saddler,
resident of Eagle River, and I want to comment
specifically on the Eagle River Senate District Pairings.
And Mr. Chairman, first I guess it’s important
to state that I strongly oppose the so-called Bahnke plan.
The reason is, to adopt this plan in a hurried process
that gives the public only a very limited ability to
review it, analyze it, and comment on it would frankly be
an abuse of the redistricting process.
The law establishes a five-member board and
charges you collectively with the task of drawing a map that balances the multitude of big factors. It's a big job, but it's also conducted in public view, and the majority rules. By contrast, this so-called Bahnke plan seems to be the product of planning by a subset of the five-member board in a process that's largely been hidden from public view.

I've been watching the process the last couple of days. We've seen what appears to be a coordinated effort to ramrod this plan through by virtue of the sheer weight of public comments, sometimes the same person commenting a dozen or more times. That in itself is a perversion of the one-person, one-vote standard that should be at the heart of a fair redistricting process.

I'll note that the Supreme Court found the board's plan, the first proclamation, to be correct, appropriate, and defensible in all but two specific instances. And the Court's finding of that issue with the Eagle River pairings does not in any way provide carte blanche to redraw the lines of other districts that, again, the Supreme Court found proper in all regards.

Okay. That said, I do want to offer my support for a simple fix to address the Eagle River pairings issue, and that would be to adopt the revised district map that links House District 9 with House District 22 that's
offered by the Alaskans for a Fair and Equitable Redistricting.

And briefly, here's why. Residents of these districts of -- their lives are characterized by their life on the foothills and the upper slopes of the Chugach mountains. That means they share a lot of common interests. While lots of the rest of Anchorage residents rely on local or state road maintenance, people in these districts rely on their local road service boards to provide for maintenance of their roads.

I guess it's necessary here to note that one of the reasons for maintaining roads in a LRSA, or anywhere, is to link you to other roads outside your district. It's not -- you know, roads are not point-to-point like a railroad track in the fact that there's not a single point-to-point connection between two elements of a district does not obviate the likelihood of that being good. You drive on one road to get to other roads.

I guess its also necessary to note that the distance between different sections of a district is also irrelevant within a single municipality. I'll note that rural districts, there may be hundreds of miles between pockets of residents within the same district which have been found perfectly appropriate.

You know, residents of District 9 and 22 face a
lot of similar living conditions and hazards. They live on the urban one at the interface. It means they face the risk of wildfires and of bears getting into their houses and threatening their household and their families. They face the challenge of less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, wind, and snow, as the recent avalanche on the Hiland Road dramatically demonstrates. Again, it should go without saying these two districts are socially, economically integrated simply by virtue of being within the Municipality of Anchorage. And they are also contiguous. And they are joined in the uplands of the Chugach mountains.

And I'd note that this is a standard that has already been found valid in earlier maps approved by previous districts that link an Eagle River Valley House District across the Chugach mountains to an adjoining House District to the south. So that argument holds no water because the law has already allowed for it.

I think my time has probably run out. So in summary, please reject this so-called Bahnke plan and approve a commonsense district map that links Districts 9 and 22 in a single Senate District. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Dan. Questions or comments? Okay.
We'll move on to -- let's see. I'm just looking at the time stamps here. Gretchen Stoddard in Anchorage. And after that we'll go to Brian Hope (ph), Robin O'Donoghue, and then we'll go back online.

MS. STODDARD: So please let me know if I'm talking too loudly or if you can't hear me. My name is Gretchen Stoddard. I live in what's soon to be District 9, South Anchorage, the set of subdivisions Turnagain View, Turnagain View Estates, Turnagain View Heritage Estates, or whatever it is. I live in a subdivision on the Lower hillside.

I haven't really been involved in this state process, but I was following the municipal process closely. And testified -- I'm only testifying for myself, even though I volunteer in some areas. I realize you have a court case and hopefully those problems can be solved. I don't understand all that. I live in District 9. I understand District 9 and 10 going together. I can stand at Bell's Nursery, there's a crosswalk going over the Seward Highway.

9, 10, they link together well. We share Rabbit Creek Elementary. We share Goldenview Middle School. We share South High. I just want to say if we're going to be put with somebody else, I -- I don't think that this has already been decided and gone out for public testimony and
decided. You know, 9 and 10 I get.

Basically if you put us in with somebody else, please put the maps clearly online so we can comment on them and have time, because I don't think that any other pairing of my district -- I get 9 and 10. I'm happy to sit back and let it go and you guys figure out everything else.

But anything else I haven't had really time to look at it. I haven't had time to go talk to my -- basically when I talked to my friends, that's what we were talking about, 9 and 10. It's like, okay, let it go through. If you're going to do anything else, there are differences. You know, I can talk to them. But basically, 9/10 I get.

Other than that, I need more time to understand this and why we really need it, and one of those things would be I go online, we go under maps, we see what is on the table. So sorry I don't really have --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: That's okay.

MS. STODDARD: -- a written set of comments or something super well prepared. I'm just saying, if it's not 9 and 10, I don't feel like we've already commented and it's done.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. You did a good job, Gretchen.
And Nicole, you’ve got a question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I do. Just a quick one, Gretchen. Thank you so much for waiting today. I know you’ve been in the room a long time. I hear you very loud and clear on 9 and 10. If it’s not 9 and 10, would your preference be with an Eagle River district or an Anchorage district?

MS. STODDARD: I don’t like the idea of the Eagle River district, but I’ll listen to it. I just need to hear why, you know, be able to go online and -- is there any other option that works.

But no, you know, I don’t like the idea. I live Lower Hillside. My house is exactly like Oceanview, across -- well, it’s not, but Turnagain View and Oceanview, you can sit there, you can (indiscernible) and go -- I was kind of getting used to doing that. I know the community council, she and I don’t always agree, but we share part of Huffman. We’re concerned about Sonic Burger traffic. And, you know, I work with her pretty regularly.

And when (indiscernible) parents get together or, you know, the moms of empty nesters, we have people from Oceanview, we have people from that little area -- anyway, all I’m saying is I (indiscernible) not everybody gets to be happy. I’m okay not being fully
happy, but move outside of 9 and 10, and just show us
online really clearly what the maps are and give us some
time.

And I will say we went through the municipal
process and there was a rush, and I get that. But we had
the decision at the municipality. I want to say that's
the end of March. And now I think we're talking about an
election in the municipality the end of June. So, you
know, we need to take the time to do this well, which
we're going to live with it for ten years, and I look at
that municipal process and see how long it is from a
decision to that Downtown election. I think it's two
months from the time of the decision to the time of the
election. So I don't -- I don't really understand why we
need to rush this for a November election or even an
August primary.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Let's go
back up the list. I see Ann Brown is back online.

Ann, are you with us?

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
wanted to -- I heard Representative -- Former
Representative Saddler's comments, and I want to echo what
he said. I oppose the Bahnke plan. I am a resident of
District 9. I speak only for myself. And I support the
pairing of District 9 and District 22. I have been a
consistent (indiscernible) map supporter, and I understand that it's part of their plan. So that would be my testimony. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And thank you, Ann.

Nicole, did you have your hand up still?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I apologize. I forgot to put it down.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. No problem. We'll go back to Anchorage. Let's see. We've got Brian Hope (ph).

Good afternoon, Brian.

MR. HOPE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. How am I coming through?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Pretty good. As close as you can get and as loud as you can speak is helpful to us, particularly those of us that are a little hard of hearing.

MR. HOPE: Yeah. The sound issue seems to be going both ways here. So we have some difficulty with you guys as well.

So the last time I was here, I think the last testimony I gave was in support of pairing 15 and 16. Of course a lot has happened since then. We've gone through a court process now. They've identified a deficiency. And I'm not sure how that deficiency has anything to do with 15 and 16. But now somehow 15 and 16 have been
1 separated because of that evidently.
2 So -- and I do want to be sensitive to Member
3 Bahnke and her proposal. I think -- you know, I've been a
4 part of these processes before, and you have to start
5 somewhere. And so if Bahnke V1 -- that's kind of how I
6 view this, is, you know, a starting point.
7 As I look at this map, though, I see pairings
8 that confuse me. And not the least of which, of course,
9 is 15 and 16. But going -- excuse me -- 14 and 16. If we
10 look at this, what I'm looking at is the, again, the
11 Bahnke V1. There are dashes here that correct the Senate
12 Districts in addition to the color coordination. And
13 we've got dashes that are diagonal. We've got dashes that
14 are vertical. And we've got dashes that are horizontal.
15 One of the features that I notice on the
16 Anchorage House Districts is that by and large they have
17 long boundaries and short boundaries. The feature that I
18 notice with respect to the map that Mr. Ruedrich has
19 developed in terms of the pairings is that these districts
20 by and large are connected on the long side, and so
21 it's -- by and large, it's a north/south pairing. So
22 you've got 15 and 16, you've got 14 and 17, 13 and 10, 12
23 and 11, 18/19, 20/21. I think that makes a lot of sense,
24 especially in consideration of how Anchorage is built out.
25 When you look at the transportation system, the
main road ways are north/south. Minnesota Expressway, the
Seward Highway, those are north/south. You see how these
districts are paired along those arteries.

So I'm going to, again, testify in favor of the
15/16 pairing, and specifically, and then I'm marginally
in favor of Mr. Ruedrich's approach with respect to the
Senate Pairings across Anchorage. And the 16/14, you
know, I've attended a lot of these meetings and I
haven't -- you know, I could be mistaken, but I just
haven't heard any testimony that puts 16 and 14 together.
16 is largely residential. 14 you've got a pretty healthy
mix. Conversely, 16 and 15, again, it seems like
socioeconomically those are more in line.

If there's any questions, happy to address them.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Nicole.

You've got your hand up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Brian. I don't
have any questions for you, but I do want to correct the
record so that residents of Turnagain don't feel as though
we're overlooking their testimony. There has been a lot
of testimony from Turnagain, including their community
council asking to be paired with Spenard. Most of that
testimony did come in in November. So I just wanted to,
again, make sure that that's on the record so that, one,
you know about it, and two, those residents don't feel
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Folks here, we've just got three left at this point. Just give you the order. Robin O'Donoghue. Then we'll go to Kathy Hosford, and then Joanne Blackburn.

Robin. Good afternoon. Welcome back.

MR. O'DONOGHUE: All right. Good afternoon. Nice to see you all again. For the record, my name is Robin O'Donoghue, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Alaskans for Fair Redistricting Coalition. As you know, we've been participating and observing the process since the beginning with you guys, and given that the board is now considering additional Senate Pairings to adopt as proposal for public comment, we want to urge the board to only adopt constitutionally -- constitutional proposals that comply with the Court ruling and would pair the two Muldoon districts together and the two Eagle River districts together.

Page 69 of the Court ruling we believe states that the Senate Pairings cannot give Eagle River extra representation, meaning that in order to correct the constitutional defects identified by the Superior Court, Muldoon must pair with Muldoon, and Eagle River must pair with Eagle River. That would be 20 and 21, and 22 and 24. These pairings are also consistent with the
majority of public testimony received by the board, and
they are the pairings that our coalition suggested to the
board when the House map was finalized. So they're
consistent with what our coalition believes to be the best
option throughout the process. And the public has been
made aware of these pairings for a while now -- or the
suggestion of these pairings, I should say.
And I just want to thank the board members for
their service to Alaskans, and the time commitment you all
have made throughout this process. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Robin, and to ASSR
and to AKPIRG. We appreciate your participation.
Alaskans for Fair -- AFR. Sorry. And all your
participation and support during the long, long process
that we went through. So thank you.
Okay. Let's see. Right in the home stretch

MS. HOSFORD: Hi there, everybody. Thank you
for letting me participate briefly today. I know I'm not
anywhere near the Anchorage issues. However, we had a
similar issue down here in the Skagway/Dyea area with
Municipality of Skagway wanting to pair with Downtown
Juneau, which didn't make any sense at all to me.
And it feels like the plan that's being pushed
right now, it feels like it's a partisan issue a lot like
it was down on this end, and I'm really hopeful that
you'll take a while to really consider the redistricting,
that it is fair to everybody and not to rush into
anything. Because of the partisan issue down here in
Skagway, it drove -- it widens the part from one another,
and it was an organized partisan issue when they testified
in front of the redistricting board.

I just want to bring to you guys today to thank
you for all of your hard work and not be pushing so hard
to push this plan through that feels like it's an
organized, partisan group. And that's about all I have.
I don't need any questions. It's just, take your time in
making the decisions on this redistricting up there.
Thank you very much. I hope everybody has a great day.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Kathy. A
comment, Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Pardon me?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Nicole, you've got your hand
up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible) testimony. I
do. Thank you, Kathy, for your testimony. Two questions
for you. You asked us to take a while. The June filing
deadline is rapidly approaching. How long should the
board take?

MS. HOSFORD: I'd like to get past the
elections, is what I'd like to see, because I just think
pushing it through too quickly, people don't understand
this process very much, and I don't either, but I do know
how I feel when something gets pushed down on -- I don't
want to be rude -- but people's throats and they don't
know any different. I think with everything being so
close to the elections, this is going to create total
chaos.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. Last question for
you. If you said that this plan is partisan, what plan
are you referring to and how is it partisan?

MS. HOSFORD: Well, it's -- how is it partisan?
I'd rather not comment on that. You know exactly what I'm
talking about. Okay? Thank you very much for your
service.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you, Kathy.

Last person we have is Joanne Blackburn.

Joanne, are you still with us?

MS. BLACKBURN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Please proceed. We can hear
you fine. Go ahead.

MS. BLACKBURN: Thank you. I appreciate this
opportunity at long last to comment on this redistricting
process. I'm calling in regards to the end of the Portage
area. The residential people there have very unique
experiences and even life styles and property care. We should not even be within the Municipality of Anchorage. Anchorage has to take care of concerns on 5th Avenue that are urban in nature. They don't understand things like high tides and low tides and how that affects egress. There are some people in Portage that I'm aware of that have -- have to move their vehicles around tide line times.

We are much more linked in type to the Kenai Borough, and we never wanted to be in Anchorage. We didn't know we were going to be in Anchorage in 1986. We receive nothing from Anchorage except for infernal and total and complete political planning which we are never a part of.

We have nothing to do with Girdwood. The state of Alaska, combined with Anchorage, spend a million dollars a year in naming every single mud puddle, water body in the neighborhood of Girdwood. Nothing is done in Portage. We are in the same ruined condition that we were in 1964. The most unsafe curve in -- that I'm aware of is Milepost 180 -- I believe it is 89. Excuse me. Yeah, I think it's 89. It's the right-hand turn. And people rent fifth-wheels, the radius of which was never designed for in 1959 when the Seward Highway was completed.

So mothers of five children -- and I hear them
on the CB radio -- are a little bit surprised when they
find this curve that they've never seen anywhere else in
the United States. We don't have a toilet for them. We
in the Portage Valley Community Council do not meet
because we have nowhere to meet. We are not concomitant,
generally speaking, although we're civil with each other.

Girdwood. Girdwood's approach of endless play
grounds and building up and building up and building up
and building up and building up and giving awards is not
what we do. We have other concerns. We -- you know, and
they are not concerns that any of you have ever heard
before possibly, and none of you actually care about.

We would rather be in Kenai where they have
attorney generals opinions that are still intact regarding
presumptions of the mean high tide and they have a lot of
the same, you know, locations along the Seward Highway.
We would prefer rather to be considered a rural village
outside of Anchorage so that we can put in our requests
and be meaningfully heard for hour actual, literal needs,
and we'd like to do our own planning.

We -- as things currently stand, we are most
best understood by the Eagle River people who are actually
quite overworked anyway, and they are always willing to
take one more call and they do -- they are aware to some
slight extent of our problems.
But we pay money in taxes and we get absolutely nothing but hostility and planning that doesn't include us. We would like to be relieved equitably of this unpleasant relationship with the Municipality of Anchorage, and if I was Anchorage, I would be very thankful to be rid of us, what with our bad curves, our safety corridor problems, the extension of police costs. We either belong in Whittier, where we share exactly the same horrible weather, or we belong in Kenai. And we should have the freedom to be identified as Portage and not be -- no one else can speak for us. Girdwood does not have our experiences. They may be aware of them, but they don't care about them --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Understand --
MS. BLACKBURN: -- in detail --
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. Let's -- I think all valid points, Joanna. Just a quick question. Or Joanne. I'm sorry, Joanne. You mentioned having some commonalities with Eagle River. We've been discussing some of the pairings, the Senate Pairings between the House -- two House Districts, and there's been some discussion about pairing the -- District 9, which I believe encompasses Portage --
MS. BLACKBURN: I have to apologize for not -- not knowing any of the particulars of current debate,
because my computer, no matter what maps are put up, they
tend not to include us --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I see.

MS. BLACKBURN: And -- and also we only talk to
them because they feel scorned by Anchorage proper. We
have that in common. That's the commonality.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Eagle River you're referring
to, Joanne?

MS. BLACKBURN: Eagle River feels scorned --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Got it.

MS. BLACKBURN: -- by the -- by animus of the
wealth of concern in Anchorage proper, the largest city in
the state. Now, Portage does not even have toilets. We
don't have electricity. Some of us don't have driveways.
We have nice properties --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Joanne, are you able to
see -- are you able to see the screen on your computer?

MS. BLACKBURN: No. No, I do not have -- my
computers are rickety and slow and no matter what you put
on them, I can only get like the first page.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I see.

MS. BLACKBURN: (Indiscernible) down doesn't
happen for me.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: If you could -- if we had
your e-mail address, I wonder if we sent you by e-mail a
PDF that showed District 9 including Portage and where that's located in the overall district, would that be helpful to you?

MS. BLACKBURN: Probably not, because I am begging that we be disengaged entirely from the municipal apparatus, the Municipality of Anchorage, so that we can compete with Tuntutuliak and other rural areas of Alaska and get our fair share of what we need --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I get you, yeah.

MS. BLACKBURN: -- that we cannot get anything, including representation, from anyone who is mostly concerned with urban areas, and this needs to be fixed.

It's very, very important because some of the biggest infrastructure problems that Anchorage -- not Anchorage -- but Alaska has is the throughway, the highway, and as long as that's got to have a municipal filter --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Say, Joanna --

MS. BLACKBURN: -- that's a problem.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Say, Joanna, just a quick question and a clarification really. You know, that is way outside of our purview of this board, to be able to look at the municipality boundaries. I know they've had some recent redistricting within the municipality, but they don't allow us really to work on that or any of the other issues dealing with the municipality. So we
appreciate it. I think all the board empathizes with the concerns. And even though you're in the municipality, you feel like you're more rural area and not well represented, but it's really outside of the scope of what we can deal with as a board.

So I might just see if there's other board members that have comments --

MS. BLACKBURN: (Indiscernible) the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: You bet.

MS. BLACKBURN: That we have title problems the 5th Avenue is not going to understand.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah.

MS. BLACKBURN: The State of Alaska barely understands it, and we are, you know, along the chokehold between the mid -- or Southcentral and the rest of the state.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: We get that. We get it, and if there was something the board could do about that, I'm sure we would address it, but it just, unfortunately, is not something that we're able to do or capable of.

So I'm going to reach out to the other members. If you want just a few seconds to wrap it up, Joanne.

MS. BLACKBURN: I would just say that, from 1986 to present we have nothing to show for our being kidnapped into the Municipality of Anchorage. We have a completely
different set of needs that are completely misunderstood
and, you know, within the largest urban setting, and we would like to compete with Tuntutuliak and other rural areas for our fair share or the state cannot grow and --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Well, Joanne, we're going to make your testimony a part of the public record before this body, and to the extent that that's helpful, that will be shared by whoever else can take a look at it.

So I'm going to ask any members if you have any questions of Joanne or any comments. If not, we're going to move on.

And I believe that really concludes public testimony. I don't see anybody else online or in the Anchorage LIO who is signed up to participate.

And so we're going to move down the agenda. And we'd like to close the public hearing portion of the meeting and go, I believe, to member comments. I don't have the agenda in front of us, but I think that's the next item on the agenda. Peter.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, sir, that's correct. Okay. We're going to open it up for member comments. Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much. And I want to extend a sincere appreciation to the public. I know this has been a long process. Waiting on the line for hours is not easy. But we do want to be cognizant of
the fact that we're working under short time frames here
and we're going to continue to hold public hearings to
take public testimony.

During the process the board will be asking
questions, or at least I will be asking questions. And I
understand if some of the questions are difficult for
public testifiers to answer, and if you prefer not to,
then that's okay as well. But I'm not going to succumb to
criticism from my fellow colleagues that this is in any
way badgering the public.

The chairman asked a lot of questions at the
Fairbanks hearing, I understand. I wasn't there. I've
never gone on record saying that he was badgering the
public. In fact, this may be my only opportunity to ask
questions. So if you're going to call in and testify to
maps, which I encourage you to do, please stay on the line
and answer our questions. It will help us get to the end
of the line faster and ideally in a more constitutional
way than we did last time. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just
wanted to say that I appreciated hearing some varying
ideas in terms of ways that districts could be paired.
It's given me some food for thought. I think there might
be a way of taking some of the various proposals we've
seen and amalgamating them together into yet another option. So I will be working on that. But it has been very fruitful for me to hear the comments and the ideas about pairings and the rationale for those pairings today. So thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you. Further comment, Melanie or Budd? Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I do. Question for Matt. As we move forward, are you going to be advising us about any problems you see with potential maps in terms of the Court rulings? How can we get that advice from you?

MR. SINGER: I'm happy to --

MEMBER BAHNKE: How we can comply with the Court orders.

MR. SINGER: I think once the -- once the board has collected all of the ideas and shared its own ideas, then it would be appropriate, if you want me to answer questions on the record, I'm happy to do that. I can -- I'm also available to board members to provide legal advice so you can reach out to me directly with questions. The -- I think the preference of the board is not to hold executive sessions. Just finish this work, try to finish this work in public, and so -- so I would make a list of your questions, and either feel free to call me directly or bring them to our meetings after the
options are on the table.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Budd,

any -- yep, Budd. Go ahead.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just
wanted to touch on kind of going forward what's happening
next, and a little farther down the road. As I understand
it, we've got a meeting tomorrow, same time as this one, I
think. And it's the deadline for either members or third
parties to put in alternative proposals for the correction
of Senate District K and whatever flows from that. So
just kind of putting that on the record. That's like a
hard deadline tomorrow.

The other thing that's on our agenda still is
the Cantwell correction. Mr. Torkelson mentioned that it
would be good if we could get that done so that the metes
and bounds description could be revised early on because
that takes a few days, and if we're trying to do a report
to the Court by the 15th, it would be good to get a head
start on that. Given that and given that I don't believe
we've heard any negative comments about the proposed fix
for that, and we've all had at least a few days to look at
it, I'd be willing to put that to a vote tomorrow
during -- during that scheduled meeting. Get the Cantwell
out of the way and that even further narrows the remaining
work for us to do on Senate K.

MR. SINGER: I would just encourage, if that's the -- if the board is indicating an interest in doing that, put on your agenda for tomorrow possible final vote on the correction of Cantwell appendage or correction of District 36 so that the public understands in advance that that's -- the board is intending to potentially make a final decision on that aspect of the proclamation plan.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. I think that's a good idea. If anybody does have comments on that, that as a step forward, it would give one last chance to do it. And -- yeah, perhaps we'll get some comments that are relevant and make us change our mind or something. But I think we have pretty clear direction on that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Just a clarification, Matt. You mentioned yesterday that it's important to adopt a proposed plan and have it out there for the public to be able to spend some time to look at and then come back and hear testimony on that specific plan. So I'm wondering, when we say adopt a final plan tomorrow, if that truncates that somewhat or we should adopt -- I guess we did adopt a proposed plan, even though it wasn't completely vetted on Monday.

MR. SINGER: I think that the board has satisfied -- Mr. Chair, I think that the board has
satisfied its constitutional obligation. So it adopted a proposed plan, it shared that with the public, we heard testimony about it today, not a lot of testimony, but I think Mr. Amdur-Clark did, and then the board discussed it as well at this public hearing. Then presumably there will be public testimony to start tomorrow's hearing. So a second opportunity for the public to testify.

And I think after -- after we share the proposed plan, we have two different hearings in which the public was invited and able to testify, we then told the public that we're about to make a final decision, it would then be appropriate for the board to make a final decision.

This is an expedited process, and I think it's important to be an expedited process. I like the board's goal of reporting back to the Superior Court on the 15th that our work is done. And so I think it's -- you've checked all the constitutional boxes appropriately and it would be constitutional to adopt a final solution to the House District 36 error tomorrow.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. I might suggest, then, what we do, and maybe for the agenda tomorrow, is separate out and have at the beginning of the meeting the discussion on that Cantwell issue and have testimony specific to that, and then discuss, hopefully take action on that, and then go into a general public hearing as well
to listen to the public.

Presumably then on District K -- or Senate District K and those changes so that somebody -- we don't bury the people who are coming potentially to testify about Cantwell at the end of all of our general testimony before Senate District K. So that would just be my suggestion, but open to any other thoughts on how we should proceed tomorrow.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Good idea.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I like that, putting it at the end in case people that want to testify on it.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, I was suggesting we do it at the beginning.

MEMBER MARCUM: The beginning, yeah.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Oh, I thought you said do it at the end in case people want to testify on it, like have it be one of the last things that we do.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: No. My suggestion was to do it first, but I mean, that could make sense.

MEMBER MARCUM: I think you were saying to give testimony opportunity first, right?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Exactly. Exactly. So that somebody who came maybe a little late to testify on Cantwell wasn't having to wait for all the people to testify about other things.
MEMBER BAHNKE: I see. So it looks like, Peter, you're going to try to rough out a potential agenda.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. So I just drafted up based on what you were suggesting. I just scratched up a few points that are on the screen now for everyone to see.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: How does that look? So we would open with public testimony specific to District 36 and then look for possible adoption of District 36 and associated plan revisions and then go into general public testimony, and then we would -- item 6, I don't know if we're going to adopt further plans or not. That's subject to the board's discretion there.

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I would just ask that we -- rather than stating just District 36, there are three districts there are -- that are affected by this, and I would like for the residents of those other districts to know how they will be affected. So if we could include Districts 29 and 30 in that District 36 reference so that those residents also know how they might be affected.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I think that's fair.

Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I think we had noticed that we would be accepting possible maps for consideration through tomorrow. Is it 10:00 a.m.?
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. We're scheduled to start at 10:00 a.m., and I think that's another good point. I think maybe in 6, after public testimony, we -- I don't know what the right terminology for that would be, but accepting alternative maps.

MEMBER BAHNKE: For consideration.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah.

MEMBER BAHNKE: To that I have one more question. We've had some people testify and give us really specific pairings. I don't know if they've also provided a map. If people have submitted specific pairings, are we going to consider those as part of the things that we consider?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: That's a good question. I've taken notes and tried to write all those down, but Matt, what are your thoughts on that?

MR. SINGER: I'm sorry. I was just making some notes. Can I get the question one more time?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. There have been a lot of pairings that have been presented during the testimony, and should we consider that as a formal presentation and have a map prepared that would show all those various pairings that people have suggested in their testimony?

MR. SINGER: I think, to the degree you're able to, and maybe we could label them just options 1 through
whatever, if we're able to do that, try to consolidate. You know, it's easier when somebody writes a written proposal. We've had a couple of different parties that have provided specific written proposals and those would be easy for our staff to create in a visual map form.

For example, we heard the East Anchorage plaintiffs have four districts they've proposed be changed. I think Mr. Ruedrich today proposed five districts to be changed. So those would be easy to map, and I think you could call them options 1, 2, 3, and that would be -- that would make then something you could post on the website. People can then digest and offer you additional comment about them, and then the board also has an anchor or reference point. Maybe we can also get away from calling these by people's last names.

MEMBER MARCUM: Please.

MR. SINGER: And so since the board has adopted one proposed solution so far, that could become option 1 or option A, and could just use sequential numbering or lettering to show the public additional proposed options.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I would appreciate that. I think the reason why people call it the Bahnke map was we didn't have time in November to label it like we did the other maps, Board V3, Board V4, things like that. So I would appreciate moving off of my last name from...
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And people seeming to butcher the last pronunciation of your last name too.

MEMBER BAHNKE: It rhymes with cranky, if that helps.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, it would be helpful, Peter. I don't know what resources you have or what you're capable of getting done by tomorrow, but even as simple as just having the maps with a straight line drawn between them is -- doesn't have to be color-coded but just a line between them is helpful to distinguish the difference. And then in a side column, how many districts are affected by that plan.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay. So I would just need some guidance on which of the several pairing suggestions brought forward that we would like to have as maps (indiscernible) creating them, I'm happy to do it, but I need some kind of guidance because --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I would say all of them. I don't know if you were able to keep notes.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I think the Ruedrich one is already up on the website, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah.

MEMBER BAHNKE: It would have to be the East Anchorage. I don't know if there were any other ones that were comprehensive.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I thought there were. There was Mike Robbins that had one that seemed to be different than all the others.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Let me find it.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I've got (indiscernible).

MEMBER BAHNKE: What was the name?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Mike Robbins.

Budd, go ahead.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify a point, too, when I mentioned that tomorrow's meeting would be a hard deadline for getting additional plans in. My intention would be anybody that comes to the meeting with a plan that they want to offer, either through testimony or that has -- that sends it in at that time, those should be accepted. Not that like the beginning of the meeting is the deadline. That's all.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chairman, was Mike the one right before Yarrow? Because I did have some pairings written down. I didn't catch all of them, though. I think he's the one that you asked him to repeat.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. I've got them written down, and I can give those to Peter as I took them. It was just after Senator Begich, I believe, and before Alex Baker.

MEMBER MARCUM: I've got them written down, too,
if we need to, at least I think I've got them right. I had them wrong until you asked that question. That was the question I was going to ask, too, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. It was a complete --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Was it starting with 11 and 12?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Mine shows 10 and 13, 11 and 12, 14 and 17, 15 and 16, 18 and 19, 20/21, 22 and 9, and 23 and 24. And I don't know how that relates to the other ones, but that's just what I wrote down. It was one of the few that was a complete plan other than referring to the names of some of the (indiscernible).

MEMBER SIMPSON: That's more names (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Specifically the one or two Senate Districts.

MEMBER SIMPSON: And then Yarrow Silvers had a complete plan, right?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: That was for the plaintiffs, I believe.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Right.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Holly Wells and I think --

did she submit that, Peter? The attorney, Holly Wells.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. That was in our testimony packet from last night.
MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. We received that plan already. It's just in textual form, and I can certainly make it into a graphical map. But if someone were to come on Wednesday at public testimony with a new set of pairings, they would not necessarily have a map like everyone else would.

So I would just ask for a little bit of time if someone were to come Wednesday and meeting the deadline with new pairings, that I will be given the chance to make a map for them if desired so that they would be on even footing with everybody else's proposal. With just a little bit of time, I think we can pull it off.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I think that's fair. You know, I don't sense that the board wants to make a final decision tomorrow, but to have all those maps that were received by the end of the day tomorrow out there in the public for them to be able to look at and, you know, weigh the differences between them.

Budd, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER SIMPSON: That was exactly my point, Mr. Chair, just that if we get every suggestion that we're going to get by tomorrow, put them out there and give people several days, give ourselves several days to assimilate that, think about it. The next time we come together, we can at least start trying to narrow it down,
decide what we can or can't do, possibly come to a final solution.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Matt.

MR. SINGER: Is the board inclined then to schedule another hearing? I think it would be good to telegraph to the public tomorrow is the deadline for presenting the options. Then those will be posted to the website. And let folks know when the board wants to hear public input on that.

I would encourage you to set one or two days before the 15th where the public gets the opportunity to testify about each of the options that are posted to the website and then the board debates and makes a decision, hopefully.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEI: I think that the board should set a public hearing for April 7th, again from 10:00 until 12:00.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I didn't catch the end of that. Say again. April 7th?

MEMBER BORROMEI: Thursday, April 7th, same time, same place, 10:00 to noon.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Just for a hearing?

MEMBER BORROMEI: Just for a hearing.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Personally I think we need to
1 give the public some time to absorb that, let alone board
2 members. We will have received those, I guess, close of
3 business Wednesday. It seems a little early to take
4 testimony on all those when it takes us a little bit of
5 time to absorb those, look at the differences, and
6 understand what those are. Nicole.
7
8 MEMBER BORROMEO: So Mr. Chairman, my sense is
9 that if we don't continue with the public hearing process,
10 it's going to be rushed and jammed at the end. This is
11 all of the public testimony that I printed off that I've
12 printed off just on the Senate Pairings. This is double-
13 sided. So if you've not gone to the website and printed
14 them off, you haven't been keeping up in regular time. I
15 strongly urge the board to do so.
16
17 A lot of the themes are repetitive and common.
18 It is not that complicated to see what the public is
19 asking us to do. But I don't believe that we should be
20 canceling public testimony. We should schedule it as
21 frequent as necessary through Friday. Hopefully the board
22 will be able to act on Friday and adopt a solution to the
23 proposed correction for Senate District K. But I think
24 we'll have a good idea of that come Thursday.
25
26 CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. I appreciate that,
27 Nicole. Not everybody needs to print them out to read
28 them. I read them on my computer or my phone, which is
perfectly adequate, and I'm typically able to keep up. So that's great that you print them out and read them that way, but a lot of us choose to read them a different way. We don't have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow -- or for Thursday, so it would not be canceling a public hearing. And so I think we need time to absorb that, just my opinion.

Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can I suggest a compromise? Since we're encouraging as much opportunity for public testimony as possible, there might not be some who are ready to testify on Thursday who might want to testify on Saturday. There might be some who work on Thursday, who can't -- who need to testify on Saturday or vice versa, people who work Saturday and who didn't -- might need a chance on Thursday. So why don't we do both?

And then I apologize to the board, but Friday is the day that I'm not available to have a meeting. I'm traveling back on Friday. So I'm suggesting what we plan for tomorrow, but also it doesn't hurt to offer the public as much opportunity as we can between now and Saturday.

So I'm suggesting we compromise and have a hearing on Thursday. We might not get anybody call in. But look what happened this last Saturday, how many people we had call in. And then today was just for people to
call in, and there's robust public participation, and I'd rather offer more opportunities than fewer between now and the time frame that we have to abide by.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Bethany and then Budd.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. If we do go forward with a meeting on Thursday, I would just ask that it be at least a couple hours later, as I have a doctor's appointment conflict at the time that was proposed. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I've got a conflict and some travel going on Friday and over the weekend as well, but I'm willing to have a hearing meeting on Thursday. I think there's some value there just to kind of keep up with, like Nicole was suggesting, so we don't get a big backlog and then have to, you know, have it bunched up all of a sudden, and then doing that Thursday.

I would suggest then that we schedule back to back on Tuesday and Wednesday next week, 12th and 13th, and basically just go for as long as it takes to get any remaining testimony in and essentially work sessions to go through the rest of the decision-making.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I'm not available on Tuesday.

So I would suggest we do it on Wednesday and Thursday of
MEMBER MARCUM: I'm sorry. I just didn't take my hand down. My apologies.


MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm concerned about pushing it out so far close to the deadline. We talked about why we need to go ahead and give Peter a chance to work on Cantwell because there's the metes and bounds issue.

Budd, I thought you had said you were available through the 11th, that you blocked this time out. I'd rather not wait until as close to possible as the deadline for a status update to the Court if possible.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, let's see, metes and bounds, Peter, is that going to be difficult for the Senate districts? Don't we just take the House districts and just combine them? You know, no metes and bounds involved?

MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chairman, if the board were to take action on the District 29, 30, and 36 tomorrow, I'm confident we do have the metes and bounds done by end of business Friday. The metes and bounds are not involved with the Senate district.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: And Matt, I know you -- in terms of getting a status report to the Court, is that a -- is that a long process in -- if we've completed our
work? Does that take you long to write that status report?

MR. SINGER: No. No, Mr. Chair, it does not. It's my great -- my optimism and hope is that I will be reporting that the board has adopted a final amended proclamation plan as of X date. So I need to write a sentence or two to make that report to the Court. So that's -- that's not -- my task should not be a concern to the board.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. I would suggest then that we -- I would support having a public hearing then on Thursday, and then --

MEMBER MARCUM: As far as the time, can we clarify that?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Yeah. What time works for you, Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: If it were noon, that would work for me best.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's do it from noon to 2:00. Let's schedule that. If it has to go longer, it will go longer. But let's schedule noon to 2:00 on Thursday. And then I would suggest that we, for next week, we scheduled Wednesday and Thursday.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I mean, in terms of people that
work during the work week, why is Saturday out, or Sunday,
to give people who can't take time off from work to also
call in?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, I think one of the
members is tied up on Saturday. Budd I think indicated
that he was not able to attend on Saturday.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, though, sorry to
interrupt, but I made travel plans. I didn't have those
before. I made those plans after we didn't schedule
anything then. But if you wanted to have just a meeting
to take testimony, I can always go back and read that off
of the record if I miss something, or if any of us do on
any particular day. If it's just a testimony meeting.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I feel the same way for Friday
then if it's just to take testimony, I don't want to hold
you guys up, but if you wanted to schedule something for
Friday -- Thursday, Friday, Saturday, I don't know -- I'm
okay with that.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I don't think you have to do it
every day from now until then, but...

MEMBER BAHNKE: I know. I'm just suggesting
that we not push it towards the very end to the deadline.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's -- I think
Saturday is legitimate in terms of doing it. Why don't we schedule Thursday noon till 2:00. And then Saturday, maybe the same, noon till 2:00. And then Wednesday I think we should probably get an earlier start, 10 o'clock till 2 o'clock. And then Thursday 10 o'clock till 2 o'clock. How does that sound?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chairman --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Mr. Chairman, can we (indiscernible)?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Pardon?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Sorry. My hand has been raised for quite some time. I'd like to get in the cue to talk.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Oh, sorry. I thought it was a smiley face or something. I see it now. Go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Well, yeah, the smiley face was up, but I don't know how that happened. So I would really encourage the board not to go all the way up until the 15th as a deadline. If we want to open up this entire week for public testimony, including over the weekend, tomorrow is Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday. That's four more days of public testimony. Budd and Melanie have travel plans, but with technology, they can watch the Zoom later. Peter could also summarize technology. A good amount is coming
in over the e-mail, and as you observed, members are keeping up on the e-mail testimony in realtime.

So I -- I really want to start debating these plans and hopefully adopt one as soon as Monday. Or at least have something out there for the public to react to. I don't want last-minute surprises and not enough time for the board to debate these in an open and public forum.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. I think the problem about Monday and Tuesday, we've got members that can not attend on those two days, and if we're going to be debating the issue, we need to have all five of us there.

MEMBER BORROMEO: So who can't attend on Monday and Tuesday?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Budd can't attend on Monday. I can't attend on Tuesday.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I thought Budd was available the whole time. When are we going to debate the plans then?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Wednesday and Thursday.

MEMBER BORROMEO: That's what I'm trying to figure out.

MEMBER BAHNKE: And also on Thursday we're going to supposedly vote on them and come up with a proclamation and all of that?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Well, I think -- I don't
know. I think we set aside those two days. Maybe we can
come to a conclusion and end on Wednesday, during those
four hours. We would have had, you know, a week of public
testimony and then it's time to debate and make a
decision. So I don't have any problem in making a
decision on Wednesday.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I just want to --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Why can't we make a decision
on Saturday, the 9th?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I don't think Budd can be
there on Saturday the 9th, and I don't think it's a good
idea. I think that's a little tight. I think we need to
give a little more time for people to digest the plans
that are going to be out there for them to look at and
then make a decision on Wednesday, or possibly Thursday if
we need it.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'm not going to be ready by
Saturday.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Bethany, did you have your
hand up?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah. I was just going to say,
we heard from multiple testifiers today that they are not
yet understanding the process. I want to make sure we
give them time to learn the process, to see the plans, the
proposals that we adopt tomorrow. Saturday would
certainly be too soon based upon what we've heard. The Anchorage municipal election is still going to be returning results during that time period. I think it's much safer to wait until next week. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I just really want to make sure that we have adequate time for discussion and debate on the public record about these maps to show that we have given a good, hard look at all of the options before us and that we put our reasoning on the record for whatever our final decision is, and that might include some healthy debate.

We're up against some hard timelines, and I appreciate your desire, Mr. Chairman, to give the public time to offer up plans, to give the public time to digest those plans, to give the public time to comment on those plans, but we also need to afford ourselves as a board to have adequate time so that we don't -- and discussion and debate abruptly just to meet the Court deadline. I'd like us to ensure that we've got adequate time to do that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I agree completely.

Nicole and then Bethany.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. In the interest of time, I know that tomorrow is the deadline for proposals, but I'm just going to move the maximum participation plan
advanced by the East Anchorage plaintiffs into consideration. I'm also going to move the plan that has been proposed by Randy Ruedrich on behalf of ASFER -- or ASER -- I can't remember the acronym -- in for consideration. I want to get this process going. I'm observing what I consider to be delay tactics at this point. So I'd like those two considered.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I believe -- was that actually a motion then, Nicole, or are you just asking that we adopt those --

MEMBER BORROMEO: It is a motion. It is a motion that we consider the maximum participation plan and Randy Ruedrich's plan for proposed corrections to the unconstitutional now standing Senate K.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. So there is now a motion before us.

Peter, were you able to take that down verbatim?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, I believe I understand the motion. I can restate it or the maker could restate it if she desires.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. So is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'll second that motion. But Nicole, just so you know, I think there was one more out
there, the one that John had mentioned he took notes on.

But I'll second the motion.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion —

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- (indiscernible) record for consideration.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: There's a motion and seconded that -- second to adopt for the purposes of discussion two of the plans that were presented today.

And Peter, there was an acronym or some name of some plan, and again, I don't know that we should be naming the plans either after people or organizations. I think we should give them actual letters or numbers or something so that it doesn't devolve into a characterization of those plans by naming them.

So discussion on the motion now? Bethany, I see your hand is up.

MEMBER MARCUM: That's for after this motion. I have another motion to make.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Let's see.

MEMBER MARCUM: It was up before I knew she was going to make a motion, so...

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole, do you still have your hand up?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I do. Thank you. I want to clarify that this is not an exhaustive list, but I do want
to get the process going. I've heard and read a lot of
testimony supporting both of these plans, so I want to
propose them for corrections. It's not going to be
exhaustive, but I'd like to add them to the other one
that's on the table for consideration.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Budd and then Melanie.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I support the
motion. I favor moving the process along.

I would point out that repetition by members
that they consider something to be a delay tactic does not
make it so. I specifically reject that allegation and
favor moving this along and being done with this by the
end of the meeting on the 14th that we've scheduled.

There's nothing delay about that. And I wish, along with
the many other wishes that have been expressed today, that
people would stop saying that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie and then

Bethany.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I speak in favor of
the motion. I just realized that what this will do is it
will get those two proposed Senate Pairing maps on our
website and notice to the subscribers so that they can
start digesting that.

But I do think that there was another -- one
more map that you had pointed out. So I don't know if you
want to deal with that as a separate motion, but I just
wanted to point that out. So I speak in favor of this
motion so we can start getting things in front of the
public for them to view and digest earlier rather than
later.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany, and then,
Peter, I see you have your hand up.

MEMBER MARCUM: My hand is still up from when --
before the motion. So I will lower it and plan to reopen
it after the vote on this. I have no opposition to the
motion, though.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Did you want to move
an amendment to the motion? I don't know what the nature
of it's going to be, but that's another option. Okay.

MEMBER MARCUM: No, no.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Peter.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. So the
proposal brought forward by testifier Mike Robbins. So it
is in my pad and I believe it is the same as the AFFER
plan, and so it is covered by the original motion.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I see. Okay.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Great.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. I would speak in favor
of the motion. Also I think the sooner we can get those
out, the better. Doesn't preclude us from adopting more
plans at the end of the session tomorrow when we see what might come forward and the deadline that we've imposed on people formally getting us those plans. So I have no problem with that.

Is there further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing none, that's adopted.

Bethany, I think you wanted to make a motion as well.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, because we seem to be not making a lot of progress in terms of determining when our next meetings are going to be, I wanted to make a motion for the board to schedule meetings as follows: On Thursday, April 7th, at noon for two hours of public testimony. On Saturday, April 9th, at noon for two hours of public testimony. On Wednesday, April 3rd, at 10:00 a.m. --

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Just -- 13th you mean?

MEMBER MARCUM: I'm sorry. Wednesday, April 13th, at 10:00 a.m. And I would -- I'm purposely not putting an end time on there because I do think that it may be one of those ones that runs for a while, particularly if we decide to finish our business that day. And on Thursday, April 14th, at 10:00 a.m. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion for
us to adopt the schedule as outlined by Bethany. Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second it.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion before us to lay out a time frame as articulated by Bethany. Is there discussion of the motion?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Chair, I have a question.


MEMBER BAHNKE: Who is unavailable to meet on 12th?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I'm unavailable to meet on the 12th.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Further discussion on the motion? Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: So I also have all-day meetings the 13th and the 14th that are going to be hard to work around. In light of that, I'd like to ask that we schedule another opportunity for public testimony on Friday, the 8th, and those of us that can participate will from 10:00 until noon, and hopefully that will alleviate some of the pressure on the 13th and 14th.

MEMBER MARCUM: If you would like to offer that as a friendly amendment, I would be happy to accept that.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Budd, are you okay
with that?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes. Again, it's something we can -- if we can't be there for it, we can go back and listen to it or read it later.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Nicole, you've still got your hand up. I don't know if you've got another question on that. Okay. It looks like that was a friendly amendment offered by Nicole and accepted by the maker of the motion in the second to adjust that schedule to include another public hearing on the 8th, Friday, from 10 o'clock until noon.

Any further discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion is adopted. We have our schedule going forward.

I believe -- Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah, I have a technical question for when we do end up with a final proclamation. Is everybody going to be in Anchorage to sign that or how are we going to do that?

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: I'm hopeful we can do it electronically. Peter or Matt, is there any requirement that we do it in person?

MR. SINGER: No. I think we can either have -- get electronic signatures or figure out a way to FedEx it around to people. So I think it's -- meeting remotely or
meeting by telephone is permitted under the Open Meetings Act, and we have mechanisms for gathering signatures that don't require travel.

So if folks are able to be in Anchorage, wonderful. I'll be back and will attend these meetings next week in person, but I wouldn't -- I wouldn't be concerned about that if someone is not able to gather in one particular place.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, does that answer your question?

MEMBER BAHNKE: It does. And Peter, just a heads-up, I would like to be in Anchorage. The only reason I'm not there in person this week is because my board is having its five-year strategic planning and I've stepped out from that to do this. But I will be planning to go to Anchorage next week for those Wednesday, Thursday meetings. I can do my own travel and then just bill the state if that makes it easier on you.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Thank you. Melanie. Anything else to come before the board?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I might be able to be there live and in person, too, next week.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. Anything else? If not, we look for a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER SIMPSON: So moved.
CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Is there a second?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN BINKLEY: Okay. A motion before us and seconded to adjourn for the evening, and to reconvene tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, I believe we're scheduled for. Is there discussion on the motion? Any objection to the motion? Hearing none, we're adjourned.

Thank you all very much. Thank you, Matt.

Thank you...

(Proceedings concluded)
I, Deirdre J.F. Radcliffe, hereby certify that the foregoing pages numbered 1 through 132 are a true, accurate, and complete transcript of the above-referenced proceedings, transcribed by me from a copy of the electronic video recording to the best of my knowledge and ability.

I further certify that I am a disinterested party to said action.

April 21, 2022

Deirdre J.F. Radcliffe, Transcriber
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>68:2,4,7,10 70:5 71:12 110:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aligned</td>
<td>56:13 65:7,8,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignment</td>
<td>9:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignments</td>
<td>27:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all-day</td>
<td>129:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allegation</td>
<td>126:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alleviate</td>
<td>129:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowed</td>
<td>12:13 47:15,16,20 81:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>allowing</td>
<td>19:23 73:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternative</td>
<td>30:21 102:9 107:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amalgamating</td>
<td>101:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amdur-clark</td>
<td>49:5,7,10,11 51:13 52:4 22 104:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amended</td>
<td>118:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amendment</td>
<td>6:10 127:13 129:24 130:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amount</td>
<td>16:22 120:25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ample</td>
<td>56:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>analyze</td>
<td>78:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anchor</td>
<td>108:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage's</td>
<td>75:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage/Jber</td>
<td>14:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchoragites</td>
<td>30:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANCSA</td>
<td>51:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animus</td>
<td>96:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>64:17 85:18,19 86:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anymore</td>
<td>17:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apologies</td>
<td>38:11 117:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apparatus</td>
<td>97:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appears</td>
<td>79:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appendage</td>
<td>103:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apples</td>
<td>35:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointment</td>
<td>116:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apportionment</td>
<td>22:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciated</td>
<td>51:16 100:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciation</td>
<td>99:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appreciate</td>
<td>62:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach</td>
<td>11:11 88:6 94:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approaching</td>
<td>91:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriately</td>
<td>104:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approve</td>
<td>81:21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approved</td>
<td>59:1 81:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approximate</td>
<td>76:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>2:2 3:15 43:24 69:15 70:8, 10 113:17,20,21 128:14,15,16,20, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arbitrary</td>
<td>69:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>argument</td>
<td>74:8 81:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>array</td>
<td>12:7 15:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arteries</td>
<td>88:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulate</td>
<td>64:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articulated</td>
<td>129:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASER</td>
<td>124:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASFER</td>
<td>124:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>44:15 103:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assault</td>
<td>77:8,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assembling</td>
<td>33:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assembly</td>
<td>10:4,10 13:12 34:12, 15,25 68:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assertions</td>
<td>59:10 63:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilate</td>
<td>112:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>association</td>
<td>49:12 71:23 72:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSR</td>
<td>90:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assume</td>
<td>33:20 62:19 78:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assuming</td>
<td>7:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attach</td>
<td>75:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attend</td>
<td>54:15 119:7 121:10,13,15, 16 131:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attended</td>
<td>88:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>40:21 62:2 63:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attorney</td>
<td>25:24 44:14 94:14 111:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attributed</td>
<td>64:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audible</td>
<td>4:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audience</td>
<td>7:6 19:16 61:20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>85:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authority</td>
<td>44:2,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avalanche</td>
<td>81:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue</td>
<td>93:3 98:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>24:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>33:3,18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awards</td>
<td>94:9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>backlog</td>
<td>116:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>95:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>badgering</td>
<td>29:4 53:16 100:10,13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bahnke</td>
<td>2:6,7 3:1,25 4:7 5:1,5,8, 12,20 6:20,25 9:5,12,13,15,19,21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenge 35:24</td>
<td>challenging 54:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chaos 92:8</td>
<td>characteristics 65:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterization 125:14</td>
<td>characterized 80:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characterizations 56:5</td>
<td>charges 79:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charter 12:14</td>
<td>check 69:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checked 104:17</td>
<td>chest 32:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester 37:9</td>
<td>Chiefs 49:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children 93:25</td>
<td>choice 23:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chokehold 98:14</td>
<td>choose 23:8 66:5 115:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choosing 29:13</td>
<td>chose 41:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chosen 41:16</td>
<td>Chris 16:2,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher 10:3,9 18:11 31:17</td>
<td>Chugach 14:18 72:12 80:5 81:12,16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuglak/north 44:20</td>
<td>churches 27:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cite 60:23</td>
<td>cited 72:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cites 60:7</td>
<td>city 37:2 77:6 96:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civil 53:11 94:6</td>
<td>clarification 5:13 97:20 103:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarify 36:17 110:9 118:14 125:25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarity 32:24 56:17</td>
<td>class 12:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clients 52:9</td>
<td>Cliff 7:20,22,24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>closing 66:9</td>
<td>Club 68:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coalition 49:11 51:15 52:2,10,14 89:10 90:2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cognizant 99:25</td>
<td>collate 18:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues 100:9</td>
<td>collected 101:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collectively 79:1</td>
<td>color 54:2,8,9,12 87:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>color-coded 109:9</td>
<td>column 109:11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combine 17:1 42:12,20 48:22 117:16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combining 36:1 60:7 64:11</td>
<td>comfortable 27:12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commend 18:3</td>
<td>commended 34:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commentary 15:23 51:17 52:18</td>
<td>commented 83:22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissions 54:7</td>
<td>commitment 90:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonalities 95:19</td>
<td>commonality 73:14 96:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commonsense 81:21</td>
<td>communicate 23:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communicated 10:8</td>
<td>communication 59:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communities 10:15,23 30:15 31:8,12,19 41:4 43:4 46:23 47:2 54:8 60:10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
grapefruits 35:2
graphical 112:3
great 5:21 8:17 33:9 43:25 91:14
115:2 118:4 127:22
greater 77:5
Gretchen 82:2,7 83:25 84:3
grievance 32:8
grounds 94:8
group 91:11
groups 54:9,12
grow 72:21 99:4
Growden 52:24,25 53:2,6
grown 36:9
guess 4:25 4:26 6:16 2:40:17
44:23 64:19 74:3 78:19 80:11,19
103:21 114:2
guidance 109:14,17
guys 4:12 8:16 33:8 49:8 77:21
78:1 83:6 86:19 89:12 91:8
119:18

half 14:2,4 40:10
Halford 20:10,11
hallmark 52:1
HALO 15:7
hand 21:3 24:17 28:24 40:21
86:5 88:16 91:8 112:19 117:3
120:11 122:20 125:16,23 127:7,8
130:6
handing 16:4 31:21
hands 77:25
happen 54:3 57:4,5 96:23
happened 24:6 38:10 56:6 86:22
115:24 120:17
happening 19:13 29:8 31:3
55:19 63:24 77:22 102:5
happy 33:10 50:14 61:6 83:5
84:25 85:1 88:14 101:12,18
109:16 129:24
49:15 61:22 86:15 91:9 102:12
110:11 123:9,13 129:17
harm 17:23
harmed 41:14
harmful 44:22
hate 29:23 34:16 68:10
hazards 81:1
head 16:8 102:18
heads-up 131:12
health 37:20 53:8
healthy 88:11 123:11
hear 4:12 7:21 15:21 19:3 23:24
48:15 49:8 53:10 56:13 57:21
60:12 68:3,4 71:19 75:4 78:14
82:6 84:4,10 92:20 93:25 101:3
103:19 113:8
heard 12:18 29:19 55:15 56:16
74:1 85:21 88:10 94:11,19 102:20
104:2 108:6 122:22 123:1 126:1
hearing 6:17 48:19 58:21 61:11
68:11 86:16 99:16 100:12,22
104:5,6,25 113:5,17,23,24 114:8
130:10,13 132:7
hearings 100:2 104:9
heart 79:14
heavily 30:10,11
Heights 31:16 42:21 65:19 67:1
held 49:20
helpful 3:8 21:17 30:3 33:10
34:23 40:16 51:16 68:12 86:14
97:3 99:7 109:5,10
helps 109:4
Heritage 82:10
heroes 12:4
Hickel 59:16
hidden 79:6
high 66:5 72:5 82:23 83:5 94:15
high-income 31:6
high-turnout 31:6
highest 44:18 45:7
highlight 55:9
highlighted 13:25
Highly 31:6
highway 66:6 82:20 88:2 93:24
94:16 97:15
Hiland 81:7
Hill 45:8 68:19,21 69:1
82:11 84:13
hired 12:21
historic 39:8 55:17 56:12
historical 25:3,16,21 37:1 49:17
55:14
history 53:25 55:13,20
Hockema 29:18,19,25 30:2,5,7
Hodge 52:24,25 53:2,5
hold 32:25 71:9 100:2 101:22
119:17
holding 32:9
holds 20:24 81:17
Holly 44:14 111:22,23
home 12:12 37:15 90:16
homeowners 71:23 72:18
homes 11:7 37:4,5
honest 32:9,11
hope 10:7 13:12,13 19:15 20:22
82:3 86:9,11,17 91:14 118:4
hoped 19:6 59:12
hopeful 91:1 130:20
horizontal 87:14
horrible 77:22 95:9
Horton 43:25
Hosford 89:4 90:17,18 91:25
92:12
Hospital 37:15,16
hostility 95:2
hour 53:5 94:19
hours 99:25 116:7 122:3 128:14, 16
house 7:25 10:20:23 34:4, 11, 12, 13:25 35:3, 17 36:3, 6, 10, 12 37:5, 21 42:6, 9, 12, 18, 20, 22, 24 44:11
household 81:4
houses 81:3
housing 39:12
How's 3:7
Huffman 84:18
Huffman/o'malley 15:11
huge 33:25
Huggins 20:12
Hughes 20:13
hundreds 37:5 80:22
hurried 78:21
hurt 115:20
husband 26:24 27:11

I
idea 84:8, 12 103:10 105:9 114:22 122:12
Ideal 75:16
Ideally 100:18
Ideas 100:23 101:3, 16
Identical 50:25 61:9
Identified 55:16 56:20 57:15 86:23 89:22 95:10
Ignited 41:13
ignore 41:16 54:8
ill 61:5
illogical 41:11
immediately 36:23
impact 35:5
impacts 38:1
implied 47:9
implies 60:13
implore 33:2
imposed 128:2
impression 26:14
in-audience 7:8
in-person 13:9
inappropriate 13:11
inclined 113:4
include 41:25 95:2 96:2 106:18 123:11 130:9
included 46:3
includes 31:15 44:16, 17 76:15
including 13:17 88:21 97:1, 11 120:21
income 44:18 67:17
incorporate 13:14
increases 47:4
increasing 56:3
incredibly 33:10 54:4
incumbent 26:6 32:6, 19
indicating 103:3
indication 33:25 64:19
individuals 25:12
industry 27:24
infer 64:6
infernal 93:12
info 70:13
information 25:5 26:6 70:16, 17
informed 41:6
infrastructure 97:14
ingress 72:20
initial 43:5
initially 41:16 42:2
input 113:9
insanely 76:12
insinuate 20:5
insinuation 29:6
instances 79:18
insulting 24:21 25:1
intact 94:14
integrated 36:4 69:2 75:15 81:9
integration 41:5
intelligent 64:14
intending 103:7
intent 47:9, 24
intention 110:12
intentional 56:2
intentionally 60:25
interchanged 63:25
interesting 25:10, 12
interface 81:2
interject 28:7
interjecting 28:15
interrupt 34:16 68:10 119:9
intertie 39:12
intervene 52:17
introduced 43:4
introducing 41:2
invited 104:10
involved 14:23 22:21 30:8, 10, 12 54:10 71:13 82:12 117:17, 21
mine 43:16 111:7
can 46:2 217:10
minimal 11:22 12:17:5 50:8
minimize 16:22
minimum 35:5 43:2
Minnesota 88:1
minority 9:4,20 26:25 27:4 56:15
63:6,9 64:11,12
minus 4:24
minute 30:25 32:12
minutes 71:9
mirror 67:23
missed 66:16
mistaken 26:12 88:9
misunderstood 99:1
mix 88:12
moderator 7:9
modified 5:3 6:6
moment 3:1 19:12 76:17
moms 84:22
Monday 23:25 103:23 121:4,9,
13,15
money 95:1
months 32:18 35:18 85:13
morning 2:5 7:22 9:1 10:5,6,7
18:8,13 19:2 29:18,19 33:15,16
34:6 40:24,5 49:6 52:5 53:1
55:1,3 58:15,16 65:1 75:4 132:5
mothers 93:25
motion 4:24 5:2 6:4,13,16,17
124:10,12,13,17,20,23,24 125:2,
3,6,15,17,18,21 126:8,20 127:1,3,
9,11,13,20,24 128:5,6,8,13,25
129:2,4,6,15 130:8,12,13 131:24
132:3,6,7
motivated 9:24 21:14 58:1
motivation 16:1
motivations 26:7
mountain 23:3 42:21 65:18 67:1
72:13
mountains 14:18 80:6 81:12,16
move 6:23 8:20 9:8 12:9 17:11
57:13 70:1 78:11 82:1 85:1 93:7
99:11,15 101:9 123:25 124:2
127:12
moved 37:19 73:17 131:25
moves 6:18 17:19
moving 54:24 56:9 71:22 75:2
108:25 126:8,12
mud 93:17
muffled 4:16
Muldoon 7:24 8:2,4,5,7,15 17:9,
15,17 30:18 31:1,4 33:3,5 37:22
42:16,23 44:11,17,19,20,24,25
45:12,20 46:8,9,11,13,14 47:16,
19,21 48:3,4,5,7,8,11,14,23 57:11
60:7,10,17 65:22 89:17,23
Muldoon/northeast 37:24
multiple 10:23 32:22 69:25
122:22
multitude 79:2
municipal 31:14 35:21 82:13
85:4,11 97:5,16 123:2
municipalities 16:18
municipality 10:11 12:10,12,14
16:11,15 27:22 35:16 36:4 80:21
81:10 85:6,8 90:22 93:2 95:4
97:6,22,23,25 98:2,25
municipality's 15:3 22:12
muted 38:5,6,7

N

NAACP 53:10
names 21:10,11,22 108:15
111:12,13
naming 93:17 125:11,14
narrow 16:23 112:25
narrowly 11:16
narrates 102:24
Native 37:16 49:12 64:5
nature 56:19 58:25 67:21 93:4
127:13
practice 18:18
preclude 127:25
prefer 32:10 94:17 100:7
preference 84:6 101:21
prepared 83:21 107:22
present 2:4,7,9,16 98:24
presentation 33:18 44:9 107:21
presented 11:15 35:9 62:17
107:20 125:8
presenting 8:1 113:7
preservation 41:24 42:4 44:3
55:8
president 53:6,12
pressure 129:22
presumptions 94:15
pretty 33:25 69:2 84:19 86:13
88:11 103:14
prevent 59:17
previous 22:10 31:22 47:14
55:10 81:15
previously 5:21 11:15 64:2 66:1
primarily 34:10
primary 39:7 75:1 85:16
principle 55:23
principles 47:1,5
print 114:24 115:2
printed 114:10,11,12
priorities 30:24
private 27:24
problem 23:6 38:2,15,25 70:23
86:8 97:18 121:9 122:5 128:4
problematic 39:20
problems 11:17 17:10 82:16
94:25 95:7 97:14 98:10 101:10
proceed 30:4 92:20 105:8
proceeding 132:10
process 10:10 11:22 12:4,6,10,
17,22 13:1,17 16:12 17:20 19:21,
33:7,9 40:1 43:5,24 46:20 52:3,8
54:1,10 56:20,21 57:5 59:9,17
60:21 61:23 62:4 63:2,14 69:11
70:2 78:21,24 79:6,8,14 82:13
85:5,11 86:23 89:11 90:5,10,14
92:3,24 99:24 100:4 104:13,14
126:1,8
processes 31:23 32:14 59:17
61:12 64:15 87:4
proclaiming 41:20
proclamation 33:23 79:16 103:8
118:6 121:23 130:17
product 79:5
profile 9:6
profiles 27:2 65:3
progress 40:10 128:11
promote 19:22 21:7
promoting 21:8,18
promulgated 13:12
pronunciation 109:2
proper 79:21 96:5,12
properties 96:15
property 14:16 27:25 93:1
prophesies 31:5
proposal 16:1 41:2 42:4 43:6
49:24 50:2,3 55:7 75:22 87:3
89:14 108:3 112:11 127:18
proposals 32:5 41:10 43:14
123:24
propose 27:13 41:24 126:3
proposed 3:17,19 4:21 12:21
21:24 30:14 32:1,8 37:21 42:2,17
43:1 75:19 102:20 103:17,22
104:2,8 108:7,8,18,20 114:21
116:8 124:3,14 126:21
protecting 12:5
protection 55:22 56:11,14 57:16
72:15,25 73:21
proud 51:19
provide 7:8 28:21 53:5 59:2
79:19 80:10 101:19
provided 15:24 25:3 60:15 61:14
set 32:14,22 35:1 82:8 83:20 99:1
          112:4 113:10,17 122:1
sets 30:23
setting 99:2
Seward 82:20 88:2 93:24 94:16
shame 51:20
shapes 41:7,11
          66:2 68:19 72:14,23 80:6 82:21,
          22,23 84:18 95:8 97:8 99:4 104:8
shared 54:11 65:19 74:25 99:8
          101:16 104:2
shares 31:20
sharing 37:7
sheer 79:10
shifting 11:10
shopping 27:23
short 24:11 52:6 71:5 87:17
          100:1
show 18:6 51:8 85:1 98:24
          107:22 108:20 123:8
showed 6:15 97:1
showing 70:11
shows 10:3 63:8 70:10 111:7
slide 15:22 37:22 50:8 52:16,18
sided 114:12
sides 61:19
sign 130:18
signatures 130:24 131:2
signed 8:23 26:18 29:17 99:14
significance 39:9
significant 35:21 55:17
SILVER 40:25
Silvers 40:18 41:1 44:4,16 45:1,
          4,6,13,15,22 46:14,17 48:7,16,18,
          25 111:17
similar 9:6 13:16 27:2 65:2,8,12
          66:2 67:10,15,17,18,20 81:1
          90:21
simple 79:23 109:8
simpler 17:11
simply 17:12 46:8 57:2 81:9
Simpson 2:10,11 6:8 102:4
          103:9 105:9 110:9 111:13,17,21
          112:20 113:23 116:11 119:8,21
          122:17 126:7 129:3 130:2 131:21,25
sincere 99:23
SINGER 4:15 38:7 101:12,15
          103:2,24 107:17,24 108:17 113:4
          118:8 130:23
single 36:3 65:7 66:2 67:22
          80:15,21 81:22 93:17
sink 76:17
sit 60:23 90:20
sit 83:6 84:15
site 37:23
situation 37:12 39:7
sizes 67:18
Skagway 90:22 91:5
Skagway/dyea 90:21
slight 94:25
slippery 44:5
slope 44:5 76:20
slopes 72:12 80:5
slow 38:22 96:19
small 12:5 49:21 50:10 51:22
smiley 120:15,16
snow 35:23 81:6
snowy 8:17
so-called 21:13 78:20 79:4 81:20
socially 30:20 75:14 81:9
socioeconomic 8:5 9:6 27:2
          41:5,12 65:3,20 66:7
socioeconomically 36:4 88:13
solution 17:1 21:24 24:14,15
          38:17 50:20 104:18 108:18 113:2
          114:20
solved 82:16
solves 38:16
solving 17:10
Sonic 84:18
sooner 127:24
sort 63:19
sorts 29:7
sound 3:11,13 34:21 63:13 86:17
          120:6
south 7:24 8:2,4,5,7 13:4,24
          14:13,22 15:1,12,20 20:3 22:4,15
          30:18 33:3,5 35:13,18 36:8,12
          37:9,25 42:23 44:11 45:20 65:21,
Southcentral 98:15
Southeast 75:23 76:6,24 77:5
Southport 31:18
Southside 31:17
southwest 10:20
spans 17:14
speak 4:18 16:22 22:19 29:22
          126:19 127:2,23
SPEAKER 58:10
speaking 38:20 41:1 55:6 72:16
          89:9 94:6
special 19:22 32:23
specific 9:15 16:25 21:7 24:1
          28:4,10 45:9 46:2 79:17 103:19
          104:24 106:7 107:10,11 108:4
specifically 71:25 78:18 88:5
          111:15 126:11
specifics 25:13 28:9
speculation 25:20 62:9
speed 28:10
Spenard 31:15 37:7 42:11 65:11
          88:22
spend 54:16 93:16 103:18
split 69:7
splits 48:25
splitting 42:16 52:11 60:6
spoke 10:18
In the Matter Of:

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

April 06, 2022
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
BOARD MEETING
APRIL 6, 2022

Members Present:
John Binkley, Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke, Board Member
Nicole Borromeo, Board Member
Bethany Marcum, Board Member
Budd Simpson, Board Member
Peter Torkelson, Executive Director
Matt Singer, Legal Counsel
Chair Binkley: Okay. Well, let's go ahead and get started.

Peter, if you could call us to order and establish a quorum is present, please.

Mr. Torkelson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Member Bahnke?

Member Bahnke: I'm here.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Borromeo?

Member Borromeo: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Marcum?

Member Marcum: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Member Simpson?

Member Simpson: Here.

Mr. Torkelson: Chair Binkley?

Chair Binkley: I'm here.

Okay. We have before us proposed -- we have all members present -- proposed agenda before us.

Peter, do you want to put that up on the screen, please?

As you can see, we're going to take public testimony first specific to Districts 29, 30, and 36, look at possible action on Districts 29, 30, and 36, general public testimony, and consider any
alternative pairings that third parties may be bringing or individuals may be bringing forward, and then adjournment.

Is there a motion to adopt the agenda as presented?

MEMBER BORROMEO: This is Nicole. So moved.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Is there a second on the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. A motion before us and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented.

Is there a discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, the agenda is adopted.

First item on the agenda is public testimony specific to Districts 29, 30, and 36.

I see we have one, two, three people locally and two off-net. It looks like the first one to sign up was Frank McQueary, from Anchorage. Frank, good morning. If you could join us at the table and give us the benefit of your testimony this morning.

And next we'll go to Ray Craig in Anchorage, and then Christine Hinter, Elizabeth Roderick, and Randy Ruedrich.

MEMBER BORROMEO: John, the three people
here in Anchorage are here to talk about Senate District K, not Cantwell.


Thank you.

So let's look off-net -- online to Christine Hinter.

Good morning, Christine. Can you hear us okay?

MS. HINTER: Yes, I can.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Do you have public testimony specific to Districts 29, 30, and 36?

MS. HINTER: Yes, I do. And what I wanted to put forth today is that we really would like to see the board considering a plan that's going to be more representative of the similar socioeconomic profiles and equitable Senate seat assignments.

We're going to be living with these decisions for, obviously, ten years, so they're very impactful to all of us, and we're just looking for something that's going to be more representative of all of the people in these communities.

And that's really what I wanted to share today.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Christine.

Okay. Any questions or comments from board
Let's move on to Elizabeth Roderick in Anchorage. Elizabeth, do you have testimony specific to District 29, 30, and 36?


I just wanted to say I oppose pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River. That's -- I think that's an irresponsible pairing. And I encourage the board to support the East Anchorage proposal, most closely aligned with the Court ruling, that has the smallest amount of change to it.

That's really all -- all I have to say.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Elizabeth.

Questions or comments on Elizabeth's testimony?

Let's move down, excuse me, to Leon Jaimes.

MR. JAIMES: Hi. This is Leon Jaimes. I live in East Anchorage.

And I also wanted to voice my opposition to pairing Eagle River with South Anchorage, and also wanted to say that I support and encourage the board to work with the solution that was proposed by the plaintiffs from East Anchorage to pair -- or to make
the least amount of change and keep the Muldoon area
together and Eagle district -- or Eagle River
districts together.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. And I
apologize for mispronouncing your last name.

MR. JAIMEs: No problem. Thank you.

MEMBER MARCUM: John, could I just get
clarification? Are we taking Senate pairings
testimony now or just about the Cantwell appendage,
Districts 29, 30, and 36? I'm a little confused.

CHAIR BINKLEY: It's -- on the agenda it's
public testimony specific to District 29, 30, and 36,
but I didn't really want to interrupt people that
were here to testify. And I think the testimony's
been pretty quick and to the point, so I just allowed
that to go forward.

And it should be reflected in the record
specific to those Senate pairings, not the House
districts that were -- are before us.

MEMBER MARCUM: I just want to clarify, make
sure we put that in the right pile.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Yeah, exactly.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Let's see. Those are the
only ones that I show here to testify this morning.
Is there anybody else online or in the LIO office that wants to testify specifically to the changes in House Districts 29, 30, and 36 as a result of the remand from the Supreme Court to the Superior Court and the Superior Court's guidance to us?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, just to clarify to the public that the Cantwell -- what we've been referring to as the Cantwell cutout, I don't know that everybody has the House Districts memorized. So for those of you --

MEMBER MARCUM: I agree.

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- participating, that's what we're taking public testimony on right now.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Good point, Melanie.

Thank you for pointing that out.

Okay. I don't see anybody online or nobody's come forward in the LIO, so I would propose that we close public testimony as to changes on remand to what is commonly called the Cantwell carve-out, Districts -- and affects Districts 39 -- excuse me, 29, 30, and 36. So with that we're going to close public --

Nicole, did you have a question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman for closing public testimony.
I'd like to move my proposed correction to Districts 36, 29, and 30 that would return the community of Cantwell to the Denali Borough, in line with the Alaska Court directions to the board on remand.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. The motion is made to adopt Nicole's changes to 36, 30, and 29.

Is there a second to that motion?

Budd, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, can I just ask that we put up the map showing the corrections before -- before we proceed further?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. If you could put that up, please, Peter, and then we're still waiting for a second on a motion. And then we can get into discussion if there is a second on the motion.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I'll second it once it's up, after I look at it, if it's the same one.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: What should be showing on your screen now is a graphic of the proposed change in effect where the new boundary for 30 and 29 is defined by the line, the borough boundaries of the Mat-Su Borough and the Denali Borough, and then the
eastern boundary of District 29 is defined by the eastern boundary of the Matanuska --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I'll second that motion then.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion before us to adopt Nicole's version of Districts 36, 30, and 29, and it's seconded.

Discussion on the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: I'm going to make a comment if there's no other discussion.

I'm going to speak in opposition to the motion. I was able to read clearly the -- the remand from the Supreme Court. I was -- disagree with it, and I believe that short of a full explanation and really addressing Calista's argument before the Court of addressing the legitimacy of ANCSA corporations as legitimate boundaries, I can't support it and I disagree with it. And I've been able to read the plain language of that, but I can't support it.

So that doesn't mean that I won't support the full and final proclamation, but for this one. I'm sorry, but I can't support it.

Peter -- Budd, did you have a further question or some discussion?
MEMBER SIMPSON: In the nature of discussion, Mr. Chair, you know, we all voted in favor of the -- the Cantwell extension, or whatever, but my -- and we all thought it was a good idea. We were simply attempting to accommodate a number of comments from the residents of the area that -- as to how they preferred.

I also certainly agree with you regarding the importance and significance of ANCSA corporation boundaries. I feel that that should be a consideration, maybe not a requirement but certainly a consideration, in terms of the -- the mapping of legislative districts.

However, I think the order of our Supreme Court is clear on this point, and my vote is going to be in favor of this revision rather than, you know, continue to create heat over the issue. I think we should honor the Court's directive and then be able to move forward. Thank you.

Any other discussion? Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah, Mr. Chair. I would just like to add that I am going to be voting in favor of this motion because I respect our State's highest court. The five-member Supreme Court ruled and we should abide by that, and that's why I will be
voting in favor of this motion.

And I'd also like to thank Nicole, and I know Bethany also verified, both of you came up with the solution. So thank you to the two of you for having come up with this solution.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Budd, I don't know if your hand is still up or that's from before.

MEMBER SIMPSON: It's from before. I tried to take it down. Here, did it go down?

CHAIR BINKLEY: It's gone.

Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to note that I found it interesting that we had such overwhelming testimony in favor of the action that we took regarding Cantwell, and yet the Court determined that that testimony was not sufficient to support what we wanted to do. And yet the Court found that testimony in the other issue which they ruled was part of the rationale.

And so I found that there was a little bit of inconsistency regarding what role testimony is supposed to have in this process and what role we, as the board, are supposed to use to put that testimony
in context with what we do.

So I will be supporting the change, but I do just want to put on record that I think it would be helpful from the Court in the future for us to get some more clear guidance regarding the role that testimony is supposed to play in all this. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, and then Budd.

MEMBER BORROMEO: For purposes of the record, the problem that the Court had with what we did in terms of Cantwell and the carve-out is that we upset the first two criteria, which was we destroyed compactness and contiguity. So that was the crux of it as it related to public testimony.

I'd like to renew my previous request to call the question and vote.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Sorry, Budd. Nicole has called the question, so there's -- the question is called to stop debate and move to a vote.

Is there any objection to stopping debate?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I mean, I just wanted to make one more comment also addressing Ms. Marcum's observations, as well.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, the question has been called. I don't know if Nicole wants to amend that
or --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Withdrawn.

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- withdraw that, allow

Mr. Simpson to further discuss the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I'll just

withdraw that. I was basically in agreement with

what Ms. Borromeo said, so I'm fine. Let's just --

MEMBER BORROMEO: In that case, I withdraw

and I'm happy to let Budd elaborate.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Budd, you've been

given the green light by Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: (Indiscernible) back

together.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you. I'll try to

make it concise.

My point was only that this -- the Cantwell
cutout, as we were calling it, was one of those weird
appendages and did -- and crossed borough lines and
so forth, so it had some other difficulties.

Whereas the Skagway situation we were -- we
honored borough lines, and clearly the decision we
reached was the more of the compact one, and the
Court went along with -- with that rationale.

So Ms. Borromeo and I are in agreement on
that, and that was my other comment. Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I think Ms. Borromeo mentioned contiguous -- that it wasn't contiguous. It was not compact. I think that's what the distinguishing factor was by the Supreme Court.

Again, and I agree completely with Ms. Marcum's suggestion that the Court was very inconsistent in looking at those districts, and the standard that they held to other districts was not applied to this situation, and that's one of the several reasons why I'm not going to support it.

With that, we'll proceed to a roll call vote, if you would, Mr. Executive Director.

MR. TORKELSON: So, Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Simpson?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: No.

MR. TORKELSON: By a roll call vote of four to one, the motion carries.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We've going to move
on then to item 5 on the agenda, which is public testimony on all topics. And we -- again, we'll go back to the Anchorage LIO and to Frank McQueary. Frank, are you still there and available for testimony?

MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chairman, were you able to hear that comment?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Oh, no. I heard some paper rustling, and that was about it.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I think that was me.

MR. TORKELSON: They're asking to exchange the order of the testimony so that Mr. Ruedrich can go first, and then the other testifiers would follow.

CHAIR BINKLEY: That's fine with me.

Mr. Ruedrich?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, while he's getting ready to testify, can you let us know how many people you've got in the queue for testimony?

CHAIR BINKLEY: I've got three people in the queue after Randy.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Good morning, Randy.

MR. RUEDRICH: Good morning. I'm Randy Ruedrich, representing AFAER.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Randy, could I just --
Randy, if you can get it -- yeah, just swallow that microphone, if you would, because it's tough to hear you.

MR. RUEDRICH: Is that better?

CHAIR BINKLEY: That's better.

MEMBER BAHNKE: (Indiscernible.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: Little bit, yeah.

MEMBER MARCUM: Louder.

MR. RUEDRICH: Louder. Wow. I've rarely ever been asked to speak louder in my entire life.

This morning I want to make a minor repair to our proposal of yesterday in terms of adopting a more direct route from South Anchorage to East Anchorage, which removes Districts 17 and 18 from the past in South Anchorage to East Anchorage.

So our process would leave four districts in -- four Senate districts in place as were adopted in the proclamation map, and those are District F, which is 11 and 12; District H, which is 15 and 16; District I, which is downtown, 17 and 18 in Mountain View; and District L, 23 and 24, the northern Muni districts.

Now, I want to focus on one detail before we go into further discussion. We must remember that Anchorage Municipality is a socioeconomically
integrated entity by law, and to discuss things are better -- that's a standard that does not exist for the redistricting process. All 16 districts are socioeconomically integrated.

So the only requirement left for us to truly consider is the one that the constitution directs us to look at, which is they must be contiguous. Literally, District 9 and District 22 are contiguous along a long section of the eastern portion (indiscernible), which is across the mountains.

This has been done before. As a matter of fact, it was done when the populations were smaller and they were put in one House district, which affirms that they are unquestionably, in the eyes of the Court -- and the board in 2001 ruled that they are a highly functional entity.

These are neighborhoods that have many things in common that they truly don't share with anybody else in Anchorage to any significant extent. They take care of much of what the community normally gets from the municipality themselves, and they're proud to get it -- to do this on their own in their local service area entities.

Now, to connect the rest of the map, we pair the leftover district in South Anchorage,
District 10, with District 13 to form Senate G. We connect District 14 with District 19, which is the U-med district.

This also has been done in a number of maps (indiscernible), and I would simply say was an oversight on my part, because I was looking at going straight down the major highway from South Anchorage into downtown, then going east. You literally want to go through 13, through 14 from east into 19, and then combine 21 and 22, which is the request of the Supreme Court.

So we accomplish this now with four districts impacted, doing the least disturbance to our map for the benefit of all the folks who are already working within the other four districts -- four Senate districts, other eight House seats.

Let me just look through and see if I have anything else to add. I think that summarizes it. We have simplified our map, and we look forward to the adoption of this change to create an East side district to represent the uplands of Anchorage, which need to be considered as they work to maintain their semi-autonomous status. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you,

Mr. Ruedrich. If you'd be willing to answer some
questions, I see we've got some members up with their hands up.

Melanie, Nicole, and then Budd.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Randy, I just want to make sure I got your new pairings correct. Did I hear you say 11 and 12, 15 and 16, 17 and 18, 9 and 22, 10 and 13, 14 and 19 -- that's all I heard you say. Did you intend to also say 20 and 21?

MEMBER MARCUM: He said it.

MR. RUEDRICH: I definitely said 20 and 21. I'm sorry if you didn't hear that.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay.

MR. RUEDRICH: That would be Senate District K. And then Senate District L would be 23 and 24, the north Anchorage communities.

MEMBER BAHNKE: And, Randy, did you look at incumbent information as you came up with these pairings?

MR. RUEDRICH: Did I look what?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Did you look to incumbent information as you came to these suggested pairings?

MR. RUEDRICH: No.

MEMBER BAHNKE: That's all I have.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole?
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

Randy, why wouldn't you suggest pairing the two Eagle River districts?

MR. RUEDRICH: As I said yesterday, District 9 has unique characteristics and 22 has unique characteristics. They have been paired -- they were combined in a House seat. They definitely should be considered to be paired in a Senate seat.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Follow-up to that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: You did quote the constitution earlier in your testimony where you talked about the Senate districts being compared -- being composed of districts that are contiguous, but there was an important qualifier that was left out, and the constitution actually says that the districts shall be composed as near as practicable.

So in your estimation, is 22 and 9 as near as practicable when it comes to that requirement?

MR. RUEDRICH: They have a significant contact, as you see on the map behind you. I view that as way more than minimal or as practicable. It is an actual significant contact.

Let's look at the map. 19 and 20 have a modest level of contact the way it's drawn today. 14
and 19 will have a slightly more significant contact. So when we look at contiguity, we have a pretty good map, as someone testified a couple of days ago about the long boundaries that are shared by 11 and 12, by 15 and 16. That was one of the things that led me to want to combine 17 and 14. Clearly to get to East Anchorage I don't need to go that far north.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Right. I want to make sure that we're looking at the same map here, because when I look at House District 9 that you're suggesting that we pair with 22, you have to go through Districts 11, 12, 21, 20, and 23 to get to it, right? So that's one, two, three, four, five districts. Whereas 21 and 24, it's just one and they're connected.

MR. RUEDRICH: I don't think that is what contiguity -- you're contiguous if you're contiguous. And this map is contiguous across the mountains within the municipality. We're not leaving the municipality. We're connecting across the feature called the Chugach Foothills, and those folks have similar governor's processes in both the north side and the east side of the municipality.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Budd?
MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, my -- I was just going to ask for clarification, too, because I didn't catch it all, and it's been covered. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Further questions for Mr. Ruedrich?

Thank you, Randy.

MR. RUEDRICH: Thank you. I submitted this last night, and this change to the map is a simple converting 18 to an I and 19 to a J, so that we have a functional map for Peter to work with.

I thank you for your attention.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Can I just get that again, Randy? Randy, just for my notes, could you -- just that last little bit, I didn't get a chance to write that down. Could you give me that again, please?

MR. RUEDRICH: Okay. Peter, if you -- Peter, could you put the map back up, sir?

The map that we filed yesterday had 18 as a District J. It is now a District I. And 14, which shows as a G on the map you're looking at now, needs to be a J so that the map will be consistent. 18 becomes an I, and 14 a J. That's the only change from my map of yesterday. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Might I suggest, Mr. Ruedrich, that you maybe put this down on a map
and get that to Peter by this evening or --
Go ahead, Peter. Peter, why don't you comment?

MR. TORKELSON: I was going to -- yeah, I already have a map built. It would be easier for me just to change it. I just would need direction from the board.

If it's the board's desire for me to replace option 3, which was previously the AFFER map, with the updated option 3, or if you want me to make a new option 4. I just need some direction for what you'd like me to post to the website.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I think if -- as Mr. Ruedrich presented option 3 to the board, and he's within the time frame that we talked about and wants to make a modification to that, I think it's perfectly appropriate to keep it to option 3 but change it to his preference now. That would be my guidance. I don't know if other board members have comments on that or thoughts on that.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I agree.

MEMBER MARCUM: I agree.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany -- okay.

MEMBER MARCUM: Well --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Bethany.
MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah, I have a slightly different comment, because completely independently I worked last night on a map that I sent to Peter that apparently is the same as what was just presented here. And so I sent it to Peter, and Peter and I worked on getting an actual map created last night. And so I thought Peter has that done and it was going to be -- the next map was going to be another map for us to consider for adoption.

So I guess I'm a little confused about how this whole process would work, because Randy already has a map out there with a map number, right?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I don't know. I didn't get that map. I got -- I received three different maps that I printed out and have in front of me. I've been trying to mark them to keep up with Randy's changes here.

So I don't know. Are you suggesting then, Bethany, that we have four maps and keep the AFFER map --

MEMBER MARCUM: I --

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- as is?

MEMBER MARCUM: I sent my stuff to Peter yesterday late afternoon, so I'm not sure how -- I'm not sure when this -- this map came about or when
this was sent. I really don't care how it comes
about, but yeah, it's just a little bit confusing to
me at this point.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Matt, you've got your
hand up.

MR. SINGER: I just think in keeping with
just judging each map on the merits instead of each
map on what person is -- or entity is identified with
it, I would just label it option 4 and encourage the
board to put it out to the public to get feedback.

So I just -- I just encourage you all as
you're here -- there's a number of ways to do this,
and I would consider just label it and get it out
there for discussion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, and then
Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. What I heard was
when Mr. -- when Randy testified, he said he was
offering amendments to the map that he had submitted,
not submitting a whole second map to consider. So I
think the fewer the maps that we have, the less
confusing it is.

So I'm hearing that what he presented should
be a replacement to what he had previously presented,
and by some magical coincidence Bethany has the map
already mapped up and it's ready to replace the one that was initially introduced by AFFER.

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I am going to object --

MEMBER BAHNKE: So it's confusing --

MEMBER MARCUM: -- to the "magical coincidence" --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Excuse me. I -- excuse me.

MEMBER MARCUM: No. Excuse me.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I have the --

MEMBER MARCUM: No. No, I'm not going to let you --

MEMBER BAHNKE: I have the floor here.

MEMBER MARCUM: -- insult me like that publicly. I'm tired of it. It's been going on for over a year.

There is no magical coincidence. I worked hard on my own on this map. I came up with these pairings.

And for you to imply otherwise I find very insulting, and I am going to await an apology.

Magical coincidence? Are you kidding?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can we not (indiscernible) emotions here?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, I think it's important
not to impugn somebody's motives on something, as
well, and I think it's a caution we should all have.
I think we should be careful about when we talk about
individuals to not assume things in terms of motives,
and let's refrain from that and be civil with each
other and polite to each other and try and restrain
ourselves from getting this (indiscernible).

MEMBER BAHNKE: Well --
CHAIR BINKLEY: Your point, I think,
Melanie --
MEMBER BAHNKE: Let's get back to the
substance of the map.
CHAIR BINKLEY: -- your point -- well,
let's -- that's agreed.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Bethany, I apologize you
felt insulted by what I said.
MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Nicole?
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I heard the
same thing that Melanie actually heard, which is that
the maker of the first AFFER map wants to withdraw it
and replace it with a new option, that he doesn't
want to have two competing maps.
But it's not for our legal counsel or the
board. I'd like to hear from Randy what he wants.
Randy, do you want two maps out there, AFFER 1 and AFFER 2, or do you just want one AFFER map for the public to consider coming down the home stretch?

MR. RUEDRICH: I believe that one map would be extremely superior. We've asked for the other map to be modified, not for the -- another map to be created. We have enough problems with changes.

This board took testimony, as an example, in Homer months back, and then used that testimony to draw a Senate district. After the world changed, the board took Homer, a decent city, Seward, and removed it from the borough, and then relied on Homer's prior testimony for pairing.

I found that to be a huge mistake. We don't need to create more confusion in testimony. Let's go to a single proposed AFFER map for this consideration.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I agree. Thank you, Randy.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Budd, you've got your hand up.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you. Yeah, that was going to be my suggestion, too. I heard the same thing, so I suggest one map.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany, are you okay with that? And we're not putting titles. This isn't the AFFER map; this isn't the Bahnke map. This is option No. 3 that was presented by Mr. Ruedrich and his group, and he apparently wants to change that with the changes that he's indicated.

Are you, Bethany, okay with keeping option 3 and making those changes to that map?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, I will accept that.

And you're welcome for getting it to Peter well in advance so that he had time to put together the map.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. And I don't know why Peter didn't send that out to us, but we can get clarification from that.

MEMBER MARCUM: Well, no. I told Peter I wanted to present it today. I worked on it -- you know, all the justification for it, and I told him I wanted to present that today, so --

CHAIR BINKLEY: I see. Okay. Well, apologies, Bethany, that that got confused in the presentation and the exchange there.

MEMBER MARCUM: Not a problem. I just -- it's not about proprietary. It's just I wanted to make sure that the information is able to be
presented, so I will do so at a different time, I suppose.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Let's see. Let's go on to the first one that was in the queue, Frank McQueary, in the Anchorage LIO.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Before we go on, Bethany, do you think (indiscernible) to compose yourself, or are you ready to move on?

MEMBER MARCUM: I'm sorry. I'm having trouble hearing. I was shuffling papers.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Out of respect for you, because I said something that made you emotional, I'm wondering if you'd like a moment or not.

MEMBER MARCUM: No, I'm fine. Thank you, though.

MEMBER BAHNKE: All right.

MEMBER MARCUM: I appreciate you asking about that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Frank, are you -- oh, there you are. Okay. Good morning.

MR. MCQUEARY: Mr. Chairman, members of the (indiscernible), can you hear me?
CHAIR BINKLEY: I can. Get as close as you can and speak loudly. Apologize for the poor sound quality, but anything you can do to help.

MR. MCQUEARY: I'm sorry. I could not hear what you were saying, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Apologize for the poor sound.

MEMBER BORROMEO: John -- wait. John, I don't know if you can hear me, but it's extremely loud here in the LIO. These microphones are at, like, max volume, and we can still hardly hear you guys. So when you're asking them to speak up, they're getting blown back by their own voice reverberating through the surround sound.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, just speak as loudly as you can, Frank. I apologize for the problems with the sound system.

MR. MCQUEARY: Okay. Starting over again, my name is Frank McQueary. I've been a resident of Anchorage for many years. I have not been directly involved in this process intimately; however, I bring a little historical perspective.

My company did supply technology to the -- to AFFR in the last redistricting, 2010 redistricting. And I got to make a number of
observations, both educational and entertaining. I got to watch Tom Begich and Randy Ruedrich battle out and come to a plan that got the most obvious political considerations neutralized and ultimately became broadly the base for the title plan, which I think we've resolved in 2013.

You guys have done a great job of getting close to success here, I think. My observation would be that, once again, the AFFER plan presents the least possible opportunities for additional litigation. By reshuffling every pairing in the city of Anchorage under one of their other proposed plans, you simply open up the opportunity for this to continue on with additional challenges and court cases.

The historical validity of the pairing of -- and without the map in front of me, I'm not (indiscernible) it's 9 and 22 -- is certainly defensible. The amended AFFR maintains the already approved pairings to some extent and for the most part in Anchorage, and thus is probably the most logical, shortest path to declaring victory on this and in getting a final map approved.

So my suggestion would be don't -- don't tread in that political abyss that will be awaiting
you by reshuffling every pairing in Anchorage and being accused of a totally political activity. Go with what you got, accept the 9 and the 22, and declare victory.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Frank.

Questions for Frank? Thanks again.

Let's go to Ray Craig, in Anchorage also.

MR. CRAIG: Okay. Mr. Chairman, can you hear me okay?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can hear you.

MR. CRAIG: All right. My name is Ray Craig, long-time resident of Anchorage also.

I support Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting's proposed Anchorage Senate pairings.

The Supreme Court ruled that Senate District K, HD 21 and 22, should be revisited. AFFER pairs 22 with 9, creating Senate District E for the Anchorage --
eastern Anchorage Municipality uplands.

Local service areas and snow management are key common upland issues in both these House districts. The 2001 map combined major parts of this Senate district in a single House district, so, as has been referenced earlier, this is repeating history in that former single House district.

Three other Anchorage Senate districts have
revised pairings to facilitate this Court-required action. Four Anchorage districts are unchanged. The alternative Bahnke pairings disrupt all eight Anchorage Senate pairings, and the Supreme Court decision, in my opinion, does not justify this gross redistricting map disruption.

So in conclusion, I support the proposed AFFER Anchorage Senate map for Supreme Court compliance. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Questions for Ray?

Nicole in Anchorage, go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Ray. Besides for the road maintenance issues, what other similarities are there between Districts 9 and 22 that you'd like to put on the record?

MR. CRAIG: Well, I think the real estate, the socioeconomic has more uniformity than with other districts in the low ones. Further down the Hillside, would be one.

Culturally, just in the settings of those neighborhoods, and certainly, as was pointed out earlier, these folks are taking care of their own maintenance rather than relying on a bigger government Anchorage municipality road -- road
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Ray. I have a follow-up on that, because I --
CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Nicole.
MEMBER BORROMEO: -- live in -- thank you. Follow-up. I live in a district that is maintained, as that word gets loosely used most winters, by the Municipality of Anchorage.

Does Eagle River and Hillside share a uniform road maintenance crew? Is that what makes them a natural pairing, in your mind?

MR. CRAIG: No. It's more the structure of local road service districts rather than the top down bigger government approach within the Anchorage road service entity.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you for that clarification, Ray.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Well done. Thank you, Ray.

Appreciate it.
We're going to go online to, let's see, Steve Strait -- or no, no, excuse me. Ellen Jaimes was on the line ahead, was right after Leon. So I apologize for both.
Ellen, are you with us?
MS. JAIMES: Hi, yes.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Please proceed, Ellen.

MS. JAIMES: Thank you so much.

My name is Ellen, and I live in East Anchorage.

I just wanted to encourage the board to support whichever East Anchorage proposal is most closely aligned with the Court ruling and takes the smallest amount of (indiscernible).

Honestly, it's a little confusing, just from a bystander perspective. I'm not sure if that means option 1 or 2, but I think align it with the Court ruling and the smallest amount of change should be the criteria for your decision. I oppose pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River.

So thank you very much for all of your hard work on this. I really appreciate it.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Ellen.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chairman --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Hi, Nicole.

Did you have a question, Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I didn't hear her last part of the sentence about South Anchorage.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think she opposed 9 and 22 being paired.

MS. JAIMES: Yes.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ellen.

Let's move on to Steve Strait.

MR. STRAIT: Good morning, members of the board, chairman. Steve Strait is my name, long-time Alaskan resident.

I'm going to speak -- I'm going to speak in favor of joining Districts 22 -- pairing 22 with 9.

That would be East Anchorage (indiscernible). So I believe that's the AFFER proposal. I'm not sure on that. But I do believe those two districts should be paired.

And here's why. Well, obviously, we're all here for the same reason, is the State Supreme Court made a ruling. But beyond that, you, as a board, are struggling with this, to adopt a plan that will pass Court muster.

I support this district, the -- the Hillside mountainous areas of Anchorage. Having grown up on the Hillside back in the day -- which, funny enough, I mean, it was outhouses then. But still, without laughing, still, what's common between 22 and 9 now, somebody asked the question, I'll try to list off a few of these commonalities, is septic systems. When you get up -- when you get up the elevation a little
bit, you've got a lot of things in common, in my opinion, as far as pairing a Senate district here.

One is -- let's just talk about the first issue right now, and that's snow. We've just gone through a major event in Eagle River. Snow is a huge -- a bigger issue on these Hillside districts, the elevated areas, than they are in the lowlands, Municipality Anchorage (indiscernible). So you've got that issue in the winter.

In the summer the major issue, which actually we don't talk about much anymore, is the -- the disaster zone that both of these districts are in when it comes to fire. In the summer, there's a huge area -- we've got a lot of burned-out trees here, and it's been an issue for the last 15, 20 years, the spruce.

And if a fire should get going in either one of these districts, the State's going to be -- entity is going to be hellbent to try to shut it down. Why? Well, there's no hydrants out there in many of these areas. These are water wells that supply the area for -- both 9 and 22, in large part. So you have water wells. So that means to get a fire put out you're going to have to have two assets that have got to get in there, one, a fire truck that have water
trucks that carry water up these roads to put out a fire. Small to start with, of course.

Or aviation assets. Let's talk about that.

With a water truck going up these roads, one thing they have similar, 22 and 9, is they are non-standard roads. These are winding, narrow roads that go through neighborhoods that predate the City code or have been exempt from City code.

So water trucks going up these mountains -- this is a fireman's nightmare, going up these trails to put a fire out, when you've got traffic trying to evacuate and get the hell out of the homes up in these hills. You have traffic going both ways on one lane. It's virtually -- it's just a disaster waiting to happen.

Now, the second (indiscernible) is aviation. With aviation you can't -- it's difficult to do a water drop in a mountain area, especially if you've got heat coming off the fire. You've got -- you've just got all kinds of turbulence issues. So for that alone I think it makes sense to pair these two.

But beyond that, just moving on, they're both on septic systems in large part in both of these districts. They are not on the main City water system, in large part.
So there's -- that answered the question on -- on what they have similar. So I -- I speak in support of joining, pairing up, House District 21 and 22.

I think that that concludes my remarks. I'd be glad to -- oh, and the road service area was the same here. These people pay for their own road contractors, unlike the city.

Thanks. I'll take any questions. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

I see two questions, Nicole and Melanie.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks, Steve. At the end of your testimony you mentioned 21 and 22. That's the district that the Court ruled was unconstitutional. Did you mean what you said in the beginning, 22 and 9?

MR. STRAIT: My -- my correction on that. Thank you for pointing that out. 22 and 9 are the two House districts I would like to see paired up in one Senate district.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Fantastic. You offered some specific examples, and I appreciate it because I'm learning a lot more about the commonalities between 22 and 9.
Can you speak to any perhaps experiences that they share in common by areas that they frequent? And by that I mean do they have common parks you know about, or stores, clinics, community centers, or schools?

MR. STRAIT: Much like most of Anchorage, parks are pretty much neighborhood parks all over Anchorage. I don't know -- I think the park -- the largest park there would be Bicentennial Park, which is shared, I believe, between both districts. If not, that's a State-owned park. I'm not sure if you're referring to Municipal or State.

But to a park -- to a hiker, somebody skiing across country, political boundaries are really not an issue. You just go up in the high country and you just go from one area to the next, regardless of parks or City boundaries or (indiscernible) boundaries, constructed boundaries.

So it's -- it's a great area for recreational users to share both sides. They travel from South Anchorage up into -- from 9 into 22 and vice versa. It's a wonderful mountain trek, summer and winter, bicycles, walking, or skiing.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

All of the things that you said that 22 and 9 have in common with each other, are those also things that Eagle River and Eagle River have in common with each other, 22 and 24?

MR. STRAIT: To the questioner -- to the person, I cannot speak to that. I could, but I'm just not prepared to, in the sense that I wasn't prepared for that question. I'd have to go check with my friends in Eagle River and get more detail on it. I'm just speaking specifically now.

If you'd like me to talk about that, I could, I suppose, but I'd just as soon talk also about southeast Anchorage, if that's where we're going, or southwest Anchorage.

But 22 and 9 is what I'm referring here.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Any further questions for Steve?

That was very enlightening and in depth and appreciated. Like Nicole, we're learning more and more about these two districts and their commonalities, so it's much appreciated, Steve.

MR. STRAIT: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Moving on, we have
Rachel Lackey (phonetic).

MS. LACKEY: Hello. Yes, this is Rachel Lackey. And I am calling to oppose pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River. I don't feel that they have very much in common. They're definitely not contiguous, unless you count walking over a mountain.

And when it comes to fire, HALO, I have never seen the Eagle River community join up with HALO to address fire needs because they have totally different geographic regions. And they both have a lot to deal with, but that certainly doesn't mean that they get together and kind of troubleshoot these plans together. They are just too far apart.

I think that the East Anchorage plan is a lot more in line with the Court ruling, and it works.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Rachel.

Questions for Rachel?

Okay. Moving on, Doug Robbins.

MR. ROBBINS: Thank you. Okay. Thank you. This is Doug Robbins. I am a resident -- long-time resident of the Anchorage Hillside.

The residents here on the Hillside, I'd like to say we have nothing in common with Eagle River, as opposed to pairing of Districts 22 and 9. Contiguity across the mountains is not contiguity.
Demographics published by the State in 2017 show that the Anchorage Hillside is distinct as a community in terms of marital status, household income, college education, voting turnout. And those are not -- again, the communities we are -- that we are in continuity with and integrated with, communities I can walk or bike to, not Eagle River.

I'd like to further say the board's pairing in Senate District K was ruled unconstitutional as a partisan gerrymander by the Superior Court and the Alaska Supreme Court. I'm really struck by the complete lack of remorse on the part of the Republican mapmakers who willfully proposed an illegal map with the intent of leveraging the Republican majority in Eagle River into an additional Senate seat, and to the Republican mapmakers then and still is to do whatever they can get away with.

The remands to the board was not a license to pursue new ways of unconstitutional gerrymander. Remand is to fix previous error.

Option No. 3 is clearly the same kind of gerrymandering that was already rejected by the courts. The board has two reasonable choices, in pairings represented by options 1 and option 2. Of the three choices, I prefer option 1, which I think
is the best map reflecting the integrated communities, particularly on the Anchorage Hillside.

Option 2, on the other hand, represents the fewest number of changes to the pairings already approved by the Court. It is also a reasonable choice.

I think that's all I have to say.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Question -- any other questions?

I do have a quick question, Doug. You mentioned demographics, the differences in demographics between Districts 22 and District 9, and you cited a 2017 report. Was that a Department of Labor report? Could you give us some specifics on that, Doug?

MR. ROBINS: Sure. Sure. That was published in Alaska Economic Trends, which is a State publication. The author's name escapes me at the moment. It was the April issue.

And it was demographics by House districts. It was very interesting. In former District 28, which is now almost identical to the current District 9, stands out in -- in almost every regard as -- as a unique -- unique demographic in, again, household income, college education.
And separately from that report you can look at voter turnout and on any -- on any plot of those parameters, District 28 just jumps off the graph.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And that's separate and distinct from the Eagle River area. So 9 and what you (indiscernible) described in Eagle River are very dissimilar in terms of their demographics with regard to college education, income, type of housing, that sort of thing?

MR. ROBBINS: Yes. Yes, housing was not mentioned. Marital status was mentioned, education, income, those three parameters in particular really jump out.

And, again, 9 is more similar to the adjoining Hillside area, (indiscernible) as I was -- I was moved out of 9 and into 11 by the re-drawing of the lines. But, again, these are neighborhoods I can walk to, people we have dinner with. The -- you know, it's our community.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

We'll see if we can dig up that April 2017 publication and look at those differences between the Hillside and Eagle River. Thank you, Doug.

MR. ROBBINS: I'll e-mail the reference to Peter -- Peter Torkelson.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Next is Carl Burger. Good morning, Carl.

MR. BURGER: Thank you. My name is Carl Burger. I'm a ten-year resident of Anchorage and a 58-year resident of Alaska. I have a lot of time spent over the years in the Anchorage area.

And I'm calling to also object to the pairing of District 9 and District 22. These appear to me to be two non-contiguous districts, and I think it goes against the wishes of the Court and the ruling that they made.

I'm not experienced in mapmaking and drawing of maps, but I understand that option 1 is an alternative that would be approved by the Court, and that seems to me to be a reasonable district formation. So I would like to state my support of option 1 and my opposition of putting two non-contiguous districts together, namely District 9 and District 22.

And that's my statement. I wish you all well. And I'm sorry to hear there's getting to be strife and conflict among your membership, and I would encourage you to treat each other with respect so this job can get done. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Carl, thank you. And wise
1 counsel. We appreciate it.

2 Veronica Slajer. Good morning, Veronica.

3 MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, is Bethany's hand up?

4 CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany, sorry. I didn't see it. Go ahead, Bethany.

5 MEMBER MARCUM: No problem. I just wanted to say to Carl, thank you very much for that -- for those wise words. Thank you. I appreciate that, so something we all need to keep in mind all the time. And I include myself in that, as well, of course.

6 CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Veronica, good morning.

7 MS. SLAJER: Good morning. Veronica Slajer here, calling in from Anchorage.

8 But like Carl, long-time Alaskan. In fact, I'm a lifelong Alaskan. Wish me happy 60th birthday, please.

9 CHAIR BINKLEY: And a great gymnast.

10 MS. SLAJER: Anyway, I'm calling in support of the East Anchorage proposal. As others have said, it's most aligned with the Court's ruling, and -- and strong opposition to South Anchorage being paired with Eagle River.

11 CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Veronica. And
happy birthday to you.

MS. SLAJER: Thank you. I had to -- you know, I had to reach out to people I don't know because my family didn't send me a card, so thank you.

Just kidding. Anyway, thank you for your work.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, maybe we can sing happy birthday to you, but --

MS. SLAJER: No, no. It's okay. It's okay. Anyway, the point is that I'm a proud, lifelong Alaskan. And -- and I understand this is very complicated, but keeping -- keeping East Anchorage in its -- in as cohesive as a community is really important to me. I did live there, as well as currently live downtown.

So thank you for your work.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. And we're going to let Jack know that he'd better not forget your birthday.

MS. SLAJER: Good idea.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Kimberly Hunt.

MS. HUNT: Hi. My name is Kim.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Good morning, Kim.

MS. HUNT: Hey, can you hear me?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can.

MS. HUNT: Okay. Well, my name is Kimberly Hunt. Thank you for taking my testimony. I am a seven-year resident of Alaska, and this is my third year in Anchorage. I'm looking forward to it being the progressive city I moved into.

I'm just calling today to say I oppose pairing Districts 9 and 22 because they are non-contiguous, they are separated by mountains, and they represent cohesive communities that would be diluted.

So I am all for the adopting a map that's supposed -- that supports the Court most closely and represent the smallest amount of change.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Kim.

Any questions? Okay. We'll go on to Joni Bruner.

MS. BRUNER: Hi. I'm Joni Bruner, and I live in South Anchorage.

And I oppose the pairing of South Anchorage with Eagle River and encourage the board to support the East Anchorage proposals that mostly -- most closely aligned with the Court ruling and has the smallest amount of change.

I have never done this before, so thank you.
for listening to me.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, you did great, Joni.

Very concise and to the point, so we appreciate that.

Well done.

MS. BRUNER: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. If there's no
questions of Joni, we'll move on to -- it shows Loy
Thurman. I hope I got that right. Is that Loy?

MR. THURMAN: Yes, sir. You've got it
right. I'm Loy Thurman. I'm out here in the Big
Lake area.

And I -- I know that as we're talking about
the situation here, we've had so many changes within
the districts of which I know that the old
District 8, which was Big Lake, has been decimated by
the redistricting that has gone on, and now we have
been pushed out of the Valley, in essence of which
it's the largest growing area.

A little bit of consternation is involved
there because we're the largest growing area in the
state. We're already almost a plus 2 or 3 percentage
points, and yet we didn't get any new
representatives. Yet people in Southeast or whatever
are even a minus down there. So that's a little
bit -- and especially with the next ten years that's
going to be coming, we're going to even have even more growth.

Concerning our specific district, which was the old 8, we have been pushed out into the Bush. Not that we're opposed to the people of the Bush. We had not a problem on that. But seeing as how we're to the west -- to the west end of the Valley, and it's the largest portion where it's growing, that's an irritation.

I know that we're dealing in a situation here, and now our -- our area now runs all the way from Point MacKenzie just across from the airport clear up to Clear and Anderson, about an hour and 20 minutes out of Fairbanks, which is crazy. And Cantwell has been gerrymandered clear across over to Glennallen. At least it could have reduced some of that area.

I know that we're dealing in a situation now concerning Eagle River. I do believe that they should be kept to their own entities as much as possible due to the socio and economic factors. I think the Courts have pulled that area in and specifically addressed it as being a -- a problem in how this has been handled.

I guess one of the key things that I would
also put forward is I'm not high on the Blanch [as spoken] plan, or exactly however it's pronounced, and specifically because of lawyer Scott Kendall. Scott Kendall is a person who has perpetrated this ranked choice voting and the mess that we're into on that. And now he's also involved in this portion concerning the efforts here, as well, in the Branch plan. So therefore I'm basically just trying to communicate that I'm in opposition to that Branch plan.

So those are the things that I have on my portion, as well. So I know I've kind of covered a lot of things, and nobody's going to -- you know, it's going to be an un- -- ungratitude and unthankful job that goes on, but I do think that this should definitely at least be able to have some reasonability here involving this situation concerning Eagle River.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. THURMAN: That's my statement. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Loy. I see there is a question from Member Bahnke.

Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Thurman.

Since this is all part of the public record, I did clarify yesterday that the map that came from the -- the alternate map to the one that was adopted in the proclamation in November, which for some reason people are calling the Bahnke plan, I did not work with Scott Kendall on that. I did not work with Tom Begich on that. I know there's a blog out there that has asserted that, but that's incorrect. That's not factual. I did not work with either Begich or Scott Kendall to develop that map.

I do want to ask you a question.

MR. THURMAN: You're talking --

MEMBER BAHNKE: Did I hear you correctly that you want Eagle River and Eagle River to be kept intact?

MR. THURMAN: Sure. Because I feel that they're a completely different socioeconomic group there than what is down on the south side.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. Thank you for your testimony.

MR. THURMAN: Uh-huh. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Loy.

MR. THURMAN: Yeah. Thank you very much.

Appreciate your work. Bye bye.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Next we have actually a little commentary here. One of the top right wingers in the state of Alaska, and I'm not talking political right wingers, I'm talking about a hockey right winger, former Representative Randy Phillips, I hope that's you, from Eagle River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. This is Randy Phillips. And I also play left wing, European style.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thanks for the clarification.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, can I -- can I speak now?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Please. Your -- it's your show. You have the floor.

TRANSCRIBER NOTE: Mr. Phillips' connection was intermittent, causing gaps in his recorded remarks.)

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay. I don't know a whole lot that's going on with this redistricting. I phoned in -- or (indiscernible).

Anyway, for the record, my name is Randy Phillips. I used to represent north/south Mountain View, Nunaka Valley, Muldoon, Chugiak, Eagle River, all the way out to Eklutna, Fort Rich for twenty- -- I'm going to make some observations here, and then
more or less be a resource for you guys on -- I know about -- part of Anchorage.
First of all, we have -- we have a different road service area than they do in Hillside. Hillside I think has got 18, 19 separate ones. We have one. Then we have one member from each community council who is the road board member, who supervises and operates and maintains the whole area here. Out by Hillside, I think they are elected in -- each of those road service areas. I believe there’s 18 or 19. Out here we get the economy of scale. We did it -- we did it intentionally because we wanted the community to stay together, and it costs us a lot less money -- the only thing that’s connecting Hillside with Eagle River is Chugach State -- and the water and sewer.
I believe most of the water/sewer in Eagle River is public water and sewer. I live up here at Hiland, about a mile short of the avalanche. Up there we’re all on septic, the further out you get to Eklutna, Peters Creek, Chugiak, and Birchwood. And then closer you get to Eagle River, I believe the vast majority, and I’m talking about population, are on public water.
We put that in years ago, the legislature or
the local delegation here -- landfill -- have a joke
that Eagle River gives Anchorage clean water and we
get their garbage. But that's the standard joke we
had.

And then that's about it. I just wanted to
phone in and just serve as a resource for you guys.

We -- also, we have Chugiak Fire Service,
which is separate from the Municipality of Anchorage.

And the other thing is my observations and
practical experience, boots on the ground, when I
represented East Anchorage and Eagle River. Eagle
River is basically a middle-class community, and the
East side of Anchorage was working class. Quite
frankly, each of them kept each other honest.

So I -- frankly, I really (indiscernible).

Anyway, a lot of good people in both areas of the --
of East Anchorage, as well as Eagle -- good, good,
good people.

Anyway, that's all I wanted to say. Oh,
there's a couple of other things I wanted to say to
pass on, because -- a couple of phrases anyway.

One is, don't let the perfect ruin the good.
Secondly, take the subject matter seriously, but not
yourself. That's what a lot of us back in the day
lived while we were serving the people in the --
that's all I have. I know it's very informal, but I just wanted to speak --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Randy.

Questions for Randy?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yeah, if there are any questions -- have some.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole has a question.

MR. PHILLIPS: Sure.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Randy, for calling in. It's a little difficult to hear you in the Anchorage LIO office. And I appreciate you agreeing to serve as a resource, so I may ask --

MR. PHILLIPS: Sure, go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: -- for your contact information to be able to follow up after.

But were you saying that the road service is different in Eagle River compared to Hillside?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes. Because we have -- it goes from -- basically from South Fork, Hiland Road, out to Eklutna. We have five members who are on the board of supervisors, and they are elected -- or selected, I should say, were elected by the local community council.

Whereas Hillside, as I understand it -- I'm
not an expert on Hillside -- they have, like, 18, 19

different road service areas, and I believe they are
elected on the ballot (indiscernible) elections. So
that's the differences.

We decided to do area wide because -- the
way we did it because the (indiscernible) have about
200 (indiscernible) miles of road that we maintain
ourselves, and the rest is either us or the state,
(indiscernible) the state. That's basically the --
it's minor differences.

Similarities, service-area concept, and we
don't have a whole lot of municipal employees. It's
all private contracts. That's the similarities.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Any

further questions?

Much appreciated, Randy. I hope you've been

well.

We'll move on. We have next within the
queue is Susan Fischetti, and then we'll go to Denny
Wells, and then Judy Eledge.

Susan, good morning. Susan, are you online

and unmuted?

MS. FISCHETTI: Hello.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes. We can hear -- we can

hear you now.
MS. FISCHETTI: Okay. I am here to testify today that I believe District 9 and 22 are contiguous, as they probably share more land mass along the district lines in the Chugach State Park than any other district pairing in Anchorage. And historically we have been paired with the Hillside before, when we had Senator Con Bunde and Cathy Giessel.

And I've been involved all of those years, where many of the people that are testifying now are saying they have not been involved before. And they really don't understand; they're just saying what they've been told to say.

The demographics of District 9 and 22 would seem to me to be very similar. We're talking about Eagle River Valley. And I would like to see that study myself, because I would say that the household income, education, and marital status would be very similar.

And as far as the road service areas go, we have our own separate, and so does the Hillside. Neither one is maintained by the regular municipal employees. It's private contract. And that's where, living here, we all know this. But for those that don't live here, they
wouldn't know. It doesn't matter that we're, you know, not in the same road service area. It matters that we each have our own road service areas and that we are separate from the municipality as far as that goes.

These are just a few things I'm trying to clarify, because it seems like sometimes the testimony isn't exactly factual. I think that's about it right now.

I also believe that option 3 does have the least impact on all the other districts, as far as making changes, so I support option 3. Thank you very much.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Susan.

Questions for Susan?
Okay. We're going to go to Denny Wells.

Good morning, Denny.

MR. WELLS: Hi. Good morning. Am I close enough? Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can actually hear you (indiscernible).

MR. WELLS: Okay. Good. I -- coming in, I would like to reiterate having -- having done mapping with -- with the Anchorage reapportionment, that I really do appreciate how -- how challenging this is
and -- and I appreciate -- I appreciate your efforts. They're not -- they do not go unnoticed.

I would like to respond to a few things that have kind of occurred in the public testimony and to add some additional context.

One is -- has been several comments perceiving the -- the plans that I -- that I believe are currently being called No. 1 and No. 2 on the table as -- as partisan gerrymanders. And I would just like to point out, like, I don't -- I can't -- I'm not in your heads. I'm not in your hearts. I can't -- I can't understand your specific motivations.

But I would like to point out that there are two board members who are non-partisan, and there are three board members who are specifically connected to a particular political party. And there are two maps that are proposed by non-partisan groups and one that is proposed by a member who has been the chair of a particular political party.

And I believe that the public perception is that if you are not -- if you are not being diligent to -- to intentionally be non-partisan, especially if you are coming from a particular political perspective, you are coming from a particular
connection to a particular party, your maps may be perceived as partisan gerrymanders.

But it's not appropriate to automatically hang that moniker on maps that come from non-partisan, and especially ones that genuinely preserved communities of interest together, as maps 1 and 2 do.

Specifically to the discussions going on today about pairing District 9 and 22, I would -- I would agree that road service areas and -- and substantial -- substantially white and -- and largely -- relatively -- relatively high-income communities can be found in Districts 9 and 22, but also in Districts 11 and 24. Those are all districts that are -- that are better than 75 percent white.

And -- but what distinguishes them is that District 22 and 24 also share the core of Eagle River. They actually share a community. Districts 9 and 11 share a home- -- they share the Hillside Homeowners Association, the HALO association. So they actually have specific connections to them, where 9 and 22 they share Chugach Park, but they don't share other political entities together.

And specifically also District -- the pairing in map 1 and 2 pair Districts 22 and 24
together and 23 and 17 together. Both of those are preserving very specific communities together. 22 and 24 are House districts split right through the heart of Eagle River, and pairing them together in a Senate district keeps Eagle River together.

Districts 23 and 17 split right through the heart of downtown Anchorage. Putting them together keeps downtown Anchorage together.

I've heard some discussion about the -- in support of keeping the 23 and 24 House pairings together as a Senate district because a tie from JBER to the Chugiak/Eagle River area. And in my real estate photography, I can absolutely say that anecdotally I see the -- I see military households in Chugiak/Eagle River a fair amount. I'm a real estate photographer.

Anyway, I do houses all over Anchorage all the time, in the entire municipality. And it's -- and it's absolutely true that I -- that I see a fair amount of -- of military houses out in Chugiak/Eagle River, but they're pretty much all the military houses with -- the certificates on the wall, the -- the -- you know, the graduate certificates and the -- and the evidence of being (indiscernible) homes. The enlisted people that are -- that are on Base housing
and that are on and off Base housing, they rent in my
duplex in -- in Muldoon.
And -- and I feel like that -- like, if
you're -- you're equally as likely to find the people
that are on Base renting in Anchorage as you are to
find them out in Eagle River and Chugiak. I --
that's the -- the -- that's a connection that you can
find elsewhere, as well.
But the connection between downtown
Anchorage and downtown Anchorage is not one that you
can find elsewhere.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Nicole?
MR. WELLS: Yes?
CHAIR BINKLEY: I'm sorry. I didn't -- I
didn't know if you were done or not. There's a
little bit of a lag here, Denny.
MR. WELLS: Okay. I was going to wait and
make one more brief comment, and just to say that
the -- that I think the feedback that we got in our
Anchorage reapportionment process, the comments
notwithstanding yesterday, that -- that they are
substantially different processes. Those are still
the same people and still the same communities, and
we're still dividing them in -- in similar ways.
For the Anchorage reapportionment we divided
the community into six. For the Senate pairings, we're dividing the community into eight. Those are different numbers, but they're still the same people, same communities, same issues.

And in our process, when we -- when we have maps on the table considering pairing Hillside and Eagle River, we got strong formal feedback from -- from community councils from Huffman/O'Malley Community Council, the Rabbit Creek Community Council, Home and Landowners Association, the Basher Community Council, Girdwood Board of Supervisors, all specifically calling out, and in opposition to pairing Hillside with Eagle River.

And I would encourage you to -- those are organizations that -- that meet on a monthly basis. They're not going to have time to meet and give you formal feedback in the tight time frame that you are working on.

And I would encourage you to -- to review their -- their formal resolutions in the Anchorage reapportionment public (indiscernible). Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Denny. Any questions? Hearing none, we'll move on.

Judy Eledge. Good morning, Judy.

MS. ELEDGE: Thank you for (indiscernible).
This is Judy Eledge. I live in Anchorage, Alaska, and I am testifying on behalf of myself. And I thank you for this opportunity.

I would like to respond to the last man, I believe his name is Denny, in the fact that if he actually believes that it is not -- that anything is nonpartisan on either side of this redistricting, he hasn't lived here as long as I have, and this is my third redistricting I've been involved in, in the state of Alaska. And so to say that one side is partisan and the other not, wow, that's a -- that's a statement that just is not true and we all know that. So I need to just say that.

Plus, I think the Anchorage redistricting, when you have people that are actually in elected office choosing what the redistricting is going to be, to say that that was not -- that we should consider anything there, this is a State redistricting, not the City, and these are people that were appointed, not necessarily in office trying to protect their seats. So I just needed to say that, because that just was not true.

I am here to testify in favor of option 3. It's not perfect. It's not one I probably would have picked, but I am somebody that has lived both in
Eagle River for many, many years. I also lived on the South/Hillside many, many years, and I currently live in the Airport/Sand Lake. And I absolutely believe the 16 and 15 Airport and Sand Lake go together. I live in that community. They're all very closely related to each other.

And I do -- we have District 22 and 9, Eagle River and the -- and South -- South Anchorage, the Hillside, they have been teamed together before. As we said, Con Bunde, Cathy Giessel. I do think that they all share things that are very similar together. It's very much a rural area, much more than maybe, like, some of the other areas.

And I just -- I think that has a good pairing. I think it's fair. And I just guess I wish that this -- the Superior Court stated the way -- the public testimony should guide the board's actions. I guess that's maybe so, but I really think you need to take a good look of what's going, because, you know, you can line up a group -- a whole bunch of group of people to testify on something that they don't know anything about.

The only reason I'm testifying today is because I do know enough about it, because I've lived in both -- like I said, I've lived in Eagle River,
I've lived in South Anchorage on the Hillside, and I currently live in Sand Lake. And so when I look at option 3, it most certainly looks to be -- to me to be the fairest among all of them, and so that was my testimony.

And basically that there's nothing in this world that is nonpartisan anymore, in my opinion. So I just bring the fact that I've lived in those three areas, where other people testify and maybe have not.

So that is my testimony. Thank you so much for the opportunity.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Judy.

Any questions for Judy? Okay.

We'll move on to Ted Eisenell [as spoken] -- or Eiseneit [as spoken]. Ted, are you here with us?

MR. EISHEIT: Good morning. The name is actually pronounced Ted Eisheit (phonetic). It's a German name. Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can. Eisheit. I stand corrected, and I appreciate it.

MR. EISHEIT: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you to members of the board for your hard work. It's not easy. I've done some public service, and so thank you for the opportunity to testify.
I just -- I have maybe -- I've been listening to testimony the last couple of days, and perhaps I have a different perspective. I live in East Anchorage. I was very pleased with the Supreme Court decision that said the -- some of the changes. East Anchorage and Eagle River were problematic, and so here we are.

And I'm pretty concerned about your work and about the perception of your decisions. And specifically I want to talk about the Senate pairings involving my experience with living in Alaska, and that involves 22 and 24, District 22 and 24.

So I -- I work in the Mat-Su Borough, and so I commute from East Anchorage up on the Glenn Highway. And so I go through 22 and 24, and I -- I see the connection between those two districts as one Senate district.

I think many of the people living in 22 and 24 have similar interests and characteristics, and it makes sense to me, kind of, the -- kind of, based on my drive, it's just, like, oh, yeah, these are people that are living outside of Anchorage proper. They're still in the muni, and, you know, more power to them. It makes sense. It looks logical. And that perception is very important, I think, especially
after the Supreme Court decision.
I've been listening to the connection between Districts 9 and 22, Eagle River and South Anchorage. And my experience just makes it hard for me to see that as logical. And my experience involves Arctic Valley.
I like to go up to Arctic Valley, northeast of town, my house, quite often. I was there yesterday. And there's a pretty well-known ski traverse from Arctic Valley south to Indian, the Arctic to Indian traverse. It's about 20 miles, and it's a popular ski tour in early spring, when snow is up.
And so if I invited one of you as board members to say, hey, let's go for a drive from my house up through 22 and 24, I think you would see, like, yeah, these two districts seem to make sense to pair in a Senate district.
But if I said, okay, let's go on a ski tour from Arctic down to Indian, I think you would see, after 20 miles of wilderness, you'd say, like, there's really not much of a connection here. Yeah, there's a physical connection, I guess, Chugach State Park, but there's a whole lot of wilderness there. And you would perhaps say that doesn't make sense.
So I would encourage you to really just watch your -- the perception of your decisions. You've gotten a lot of testimony on all sides of this issue, but I think it's really important to me to -- as a citizen of Alaska, that, you know, at the end of the day that I feel like your decision was fair. And if you go with 22 and 9 as paired, you know, my -- my ski tour experience is just going to say, there's not a connection here.

So I would just ask you to -- to consider that. I would also mention, too, that living in East Anchorage, I'm always amazed at the number of people on the Base that live in my community, so they're not all associated with Eagle River, as well. So the downtown connection of 17 and 23 makes some sense to me.

But anyway, I thank you very much for the opportunity to testify.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ted. Questions for Ted? Seeing none, we'll move on to Jason Norris. And this is the last one that I have in the queue. Jason?

MR. NORRIS: Yeah, good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to testify. This is on behalf of myself. I currently live in District 11, previously
lived in 9 and 10.

My opinion is that option 1 is great, 2 is fine, and option 3 does not make any sense to me at all.

When we were going through the original Senate pairings, one of the arguments was that people in Eagle River shop in Muldoon, and so therefore it was okay to pair them. And -- but now the argument is 22 and 9, but they don't share any of that. They don't share any of the characteristics that was the basis for the original decision to pair Eagle River with Muldoon.

And I would say that the arguments for the connections between 22 and 9 are outweighed by the arguments for connections between 22 and 24. I think that that's something that's getting skipped over is the very obvious connections between 22 and 24.

And I'll be honest with you, the Supreme Court was pretty bold in calling the previous pairing a political gerrymander, and to me option 3 just appears to be that same gerrymander restated. It's just my personal opinion, but that's what I see.

Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Jason.

That is all I show in the queue. Is there
anybody else online or in the audience there at the
LIO that wishes to testify here today?

We will be having public testimony again
tomorrow, Thursday, as well as Friday and Saturday,
and then we will be back together as a full board on
Wednesday, and have Thursday set aside, as well, to
hopefully come to a decision on how we're going to
proceed, given the remand by the Superior Court. And
let's see. I see, Bethany, you've got your hand up.

Go ahead.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Whenever
it's opportune, I just wanted to walk through the
rationale for the pairings that I put together, for
the record, whether that be considered my own
personal public testimony or board comments, or
whatever is -- whenever you feel it's most
appropriate, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I think any other --
let me take a few minutes, which I appreciate. And
maybe what we should do is close the public testimony
for the day, and then we could go to -- let's see. I
guess we've got consideration of alternative pairings
proposals.

We had one that came up before us, the one
that Bethany's going to speak to, and we can do that
next. So why don't we close the public testimony for
the day, and then we'll go to board member comments.
And maybe, Bethany, under that you can
present the rationale or explanation for the pairings
that you came up with yesterday, as well.

MEMBER MARCUM: At this time, Mr. Chairman?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, I think that's an
appropriate time. Why don't you go ahead?
MEMBER MARCUM: Absolutely. Thank you.
So the constitution is clear that our
requirement for pairings is contiguity. The
constitution also, as we know, makes reference to
district boundaries. So those are the two primary things that
I took in mind.

And I started with the response to the Court
ruling as far as 20 and 21, and I will walk through
how I derived the subsequent pairings, starting with
my response to the Court ruling.

So in response to the Court ruling, and as
proposed by Member Bahnke, I paired Districts 20
and 21 together. This would be the Muldoon Road
district. It's got a wide mix of infrastructure to
include mobile home parks, zero lot lines, and
district, as well as big box stores, and
many small businesses. And this pairing joins residential neighborhoods that exist along the major east-west transportation boundary of DeBarr Road that now exists between Districts 20 and 21.

So that then leaves District 22 stranded.

And so in looking for a new pairing for District 22, I looked to the Chugach Mountains. You’ve heard various pieces of testimony all this week regarding road -- the road service areas and some of those pieces of information.

But one thing that I think is important is Ship Creek. So Ship Creek is in the east, and actually it goes -- to the most previous testifier, regarding the ski route he was talking about, I have used that as a hunting route. I have had sheep tags myself where I have hunted in the Ship Creek drainage.

Ship Creek is in the east part of District 22. It winds through both Districts 9 and 22, and then it drains out near Bird Creek, near Indian, as the previous testifier was just mentioning. So the Ship Creek drainage is one of those geographic pieces that absolutely links Districts 9 and 22.

The next pairing is District 10 and 13,
because in pairing 9 and 22, that leaves District 10 stranded. So looking at District 10 I put it together with District 13, because that is nearly the same as the current District L, of Senate pairing L that exists.

And the reason that is important is because it unites the neighborhoods that are along the three major north-south transportation arteries that travel the length of both districts, both District 10 and 13. You have the Old Seward Highway, you have C Street, and you have the Hickel Parkway, otherwise known as Minnesota. So you have those three transportation arteries that travel the length of both district, naturally linking Districts 10 and 13 into a pairing.

So in making that pairing that leaves District 14 stranded, so it was paired with District 19, which is a new pairing. That allows the two primary Midtown roads that travel east-west in those two districts, Northern Lights and 36th Avenue, to be combined into one Senate pairing. Both districts also contain similar commercial infrastructure, with their high-rise office buildings, medical buildings, hospital buildings. That leaves four districts intact from our
current proclamation plan. I want to point out something important with District 23, which as we've been referring the JBER district -- I'm sorry, district -- yeah, District 23 and 24. So both District 23 and 24 are JBER districts.

And, again, this is a pairing that is the same, but our House district plan truncates. It separates parts of JBER. And the only way that JBER can be made whole and putting back together is by putting Districts 23 and 24 together. Additionally, as far as geography, these are the two districts that have long boundaries along the Knik Arm.

Districts 17 and 18 exist in our current proclamation plan, no change there. This unites the areas around the Merrill Field infrastructure, or the airport.

District 11 and 12, no change there. Also the same as our proclamation plan. These districts have great swaths of greenbelts and parks, and that allows the neighborhoods along the shared boundary of Abbott Road to be united. So that road is the -- a denominator there that draws those two districts together.

And then Districts 15 and 16, also no change, the same as our proclamation plan. It's
largely a coastal district for Cook Inlet. So that leaves four districts that are intact from our proclamation plan, starting with the response to the ruling on the -- on current K district. One district that is nearly the same as the current district, one district that is the same as proposed by Member Bahnke, and really then just one district that is completely new. So any questions about those?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Any questions for Bethany? Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. In coming up with the pairing for 22, why didn’t you look to its natural neighbor and pair it with the other half of Eagle River?

MEMBER MARCUM: For the same reasons that I talked about in the past, because 23 and 24 is what is required for JBER and Eagle River or JBER and JBER, is the way I see it to be linked together. So their geography dictates that there is the end of the Anchorage Municipality there, and so when 23 and 24 are put together, that leaves 22 with 9.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. One follow-up question.

The same reasons that you articulated before
also, with splitting the districts would give Eagle River more representation, does that follow through, as well, to your current suggestion?

MEMBER MARCUM: So this means that Muldoon would only have two senators as opposed to one senator, because of the fact that 21 and 20 are together. I would prefer that Muldoon is able to have three senators, if they were -- if we were to separate Districts 20 and 21. But it seems that there's consensus with putting 20 and 21 together, and therefore Muldoon would end up having one senator with 20 and 21 and one senator with the part of Muldoon that is in the JBER district.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, I think you've got your hand up.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you.

Bethany, the Supreme Court ruled that we shouldn't split Eagle River to give it more representation, so the splitting of Eagle River was an issue. And this doesn't seem to solve that -- that problem. What do you have to say about that?

MEMBER MARCUM: This has never been about more representation for Eagle River. This is about pairing districts that are contiguous, that have geographic and socioeconomic similarities, and it has
nothing to do with representation.

As you heard from one of the testifiers yesterday, sometimes some people see having two senators as a negative. I personally see it as a positive, which is why I wanted to give Muldoon three senators. But some people see it differently.

And so representation is one of those things that, you know, can be seen as something that is helpful or hurtful, depending on whether or not you see working with multiple individuals is going to be time-consuming, or if you think having the representation of multiple individuals is going to be helpful to you.

So in this instance, this puts forward changes that allows the -- or sorry -- the requests of the Muldoon area to be heard, as well as the requests that we have heard from Eagle River residents.

MEMBER BAHNKE: So who is this helpful to?

MEMBER MARCUM: It's not helpful to anybody, in terms of the context in which you're presenting it. It's helpful to all residents of Anchorage in the sense that it's a fair map with contiguous pairings.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Further questions for
MEMBER BORROMEO: I have another one.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Go ahead, Nicole.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

So referring to the Superior Court's ruling on page 59, where the trial court is exploring the argument that splitting Muldoon over three districts is actually helpful, what the Court said is, quote, "Where the board argues that the current Senate pairings actually spreads Muldoon among more Senate districts, giving it more Senate seats, that argument falls flat in the face of reality. Instead it seems as though Muldoon is actually cracked among multiple Senate districts and its voting strength is diluted as a result."

So I want to caution the board as we move forward not to fall back on this argument that we are trying to give Muldoon three more Senate seats. I don't believe that the Supreme -- that the Superior Court is going to fall for that on remand.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you for that question, Nicole. And that is why I've combined 20 and 21 into one district, with one senator -- to one Senate pairing with one senator.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Are there any further
board members that have proposals? I know we've got Melanie's proposal, but any other board members --

MEMBER BAHNKE: I wish you'd please call it option 1.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, option 1, which was proposed by Melanie, just so we're -- we're -- option 1.

Are there any other board members that would like to propose an alternative pairing for the Senate districts? Okay.

MEMBER BAHNKE: So --

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman -- I'm sorry, go ahead, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't have anything new to propose. But can we go back to Bethany's map? I have a question about how it's being titled, since we're talking about how we're titling maps.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Do you need to pull it up on the screen?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. So, so far I'm aware that we have option 1, option 2, and now we've got option 3R. And I'm wondering what the "R" stands for.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I assume "revised," but I don't know.
Peter, I think you put that on there.

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. Yeah.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can everyone hear me okay?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, I hear you.

MR. TORKELSON: I'll put my -- I'll talk closer to the mic.

So yeah, this is the option 3 that was previously presented, and then it was revised today during testimony. And so whether we put an "R" after it or not, it felt like it couldn't be named exactly the same, but it is related. So this was my best shot at a neutral naming convention. It's not -- it's just 3R. It's a revised version of 3. So I hope that makes sense. We can name it something else if that's desired.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'll leave it up to the rest of the board, but to me, when I see an "R" behind something, I think "Republican." I don't want to confuse the public.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think that's a good point. And maybe we ought to just call it option 3 and take down the original, if it's on the website -- I assume. Take down the original 3 and just put this 3
on there, so that there's not confusion and there's three options going forward.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Or even a 3B. I don't know.

That's fine. Option 1, 2, and 3 is fine.

MEMBER MARCUM: Or maybe "A," for "amended."

MEMBER BAHNKE: I think it was appropriate, to have something that might confuse the public be after that number.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think that's well pointed out. Thank you.

Let's see. Bethany, do you still have your hand up?

MEMBER MARCUM: I do, yes. Because you asked about other pairings. And I don't know that I'm wanting to necessarily bring it forward for adoption, but I think it's worth discussing, so maybe. I wanted to get the board's input.

So I saw in our public testimony packet from last night a proposal that had a different pairing from the pairings that we have.

Now my computer's locked up. I'm trying to get to it. Can you guys still hear me?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes.

MEMBER MARCUM: Because I can't scroll or do
anything to get back to it.

Anyway, there was a pairing that was introduced -- or a group of pairings that was introduced in our public testimony packet that was different from all of the others that I thought might be worth discussing, but I can't get it to open right now.

Budd, you have your hand up, if you want to go ahead and talk while I see if I can get my computer to do something here.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Go ahead, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Yeah, I just wanted to weigh in on the naming. I like the idea of somehow distinguishing this from the original 3, and was going to suggest maybe the old 3 is 3A, and this one is 3B, just to show there's a sequence there.

And so somebody that wants to testify about it starts talking about No. 3, and they're still looking at the old one or something. So I -- it needs to be distinguished in some manner, is all.

And I appreciate Melanie bringing that up.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Peter, what works best for you?

MR. TORKELSON: 3B would be fantastic.
CHAIR BINKLEY: So options 1, 2, 3, and 3B?

So then we're going to have four options out there?

I'm not certain we need to have an option 3, so maybe we just have option 1, 2, and 3B.

MR. TORKELSON: That's my interpretation.

We would only have three on the website.

But when someone comes to testify, if they perhaps saw an old version and they say 3, then we would know to ask, you know, which version. If they say 3B, then we'll know what they're talking about (indiscernible) version.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. That seems reasonable. Any other comment on the naming format?

Everybody agreeable with that?

Okay. At this time we'll ask if there's any other alternative pairings. I think --

Yeah, Bethany, let's go back to the one that you picked up on yesterday.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah. So I got my computer to work again here and to open it.

I think it's of interest because it's from a 40-year resident of Eagle River, Craig Campbell, but I think it would be of particular interest to Melanie and Nicole. I'm not sure if you both saw it.

Because you are both of the mind that 22 and 24
should be together, so this is a group of pairings that does combine 22, Eagle River, and 24, what I am calling JBER/Chugiak, into one. It's an interesting group of pairings because it does require us to do something a little bit out of the box, but it's also something that I'm -- that I would not object to. What it does, it takes a couple of areas -- I'm trying to read the content of the note here.

To create this pairing a minor change must be made swapping an area with no population, which is currently assigned to House District 22, and putting that area into House District 29. To reiterate, no population is affected.

And so I wanted to find out if others had looked at this group of pairings and see what their thoughts were. I think it's worthy of a discussion.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Who submitted that?

MEMBER MARCUM: Craig Campbell, former Lieutenant Governor Craig Campbell. I can tell because the e-mail address is lieutenantgovcampbell@gmail.com.

Sorry. I shouldn't have said that publicly.

Sorry.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie, I think you had
your hands up.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah, I didn't have a chance to read the public testimony that was uploaded last evening. I plan to do that tonight.

But can we pull up the maps, Bethany, so you can explain that and we know what you're talking about?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah. I can just walk through what is -- and read what's here at the time that you have the map up.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Peter, are you able to pull up the map?

MEMBER MARCUM: Okay. You guys -- can everyone see? Are you ready?

MEMBER BAHNKE: It's --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Go ahead, Bethany.

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- 24, though, but everybody knows where 24 is hopefully. That's what's stressful about this map is you don't see 24 on the map.

MEMBER MARCUM: So Districts 22 and 24 remain combined. This pairing aligns two very similar areas within a single Senate seat, an area that shares common socioeconomic and cultural characteristics.

Districts 20 and 23, so that looks --
everybody see where those are? 20 and 23 should be combined as they represent an integrated community located both on Base and immediately adjacent to the military installation. 18 and 19 have similar housing patterns and are comprised of close-knit family units, also sharing similar characteristic as the JBER and North Muldoon area. Neighbors work, shop, go to school, and share recreational activities in this area, making it a well-aligned district.

Districts 15 and 16, as in the original plan. This should not be changed. I'm just toggling back and forth here, so sorry.

Districts 14 and 17, these two areas are heavily business and commercial oriented, which allows a single Senate seat to fairly represent the interests of all voters. While the housing stock is varied throughout the two areas, the characteristics of businesses and neighborhood is very similar.

Districts 10 and 13, this district was deemed satisfactory by the Court.

Districts 11 and 12, trying to look for those -- okay. See where those are? This district also does not need to be adjusted.

Districts 9 -- and I'm not keeping track. I
don't know how many of these are changes versus not changes, so maybe someone else could be tallying that. But I'm reading.

Districts 9 and 21, these two areas have been paired for -- in the most current election cycle in what is now known as Senate Seat N, and is thus considered a legal combination.

To create this pairing a minor change must be made swapping an area with no population, which is currently assigned to House District 22, and putting that area into House District 9. To reiterate, no population is affected.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So just -- go ahead, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. And I appreciate Bethany asking why I didn't -- or my thoughts.

Why I didn't move this forward is because it's unconstitutional. Districts 9 and 21 are not contiguous. The Court's going to strike that down immediately. If that somehow gets by Judge Matthews and his trustee law clerk, it will almost certainly be ruled unconstitutional as packing Districts 18 and 19, which have high minority VAPs, and crafting Districts 20 and 23, which also has high minority VAPs. So, in short, this is unconstitutional and
should not be considered.

MEMBER MARCUM: Nicole, I just wanted to respond. You said that it was not contiguous, but the -- the testifier submitted the solution to that.

So just to make sure everybody's clear on the record that there was a solution submitted to make them contiguous. Thank you.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't think that the remand authorized us to amend House districts underlying the Senate District K that we were ordered to correct. So I think -- and I'm not a lawyer, though. But I don't think it authorized us to modify House districts, other than the Cantwell solution.

But, Matt, this is where I guess I put you on the spot because you are our attorney, and I'm going to make you earn your lunch today.

MR. SINGER: Mr. Chair, would it be appropriate for me to answer?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Please, Matt, yeah. Please respond.

MR. SINGER: The Court has remanded to the board, and the instructions are to correct the so-called Cantwell appendage and to correct Senate
District K, and then to make changes resulting therefrom.

I encourage the board to be able to explain how each change that it makes is directly linked to one of those two specific errors that the Court identified.

It's my reading of the constitution that the board's authority on remand, under Section 11 of Article VI, is to correct and adopt a new plan. And I think that "correct" -- the word "correct" modifies "and adopt a new plan." That is, it's a limiter on the board's authority.

And so if, in addition to revising the Cantwell district, the board were to say, you know, "On second thought, Ketchikan would be a better fit with Yakutat. Let's redraw the Southeast," I think the board would say -- or the Court, the Court would say that the board has exceeded its authority under Section 11 and under the Court's remand.

So with regard to this specific question, could the board make an adjustment to the House map in order to fix Senate District K? You'd have to have a very good explanation to the Court that that was necessary. Because there are several other alternatives already before you.
I'd like -- if somebody has it, I certainly would want -- the board could make that decision inarticulately, but I think it would be a push, a real push, to convince -- and then I think adding the -- Mr. Campbell's suggestion, add census -- non-populated census blocks in order to create a connection between two House districts that are not presently connected, would -- we'd have to look at it optically, but the sound of it, it raises a question of compactness.

And so making your House plan less compact in order to pair districts is something that would raise eyebrows, I think, at the Court, and I guess would not be my first -- would not be my first choice or recommendation to you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Just a -- just a note there. I don't think, Matt -- your example of changing Ketchikan, I don't think that relates at all to what is being suggested here.

I think the purpose really is to correct Senate District K. And I don't know, because the -- the proposer of this is not here to answer questions. But just my opinion is that we've asked the public to come up with ideas, plans to suggest how they might approach this. We've received three. This appears
to be four.

We might not agree with it. We might not in our opinion think it’s constitutional, but I think it’s still only fair to some member of the public who’s put some time and effort and thought into this to allow this to be a proposal that we look at, like all the other proposals.

And we may have our legal opinions and personal opinions on any of the three that have already been proposed, but we should have the opportunity, and the public, too, to weigh in on this, as well. Just my opinion.

MR. SINGER: And I agree, Mr. Chair. I mean, I am encouraging the board to get options on the table and hear from the public. I think that’s the right approach.

CHAIR BINKLEY: We’ve got Melanie, Budd, then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I’d just like to point out that the House map was deemed constitutional. For the first time I guess in redistricting history that was not sent back, other than the Cantwell situation, right? I don’t want to go backwards. I think amending House districts in Anchorage opens us up to
a whole 'nother can of worms, will delay things, and
there is already a solution that allows for 22 and 24
to be paired up as an option.

And, Bethany, I appreciate you trying to
bring this forward as an option that would connect 22
and 24, but we already have two options actually that
connect 22 and 24. And while I appreciate that we
allowed the public to submit their proposed Senate
pairings, nowhere in there did we guarantee that we
were going to accept all of them for consideration.
Had we received 50 of them, I would hope that we
would whittle them down to the most viable, most
legally defensible ones.

So I don't feel obligated to put every
single one of the proposals that has come forward up
as a proposed solution, especially not one that takes
us backwards. We should be looking at improvements
and follow the Court's order to make the correction
to Senate District K, not coming up with some new
House map to try to do that.
yesterday.

Personally, I'm not very interested in messing with House districts. I think that does kind of get us close to going beyond our -- our authority here, and unnecessarily.

However, at the same time, I have no objection to simply accepting it for consideration. Maybe there's some part of it that represents a compromise from something else that could be useful in the -- in the final analysis.

So I -- and we don't have 50 maps before us. We have three, and this would make four. So it's not like an overwhelming thing just to accept it for consideration, if nothing else as a courtesy to somebody that went to considerable trouble to put together a proposal for us.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, and then Bethany.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I'm going to, again, speak against considering this plan.

During the initial 90-day (indiscernible) period, one of the things that Budd often said when third-party maps were presented or the public commented on maps is that the public was not bound by the law, by the constitution, whereas the board was. So the options that we put forward as a board were
always legal, always able to be acted on.

This, unfortunately, is not. It suggests linking two districts that aren't even connected right now and reassigning parts of District 22. That is way beyond the scope of our authority on remand.

Also, to John's points that the public -- maps. Yes, but they don't have access to the information that we do. And we have months of legal review under our belt. We have the benefit of hearing from a VRA expert.

And I don't see the benefit of entertaining a plan that is not going to pass muster. This is just going to get struck down again.

District 18 has a 66 percent VAP. That's the highest in Anchorage. If we pair it with 19, also a super high VAP, the Court is going to say we're gerrymandering again by packing minority VAPs.

And same thing with District 20, except in reverse. It has a 60 percent VAP, and District 23 has, like, a 25 percent VAP. That's going to be (indiscernible) of cracking. We're just going to get slapped with the gerrymandering stick again.

Let's not consider this. I appreciate Mr. Campbell's time in making these suggestions, but, with all due respect, he didn't have the benefit of a
VRA expert, and we did.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany, and then Melanie.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to move that we adopt the proposal as submitted by Mr. Campbell as a potential correction for publication on the website and to receive public testimony.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion before us to adopt that as what I'm listing as option 4 to put out there for the public to review and comment on.

Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I'll second it with reservations, as I expressed before. I am not interested in messing with the House districts, but I -- I just don't see that much downside to letting people comment on it.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There is a motion before us and seconded.

Discussion on the motion? Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I can't understand how we're adopting a map for consideration that is not constitutional. It proposes pairing District 9 with 21. They're not contiguous. And it's only
going to serve to confuse the public for them to have
to comment on unconstitutional maps.

This Senate pairing, as proposed, is not
classical. And we can put it somewhere on the
website as this was considered.

Thank you, Mr. Campbell, for having offered
it, putting the time in, for having done this, but
it's not a viable option. It's not legally
defensible, in my mind. Districts 9 and 21 simply
are not contiguous. That's the bare minimum that
we've been hearing this whole time needs to be
considered. 9 and 21 are not contiguous.

I think it is going to confuse the public if
this board adopts as a possible solution to fixing
Senate District K -- it's going to serve to confuse
the public and belabor the process.

So I speak against the motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Nicole, and then
Bethany.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. The public is
barely hanging in there with us. We have abused
their sense in trust significantly during the Senate
pairing process.

Please do not adopt this unconstitutional
suggestion. We've got three that will work. And I'm
not suggesting that Mr. Campbell did this on purpose, but he doesn't have the benefit of a VRA expert, that I know of. And if he did consult a VRA expert to come up with these pairings, then that person is wholly misguided in their expertise. This is not a good look.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to clarify that the proposal by Mr. Campbell did include making changes to the House district so that the map would show contiguity when we produced the map, because his proposal did include making that swap of what he said were -- I've closed it now, but that area that is zero population. So I just wanted to get clarification that we'll produce a map that's per the actual proposal that he made that would then show the contiguity.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

I'm just going to make a comment, if there's no further comment from board members. You know, that's -- I appreciate board members' opinions on whether this approach is constitutional or legal or fits within the confines of what the remand was.
But, really, that's not what we're debating. It's debating whether or not somebody from the public, who we've asked to come forward with their ideas, should be one that we have -- allow for the public to comment on.

I have my reservations, just as Budd does, about whether this meets constitutional muster or not. But to be honest with you, I have my reservations about option 1 that changes all eight Senate districts, when the Court was very clear to do this with as much disruption to the other Senate pairings as is possible [as spoken]. But I'm not going to prejudge that or try and take that off the table so the public can't comment on it.

And I have great faith and trust in the public that they can sort through four different plans and comment on whether they like them or not and what their opinion is.

So I'm going to support the motion. And it's not that I'm going to support the plan, not that I think it's constitutional, not that I think it fits within the remand from the Court, but simply we asked the public to come forward and do this. I think it would be disingenuous for us to now dismiss this out of hand and not allow people to comment on it.
So with that I'll ask for any further discussion on the motion.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I have --

CHAIR BINKLEY: If not --

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- where this is going, and I'll just say I look forward to hearing from the public on this fourth option.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I would agree with you completely. And I -- I actually hope -- my hope is that we don't get distracted by option 4, and I don't think that's going to be -- I don't think the public's going to get distracted with that. But that's my opinion.

Peter, if you could call the roll please on the motion.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Hold on. I don't think you're seeing Matt raising his hand. He's not --

CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't.

MEMBER BORROMEO: -- in -- he's physically raising his hand.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't see it. Matt?

MR. SINGER: You see my hand?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There. I didn't see it here.

MR. SINGER: I would encourage, let's --
let's set aside discussion about the Voting Rights Act and race and just -- I think those are -- under the Hickel process, the board should be focused on Section 6 of the constitution, on identifying contiguous Senate districts that are rational.

And we got taken to task by plaintiffs who felt that we were approaching those issues in the wrong order. And I just wanted to remind the board, there's times that have that analysis, but let's focus -- I would encourage focusing on options that meet the Section 6 requirements of the constitution.

That's primarily contiguity, and the same section says geographic features and drainages can be used to describe boundaries.

So I don't -- I don't mean to disregard a concern, but I just -- we have to -- we have to honor the Hickel process. And Judge Matthews found that the board had complied with the Hickel process but raised concern and, you know, even suggest- -- it seems to be that even using the word "VRA" gets people's hackles up if we do it too soon. So one step at a time.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Matt, can you see this map
MR. SINGER: Yeah. I'm familiar with that map.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Are Districts 9 and 21 contiguous?

MR. SINGER: That's what I said -- I said earlier.

MEMBER BORROMEO: As -- as --

MR. SINGER: No.

MEMBER BORROMEO: As we drew the maps, is 9 contiguous with 21?

MR. SINGER: No, it is not.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. And a Senate pairing has to be contiguous under Article VI, Section 6, correct?

MR. SINGER: Well, no. Here's what the constitution --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes or no?

MR. SINGER: It's not a yes or no, Nicole.

Let me answer your question.

The -- here's what the constitution says.

"Each Senate district shall be composed as near as practicable of two contiguous House districts."

So the framers of that section contemplated that there could be a circumstance where not every
Senate district could -- you know, it would not be practicable for every one of them to be contiguous, but that's -- I think that's a very tough standard. I believe -- I suspect that that sentence was written that way in light of the Voting Rights Act, and the -- I think you can think of an instance, for example, where there were five Alaska Native-controlled House districts. A Voting Rights Act expert might say that the fifth district needed to be paired with a House district of a certain racial makeup in order to comply with the Voting Rights Act, and that might be an exception to the contiguity rule.

So it's -- there is a little -- there is an exception or a little escape hatch there. It shall be composed as near as practicable of two contiguous House districts.

I would have a hard time making a case for the board on looking at this map, that you cannot identify eight contiguous Senate districts. That is, it seems to me each of the Senate districts in Anchorage can be composed of contiguous House districts. I think that's your point, Ms. Borromeo, but I wanted to be precise about the language in Section 6 of the constitution.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'm happy that you were precise and that you read it, because the word that stood out to me, again, was "contiguous," and that you said 21 and 9 are not contiguous.

MR. SINGER: They are not. They are not. And as I said earlier, I would not recommend that -- I'd have some significant reservations about that pairing.

And it would -- as the member of the public who was correct about the constitution suggested, it would require a change to the House district. And if the board were inclined to do that, it would need to explain why that was necessary and consistent with the remand order.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

And just to reiterate to -- again, as Budd had said, myself, this is not any kind of endorsement of this plan, not that I feel it's legal, not that I feel we should be changing any underlying House districts.

It's simply to allow the public, if they wish, to comment on something that we had asked the public to -- to provide for us.
So with that, Peter, if you could call the
roll, please.

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: As it's unconstitutional,
doesn't meet the criteria for contiguous districts,
no.

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you.

Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: For the same reasons, no.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Simpson?

MEMBER SIMPSON: No.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: By a vote of two to three,
the motion fails.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We have then before
us three maps. And I think that concludes all the
alternative pairings that were proposed, unless
there's anything else that's come in, Peter, or board
members that you see? Nicole?

MR. TORKELSON: I haven't had a chance to
check --
CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Peter. Sorry.

MR. TORKELSON: I have not had the chance to check the testimony file since the meeting commenced, you know, this morning.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I was just -- I was just going to ask that we take a brief at ease so Peter can check the files, because today is the day that we had previously decided was going to be the time certain for us to adopt final plans. So if we could have a 10- to 15-minute at ease while he does that, I think that would follow with what we previously decided.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And, Peter, how long will it take you to check that?

MR. TORKELSON: I have 28 public testimony submissions to go through, so it'll just take me probably less than five minutes.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Let's just stand by. We'll stay online. It's 12:28. We'll come back at 12:33 and be back on the record. We'll stand at ease.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, can I ask for a ten-minute break?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We'll come back --

MEMBER BAHNKE: I want to make sure that he has a chance and doesn't miss any.
CHAIR BINKLEY: We'll come back at 12:38.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

(At ease.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: The recording's in progress.

We're going to call the meeting back to order.

Peter, did you get a chance to check the website?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I reviewed all 28 public testimony submissions, which were received after 10 p.m. last night up until the present moment, and there are no additional plans submitted. There are, obviously, plenty of comments.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We'll look forward to those.

So I believe we have our three alternative pairings that are before the board.

Nicole, you've got a question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I don't have a question.

I have a statement, rather, that I would like to, as the maker of the motion regarding option No. 1, to withdraw option No. 1 from the board's consideration.

While I do believe that there was overwhelming public support for this option back in November, I recognize that times have changed and the
Supreme Court and the Superior Court have spoken. So while it may have been a more perfect option, options 2 and 3 are sufficient for the board to consider, and I'd like to withdraw the commonly referred to Bahnke pairings.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.
MEMBER BAHNKE: I'll second that motion.
CHAIR BINKLEY: I missed that. Was that a motion, Nicole?
MEMBER BORROMEO: It was a motion, and I believe Melanie seconded it.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So there's a motion before us and seconded to remove option 1. And then we would keep options 2 and 3B. Is that what it's proposed now, Peter, B, as in bravo?
MR. TORKELSON: That's correct, Mr. Chairman, 3 bravo.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Discussion on the motion?
MEMBER BAHNKE: I have discussion, Mr. Chair.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Melanie.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Sometimes it's hard to get that little icon to show up with my computer.
I appreciate the outpouring of public
support for option 1. Unfortunately, it was referred to as the Bahnke map because we didn't have time to deliberate it and give it a name back in November. Trying to remain within the scope of the Court's remand, though, and offer a more surgical amendment to District K without too much disruption, I do think that option 1 causes too many changes. Unfortunately, the map that we had to look at to make changes to, the cornerstone of that was keeping -- separating Eagle River to give it more representation. That's what the Courts found. So we're having to make improvements to a less-than-perfect map. I do still feel like back in November, had we made the right choice, that option 1 would have been the best choice for all Alaskans. But given the narrow scope of the remand, I am going to be voting in favor of withdrawing option 1. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Budd?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I would speak in support of withdrawing option 1. It had the inherent problem of requiring a change to every Senate district, and not having the more surgical or
minimalist approach that I would certainly prefer. So I think if we get down to the two remaining choices, there's plenty to talk about there and -- you know, but by the time we talk it through we could end up some other kind of hybrid or something, too. So I'm -- I speak in favor of withdrawing option 1.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie, is your hand back up?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I just wanted to thank the person who called in earlier who had very wise words to not let perfect be the enemy of good.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And I'm also supportive of the motion, as well. I appreciate you recognizing that, Nicole.

I think there are more surgical options. I think both option 2 and 3 bravo demonstrate that. So I appreciate you simplifying it, narrowing it down, and I think that'll expedite our debate on it, and also help form public opinion, as well. So thank you.

Any further discussion? Is there any objection to the motion? If there's no objection to the motion, the motion is adopted, and we now have before us two
plans, option 2 and option 3 bravo.

Okay. That takes care of item 6.

Board member comments. Why don't we do that before we look for a motion to adjourn?

Nicole, I see your hand up. I don't know if that's from before or not.

MEMBER BORROMEO: It's not.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Okay. If there's no comments -- oh, it's not. Sorry.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I have a comment. Thanks.

And, in fact, I want to piggyback on what you just observed, that withdrawing option 1 does streamline the process and enabled the board to move a lot quicker.

This week the board put on -- put a proposed correction on the table for Cantwell. We did that Monday. It sat out for public comment for more than enough time to elicit public comment, and we took action today.

So what I'd like to propose going forward is that since we have two options out, that they remain out for public comment Thursday and Friday, and that the board take action on these plans on Saturday.

There's no need, in my opinion, to continue to belabor the process into next week. We've got two
options. We've got two more days of public testimony to hear what the public has said, and this is in addition to what I think right now is about 6 inches of double-sided public testimony that I've printed out on this.

So I'd like the board to be prepared to move on a proposed correction to Senate District K on Saturday. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to propose that we continue with the meetings that we have publicly noticed.

As we know, Anchorage is still in the middle of an election. There are still returns coming in, and a lot of effort and work being put in by regular citizens and residents regarding the ballot counting and such. So I think it's important to honor the fact that there are people that are otherwise occupied and to give them more time to observe this process and understand it.

I've heard from some people asking how they could hear the recordings of these meetings, and that's something I -- Peter, a question I have to put out to Peter, to see if it's possible for people to
go back and hear these meetings, because there are folks who are interested in being able to go back and listen. I want them to have the time this week to be able to do that, absorb that information, put together their thoughts, present those perhaps on Friday or Saturday, or maybe even present that information next week, when we come back together on Wednesday and Thursday, as previously discussed.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Budd?

MEMBER SIMPSON: For one, I won't be ready to address this substantively by Saturday, so I think we should keep our current schedule in place.

If more people wish to testify, I see no conceivable downside to that. Anybody that doesn't want to be in a meeting, whatever, can always put it in on the Web site in written form, which is honestly more convenient for I think everybody to look at.

I note that we did expeditiously address the Cantwell situation. And, as I had expected, that was not controversial, and therefore easy to just deal with.

This -- this is a more complicated issue with a lot more moving parts, and I think we should take the allotted amount of time to think about it,
and then address it in due course. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And I would concur with that. I think we've got a good schedule laid out. It complies with giving a positive report on the 15th that Judge Matthews has requested. There's, obviously, far more interest by the public, given the voluminous amount, as Nicole had pointed out, of testimony we got, and regarding Senate District K and how we're going to make those changes to comply with the remand.

And Cantwell really wasn't that controversial. I think we had one comment from Tanner Amdur-Clark, and I think that was it regarding Cantwell. But there is a lot of interest and concern about this, and I think we ought to maximize the amount of opportunity the public has to weigh in. And now that we've narrowed it down to two, it's going to be more focused, I believe, the public comments. So I would agree that we should keep with our schedule.

Any further board comments? Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Remind me again why next week we can't meet Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday if need be? I just worry about pushing this right to
the last day for a final decision before the Court order is due.

And I'm not trying to rush this to the point where the public doesn't have a chance to weigh in. And I am trying to not wait until the very last minute to issue a new proclamation. We need time as a board to debate and discuss the plans and take in all that public testimony which has been, you know, voluminous, like everybody has commented on.

But we have meetings noticed for Thursday, Friday, Saturday, and I'm wondering if it's going to take -- if we're anticipating two days of debate and discussion and coming up with a final proclamation, why are Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday out?

CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't believe Wednesday is out. Wednesday we're planning on coming back and starting debate on this.

And we want to make certain that all five members can be present when we start to debate. We probably could take more public testimony on Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday, but all members can't be present at that time.

And just a reminder from Judge Matthews, he did not mandate that we have a decision by April 15th, Friday, just that we give him a status
update on where we're at with the process. I think it's our desire to get it wrapped up by then, but it's not a court order that we have this completed by Friday the 15th.

I believe most of the complication in terms of time is dealing with the drawing up the metes and bounds with the underlying change to the House districts that will affect District 29, 30, and 36, which now that we've adopted those, the demographer can start to work on writing up the metes and bounds, so we have plenty of time to get that accomplished.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. So one of the points of many that Judge Matthews was critical of the board last time around is that we didn't give the public opportunity to weigh in on what the board's proposed correction or, in that case, plan was.

That's why I think that we need to go ahead Saturday saying we are favoring as a board moving ahead with option 2 or option 3B, and then allowing them to react to what we're doing. Otherwise, we're going to get ourselves back into the same hot water that we did with the trial court last time around.

So I favor, again, starting the debate on this on Saturday, with the board signaling to the
1. public what our proposed correction is for Senate
2. District K.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Maybe it's just semantics.

4. I think once we make a final decision, that is, as it
5. implies, final. We listen to public testimony. We
6. make proposals, we listen to those proposals, we
7. debate those proposals.
8. At some point we make a final decision, and
9. that final decision then is the final. And I'm not
10. certain that we need to go back out to public
11. testimony on what our final proclamation is.
12. Any other comments on the scheduling?
13. MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. John, I want to
14. call your attention to page 50 of the trial court
15. order. Maybe between now and the next couple of
16. days, or before the next hearing, you can take a peek
17. at what it says. But the judge says that the board's
18. choice not to hold public hearings on Senate pairings
19. it actually proposed in the final House map and then
20. subsequent choice to effectively rush those proposals
21. to a majority vote frustrates the basic tenets of
22. Section 10.
23. I just am very conscience of what the trial
24. court has signaled that it has an appetite for the
25. board to do on remand and what it has signaled that
it has no more patience for. And it appears that
last-minute decisions without the opportunity for the
public to weigh in is one of those that is going to
get us in hot water.

We are in a race of arms now, as Peter told
me the legislature -- legislative aides call it,
where we're just amassing testimony on each side.
All -- I don't know. "All" is probably too strong of
a word. But the public has meaningfully weighed in.
There are thoughtful proposals here and reasons to
back them up.

I'm ready to start debating this on Saturday
and potentially make a decision on Sunday. There's
no reason to delay it.

Also, I'm going to assume that you didn't
hear me yesterday when we were talking about
schedule, but I'm in all-day meetings the 13th and
14th.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to point out that using the
process that Member Borromeo put forward would work
perfectly fine with the schedule that we have laid
out.

So if it's desire of the board on Wednesday
morning, after hearing public testimony today,
Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, the board could come
together next Wednesday and right away choose to vote
on a particular plan, as far as which to adopt, and
then take public testimony on that for the remainder
of the day, and then, I don't know, come back to
affirm -- I'm not sure what the legal process would
be or the meeting process.

But having meetings next Wednesday and
Thursday does not preclude us from following the
process that Member Borromeo put forward, so it
certainly could be accommodated, if that's the will
of the board. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Whatever we decide, I wanted
to make sure we've got time to debate and discuss and
not just go into a meeting on Wednesday, have a
motion to adopt a plan, and then we take public
testimony on it. I want adequate time to deliberate
and debate the maps as a board, not take action, then
invite public testimony for possible reconsideration.

I'm not opposed to taking public testimony
after we, you know, make a final vote, but I want
adequate time to debate and discuss the options
before we just take it to a vote. Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Just so I understand that, when you say take a final vote and then allow public testimony on that, are you suggesting that if we hear public testimony, that would then change the final vote if we hear something in public testimony that maybe they -- people don't appreciate or support the plan, that we then change the final vote again?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm not suggesting that we do that, because I don't know what is going to happen. I'm just asking that we have adequate time for debate and discussion before we take a vote.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I would certainly support that, that we have adequate time for discussion and debate.

But when we take a final vote, you know, the name implies, that's a final vote. And at some point we have to make a decision, and then that's the final proclamation. And we've taken -- you know, to get to that point we've had debate, we've had discussion, we've taken public testimony, we've articulated, each of us individually, why we're voting and how we're voting, and then that is the final plan that then goes back for the Court to take a look at. At least that's my assessment of it.

Budd, and then Melanie, and then Nicole.
MEMBER SIMPSON: I believe I agree with what Melanie just said, which is that we should have an -- we should choose one of the options, and then allow the public to weigh in on that further-narrowed choice before it becomes final.

And I think that implies that we keep an open mind, keep our ears open to that further public comment. Because I believe that's what the Court said that we kind of missed last time, because we kind of waited until the very end.

So I also agree with Bethany, that the timing that we have laid out now is sufficient for that. If something happened that we weren't finished and people were still commenting or whatever, you know, by the 15th, that wasn't a hard deadline by the Court. We've imposed that on ourselves, you know, if it's possible.

But I think the current schedule allows for what Melanie is suggesting, and that's what I would support maintaining.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: At a minimum I suggest we keep the portal for comments open even after we've adopted a proclamation, because we adopted one in
November that we thought was final. That ended up not being final. I recommend we keep that portal open until the deadline for possible litigation has passed.

Because had we kept that portal open and allowed for some public testimony after we adopted the proclamation, I think we would have had way more than the six reams that Nicole has right now. We need to give the public an option, the opportunity to comment on our supposed final plan.

And we might want to believe this is final, but we don't know who could possibly litigate. And I think had we kept that portal open and allowed for public comment, that might have even informed the courts further about what to issue on remand.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'd like to suggest a path forward, which is to add another meeting on Sunday, where the board begins to debate the options. And I'd like to again raise -- because I'm not seeing that you're appreciating that I'm in all-day meetings the 13th and 14th.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Are you able to attend on the 13th and 14th? Is that what you're saying, you cannot attend?
MEMBER BORROMEO: It's going to be very difficult to get out of an all-day meeting at a four-hour block, no.

And, you know, I see Budd's schedule is being taken into account, yours is being taken into account, Bethany's has been all along, and I'm not feeling like I'm being extended the same courtesy. And I've bent over backwards in this process to be at the public hearings, to make myself available.

And so I'm asking that we start this debate early, put our cards on the table as early as Sunday, saying what we're going to do, to signal to the public.

So we can keep those days open, I guess, Wednesday and Thursday, to hear more public comment, and then I will have to excuse myself from this meeting to vote apparently.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, that's -- to me, that's not acceptable. We all five have to be here when we make the decision, and we have to fully participate in the debates.

And if you're not able to be at the meetings on Wednesday and Thursday, I would suggest that we find a time that everybody can be together for two days straight. And if, indeed, that pushes it back,
we send notice to the Court, lay out what we've done, how earnest we've worked on this, the fact that we have five different very busy lives, and the first time we could come together to debate -- fully debate, discuss, and make decisions on the plan might be beyond the April 15th status report that he wants, is a possibility.

Let's see. Bethany is next.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you,

Mr. Chairman.

I'm not sure what dates the all-day meetings -- I'm sorry -- what times the all-day meetings start and finish, Nicole, but perhaps we could consider starting after those meetings, whether that's 5 p.m., and maybe do this 5 until 9 or 10 in the evening. That's actually a time that's usually better for regular citizens and residents to participate.

But if we can find some way to work around the times of Member Borromeo's all-day meetings, I'm certainly open to that and would be happy to accommodate that. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Bethany, for that accommodation. And let's proceed with that
I'll go ahead and push for the agendas and see what my schedule is next week. Let's not cancel the 13th and 14th, and let's please give the judge what we consider to be our best and final new plan by the 15th.

I'm not interested in delaying this any further past the 15th. I haven't heard that anyone else is here, as well. So thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Great. We appreciate that, Nicole. Thank you.

Okay. Anything further to come before the board? If not, we'd look for a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER BAHNKE: So moved.

MEMBER SIMPSON: So moved.

CHAIR BINKLEY: One of you take the motion and one take the second, between Melanie and Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Melanie moved, Budd seconded.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, we are adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)
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CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's go ahead and begin the meeting or open up the meeting of the Alaska Redistricting Board on April 7th, 12:00 noon, and I would ask our executive director to call the roll and establish the quorum.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Good morning. Thank you.

Member Bahnke.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Member Borromeo.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Member Marcum.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Member Simpson.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Member Binkley.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Here.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Present and accounted for.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Peter, if you could put on the screen the draft agenda for today's meeting, the purpose of which is to take public testimony. And the first item is to adopt the agenda, and you can see it on our screens there, take public testimony, and that's it for the day.

And I'll move the motion to adopt the agenda as presented.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So moved. Member Marcum.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'll second.

Member Bahnke.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: The motion moved and seconded before us to adopt the agenda as presented. Is there a discussion on the motion? Is there objection to the motion? It's adopted, and we will start down the agenda.

The first item is public testimony. I do have some off-net folks that are on the phone line looking to testify. The first person to testify is Ann Rappoport.

Good afternoon, Ann. Can you hear us okay?

MS. RAPPOPORT: Yes, I can. Should I begin?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yes. Please begin.

MS. RAPPOPORT: Okay. Thank you.
My name is Ann Rappoport, and I thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the Rabbit Creek Community Council, which I co-chair. I had every intention of being there, but my husband tested positive for COVID last night.

The Rabbit Creek Community Council is one of Anchorage's 38 community councils that provides the direct means for citizens to participate in government and local affairs. We represent residents and landowners in Southeast Anchorage along the Hillside, and I'm here to state our strong opposition to any Senate redistricting that would combine our area, as well as any Hillside areas, with Eagle River for the purposes of government representation.

I submitted more extensive recent comments. These are the ones we submitted in February where the Anchorage Assembly needed to redraw assembly member districts, and the same requirements hold -- held for the Assembly as they do for you, for the State, the same legal requirements, and those show that Anchorage's Hillside and Eagle River are not contiguous -- one of your requirements -- nor are they compact; they aren't a relatively integrated socioeconomic area; and they're -- they're separated by a huge uninhabited area, Chugach State Park.
And, additionally, the constitution asks you
to consider local government boundaries. So if you
look at what the Assembly came up with, the Hillside
areas were kept together, and it was also -- we want
to also speak to -- we're not just being NIMBYs -- you
need to keep the East Anchorage neighborhoods together
with East Anchorage and other neighborhoods together.

So we would urge you to adopt the
redistricting map that keeps neighborhoods together,
and this can be accomplished with either Proposed Map
Option 2, or if you go back to the original map
proposed by Redistricting Board Member Melanie Bahnke,
that can also happen.

But on the Hillside, we have issues of onsite
water and septic system, wildfires, Limited Road
Service Areas. Our kids go to school totally
different from Eagle River. We're traveling totally
different roads to go do shopping and to go to
downtown. So there's -- we have our own local road
service areas. There's just no rhyme or reason for
combining the Hillside areas with Eagle River.

And we did have the 2010 Hillside District
Plan that defines the boundaries of the Hillside.
There was a lot of thought, effort, and a big public
process involved in that. So that's -- that's also
one of the reasons you just need to keep our areas
with our own neighborhoods here, and I hope you will
go to those -- that -- that ruling in your final
efforts.

So thank you very much for this opportunity.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Ann.
Nicole, you've got your hand up.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you very
much, Ann. I appreciate you calling in.

One of the justifications that the Board
repeatedly hears for combining District 22 in
Eagle River with your District 9 in Hillside is that
you're connected through the Chugach Mountains. I'm
looking at the map here, though, and I don't see any
direct roads. Is there a road there that you know
about that would connect --

MS. RAPPOPORT: No.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- to your
District 9?

MS. RAPPOPORT: No. And thank you for calling
that out. I did mention that, but there is absolutely
no road, and you would have to travel through several
other districts to get from Eagle River to the Hillside
area. And the Chugach State Park is a state park. It's
one of the largest in the nation. It's, like,
500,000 acres. It's uninhabited. And there may be some
trails through it, but there's lots of areas where
people can't even traverse it. So walking for three
days to get from Eagle River to Hillside's area on
trails is not a way to be connected for our
representation.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Ann.
I also see here that it would require you
crossing seven other districts to get to 22 from 9.
Is that the most contiguous pairing as practicable, in
your view?

MS. RAPPOPORT: No, that is not, and that's
why we're very much opposed to this. Yeah, you need
to X out that whole Chugach State Park area when
you're trying to look at contiguous and compact. It's
certainly not very compact either. I mean, from my
house to Eagle River, it's probably at least
25 minutes.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Final question
for you, Ann: I understand that the major hiking trail
from Girdwood to Eagle River is the Crow Creek Pass
Trail (as spoken), which isn't even navigable half of
the year when it's snowing, and we have freezing
temperatures up here. That's a 21-mile trail from
Eagle River to Girdwood that also crosses a dangerous,
for I think what most Alaskans would consider, waterway.

Do you know a lot of your friends and neighbors that are regularly traveling the Crow Creek Pass Trail from Hillside to Eagle River, 21 miles on foot?

MS. RAPPOPORT: No. Nobody. People do that, and I have done it as a three-day backpack trip. It is an extensive trip, and you need to make preparations, and you probably can't even start it until June. There's a glacier. There's major snowpacks, and Eagle River is treacherous and people have died in it, crossing that, if you cross when the water is too high or too swift. And I'm sure by probably late September you wouldn't want to be doing it either because it's going to be getting -- yeah, things will start freezing. It's -- it's up at elevation. You have to go over a pass that's over 3,000 feet. Most people are not able-bodied enough to do that -- that walk.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Well, thank you very much for your testimony today, and congratulations on completing the trail in three days.

MS. RAPPOPORT: When I was a lot younger, I have to say. Thank you for your questions and time.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.
Other questions for Ann?

I might just note, Ann, and we respect the community council and -- and their combined decision and weighing of this and appreciate the testimony. Just, you know, there's a little difference between the Assembly's task when they redistrict as opposed to the State's task that we're tasked with in redistricting. So there's not always the same parameters that we're probably looking at when the Assembly does it versus the State. And it really -- for our purposes, Anchorage itself, the municipality is really considered one area, all of the municipality, like other large communities, the Borough and Fairbanks, for example, the same way. And so it really -- you know, it doesn't always matter that you have to drive through other districts to get to the same Senate district as long as they are physically touching the borders of those. That's how they really look at continuity.

And even the Board, in some of our deliberations and some of the pairings we've made, the Senate pairings, for example, Valdez with the Mat-Su, you can't drive from Valdez to the Mat-Su without driving through another legislative district. But the courts have really held that that's fine, that that's
a workable plan, and it can make sense in that regard.

So, again, we appreciate your testimony and --

and where the community council is coming from on

this, but there's probably a little different

perspective that we're looking at in trying to pull

together this -- this statewide plan and then getting

the 16 underlying House districts into 8 Senate

districts.

MS. RAPPOPORT: Thanks. Can I say one more

quick thing?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Please.

MS. RAPPOPORT: Thanks.

I certainly understand the State, in that so

much of our state is without roads, that we're going

to have some connections of communities that are --
you can't drive to. But in the case where you do have

that opportunity, it just makes so much sense to go

with the contiguous and compact, because -- if you can

do that, because we have these roads in Southcentral

Alaska. So I would hope you would give consideration

to that. And, really, there were the exact same

requirements in the constitution and in the Assembly

rules for being compact, contiguous, and relatively

integrated socioeconomically.

So thank you, again, for this opportunity.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: You bet. And thank you, and I hope your husband is okay and -- and deals with COVID in an expeditious manner.

MS. RAPPOPORT: Thank you so much. He will.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Next is Cindy Sanders -- or Saunders.

Cindy, good afternoon.

MS. SAUNDERS: Hi. Hi, this is Cindy Saunders, and I'm a long-time resident, since 1977. I really pretty much totally agree with what Ann said, and I'm not going to waste your time giving you my exact -- excuse me -- my exact words because she actually explained it perfectly, and that's basically what I was going to say.

And, also, I'd like to say that the only thing that even comes close to something that I feel would work would be -- I think it was called 3B. I have a ton of notes here, but I think it's -- 3B is the one, if we had to choose right now.

I also had a question. When you guys were doing this before and I was on a -- I guess it was a Zoom call but you couldn't see or talk to me, you guys were eating lunch and doing all kinds of stuff, and I could never figure out why you were saying, "It looks more like a beautiful picture" this way or that way,
or, you know, like it was a piece of artwork, instead
of, "These are our boundaries for boating, our
boundaries for whatever," you know, fire department,
police, all that. And I didn't understand why it
should look beautiful. I didn't understand that.
Maybe that would be one thing you could just explain
to me.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I don't know that
particular -- thank you, Cindy. I don't know the
particular instance that you're talking about, but, you
know, when you talk about compactness, it -- it
really -- sometimes it's the shape that can determine
compactness. The most compact is a circle, and then,
you know, coming out to a square or maybe a rectangle.

But sometimes when you get really odd-shaped
districts -- and we're talking about House districts
now, the 40 House districts around the state -- they can
look odd. And maybe we were equating that, looking odd,
where they might not be considered compact, as not being
as, quote, "beautiful" as something that is relatively
compact and tight that is -- just is -- is pleas- --
more pleasing to the eye in that regard.

MS. SAUNDERS: Okay. I still don't understand
that, but it's -- I guess my -- my opinion is I can't
probably change that. I just thought I'd bring it to
your attention that someone has been watching those,
even if you guys didn't talk to me or anything. I think
it was, I -- I don't know, last year sometime, I
believe.

Anyway, and then I would just like to say that
I appreciated Ann's call, and I thought she explained
everything really well, and I am in that -- I guess
I'm considered in that area. I'm on O'Malley above
Birch and below -- just close to Birch is the only
thing I can say right now. Close to the zoo, I guess,
in between there and Birch, so I'm not way up high.

But I -- I really think 3B. If I had to vote
today on it, that's the only one I see. And I -- I
really do not think it makes sense to have Eagle River
and Anchorage together. It just -- I don't understand
how that would even be a good idea.

And I appreciate you letting me talk and share
my opinion. And this is going for my -- my whole
family. I have two sons and daughters-in-law, and we
have in-laws here as well. So everyone pretty much
agrees with me, but they're not on the call. But I do
have a family of Saunders, including my husband,
that's either working or taking care of children
today.

So I don't know if that would help it -- give
me a little more feasibility of why I called, but I
thought that would be a great thing, because we have,
right now, nine grandchildren that are very young, and
they're going to be growing up here. As far as we can
tell, nobody is moving.
So I just wanted to throw that in, just to do
that, because I'm a grandma and I can say that now.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Congratulations, Cindy.
And we do have a couple of questions from Member
Bahnke and Member Borromeo.
BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you for
calling in, Cindy.
Peter, are you able to put up the two maps
that we have decided will be what we're considering
for public testimony? Because I think there's some
confusion.
It sounds like, Ms. Saunders, you're in favor
of keeping Eagle River intact and not trying to
combine it with Hillside for a Senate seat, and that
actually would be (indiscernible) that does that. The
other option, 3B, pairs Hillside with Eagle River.
So I want to clarify. Are you testifying in
support of not combining Eagle River with Hillside?
Cindy, are you there?
Did we lose her, Peter?
Can anyone hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: We can hear you --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: I can hear --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- Melanie.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- I hear -- I hear you, yeah. I'm not sure if Peter can.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I don't even see Peter.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: He's on the 465 number.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. He said that LIO is calling back in. The line to Juneau dropped.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Ah.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Well, I -- I got the gist of her testimony, but she sounded a little confused on which map she was testifying in support of.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: We probably heard different things, Melanie.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Well, I heard her say she supported the person who testified before.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Which that person was in favor of Option 2.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Right. Exactly.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: So I think the
numbering might have been -- and that's why we should probably get the maps up with the labels, if possible.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: If there are people who are calling in on the line -- on the phone line that don't have access to the Zoom, necessarily, so we want to clarify if they can -- if they're actually on the Zoom, because they'd have to be on both in order to be able to see the maps.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: That's a good point. Yeah, if they're on the net, unless they're watching and --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: And listening, both.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- and listening --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah, on both.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Right.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: It would be good to get it out there to as many people as we can. I don't know if it's --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- possible to get it out there on both.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Sure. Sure.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: For now, we're still
waiting to get connected to Juneau so that people on the
phone, on the net, so to speak -- or "off-net," they
call it -- can hear. So we should probably just stand
by until we get the technical difficulties worked
through.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: He's working on it
now, he says.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Nicole's saying
she can't hear us.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: That's because
she's on the off-net, I think, isn't she?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Isn't she on
the -- yeah.

So, yeah, he says he's working on it. Peter
texted.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'm going to be
going to the meetings in person on Wednesday and
Thursday. There's too many technical issues that we've
been having.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: There's been a
lot, for sure. We missed the owl (as spoken).

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I -- I was
surprised about your Internet connection, Bethany, being
in Anchorage.
BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: I'm not in Anchorage. I'm out of state. I'm not allowed to fly right now.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Oh, okay.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah. I had medical problems, and I was supposed to fly back with my husband last week, but I'm stuck here and not allowed to fly.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Oh, well, I hope you recover quickly.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Trust me, I do too.

(Background noise.)

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Is that (indiscernible)'s testimony? That needs to be transcribed.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: "Loud dog barking," it'll say on the transcript.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Everybody --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Wow.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- and their dog has an opinion; right?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: That was a good one.

(Pause.)
BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I wonder who Nicole is talking to.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Earlier I didn't see anybody else in the room, but maybe the LIO staff or Peter.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Does it -- oh, it shows Yarrow Silvers is in the -- has signed up in person in the LIO.

(Pause.)

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Peter, can you hear me? This is Denaya (phonetic).

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: We can hear you. We can hear you, Denaya --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. Okay. Just a --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- but -- but we can't hear Peter.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- moment. I'm going to -- oh, oh, okay. Well, when I can hear Peter -- Peter, I will transfer him back into the teleconference --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Okay. I'll --

I'll text him --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- but I want to hear him --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- and let him
know that you're on the line now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- first.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Okay. I'll --

I'll text him and let him know that you're --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- on the line,

Denaya. Sure.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

(Pause.)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah, we've --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: We hear you --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- got you, Peter.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- Peter.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Okay. The call has been reestablished. Let's hope that the call does not drop in the future.

I'm here with --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I'm sorry.

(Indiscernible)?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Cindy.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Cindy.

Cindy is still on the phone with us, having
been very patient.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Cindy Saunders from District 9.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Cindy Saunders?

MS. SAUNDERS: Yes.


MS. SAUNDERS: Okay. I'm not sure how much you heard, but --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: We -- we heard all of your testimony.

Cindy, just -- just to give you an idea of where you dropped off, we heard all of your testimony, and then we had a couple of questions from members, Member Melanie Bahnke first, and then Member Nicole Borromeo had her hand up as well.

So are you willing to answer some questions?

MS. SAUNDERS: Yes. But I have one more thing to say that I didn't realize. I didn't realize the one that I thought was the one -- the number I wanted was 3B, but there's no -- 3B is not the way I wanted -- it's 2.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: It's 2. Gotcha.

MS. SAUNDERS: That changes it. But I'll -- so I -- I think that that's -- that would work. But the
other -- you know, joining Eagle River to Anchorage just
doesn't work for me either. A long-time resident, and
like I said, lots of family here.
So I'll talk -- I'll stop talking, and then
let me know what you'd like me to do next.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Well, you've answered
some of the questions.

Melanie?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah.

Thank you, Cindy. That's -- that was going to
be my question, was clarifying that. And I apologize
that we don't have the maps up on the Zoom or visible
right now to the public. Hopefully we can get that up
somehow for members of the public to look at the maps
that they're commenting on.

But I wanted to clarify that you want -- you
don't want Hillside joined with Eagle River, which
is -- would be the Option 2?

MS. SAUNDERS: Yes. And that's what I'd like.
And I -- I'm not on Zoom or anything, so I can
only hear you. I can't see you.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Okay.

MS. SAUNDERS: I do want you to know I watched a
lot of them in the past, but this one I just called in.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: And then just for
the public, if you're not watching on Zoom, if you do
have access to the Internet, the maps are up. The two
options to consider are up on the Alaska Redistricting
Board website. So I encourage you to take a look --

MS. SAUNDERS: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- at those.

Thank you for calling in and testifying,
Cindy.

MS. SAUNDERS: Okay. Thank you so much for
your patience, and I hope everything goes well and
everything turns out just right.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Great. Thank you
very much --

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I think Nicole --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- again, Cindy.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- had a question.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Nicole, you still have
your hand up?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I still do
have a question.

Thank you very much, Cindy. I -- I want you
to rest assured that I'm not making Senate pairings
based on any beautiful groupings, but rather guided by
Article VI, Section 6, which states that: Senate
districts shall be composed as near as practicable to
two contiguous House districts.

When you have to drive through seven other House districts to get to Eagle River, is that the most contiguous pairing as practicable, in your mind?

MS. SAUNDERS: (Indiscernible) really.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Any further questions?

Thanks again, Cindy.

The next person in the queue, Suzanne Fischetti (as spoken). Suzanne, are you still on?

MS. FISCHETTI: Yes, I am. Thank you.


MS. FISCHETTI: All right. Thank you so much for listening again, and I hope you guys can make a decision soon, because as we can see, as it goes further, there's more confusion. It's not getting any better for anybody to try to figure this out.

But I do support a Chugach Mountain district as laid out in Map 3B. When you look at the map, it's clear that the rest of Anchorage is cut into little blocks, but Districts 22 and 9 are the two large districts with thousands of acres of parks and mountains. There are none others like these.
The Upper Hillside of Anchorage has been combined with Eagle River Valley in the past, both as a House and a Senate pairing. That's because there are legitimate, logical reasons to do so. That is just as true today as it was in the past, maybe even more so because parts of Anchorage have become even more urbanized. Those in the outer areas, like Eagle River Valley and Hillside, have chosen for -- a more suburban experience, surrounded by mountains and wildlife instead of the city life. That's why bringing together Districts 22 and 9 makes sense, and I urge you to choose Map 3 which does this.

I've also recently looked at the maps online, and I can see all of Anchorage, from Girdwood to the Knik River, and the big districts are 9, 22, 23, and 24. It's obvious that these are the four districts that share the most area of topography, and thus, they should be paired together due to related needs.

Maps that carve away portions of the military base from its primary district would also be a mistake. JBER belongs with JBER. That means Districts 23 and 24 belong together, as shown in the map called 3B. That's the one to support if you care about our military. You've already broken up JBER into separate House districts. We owe it to the
military to put the base back together by pairing Districts 23 and 24, which makes the base whole again. And I do agree that there's a lot of confusion, because the Anchorage Assembly district -- redistricting got a lot of people testifying, you know, keep their Assembly district separate, which made sense. And now they're struggling, because now they're trying to come back and say, "Well, now we have to change because we see this as a different scenario. It is not the same as the Assembly districts," and that's where you're going to see a lot of people that right now are even afraid to testify because of this situation. And, unfortunately, I think the last speaker was one of those people that -- separated the two.

Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Suzanne.

Nicole, it looks like you've got a question.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Susan, for continuing to call in. I understand that you were involved in the municipality's redistricting, and thank you for your efforts there as well.

What do you say to Rabbit Creek Community Council's resolution that, quote, "Travel from Hillside to Eagle River requires traversing several
intervening districts. It is inappropriate to use the large, steep, uninhabited, and in some areas or in some people's -- inaccessible -- Chugach State Park as justification to combine Eagle River and Hillside into one district"?

MS. FISCHETTI: I'd say there are roads that connect us, we drive them every day, and that should not be an issue. We have a big state, and these two districts are mostly mountains and parks, and you can't drive through them. So in order to get there, yeah, we have to, you know, drive for 20 minutes. And it's been done before, and it was constitutional then, and it worked.

And a lot of these people that formulated their Assembly redistricting testimony, or, you know, that was reasons that they gave, but it may not really be the best reason for this situation.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: But to be fair, you also gave the same testimony that they did in the municipal's redistricting.

One follow-up question --

MS. FISCHETTI: (Indiscernible) --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- have you ever hiked Crow Creek Pass?

MS. FISCHETTI: -- said that's why --
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Maybe if she could respond to your comment, Nicole.

Go ahead, Suzanne.

MS. FISCHETTI: I said that's -- I agree, and I clarified that the other day, and that's why I have to keep calling in because people are confused, and they're afraid at this point because they don't really understand what's going on. And I'm just trying to clarify that at this point, you know, it's a different scenario. It's a totally different situation.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole, you had a follow-up?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I do. One final question.

Susan, have you ever hiked Crow Creek Pass Trail?

MS. FISCHETTI: I have walked back there, but not the whole thing. But I've been at the end of the trail when they come through every year for the race. My kids have done it. My neighbors have done it. And I don't think that really has anything to do with what we're talking about.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I would disagree, just in the sense that that's the quickest way to access your proposed pairing, would be that trail. So --
MS. FISCHETTI: No.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- I -- I do respectfully disagree.

But thank you for your time today. Please continue to call in and point out inconsistencies. We do want --

MS. FISCHETTI: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- the public to understand what we're doing here today.

MS. FISCHETTI: The thing that I will say: I live here, and so I've lived here for 40 years, and I drive the roads every day.

So, you know, it's the year 2022, and we can get there without any problem at all. And we have more in common than most people would understand, unless they were actually physically here to see it.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Suzanne.

Melanie?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Not so much a question, just a statement.

Suzanne (as spoken), I -- I heard you twice say that people are afraid to call in, and I hope that the public doesn't feel afraid to call in. This is a public process. We have an obligation to take testimony from the public and ask clarifying questions.
so that we ensure that what they're intending to say is heard. Just like the previous testifier, I had to ask her some questions to make sure I clearly understood her intent.

So I can't speak on behalf of the whole board, but I certainly welcome public involvement and public testimony in this process, and I -- I hope people don't feel afraid to call in.

Thank you.

MS. FISCHETTI: Unfortunately, after what just happened with the last caller, probably more people will be afraid because they just aren't understanding what's going on because they haven't been watching for the past week.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'm not understanding how the last caller's experience would create fear. I asked the question to clarify which map she was supporting because she stated that she was not in favor of pairing Hillside with Eagle River but that she was in favor of Option 3B, which does just that.

So I do feel like it's my obligation as a board member, and I wasn't intending to intimidate her. And, again, I want the public to feel comfortable calling in. And I -- I'm sure our chairman does too, and other board members as well,
but I can't speak on behalf of the Board.

MS. FISCHETTI: Yeah, I'm -- I'm sure she's very confused, and, unfortunately, it didn't come out the way that she intended, I don't think.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you again, Suzanne.

I think next on the list is Leon Jaimes.

MR. JAIMES: Hello. Thank you for allowing me to testify again today. My name is Leon Jaimes. Thank you for pronouncing it correctly as well.

And I'm -- I'm testifying on behalf of myself, and I just wanted to -- to start out with saying that I am not confused, and I haven't confused the Senate pairings with the municipal redistricting at all.

I think that the Court has asked for this to be a correction to the Senate District K pairings, and the Option 2 Map accomplishes that, and it also keeps communities of interest, like Eagle River and the South Anchorage community of interest. It keeps those two distinct communities together. As well as the Muldoon community, it keeps that together.

And I'm not a long-time resident. I've only been up here, you know, maybe ten years into my (indiscernible) visit. And so, you know, I don't have the 40 years of experience, but I know that when I
moved up here, I was researching neighborhoods to live in, and, you know, there was many responses that talked about Eagle River specifically as a community to live in, and I don't recall seeing any responses where they said, you know, that Eagle River is similar to South Anchorage or that those are the same community or that you can go across the street from the zoo to, you know, the nature center or something like that. And then they -- they talked about Muldoon and East Anchorage as a community, and that -- that was back in 2012.

And then, you know, I still follow some of those same online forums where people that are thinking about moving up here ask those same questions, and the responses are still the same, and they talk about the -- you know, kind of the -- the ideological slant of Eagle River versus other parts of town versus Midtown. And so I think those are -- are distinct communities of interest.

And then when I was listening to testimony today and yesterday, there was talk about the -- you know, traveling through the Chugach Mountains, which I would also argue extend down into Midtown. And so I don't think it, like, you know, stops at -- at Debarr or anything like that. It -- it continues downwards.
But -- but the hiking trails are -- are very, you know, I think, advanced in some places. And I hunted the Ship Creek Valley two years ago, or maybe it was three years ago, and even though it's relatively close to the highway, once you're down in that valley and off the road, you are very much relying on your -- yourself and, you know, the equipment that you brought with you, and in some of those places the satellite tracker didn't pick up a satellite down there.

So, you know, I think -- and -- and I've heard a lot of talk about the Crow -- the Crow Creek Trail Pass, and the Arctic to Indian -- Indian Trail, but before you even get to that you have to go through the -- the Ship Creek Valley. And I -- I think it was -- there was a gentleman a few years back, that he, unfortunately, passed away trying to make that hike up and out Ship Creek Valley coming from the -- the south side of the range.

And so I -- I don't think that that -- you know, just because there's a geographic connection between those two districts makes them contiguous or a community of interest at all, and especially when -- and Eagle River, with the Option 2 Map, you can, you know, pretty much walk across the street and be in the
other House district, and same thing with Muldoon.

And so I think the Option 2 Map accomplishes what the Court asked the Board to get done, and it does so quickly, and it does so without separating communities of interest.

And so thank you very much for letting me testify.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Leon.

Questions for Leon? Melanie, please.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: This is not a question for Leon. I don't know if it's -- maybe it was Budd. When you're shuffling some papers around, your mic is picking up on it really well. I'm not sure if it was you. It could have been any one of us that are not muted. But just so you're aware, it got really loud there for a while. I was still able to hear what Leon said, though.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

The next person is in the office there, Yarrow Silvers.

(Pause.)

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Just so you know, she hears you. She's making her way up.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

(Pause.)
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: John, there's somebody else in the queue online that you can move to if -- if you'd like, and Yarrow said she'd like that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: You're not ready yet, Yarrow?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: She'd like to go after the person online, she said.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Judy Eledge is online. And we've got somebody there in the room that would desire to go after you, Judy. Are you ready to testify at this point?

MS. ELEDGE: Yes, I am.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Good afternoon.

Welcome back.

MS. ELEDGE: Good afternoon. My name is -- hi, how are you today? I hope you're all having a beautiful day. I'm Judy Eledge, and I'm calling to testify in favor of the Map 3B, and I want to list some of my reasons. I've done (indiscernible) research, and I -- the Supreme Court asked the Board to revise Senate District K, and I think this map does so.

The 3B map makes the obvious logical pairing -- pairing of the two more rural and sparsely populated areas that both are 9 and 22. I did testify yesterday that I had lived in both of those areas, and so they are
very similar, and we have been represented together before. I -- I just see that District 22 is the best match for District 9, and they share a very long common boundary, and they're very contiguous -- contiguous districts.

I also believe that they have similar road service, snow removal, and they have that in common, and they were joined in a House district in 2001, and mostly higher-price, single-family homes make up those communities.

And I just -- I choose -- I don't like Option 2, because I believe the military voters should be paired with -- should not be -- should be paired with Downtown Anchorage -- do not believe that they should be paired with Downtown Anchorage. I think it would seriously diminish their representation.

And so, once again, I'm calling in favor of Map 3B, just because I think that they share a lot of the common -- same commonalities, and I have lived in both of those districts, and I would have no -- even though it may not be my perfect choice, it most certainly would be the most logical one if I was still living there.

Thank you so much for letting me testify.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Judy.
Nicole Borromeo has a question for you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

Before I --

MS. ELEDGE: (Indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Before I ask my

question, Judy, can you clarify something I -- I think I

heard you say. Did you say "don't pair military voters

with -- with" --

MS. ELEDGE: (Indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- "Downtown"?

MS. ELEDGE: Yes. Yes. I just feel like,

that -- that most of the military that are -- live in --

they don't live downtown. Most of them live out towards

Eagle River and Chugiak. So I don't -- do not believe

that the military voters should be paired with Downtown

Anchorage.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Thanks for

that clarification.

My question --

MS. ELEDGE: You bet. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- for you -- my

question for you, Judy, is -- is simple. The

constitution instructs us. We don't have any

discretion. It's a "shall" versus "may" in putting

pairings together that they should be contiguous as
practicable.

Can you explain how Districts 22 and 29 (as spoken), in your mind, are as contiguous as practicable for the record?

MS. ELEDGE: Say that again. I'm sorry. Did I say -- it's 9 and 22 -- did I say 22 by mistake?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You think 22 --

MS. ELEDGE: I -- I --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- is a mistake?

MS. ELEDGE: I'm sorry. I think that I -- I'm sorry. I just came from a very long training, and I'm -- I'm -- I'm testifying on 3B.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Yes.

MS. ELEDGE: Map 3B.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Yes. And -- and so 3B --

MS. ELEDGE: So I believe that 9 and 22 makes the most sense -- I'm sorry. If I said 22, I misspoke.

9 and 22, I -- you said -- you're asking about 24 or 23? I'm sorry.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: No. I didn't say 23 or 24. I'm talking about 22 and 29 (as spoken).

The constitution says that we shall pair Senate districts as most contiguous as practicable.

So I'm trying to help understand the argument that 22
and 20 -- and 9 should be paired, because when I look
at them, how you travel is through seven other
districts, and in my mind that's not the most
contiguous as practicable.

So how -- how do you find them --

MS. ELEDGE: Well, I --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- to be the most
contiguous --

MS. ELEDGE: Well --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- as
practicable?

MS. ELEDGE: -- I lived in those areas when they
were paired together. So it worked great. They are --
they may not have a road to them, it may be a longer way
to have a road to them, but I'm looking at other things,
in just contiguous -- they are contiguous if you want to
go -- you know, if you want to go across to Hillside,
there may not be a road -- well, it is kind of a road,
but not as closely -- so I'm looking at other things on
what they have in common and the fact that they have
been paired in the past. I know that when Con Bunde was
elected, when Cathy Giessel was elected, they were
paired that way.

And so the other -- other redistricting people
in the past have seen that it was not any problem at
all, so I would assume there wouldn't be any problem
at all now. I think it's more important to maybe have
communities together and -- and what they -- you know,
like, if the military people are living in Eagle
River, that is their community even though they --
they're from maybe JBER and they work there, maybe
even live there.

So I just think there's a lot of commonality
between those two districts. It may not be the most
contiguous, but it most certainly puts like-minded
communities together. And I think of all the
testimony I've heard, whether it be for the -- all the
other maps that I've heard, that was a number one
thing that people wanted: They wanted the -- the
communities linked together because of their
commonalities.

So that was my reasoning.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Further
questions?

Thank you, Judy.

We'll now go back. Is Yarrow ready there in
the office, Nicole?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: She's
approaching.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Good afternoon,
Yarrow. Welcome back.

MS. SILVERS: Hi. Thank you.

I want to start off today -- first of all, my name is Yarrow Silvers. I want to start off today by thanking the Board for your responsiveness in proposing maps that reunite Muldoon. I would also like to thank the Board for outlining a clear process with set dates, deadlines, and expectations. Now let's talk about the rest of the maps.

I just want to say that if I was a board member, I would proceed with extreme caution to avoid the appearance or action of replacing what was found to be one unconstitutional gerrymander with another.

The Court makes one thing very clear: Senate District K was unconstitutional because it split Eagle River into two separate Senate districts for the purpose of increasing majority party representation and at the expense of East Anchorage voters. If Plan 3B is adopted, the Board will, once again, split Eagle River into two separate Senate districts for the purpose of increasing majority party representation at the expense of voters outside Eagle River.

The Board's refusal to correct the gerrymander and its willingness to jeopardize everything to hold on to this gerrymander would not only be irrational;
it blatantly and directly violates the court order. Plan 3B does not correct the gerrymander. It only swaps out the voters who will be muffled. It also continues to tear Eagle River in two, despite consistent testimony from many in Eagle River who put their Eagle River community above their party and have asked that Eagle River remain united.

I would be cautious about adopting pairings that were introduced by an individual who not only chaired the Republican Party and uses political data to map, but also sent this board a chart that shows how the political data relates to proposed pairings, who the incumbents are, and even a column that appeared to indicate whether certain incumbents were electable or not; a chart which was referenced by at least two board members during the process and who (indiscernible) suggested Eagle River pairings were found to be unconstitutional.

I believe that the most simple fix is the best: Keep Eagle River with Eagle River and Muldoon with Muldoon. Do not undo Senate and House districts the Board already adopted, unless necessary to keep Muldoon as one and Eagle River as one.

Please reject politically motivated pairings that circle all around the map, pairings that continue
splitting the park communities and that continue to
give Eagle River more representation at the expense of
other communities of interest, and please stop
utilizing contiguity of a type that has been described
by the Supreme Court Justice as "second-rate
contiguity" and what has been described by
Budd Simpson as "basically attrition." I will give
you the full quotes here for context.

Located in the February 3, 2022, trial
transcript -- transcript is the following statement by
Budd Simpson: "And so I could not ever describe 33 as
compact. It's barely contiguous, and by 'barely' I
mean the part that connects the northern part of that
to the southern part basically has almost no people in
it. So it's just -- it's basically attrition in my
mind."

Also, in the Friday, 3/18 video at 11:23 is
the following conversation between Supreme Court
Justice Matthews and Matthew Singer. Supreme Court
Justice Matthews says: "I do like your concept of
false contiguity when you said, for example, linking
Girdwood with Downtown Anchorage would be contiguous,
meaning if you went out into the saltwater that would
be false contiguity. Doesn't that imply there would
be a natural scheme of things? When you look at a map
and when you use links that are unpopulated wilderness, use saltwater, that really is second-rate, in a way."

And Matthew Singer responded with: "That really was the Board's perspective, that is second-rate."

So I would think that if this board wanted to continue this trend of splitting apart communities and giving Eagle River more representation than they have the population for, that they would need to have a pretty good justification for why doing this was necessary. But I have read the testimony and listened to the testimony and the board members, and I have not heard any rational justification for doing this, much less good justification.

I've heard Bethany Marcum state concerns to the section of JBER (indiscernible) Eagle River, so they need to be paired so that all of JBER is represented together. I would like to assure Ms. Marcum that having looked at a map of this section, this area is a swath of trees with no infrastructure and likely no-to-few people living in it. Having this consistent representation for a swath of trees is not justification for breaking apart Downtown, Eagle River, and South Anchorage using
second-rate contiguity.

I've heard concerns about service members living in Eagle River and the type of representation they receive. I want to point out that service members live all over Anchorage and that they are represented in accordance with their place of residence, not their workplace. Military service members living in Eagle River are already represented by an Eagle River representative.

I want to push back on this idea that the gated and inaccessible community of JBER, that includes service members who both work and live on base, can only be represented by Eagle River, when there is not even an Eagle River gate. There is a Government Hill gate and a Muldoon gate, however, as well as other Anchorage gates where residents of JBER are closely integrated with the surrounding communities included in North Anchorage District 17.

My point being that the connection between JBER service members who already live and receive representation in Eagle River is not adequate justification for splitting Downtown, Eagle River, and South Anchorage neighborhoods, as well as splitting residents of JBER from the communities outside of their gates.
I've heard about historical connections and how maps have looked in the past. I really just want to remind you that there is a reason that maps are changed every ten years and that we are not mapping for the past; we are mapping for the people that are living here now. Also, in the past, Eagle River's population was vastly different, requiring Eagle River to be split between two Senate districts, when now it finally has the opportunity to be in a single district.

Now let's move to the justification for splitting South Anchorage apart. I've heard people talk about how South Anchorage and Eagle River both have Limited Road Service Areas and independent snow removal and so it should be paired. I would like to support the many Eagle River residents who have testified for the preservation of their Eagle River community and encourage the Board to listen to them as they have pointed out the obvious: North Eagle River also has Limited Road Service Areas and independent snow removal, and not only that, but they have the same independent LSRA in South Eagle River, not a completely different LSRA, which is not connected in any way physically, in implementation, or in funding.

I've heard that the two areas share a hunting
route over Ship Creek. I would like to point out that
there are 100 permits issued per year for the Ship
Creek moose hunt. So this idea that people --
BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: It's not a moose
hunt.
MS. SILVERS: -- (indiscernible) hunting routes
creates a justification for this pairing when these
people do not work, shop, eat, or play in the same area
is tenuous at best, and this pairing absolutely opens up
the Board for further lawsuits from negatively affected
South Anchorage residents, as well as Eagle River
residents, and proponents of EaglExit.
I've also heard this idea that basic
contiguity in the (indiscernible) is all that matters,
and I'd like to remind the Board that this idea of "we
can do it because we can" --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).
MS. SILVERS: -- has been said before, and look
where it got us.
Finally, I want to discuss a rather cynical
thing that is happening in the background that I hope
this board can, as professional public servants to the
community in this mapping process, rise above. This
involves political blogs that are urging people to
testify based on politically-motivated reasons, such
as saving a certain number of Republican Senate seats. This involves people calling from outside of Anchorage and quoting these statements and then hanging up, because they don't have the actual knowledge of the Senate pairings they're calling in to support, and are unable to respond to even the most basic clarifying questions, like, "Why do you support this district?"

This involves people sending the same forum letter each day and completely changing their testimony from what they said just one month ago in the municipal process, testimony that the Assembly listened to, and that in doing so resulted in a (indiscernible) 3.6 percent deviation in municipal maps.

In contrast, the Anchorage pairings under consideration do not practicably change deviations. But while this is inherently a political process, our constitution does not allow for political gerrymandering, which was recently reaffirmed by the courts.

I hope that you can rise above the political noise and employ rational, logical justification for your actions, while looking at communities and not parties in your final map.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you very much, Yarrow.

Let me get back to the list here and see. I don't see anybody else that's signed up either online or in person. Let's see.

Nicole, oh, you want to ask a question. I'm sorry. Excuse me. Go ahead. I can see you now. Go ahead. Sorry.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

Thanks.

Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You -- you can hear me. You're sitting right across from me. But I'm not hearing the loud echo in the room anymore. We're having trouble with audio.

Yarrow, you were reading off of your phone for a lot of that very passionate testimony there. Would you mind e-mailing it to our generic lister so I can take a look at it again later and refer to it? You had some very specific pincites to court opinions that I want to make sure that I reference as I go through.

Secondly, my question is really as a board member with a law degree and looking at the constitution, the constitution is pretty clear in what
the charge is in terms of pairing the most contiguous
as practicable Senate districts for Anchorage, and I'm
having difficulty with the -- with the notion of
pairing 22 and 29 (as spoken) for contiguity purposes
for a lot of the reasons that you brought up, this
false sense of contiguity or second-rate contiguity.

How would you travel by road, the existing
roads that we have, from 9 to 22?

MS. SILVERS: It depends on where you live in
9 --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay.

MS. SILVERS: -- but where I used to live in
District 9, near the Hilltop Ski Area, you would go
down to Elmore, you would take Elmore to probably MLK,
and then you would go around the Muldoon curve. You
would go to the highway, and then you would take that
out to Eagle River.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. So by my
estimation looking at the map, that's going through five
different Senate -- House districts to get there. Would
the most common way or another acceptable way be the
New Seward Highway?

MS. SILVERS: Yeah. I mean, if you lived
further down.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. And -- and
that would require one, two, three, four, five, six different districts.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Any further questions?

Melanie.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah, not a question for Yarrow, but like I was saying about the background noise, Bethany, I don't know if you know that the mic is picking up on what you were saying while Yarrow --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah, I am. Sorry. My dog is jumping up here, and I was trying to get her down so that she wouldn't knock the computer over. I apologize.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: No. It wasn't your dog. It was when she talked about the hunt, I heard you say, "Those are moose tickets," and then at the end I heard you say, "Oh, geez."

So just so you know, when you're speaking, it's getting picked up by the mic.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah, well, that's why I would like to be able to mute it, because I've -- I've been trying to keep my dog down. And so I apologize that we don't have a way of muting ourselves right now. So I'd be happy to do that if there was a
1  way to do it.
2  BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE:  Yeah, no, it
3  wasn't your dogs.  It was when you commented about --
4  BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM:  Well, you -- you
5  can't see my dog jumping here, so how would you know
6  that my dog wasn't jumping up here?
7  CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY:  I think it -- it doesn't
8  matter.  I think you get the point.  There are hot mics
9  on, so we all need to be cautious.
10  BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM:  Right.  Well, I --
11  I guess -- if I have to -- if I have to -- if I have to
12  push her -- if I have to ask for her to stop, I'm not
13  going to be able to mute myself.  If we'd like -- if
14  we'd like to address that technology, I'd be happy to do
15  that.  So I don't know if Peter can find a way to do
16  that, but I don't have any other choice right now, so...
17  BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE:  Mr. Chair, it had
18  nothing to do with her dogs.  I understand the dogs.  It
19  was when she commented about the moose hunt.
20  CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY:  I -- I didn't hear
21  anything about a moose hunt, but regardless, just -- we
22  should all be cautious if we can because there is not a
23  way for us to mute ourselves.
24  Okay.  Another question?  Did you have an
I don't know what -- I guess, Peter, can you unmute Melanie?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you. I was trying to put my hand down and I muted myself instead, so I hear Bethany when, you know, we're talking about this whole technology stuff.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Did you have a question, Melanie?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: No.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Okay.

Let's see. Any other questions? I don't see any other hands up.

And I do see one more. Jamie Rodriguez.

Jamie just came online.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Thank you. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yes, we can, Jamie.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Okay. Thank you.

I -- I wasn't planning on saying this, but I'm calling to clarify some of the comments about Eagle River and Southeast Anchorage, and people were talking about the distances and the roads and so forth. Well, there's one thing that's been left out very, very noticeably.

I live in -- in House District 28, soon to be
9, so I'm really aware of this district area, and that is -- people have been talking about the districts and the distances between Eagle River and Southeast Anchorage, and I would like to clarify for the record, because I think people don't know that this district not only includes Southeast Anchorage within town, but it also includes Girdwood, all -- the whole road system out there, Girdwood, Portage, and Whittier. And so I did some -- some looking into numbers, and I think people need to hear that.

Eagle River and Southeast Anchorage, the distance is 27 miles. So that's all in town, you know, from Eagle River. Eagle River to House -- Proposed House District 9 to Girdwood, sitting down, is 67 miles.

Eagle River and House District 9's Portage is 78 miles. Eagle River and House District 9's Whittier is 87 miles, and that also includes having to be aware of the scheduling in order to get through the tunnel there and back and not get stuck or locked out. And depending on the route taken, it must be crossed through six to eight unrelated House districts from Eagle River to Southeast Anchorage.

So I think people need to keep in mind that this district will include Anchorage, Girdwood,
Portage, the whole road system there, and Whittier, which I was very surprised to find out is even further away than Portage, 87 miles long. That's this district, and actually that's not -- that's counting just from Eagle River, so it's -- it's longer than that even for people who live in Eagle River.

And, no, people can't cross the mountain. They're pretty unsurmountable unless you're all geared up and you're all ready to go. And that -- that -- that's not -- a lot of our district, we have a lot of older people in our district.

So, anyway, 87 miles long. Please clarify that and please keep in mind the road system, the Turnagain Arm community towns and so forth. It's -- it's a really, really long and ridiculous district when there is a solution to pair somebody next door -- across the highway sounded bad -- and, you know, 87 miles, that is absolutely ridiculous.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Questions?

Melanie, you've got a question?

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah.

Thank you, Jamie, for calling in. I just want to make sure I'm hearing you correctly. Are you in favor, then, of keeping Eagle River House districts
together? Is that what you're...

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Of course. If I lived in Eagle River, that's what I would want too, because people go to meetings and so forth, and to drive that distance it's impossible, you know, and we're -- maybe we're all thinking that we're in a Zoom world, but we'll be meeting soon, you know?

Yeah, Eagle River should be with Eagle River, and people that I know out there are thinking the same thing. Not everybody wants to divide it up.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Okay. Thank you for clarifying that, and thank you for calling in.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Thank you. Okay. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Further questions?

Okay. Thank you, again, Jamie.

And I don't see anybody else in person that's signed up or online. What do members think about closing public testimony and opening up again tomorrow at noon at the same time that we've got scheduled?

Nicole.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm here in the Anchorage office, so I plan on hanging out until 2:00. That's the length of time that the hearing was noticed for. I've cleared my calendar to make that happen, so I would not favor
shutting down public testimony early unless the Board's ready to start debating the plans.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Well, we appreciate you sticking around. I think maybe I'll click off the line, then. Maybe while you're in Anchorage at the meeting, you can chair the meeting in my absence.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I think Bethany's muted and she's trying to get your attention.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. I don't see her there, but let me --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: There. Peter just unmuted me. Thank you.

I just want to get clarification. There was -- there was -- was there an end time? Did I miss that there was an end time given for this? I certainly could have missed it, but I just wanted to get clarification from Peter on that, please.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: It was noon to 2:00.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I would suggest maybe -- well, it's up to the members. I -- I really don't know what the preference is.

Peter just sent me a note that said tomorrow's meeting starts at 10:00, actually, not at noon.
Okay. We've got somebody online.

Lee Hammermeister -- Hammermeister -- Hammermeister.

Sorry. Sorry, Lee. Are you -- are you there?

MR. HAMMERMEISTER: I am here. Can you hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Please go ahead.

MR. HAMMERMEISTER: Okay. So how does this work?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Perfect. Give us -- we're here -- we're on Zoom. It sounds like you're calling in, but it's an opportunity for you to testify before the Board regarding the redistricting plans.

There's two plans out there. One is called Option 2, and one is called Option 3B, a little bit difference in how they align the House districts.

MR. HAMMERMEISTER: Okay. Thank you.

Yeah, I'd like to testify in favor of Option 3B. I -- I live in Eagle River. I've grown up there my -- my whole life. I remember when Hiland Road was a -- was a dirt road, and going to school it was often filled with kids from base. And I -- I know that there's a massive portion of people that live -- or work on base that live in Eagle River, and their children also go to school there. It's also far closer than the alternative; minutes away as opposed to over an hour.
drive time to the alternative for Option 2.

So I'd just like to go and -- and point out that it makes vastly more sense for Eagle River to be aligned with JBER in Option 3B as opposed to Option 2.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

Any questions for Lee? Hearing none. We'll go to Forrest McDonald.

Thank you, Lee.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah. I'd like to say that I personally support Option 3B, and, you know, the other -- the only reason we're even having this conversation to begin with is because board members got caught red-handed having conversations with people who are not on the Redistricting Board who gave them very explicit instructions on how to gerrymander and rig the process using bogus racist arguments in order to, like, create some fraudulent legal context to get rid of the map that we already had, which was perfectly fine. And we've got all these weirdos like Yarrow Silvers -- Silvers calling in dozens and dozens of times over and over again.

Look, there's a process in place. We have --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Excuse me.

MR. MCDONALD: -- Redistricting Board Members.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm -- I'm going
to interject here since no one else on the Board is.

Members of the public are not allowed to call in and insult other members of the public who have testified, and if you want to give intelligent public testimony, by all means we're open to hearing that, but we're not going to allow this opportunity to be hijacked for you to tear down other Alaskans.

MR. McDONALD: I did not insult or tear down anyone. I just stated simple facts. You have multiple people that have been calling in over and over again, and you're treating their testimony as individual -- multiple instances of testimony. That is not the case. No one civilian person has more say or input than any of the rest of us, and none of them are on the Redistricting Board, and Senator Tom Begich is not on the Redistricting Board.

So when you allowed all those other people to have a heavy hand in the process, you are disenfranchising all of the people who are represented by duly appointed Redistricting Board Members. Okay? And we know what you're doing. We're not dumb.

So Option 3B. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: (Indiscernible).
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: And Nicole?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I'm not suggesting that anyone who calls in is dumb.

Were you aware that Senator Begich submitted a third-party plan that was adopted by this board?

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: He just hung up.

MR. MCDONALD: -- I was.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Oh, you are.

Okay. Great.

And so since he submitted that third-party plan, is it, then, your position that he is not allowed to comment in the redistricting process because he holds office, even though he is an Alaskan?

MR. MCDONALD: I never said that. And I would also point out that his commentary to the Redistricting Board was different from his commentary in your text messages, which you entered to the Redistricting Board, which is why I'm complaining.

There was a backdoor process.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I -- I appreciate you bringing this to light. We were told at the beginning of the redistricting process, that if we did have conversations regarding redistricting with Alaskans, to preserve our text messages.
I preserved all of my text messages. I didn't delete them. I didn't give our attorney some BS answer that I was deleting my text messages on a daily basis for data purposes or other reasons.

I have nothing to hide in my text messages. I firmly believe that everything was above board. The Supreme Court and the Superior Court didn't find anything wrong with the mode of communication, and for you to suggest otherwise here is completely bogus.

MR. McDONALD: Okay. I'm sorry. It's obviously a coincidence that his exact words, in context, were paraphrased, and your statement's exactly how he recommended they be made, when he recommended they be made.

It's clearly a coincidence. I should have foreseen that. I don't know how I could have thought any -- otherwise. You guys were just obviously on the exact same page. Maybe there's some kind of mindlink between you two, and I am so sorry.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Any further questions?

Maybe we can just stick to questions.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm going to finish the -- the record. I'm -- I'm sorry. I'm not going to let a member of the public spew lies and not
1 protect my integrity and my reputation.
2 He's making false statements. The end.
3 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Let's see. I
4 think that's the last person we see on the list.
5 Anybody else in the office there, Peter?
6 BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Melanie has her hand
7 up.
8 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Oh, okay. Melanie,
9 sorry. Go ahead, Melanie.
10 BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you, John.
11 I think if we noticed the meeting until 2:00,
12 I'd like to make sure the lines are open in case
13 somebody planned to call in and testify at, like, you
14 know, 1:30 or whatever.
15 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I think -- I think
16 that's fair.
17 BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: So I'm willing --
18 I'm willing to stay on. I would like to step away from
19 the computer for a little bit. So if Peter could text
20 me if there is somebody that's either showed up in
21 person or on the line, I really want to make sure that
22 we're listening to the public. I booked this time out.
23 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Peter, could you let
24 Bethany back in? It looks like she's been muted.
25 BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thanks. Sorry.
My dog is very distressed. That's why I've been away so much.

So -- yeah, so I'm going to be online as well, so, yeah, and, you know, if I see somebody come in or whatever, Melanie, I'd be happy to text you as well. But I'm going to be online here the whole time, so...

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Great. Thank you.

Budd?

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Same with me. I can remain available, but if nobody's testifying, I've got other things I could be doing. So I'll stay available.

If someone would just let me know if someone's wishing to speak.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. I'm going to let you know right now we've got somebody online,

Sandra Graham (phonetic).

Hi, Sandra.

MS. GRAHAM: Hi there. Can you guys hear me?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: We can. We can hear you fine. Go ahead.

MS. GRAHAM: Awesome. My name is Sandra Graham. Some of you know me as Sandy. That's my nickname. I've been a 62-year resident of pretty much Downtown Anchorage.

I personally support Plan 3B emphatically. I
taught at Birchwood ABC Elementary many years ago, and a lot of military families go to school in Birchwood and in Eagle River. They align with that community. I was also a principal in South Anchorage, and there's a vast difference between Chugiak, Eagle River, South Anchorage, and then Girdwood, of which I was also raised on the weekends at Girdwood because my dad had a ski cabin there. A huge difference between the communities. So I really urge you to look at the difference in the communities, and I would wholeheartedly support Option 3B.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Nicole, go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Sandy. Unfortunately, the constitution instructs us to look at the districts that are most contiguous as practicable. In your mind, which districts are most contiguous as practicable in 3B?

MS. GRAHAM: I'm not quite sure of the question, A; and B, I don't have a map in front of me because I'm in the car with my phone. Sorry.

But after looking at the map, 3B was the one that I was happiest with. I don't think it's wise to separate -- to combine Eagle River with Girdwood.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You -- you don't think it's wise to combine Eagle River with Girdwood, but that's what 3B is trying to do.

MS. GRAHAM: Oh, sorry. I'm -- maybe I have the maps confused. But I do support 3B.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. So 3B suggests splitting Eagle River and combining one district with South Anchorage down to Whittier and the other district with JBER and Downtown.

MS. GRAHAM: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I don't want to belabor the point, and I realize you're in your car without a map, so maybe you can take a peek at the two different options and either send us an e-mail or potentially call back in.

MS. GRAHAM: Right. I did. So I -- if I -- if I hear you, 3B aligns part of Eagle River with JBER; correct?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Correct. And then the other part of it splits Eagle River and combines it with Girdwood and South Anchorage.

MS. GRAHAM: Right. The one that -- right. And 3B aligns JBER with -- with Eagle River; correct?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Correct.

MS. GRAHAM: That's the one I support.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you --

MS. GRAHAM: Hopefully that's clear.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- for the clarification.

Thank you for the clarification.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

Just looking -- Peter sent me a note here.

Just -- it said that -- Peter, do you want to explain that in terms of how we've done this in the past and what the agenda says?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Well, just at the advice of our legal counsel, we don't notice end times anymore, just in case we want to go longer or something else. There's just notice of start times.

But if -- if members have mentioned on the record they want to stay -- clarifying that the -- we just -- at the matter of form, we don't normally notice end times.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I can hardly hear you, Peter. Can you speak up a little bit, please?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: It's just a matter of form at the advice of our legal team we don't notice end times just because it's impossible to know how long a conversation might go. But apparently it was mentioned on the record that we'd be here until 2:00 at
another time. So just -- our agendas and our public
notices just say start times for that purpose.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I see. Okay. Thank
you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON:
(Indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Well, if you're fine,
Nicole, chairing the meeting from there in Anchorage
where you can see the lists, I think I'm going to sign
off, and I'll just look for Peter to send, as he does
every evening, copies of the testimony that's come in,
written, and then a consolidation of the testimony
that's live as well.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Mr. Chair?


BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'm just wondering
how many of us are planning on being there in person
next week. I know I am.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I'm -- I doubt if I will
be there in person. I'll be on the Zoom -- Zoom line.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: We've just had so
many -- we've been plagued with some technical
challenges, so because of that I plan to fly in.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Peter, you've got your hand up.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Yeah. So just as we have a brief lull, and for the benefit of members and anyone who might be listening, we have a consultant, a contractor, who is in the process of summarizing all of the verbal testimony and adding it to our database. So members will be receiving a second -- every night you get a report from all of the testimony for that day, and tonight's report will have the first batch of verbal testimony summaries in a separate PDF file so you can keep them apart. And I know that Member Bahnke had requested that earlier, and Emily (phonetic) is in the process of doing -- working her way through all of the recordings to provide that for us.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

Okay. And, Nicole, thanks for taking over as chair there in Anchorage.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Bye, John.

(Chairman John Binkley leaves meeting.)

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Peter, send me a text if we have somebody that wants to testify. And I'm going --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I'll --

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- to mute.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I'll shoot you a text.
1 (Pause.)
2 BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Good afternoon.
3 We're going to be coming back on the record shortly to
4 take testimony from a caller. Our executive director is
5 alerting the other board members who are calling in
6 virtually.
7 Oh, I think Bethany is on.
8 Budd and Melanie, if you can hear me, we've
9 got a caller. As soon as you two come back on screen,
10 we'll take --
11 I see Budd. I see Bethany. Waiting for
12 Melanie.
13 (Pause.)
14 Okay. And Melanie is back on as well.
15 Returning to the phone lines, the
16 Redistricting Board is going to gavel back in at 1:42,
17 and we have a caller from Anchorage. I believe it's
18 June McDonald (phonetic).
19 MS. MCDONALD: Hi. I -- my name is
20 June McDonald from Anchorage. I just want to say that
21 I support Map 3B.
22 BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, June.
23 You came in a little faint. Did you say you
24 oppose or you support 3B?
25 MS. MCDONALD: I support.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You support 3B.

Fantastic. Are there any reasons that you want to put on record? And if not, that's okay.

MS. McDONALD: Because I -- I think it's good for the Korean community. So I don't know if that would explain why.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: What -- what community is it good for?

MS. McDONALD: Supporting the Map 3B, it's good representation from -- for the Korean community.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Oh, you -- you like 3B because it's the best representation for the Korean community?

MS. McDONALD: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.

What district are you calling in from?

MS. McDONALD: Pardon me?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm just trying to figure out what part of Anchorage you're calling from.

MS. McDONALD: Oh, oh, okay. Abbott Loop.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Abbott Loop.

Okay. Thank you.

MS. McDONALD: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I see a question
from Melanie.

Melanie.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah. Thank you for calling in, June. We have to consider not necessarily what's best for one group of people over another group of people when we're figuring out Senate pairings. The charge we have before us is to look at House districts that are as contiguous as practicable, and that means they have to be touching on the map.

And then also, my understanding, meaning "as contiguous as practicable" is being able to get from one House district to another House district as easiest as possible.

Are you understanding what the contiguous part is?

MS. McDONALD: Well, my understanding is you threw out other maps because you're considering other communities, and I don't understand why you don't consider the Korean community's opinions and stuff like that.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Yeah, we're --

MS. McDONALD: So I feel a little offended by that.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'm -- I'm sorry. I didn't mean to offend you.
MS. McDONALD: I -- I can explain it --

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: And I'm not --

MS. McDONALD: I can explain it better in

Korean, but I'm just saying that you guys have threw

out -- threw -- threw -- threw out the map that we had

before and then -- for other communities, but why not

considering, like, our community? So...

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you.

The other maps were rejected by the Court

because it diminished the votes, the -- the "one

person, one vote" power. So I don't want you to be

left with the impression that we're not considering

the Korean community or all communities. We're

considering maps that are best for Alaska.

MS. McDONALD: So I -- so my understanding is

you're diminishing my community, and so...

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'm not intending

to diminish any community. We're looking at two

possible maps to consider, but I just wanted you to be

aware of the limitations that we have in terms of Senate

pairings. And I thank you for calling in.

MS. McDONALD: Yeah, but -- and thank you for

your opinion. I just want to say that I support Map 3B,

and that's all I want to say.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you for
calling in.

MS. McDONALD: All right. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEI: Thank you, June.

We have another caller, Roy Syren, also from Anchorage.

MR. SYREN: Yes. Yes. It's Roy Syren.

Can you hear me?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEI: We can hear you.

Please identify yourself and provide your testimony, Roy.

MR. SYREN: Yes. My name's Roy Syren from Anchorage, Alaska, and I want to call to say that I support Plan 3B. I think it's the fairest one out there to support. And I appreciate you guys taking your time to listen.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEI: Thank you, Roy.

Is there any questions from the Board? No questions from the Board.

Roy, I have a question that I'm asking callers who support this map to help me wrestle with as we come down to a final determination here, and that is squaring the constitution with the way that 3B is drawn.

Article VI, Section -- Article VI, Section 6 requires us to pair House districts that are as
contiguous as practicable, and when I look at the map here, 22 and 9, it requires residents from 9 or 22 to go through five or six different House districts to reach the other end of the Senate district. How -- how can you help the Board square that?

MR. SYREN: Well, I -- I don't think that that's been an issue before, and now all of a sudden it is. I think we need to stick with the fairest thing for -- for everything and make sure that gerrymandering doesn't get involved in this. That's what I think is going on with these other changes. So I -- I think that you're -- yeah, I -- I don't -- I -- I don't agree with your analysis of this situation.

So, but like I said, I'm testifying for Plan 3B, and I think it's the fairest for everybody. And we need to keep -- keep these districts together, and the people -- everybody goes to the polling places and votes.

So thank you for your time.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you for your time, Ray, and -- or Roy, excuse me. This -- this really isn't my particular analysis either. It's what the constitution requires the Board to do.

So I want to make sure that you have the right
cite, and you can go back and review Article IV, Section 6 if -- if you'd like to.

Thank you.

I think he's hung up.

Okay. There are no more callers in the queue right now. We'll go ahead and stand back at ease for another 11 minutes in case Alaskans want to call back in.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Am I muted still or not?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We can hear you, Budd, but you can mute yourself if you'd like to.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Yeah. I -- I will.

I had done it before, and then I unmuted and it worked. So I thought that was going to de-link us or something.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: No. I just have to let you back in.

(Pause.)

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Good afternoon.

It is 1:59. The Redistricting Board is going to gavel back in. We do have one final caller who called in.

Kimberly Hunt, can you hear us?

MS. HUNT: Can you hear me now?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: We can hear you.

Go ahead, Kimberly.
MS. HUNT: Okay. Thank you very much for your time.

I called in yesterday, and I felt like I didn't get my point across because I mentioned I've only been in Alaska for seven years. But the point is that I've had relatives up here since the pre-pipeline days, and I really miss that perspective or that perception of Alaska and Anchorage, and I really like what I see of the pre-pipeline days here in Anchorage. And as such, I wanted to just call in and reiterate my support for the Option 2 Map to avoid unnecessary -- unnecessary delays and to honor what the Court has to say.

So I wanted to just call in and -- and be a little bit more credible. I'm familiar with Alaska since the pre-pipeline days, and I'd just like to make sure that the communities that were there then stay here now.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Kimberly.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: Thank you, Kimberly, and thank you for calling in again.

Can you --

MS. HUNT: Thank you.
BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: -- (indiscernible)
a little bit more about what it is that you like about
Option 2?

MS. HUNT: Well, it seems to -- it seems to keep
communities -- it -- it doesn't break up communities as
much, and it keeps contiguous communities together.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: All right. Thank
you.

MS. HUNT: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you very
much, Kimberly. And I -- I don't believe that the Board
took any (indiscernible) interpretation to you being a
resident for the time that you have. We are happy to
hear from all Alaskans, no matter whether they arrived
yesterday or have been here for their entire life.

Okay. And with that, we've now moved to the
point on the agenda where we open it up to board
comments. Is there any comments from the three of you
that are online? All of you are shaking your head
"no."

In that case, I'll entertain a motion to
adjourn the meeting and a second.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: So moved.

BOARD MEMBER MELANIE BAHNKE: I'll second. This
is Melanie.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

Motion by Budd, seconded by Melanie.

Is there any objection to adjoining -- to adjourning the meeting at 2:02?

Hearing none. The --

(Off record.)
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MR. GRAY: -- and I speak for myself only --
just started the recording.

My name is Andrew Gray, and I speak for myself
only. I do not represent my employers in any way. I
live in House District 19 in Anchorage. My family
moved into our home there in 2019, just two weeks
before I deployed with the Alaska Army National Guard
for ten months. So I have a relationship with the
military and with JBER, and that's the bulk of what I
will be testifying about.

While on that deployment, I was having lunch
with some enlisted soldiers in the dining facility,
and I asked one where he had grown up. He said the
trailer park across from Northway Mall here in
Anchorage. I remarked that I had never met anyone who
had grown up in a trailer park, and after a pause, all
four enlisted soldiers I was seated with explained
that they, too, had spent at least part of their
childhoods in trailer parks.

I told this story to illustrate a fact about
the U.S. military. Many young people who sign up to
serve do so to escape the poverty of their childhoods.
You see, I, as someone unfamiliar with trailer park
living, am the anomaly. Those with firsthand knowledge are the majority. "Three hots and a cot" is a popular saying describing the promise of food and shelter for many 18-year-olds, and it would not be a given without the military's help.

A 2018 demographic analysis by the Council on Foreign Relations shows that over 60 percent of enlistments came from neighborhoods with a median household income between $38,000 and $80,000. 19 percent of recruits came from households with an income of less than $38,000.

The average annual income in Eagle River is $129,768. This means more than 80 percent of military recruits come from households unlike those in Eagle River. And if lower enlisted choose to live off base, they inevitably end up in lower-cost housing in Mountain View, north Muldoon, or even in my neighborhood in Midtown, and yet members of this board are insisting on pairing Eagle River with JBER. What military members can afford to live in Eagle River? Higher-ranking officers.

The Congressional Research Service reports that 63 percent of enlisted service members are white, 37 percent non-white. JBER is actually even more diverse, with 60.7 percent of the voting age
population identifying as white and just under
40 percent identifying as non-white; however,
88 percent of senior military officers are white, and
it is these higher-ranking officers who can afford to
live in Eagle River.

I should point out that the voting age
population in Chugiak/Eagle River is over 73 percent
white. In recent litigation that made its way to the
Alaska Supreme Court, this Redistricting Board was
found guilty of an unconstitutional gerrymander for
creating a Senate district pairing Eagle River House
district with an East Anchorage House district.

I would argue that the Senate district pairing
Eagle River with JBER is just as egregiously
unconstitutional, if not more so. The poor minority
voices of JBER will be overridden by the rich, white
residents of Eagle River, and that is what the goal is
here, to increase the Senate representation of Eagle
River.

As Board Member Bethany Marcum so eloquently
stated on the record on November 5th, 2021, quote,
"This actually gives Eagle River the opportunity to
have more representation," end quote. Why? Why would
anyone want Eagle River of all places to have more
representation? Well, the Chugiak/Eagle River area
has been a conservative stronghold since prior to Alaskan statehood. In fact, that area was so conservative that they actually opposed statehood in the 1950s. So if there were a way to increase their representation, one could enshrine a conservative advantage in the makeup of the Alaskan Senate for the next ten years.

Yesterday Chairman Binkley explained to a testifier that she could not compare Anchorage reapportionment -- reapportionment of an Assembly district with Alaska redistricting, that these were two completely different processes. Although the processes may be different, the conservative objective is the same: Increase Eagle River's representation.

During Anchorage reapportionment, Eagle River was guaranteed from the start two Assembly members. So in that case, in order to increase representation, the tactic was to minimize the population represented by those two Eagle River Assembly members. This was achieved by fierce testimony against the pairing of Eagle River with any other part of Anchorage. The option most strongly considered was a pairing of Chugiak/Eagle River with Hillside in South Anchorage.

I would like to quote some of that testimony from a town hall held on January 27th, 2022. Eagle
River Assembly member and current unopposed candidate for State House, Jamie Allard, said, quote, "It was brought up the fact that if we are connected to Hillside or we are connected to Girdwood, you would literally have to ride a Dall sheep in order to get to those areas, unless we drove, approximately from our location, almost an hour to get to Hillside and an hour and a half to get down to Girdwood.

"I would also point out that when folks are saying that we have things in common over there, look at who their elected officials are, Suzanne LaFrance and John Weddleton. Wonderful people, but you have to still ask: What do we have in common with those areas? We don't," end quote.

Although I personally disagree with Ms. Allard's assessment that the only major transport or one of the only major transports would be riding Dall sheep, I want to thank her explicitly for stating that this is a political process. And although the method is different here in redistricting, the goal is not, by avoiding pairing the two Eagle River House districts with each other, which by any metric is how you would create the most compact, contiguous, socioeconomically integrated Senate district.

The Redistricting Board is seeking to expand
Eagle River's influence on the Alaska Senate. We know from numerous studies that voter participation increases with family income. In the 2016 presidential election, 48 percent of voters in the lowest income category voted, while almost double that, a whopping 86 percent of voters in the highest income category cast a ballot. This trend holds true for Eagle River. Eagle River consistently participates in elections at a significantly higher rate than their lower-income neighbors.

So if Eagle River gets two senators, you can bet it will be Eagle River electing those senators, not the JBER House district, nor the South Anchorage House district. We will get two Lora Reinbolds, not two Bill Wielechowskis.

Please allow -- allow me to, again, quote Bethany Marcum. Quote, "This actually gives Eagle River the opportunity to have more representation," end quote. She is absolutely right, and that's why this plan is absolutely wrong. Giving Eagle River extra representation is unconstitutional and should not be allowed.

So why is this board continuing with this ill-intentioned plan? Because there are no adverse consequences to the Board adopting another
unconstitutional gerrymander. There is only upside for them. There's a chance that no lawsuit will be brought forth, and therefore the gerrymander will stand for the next ten years. Alternatively, litigation could be pursued, but it will take time. Even on an expedited schedule, it would take several months after an appeal to the Alaska Supreme Court before you are sent back here to rework the Senate pairings, and by then the November election would be approaching, and it might be too close to print new ballots. No one on this board will be held personally liable for any unconstitutional pairings. So what have you got to lose? Nothing. What have you got to gain? Continued Republican control of the Alaska Senate.

With that knowledge, I make this plea in vain, I know, but nevertheless, I ask all five of you to please oppose the Senate pairings and Map 3B. Please support the Senate pairings and Map Option 2, which keeps like parts together, JBER with Downtown, South Anchorage with South Anchorage, and Eagle River with Eagle River.

Thank you for allowing me to testify, and thank you for your service for the State of Alaska.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Andrew,
there's -- there's a few questions. I think John might be muted. I see Bethany has her hand up.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I am. I apologize.

Nicole and Bethany. Go ahead, Nicole.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you for your testimony today, Andrew, and it's probably not a surprise that I agree with a large amount of what you said today.

Peter, can you please pull up the map that we worked on yesterday that showed the route from the southern portion of District 9 to District 22?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I -- I want to acknowledge all of the points you put on the record about gerrymandering, but I also want to bring you back to the constitution, because at this point in our work, it's very clear what we're supposed to do under Article VI, Section 6, which says that each Senate district shall be composed as near as practicable as two contiguous House districts.

And this is a point that I continue to struggle with as a board member as to why we would pair a House district that is at some points 87 miles away with another one that an Anchorage Assembly member, as you testified today, has said the most practical means of
traveling is on the back of a Dall sheep, which I don't believe any Alaskan wants to do, or the representative who's elected to represent those two Senate pairings.

So Peter is going to bring up the House map here that shows the primary mode of transportation, via either the New Seward Highway or up through Lake Otis to -- sorry -- Elmore to Lake Otis here. And looking at this map, Andrew, are these the two most practicable contiguous linkages in your opinion?

MR. GRAY: Yes, these are the most practicable. This is how I would drive between South Anchorage and Eagle River.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you. And I see here that if you took the New Seward Highway from District 9, you would cross through Districts 10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 23, and a bit of 21. So that's seven House districts by my estimation.

MR. GRAY: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Is that the most practicable linkage, or are there more natural linkages that would make districts closer together?

MR. GRAY: Well, as was discussed yesterday in the testimony, I mean, you can use the Crow Pass Trail, that is 21 miles long and it's only usable half of the
year, and it's -- you'd have to be in very good physical
shape.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. And then
the other route would be what's in red, the -- what I'm
going to call the -- the Elmore route, in which case you
would go through Districts 11, 12, 19, 21, 20, 23, and
that's six.

MR. GRAY: Correct.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: So, again, not
very practicable in terms of contiguity, or -- or -- or
the -- the most practicable.

Thank you. That's it.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany.

Bethany, I think you're still muted. There you go.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yep. I was -- I
was looking for the mute button. Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.

Yes. I'd like to say thank you, Mr. Gray,
very much for testifying. As a fellow military
member, I want to thank you for your service. I'm not
sure if we were deployed at any of the same times or
not, but if we -- if we were, I'm sorry that I didn't
get a chance to meet you in theater.

But I wanted to ask, because you -- you did
mention my statement several times, and I wanted to
ask if you had also heard what I said on the record
about Muldoon and the configuration that we gave
Muldoon in the proclamation plan?

MR. GRAY: Well, I have followed the
Redistricting Board very closely since November, but
I'm not sure if I remember the statement. So if you
want to remind me, that would be helpful.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Sure. What I
talked about was the number of potential senators that
Muldoon would have been able to elect in the same plan
that you're referring to that would have allowed
Eagle River to potentially choose two senators.

Does that ring a bell at all?

MR. GRAY: Well, yes, it does ring a bell.

And what I would say -- and it wasn't present in my
testimony -- was the well-established fact by multiple
studies that the higher the income, the higher the
voter participation. So if you pair a high-income
area such as Eagle River with a lower-income district,
the higher-income area is going to have a much higher
degree of voter participation, so the chances of the
higher-income area being the -- the group that chooses
the senator is much, much more likely. So what you
would end up with is two Eagle River senators, not a
Muldoon senator for Eagle River, if that makes sense.
BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Well, I appreciate that that is someone's theory, but I think the reality of what we're looking at in terms of the senators that are elected in Alaska shows that that's not the case, that there are certainly places where we have been able to elect senators from areas that are -- are -- you know, not necessarily in line with the -- the philosophy that you just quoted from, so...

So since you weren't able to --

MR. GRAY: I will send you the studies. They are not --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Sure.

MR. GRAY: They are not theories, but they are actual studies from the 2016 presidential election that showed that the lower the income, the less likely someone was to vote.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So back to the question that I had asked. I wanted to clarify, since I wasn't sure if you heard, that the way that the configuration was in the last plan, Muldoon actually had House representation in three different districts. And so certainly it was never my intent and is not my intent to try to get extra representation for Eagle River -- has been -- has been -- has -- as has been purported by some. It was to give Eagle River just the opportunity
to participate in elections and choose their representatives and senators in the same way that Muldoon would be able to have that opportunity. And in the case of the plan that was drawn for the proclamation, Muldoon would have had the opportunity to participate and -- and have three different senators to represent them in the -- the Alaska State Senate.

So I just wanted to make sure that you had that information, but thank you for your testimony.

MR. GRAY: Yes. So -- so for clarity, what you're saying is that you -- you were -- your test- -- what you were trying to do was to help Muldoon at the expense of Eagle River?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: That's not what I said. I said that they would have the opportunity to elect that in the same way that Eagle River would have the opportunity. The intent was not to give anyone more representation than any others. That is words that other people have put in my mouth.

The full exchange that --

MR. GRAY: (Indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- happened at the time was someone asked me what -- what could be the result, and I said the result could be that Eagle River would have more representation, just as the result could
be that Muldoon would have more representation.

MR. GRAY: Ma'am, what is the harm of pairing Eagle River with Eagle River?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Well, first of all, there's only one Eagle River. The other seat is Chugiak, Peters Creek, and JBER. And so just to clarify that, there's one Eagle River seat, where most of Eagle River resides.

But the -- the harm of -- of pairing -- of pairing Chugiak, Peters Creek, and JBER together with the Eagle River seat is that JBER then is -- is orphaned, and JBER then is forced to do as is purported in Plan Number 2, to be paired with the -- the Downtown district, and there certainly can be no bigger differences than Downtown and JBER.

So when you're talking about folks that live in -- you know, along 9th Street or Bootleggers Cove or the -- the -- you know, 13th Street and I Street, in those areas, compare those folks with the people who live in -- in base housing, we're talking about two very different sets of -- of living and such.

And so that is the harm, is that by -- by forcing the -- those two districts together, the -- the intent, in my opinion, is to force JBER to then be swallowed up by the Downtown district.
MR. GRAY: Roger. I hear what you're saying. I would argue that most people who live in JBER housing cannot afford to live in Eagle River, and the differences are just as distinct.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: And I would have to differ with you there, because I think that Eagle River is much more working class compared to Downtown, which is much more expensive than Eagle River.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. GRAY: The average household income is $129,000 in Eagle River, so I would -- I would differ with you there. And I would be happy to send you those -- those figures.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah, I would look forward to getting those.

As a military person, I can say that I, myself, have lived in Eagle River, and so I -- I know that -- and I know many people who do, being still an active military member. And so I know many folks who do. So I -- I do know that it is affordable to them, but I'm sure there are exceptions.

So thank you for your testimony today,

Mr. Gray.

MR. GRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Mr. Gray.
Nicole, is that your hand back up again?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: It -- it is.

Thank you very much.

And, Andrew, thank you as -- as well for your service, as a military spouse. My husband also came from those same demographics that you mentioned earlier and was able to rise out of what would probably be considered poverty and go on to the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis and graduate -- and graduate and do 13 years active duty, two tours overseas in Iraq and Afghanistan. So I do appreciate the sacrifice and service to the country.

I also want to just add for -- for the record here, again, with what I consider at this point to be overemphasis on -- on the similarities and differences between the two -- between all of the Senate pairings in Anchorage, because the task before us is very clear at this point: We have to pair the most contiguous districts as practicable. And that's where I continue to have a problem with Option 3B, is 9 and 12 are not the most contiguous districts as practicable.

But I also want to state for the record here, because I think Bethany was going down a slippery slope here with that argument that this is actually giving Muldoon three separate senators. The Court has
already reviewed that and found that it actually, quote, "fails and falls flat in the face of reality, and instead it seems Muldoon is actually cracked among multiple Senate districts and its voting strength is diluted as a result." Again, page 69 of the opinion. So I don't want that perception to be out there, that the Board did this in a way to somehow bolster the voting power in Muldoon. It was found to be the exact opposite.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Any -- you've still got your -- oh, are you done, Nicole?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm done. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Gray, very compelling testimony. You did a great job.

One quick question, maybe, if I could. Just about contiguity, do you think that means in terms of -- you know, you've equated it to how you have to drive and drive through more districts. Do you think that --

MR. GRAY: (Indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- it really, in terms of the def--

MR. GRAY: -- that was not me.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- the definition of contiguity relates to drivability in a car?

MR. GRAY: I personally don't. That -- that -- that would be Jamie Allard. I would refer you to Republican thought leader, Jamie Allard, to discuss that.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: So you don't believe that it's any more or less contiguous if you have to drive through a district to get from one place to another?

MR. GRAY: I mean, I know that in Alaska we have Senate districts that are not necessarily drivable, but I would argue -- and -- and I -- I agree it could be argued. I think it's easier to drive from Eklutna to Eagle River than from Portage to Eagle River.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Right. I -- I would agree with you, too, but do you think in terms of the constitution and the word "contiguity" that it refers to driving?

MR. GRAY: I think that you want the most compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated districts that you can find, and I would say, without a doubt, that pairing Eklutna, Peters Creek, and the north part of JBER with Eagle River is a more compact, contiguous, socioeconomically integrated pairing than
South Anchorage, Girdwood, all the way down to Portage.

I just -- I -- I mean, I just think that common sense tells you that that's a more compact, contiguous, socioeconomically integrated Senate pairing.

Would I -- I mean, do -- do I think it's possible in certain circumstances to have non-contiguous Senate pairings? I do. I do think that's possible.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: And so we are talking about Senate pairings here, and you're obviously well-schooled and -- and up to speed with this.

But with regard to the Senate pairings, what's your understanding of what the constitution says we are required to look at for Senate pairings?

MR. GRAY: I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: If -- if it would help you, Andrew, I can show you that part of the constitution.

MR. GRAY: I'm going to be shown that part of the constitution, sir. Just a moment.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Well, I -- I thought maybe you had a legal background. You did a very eloquent job in laying out --

MR. GRAY: (Indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- arguments.
MR. GRAY: -- a legal background.

You know what, I will be honest with you. I would not be testifying today if you guys hadn't had these extra days of testimony. If you had asked me to testify on Tuesday, I would have had nothing to say. It was really from listening to the hearings the last couple of days that got me to thinking. So thank you for the extra days of testimony that allowed me to kind of get my thoughts together. But, no, I don't really -- I'm not legal.

So "Each" -- I'm going to quote from the constitution: "Each Senate district shall be composed as near as practicable of two contiguous House districts."

So I think what this is saying is that sometimes it's not practicable to have two contiguous House districts; however, in this case there is, and it's very practicable to pair Peters Creek, Chugiak, north JBER with Eagle River.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I think you mentioned that you are -- about --

MR. GRAY: (Indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- about the socioeconomic and compactness --

MR. GRAY: Yeah, that was for House districts.
I understand that this is for Senate, so you don't have
to include that. But it does seem to be the most
contiguous with the South Anchorage with South
Anchorage, south JBER with Downtown, and Peters Creek
with Eagle River.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you very
much, Andrew. And, again, you did an excellent job.
You're very articulate, and I'm very impressed.

MR. GRAY: Thank you so much.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Peter, do you
have the sign-up list there?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: John, do you have
the off-net list yet, or are you talking about the in --
the in --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- (indiscernible)

list?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: The -- the off-net list
and the sign-up sheet there in the LIO.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Yes,
Mr. Chairman. The next person in the queue is
Susan Fischetti, who is on-site here in Anchorage.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yes. Good morning,
Susan. Good to see you on Zoom this time.

MS. FISCHETTI: Yes. Finally I made it. I'm
happy to be here and to see you in person.

I'm here to testify as a 40-year resident of Eagle River in support of Map 3B. I appreciate the opportunity to testify as a private citizen. I'm not an elected official or paid by any organization or law firm.

It doesn't feel right to have my public testimony in writing for the Anchorage -- Anchorage Assembly redistricting blasted on Twitter by public officials. My testimony on the Assembly redistricting is not to be confused with my testimony for the State of Alaska redistricting; they are two separate issues, which should also apply to community councils that pass resolutions for the Assembly redistricting and are now pairing it over to the State. I attend community council meetings regularly, and usually they are anywhere from 6 to 20 attendees, which may not always represent the thousands of voters in their area.

I also don't appreciate the intimidation and attacks against private citizens in this process. We're nervous, confused, and scared in saying the wrong thing. Many of us have tried to stick with two minutes for our testimonies, but some have testified for over ten minutes. Testimony is now becoming a
numbers game and bashing Eagle River and personal attacks.

Historically, when Eagle River has been paired with the Hillside, the elected officials have been from the Hillside, so it does not guarantee Eagle River another seat.

I disagree that the accusation of gerrymandering would be Map 3. I believe any claim with gerrymandering would be Map 2.

I drive all over Anchorage. We in Eagle River pay the same property taxes as Anchorage, so we should not be discriminated against. In fact, we share more land mass and miles with the Hillside along the Chugach Mountains than any other district. They are most certainly contiguous.

Also, military and veterans are very prominent in Chugiak/Eagle River and should be paired with JBER. They are contiguous and have been historically paired for many years.

I will limit my time and hope that others will be more respectful.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Susan.

Nicole, you've got your hand up.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I do. Thank you
very much. And I have three questions for the
testifier.

Map 2, in your opinion, is gerrymandered. Can
you give us an example of that? This is maybe the
third time that you've said that, and I'm having a
hard time understanding what you mean when you just --

MS. FISCHETTI: It doesn't matter what I say.

If I -- you ask me it three times and I've said it
three times -- you know, you've got your opinion
already predispositioned --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Right.

MS. FISCHETTI: -- so anything that I say, I'm
not going to change your mind --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. But --

MS. FISCHETTI: -- (indiscernible)

gerrymandering.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: But the analogy
to that is that it's -- it's sunny outside, and you --
and I can say that it's snowing, and if I just say that
it's snowing it doesn't mean that it actually is
snowing, does it?

Next question: You asked us not to
discriminate against Eagle River. How are we
discriminating against Eagle River?

MS. FISCHETTI: The prior person that just
testified, he, I don't think (indiscernible) Eagle River, but yet he seems to have quite a bit of his opinion on it, and I disagree with that.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Is it your position that you represent Eagle River?

MS. FISCHETTI: I've been a resident for 40 years of Eagle River.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Because I have a lot of testimony from Eagle River here that says not to split Eagle River, so I just want to put that on the record.

MS. FISCHETTI: For the Assembly redistricting.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Actually, Ms. Fischetti, it's not. It's been taken over the last several days coming in.

MS. FISCHETTI: (Indiscernible) intimidated and bullied. That's an example of that to me.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You don't have any problem -- you seemed to find your way here over the intimidation, so I thank you for being brave enough to appear.

Final -- final question -- Peter, please put up the route maps.

MS. FISCHETTI: It is.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay.
MS. FISCHETTI: I'm a member of the public.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I appreciate that, and I appreciate you -- on being brave, again, to appear here today.

These are the most common routes between Districts 9 and 22, and the constitution says that it is our task to pair the most contiguous as practicable districts.

Can you explain how you would drive from District 22 to 9 via the Seward Highway and how many districts you go through?

MS. FISCHETTI: Can I ask you a question? Because I don't know the answer to this.

My question is: Where do you live?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I live in Turnagain now.


BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I used to live in Fairview.

MS. FISCHETTI: (Indiscernible) 25 or more routes that I could take to get to the Hillside. I could take Lake Otis --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: That's the red.

MS. FISCHETTI: -- and, you know, whatever way I want to go, I can go there. It's the miles.
If you look at the purple, we have the most contiguous districts that there are. These other ones are just little tiny blocks that are contiguous. We have a big contiguous area.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Through the Chugach State Park?

MS. FISCHETTI: Contiguous area, according to those lines that have been drawn.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. For the record, if Ms. Fischetti does take Lake Otis like she said, that does require going through six House districts.

That's it. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Suzanne (as spoken), I think there's another question from Bethany.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thank you, Ms. Fischetti. I appreciate you testifying.

So in response to the question that you were just asked by Member Borromeo, if you were in a Senate district that was rep-- -- that had a Senate seat that was composed of two districts, an Eagle River seat and a South Hillside district, what would be the reason for going to the other district?

If you were -- if you were trying to contact your legislator, you wouldn't be going to their House
anyway; right? So what would be the purpose of
driving through those places to go to the other
district? Can you think of a reason why you would
need to -- to do that?

MS. FISCHETTI: No. That's why we have the
LIO, which is where we usually would meet with our
legislators. That's why we're meeting here today.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So there really
isn't any -- you know, when you talk about the link- --
linkages and the -- driving to South Hillside, there's
not any -- just because you're paired as a Senate seat,
there's really not any need for you to go to South
Hillside, you're saying?

MS. FISCHETTI: I can't even get to Juneau, so,
you know, I don't think it's an issue myself.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Okay. Well, we're
just grateful that we do have the LIO. It's available
to folks all over Anchorage; right?

Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: It is.

And, Suzanne, too, you might have heard the
exchange a little bit earlier about what the
constitution actually says. It says continuity --
contiguity, but it does not say anything about which
is the quickest way or the easiest way to drive to get
from one side of the district to the other or if it requires going through other House districts to get from one side to the other. It mentions nothing about that. It simply means they have to connect. At least that's my basic observation of what "contiguous" means. And I think as you pointed out, 22 and 9 have a huge geographic linear amount of contiguity as they touch, and the constitution does not say anything about having to drive from one side of the district to the other or how many districts you may have to get through.

Nicole, you want to add something else for the record?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I do. Thank you very much. I'd like to point out that the Supreme Court has addressed that very issue, John, and they called it false contiguity and second-rate contiguity.

So we've been down that path before where we listened to counsel, when counsel says they just have to be touching, and the Court was pretty clear that it's got to be a little bit more than false contiguity or second-rate -- second-rate contiguity.

So I caution members here to be very careful as we consider this line of argument, again, because it's already failed once.
MS. FISCHETTI: It's already been done, though, several times.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: And -- and I might mention also, Nicole, that the Supreme Court also spoke, and the Superior Court, in Valdez, the challenge there where you had to drive from -- through other districts to get from one side of the district to the other, and upheld that. And so I don't think this notion -- and I don't agree with it whatsoever -- that just because you have to drive through another district to get from one side of a Senate district to the other eliminates it from being an acceptable district. But we obviously disagree on that, so let's move on, if you don't mind.

Is there anybody else --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I can appreciate that --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- in the room there, Peter, to --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- but you're comparing apples to oranges. We're not talking about the Mat-Su Borough and Valdez. We're talking about the Municipality of Anchorage and what the most practicable contiguity is.

So let's focus on the law. Let's focus on (indiscernible), and let's focus on the compass. Okay?
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Let's do focus, and let's not be condescending either to witnesses or to each other.

So let's move on. Peter, who's next in the queue?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We have Katie Nolan, who is off-net. She's from Anchorage.

She's been in the queue.

MS. NOLAN: Hi.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Katie?

MS. NOLAN: My name is Katie Nolan. Yes.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Please proceed.

Thank you.

MS. NOLAN: All right. I'm the president of AHLOA, the Home and Landowners Association, Incorporated, of the Anchorage Hillside. And for those of you who don't know, we have been representing the Anchorage Hillside since 1970, which was long before we were incorporated into the municipality.

We created the Hillside District Plan, which is a planning document for the Anchorage Hillside, and the Anchorage Hillside now consists of the same areas that we have been representing. They are now the community councils in the area too, including Abbott Loop, Bear Valley, Glen Alps, Hillside, Huffman/O'Malley and Rabbit
Creek Community Councils, but we were there before everybody else, representing the Anchorage Hillside. And we had our normal monthly meeting last night, and we looked at these two maps, and I will tell you that neither one of them is perfect, but the one that meets the needs of the Anchorage Hillside is going to be Map 2, not Map 3.

The idea that we are contiguous with Eagle River ignores the fact that there's one of the largest state parks in the nation between us, and it -- it is faster to get from the Anchorage Hillside to Whittier and the Kenai Peninsula than it is to get to Eagle River Valley.

The challenge is, is that not just is this not contiguous with no -- there are so few similarities between the Anchorage Hillside and Eagle River. We have different road systems. We have different service -- they have their own parks department. There are things that the State does with Eagle River that are not appropriate for Anchorage and vice versa.

The biggest problem, though, that we saw with it was that we like seeing our Juneau representatives at our meetings whenever they're not in session. It's virtually impossible for any of our representatives to adequately represent an area that is so far away from...
us. It's not fair to them. Trying to spend an hour
driving to a meeting in Copper River Valley and then
come back to a meeting on the Anchorage Hillside,
that's not going to work for anyone, which means we're
going to keep Zoom as an option, and Zoom and
one-dimensional people is not an option that's
(indiscernible) relationships with our
representatives.

Another thing that's -- that's important to
remember is that we have everything in common with
each other and we have had for over 50 years; we have
little in common and little interest in common with
Eagle River Valley, Eagle River, Chugiak, all those
areas.

The other thing that I've heard, listening to
testimony, is that for some reason we've got this
faulty belief that everybody on the Hillside is
wealthy, like everybody on the -- Eagle River is
wealthy. We have, sure, wealthy areas, just like
Eagle River does, but we also have very high-density
housing on our lower sections. We have workforce
housing throughout, just like Eagle River does, and to
think that we're all just, you know, these rich nabobs
is -- it's offensive. We're just people like
everywhere else in Anchorage.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Katie.

Any questions for Katie?

Thank you, again.

Who is next on the list, Peter?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Ruth Kosack or Kosack from Chugiak, it looks like.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Ruth, are you with us online?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: No. It looks like we've lost her.

Joan Corr from Soldotna.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Good morning, Joan. Can you hear us?

MS. CORR: Yes, I can.

I'm -- I was just concerned, because Anchorage is important to the whole state, and I have quite a few friends who live in Anchorage and Eagle River and Rabbit Creek, and to me it seems like they have more in common than the Option 2 Map.

And then, in listening, I don't see what the working military people have in common with Downtown Anchorage, and I just wanted to encourage people to choose Map 3B with the like pairing.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.
Any questions for Joan? Seeing none. We'll move on to the next testifier.

Peter?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We have Briana Sullivan from Girdwood.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Good morning, Briana.

MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning. Can you hear me all right?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: We can very well. Please proceed.

MS. SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Good morning to the Alaska Redistricting Board. My name is Briana Sullivan. I'm a lifelong Alaskan, and today I am speaking as a Girdwood resident who also sits in an elected seat on our Girdwood Board of Supervisors. It may be trivial, but I spent my formative years living in close proximity to District 22 and now call District 9 home.

Thank you for all of your time, your work, and for holding additional meetings online, the phone, and in person in order to listen to thoughtful public testimony to allow more weigh-in from Alaskans who care about the present and future of their communities, small and large, and ostensibly the process of government in our state.
I don't know everyone in Girdwood, but I know lots of people of all ages. In fact, I am constantly reminded that most of my peers are starting families or caring for theirs. They are busy working and enjoying their days. Unlike most of them, I paid attention to the reapportionment by the Anchorage Assembly because of my involvement in the community and the significance of the potential changes. For the same reason cited in reference to local government and acknowledging compact areas of town found during this thorough process, the Senate redistricting could also reasonably follow identified voting areas of the municipality.

Regarding the Senate redistricting, from the few written testimonials I've read from various dates and oral public testimonials I have heard over the last week, it seems apparent countless individuals have urged you to quickly make this next crucial decision, to not waste time, to not pair Eagle River with Girdwood, and to take the Alaska Supreme Court ruling into utmost consideration when making these decisions.

For example, the Supreme Court ruled that Eagle River should not be split as this would give them more representation. Solving this issue would be
prudent. Pairing Districts 24 and 23 does what the
Court already cautioned against. I urge you to revert
to the pairing of 22 and 24, where the Court urged
against breaking districts and therefore their
representation. Please advise.

In the public process, to live fairly,
equitably, to make changes, to make our communities
operate in their best capacity, function well and
organized, to address the needs of society, we start
with our roots, with our neighbors, and then our
communities and our representatives. These public
offices are held by residents in the areas in which
they live, who understand the nuances of their towns
and cities and thus have a vested interest in serving
their constituents.

Citizens can support and vote for their
representatives, and it makes sense that these
individuals be within reach to be in contact and be
physically in places of need to support and to
represent. Two contiguous districts makes sense, and
therefore, do not substantially disrupt or break up
communities.

I acknowledge the uniqueness of communities
and neighborhoods within the expanse of the
Municipality of Anchorage. Because they are all
connected by roads and bridges and similarities, it's possible to group them within the constitutional definition. The commonalities they share are the proximity and culture and, most often, the terrain. People feel tied to their communities, whether it's tangible or a line on a map. The idea of connecting extremely distant Districts 9 and 22, where thick forest, rivers, drainages, and mountains stand firmly in between, causes confusion and seems far-fetched when there is an alternative practical option the way that the Municipality of Anchorage has developed.

Moreover, having a representative of Girdwood or Whittier living in Eagle River or a representative of Eagle River living in Girdwood or along Turnagain Arm makes a very challenging and undesirable job for a representative. I'd like representatives to run for office that want to work for their constituents. The communities of South Anchorage, Girdwood, and farther south, and Eagle River exhibit distinctive and obvious differences already explained and have a very long and unnecessary drive by car, with plenty of construction lately, connecting them.

Also noted, 9 and 22 have six to eight densely populated Senate districts squished between. Based on
public testimony, most comments from Eagle River do not want to be paired with South Anchorage and Girdwood and vice versa. We are humans with habits, and we are bound to roadways -- roadways and flying, the City of Anchorage for transportation, business, and commerce. Anchorage not only connects us, but the largest population in Southcentral Alaska separates us. We are not wildlife that roam among or above the Chugach Mountains.

Regarding testimony on the size of districts when looking at the map, the missing information is the topography. Hillside and South Anchorage have more in common with the Turnagain Arm and Girdwood community than the majority of Eagle River.

Through the Chair, I urge Board Member Simpson to strongly consider the constitution as read, to listen to the outpouring of public support for Option 2 and to the countless people who are providing public testimony on this important issue.

Furthermore, I encourage all board members to oppose Option 3B, which is unconstitutional, and support Option 2. Keep East Anchorage districts together as they request and Eagle River districts together as they request. This would obviously maintain the most satisfaction and better functioning,
already established, of a healthy society. Do not further confuse anyone with more maps, and please do not delay this process.

Thank you so much for your efforts and time in this matter.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Briana.

Nicole, you've got your hand up.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I do.

I have just a point of clarification, Briana. Are you calling in on behalf of yourself or the Girdwood Board of Supervisors?

MS. SULLIVAN: I'm calling in on behalf of myself. Thank you, Nicole.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay.

MS. SULLIVAN: The Girdwood Board of Supervisors did submit our opinion as well.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Fantastic.

Last question: If you were to travel to Eagle River, how -- how would you do that?

MS. SULLIVAN: I would, unfortunately, get in my car and not carpool, and I would drive the Seward Highway. And I would take the most direct route, so I would stay on the Seward Highway until I hit 36th and Gambell and take a right and stay on the highway all
the way. But there are lots of other ways I could
take that would not save any gas.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

MS. SULLIVAN: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: My question, Briana:

Have you -- in the time that you've been on the
Board of Supervisors, have you -- and involved in the
political process, have you had an occasion to travel
from where you live in Girdwood to the other House
district that is -- is connected by your senator?

MS. SULLIVAN: By my senator. I have, but not
for purposes of being on the Girdwood Board of
Supervisors. And since my time on the Board of
Supervisors, we've been in a pandemic, so all of our
meetings have been virtual. But I've met a lot of
people through that process, and it's been a really
great experience.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I guess the question, I
didn't ask it very well, but do you find yourself
traveling from one -- one House district to another
House district for purposes of contacting your senator?

MS. SULLIVAN: Not for purposes of contacting my
senator, no. I do not drive.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

I think next is Phil Moser from Juneau.
Phil, are you on the line?

MR. MOSER: Yes, I am on the line.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Good morning. We can hear you fine. Please proceed.

MR. MOSER: Thank you.

My name is Phil Moser. I'm testifying from Juneau in the Mendenhall Valley. I'm representing myself.

I've been following along the redistricting process since it started last year, and I would like to call in in support of Option 2. I -- I don't live in Anchorage, but I'm familiar with the (indiscernible) and the -- the history of gerrymandering in the United States and in Alaska.

I've read up on the previous instances where that's become an issue.

I feel Option 2 is the map most likely to fairly represent Anchorage, and this has ramifications for the entire state as well. South Anchorage is a diverse area, and the representation that we get there not only represents Anchorage or the -- the people of South Anchorage, but it helps (indiscernible) to diverse communities around Alaska, including here in Juneau. For that reason, I would really like to testify in support of that.
And I would like to add that throughout this process, there -- there's been multiple warnings about constitutionality, and there's been multiple warnings about the risk of running up against racial, non-discrimination policies, constitutional policies, and the mandate of the Board to keep districts contiguous -- representative, and to make sure that it connects communities that are similar to each other socioeconomically.

There have been board members that, throughout this whole process, have been very clear in the warnings against those issues, and at this point those board members have -- have been correct. So when Board Members Borromeo and Bahnke have been recommending Option 2 as the one least likely to run into constitutionality or other issues, I'm inclined to trust them, and I recommend the Board do the same.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Phil. Questions for Phil? Thank you.

Next on the line is Leon -- Leon Jaimes.

Good morning, Leon. Are you there?

MR. JAIMES: Hello. Good morning. Yes.

This is Leon Jaimes. I'm calling back in on
behalf of myself, and -- and thank you for taking testimony.

And the -- I -- I was listening to some of the testimony earlier on the -- on the definition of "contiguous," and I was reading the -- the Article VI of the constitution, and the last sentence in there is: "Drainage and other geographic features shall be used when describing boundaries wherever possible."

And so I just wanted to point out that if you look at the -- the topography, the -- the drainage for District 22 goes into both the Turnagain Arm and the Knik Arm of the Cook Inlet, and District 9 only drains into the -- the Knik Arm of the Cook Inlet.

So I think it's significant that they -- they chose to put "drainage" in there and "other geographic features." But I think, you know, if you look at the highest elevations in the -- the area between Whittier and Eagle River, you know, those are -- that's a pretty distinct boundary there. So I think that, you know, is something that could also be taken into consideration in the debate on whether or not the -- the Supreme Court means "contiguous" on -- to only, you know, refer to the geographic map as a two-dimensional map.

And my -- after I'd already called in, I -- I
1 did hear that this might be settled already. So,
2 yeah, that was -- that was all I wanted to say today.
3   Thank you.
4 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Leon.
5 Nicole.
6 BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thanks, Leon.
7 I -- I didn't hear. Do you have a preference
8 on either Option 2 or 3B at this point?
9 MR. JAIMES: Oh, yes. I think that Option 2
10 is really the only map that is practical --
11 practicable for a Senate district pairing for Senate
12 District K.
13 BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you for
14 your time today.
15 MR. JAIMES: Thank you.
16 CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. We'll go back to
17 the LIO office.
18 Mr. Ruedrich, Randy Ruedrich.
19 (Pause.)
20 Good morning, and welcome back.
21 MR. RUEDRICH: Good morning.
22 And I have a question for staff: Is --
23 is the map that I filed at 9:15 this morning available
24 to be shown, Peter?
25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I do have
the e-mail.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Point --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I could just show --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Point of order here: We agreed as a board, Randy, last week that yesterday was going to be the final time for options of corrections to be considered. So if you're insisting on amending 3B again, that's out of order.

MR. RUEDRICH: That is not what I'm doing. I'm trying to clarify what 3B is all about.

Thank you, ma'am.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you for that clarification.

With -- with that explanation, I have no objection to being shown the map.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: I need a second to...

(Pause.)

Is that what you want to show?

MR. RUEDRICH: That does show it.

I'm Randy Ruedrich. I'm representing myself this morning to just provide some clarification. I actually sent in a map that only focused on the new Senate E and Option 3B, but this will suffice since it
clearly shows the boundary, the full length of the boundary from East Anchorage where District 9, District 22, and District 12 meet. The boundary extends to the east in various segments to the far side -- to the far east side of the Anchorage municipality.

This map is clearly contiguous; therefore, the words of being "close to contiguous" are not relevant. We have a map here which has been materially the same as a Senate district that has existed in the past, and a House district has actually gone across that to show that that whole area is socioeconomically integrated, which is even a higher standard on what you need for a Senate district.

I just wanted to point out that this is potentially 35-plus miles of contiguous territory.

Any questions?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Nicole.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you.

Randy, this is going to be a point of contention, I believe, for you and I going forward, because as a trained lawyer, I have to fall back on the constitution, and the constitution does say in Article VI, Section 6 that the Senate pairings -- each Senate district shall be composed as near as
practicable to two contiguous House districts.
So I want to very strongly object to your observation that "as close to contiguous" is not relevant. It is indeed exactly what this board is followed -- is -- is required to do, and I intend to follow the constitution all the way until the end of the process. I'm not suggesting that you are not, but you and I have different readings of the constitution, and I'm going to follow what words are written in it.
Thank you.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Nicole.
And I would certainly agree with Mr. Ruedrich. I'm not a trained attorney, but my plain reading of the constitution, I agree with him, so we can all disagree respectfully.
Any other questions for Mr. Ruedrich?
Bethany.
BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: There we go. Found the mute button.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
So there are definitely different interpretations of what the language in the constitution means. Do you know of any place that it is a settled law or that is -- or is it a -- a point that would need to be litigated in order to determine
what the actual meaning is?

MR. RUEDRICH: Through the Chair, Ms. Marcum,
in the maps that have been drawn since '94, I believe
we have had physical contact with one district on land
with another district for them to be paired. You meet
that standard in this case with one of the longest
contact areas in Anchorage as possible.

Before '94, when Southeast had more districts,
I do not recall exactly how it was done, but there
were districts that were, I think, connected island to
island -- touched island to island -- that's not going
to make sense. Let me try again.

The district would contain a group of islands.
Another district would contain an adjacent group of
islands. There was no place where they physically
touched on the same island because that would have
been splitting the island, and they were, therefore,
connected across water.

That might be as close to an interpretation as
one can get to creating 20 districts in certain parts
of the state just due to the complexities of geography
itself.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Mr. Ruedrich.

Nicole, another question.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I just want to make sure that Randy has seen page 27 of the Superior Court opinion, because Judge Matthews addresses this very point where he talks about citing Hickel.

The Court has defined the contiguity criteria to require, quote, "territory which is bordering or touching, or more specifically that" -- quote -- "every part of the district is reachable from every other part of the district without crossing the district boundary."

So, Peter, pull up the route map here so we can take a look at it.

You --

MR. RUEDRICH: (Indiscernible). Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you. Then you can rely on your memory, but Peter will still pull it up.

Because if I look at the route map, you cannot get from District 9 communities, like Whittier, Portage, Girdwood, Indian, without crossing through at least six other districts to get to Eagle River.

Is -- is that your assessment of the -- the transportation corridors that doesn't involve the Dall sheep?

MR. RUEDRICH: At this time, as several people have testified today -- sorry.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Fischetti. Nobody's going to ride a Dall sheep, I agree.

MR. RUEDRICH: Okay. Several people have testified today.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Right.

MR. RUEDRICH: We have been blessed with Teams and Zoom and most meetings no longer require physical attendance, and as a matter of fact, it saves energy; it saves time; it saves, in the case of a little more complicated logistics, long trips on airplanes or ferries.

So the argument that you must be able (indiscernible) creates many problems for many parts of the state, and I think our technology has moved beyond this as a reliable sitting standard.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you, Mr. Ruedrich, for that, and I'm going to have to respectfully disagree. I'm going to fall back on the constitution, the words of the constitution, and the esteemed jurists who we've appointed to the Alaska Supreme Court to interpret that constitution when, once again, they have said in Hickel, quote, "Every part of the district must be reachable from every other part without crossing the district boundary."
MR. RUEDRICH: And what year was Hickel?


MR. RUEDRICH: My point exactly. I respectfully --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Is -- is your point that the constitution has changed --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Could you let him --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- between (indiscernible) --

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Nicole, could you let him finish, please, without interrupting?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: There's a little bit -- there's a little bit of a lag here, John, so don't worry. Randy and I are interacting just fine.

Go ahead.

MR. RUEDRICH: We're having a significant engagement, John.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: We are having a significant engagement, and I -- I -- I -- I appreciate the engagement.

MR. RUEDRICH: (Indiscernible) making is that the constitutional law is constitutional law. Findings are findings. And the reasons that new court decisions are made frequently is because the world has changed somewhat, and our means of communication have changed
radically. My need to be at my desk has substantially disappeared because anybody can reach me 24 hours a day as long as I don’t forget my cellphone.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I would agree with that. I also agree that the constitution is our most foundational document and that it should be strictly adhered to.

MR. RUEDRICH: I’m positive that we’re in compliance -- that 3B is in compliance.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You’re positive that 3B is in compliance with the constitution?

MR. RUEDRICH: I would not have put this map forward with it being -- with the District 9 and District 22 pairings if I did not think that it met the specific clause in the constitution, Article VI, Section 6, which says they must be contiguous.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

Do you have an opinion on the Court’s observation of second-rate contiguity?

MR. RUEDRICH: I have not looked at that.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Randy, thank you very
much. We appreciate -- and all of the public too, we
appreciate you participating, and -- and (indiscernible)
keep respectful. The -- the -- people are here to give
their opinion, and we don't necessarily need to
challenge them on their opinions.

At this point, we don't see anybody else
either in person or online to testify.

Nicole, you've got your hand up again.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I just have
a response, John, and I understand that you and I are
going to agree to disagree and that's the way that it
will be from here on out. But if a member of the public
intends to present a plan, I do intend to ask questions,
and whether or not you phrase that as a challenge,
that's a subjective observation, but I will continue to
ask about the constitution.

So to Alaskans listening across the state,
back in September when I presented v.4 and other
third-party mappers presented their maps, I told
Alaska, "At the end of the day, you may not like the
maps that we agree on and we adopt, but I'm going to
be able to defend every single line," and I'm still of
that opinion. I will be able to defend every single
line and every single pairing, and if it takes
questioning the members of the public to make sure
that we're under the same reading of the constitution, that's just how it's going to be.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: I would just ask you to be respectful of their opinion if they may have a different opinion, and we should respect that. And so I wouldn't agree with you -- I couldn't agree with you more, and I think every member of this board expects to follow the constitution, but the basic fact is we may have a difference of opinion, and sharp legal minds can have differences of opinion. If there weren't, there probably wouldn't be a need for attorneys.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I -- I agree with you, but I -- I'm not going to accept the classification that because I'm asking questions I'm being disrespectful to the public.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. It looks like we still don't have any --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: (Indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: -- any more testifiers either in person or online. Let's take a bit of an at-ease, and then we'll come back at, say, 11:20 and see if there's anybody either in person or online that has queued up to testify.
So we'll stand at ease -- okay. Online to testify, Peter?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Yes. We have Judy Eledge.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yep. Judy, good morning. Can you hear us?

MS. ELEDGE: Yes, I can.

Thank you very much for allowing me to testify. I know that -- I hope all of you are having a blessed day. I know it's pretty difficult to sit there and listen to testimony for so many days, but I did want to call in today. I had the opportunity during my lunch break today to be able to listen to some of the interactions, and I haven't been able to do that before.

And before I give my testimony, I would like to say that it seems to me that -- that -- that there is one person -- I don't know her -- that seems to already have her mind made up on what map she wants, and that -- I -- I get that feeling just by the aggressiveness in her questions to people that don't support the map she does, and I just -- you know, we all have a difference of opinion. And you're correct, we just need to all be respectful to everyone, because I respect everyone and the work they've put in.

And -- and I think that they don't need to question
what we're saying. So I just wanted to say that before I began my testimony in support of Map 3B. So one of the things that bothered me the most was the Board was accused of gerrymandering District K -- K, but the proposed Option 2 simply gerrymanders in another place to protect the State Senator Tom Begich, who was actually caught sending instructions to one of the board members in November, and Option 2 is his plan. So we do all have a plan. Also, the new controversy is whether to pair the two Eagle River Districts 24 and 24 (as spoken) or to use a more logical combination of 23 and 24 following the transportation corridor and common interests between JBER and Eagle River. But remember, importantly, 3B makes the obvious logical pairings of the two more rural and sparsely populated areas in Districts 9 and 22.

Looking at the full page -- the full map, as I did last night, anyone can see that 22 is the best -- best map for District 9 to share the common boundary. They most certainly are the (indiscernible) most contiguous districts.

And I will remind people that I did live on the Hillside, and I both lived in Eagle River, and I do remember that when Senator Cathy Giessel was
elected in office, she went from the -- the first time
she went all the way from Hillside to Kenai, which I
think was very difficult for her to have to do, but
that was what was passed. So we've oftentimes had --
had districts that were not easy to reach. Most
certainly if you lived in rural Alaska, that would be
the reason. So -- and I also think that every
person -- Anchorage muni is generally socio and
economically tied in some way.

But I do believe that 9 and 22 make the most
sense overall, just like the 23/24 makes sense to the
JBER and Eagle River connection. It also protects the
interest of any minority community in East Anchorage,
Muldoon, and Mountain View, and I just think that the
3B pairing is logical and makes common sense.

And so that is my testimony. I know that
there's some that don't agree with me, but those are
my reasons.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Judy.
Questions for Judy?

Bethany and then Nicole.

(Pause.)

All right. Give us just a minute here, Judy.

Bethany's --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Sorry. There we
CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: If we can get her unmuted. There we go.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: There we go.

Thanks.

Thank you for testifying. In your testimony you mentioned a legislator, a senator who had districts that were not necessarily close to each other but were contiguous. Was it your experience that the senator only had, like, town halls and meetings in one of those districts or, you know, had different meetings in -- in both districts to accommodate those residents who lived in -- in the two different areas?

MS. ELEDGE: I -- you're going to have to repeat that. I'm not sure what you're asking me.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So you said you lived in the Hillside; right? And so I --

MS. ELEDGE: Yes.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Did -- did the senator or -- I don't know if you said it was a senator or a representative -- but did that person have meetings and town halls and such and invite Hillside residents?

MS. ELEDGE: Yes. Yes.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: And then --
MS. ELEDGE: It was -- you're talking about Cathy Giessel? Is that what you're talking about?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah. If that's -- if that's the one that you referenced before, so...

MS. ELEDGE: Yes. Okay. Yes.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: And then -- and then when -- and then when she represented other parts of -- of the area, did she have town halls and meetings with those folks as well?

MS. ELEDGE: Yes. That happens in a lot of Senate districts because they're different communities. So if you're an elected official, you're going to go to each community. And this was before we had Zoom and things like that, so she had to drive to each one of those communities to have everything, and it was very difficult, but she did it, and she was re-elected, so I assume she did it very well. So --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So --

MS. ELEDGE: -- this is not the first time this has happened, and --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: So I guess my question is: The burden is really more so on the legislator, not on voters? It's not on residents. Residents --
MS. ELEDGE: Right.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: -- will have the opportunity to -- to meet with their legislator. It's really more of the burden on the -- the elected official as far as making sure they accommodate those people; right? Okay. Got it. Thank you.

MS. ELEDGE: And that's -- that's -- yeah. And that's -- okay. And that's common among people that are -- that live in rural Alaska, Bush Alaska, or most certainly the more rural areas, like in Kenai and maybe Mat-Su.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Nicole, you've got a question for Judy?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I do. Thank you for -- for calling in, Judy. And -- and you're right. I -- I do have my mind pretty made up at this point, which, again, is that I'm going to follow the constitution and stick very -- stay very far away from the type of actions that got the first proclamation declared as an unconstitutional gerrymander. And I will continue, as I told John earlier, to ask questions.

My -- my question to you, Judy, is: How would you travel from Portage to Eagle River?

MS. ELEDGE: The same way everybody does that lives there. I mean, that's -- you just have to go
around that way. But you know what? If I'm going
to -- if I'm going to probably meet -- since we do
that in town across the street -- I'm probably going
to do a Zoom meeting.

As Randy Ruedrich said, you know, our day has
come to where things are not distance -- I mean, how
does someone in rural Alaska, in Kotzebue meet all the
villages? They have to get on a plane and fly to
those communities. So that's not uncommon.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And I appreciate
that as a Bush kid. I grew up in McGrath.

But how --

MS. ELEDGE: Yeah, I -- I grew up in --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- do you
advise --

MS. ELEDGE: -- the Bush in rural Alaska, yes.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Fantastic. I'm
happy to hear that.

How -- how would you advise the Board, then,
that we should interpret the guidance from the Supreme
Court in Hickel that said very clearly, quote, "every
part of the district is reachable from every other
part without passing the district boundary" and that
that should be our criterion for contiguity?

MS. ELEDGE: Well, first of all, I -- you
know, everyone has an opinion on what the constitution says and how it reads. So that is -- when you say, "I'm going to follow the constitution," well, you know very well that all of us have a different opinion on that.

I assume that those re- -- re- -- vehicles -- you know, I don't know how to answer that, because how did they approve Cathy Giessel crossing district lines to get to Kenai? So I just guess -- you know, I have seen it over and over again, so I'm not really sure why that is such a big concern right now, because it hasn't been in the past.

And, so, you know, I think that -- I think that -- that the 3B is arguably -- it can be argued because it's happened in the past. Like I said, we have been -- when Con Bunde and others in Eagle River -- we have been -- we have been paired with South Anchorage before. This is not the first time.

And so I'm not sure how that stood in the constitutional view, if it doesn't now.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm assuming, then, that that was under different census populations.

Again, if -- if we were going to keep the same lines, there would be no point to redistrict, but we are here --
MS. ELEDGE: Right. Well, I -- you know, I
don't think that -- I don't think that there's been that
much. I think probably South Anchorage has maybe lost a
little more than Eagle River, and I -- I don't see the
numbers in the population, but, you know, every time we
go through this for ten years, you know, people think
this isn't a political process. Yes, it is. Because I
have seen -- you know, I've seen districts change that
absolutely just didn't need to change that much. It's
all an opinion of the Redistricting Board and what they
do.

And so I just don't think -- unless I could
see the numbers, I couldn't tell you whether or not
that population has changed that much. I think it had
more to do -- I mean, was not Eagle River with East
Anchorage (as spoken)? That's happened for many
years, and all of a sudden that's not okay. And so --
and I know that South Anchorage has been with part of
Muldoon and that was okay.

So I guess it just depends on what's happening
and what people want at that time. At least that's
how I -- it appears that way to me, that it's much
more political than it should be.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I appreciate
that. I -- I will extend an invitation if -- if you
want to come in and review some numbers. I'm -- I'm happy to meet with you either before or after public testimony. I'm also happy to share my contact information and we can go over the numbers, because I think they would be a little illuminating in -- in your future testimony.

But I do thank you for your time today --

MS. ELEDGE: You're welcome.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- and I'm --

MS. ELEDGE: Thank you for listening.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- I'm -- I'm really happy to see you engaged.

MS. ELEDGE: Thank you very much. Bye-bye.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Judy.

Next we have Forrest McDonald who just dialed in.

Forrest?

MR. McDONALD: Yeah. Thanks for taking my call. I'm calling in support of Map 3B, and the reason why -- so I've -- I've heard a number of comments from previous people testifying and from board members being very critical of people who are supporting Map 3B and accusing them of being the same people that were against the Assembly district pairings, and that's not how this works.
First off, you don't get to assume or criticize people for their opinion on this call and accuse them of making calls previously when you have no evidence of that happening.

But, furthermore, if you're going to make the argument that it was appropriate to link the Assembly -- and Eagle River, which did happen, if that's appropriate, now you also have the burden of evidence. You have to prove that this is somehow not appropriate, because as of right now, it seems like you're just changing standards willy-nilly. You're specifically targeting Eagle River voters through your actions and through your commentary. You're making it clear that you're trying to reduce their voting power as much as you probably can and reduce their footprint. You haven't given an explanation on why you feel like that's appropriate.

And, furthermore, I'm really upset that board members have been coaching testimony as people are calling in, asking very confrontational questions, pushing people to reevaluate their opinions if it doesn't match your personal views. People can have whatever opinion they want, because guess what? They might have different values than you. They might have different priorities than you. They're trying to add
that to the equation so that their voice is heard so
that we can have a diverse array of views and opinions
represented, not just one person, who happens to be a
board member, just dictating the entire process and
talking down on anybody who has a different opinion.

Thank you very much. 3B.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Forrest.
Questions?

Nicole.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROME: Thank you, Forrest, for calling back in. We seem to have gotten
disconnected the other day before I was done asking you
my questions.

I want to make very clear that we're not
trying, or at least I'm not trying, to reduce the
voting power in Eagle River, but I'm also not of the
opinion that we need to walk down the same road that
was already declared an unconstitutional gerrymander
by the Superior Court and affirmed on appeal to the
Supreme Court.

Can you give your -- your opinion as to why
the two Eagle River districts should not be linked?

MR. McDONALD: Yeah. I'd like to know why it
was appropriate to do it with the Assembly but it's
not appropriate now, and I'd like to know why
specifically Eagle River has all of these additional qualifications and constitutional questions that are applied in the process when you didn't apply it to any of the other districts in the entire state.

This -- this incredible criteria of evaluating racial distribution and then applying it to one Senate district and only one Senate district without any explanation of why you didn't look at any of the other districts in Alaska with the same criteria, that -- we've -- that seems like something that you should offer an explanation to.

If you're trying to make these arguments only looking at one area, then I don't have to prove anything to you. You need to dem- -- you have to make the case for that. You have to tell us why it's appropriate for you to be looking at racial demographics in only one case when there's -- that's not even a statutor- -- a statutory requirement anymore. Okay? The statutory rules have nothing to do with this really contrived constitutional argument that you're trying to make about racial distribution.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Thank you very much. I -- I have not been looking at racial data as it relates to Eagle River. I -- I don't impugn that motive to any of my other colleagues on the Board either. And
the only thing that I'm -- I'm looking toward is the
constitution, that, again, says each Senate district
shall be composed as near as practicable to two
contiguous House districts.

So I -- I appreciate your testimony today. I
understand that you are in favor of 3B, and I
appreciate that we had a better connection and we
didn't lose each other as we engaged in question and
answer.

Thank you.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah, and the -- the record is
well established that the constitutionality of this
pairing was never previously an issue. This is a
precedent that's well established going back decades,
this pairing. This is not the first time this pairing
has come up.

And if you want to make the argument that this
pairing is not appropriate because the districts are
too far apart, we already had a map where all the
map -- where all of the districts were right on top of
each other and touching, and you didn't like that one.
You threw that one out.

I also agree that the previous map was better
than this one, but since you already threw that one
out, now you're trying to throw this one out. You're
trying to throw out four out of five maps and just get your way with the map that was re-selected by the Senate Democrat minority leader in a text conversation with you several weeks ago. It's very transparent what you're doing.

Thank you very much. Have a great day.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Okay. So that -- that map actually was Option 1 that Senator Begich favored for his preferred Senate pairings, and that's not under consideration today. So let's keep facts to facts and slander for another day, but --

MR. MCDONALD: Okay. Here -- here's a fact:

Why is only this district -- only this pairing -- why are you applying all of these constitutionality questions to just this one specific area, only Eagle River? In -- in all of the maps you looked at, you were only applying these criteria to Eagle River.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Because in my opinion, Forrest, this is the pairing that the Supreme Court had an issue with, because we have a member of the Board who said during public testimony that Eagle River was being split to get Eagle River more representation. That's an unconstitutional gerrymandering move, and I believe it's going to get the Board right back into the same hot water that we found ourselves in a few months
ago. So that's why I continue to have great heartburn
over splitting Eagle River to increase its reach in the
Senate.

MR. McDONALD: So there you go again, saying
that you're specifically targeting Eagle River, that you
don't want Eagle River residents to have a level of
representation --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: No. I'm -- I'm
not saying that I don't want them to have --

MR. McDONALD: -- that you don't feel it's
appropriate. So --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Oh, sorry.

MR. McDONALD: -- why don't --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I thought you
were done.

MR. McDONALD: -- why don't you feel like Eagle
River rep- -- why -- why doesn't Eagle River deserve to
have representation? What is it specifically about
Eagle River voters that you're very cautious about them
having a voice in this Senate?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Oh, thank you for
that follow-up question.

I do believe Eagle River should have
representation. I don't believe Eagle River should
have any more representation, though, than it's
entitled to. I don't believe we should split two Eagle River districts so that they can swallow up their neighboring districts and control the Senate seats. That's where my -- that's -- that's where I have been on record. That is going to be my position going forward.

So I'm not saying that --

MR. MCDONALD: If that's not an appropriate action, then why are you trying to do that with the downtown Democrat districts? Why are you trying to split up Democrat districts downtown and push them into the base and Eagle River so that those districts can be swallowed up so that your people can have a disproportionate amount of representation?

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Oh, again, I appreciate that question, too, because if you look at the maps that were presented in the House, my maps were by far the less advantageous to the Democrats. They paired -- my map paired Democrats against each other in two different districts. My map also paired a very popular Republican against a Democrat in another district. So I don't know --

MR. MCDONALD: If your -- if your map --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- what you're referring to.
MR. McDONALD: -- is the least advantageous to
the Democrats, then why is the Democrat minority leader
and the Senate pushing them behind closed doors? That
seems a little bit confused on his part. I think that
Tom Begich is a very savvy, very intelligent man. I
think that it would be very questionable to assume that
behind closed doors he's acting against his best
interests.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm having a hard
time following that -- that comment, but I -- I don't
think --

MR. McDONALD: You said that -- you said that
your map is -- and, also, I mean, if you're saying that
your map is not advantageous to the Democrats, then that
means that you're factoring bias into the equation.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: That's not
exactly what I'm saying.

MR. McDONALD: Well, you just admitted --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm --

MR. McDONALD: -- that your consideration --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm saying
that --

MR. McDONALD: -- specifically --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- I'm -- I'm not
factoring either party into the consideration.
And I've -- I've drawn this map of Anchorage, Forrest, and I did so using major transportation corridors. I grouped schools as well. So that's --

MR. McDonald: You just said on the record --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- what I was looking --

MR. McDonald: -- in a recording that you considered the strength of the Democrat Party in your drawing of this map, that you specifically drew it in a way that you consider the Democrats not to be particularly advantage- -- advantaged by.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I didn't say that at all. I said if you look at the maps, mine was definitely the less advantageous to the Democrats.

That's what I said.

MR. McDonald: Okay. I'd like you to explain how you -- how you came to that conclusion, and --

and...

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I'm -- I'm really happy to, but it's beyond the scope of what the Board has been asked to do on remand. So if you leave your contact information with Peter or Yohan (phonetic), I'm very happy to give you a call later today and --

MR. McDonald: I -- I just called in --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- we can
MR. McDONALD: -- to say I support Map 3B. You wanted to have all of these additional conversational questions, and now you're talking about how you were evaluating these districts based on whether or not they -- they benefited the Democrat Party. And if you --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: No. I -- I -- I

MR. McDONALD: -- wanted to bring that up, I think that it --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- I never said that, and I'm not going to admit to saying it just because you say it. So I never said that.

MR. McDONALD: I mean, the conversation --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I -- I appreciate that that's --

MR. McDONALD: -- (indiscernible) on the record that you just said that you're evaluating --

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: -- that that's your position and that's what you think that happened, but, again, just because you think it happened doesn't make it so.

MR. McDONALD: You just said that you drew a map that specifically didn't -- Democrats -- that didn't
benefit -- like, you just said that a second ago.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: And that's my position. It's true. My House map of Anchorage didn't benefit the Democrats.

MR. McDONALD: Okay. So now you're saying that you're evaluating that question in your decision-making process, but you're not offering any explanation. You're saying you're evaluating whether or not this benefits the Democrat Party specifically.

I was under the impression that this was a non-partisan process where you did not consider whether or not it would benefit the Democrat Party. Now you're telling me that that was an important part of your decision-making process. And I don't think that you've -- you haven't offered an explanation anywhere on how you did that or why you think that's appropriate.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: I -- I have. You're -- you're just not listening. I drew the map based on transportation corridors and school systems. That's -- those are my two primary guiding forces. And, again, just because you say it so doesn't make it true. I appreciate that you are firmly tied to Map 3B. I'm not hearing any strong constitutional reasons, though, and perhaps over the next couple of
days, we'll hear that from you, Forrest.

MR. MCDONALD: Yeah, the constitutional reason
is you're applying questions and legal standards to
this specific district in a way that targets
Eagle River voters that you're not applying to any
other district. You can apply all of those same
arguments to Down-- -- you're trying to -- you're
attempting to do a Downtown and -- and base pairing.
All of the same arguments you're applying against
Eagle -- Eagle River residents could be applied to
Map 2B (as spoken) when you're looking at, like,
(indiscernible) Downtown people into Republican areas
to try to drown out the Republican vote on base.
Okay. All of those arguments cut against you as well.
You have a very myopic one-sided view of this.

Anyways, thank you very much for your time.

Appreciate it.

BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: You're right, and
that view is the constitutional view.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you,
Forrest.

Next up is Yarrow Silvers there in the LIO
office.

Good morning, Yarrow. Welcome back.
BOARD MEMBER NICOLE BORROMEO: Really quick before she starts to testify, I -- I want to make a note here that I have a previous obligation. The Board knows about it. Peter knows about it.

So I'm going to be leaving here in a couple of minutes, but I didn't want to be rude and interrupt you, so just continue as I pack up.

Thank you.

MS. SILVERS: Thanks. This is going to be really quick. I hadn't actually been planning to speak today, but I did just want to discuss really quickly the burden of proof, the burden of proof for using what has been described by Justice Matthews and Matthew Singer on behalf of the Board as second-rate contiguity and false contiguity, as well as the splitting apart of the communities of Downtown, Eagle River, South Anchorage, and JBER residents from their gated communities in Anchorage, falls on those suggesting that these actions are logical and rational and not just a gerrymander restated.

So I think that the burden of proof falls on the people that are suggesting that 3B is a rational and logical set of pairings when it splits every community in Anchorage apart. Keeping communities together is not gerrymandering; splitting communities
apart is, unless you have a really rational, logical argument for it, and I have not heard that, and I have not heard a rational, logical argument for using second-rate contiguities, false contiguities. I have not heard a rational, logical argument for any of this.

So that's all. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you, Yarrow. Questions for Yarrow?

Thank you very much.

Let's see. Peter, we do have somebody, Mike Edgington from Anchorage, online.

Mike, are you with us?

MR. EDGINGTON: Can you hear me now?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yes, we can. Go ahead, Mike.

MR. EDGINGTON: Thank you.

So my name is Mike Edgington. I live in Girdwood, but I'm actually representing the -- I'm cochairing the Girdwood Board of Supervisors, and I'm representing the Girdwood Board of Supervisors in this call today in my testimony.

We had the opportunity to meet on Tuesday evening. At the time, there were three maps -- or
three options being presented: Option 1, Option 2, and Option 3.

We discussed in some detail -- and we are the body -- we are an elected body. We are elected to represent the community of Girdwood, and we also have the functions of the community council, but unlike the community council, as individuals, we're elected by the -- by the whole of Girdwood in the municipal elections.

So we considered all three maps. The unanimous feeling of the Board was that, at the time, Maps 1 and 2 represented the -- a much more compact and contiguous Senate district than Map 3. We did discuss if there were going to be any additional changes, what the features were that we considered better, but we supported Maps 1 and 2 and did not support Map 3. It really was the issue of continuity or contiguousness across the Chugach National Forest and Chugach State Park.

The idea that -- to -- when there are options -- again, we're not talking about places where there are no options here. There are many options. So when you look at the -- Map 2, in this case, or Map 3B, one uses the continuity of literally, you know, houses and residential areas right next to each
other. The other uses miles and miles and miles of a major mountain range to get continuity. There's no population there. There's no practical way of getting from one side to the other unless you have mountaineering skills, which would take several days. It's not -- just not a -- it's not contiguous in any practical sense. But we do have Option 2.

So the -- the census the Board has had in a unanimous vote was that we supported Map 3 -- sorry -- we supported Map 1 or 2 over Map 3 or any similar maps which combine Eagle River with South Anchorage, Hillside, or Turnagain.

And I'm happy to take questions.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. Any questions for Mike? Hearing none. Let's see. Peter, is there anybody else that you see there in person or online?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do not see anyone else off-net or in the room who would like to testify at this time.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. We can -- we've got -- we were going to go until noon. I don't know what the wishes of members are. We're going to convene again tomorrow, so if people didn't get a chance to testify today because it was a workday or couldn't make
the schedule, they can certainly call in tomorrow and testify as well. That's our current schedule.

I don't know if members want to stick around and see if in the next 11 minutes anybody else comes on, or if we should just adjourn until tomorrow when we have our next public hearing.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Yeah. Go ahead, Bethany.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: I'm happy to stay on. I have no problem with other members dropping off. I'm happy to stay on. And since we know that the -- the testimony will be recorded as well as transcribed, other members will be able to see it. But I'm happy to stay on and -- and hear the testimony of anybody who calls in in that time period or comes into the office.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you. And that is very handy.

And I appreciate, Peter, all the work that you do -- do to get those transcribed to us by the evening of the day that people are actually testifying. That's incredibly helpful. I know it's a tremendous amount of work, and your time and effort are very much appreciated.

So with that, I think I'm going to ring off.
And, Budd and Bethany, if you two want to stay on or -- oh, go ahead, Budd. You have your hand up there.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: I -- I was just going to say I can stay on too. I may do some other chores or something, but I'll -- I'll leave the Zoom on in case someone comes on.


BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: All right. Bye, John.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: See you tomorrow. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Take care. See you tomorrow, John.

CHAIRMAN JOHN BINKLEY: Thank you.

(Chairman John Binkley leaves meeting.)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Doug Robins just signed up to testify.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Peter, you broke up there. I -- I couldn't hear what you said.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We have a Doug Robins who just signed in to testify, if members would like to hear his testimony.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: Okay.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Mr. Robins,
are you with us?

MR. ROBINS: Yes. I'm on the line. Can you hear me?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Yes.

Please proceed.

MR. ROBINS: Okay. Thank you.

Yeah, so this is Doug Robins from the Anchorage Hillside representing myself. I've -- I've spoken before. I -- I had another -- I'll be brief here and quote the Alaska Constitution from the Redistricting Board website.

After describing the criteria for legal standards for redistricting, the final words are "drainage and other geographic features shall be used in describing boundaries whenever possible."

So it does seem to me that the Option 3, as modified, is clearly contrary to the criteria defined in the constitution for designating Senate districts. This is under the description of Senate districts.

And either -- to -- to validate that -- that pairing, you either have to consider that the Chugach Mountains are not a geographic feature, which is false because they're -- they're virtually impassable for ordinary civic interaction, (indiscernible).

Well, I guess that's -- that's just it. You
have to say that -- that the mountains are not a geographic feature or -- or that there is no other possible way to join districts, which there clearly is. You can join Eagle River to Eagle River, South Anchorage to South Anchorage.

So, anyway, that's -- I -- I -- I think that Option 3 can't stand according to the constitutional criteria.

That's all I have to say. Are there any questions?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Budd, do you have any questions for Mr. Robins?

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: No questions. Thank you --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: All right.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: -- for testifying.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Robins.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We have --

Gretchen Stoddard has dialed in. She's from Anchorage, but she's through the teleconference system.

Gretchen, can you hear us?

MS. STODDARD: Hi. Thank you. I -- I'm not really ready to testify. I thought that -- but I was wondering if I could request for tomorrow, like, a
time, or that people could call in and request that --
I'm not -- I'm not comfortable enough with these
topics to be questioned on it, but I'd like my
comments to help, perhaps.

You know, some things are more of, like, a --
you have a three-minute time limit and you talk and
then it's done. Is -- is that something that could be
requested in this?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Yeah. Gretchen,
if you -- yeah. If you would like to -- to give your
comments and -- and decline to answer questions, that's
certainly your prerogative. You -- you are -- you are
not required to -- to answer questions of the Board.

We want to hear your opinion. We want to hear
from every Alaskan, and if you don't feel, you know,
that you have, you know, the -- the expert background to
answer some of the technical questions that might be
posed, by all means there's nothing that requires you to
answer those questions. So always feel free to give
your testimony. Your voice matters.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: The other option is
just to submit written comments or testimony online, and
then nobody -- nobody's going to cross-examine you on
that.

MS. STODDARD: Okay. All right. Thank you.
That's all I had.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Okay. And you are on record --

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thank you for contacting us.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: -- now. If you have testimony, you're free to give it now if you wish.

MS. STODDARD: No. I'm not really comfortable doing it now.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Okay.

MS. STODDARD: I -- you know, I was in -- I was asking questions in the chat. I -- I was in there earlier in person, and I kind of didn't -- didn't realize the way to do it was, yeah, to call -- you know, yeah. Anyway, no, I'll -- I'll -- I'll call back tomorrow if I'm ready.

Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: I was going to say, do you have the information about tomorrow and next week's hearings?

MS. STODDARD: Yes. Yes, I do.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Okay. All right.

Great. Thank you.

MS. STODDARD: All right. Bye.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: All right.

No one else is signed up presently, so we'll just wait for an additional five minutes or so.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Will do.

(Pause.)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: We have Julie. I'm going to mispronounce her last name.

Julie Coulombe.

Julie, can you hear us?

MS. COULOMBE: Can you hear me?

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: We hear you, Julie.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: 

(Indiscernible).

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Hi, Julie. Hi, Julie. Could you state your last name for us?

MS. COULOMBE: Yes. Julie Coulombe.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Coulombe.

Okay. Great. Thank you for calling, Julie.

You may proceed with your...

MS. COULOMBE: Yeah. Hi.

So I've been listening, and I am a resident of the Hillside. I was very engaged in the reapportionment process. And so I have not called because I've been really torn. I hate both maps that
are left.

One of the things that we did was -- in reapportionment was we fought really hard to combine south side with Eagle River. My main issue with that is because in reapportionment they were taking a pretty small population of the Hillside and combining it with a large population in Eagle River, so I didn't feel like the representation for the Hillside would be there.

So when I look at this and I'm listening to people calling in, sometimes I think we -- we get in the weeds, and I'm not saying that the constitution is just the weeds, but -- it -- it's obviously -- it needs to be constitutional, but the bigger picture is: Are the people being represented? Is representation happening?

And I really struggle with Map 2, and I struggle with 3B just because of the combination of Hillside and Eagle River because that's what I fought against in the Assembly districts. But as I -- as I thought about it, when you -- when you're making lines for Senate districts, that's much different than an Assembly. The -- the -- the issues that a representative has to tackle as a senator are going to be different than an Assembly member.
And so I'm not a fan of both maps. I would veer towards 3B just because I think JBER's better represented in that. And I do believe that the -- the area that Eagle River is being combined -- I feel like they would have fair representation. They would not be overwhelmed by Eagle River. We would still have -- because it's going all the way to Whittier, and the majority of the Hillside, at least the representation there, the population is more even than what we were talking about in reapportionment.

I also super struggle with all these -- these arguments against being contiguous. I went through all of those reapportionment meetings, and there were so many fights that those should be combined, that the Chugach State Park makes it contiguous, and now in a different setting somehow it's not contiguous.

I've lived in Eagle River. I live on the south -- I lived in Eagle River for 20 years. I've lived on the south side for 15 years, and I've lived on base. And I -- we're a military family, and I want JBER well represented. I don't think they're well represented by a town -- a Downtown representative. I think -- I know Eagle River very well. I have my son who is in the military. His family lives in Eagle River. That is a very heavy military
population.

And, so, yes, they work on base, in JBER, but they live in Eagle River, and their families go to the schools and everything. I -- I just look at the people that are being represented. Are they being represented well in 2 -- in 2 or Map 3B? If I have to look at the numbers and the -- and how people are being represented, I would prefer 3B. But I'm -- I struggle because I -- I really -- we fought hard to not do that in reapportionment.

But I do -- I guess the point of my call is there is a difference in what's happening now and what we did with the Assembly representation. And I have been hesitant to call because there's been such a third degree.

I'm no expert on redistricting. I'm not aconstitutionalist, but I look at it from a commonsense point: Who -- how are -- how's the population being represented? Is it equal? Is it fair? And I just want the best for JBER and Eagle River and South Anchorage.

And I know that it's a trek from Eagle River to the Hillside physically, but what was stated before, with this day in age, it's very easy to connect with your district. Most of my -- most of my
representatives connect with me through e-mail and Zoom. I very rarely see them in person anywhere. So that, to me, doesn't hold much weight.

The other point I wanted to make was the -- the decision -- the court decision right now that's being cited over and over again. Part of that decision was that the Board -- the Court had a problem with the Board's refusal to consider and make good faith effort to incorporate public feedback.

So I would just give the Board a warning on some of these calls and how they're being treated -- the callers are being treated, that is sounding like they're refusing to make a good faith effort as well, just like they did the first time around.

So I don't -- there's definitely plenty of people that are intimidated to call. I'm not. The main reason why I struggled with calling has been, you know, that -- that I went through the reapportionment process. I was very active. But this -- this isn't challenging callers. This is intimidating callers and the public, and that's not going to bode well for the record.

So that's all I have to say.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Julie, thank you very much for that very insightful testimony.
I did want to let you know that, because you brought up the issue of population, I -- I wanted to check on that, and so I went to our website and was able to see that in the -- in District 22, Eagle River -- in our proclamation map, Eagle River has 18,205 people in District 22, and the -- District 9 of the Hillside has 18,284 people. So that is -- you can see the numbers there that Peter's bringing up there for you.

So 18,284, the Hillside, and then 22 is 18,000 -- so, you know, as you pointed out, much more balanced in terms of the population, and then therefore quite different than what you were talking about for the Assembly reapportionment.

So thank you for bringing that to our attention. I appreciate that.

MS. COULOMBE: Yeah, sure, because in reapportionment we were looking at about 15 -- 12 to 15,000 people on the Hillside to 35,000 in Eagle River. That -- that just wasn't -- that wasn't balanced. So that's why I've kind of changed my opinion, just to see the -- the population even like that.

I appreciate those numbers. I knew it was closer. I didn't have the exact number. But, yeah, I
think that should be weighed into the discussion.

Just -- I guess just a reminder, like, the whole point of this is to make sure that people are being represented, and I -- I feel like that's a better representation than chopping off JBER to Downtown. I'm -- I'm very opposed to that.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Thank you very much, Julie.

Budd, do you have any questions? It looks like he does not.

So, Julie, thank you for -- for testifying.

MS. COULOMBE: No problem. Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER BETHANY MARCUM: Uh-huh.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR PETER TORKELSON: Okay.

That's -- I don't see anyone else online, and this room is needed for a Budget and Finance Committee meeting, so let's wrap it up.

BOARD MEMBER BUDD SIMPSON: All right. Good-- -- goodbye.

(Off record.)
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ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

April 09, 2022

PACIFIC RIM REPORTING
STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTERS
711 M STREET, SUITE 4
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501
907-272-4383
www.courtreportersalaska.com
Members Present:

John Binkley, Chair of the Board
Melanie Bahnke, Board Member
Nicole Borromeo, Board Member
Bethany Marcum, Board Member
Budd Simpson, Board Member
Peter Torkelson, Executive Director
Matt Singer, Legal Counsel
MR. TORKELSON: Okay. We have a few folks on the audio today and nobody off net, so I believe we can call the meeting to order.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We'll go ahead and call the meeting to order of the Alaska Redistricting Board. It's Saturday, April 9th, at 12:06 p.m.

Peter, if you call the roll to establish that we have a quorum.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Good morning -- afternoon.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: And Member Binkley?

MEMBER MARCUM: Peter, can you hear me?

Okay.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley, are you with us?

CHAIR BINKLEY: I'm here.

MR. TORKELSON: Great. We have four members present and accounted for.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. My understanding is
that Member Simpson is on the line and able to
listen, as well.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. Member Simpson is with
us telephonically and able to listen to today's
testimony.

We have a number of folks signed up to --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Do you have -- do you have a
copy of the draft agenda, Peter, that you can put
up --

MR. TORKELSON: Oh, yeah. Let me bring up
the draft agenda first.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We have a copy before
us of the draft agenda for today's meeting. Is there
discussion on the agenda or can we look for a motion
to adopt the agenda as presented?

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I move that we
adopt the agenda. Member Marcum.

MEMBER BAHNKE: This is Member Bahnke. I'll
second that motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Motion before us and
seconded to adopt the draft agenda as presented.

Discussion on the motion? Any objection to the
motion?

Hearing none, the motion to adopt the agenda
is passed.
The first item we have is public testimony. Are there any members of the public who wish to testify?

I think, Peter, you indicated that nobody is on the off-net currently, but several people at the LIO. And if you could give me the order of those, I would appreciate it.

MR. TORKELSON: Sure. The first person who signed up today is Catherine McDonald. Catherine McDonald.

CHAIR BINKLEY: If you're there and can join us, we would appreciate it.

MS. MCDONALD: Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can. It's helpful to speak directly into the microphone if you can, and fairly loudly. It's not bad, but --

MS. MCDONALD: Is this better?

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- anything you can do to project would be helpful.

MS. MCDONALD: Is this better?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Actually we've got a bit of an echo right now for some reason. My audio (indiscernible).

MEMBER MARCUM: I'm hearing it, too,

Mr. Chairman.
MR. TORKELSON: Say something.

MS. MCDONALD: Let me try again.

CHAIR BINKLEY: It's still there.

MS. MCDONALD: I think they're attempting technical assistance.

MEMBER MARCUM: We didn't have the feedback that time, oddly enough, so maybe it's resolved. We could hear you just fine that time, Catherine.

MS. MCDONALD: Is it better now?

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. I think we fixed it.

MS. MCDONALD: All right.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes.

MS. MCDONALD: All right. Wonderful. All right. Thank you.

Good afternoon. My name is Catherine McDonald, and I'm speaking for myself today. I have been an Anchorage resident for almost three decades. I've lived on JBER, I've lived off South Muldoon, off Abbott, and now I'm currently a district -- a resident of the proposed District 9, on the Hillside.

I wanted to summarize my history of written comments to the board over the course of the process to give context for the support of my proposed map.

My first written comment was on September 18th. I noted the importance of providing
Senate district pairings early to be able to provide public comment on feedback for one-half of the legislature.

Then to be informed in the process I took a shot at drawing the Anchorage map, mostly using traffic corridors, that I then submitted.

I attempted to put myself in your shoes to understand the complexities and nuances of your work, balancing the constitutional requirements. It wasn't easy drawing a House map just for Anchorage, and I commend your work on drawing a full 48-district map that withstood legal challenges.

My second written comment was on November 7th. I proposed Senate district pairings within Anchorage. That testimony didn't even include the two Eagle River districts of 24 and 22 because while part of the municipality, many individuals within Anchorage, myself, even from a former JBER family, consider them to be separate communities.

On November 8th the board for the first time began discussing Senate pairings within Anchorage. At five hours into the recording on November 8th Board Member Marcum, she was discussing her four proposed maps of the Senate district pairings within Anchorage and how each of her iterations contained
joining of District 24 Chugiak/Eagle River with District 23 JBER.

And then the following conversation occurred around a different House pairing. Board Member Marcum stated, "Another commonality I think that is in all four of my maps, yes, is the pairing of the Hillside districts of Anchorage, Districts 9 and District 15." Please note for the record that's the current District 11 in the renaming.

Continuing on, Board Member Marcum stated, "That is South Anchorage. Those are considered the Hillside areas typically, so it is really important, I think, to restore that part of District 15 to the Hillside area. And I think we heard unanimous testimony today from all testifiers that were in favor of pairing Districts 9 and 15."

To which the chairman replied, you know, "So fireworks?"

And Board Member Bahnke responded, "Fireworks."

Board Member Borromeo said, "Can we lock that in before anyone changes their mind? Going once, going twice, consensus, Mr. Chairman?"

To which the chairman responded, "Yes, we have consensus."
The board continued discussing the Anchorage map but couldn't reach consensus on most of the other pairings. The board went into hours of executive session that afternoon and the following morning.

It's understandable then that a District 9 resident trying to be informed went to bed the night of November 8th believing that the board had consensus on pairings of 9 and the now named 11. I noted as such in my written testimony of November 8th, applauding the board for proposing to pair my District 9 with the O'Malley district.

Imagine my surprise, when catching up on the hearings later, to see in the video of November 9th's meeting that the board emerged from executive session to put a vote on the record with no justification given for Senate pairings for Anchorage, and that those pairings didn't even include the singular consensus of Districts 9 and the now named 11 that the board had agreed to the day before.

In that plan District 9 was paired with District 10 of Klatt area. While not aligned with the, quote, unquote, unanimous testimony of the public or the complete consensus of the board the day prior, Districts 9 and 10 both attend South Anchorage High School, they shop at Carrs on Huffman. You can
drive directly from one district to the other. At least it made sense, a second ranked option to the prior unanimous rank 1 choice of District 9 and the now named 11.

That brings us to where we are today with the two proposed maps. I provided written testimony on April 5th, back when there were three maps for consideration. I arranged my order of support with justifications.

In that testimony I had supported map 1 first as a District 9 resident for the sole reason that it was the only map that paired Districts 9 and 11, which, as noted previously, was the singular point of agreement of the board on record.

Becoming more educated on the issue in recent days, I discovered that option 1, while aligned with the constitution, the terms of pairings as near as practicable, it doesn't comport with the limited scope of authority of the Court's remand. I applaud the board for removing it for consideration.

In that same testimony I contended that my secondary support was for map 2 and provided justification. Today I'm here in support of map 2.

I understand that some members of the board may state that contiguity or touching is all that
matters. If that is the case, then how could the Courts have found that the pairings of Districts 22 of Eagle River and District 21 of South Muldoon are illegal, as they also touch over the Chugach Mountains? It speaks to intent, to quote the opinion, of political gerrymandering of the fragmentation of Eagle River into two separate Senate districts to increase representation of a majority political party in the Alaska Senate.

Therefore, intent can be shown first legally in ignoring the charge from the remand of the Court, and second in spirit in ignoring the will of the citizens who have come forward with testimony that includes socioeconomic linkages between communities. Not necessarily with the volume of that testimony, but with the content of it.

I understand we all live busy lives, but if someone can't take time to articulate in a few sentences their justification, merely states "I support map X" or submits a form letter, it really smells of political motives.

So now, like my exercise in drawing the House map, I attempt to put myself again in your shoes.

If I was a board member who held the belief,
which I want to state for the record I do not, that
contiguity is all that matters and that the charge of
the Court is not to correct the fragmentation of
Eagle River but merely to avoid any verbal assertion
of that gerrymander -- I'm sorry, the verbal
assertion of political gerrymander owning the record
in performing that gerrymander and fragmentation, I'd
have to wonder why -- at this point, why anyone,
public or board member, is having any discussions on
socio and economic linkages between districts for
pairing Senate. If one district is touching is all
that matters, then both maps meet that criteria.

Again, putting on my board member hat, I
think that the Court reprimanded my actions based on
intent. I would be of concern that my actions,
especially to pair Eagle River once more over a
non-populated mountain range, would have at least the
appearance of political gerrymandering to the Court.

Not only that, I would be concerned that by
then selecting District 9 as the one to pair with the
Eagle River district I would again be showing intent
of political gerrymandering.

The JBER and Chugiak/Eagle River pairing was
in all four of Board Member Marcum's maps, a
characteristic that was also afforded to the Hillside
and the O'Malley districts. What is so compelling in
the JBER and Eagle River pairings that the board must
maintain it at all costs, against little
consternation in breaking the November 8th verbal
consensus pairing the Hillside and O'Malley
districts, not once to pair the Hillside with the
Klatt district in the proclamation, but twice in
remedying the finding of the Court by selecting
map 3B?

To attempt this political gerrymandering,
the board has to resort to what must be considered
the rank 3 option for pairings for District 9, in
both the words and actions of the board, to once
again fragment Eagle River.

We still live in the universe where the
Board Member Marcum used the words "more
representation" in regards to that fragmentation. We
still live in the universe where Board Member
Borromeo stated the chairman had told her that,
"Haven't you won enough," and it was time for someone
else to have a win in the process.

I guess I naively assumed that this process
would be as nonpartisan as possible to provide fair
representation to every Alaskan. We still live in a
universe where the interpretation of the Courts are
that those actions and other actions constitute an unconstitutional political gerrymander. Therefore, by continuing to insist on the fragmentation of Eagle River and the pairings of JBER and Eagle River at the expense of every surrounding district, one cannot help but be concerned that the political gerrymander may continue. I again implore the board to make their selection based on the ruling of fact and law and to help restore trust in our institutions.

Thank you for taking my comment.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Catherine.

Questions for Catherine? Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Catherine. I appreciate your testimony today.

Peter, can you put up the map?

AUTOMATED VOICE: This meeting is being recorded.

MEMBER BORROMEO: It's okay. Can you put up the route map, please? Let's explore the notion of contiguity a little bit more, because you seem very well-versed in the subject, and I appreciate your position as a now District 9 resident of Upper Hillside.

MS. MCDONALD: I live near Huffman.
MEMBER BORROMEO: Oh, you live near Huffman.
Okay. Okay. Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution requires the board to pair districts as contiguous as possible for the Senate pairings.
And when I look at this map here that shows the main transportation routes from District 9 to District 22, it appears as though residents as far south as Whittier and Portage and Girdwood can take two different routes. The black is the New Seward Highway, and the red is Elmore to Lake Otis, around the Muldoon curve, and then on to the Glenn Highway.
How many districts, if you live where your House is, do you have to cross through to get to 22?
MS. MCDONALD: Sure. So I live right near the New Seward Highway and Huffman, so right down further, down more. So I would jump onto the frontage road. I would go around the Huffman roundabout. I would go down the Seward Highway all the way until when you reach the Glenn Highway and continue on.
So I don't know if you would count the yellow and the green as touching two or one, but let's just say it's one. So one, two, three -- it looks like four, five, six to cross it.
But I also have family who lives at the top
of Huffman, and so -- and family who lives in
District 12, so I often do take the other route.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. One follow-up
question, because you did touch a lot on the
unconstitutional party gerrymandering that the Court
found the board guilty of in the Matthews decision
that the Supreme Court unanimously upheld, too.

If we split Eagle River the first time
around to give Eagle River more representation and
hurt poor brown voters, but this time we're splitting
Eagle River again to potentially hurt rich white
voters, is the intent still the same no matter who
you're hurting? So is -- does -- would it matter why
we're splitting Eagle River if the reason to split
Eagle River is for more representation of that
community?

MS. MCDONALD: No, I wouldn't think it
matters, the characteristics of the individuals at
all. As you note, I think it matters, fair
representation for most people.

And I just keep on -- I'm confused by the
notion that as long as it's contiguous it meets the
standard. If that really was what -- if I was a
board member and I really thought that, why would
there have been any kind of discussion on any
pairings anywhere throughout the state on pairings?

If I really held that belief, oh, it touches and

that's good, okay, well, then start in Southeast

Alaska and do a random number generator as you

combine all the things around.

So it just seems odd that if I really held

that view I would hold it from the beginning instead

of at the back end now, after I've been found to have

intent of gerrymandering, that I then use that to try

and gerrymander more skillfully.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Is that your baby in the

back of the room?

MS. MCDONALD: No. That is my sister's

baby. I have three children, and right now they're

being -- they're all under the age of four, and so

they're being watched by my grandparents.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Well, I note that

Ms. McDonald's nephew is in the room. He's four

months old, and what a fantastic exposure to the

public hearing process watching his aunt kick things

off today.

Thank you. I'm done.

MS. MCDONALD: All right. Thank you very

much.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Catherine, I don't know
that John --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Excuse me, Catherine. I think Bethany -- Member Marcum has a question. I was calling on Bethany.

MS. MCDONALD: Oh, yes. I'm so sorry.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Member Chair-- thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Yes. I just wanted to assure Ms. McDonald, as well as other listeners, that, in fact, I did have -- the pairing that I'm presenting now is one of many pairings that I put together at the time.

The ones that I chose to produce in the open meeting were because of consensus that other members had. So we were trying to move toward consensus, and so those are the ones I decided to put forward.

But I certainly had worked on multiple other options, including the ones that I'm putting forward today. So thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Further questions?

Comments?

Okay. Thank you again, Catherine.

MS. MCDONALD: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Denny Wells in the LIO office.

MEMBER BORROMEO: As Denny --
CHAIR BINKLEY: (Indiscernible.)

MEMBER BORROMEO: As Denny makes his way up, I do have a follow-up question to what Bethany just said, because that's new information to me that you had other pairings.

Were any other of your Senate pairings that you had explored going to pair the two Eagle River districts?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Member Borromeo. Yes, I paired Eagle River -- actually, Eagle River with Chugiak and Peters Creek together. I paired a variety of options, so -- and I moved forward with the ones that I thought made the most sense based upon the guidance we've been given. Thank you.

Mr. Wells, looking forward to hearing from you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Some graphics you said, I was able to see those. And I don't know if Peter's able to get them on the screen or not for the other members, and I don't know if you've all gotten those. But, Peter, were you able to get those on the screen?

MR. WELLS: He is nodding yes.


MR. WELLS: (Indiscernible.)
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. (Indiscernible),

Denny, so go ahead (indiscernible).

MR. WELLS: (Indiscernible) they're numbered, so 01 is the first one I want. Okay.

CHAIR BINKLEY: The Iditarod one first?

MR. WELLS: Yeah. And I'll get there in a moment.

So as the board approaches the end of this initial round of Senate pairing testimony, I would like to focus in on what the Court directed in the realities of the shared boundaries in the House districts. In creating the House districts, you were constrained by the number 18,335. That was your target number of residents per district.

In the urban core of Anchorage, that number was small enough that it necessitated many neighborhood splitting districts. You did your best to make those neighborhood divisions rational and equitable.

Now with Senate pairings, you have the opportunity to pair some of those communities that you divided in the House districts. In decades past this chore has been a challenge because the population of the Municipality of Anchorage did not divide neatly into an even number of House seats.
This year you were lucky. With the small addition of Whittier, the Municipality of Anchorage divides neatly into 16 House seats. Further, the Chugiak/Eagle River area fit neatly into two House seats.

This gives you the maximum possible opportunity to bring communities back together with your Senate pairings. Future boards may not be so lucky and may again need to pair Chugiak or South Anchorage with some community outside the municipality, or Eagle River may grow so large that they need three House seats and will necessarily be divided again in the Senate.

But today you are lucky. With the 2020 census data you have no need to divide Eagle River or South Anchorage or need to pair one of them with another community.

The Superior Court said, quote, "Senate K pairs two districts that, while contiguous in the strict definition of the word, ignore communities of interest in Eagle River and Muldoon," end quote.

The Court further stated, quote, "The Court sees Senate districts ignore the Muldoon and Eagle River communities of interest with very little justification," end quote. The Court specifically
reviewed your arguments and laid them out in their -- in their brief, the ones you still are making today, that there is a JBER connection to Eagle River and that the mountains make contiguity, and still they found they were, quote, "very little justification," end quote, for splitting both Eagle River and Muldoon.

So what can you do? What communities are split by your House districts that you could put together in the Senate pairings? Both of the plans on the table put Muldoon together.

So let's start with downtown Anchorage. You split downtown Anchorage along 4th Avenue. If you could put the image up, that would be great.

You split downtown Anchorage along 4th Avenue. This is the traditional start line of the Iditarod and the Fur Rondy. This is the home of my favorite Anchorage camera shop. For several years I lived right on the boundary of this district, at 315 Barrow Street. I definitely lived downtown. The opposite commute and the ability to easily walk to community events was great. The two ends of the chain in holding up that Iditarod sign should be in the same Senate district.
1 District 23 is comprised of 10,832 residents of JBER and 7,191 residents of Anchorage. 2,389 of those Anchorage residents are in Muldoon, the remainder in downtown on Government Hill. If anyplace in Anchorage constitutes a community of interest it is downtown, the heart of the city. You pair downtown with downtown.

Now let's consider Eagle River. You split Eagle River along the Glenn Highway, Old Glenn Highway, Eagle River Road and Eagle River Road. But you also split along a residential street in Eagle River, War Admiral Road. I've shot listing photos of houses on this road. This is a small neighborhood road where people definitely know their neighbors. The neighbors in this picture should be in the same Senate district.

In conversation with a community member at public testimony yesterday, Board Member Marcum stated there's only one Eagle River House seat. The other seat is Chugiak -- Chugiak, Peters Creek, and JBER.

This is factually inaccurate. District 24 has 7,586 residents of the Eagle River and Eagle River Valley community councils, including the residents on the left side of the previous image.
That's 33 percent of the total population of Eagle River community councils. The Eagle River Carrs, Eagle River Fred Meyer, and Eagle River business Boulevard are all in District 24. This is most definitely a second Eagle River seat.

The claim that District 24 is a district of JBER is -- is true, only in the most obscure academic sense. District 24 includes a small portion of JBER, but this portion of JBER has exactly zero population except in precisely one census block.

And (indiscernible) put that up on the screen. Awesome.

That -- that block appears to be noise from the Census Bureau's anonymization efforts. This is the block outlined in red. It is bounded by Eagle River, the squiggly line on the upper right by the Inlet above, and by Otter Lake down to the south.

That -- that block has a stated population of 197 people, but no physical infrastructure in which those people might live.

Further anomalies in that block -- in the data for that block include that the population is 100 percent adult and that it is 38.6 percent white versus 74 percent adult and 59 percent white for the rest of JBER.
In my map drawing of the Anchorage assembly seats, I spotted several anomalous census blocks like this in the Anchorage Bowl. The most obvious was a block that covered the Hickel/Minnesota Parkway, what name you want to apply to it, between International Airport and Raspberry Roads. It is not a census block that encompasses surrounding land, just the road itself, yet it has a population of 19.

While state statute, Article 2, Section 15.10.200(b) precludes you from adjusting census numbers in your work does not preclude you from putting the census numbers in context. The context in this case is that District 24 is only a JBER district inasmuch as it has a single census block with a population of 197, which appears to be anomalous. In all likelihood there will be no -- no one living on JBER who will be able to provide the state an address that places them in District 24.

I have heard that the District 23 and 24 pairing justified because Eagle River and Chugiak have a strong military connection. Anecdotally, I agree. I shoot a lot of houses -- a lot of homes with military officers in Eagle River.

Also anecdotally, I shoot a lot of homes with military families in Anchorage. On Thursday,
while you were hearing public testimony here, I shot one of each. I currently have military tenants in my duplex in Muldoon. I've had military tenants in my three-plex in Sand Lake. Those people are all represented where they live.

I have heard the concern that demographically and socially JBER is more similar to Chugiak/Eagle River than downtown. There are two problems with this argument. First, it ignores the 7,200 residents of District 23 who live in downtown and Muldoon. Those residents unequivocally have more in common with downtown than Eagle River and Chugiak. They live in houses that are smaller, on older blocks that are smaller, older, on smaller lots. They are on city water and sewer, city maintained roads.

The parts of downtown and Muldoon inside District 23 are only 40 percent white, District 17 is 51 percent white, and District 24 is 73 percent white. The downtown and Muldoon parts of District 23 are absolutely more similar to the population of District 17 downtown than District 24.

The JBER part of District 23 is 59 percent white. Again, 59 is closer to District 17's 51 percent white than District 24's 73 percent white. As a whole, the district -- District 23 is 52 percent
white.

Making a minority -- taking a minority population like that and burying it in a 73 percent white district when there are other good, available options, is a classic sign of a racial gerrymander.

The concern that JBER is more similar to Chugiak/Eagle River when it is demographically not so seems a weak justification for splitting established communities like downtown and Eagle River.

I've heard that the District 22 and 9 pairing (indiscernible) justified because both districts had rural road service, well, and septic, and they share a long, continuous border along the mountains.

These exact same justifications also support pairing the Eagle River districts, 22 and 24.

Districts 22 and 24 both have many houses with wells and septic. They share a long, contiguous border -- and they share a long, contiguous border through the mountains. The District 22 and 24 connection is even stronger because they not only share the concept of a road service area; they share the exact same road service area.

I've also heard argument the pairings in 3B are justified due to the Ship Creek hunting area.
This is a really tenuous claim for three reasons. One, people from all over the state can apply for the hunt. Two, this hunt area is entirely contained in District 22. And three, if you are relying on the constitutional verbiage that drainages justifies Senate pairings, the Ship Creek drainage would support pairing Districts 22 and 23 rather than 23 and 24. In fact, if you're using drainages for justification, Districts 22 and 24 certainly belong together due to their sharing of the Eagle River drainage.

In the end, you have House districts that divide communities by necessity and Senate districts that can pair those communities. Imagine if we were discussing pairings in my old hometown of Fairbanks. Imagine you drew House districts which divided downtown Fairbanks along the classic Open North American start line on 2nd Avenue. You would want to pair those two House districts into one Senate district if you could.

Or imagine we were discussing pairings in Nome and you had House seats that divided down Front Street where the Iditarod burled arch flies. You would pair those House districts into one Senate district if you could.
Or imagine we were discussing Juneau and you had House districts that divided along North and South Franklin Street. You would pair those House districts into one Senate district if you could.

You have an option on the table that clearly corrects the error the Courts saw in splitting Eagle River and Muldoon. It puts together clear neighborhoods and brings Muldoon together. It brings neighbors on War Admiral Street in Eagle River together. It puts the ends of the chain holding the Iditarod sign on 4th Avenue into one district.

You should adopt Senate pairings map No. 2.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Denny.

Melanie, you’ve got a question for Denny?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Wells, for your testimony.

Peter, can you get that -- I think it was the map, the aerial --

MR. WELLS: Aerial photo of JBER?

MEMBER BAHNKE: -- back up on the

(indiscernible)?

So when I think about these House districts and in terms of a Venn diagram, looking at Eagle River and Eagle River has significant overlap in
terms of being contiguous and all the other things.

So those two, in my mind, have the most connectivity.
And then 22 and 29 have some partially, and then 24
and 23 have some together.

But are you saying -- in my mind, if this
was a Venn diagram -- that between 24 and 23, Eagle
River and JBER, the part in my mind that's the Venn
diagram connecting them, the little sliver, is this
unpopulated -- well, no structures, right, in homes?

MR. WELLS: Right.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Is that -- am I getting that
right?

MR. WELLS: Yes. This -- JBER extends a
little -- a little further north of Eagle River here,
but all of the census blocks that are on JBER and
north of this -- of Eagle River, the river, all of
those are vacant census blocks.
The only census block that is in District 24
as drawn right now with a population that is on JBER
is the one that is drawn with the red line here. And
your boundary between Districts 23 and 24 follow
the -- the westernmost line here in the southern edge
of -- of this census block.

MEMBER BAHNKE: All right. Thank you very
much for explaining that to me.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Melanie.

Any other questions for Denny?

Okay. Next we have, I believe off-net, Jason Warfield.

MR. WARFIELD: Yeah, I'm here. I'm here.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Go ahead.

(Indiscernible.)

MR. WARFIELD: Thank you. So my name is Jason Warfield. I've lived in Anchorage a little over 40 years.

First, I'd like to thank you all for your service to the community. You have a tough job, and I know how challenging it can be to -- and thankless, for that matter, to be on a volunteer-appointed board. Thankfully this only has to happen, you know, what, every decade?

Next I'd like to speak briefly about redistricting, and specifically map 3B. There seems to be a lot of pushback joining Districts 22 and 9, and some point to the fact that the Hillside just spoke out against it, the municipal reapportionment committee was making that case and taking part of the Hillside and throwing it into municipal District 2.

In a nutshell, this is why it's completely different. Throwing a portion of District 6, about
12,000 people, into municipal District 2 would cause them to be far underrepresented due to the population disparity. I don't have the population numbers in front of me, but I know it wouldn't be an equal pairing.

In map 3B, the district pairings -- while not optimal, nobody likes change -- represent the most fair map on the table in my opinion. The two districts share a 35-mile border and are demographically similar.

This is the argument that was made by the municipal reapportionment committee, you know, when they were trying to put 6 and 2. The glaring differences in pairing these two similar districts is that both have a very similar population and would be equally represented by their state senator.

This map also puts JBER with Eagle River -- the Eagle River district instead of lumping it in downtown. And while this is purely anecdotal, I spent decades in the automotive industry here in Anchorage, and the vast majority of our military clients lived in Eagle River or on the Base itself and not in the downtown district.

What is not anecdotal is that the majority -- that a majority of middle and high school
children from the Bases attend school in Eagle River
and not downtown.

In closing, you know, I respectfully request
that you support map 3B. And thank you again for
your service to the community.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Jason.

Questions? Melanie, you've got a question
for Jason?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. Thank you, Jason, for
your testimony.

I was confused, because you were talking
about District 6 and 2. Are these districts from the
municipal reapportionment that you're referring to?

MR. WARFIELD: That's right, yeah.

District 6 in South Anchorage, and District 2 is
Eagle River.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. All right. Thank you
for that clarification.

MR. WARFIELD: Uh-huh.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Jason. As I
look at the testimony, a lot of it has been coming in
related to the municipality's reapportionment
process. And while that is not mandatory authority
for us to follow, it is persuasive.
MR. WARFIELD: Right.

MEMBER BORROMEO: The weight of the evidence, though, was very much for keeping Eagle River and Anchorage -- South Anchorage separate.

Of course, that's not what our job here is. Our job is very limited, to look at the constitution. The constitution, in Article VI, Section 6, says that we need to pair the most contiguous as practicable districts.

But that aside, assuming that we didn't have the constitution to follow, which we do and I intend to, how do we square the weight of the evidence in the municipality's process from what seems to be a contradictory approach now?

MR. WARFIELD: Well, the municipality is making the argument that -- you know, the argument that they were contiguous, that they had a similar demographic, and that's all correct.

What they weren't taking into account -- and I live on -- and I live on the Hillside. What they weren't taking into account is throwing 12,000 -- taking 12,000 people out of District 6 and throwing them into District 2. I mean, there would be a massive underrepresentation, where this is completely different.
You're taking two House districts that are equal in population roughly -- I don't have the numbers right in front of me, but you have equal representation. And the City made the argument already that they're similar in demographic and they are contiguous and they share a huge border.

So it wasn't that the City was -- was wrong in saying that they were contiguous and that they were demographically similar. It's the fact of taking 12,000 Hillsiders and throwing them into a district where they would be basically completely underrepresented. They would never, ever have equal representation as the district -- as the district they were going into, as the majority of the people in the district.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.


MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can hear you.

MEMBER MARCUM: Okay. Thank you for your testimony, Mr. Warfield.

We did hear this. The last testifier of the day yesterday raised this point, which was a very interesting point. But I just wanted to give you the
same information that we gave to her and put it on
the record, that we did take a look. Peter brought
them up yesterday during the hearing. I'm sorry, was
that yesterday? Yeah, I guess it was. Seems like it
was a long time ago.

And District 9 has population of 18,284.
That's the South Hillside district. And then
District 24, the Eagle River district, has population
of 18,205. So they're both 18,200 approximately, so
your presumption is correct in the sense that the
districts are essentially the same in terms of
representation. So thank you for that.

MR. WARFIELD: Right. I appreciate that.
And, you know, while nobody likes change, you know,
in my humble opinion, this map is the fairest map on
the -- on the table right now. That's why I urge you
all to support it, please.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, did you have another
question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I do. One follow-up
question.

Because, Jason, I'm not sure if you've been
following the litigation process or not, but the
Supreme Court upheld the Superior Court's
determination that the three-member majority was
unconstitutionally partisan gerrymandering, which, in my mind, is the exact opposite of fairness.

And option B continues to split Eagle River.

So, again, looking for guidance on how you square what's been deemed as unfair already and unconstitutional with the proposal.

MR. WARFIELD: I just disagree with it.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. One quick question, just so I understand it, Jason.

And I have not followed the municipal redistricting process. But what you're saying is the municipality had suggested that Hillside and Eagle River be combined into one assembly seat or assembly district?

MR. WARFIELD: No. What they were -- no. What they were proposing is taking a portion of District 6, the mid Hillside, and throwing it into District 2. So, you know, you're basically taking, you know, a disproportionate amount of people who would end up being underrepresented, obviously. Not -- not combining the district, but just taking a small portion of the district and throwing it into District 6 in order to, I don't know, reach whatever population they needed to have in each district. So
they were basically cutting the districts up. But the argument they made was that these are -- you know, that these are -- these districts are similar in demographics and, you know, share a border, and they were right about all those things. The thing that -- the thing that wasn't correct is the fact that, you know, you can't -- you know, there wasn't an equal pairing, not like what this would end up being with 9 and -- and 22. You know, as somebody -- as one of the board members said, you basically have 18,000 people in each -- roughly in each district that are going to be represented by a senator. That would be equal representation. What the City was trying to do was not that. It's just carve out a small portion. CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. So I think I follow that. So the -- I know there was a lot of criticism of people who supported pairing those in our process because they had testified to something that may have been different or that was perceived to be different during the assembly process. But what you're saying it really wasn't because of contiguity or socioeconomic closeness. It was really an imbalance in the populations or the
representation?

MR. WARFIELD: That's right. In my -- in my humble opinion, that's the difference here. You know, the -- the City -- the reapportionment committee made the points. And you're absolutely right. There was -- there was a lot of Hillside people that pushed against it.

And on a perfect world, yes, we all have districts that are side by side by side by side and are joined. But in my -- once again, in my opinion, this map is the fairest map on the table. And I'm not concerned with underrepresentation like I was when the City was recommending taking 12,000 people off the Hillside and throwing them into Eagle River, because we have two districts that are going to have the similar amount of population that are going to be represented by a senator.

And they're -- and, you know, go back and look at the City. They made it -- laid out a clear -- a clear case that the demographics are very, very similar, that the -- you know, that the -- that they're -- you know, they're contiguous, they share a huge border, at least 35 miles.

This map also, once again, keeps JBER with Eagle River, which is, you know -- once again,
it's -- it's the right thing to do.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Jason.

That was very helpful, that explanation, because I did not follow the municipality proceedings or process.

Nicole, did you have another question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Not a question for Jason --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Just a second. I see your hand up.

Yeah. Jason, if you could bear with us, Nicole's got another question.

MR. WARFIELD: Okay.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I don't actually have a question for Jason, so he can -- if he's got other things to do, he's willing to -- or he's able to do those. But if not, he can stay on the line.

I just wanted to refer you, John, for purposes of easy review, to the letter from Chris Constant dated the 5th of April, because I don't believe that Jason correctly summarized the testimony from other Anchorage residents regarding the pairing. It wasn't due to the disproportionality in the numbers. It was a lot of objection to them being paired for socioeconomic reasons, et cetera.
But the packet there is -- is in our material. And maybe Peter would be so kind to just pull it up separately and circulate it to the board so we all have it. Because that's the actual testimony versus someone else's interpretation of the testimony. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: (Indiscernible) testify, Jason. He's got his opinion, and that's what he stated it was just then, his opinion. So I think we can all respect that and he can --

MEMBER BORROMEO: But you -- you know me, John --

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- have that position and --

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'm a stickler for the law and stickler for not interpreting other people's testimony.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole -- Nicole --

MEMBER BORROMEO: So just be sure to please read what they say, not what others have opined that they said.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you very much, Nicole. But -- and please don't interrupt.

It is instructive to me, and the gentleman indicated that it was his opinion and only that. And I think we should respect people's opinion, even
though we may not agree with them.

Bethany, you (indiscernible).

MEMBER BORROMEO: Hey, Bethany, I'm sorry here. Can I just interject really quick to finish the conversation with John here?

MEMBER MARCUM: If it's -- it's up to the chairman.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

MEMBER MARCUM: If he recognizes (indiscernible).

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany, go ahead, and then, Nicole, if you've got a follow-up question you can have it afterwards.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. That works.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So, Mr. Warfield, are you still on?

MR. WARFIELD: I am still here.

MEMBER MARCUM: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to ask a follow-up question. So there might have been some misinterpretation of what you said. So my understanding of what you said, you were not the arguments for -- you were talking about the fact that people from the public were opposing
it, but you were stating that the argument for
pairing Eagle River with South Anchorage were put
forward by the muni, by the reapportionment
committee, right? That's what you're referring us
to, is that -- am I correct in understanding that?

MR. WARFIELD: Yeah, that's correct. Now,
there are people that are my neighbors that disagreed
with that and said -- and I don't know which board
member was talking.

I'm looking at a screen of the -- the people
in the gallery right now, so I don't know who was
talking and who said whatever they said about what I
said.

But what I said is -- is, you know, the
municipality made the argument that, you know, these
are contiguous, that these are demographically
similar. That's why these people shouldn't have a
problem going into Eagle River.

And -- and that's not -- that wouldn't be
my -- that wasn't my concern. My concern is not
that. My concern is underrepresentation. My concern
is that if you take, you know, a small group of
people that are -- and throw them into a larger group
of people, they're not necessarily going to be
represented equally.
Whereas if you pair two of these --
according to the municipality, you pair two of these
districts together that are demographically similar
and contiguous and share a huge border and they're of
equal population, they each have their own state
representation and they share a senator, it seems
incredibly fair to me.

Now, is it optimum? Would I like to have my
district -- you know, my -- my districts side by side
by side by side, you know, all laid out like a grid?
Yeah, of course. Would I not like to have a mountain
range there? Yeah.

But, once again, I'm going to say this. And
I'm just a simple guy. I'm just a simple citizen.
I'm not some scholar or some legal expert. But it's
the simplest, fairest map on the table, and I -- and
I really -- I really would say that I would -- I
would think that I would respectfully request that
you support it.

I think that, you know, nobody likes change,
but we've got to do this every ten years. And I --
and I -- you know, I think that it's the right map.
But yes, you're correct. Some people argued
that, you know, these aren't contiguous. Some people
argued that, you know, I don't care if we're
demographically similar.

But my argument would be that -- you know, that they would be underrepresented if they were thrown into that -- if they were thrown into that district. It has nothing to do with any other things. The City made the argument that they were demographically similar and that they were contiguous and shared a border.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Warfield. I appreciate you clarifying that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole, then Melanie.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. I just wanted to correct the record that I was not disputing what Mr. Warfield was testifying to, but rather John's interpretation of what he was testifying to. And I wanted to make sure that John knew about the letter from the 5th and that he could refer to it later. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I had seen the letter and read it. I think it came to us probably that same day that Peter (indiscernible), so you're welcome. Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Not a question to the testifier. It's a question for Peter.

The testifier just said that he can't see
who's speaking, so for those who can't see who's speaking, this is Melanie.

Are we able to -- I'm looking behind Nicole, and I see the public. But are we able to do speaker view, so that people can see who's speaking? I just see -- I think that got corrected. Is that (indiscernible)?

MR. WARFIELD: I don't know if I'm -- I don't know if I'm still on, but whatever happened when you started speaking, I could just see you all of a sudden. So I was looking at the gallery before, and whoever is controlling the video just allowed me to see you for the first time.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. I think -- yeah, I think we've changed it to speaker view, so hopefully that will help the public.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Thank you, Melanie. And thanks for pointing that out, Jason. Any other questions for Jason? Thank you very much. You've been very patient. We appreciate you coming forward and testifying.

MR. WARFIELD: All right. Well, like I said, thank you for all your -- your work on these -- on these tough topics, so thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Next what I show, and I hope
I've got it right, it's Queen Parker, I believe from Sterling.

MS. PARKER: Yes. This is Queen --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Good afternoon.

MS. PARKER: Good afternoon. I live in Sterling, and I'm speaking for myself.

I'm with the fellow from Hillside. I would just -- for the board, I would like you to vote for the compromise pairing in the map 3B. And it would be just as fair for all residents, which should make the board proud. I urge the board to support 3B for fair, contiguous pairing that is not just one-sided because you put Anchorage voters first rather than special interests.

And I thank you for your time. And I have to go, but bless you all. Thanks.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Do you have time for any questions for Ms. Parker? Okay. Thank you. Peter, who's next there? Is there somebody in the LIO that's signed up?

MR. TORKELSON: Laura Bonner, who's in Anchorage but off-net. She's been signed up since -- for quite a while.

Laura are you on?

MS. BONNER: I think I am. Can you hear me?
Oh, I see it coming up on the --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can.

MS. BONNER: All right. I live in South Anchorage. And I didn't realize until this morning that it was only the two maps that were -- that you were deciding on.

And I guess to me the most logical map was to pair the two House districts in Eagle River together in the same Senate district and to keep Girdwood in the South Anchorage district, since the only proximity to Eagle River Valley is through a mountain pass that can only be crossed by foot, weather permitting, and of course the season. Pairing Eagle River with Anchorage Hillside is illogical, and Eklutna is closer.

And I couldn't tell where the line was there. I'm not as -- haven't studied the redistricting process as much as some of the previous speakers have.

But keep Eagle River with other -- in Eagle River area, and East Anchorage is East Anchorage, Anchorage Hillside and Girdwood with South Anchorage, and Anchorage downtown with Anchorage downtown. That's the most logical pairing for the Senate.

It's nice to have a senator that -- what I
would like to be in the -- I live in Lower Hillside, and I would rather be paired with my neighbors that are -- live above me. And I know of no one in Girdwood that lived there that they drive to Eagle River, so their interests are completely different.

So I think that it's maybe map 2 that -- that I support, but I can't tell. It's really difficult to see what the streets are when I go to your website.

So I just think that South Anchorage should be paired with Anchorage. And Eagle River should be paired with Eagle River. Eklutna is a lot closer and it's connected by the road system.

Anyway, that's my comments.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Laura.

And I think it is confusing. We apologize for that. The process is moving fairly quickly and things have changed over time.

But, I think, given the context of your testimony, map 2 is the one that you would be supporting. It really purports with what the content of your testimony was.

MS. BONNER: Thank you. I do appreciate the complexity that you have had to deal with. But yeah, thanks.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, we appreciate you calling in and testifying. And we do -- if you would be kind enough to entertain questioning, you have a question from one of the members.

Member Bahnke, Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. Again, it's not a question for the testifier. It's an observation. In the chat box here we've got a member of the public saying they would like to testify.

Peter, can you announce the way that people can call and testify so that people who are seeking that they can testify to Zoom know that they actually have to call in to a different number? Thank you.

MR. TORKELSON: Sure. So I've chatted back to that person, as well.

CHAIR BINKLEY: It looks like I saw a number just came up in -- on something in the screen, so I'm assuming that's the number that's given to dial in.

Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. So thank you, Peter, for putting it in the chat box.

For those who are listening and want to call in, the number is (907)563-9085. (907)563-9085.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.
Next back to the LIO office, Yarrow Silver.

Yarrow, can you join us, please? Good afternoon. How are you today?

MS. SILVERS: Good morning. Thank you. My name is Yarrow Silver. I would like to respond to various comments and characterizations that I've heard over the past week.

First, I want to discuss this idea that I've heard that map 2 is partisan. I introduced this map, which was arrived at by the East Anchorage plaintiffs with the benefit of legal counsel who advised us that the approach of pairing Muldoon, pairing Eagle River, and then pairing the districts that were left unpaired pass the method that most closely followed the remand order from the Court, which had ruled that the splitting of Eagle River in order to increase their representation at the expense of muffling the voices of East Anchorage residents was a partisan gerrymander violating equal protection.

No partisan data nor incumbent information was accessed, nor do I care to access it. Other than my own representatives in 21, I have no idea where any incumbent lives nor what districts they represent for the vast majority of them.

It is, however, a known fact that both
independent makers of map 3B, Ms. Marcum and
Mr. Ruedrich, have looked at political and incumbent
information during the mapping process.

By contrast, the pairings for map 2 were
based solely on logic, reason, pairing like
communities, and the constitutional as well as the
remand requirements.

In fact, I bucked the trend of a majority of
the testimony which favored map 1 to introduce map 2,
which the ADN has quoted Cathy Giessel, who appointed
John Binkley to the redistricting board, by the way,
as stating was a very elegant solution and one that
she prefers.

I believe that the majority of support and
testimony backs up the non-partisan and inherently
fair nature of this map, which indeed has had broad
bipartisan support. I have heard well-reasoned and
passionate testimony detailing in clear terms why
map 3B is irrational, from HALO, Girdwood Board of
Supervisors, Rabbit Creek Community Council, Shawn
Murphy of Eagle Exit, Lloyd Thurman, Randy Phillips,
and many others, all of whom are, obviously, not
partisan left-wing organizations or individuals.

By contrast, the majority of the testimony
favoring map 3 is based on partisan considerations,
number of Republican Senate seats, specific incumbents: Do it because you can, or one-liners based on no reasoning at all.

Despite the quick time frame of this process, we have the benefit of mounds of testimony against this same pairing in the municipality process, and yet Mr. Binkley has indicated that all this testimony should be discounted because the numbers and considerations are different.

And I ask: What numbers? What considerations are different, other than the clearly partisan ones? The false contiguity, distance, broken community, and lack of commonality are all the same.

The one thing that is different is that the lowest deviations were sacrificed in order to use meaningful contiguity in the municipal districts, which resulted in a municipal map with deviations of 5 percent and where Eagle River was underpopulated by several thousand people.

While it was originally believed by the mapmakers that South Anchorage and Eagle River had socioeconomic connections, South Anchorage and Eagle River residents were quick to correct this impression and the municipality listened.
I also want to point out that the same compromise of deviations will not be required here in the municipal map. Population was being added to equal -- to Eagle River to equalize the population. In this process here, Eagle River is being split despite having enough population for one Senate seat. I believe strongly in an inherently honest, ethical, and fair process that (indiscernible) closely to the constitution, and I believe that most people want effective, local representation that reflects their unique communities, regardless of their political affiliation, and map 2 reflects that.

If this board instead chooses a map that does not provide these things and that must use second rate or false contiguity for pairings, then the burden of proof falls on them to show why a more rational and constitutional map is not possible.

Now let's have a quick review of the justifications that I've heard for the unconstitutional map 3B, so are, quite frankly, beyond ridiculous.

I heard yesterday that District 23 was actually not Eagle River. Well, pulling up the map, I clearly saw that, yes, District 23 does include the northern part of Eagle River, including parts of its
business district. Come on now, let's be honest, please. Eagle River is literally cleaved in half, and the only justification for that is an attempt at a false narrative? This is ridiculous.

I have heard that South Anchorage and Eagle River share the longest border. I would like to ask the board to now consider how long the populated area along that border is as compared to the unpopulated area, which Budd Simpson referred to as basically a fiction in reference to another part of the map.

That number is not one single inch of populated area, and Budd's sentiment holds true here, as well. Even if it is possible to pair 9 and 22 just because they touch, it is wholly irrational to pair them when there is a pairing available that has meaningful contiguity.

Some people have said in reference to JBER and Eagle River that like communities should be paired together, while obtusely ignoring that the like communities of downtown, Eagle River, and South Anchorage have to be split apart to accommodate this false vision of JBER.

Let's not forget that JBER is integrated heavily into all the municipality, including Government Hill and downtown. In fact, there is a
Government Hill gate that is used by the majority of service members that utilize the Elmendorf half of the joint base.

Let's also not forget that service members who live off Base are already represented in their community of residence, while those living on Base are most strongly connected to the communities within Anchorage proper outside their respective gates, not far away north Eagle River.

This supposed justification falls flat in the face of reality. Some say it's been done historically. That doesn't make it the right choice for today. And, in fact, one of the legislators that represented one of these past districts has testified about the irrationality of pairing 9 and 22.

The rest of the justifications for map 3B I have heard are mostly based on partisan considerations, which I briefly mentioned earlier but will not spend any time refuting due to the simple fact that partisan considerations are not permitted in our Alaska State Constitution.

I just want to close with this: I feel relief that through the legal remedy East Anchorage residents have received their voice back. However, I feel deep regret that we're pairing one wrong. Some
members of this board seem tempted to simply shift
the burden of harm and silence to another community.
I implore this board to stop wasting time
and money fighting for maps that you know to be
unconstitutional and to choose to do the right thing
instead. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. You know, I
might mention I appreciate that. If for some reason
you thought that I said that it doesn't matter what
numbers people are testifying to, I might have
misspoke or maybe it was a misunderstanding, so --
but every bit of public testimony is important. I
listen to it, as all board members do. And we try
and help if there's some confusion on the numbers.
But, at any rate, just wanted to clear that up.

And also I would note for not only people
who are calling in or they're in person, but also for
board members, there's quite a queue of people that
are waiting to testify, and if we could try and keep
the testimony to three minutes that would be helpful,
so that everybody has an opportunity.

And also for board members ourselves, too,
if we could try and keep our questions short.

With that, Melanie, you've got a question?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I was just going to thank
her for her continued testimony. I know she
(indiscernible) since we started the process, I
think. It must feel like we're in Groundhog Day for
some of us. But I appreciate your continued
involvement.

MS. SILVERS: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Yarrow.

Next in the queue we've got Senator Holland.

Senator Holland, are you still on?

SENATOR HOLLAND: Yes. I guess you can hear
me, correct?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can. Good afternoon. Go
ahead, please.

SENATOR HOLLAND: Hello. This is Roger
Holland, Alaska State Senator, District N.

Currently I am in my office in Juneau, but I
reside in South Anchorage. I've been an Anchorage
resident for 13 years.

I'll tell you, honestly, the first speaker,
Catherine, embodied everything that I wanted to hear,
except for the last speaker before me. I believe her
name was Joan [as spoken]. She was a great, great
clean-up hitter right there.

I do believe map 3B will probably have
constitutional problems. I am in support of map
No. 2.

You know, when I first -- I'll try to keep my comments to three minute, but I saw challenges when I was first campaigning in District N, which was 27 and 28. 27 is the Muldoon curve. 28 is South Anchorage. They are very different family types there, and different -- different needs, different -- it became clearly evident to me during the CAPSIS proposals that we were working on just recently.

Everything in Muldoon was very big ticket intersection problems, very expensive, lots of concrete work, and everything in District 28 was pretty much a lot of small -- I mean, the typical project in District 27 was millions of dollars. The typical project in District 28 was hundreds of thousands of dollars.

And it's important to me, as a senator who has to represent both of them. You try to balance your representation, but you worry about, you know, just not being able to -- if you push something in 27 too hard, that could literally break the bank, while District 28, these smaller -- more numerous smaller projects don't get covered.

I think the idea that there's a 33-mile contiguous border between Eagle River and South
Anchorage, as in map 3B, that border might as well be the Berlin Wall for being impassable. I would -- I understand the -- you know, let's just read the constitution, and if it says contiguous -- but I do believe they indicate contiguous by meaning access and flow. And there is absolutely no flow of trade, commerce, or anything between Eagle River and South Anchorage.

I believe the map No. 2 pairings -- I thought, what a great pairing. It really resolved in my mind a lot of the complications I had seen in District N.

And then I was saddened to see map 3B raise its head. There is a reason to have discontiguous parts of a district, for instance, having Cordova, Valdez, and Whittier all in the same district. Well, they're all poor communities.

But I really appreciated the opportunity to have Whittier added to District N. I am a regular. I go down to Whittier at least every other week or so during the summer, and I thought it was a great chance to increase the representation.

As a senator, having to represent Eagle River and South Anchorage, there are challenges to be present and be a meaningful participant in the
community when, by my count, I have to travel through or touch parts of 11 districts getting from District 9 to its paired district of -- well, let's see if I have the map up right now. It's paired district of, what was that, 22?
I'll tell you, with that being said, I think I'm at or beyond three minutes.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, thank you very much, senator. Appreciate your hanging in there. I know you've been on the line quite a while, and I'm sure you have plenty to do there, so thank you very much.
I believe the next one on -- off-net online is Senator Reinbold. Senator, are you with us still?
SENATOR REINBOLD: Yes. This is Senator Lora Reinbold. Can you hear me?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we can. Go ahead.
SENATOR REINBOLD: Okay. Thank you. Again, I'm also calling from Juneau. We have an extremely busy session, although the media doesn't report about that. And I am a state senator right now for District G, but I am speaking on behalf of myself at this time.
And I would like to let you know that I did spend about ten years in Huffman. I spent about 15 years in Eagle River. The majority of my life was
in Midtown area, as growing up.

I have also had a cabin in -- my family -- a member of my family -- two or three members of my family have Girdwood. So I know the areas extremely well.

I never liked when Representative Hawker was my representative and he was from South Anchorage, and I'm not sure he ever even singly came to a community council.

Map 3B is absolutely ridiculous, that's all I can say, trying to have us paired with Girdwood and India -- excuse me -- Indian, Whittier area.

So bottom line is I have been trying to follow this process, even amongst an extremely busy legislative session. Yes, I followed the lawsuit. I actually thought Judge Matthews did a very good job exposing the gerrymandering in the district. And I believe map 3B actually makes it much worse.

So I am calling in to support 22 and 24 being paired together, although I really appreciate being paired with JBER. The -- 22 and 24 is an option that is available to us right now, so I strongly encourage keeping Eagle River together.

We are a very strong community, and I think that is the one that makes the most sense. And
community councils are -- you know, there's five or so of them in the area. I just think it makes far, far more sense to keep Eagle River together. So with that, I'm going to be supporting map No. 2. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, great. Thank you very much, Senator. That was quick, though. It was just two minutes, so thank you for your brevity and clarity.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much. This is Nicole Borromeo. And I appreciate your testimony, Senator Reinbold.

A couple of questions. I don't know, and I don't want to know, whether or not you live in District 22 or 24, but if 22 or 24 was paired -- or sorry. If 22 was paired with 9, that representative in the Senate has to travel through six or seven different House districts to reach District 9.

And I'm concerned that that is going to run afoul of Article VI, Section 6 of the constitution that requires us to pair Senate districts as near as practicable into contiguous House districts as possible.

If you retain the seat and you had to travel
from your home in Eagle River to District 9 all the way down to Whittier, what is going to be your preferred route of getting there?

SENATOR REINBOLD: Well, I will tell you this. There's only a road, and it's a long -- I would say hour and a half plus the tunnel maybe, so maybe at least two-hour drive, which is ridiculous. I will tell you, my mother-in-law helped build a (indiscernible) trail, and I'm a huge advocate for (indiscernible) Iditarod. You know, you could walk over the trail, but that's ridiculous.

The bottom line is, I think it was, you know, driving two-plus hours, when we are part of Anchorage Municipality, absolutely makes no sense. So I think there would be constitutional issues, as well.

And I hope that answers your question. But that is a long, long way away. Our children wouldn't be going to schools together, et cetera.

And I never thought that map where Giessel had Stuckagain Heights, Girdwood, and part of Eagle River -- we never felt represented in Eagle River.

So I believe map 3 will very much hurt Eagle River.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Senator.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Senator.
Next, back to the LIO office, is former representative Lance Pruitt. Lance, are you there?
Can you join us? Good afternoon.

MR. PRUITT: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, each one of you, for being a part of this process. I know if this was an easy process and we could create perfect maps, of course, this wouldn't be needed. So -- but I appreciate your time and the public service that you're putting in.

I'm here to -- there's several thoughts that I've had over the course of -- and I've watched the process actually from a little bit of a distance. I haven't been watching you guys every single day.

But I will say that what is -- the reason I have decided to come in, what kind of compelled me, is because I watched the process initially, especially as we dealt with an area for which I used to represent.

I should be clear, I had three separate senators over ten years. I had one senator where our district went west, I had one senator where my district went into Eagle River or that Senate district went into Eagle River, and then the remaining six years that district went into the Hillside area.
And so the initial conversation related to the district that I used to represent, and indicated, you know, I've heard -- I've used the former Massachusetts governor, Gerry. His name has been used a lot over the last couple of days. Of course, he's the guy that created salamander in Massachusetts.

And -- but yet if you look at the district that I came from already, you'd have to make that same argument with just the House district, because why would you go and carve out -- you go out and carve Nunaka Valley, which has never been a part of that district, when right south of it was an area that was in it, at least when I first represented it. You had the Reflection Lake area.

And to argue that East Anchorage was all the same, you can't do that. I think you're kind of -- as we go into the conversation today, the same thing applies.

What I'm not hearing is I'm not hearing a lot of dialogue about JBER and the -- our military personnel. And I think they've been left out of the conversation that I've heard. That's what's compelled me to come in. They do not have enough for their own Senate district, but they are more closely
tied to Eagle River and East Anchorage than any other part of Anchorage.

As East Anchorage at this point is no longer on the table, based on both of the maps, based on the conversation that we've heard related to trying to pair that District 20 and 21, I believe the two are left with the only option to make sure that our military personnel are taken care of, to make sure that the people that are not -- not going to -- they're not going to be as engaged in this process, is you're going to have to keep them in the Senate district paired with Eagle River.

Eagle River High School would not exist -- this is a fact. It would not exist if it were not for our military. It wouldn't be there. There are whole hallways at Chugiak High School that are empty. If we did not have the military, Eagle River High School could fit in Chugiak High School. You have to tie those two together because they have the closest socioeconomic situation.

And then you also have to consider when you're going to put them on the ballot, because we see higher turnout as well from our military. It comes during that time frame when we have a presidential year, so you have to -- that's
another -- I know it's separate, but when you get to that point I think any district that includes our military, you have to consider when that Senate district comes up.

That automatically pairs you with -- well, then you do have to put -- you do have to put the second Eagle River district somewhere else. And as the Courts' (indiscernible) process, and engagement here has said, it can't be East Anchorage, well, really your only other option is going to be another district very similar to it that's going to allow for someone from either one of those districts to have just as good of a chance of representing that area.

I've heard -- I've heard here said that it's a long way to drive, that people won't show up. But the reality is that if you only went in and carved a small portion of Eagle River out and paired it with -- with the Hillside or vice versa, you might be able to make that case or that argument.

But the fact that you're going to have a whole district that is both in Eagle River as well as in the other, I think you will find that the person that lives in whichever district that is the senator, you -- they will probably spend a lot more time trying to prove to the other district that they are
1 thinking about them.

2 It's what I saw actually with Cathy Giessel when she represented my district. She lived in -- she lived in the Hillside, but she spent a lot of time coming to my district because she wanted to make sure they did not feel that way. Why? Because if you don't take that into consideration, you won't be a senator. Because they will reject -- there will be a rejection of you.

3 So I think it's important to -- as you're looking at these maps, to go back and consider our military. And then when you do that, the only one that you can pair it with, because you've taken East Anchorage off the table with all of the process, is Eagle River. And then the dominoes start to fall.

4 And so that is what makes -- makes 3B really the only option that you have if you want to consider a key group that I have not heard testify from. It's all been Anchorage centric, it's all been Eagle River, it's been the Hillside, East Anchorage. But you're probably not going to have those military personnel come here, because that's just -- this isn't going to be on their radar. It's just the reality.

5 So to take care of them, you're going to
have to pair them.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MR. PRUITT: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Lance.

Nicole, question?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you, Lance, for coming to testify today.

As a military spouse, I appreciate your commitment to making sure that JBER is heard and the military is heard, as well.

Unfortunately, that doesn't square with our constitution. Our constitution doesn't let us single out one particular member of the community, even if they do represent the military, and pair them together.

What our constitution does say when it comes to Senate pairings, which is what we're talking about today, is that each Senate district shall be composed as near as practicable to two contiguous House districts. Do you have any thoughts on that?

MR. PRUITT: Well, first, I would say that the military personnel at -- because of the fact that they live there -- and I'm not saying that you carve out the person. Their socioeconomic integration within that community is pretty in depth.
The fact that Eagle River would not -- Eagle River High School would not exist if it weren't for the military personnel, if it weren't for JBER there, it shows that they are interconnected, that they are actually tied together.

So it's not a carving out and saying this one group of people should stand above another. It's actually recognizing how much that community is -- is integrated.

And with that being said, they are -- they are contiguous, in terms of the fact that you will find that majority of the people that are in that -- especially because of the new developments that are taking place in the east side of JBER, most of the housing that has been built over the last ten years has been over on the east side.

They are either going to go to school at Bartlett or Eagle River. They are going to go eat at Tikahtnu or they're going to go eat out in Eagle River, or they've actually moved out into one of these communities. You have a higher level of the active military service that live in Eagle River.

East Anchorage is second in comparison.

So the integration between the military that are active that are on Base, as well as where they
might live, which may not be where they work, I think that deep integration that they have, because -- and at this point Eagle River -- East Anchorage is off the table. It's not a conversation based on I think what -- I feel the board is going.

You are left then with Eagle River being the closest in proximity, as well as the closest in terms of socioeconomic ties, as well as just basically integration in terms of where the people not just live, but where they also go to school, where they -- they spend their money, those kinds of things.

CHAIR BINKLEY: For example, sometimes they use the word communities of interest. They would be potentially communities of interest, JBER and Eagle River?

MR. PRUITT: Absolutely they are communities of interest. They are -- you know, the only thing that separates them in some capacity is the fact that there's a big gate there or there's a big fence there.

I mean, they are -- someone once actually explained to me that -- and this was a military individual that said that their expectation is if someone were to say, "Hey, Eagle River, we want to shut the school down," that the military would not
allow that to happen. That's how closely and tied into that community that they are, that that -- they are passionate about that school, that that's where they want their kids to go.

And so I think it's really important to see that tie and to understand that tie, because they are -- they are one in the same, essentially, in that sense.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, and then Melanie.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

Just a matter of comment for the record.

Where you suggested that we consider where the military are in the voting cycle, that is not something that I am ever going to advocate for. That takes incumbent data into consideration. That brushes up against really impermissible considerations for this board.

So while I appreciate your testimony today, I won't be following at least that instruction from you. Thank you.

MR. PRUITT: And, Mr. Chairman, if you don't mind me saying, I don't care about incumbents.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead.

MR. PRUITT: I don't care about incumbents.

It's not about who -- what I will say is the
military -- I think whether -- and maybe it's not something that's ingrained in the constitution, but I do think that we do believe that we want to engage people. We want more people to vote. I think that's kind of -- that's kind of something that you hear around the United States in general today.

If you want to have as many people active and engaged in your election process, then that's when you need to consider -- the military is engaged during that -- during that time frame of the presidential elections.

Look at the data -- you can look at the data of all of our military facilities, and you can see a considerable decrease in the number of people that participate. I don't know why. I don't want to get into that.

But I will say if you want to see as much participation from those individuals that happen to be in those -- on our military bases throughout the state, that would be why you should consider having the elections during those presidential year cycles.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Thank you.

I don't think we have any control over when
elections are held. That's beyond the scope of our
authority here as part of the redistricting board.

Last, so looking at 24 and 22, Eagle River
and Eagle River, would you consider those two to be
communities of interest? And also, are they
contiguous?

MR. PRUITT: They are communities of
interest and contiguous, yes.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Let's see. Do we
have -- Joelle, hello.

I think that's Lance. Thank you very much.

MR. PRUITT: Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Joelle, for
moving up closer to the (indiscernible).

MS. HALL: I got it, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Attention to detail.

MS. HALL: I've been in this room a couple
of times, you might imagine.

First, I want to say thank you for your
service. As you know, I've been here since the very
beginning, so I've watched you and all of the work
and all the time you've dedicated to this important
endeavor. I'm sure you're looking forward to this
process being over. I know I am.
Today we find ourselves debating four Senate seats. As you know, AFFR testified earlier in support of the recently withdrawn map 1.

We, too, have read what the Superior Court asked you to do, pair Muldoon, pair Eagle River, then minimally fix what needs to be fixed. So to support the move -- to support the move to withdraw -- so we support the move to withdraw map 1 and to focus on proposals with a narrower scope, leaving us with 2 and 3B.

The Court has been very clear as to why we find ourselves here today. An improper pairing broke apart Eagle River with no basis and paired it with other parts of Anchorage that resulted in the dilution of votes and gerrymandering.

Unbelievably, the board appears to be giving real consideration to a map that commits the same illegal action, breaking up Eagle River with no rational explanation to spread its voting power across other districts, when mathematically this community is rightfully entitled to one Senate seat.

I live in the Senate seat, House 24 to be specific.

Since the remands, I've listened to contorted explanations explaining -- attempting to justify the pairing in 3B. None of them stand up to
the most basic question: What is more compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated than keeping a community whole?

The Court last found that Eagle River is a community of interest whose needs can be considered within the context of the larger MOA.

So that leads to the debate to one of the other constitutional provisions, contiguity.

Dividing -- the dividing line between 22 and 24 is the majority of Eagle River Road, which runs through the heart of Eagle River. Turn left you're at 24, turn right you're in 22. A 13-mile road running from Pizza Man to the Eagle River Nature Center.

Neighborhoods on both sides of the road feeding the same elementary schools, the same parks paid for with our local Eagle River parks assessment, and shopping at the same grocery stores.

The contiguity of 2 is clearly better than the contiguity of 3B. You've made some really tough contiguity calls in this process. Valdez springs to mind. A tough challenge requiring all the flexibility that the constitution has built into it.

But this is not a tough call. Eagle River is not a tough call, downtown is not a tough call, and South Anchorage is not a tough call. No
flexibility should be needed here. There is a simple, rational, legal, constitutional solution. Testifiers have endeavored to give you rationals to break these communities apart, but the underlying question -- constitutional question still remains, what is more practicably contiguous? It's a relative question. Is 3B more practically contiguous than 2? No, obviously not.

Choosing a map that is demonstrably less contiguous brings this board perilously close to running afoul of the exact same issue that brought this map back, brought this map before Judge Matthews and to the Supreme Court. I cannot imagine how you'll go to justify to any judge the passing of 3B when map 2 was on the record.

I want to refer back to a previous testifier, Jason, who said in a perfect world we would have districts that were side by side by side. Lucky us, the perfect world sits before you. It's called map 2, with districts that are side by side by side, exactly the way the constitution envisions. No contortions required, no contiguity, sleights of hand and close one eye and look carefully.

I encourage you to adapt the map to discharge your duties to the people of Alaska and be
proud of the work that you've done. Thank you again for your service. We appreciate it.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Madam President.

And we appreciate -- equally appreciate your participation. I know you and your organization and so many individuals have worked extremely hard on this from the very beginning, probably even before we started.

And although we might not agree in all of it, I know I do, and I think all the board members have a tremendous amount of respect for you and your organization and all the people that have put so much time into it, so thank you, as well.

MS. HALL: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I think we are on the cusp of greatness here if we just are bold enough to get it. Thanks.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Mike Edgington is on net. Mike, are you online with us?

MR. EDGINGTON: Hello. Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can. Go ahead.

MR. EDGINGTON: Thanks. Thank you very much.

So, yeah, my name is Mike Edgington. I'm from Girdwood. I also sit on the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (indiscernible) for the last five years.
However, I am speaking on behalf of myself as an individual, although of course my experience has been colored by that last five years of representing my community.

When I spoke last Saturday -- I testified last Saturday. At the time maps 1, 2, and 3, I think, were under consideration.

And my sense, and I think still my sense, is that if we were to start the process from the beginning, map 1 -- or (indiscernible) Senate pairing from the beginning, map 1 is the preferable of the three.

But I appreciate now, understand better why that appears to be outside of the remand order. So given the choices of map 2 and now map 3B, I think without a doubt map 2 is the far more rational of the choices.

I had various points I was going to make, but honestly other testifiers have done a better job than I would have done. In particular, I have a lot of data I could have discussed, but Mr. Wells went into -- I think presented that better than I would have done.

So I have a few (indiscernible) questions, really -- or (indiscernible) points, really just
anecdotes. The first one is I think one of the
discussions is -- is the -- in the communities of
interest, is how much people travel between them and
where you go shopping, et cetera.

I use -- I have history set on my Android
phone, so I went back and looked at the last four and
a half years of every single place I've been to. And
I notice in that four and a half years, I've been to
Eagle River exactly once. I think I went to Jitters
coffee shop, which is great and I should go again.

But, you know, to do shopping, one occasion Eagle
River.

In contrast, areas of South Anchorage I'm at
typically weekly, at least biweekly, and often more
than one time a week. So clearly, in terms of
connectivity. And I think that would be true for
probably most of -- most of my neighbors here in
Girdwood. South Anchorage is very closely aligned,
and Eagle River is a distant location that I rarely
go to unless there's some specific thing.

My second thought is I listened to some of
the -- some of the core case in front of Judge
Matthews, and I remember -- because Girdwood was
mentioned, I remember one interaction fairly clearly,
where there was discussion about continuity
(indiscernible). And I think the example that was being discussed was whether Girdwood could be tied to downtown Anchorage, because there is a connection via Turnagain Arm, effectively by the sea.

And what I recall is the -- is the discussion was while I -- while I suppose in the abstract it could be considered contiguous, it would absolutely be a second rank contiguity. They are not in any way really connected, only in that sort of artificial way.

And I think the other example was actually quoted in that very exchange between your attorney and the judge, was the examples where the sea is used for continuity, and (indiscernible) where unpopulated areas of mountains were used as continuity.

And, obviously, that's exactly the situation that people are attempting to justify in map 3B. There's no population on that border. There's no connectivity at all for much of the year. There's high avalanche risk in (indiscernible) between those two locations. It just makes no sense. There's no practical way of traveling along that border (indiscernible) much of the crossings.

And my third point was to (indiscernible) some of the discussion that's being had around the
municipality reapportionment process. I think several testifiers supporting map 3B have pointed out that there was objection to a proposal that included parts of Hillside -- a smaller population of Hillside with Eagle River. That is true later in the process.

At the very beginning of the reapportionment process, there were a set of candidate maps, discussion maps put out by the contractor. And one of those joined South Anchorage, Girdwood, Indian, Turnagain Arm, with Eagle River, where the populations were roughly equivalent.

Again, I heard a huge amount of opposition to that from my community. It was not a case where, you know, we -- we are in the South Anchorage area in general would be a very small population (indiscernible). It was just a disagreement that these two communities are connected in any way.

So just a little bit more color on that topic. The statement was from one of the testifiers (indiscernible) during part of the process is not true through the whole process. There was a lot of opposition to examples where it wasn't a large population, a small population (indiscernible).

And my last (indiscernible), I've heard a lot of -- a lot of things about, you know, this isn't
a very easy process. Honestly, it is a very easy process. You have one sensible map in front of you that passes constitutional muster and I think basic constitutional sense, and one which is extremely tortious, violates many of the principles you're supposed to follow, and all of the justifications I've heard from it just, you know, don't -- they are very, very contorted and don't pass basic -- basic (indiscernible) test.

So -- but I appreciate all the work that's been done so far in this process, but I think you have a very easy decision to make now. So I recommend you choose map 2. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Mike.

Any questions? If not we'll go back, Judy Eledge. Are you on here, Judy?

MS. ELEDGE: Good morning. Once again, thank you for being here on a beautiful Saturday. It is cold here, so maybe that's -- maybe that's good.

It's not as bright as it looks outside.

But I wanted to call and testify again today, because I continue to listen to the -- this testimony. And I have some people -- I know that Yarrow keeps saying that there's political organizations representing the side that supports 3B,
and I know that both she and Denny that testified
during this supported Eagle River and the Hillside
during the assembly reapportionment. I heard that,
and I believe that is documented.

And I know Yarrow's testifying, but please
don't be accusing people of things, because I believe
you are involved in a legal blog. So it doesn't do
any good to start accusing people on why they're
testifying.

One of the things I did want to say also,
when Cathy Giessel was the senator I assure you Eagle
River was represented because I know she attended
every meeting that was out there. So that was not
true. She made that (indiscernible). It is the
representatives' responsibility to get to those
communities they represent. They most certainly have
to do that in rural Alaska.

Once again, I'm going to say the residents
of Anchorage and Eagle River, they share a very
similar socioeconomic background. And I keep hearing
over and over again that -- that it is not
constitutional, that because they have to be part of
a road system -- and I did call a friend that is very
good -- I think the best constitutionalist we have in
Alaska, and she happens to be an attorney.
And nowhere in the constitution does it say there has to be a transportation corridor. There most certainly is not one in Valdez and other places throughout the state, so that just absolutely cannot be true. And it keeps being repeated and repeated. It says you had to share a geographical link. You don't have to share a road. If that was true then everybody in rural Alaska, I don't know how they would be represented.

So I just keep hearing this over and over about what is constitutional, what is not. You know what? I believe that both -- maybe both of the maps would withstand it. You don't know. We've always -- before, we were always -- Eagle River was always with Muldoon and East Anchorage, and all of a sudden that wasn't constitutional.

So I -- I really think it's hard when you say something's not constitutional. I think that just depends on the interpretation of the judge making the decision.

So, once again, I wanted to call and support 3B. I think it is -- I think it is fair. It has happened before, and in the past it wasn't unconstitutional then.

So I hope all of you have a great day, and
thanks, once again, for testifying on a Saturday.
Appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Next in the
queue (indiscernible) is Leighan Gonzales. Are you
with us online?

MS. GONZALES: Yes. Hi. Am I connected?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, you are. We can hear
you fine. Please go ahead.

MS. GONZALES: Hi. Fantastic. My name is
Leighan Gonzales, and I am a lifelong -- lifelong
resident of East Anchorage calling in support of map
No. 2.

And I hadn't actually planned to testify
until I watched yesterday's hearing and saw frankly
how disrespectfully my neighbors have been treated
during and (indiscernible) testimony. I just wanted
to note that public testimony is an opportunity for
us, the public, to share our input with the board,
and it was pretty intimidating to watch, you know,
some of the back and forths with board members, and
my neighbors, who are not subject matter experts,
being grilled on constitutional law.

Anyway, we -- you know, it's a big deal, and
we're all taking (indiscernible) to participate in
this process because we do care about our
communities. So I'm just asking the board to follow not only the Alaska Constitution, but community member requests to keep East Anchorage together, keep downtown downtown and Eagle River in Eagle River.

So, again, thank you all so much for your time and work. I know it's not easy, but, again, thank you. And please vote for map No. 2.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Leighan. That's a good reminder to us, as board members, too, is people are just citizens calling in to give their opinion, and many don't know the constitution, don't follow the process closely.

But we need to be very respectful always (indiscernible) regardless of whether we support them or not, and encourage people to testify and not be intimidated in any way. So it's a good reminder.

Thank you.

Next we have Margaret Leeds.

MS. LEEDS: Good afternoon.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Margaret, are you still with us?

MS. LEEDS: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can. Please go ahead.

MS. LEEDS: Thank you. And thanks for taking my comments. I'm calling in today because I
would like to support option 2 and speak against option 3B.

I'm a long-time resident of Girdwood.

Option 2 paired me with South Anchorage and the Hillside, who are people who have similar lived experiences and similar concerns to I, which allows (indiscernible) to be fairly represented.

Option 3B paired me and Girdwood with people who have very different concerns, who are demographically very different than I and live a very different experience.

For one example, Eagle River has well-developed infrastructure, whereas Girdwood has underdeveloped critical infrastructure, including police and fire and emergency medical services.

Because Eagle River still outnumbers Girdwood, option 3B leaves me unrepresented.

Considering other neighborhoods, option 2 also gives representation to East Anchorage and maintains representation of Eagle River. Option 3B seems to violate the Alaska Supreme Court ruling that Eagle River should not be split, as this represented partisan gerrymandering.

Option 3B map would give no representation of my (indiscernible) at all, and this may damage my
town of Girdwood.

Thanks for hearing my comments.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

My understanding is that Erik Steinfort is also sharing a phone line, Margaret. Is he there, as well?

MS. LEEDS: Yes. It's (indiscernible) his office here.

MR. STEINFORT: Hi. Yeah, this is Erik Steinfort. We are sharing a line.

CHAIR BINKLEY: You --

MR. STEINFORT: Thank you for acknowledging me. Are you able to hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes, we are, Erik. Please go ahead.

MR. STEINFORT: That's great. Yeah, great comments from other folks, like Margaret and Mike. I appreciate their time putting in.

But, yeah, I just wanted to -- to testify that I am in support of option 2 and against option 3B. It seems really obvious to me what's going on here. It's, like, oh, we've got an intent to dilute Girdwood's voting representation, and I do not support that. Sounds like you're making a lot of reasons and special -- special ideas to try to tie
things together that are -- you're just kind of hiding behind some pretty obvious gerrymandering to control the (indiscernible).

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Melanie, do you have a question for Erik?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Not a question, but I wanted people to know I am going to turn my camera off. I'm going to grab a bite to eat, but I'll be listening.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Melanie.

Thank you, Erik.

And next, I believe, we have Lisa Gentemann.

MS. GENTEMANN: Hello. This is Lisa Gentemann. Can you hear me?

CHAIR BINKLEY: We can, Lisa. Please proceed.

MS. GENTEMANN: Thank you. I'm here representing myself, and I'm from Eagle River.

And I'm asking you to please support map No. 2. I really like the 22 and 24 pairing because I'd like to keep Eagle River together.

I've lived on Eagle River Road, that a prior testifier mentioned, and I've lived on that road for about 25 years, two different homes but right off the road.

And so the map No. 3 just seems to work if
we were mountain goats. I really don't want to walk over the mountains back and forth. It's just not efficient. And so it just doesn't make logical sense, that 3B, at all. And you are navigators or board members, things like that. I think that you can appeal to logic. If you just communicate with our neighbors and help them, and also with our legislator, it's much easier.

And I helped campaign before, and door knocking is already hard enough to get people, and our houses are already far enough apart out here in Eagle River, because many of us have septics and wells and things like that, and it takes quite a bit of time.

And it would make it even more difficult with the hazardous roads. Many of us have had people that we know of that have died on the roads, so there's a safety concern (indiscernible).

And gas prices are really high. And I understand, I used to live in rural Alaska. That is a totally different situation. You fly or boat or, you know, all that.

So the constitution, it starts with con, and con is together. And so you are trying to support our Alaska Constitution. I would hope that you would
consider the basic part of con is coming together, and we'd really like to keep our community together. So thank you so much for taking time to listen. It really means a lot to me.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Lisa. Much appreciated.


CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Next online is Shelley Chaffin.

MS. CHAFFIN: Hello. My name is Shelley Chaffin. Good afternoon.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Good afternoon.

MS. CHAFFIN: I am calling in support of map 2. You've heard a lot of testimony, or at least I have while I've been on the line this afternoon, that outlines the reasons for that already, so I will not repeat. I would like you to follow the guidelines that were set forth by Judge Matthews and affirmed by the Alaska Supreme Court. Map 2 is the constitutional choice. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you very much, Shelley.

Next is Robert Hockema. And we really appreciate the conciseness of the testimony and people being to the point so that everybody has the
chance to -- to testify that wishes.

Next we've got Robert Hockema.

MR. HOCKEMA: Hi there. Can everybody hear me?

THE COURT: We can, Robert. Go ahead, please.

MR. HOCKEMA: Okay. Great. Hi, everyone. My name is Robert Hockema. I am here representing myself. I testified fairly recently to the redistricting board, and I testified before the Senate and (indiscernible) pairings were struck down by the Court.

I'm calling in today to discuss the debate about pairing the primarily JBER, Government Hill, northeast Muldoon district with Eagle River, which is what is currently presented in option 3. And a lot of people have called in to kind of debate this and, you know, there were some comments about, you know, the fact that Eagle River High School would not exist without, you know, JBER.

And I think kind of at the crux of all this, what I have a problem here and what a lot of people have a problem with their explicitly discussing is the automatic assumption that JBER belongs to Eagle River and vice versa, that because a lot of JBER
folks share conservative attitudes and because a lot of folks with JBER -- JBER end up moving out to Eagle River or there's a lot of housing development has been built to accommodate JBER's population means that they automatically belong to Eagle River.

That is false. JBER belongs to all of Anchorage. Folks from JBER that go on Base live and play in Anchorage, right? And, you know, people frequently forget that there's two different sides of the Base that have completely different social habits and economic behaviors, and that they ought to be more realistically divided between these communities rather than dumped into one giant House district.

But that debate has sort of long passed, right?

So you know, folks from the -- from the Air Force side of JBER are most associated with downtown and Government Hill, right? You go to Subway, you go to Pho Vietnam in Government Hill, you hang out in downtown, you see a lot of military folks, right?

Vice versa, if you go to the Army side and if you're in Eagle River you're going to see a lot of JBER folks there. If you're in northeast Muldoon you're going to see a lot of JBER folks.

But even then that distinction neglects the fact that JBER folks live and play in the entirety of
Anchorage's municipality at large, especially south of the bowl.

So I just reject this characterization that because we have gotten away with the assumption that JBER belongs to Eagle River means that that has to continue, right? People's strongest rebuttal to map 2 seems to be, oh, well, we've done all of these things in the past, right? 20 years ago, 10 years ago we got away with these other House districts, so why can't we just do it again, right?

I think that's a huge logical fallacy. It assumes what has been done in the past must be done in the future, even if that thing was never fair in the very first place, right?

So I think the board had a chance to correct a lot of mistakes from the previous map, right? I think they have the chance to rectify a lot of things. And (indiscernible) same sorts of (indiscernible) arguments and sort of, you know, logical fallacies that assume the past must be the future, I think (indiscernible) mistakes.

When you break down House District 23, right, you're looking at 56 JBER residents, okay, in terms of people's voting age. And then if you break it down even further, Government Hill -- well,
downtown represents about 9 percent, and then
Government Hill represents another, you know,
12 percent, and then northeast Anchorage represents
another 14 percent.

We're disenfranchising the residents -- the
minority of residents in that district by
automatically assuming that they also belong with
Eagle River, right? I mean, we're talking about a
district -- an area within this district JBER
(indiscernible). That's low, low, low voter turnout
and participation that we're -- frankly, I don't
think we need to be prioritizing those voters over
the people who would be disenfranchised by being
paired with a community that they have absolutely
nothing to do with.

So I'm just frustrated that this debate has
boiled down to, you know, are we going to give JBER
to Eagle River or are we going to do nothing at all
with (indiscernible) problem, right? I think that's
the (indiscernible), and I think it needs to be
considered by the board.

So that's why I called in. I wanted to make
the comments, you know, as someone who comes from a
military family, someone who myself has spent a lot
of time on Base, knows a lot of folks on Base. I
just am frustrated by this discussion and wanted to add that piece of clarification.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you, Robert.

Next online is Corwyn Wilkey.

MR. WILKEY: Hi. Yeah. My name is Corwyn Wilkey. I am an East Anchorage resident, District 21. Forrest Dunbar is my rep.

And I just wanted to call in today to voice my support for district map 2. I think it is the constitutional choice. I think it makes sense to keep communities together, and I think that map 3B is an obvious attempt at gerrymandering and for the far right conservative element to bolster its support by digging into areas of other communities where they know they have a conservative stronghold. So I think No. 2 is the obvious choice, makes the most sense, it's the simplest, and it is the constitutional choice.

That's all I have to say. Thank you very much for taking my comments.

CHAIR BINKLEY: You bet. And thank you, Corwyn, for coming forward (indiscernible) being so concise. Appreciate it.

Next in line is Miles Baker.

MR. BAKER: Good afternoon.
CHAIR BINKLEY: (Indiscernible) can you hear us okay?

MR. BAKER: Yes, I can hear you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead. You're a little bit broken up, but go ahead.

MR. BAKER: Okay. So thanks for taking the time. I'm calling in today in support of map 2, keeping District 23 paired with District 17 downtown.

I'm calling in for myself. I'm a lifelong Alaskan. I've lived and worked all over the state, but spent most of my life in Anchorage, and I feel like I have a very good understanding of the culture and the community of this part of our state.

I've lived in the Turnagain neighborhood of West Anchorage, Rabbit Creek Road in South Anchorage, and for the last six years I’ve been a homeowner in Government Hill, which is a wonderful community that is very much part of downtown Anchorage.

As Chairman Binkley knows well, Government Hill is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Anchorage. It was part of the original tent city for building the Alaska Railroad in 1915 here in Ship Creek. So we are a sizeable community in Government Hill of individuals who do not live or work on JBER to a large extent and don't have access to JBER.
This isn't about doing anything to disenfranchise the military. I'm a veteran. I'm a huge supporter of our military. I understand their importance to the economy of our state and to the general security of the country.

But the combination of Elmendorf with Fort Rich into JBER and the other defense security concerns post 9/11 have significantly limited public access to JBER. And as a consequence, it's simply not realistic to use a purely geographic sort of bird's-eye view to develop district boundaries.

Residents of Government Hill are in District 23. I live and work downtown. I'm .8 miles from my house to my office in downtown. It's a 16-mile drive through downtown Anchorage for me to get to someplace like (indiscernible) and Eagle River.

We simply -- we can't access, unless you're retired military, active duty military, or you're a dependent or DOD employee, you can't go through that part of the rest of what would be proposed to be the -- be adjacent House district and Senate district under the other plan.

So I'll keep it at that, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the time, and I appreciate all the work
you've done and the rest of the group. I know it's been a long haul, and good luck with the rest of your deliberations.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you very much, Miles. And thank you for your service, too, with the military and for the state over many, many decades. It's much appreciated.

And, yes, I do know Ship Creek and Government Hill area well. I've got a great picture of my grandfather's tent city storefront in 1915 down in Ship Creek, and it's what I treasure. So thank you for that.

Moving along next is Representative Dan Saddler. Dan, are you with us? I'm not sure if you're off-net or you're on net (indiscernible) office.

REPRESENTATIVE SADDLER: Thank you very much. I won't go through the can you hear me now, can you hear me now. So if you can, again, for the record, Mr. Chairman, this is Dan Saddler from Eagle River.

I would like to add my voice to the many of those who have called this week supporting map 3B. And I hope the map numbers haven't changed overnight, but the task before you is to remedy the previous
Eagle River pairings, and it looks to me like map 3B, that pairs Districts 9 and 22 together in a single Senate district, best accomplishes that.

Here's why. I guess the standards require that district pairings be socioeconomically and geographically integrated. District 22 includes Eagle River Valley, which encompasses a semi-rural area characterized by people living on or near the Chugach Mountains.

District 9 Anchorage encompasses a semi-rural area, also characterized by people living on or near the Chugach Mountains.

The standard requires that the Senate pairings be contiguous, and I've heard people say that the distance between Districts 9 and 22 are somehow disqualifying. At the risk of being disrespectful, I would remind everybody Alaska is a big state and Anchorage is a big municipality. House districts and Senate pairings reflect that size and spread.

The idea that absence of a single road linking the two Districts 22 and 9 just does not pass muster. We no longer mush our dog teams across an Iditarod trail that goes through the Chugach Mountains. We now drive cars on our roads, which,
incidentally, the people in 9 and 22 pay for
themselves to their own road service areas, as
opposed to other parts of Anchorage.

The implication that a senator's access to
constituents is limited by the short drive does not
hold water in the modern age. Senators have access
to their constituents by telephone, by mail, by
teleconference, (indiscernible), by e-mail, and by
the internet, which they've invented.

Even before the age of the internet, Senate
pairings linked Eagle River with South Anchorage. It
was appropriate then, it's appropriate now. That's
called precedent. The idea that something is no
longer good because it's old is -- just does not make
sense to me.

I want to register my opposition to the
House -- to option 2 that would link 23, which is the
(indiscernible) side of JBER, and District 17, which
is Government Hill and downtown.

I represented District 18 in the State House
in my first term, which linked these two areas, and I
can tell you, members of the board, there are
significant differences between the population. They
have different lifestyles.

One is settled homeowners, like Miles Baker
just testified, versus transient, that rotate every
couple of years through the Base. There's different
homeownership factors, versus privately owned homes
versus government-issued on-Base housing.
The children of these people go to different
schools, Ursa Major and Minor versus Government Hill
Elementary. And I need to say, the idea that there
is travel across the big fence is just not accurate.
While military personnel can leave Base and go to
town, citizens cannot get past the armed guards to
get on Base unless they have a legitimate reason, you
have a pass or have a sponsor. It is (indiscernible)
easier to drive from Eagle River to South Anchorage.
Option 3B, again, better reflects the common
interest between these districts. District 23 has
the highest percentage of veterans and significant
number of active duty families. They've got
dependent or veteran DOD passes to get them Base
access. So they go to work on Base, they shop at the
PX, they go to Elmendorf hospital for their
healthcare. These people share locational, cultural,
and economic values, and would be well represented by
a single senator.
I would offer a couple other -- well, I'm
not going to go there.
I would just state -- I would caution anyone against characterizing the motives of board members. I choose to believe that you all operate in good faith. Call me naive, but I do.

And by the same token, I would caution board members from inferring any partisan intent on the part of testifiers. The people who testify are due the same respect and presumption of fairness and nonpartisanship that you yourselves are due.

So to summarize, Mr. Chairman, please oppose map 2 and support map 3B.

And I regret I can't hang on for the cross-examination. I've got a flat tire I need to go get to. So thank you (indiscernible), and good luck with your decision. Take care.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Representative Saddler.

Nicole, go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Is he still on the line or did he hang up?

CHAIR BINKLEY: He indicated he had to attend to a flat tire on the side of the road he was working on, so I don't think he's on the line, Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay.
CHAIR BINKLEY: And that is our last testifier, I believe. We're somewhat past 2:00, which is fine. It was great testimony today. (Indiscernible) great arguments. I was really impressed that we had such a variety of people (indiscernible) and testifying, new people that hadn't been out as well before. So I thought it was -- it was very informative (indiscernible).

Is there anything else to come before the board or any present comments from board members? If not, I will look for a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I'll make that motion.

But before we adjourn, can Peter or you notify the public of when our next meeting is? I make that motion to adjourn, but after we -- I guess we should do that before (indiscernible).

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, let's do that. If you can give the public again our schedule next week, Peter.

MR. TORKELSON: Sure, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Our schedule for next week is we have a meeting noticed for Wednesday, April 13th, beginning
at 1 p.m. We noticed a second meeting April 14th, Thursday, also beginning at 1 p.m.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And in terms of connecting, I know we're going to be doing deliberation. I would suggest you -- well, we can discuss that beforehand, but I think we should have an opportunity -- well, let's discuss it.

Maybe -- I know we consistently have public testimony to open the meeting, but we do have a lot of deliberations to get through, and it may be -- it may be best to get started on the deliberations. But we can discuss that maybe when we start Wednesday.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. If you go back to my motion to add these three extra days of public hearings, it was in anticipation of us starting deliberations. So it was my intent that today would be the end of the public hearing portion as to the two options.

But after we signal which option we're choosing, then it would be appropriate to open for more public testimony.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I'm not sure how we signal that. I think maybe we can discuss that on Wednesday when we convene, exactly what the process
is going to be. But (indiscernible), 1:00 on
Wednesday, and then the 13th, and again 1:00 on
Thursday, the 14th.
Bethany?
MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
I would just want to check with Peter and
others and ensure that we haven't somehow indicated
to the public that they will be able to testify on
Monday -- I'm sorry, on Wednesday. I guess -- I just
want to make sure that -- I'm not sure what we put
out there as far as agendas and that sort of thing.
But if we are going to not allow them to
testify on Wednesday first thing we should probably
make sure that we haven't already indicated that they
will be able to.
CHAIR BINKLEY: That's a good point.
Peter, is there -- is there an agenda
published for Wednesday?
MR. TORKELSON: We have not published an
agenda. Our sort of default public notice has the
dial-in numbers, but there's been no agenda
published.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, to Nicole
(indiscernible), and I recall that, as well, that we
looked at this process testimony being the testimony leading up to beginning our deliberations on -- on the remand, which would be presumably then 1:00 on Wednesday to get that process (indiscernible). At some point we need to -- when we make a decision, allow the public, though, to comment on what that decision is.

Is that your understanding, Nicole and Bethany, Melanie?

MEMBER BORROMEO: It was.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MEMBER BAHNKE: With that, I make a motion for adjournment.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Second.

CHAIR BINKLEY: There's a motion before us and seconded to adjourn for the day. Is there discussion on the motion? Is there any objection to the motion?

Hearing none, we're adjourned.

(Proceedings adjourned.)
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ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD MEETING

April 13, 2022
Members Present:
John Binkley, Chair of the Board (via Zoom)
Melanie Bahnke, Board Member
Nicole Borromeo, Board Member
Bethany Marcum, Board Member (via Zoom)
Budd Simpson, Board Member (via Zoom)
Peter Torkelson, Executive Director
Matt Singer, Legal Counsel
Jeanette Starr, Court Reporter
MR. TORKELSON: All right, Mr. Chairman. I believe we're ready to start. It's just after 1, and we have -- folks are all online through Zoom and in person.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Good afternoon.

We'll go ahead and start the Alaska Redistricting Board meeting, on April 13th, at 1:00, 1:02.

And we're both in person at the LIO office, I believe, and also online. We have a draft agenda before us.

The first item, though, is to call us to order and establish that a quorum is present.

Peter, could you please call the roll?

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Member Bahnke.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Present.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum.

MEMBER MARCUM: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Simpson.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Here.

MR. TORKELSON: And Member Binkley.
CHAIR BINKLEY: I'm here.

MR. TORKELSON: Okay. We have all five members present.

CHAIR BINKLEY: We have all members present. And the first item on the agenda is adoption of the agenda.

So any discussion on the agenda or motion to adopt the agenda?

MEMBER BORROMEO: So moved. This is Nicole.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead, Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: This is Melanie. I'll second.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Motion before us and seconded to adopt the agenda as presented. First item is discussion of proposed Anchorage Senate pairings.

MEMBER BORROMEO: John.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, go ahead. You've got your hand up, and then I think Budd's got his hand up.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I would like to --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, my -- my hand was up --

MEMBER BORROMEO: -- on option No. 2 and move to a vote on option No. 2 with the board's plan.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I second Nicole’s motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Maybe there was a bit of confusion there. Sorry about that. But there’s an option -- there’s a motion before us and seconded to adopt option 2. Is there objection to the motion?

Well, first, let’s have discussion on the motion. Discussion on the motion?

Hearing no discussion -- go ahead, Budd.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I’m sorry. I was inadvertently talking over Ms. Borromeo. I had a question going to the agenda, and it got -- it moved -- moved on without me getting that in.

My question was: If we get through the agenda and adopt pairings, should we put something on about dealing with the truncation question or any other kind of housekeeping things if we do get through this?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Maybe what I would suggest is -- since we have a motion -- a live motion on the floor, is we can go back and revisit the agenda anytime, make adjustments to the agenda later on if we so choose.

So why don't we stick with the motion that’s
before us, and then we can go back to that?

MEMBER SIMPSON: That's -- that's fine, Mr. Chair.

And then along the same lines, I believe I was talking over Ms. Borromeo, so I didn't clearly hear the -- the motion. So could that be repeated, please?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, could you please repeat the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. I'm happy to.

And I'm sorry about the delay there, Budd, and I appreciate you asking questions.

The motion on the floor is that I move to call the question on option No. 2 and move to a vote on that plan.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So that was different than the first motion that I heard. It sounded like you want to cut off debate by calling for the question now, in the body of the motion.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I'm -- I'm happy to engage in debate, and I will entertain a friendly motion from the one who seconded my motion. But I do want some time certain stoppage on debate and to move to a vote on option 2.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll
second that.

My intention at least wasn't to end discussion and debate. I actually seconded the motion so that we can enter into discussion and debate.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. That's what I had -- that was the original motion, as I interpreted it. I didn't hear her calling for the question in the motion itself.

Typically, you'd make the motion, second the motion, and then if there is another motion to stop debate and call the question immediately, then that's a separate motion that would -- depending on if it succeeded or not, would either end debate or allow debate to continue.

So I did hear that Melanie wanted to cut off debate in her second motion.

MEMBER BAHNKE: No, I did not intend for that.

And then just for clarity's sake, I believe it requires a three out of five vote to end debate, which I learned from the last time in November.

And I do have -- I have discussion and -- discussion to offer on this motion, Mr. Chair. But I see Budd still has his hand up.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Yeah, I think, Nicole, are you willing to amend your motion, just for sticking to the motion itself and allowing debate at this point? And then we can certainly -- it's available to you at any time to call the question to try and stop debate.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes. I'm not trying to stop debate. I'm sorry that it got confused. I would like to move option No. 2 and entertain a vote on that after discussion of the board. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So the motion is to adopt option 2. And, Melanie, you're okay with seconding that motion?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. The motion is before us to adopt option 2. Debate on the motion?

And, Melanie, you've got your hand up, and then Budd.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I would defer to Budd. Let him go first since -- oh, he's got his hand down now.

Okay. And Budd --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Go ahead, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: If Budd doesn't have
anything to offer, I'll go ahead.

First of all, I want to thank all of the Alaskans who called in to testify and provide us with perspectives and those who submitted proposed Senate pairings.

Looking back to November, the alternative compromise map, if you will, that I had developed actually had also split Eagle River.

And based on all of the new information from testimony and being able to have time to review proposed Senate pairings, I now realize that -- that splitting of Eagle River would have been flawed.

So I'm grateful, again, for the opportunity for public comment and time to evaluate the options.

The splitting of Eagle River, option 3B, is not the most contiguous, as it splits the community of Eagle River, a community of interest, in half, literally by a street, and creates a Senate district with the mountain range, wilderness, and unpopulated areas in between.

I don't disagree that there are things in common between Eagle River and Hillside and Eagle River and JBER. We heard from a lot of folks that there are actually a lot of things in common.

But when I look at -- if I looked at it as a
Venn diagram, I would have Eagle River and Eagle River with the most overlap, in terms of contiguity, compactness, and socioeconomic integration.

And one part of Eagle River has some overlap with Hillside, and one part of Eagle River has some overlap with JBER, but, overwhelmingly, when you look at the transportation corridors, the number of Senate districts you have to travel through to get from one part of a Senate district to another, I looked at the constitution and the constitution requires us to consider contiguity.

In fact, Judge Matthews of the Supreme Court [sic] used the analogy of connecting Girdwood and downtown as a false contiguity, and our attorney's response was that was also the board's position. So that was back when we were before the Supreme Court. Because it uses links that are unpopulated.

Also under record -- under the record, Member Simpson had also -- when referring to Southeast he had said the part that connects the north part of that to the southern part basically has almost no people in it, so it just -- it's basically a fiction in my mind.

Now, mind you, that was referring to Southeast, but when I look at the 3B pairings, I
think that also applies there.

The constitution says each Senate district shall be composed as near as practicable of two continuous House Districts. Consideration may be given to local government boundaries, drainage, and other geographic features shall be used in boundaries wherever possible.

From the Superior Court ruling, on page 27 of the 171 document, the Court has defined the contiguity criterion to require territory which is bordering or touching, or more specifically that every part of the district is reachable from every other part without crossing the district boundary, Hickel vs. Southeast.

But in light of Alaska's size and numerous archipelagos, the Court noted that a contiguous district may contain some amount of open sea, within reason, and subject to the other Section 6 criteria.

The Alaska Supreme Court has defined a contiguous territory as one which is bordering or touching. The Court determined that a district may be defined as contiguous if every part of the district is reachable from every other part without crossing the district boundary, i.e., the district is not divided into two or more discrete pieces.
The Court acknowledges that Alaska is a unique state with many islands and massive coastline. This reality means that without limitations on the definition of contiguous, a coastal district could be considered contiguous with any other coastal district by reason of sharing the open sea.

For example, District 7, covering the Aleutian Islands, could be permissibly paired in a Southeast district despite being separated by the Gulf of Alaska.

In Kenai, the Supreme Court noted the anomalous result and determined that contiguity could not be separated from the concept of compactness when crafting Senate districts.

In my mind, option 2 is therefore both most contiguous and compact comparatively with the alternative that we have.

Peter, can you please pull up the map that shows the mountains and the transportation corridors?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. I'll have it up shortly.

MEMBER BAHNKE: While he's doing that, I also want to speak to equal rights. So in my mind, equal rights does not mean more rights for some. It doesn't mean maximal rights at the expense of others.
The other thing that I'm concerned about with the Supreme Court's findings and the remand from the Superior Court to us was to correct the constitutional deficiencies in the map that was adopted in November. It specifically noted partisan gerrymandering, as intent was stated on the record and also reflected in the outcome.

This time perhaps the intent has not been verbally stated, but the outcome is the same. This is still gerrymandering, just in a different way, in my mind, because the intent to separate Eagle River to give it more representation, which was stated in November, is still being considered in option 3B.

Just going back also to compactness and how the Courts have said that contiguity is related to compactness, the Supreme Court had defined compact territory. Compactness is defined as having a small perimeter in relation to the area encompassed, such that bizarre designs do not result.

The Court has provided some examples that may violate this criterion, such as corridors of land that extend to include a populated area or appendages attached to otherwise compact areas.

When you look at the maps, there is literally a mountain range separating the two House
districts that are being proposed to be paired in option 3B. And when you look at how you get from one part of the proposed Senate district to the other, you see how many other districts you have to cross in order to get from one to the other.

I believe that the Court sent this back to us to correct it, not to find a new way to continue to try to give Eagle River more representation. And so that's why, Mr. Chair, I will be voting in favor of option 2. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Nicole, go ahead.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. I don't have any comments at this time, but questions. And I realize that we're doing this over Zoom. If there are any questions or concerns from either you, Bethany, or Budd as to the strength of article -- of option 2 compared to option 3, I'd like to engage in some of that discussion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So you have a question --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah.

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- for one of us?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I do have a question, yes, for you and Bethany. Because I've been listening to the public hearings and reading the testimony, and in
my mind you have both continued to champion map 3B. And I'm trying to find at this point, what is the rationale for splitting Eagle River?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, I think really, you know, the motion was made to adopt version 2, and now we're having debate on that motion. So it's not really a general discussion. It's individual board members stating where they stand on the motion that is before us. So it's more of a debate on where people stand on the motion itself.

So, you know, when I express where I'm going to stand on this motion, you know, I'll address some of those things, and I would imagine other members would, as well. I don't necessarily want to do it in a manner that it's a questioning back and forth.

MEMBER BORROMEO: That's -- that's fine. The inference then is that I'm left to create the connections versus hearing it from you and to try and come up with your rationale. And I'd much rather hear it from you, if -- if you're willing to put it on the record, as to -- as to why Eagle River has to be in two separate Senate seats.

And I'm not just saying you personally, but Bethany, as well, has expressed, again, strong support for map B3. I'm not sure where Budd lies at
this point, so I'll welcome everybody into the
discussion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Again, I think we
should just debate where we stand on the motion. And
members don't have to. They don't have to express
why they're going to vote the way they do, but that's
the appropriate time to do it.

But it's -- really, I think we're beyond the
point of discussing it. I think we're to the point
of answering the question that is before us, which is
the motion, do we support version 2 or not.

Let's see. Budd, you had your hand up, and
then Melanie.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I --
I might as well jump in to my general comments,
because whether you're for or against one of the
options necessarily informs what happens with the
other option. So, in my mind, the discussion is kind
of linked between the two.

And, you know, I haven't weighed in as much
as some members have up to now, my sense being that
these hearings were opportunities for the public to
talk and not us to kind of take up the time and talk
over them.

So in that context, as Melanie said, I
really would like to thank everyone who participated over the past several months, and especially in the last couple of weeks or few days. I'm sure, like the rest of you, I've gone through and read the written testimony and the transcripts of the oral testimony and have tried my best to keep up to speed on all of that and to take into consideration what -- what everybody said.

I do note that, you know, for many people testifying in a public context out loud on video or in person is really difficult and daunting for kind of most civilians, regular folks, so I appreciate that a lot of people did take the opportunity to submit written testimony, as well. I know there's been some discussion of the importance of written versus in-person. I don't see a difference in that personally, so I just want to let the people that submitted written testimony know that I consider that as important as somebody who came in person.

So that brings us to where we are now. We are addressing the matters that were sent to us on -- on remand after the original pairings were challenged, and then appealed, and then remanded. So at this point we have two specific tasks.

And, happily, I think we have taken care of
the first one, which was the Cantwell appendage, so-called. The board had a straightforward solution to that. It was resolved, I will say, almost with consensus, Mr. Chair. And I think it's not necessarily -- necessary to beat that to death or anything. We could move on to the real issue before us today, which is the pairing for Senate District K. That was the other specific remand item.

Now, when this first came up, the testimony was very adamant that we address what became option No. 1, which had been before the board and the public now for several months, had been thought about, considered, and all of that. But I, at least, urged the board to take a little more time, think about that, get some testimony -- new testimony.

And in the end -- well, at the -- in the beginning, the public testimony definitely favored that option No. 1, at least in terms of a plurality. While we're not necessarily following what the -- most testimony supports, it was notable that there was a lot of support for option 1.

And had we gone with that, we basically would have adopted a Senate pairing that went way beyond our charge given to us by the Court and our constitutional duties, because it would have involved
re-pairing and renumbering the entire Anchorage Municipality, you know, changing all eight districts.

And on reflection and after hearing some testimony and advice, we determined not to do that. And after thinking about it, the board actually did vote unanimously to remove option 1 from further consideration. So that -- the board doesn't always act in -- in opposing factions or whatever. The board often -- often works toward a single goal, and there was an example where we all agreed on what would be the right thing to do.

So having -- having removed that from consideration, we then received three other options for Senate pairings. The first, the East Anchorage plaintiffs offered one that -- you know, they had prevailed in their challenge of our pairing of Senate District K, and so they brought what became option No. 2 to resolve the District K problem.

And then AFFER, which was another -- another group or individual that had participated extensively from the beginning, brought forth another option, which became option 3. And then -- then subsequently modified that a little bit, which is how we got to 3B, and that also was the option that Board Member Marcum came up with.
There also was a third option presented by a member of the public. That option involved the necessity -- to make it work, you had to change a House district. We were not prepared as a board overall to get into changing House districts, and so rather than confuse ourselves and the public by having a third option that at least some of us felt we just weren't going to actually entertain, we dropped that from consideration, as well, and leaving us with the two that are before us now.

Interestingly, too, in my mind, between option 2 and 3B, there actually are a number of things in common. We tend to look at this as, you know, two extreme issues, but there actually a bunch of common features.

Both -- both option 2 and 3B only change four districts. And that seems -- that seems like a reasonable number. The fact that both independently came up with a solution that changes four districts, to me, tends to lend validity or credibility to that level of change, so I appreciate that.

Also, both chose to deal with Senate District K in exactly the same way. They joined House Districts 20 and 21, which, again, was probably the simplest and most obvious solution to the mandate.
of the Court and the District K problem.

They also -- if I'm correct, both options leave in place the pairings of Districts 11 and 12, and 15 and 16. So there's a number -- number of things that are the same in both versions.

Obviously, then, the board is faced with the hard decision of what happens with the four House districts that are affected by 20/21 pairing, those being the Eagle River/Chugiak districts, the South Anchorage/Hillside, the JBER, or military district, and downtown.

So that's a lot of preface. Like I said, I haven't done a lot of talking until now, so you have to bear with me as I tee this up then to kind of move forward.

The differences then going through that analysis is whether we pair Districts 17 and 14, that would be downtown and the military district, or 23 and 24, which you could call military and Chugiak.

So how you decide those two options then pretty much drives what happens with the Eagle River District 22 and the south side of Chugiak, and it starts narrowing it down. You have the -- when you make a decision, you have fewer other options to choose from as you go forward.
So on the -- as far as the motion before us on option No. 2, I personally find the pairing of 23 and 24, being the military with Chugiak, to be the more compelling version or solution.

I think pairing the military bases with downtown overlooks JBER as a significant community of interest, and I think that, in itself, could expose us to a constitutional challenge from that constituency.

We heard a lot of testimony about interactions between Eagle River, Chugiak, and JBER, that that area has essentially developed as a bedroom community for -- for the military families. They send their kids to middle school and high school there. I'm sure there are exceptions to that, but, again, I felt the overall weight of that testimony was compelling toward that pairing.

So I've -- I've heard the argument made repeatedly that under the Court ruling Eagle River/Chugiak has to be paired with Eagle River, but that's actually not what the Court said. The Court -- the Court decreed that the way Eagle River was placed in the proclamation version was done at the expense of Muldoon. "At the expense of Muldoon" was the key to that part of the decision or the
The order directed us to reconfigure Senate District K. It didn't say anything about L -- District L, although the East Anchorage plaintiffs had expressly asked for that as part of their relief.

And the Court did not grant the relief requested regarding District L. They told us -- or rather it, the Court, told us to repair the problematic aspect of District K, and both we and -- well, both versions offered by the board make that repair.

And so that should be sufficient to meet the -- both the exact language and the intent or the sense of what the Court was concerned about. If -- if Eagle River is paired together or split, either way does not happen at the expense of Muldoon because Muldoon is taken care of under -- under both versions. Yeah. So that -- that issue is eliminated.

As far as the pairing, I don't think there's any real advantage to the Eagle River districts, in terms of splitting them or combining them. The House district is the same. It would -- you know, those House districts were approved by both levels of the Court. They are, you know, all within the municipality. They all contain approximately the
same number of people. And when you -- whichever two
you pair for a Senate district, there's going to be
37 or -- 36 or 37,000 people in it, and they all get
a vote, and they're all going to have a senator and a
representative.

So the other point is that Districts 23 and
24 is a pairing that is already in place, and so
under option 3B, that isn't changed. So if there are
folks out there who have already thought about
running or not running or whatever, that stays in
place, and it's just one less thing to be changed.

So that brings us to the pairing of 22 and
9. There's been a lot of testimony and discussion
about that, again, on both -- both sides. When you
make the pairings that are described for JBER and
Eagle River, it leaves 22 as -- you know, with no
place else to go really except 9. And so that -- you
know, that just kind of flows naturally from that
other decision regarding 23 and 24.

So the House districts have been settled.
No one complained about those. The most discussion
in that has been about contiguity and the concept of
"as nearly as practicable" has been discussed.
The concept of nearly as practicable, I
think, has been misconstrued a lot of the time in
those discussions. You know, practicable just basically means possible or able to be done, capable of being done. The way it's used in the Alaska constitution is actually not to say that as near as practicable means you have to have the best pairing. It's stated as an exception to the contiguity rule, where it is not practicable to have the two House districts paired together because they don't touch and there isn't another way to do it.

So as nearly as practicable was always intended as an exception to the contiguity rule, not an enhancement of the contiguity rule that you had to find the best, most compact, whatever.

The pairing of House districts to create a Senate district is not the same rule as you have for the creation of a compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated House district. It's a different thing. And while we have sought to find pairings that have some reasonable rational relationship, it's a different standard than what applies to the creation of a House district.

And there's nothing wrong with the pairing of 9 and 22. They have -- they are contiguous. You look at the map, they have a lengthy, maybe 35-mile, border that is shared. They consist of two districts
that are, I think, socioeconomically and demographically similar in many ways. And, of course, they are -- like the other House districts, they are included in the Municipality of Anchorage, and therefore are legally socioeconomically integrated based on precedent.

The -- the other thing that a lot of people mentioned was that you have to drive out of the district to go from one side of it to the other. The concept of transportation contiguity has been debunked as a constitutional requirement. It's just not so. It doesn't matter. The contiguity question is essentially a visual, I have said before, binary question. You can look at the map. Something is either contiguous or not. These are contiguous. They touch.

We've heard the concept of false contiguity brought up, and I think my name has been invoked in that context. The false contiguity that I have referred to was in the proposed pairing that the community of Skagway had favored, and they had drawn a connection, you know, through the water, where nobody was, and they went around the main part of Juneau in order to connect themselves with the downtown area.
I considered that a false contiguity. It was not compact and, in fact, our -- the board's proposal for that district did end up prevailing, and that false contiguity was rejected. So, yeah, the upshot is that Districts 22 and 9 have 35 miles or so of real, hard, on-the-map contiguity. To kind of wrap up, I want to briefly address the charges of partisan gerrymandering that have been tossed around with some frequency throughout this process.

The final day of testimony, on Saturday, two Republican senators and a member from Governor Dunleavy's administration spoke out against option 3B.

And I can note here that I am an appointee of the governor's and yet I find myself kind of lining up in favor of option 3, even though somebody from that office apparently has -- thinks the other one is a better idea.

If the board's option 3 is some kind of naked partisan attempt to gerrymander the map to protect Republicans, as some have claimed, then why is it that Republican Senators Lora Reinbold and Roger Holland have testified so vehemently against
it? Apparently they feel that something in option 3 harms them in some way. But if it does, that fact obviously clearly goes against the argument that any of the drafters of option 3 made any effort to protect or enhance Republican seats or interests.

So having considered all of that, I have -- I believe that if there's anything partisan in either of these two maps, the most partisan is the proposed pairing of JBER and downtown. I believe this would diminish the voice of our valued Alaska military personnel. I can't support that, and I am, just to be clear, going to be voting for option 3B.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Budd.

Let's see. Nicole, you haven't had a chance to weigh in on the debate. And then I see, Melanie, you've got your hand up, as well.

Why don't we go to Nicole, and then maybe we should go to all the members first for an opportunity to state where they're at, and then, Melanie, maybe come back for a second round. Are you okay with that?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole, you have the floor.
MEMBER BAHNKE: Do you want me to take my hand down until that happens or --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you very much.

CHAIR BINKLEY: No, that's fine.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Are we ready? Okay.

Well, I appreciate Budd for being brave enough to at least put some rationale on the record for the board to respond to. I don't think it's going to come as a surprise that, unfortunately, I disagree with pretty much all of it.

Our job when it comes to Senate pairings is to follow the constitution. The constitution is pretty dang clear, when you look at Article VI, Section 6, and it says we shall pair districts that are as contiguous as practicable.

Now, Budd spent some time talking about it's not an enhancement or an exception, yada, yada, yada. But, again, in 2022 the most practicable means of traveling between these districts is via car. Nobody is walking over the Chugach Mountains. In fact, it's totally impassable for large parts of the year.

These are significantly elder populations that live in these districts, and for us to expect that they are going to hike over the Chugach range to get from Eagle River down to Whittier is just ridiculous.
It's 87 miles, nonetheless.

It then falls to us, as a board, to put some rationale on the record for splitting Eagle River.

And, again, I hate to point it out, but we weren't just accused of public -- of partisan gerrymandering last time. In fact, we were found guilty, not once, but twice, by the Superior Court, and that decision was unanimously confirmed by the Supreme Court.

I appreciate that Budd thinks that, you know, this is being done to protect Republicans, whatever that means. In fact, what we're doing here as a board is we are co-signing the Republican parties' cannibalization of themselves.

They've got a problem with Senator Holland because he won't move certain bills out of his committee, and Senator Reinbold is a loose cannon and they can't control her. So the best option is, instead of taking them out in broad daylight at the polls, they are going to come in through the dark of night, under the redistricting cloak, to pair them against each other.

Again, when we were found guilty of gerrymandering the first time around, it was bad enough because we were hurting poor minority voters.

Now Budd expects us to believe that it's okay so long
as we're going after the rich white voters. The intent is the same. Bethany's intent has not changed. She said in November she put these pairings on the record so Eagle River could have more representation. Voila, Eagle River is still getting more representation.

So back to the law. And who picked me on their bingo card for being the strict constitutionalist here, but here we are, back to the law. And we need to look at what the Court is going to do when they get this case back again, which they will.

Page 56, Judge Matthews is instructing what the Court is going to do when they look at this new pairing that once again splits Eagle River. Quote, "The Court employs a neutral factors test to assess the legitimacy of the Board's purpose in creating a Senate district. The Board's purpose would be illegitimate if it diluted the power of certain voters 'systematically by reducing their senate representation below their relative strength in the state's population.'"

So going back to the census data, which we may not have looked at for some time, Eagle River is about 7 percent of the state's population. But yet,
under this new plan we are going to give them 20 percent of the Senate. It makes no sense, no sense whatsoever.

So when the Court's going to look at why we did this, they are going to look at, one, our process in making the decision, which has been delayed. And I know nobody wants to talk about it, but as soon as the Supreme Court released its decision I have been calling for a public meeting. I've been saying: Let's go. I'm ready. We need to get this done.

June 1 is coming up.

I hear back: Oh, no, we've already noticed it for April 2nd. We can't possibly change it. But we assumed the decision was going to come out on April 1st, so I don't know why we had to burn an entire week off the clock, but we did.

The Court's also going to look at the substance of the decision. I haven't heard anything in the rationale that has bolstered splitting Eagle River. Instead, Budd says things like: Well, last time we split Eagle River it came at the expense of South Muldoon, and we're not doing that this time. Well, it's coming at the expense of South Anchorage. Is that any better? It's not better.

Budd also says there's no advantage to Eagle
River. I disagree. Eagle River is now going to have two senators. How is that not an advantage?
And the fact that the districts are already in place and that they've been paired together in the past, again, we are on a redistricting board.
Redistricting. We come here every ten years to redistrict, based on the census data.
But I'm not going to go hard in the paint anymore, because I have exhausted myself in trying to get you three to look at the constitution, to apply the constitution, and you are not willing to do that.
So instead, I am going to call on the courts to please exercise your Article VI, Section 11 powers. Do not send this back to us when you find it invalid, which you will. Draw the boundaries yourself.
This board will continue to gerrymander. We will continue to hurt voters. We will go ahead and pick different districts next time so that Eagle River remains split. Don't send it back. We are defunct. We are derelict in our duties.
I apologize to the state of Alaska. This has been an incredible frustrating and expensive process. But if you send it back to us, Judge Matthews, I guarantee there is just going to be more
slow rolling to blow the June 1 deadline.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Nicole.

Bethany, did you want to make a statement about the motion before us?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will make a statement about the motion to support proposal 2.

So I'm very uncomfortable with proposal 2, and that's primarily because it moves District 23, JBER, from its current pairing with District 24 by linking it with downtown, which is District 17.

Downtown has almost nothing in common with the military base. It absolutely makes the least sense of any possible pairing for District 23, JBER.

Downtown is the arts, right? It's tourism, it's lots of professional services, and that is not what makes up JBER. So I really fear that a District 17 and District 23 pairing could be viewed -- could be viewed as, like, an intentional action to break up the military community.

The military, JBER, is absolutely a community of interest, I think. And so I think that, you know, choosing option 2, which would pair District 17 with District 23, could be seen as an
intentional attempt to try to break up that community of interest.

So I support keeping the existing proclamation pairing of District 23, JBER, with District 24, JBER, Chugiak, Eagle River, Peters Creek. And since proposal 2 doesn't maintain this pairing, I will not be supporting proposal 2.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Bethany.

Maybe I'll just make a quick statement and state my position on the motion, and then we'll go to a second round.

And, Melanie, if you want to make another statement, and then, Nicole, I see your hand is back up again, as well.

Just like Melanie mentioned, and I think Budd, as well, incredible really the outpouring of public testimony on this issue. It shows to me that Alaskans are engaged. They want to participate in this. They care about it. It's important to them.

We had, I believe, seven different public hearings on this. We heard directly from over a hundred Anchorage residents, over 300 pieces of written testimony that's come in, and it's just a -- it's really heartening to see Alaskans engaged in
this and caring about it.

It's not easy, because everybody can't be satisfied in it. We've boiled this down to two different options, and people are supportive or opposing one or the other.

But when we step back it's really our task, on remand from the courts, to replace Senate District K.

The Senate -- or the Superior Court was concerned about us pairing District 22 and 21, and it's heartening really to see that both of these proposals solve that problem.

And I don't necessarily read into the Court order that it requires us to pair those two Muldoon House districts that we have together, but I think it really is noteworthy that we've -- in both options, that's really how we come together to solve that part of the problem that the East Anchorage plaintiffs brought forward in the litigation.

We've heard both from people who would prefer that District 22 and District 24 be paired together. Those people explained very articulately how they believe that Eagle River, Chugiak, Peters Creek, and those areas to the north, Eklutna and other parts of those districts, are closely tied.
together to each other. And I think that's valid. I think those are valid points.

But I think, as Budd pointed out earlier, the two Republican senators, a former Republican representative that I served with back in the '80s, who was from that area, knows it well, and former Republican Senate president, all testified to that, to pair those. And that -- you know, particularly the Senate president, Senator Giessel, who I admire and respect greatly, have known her all my life and I think highly of her, she testified that those two should be combined.

So I think, as Budd opined, it's certainly not political, because there are factions within the Republican party that are on both sides of that issue, and I think legitimately. So I understand the logic of that position, and I've looked at that very carefully.

Budd mentioned another member of the administration who I've known for many, many years, and I've reached out to him to call him to ask his opinion about that, because he also supported 22 and 24 being together, and I was -- or 23 and 24. And so I was very interested in what his thought process was with that, and also pairing 23 -- excuse me, not
23 -- 22 and 24 and 23 and 17, the JBER and downtown.
So I take it seriously, and I think that those are legitimate beliefs by people.
But we've already heard that there are significant similarities between District 22, Eagle River, and District 9, the Hillside. And we heard many, many people testify that both Eagle River and the Upper Hillside in Anchorage are generally more rural parts of the municipality. They have larger lot sizes, mostly single-family homes.
Many of these areas, it was indicated in testimony, are served by road service districts, which is different than the other more core areas of the municipality. They share the Chugach Mountains and the Chugach State Park, which are really defining geographic features.
And these people, it was also testified that they're close to the mountains. They deal with wildlife closer to their homes. There are higher snow loads that they deal with in the mountains, and also wildfire dangers, as well, that they share.
So I can also appreciate that these similarities really could be important to a senator. I've had the privilege of being a senator, so I understand how, from that perspective, you look at
different parts of your district, and I believe that
a senator could well represent those two House
districts and understand the priorities of their
constituents in those two different -- or those two
House districts that are connected there.

And when you look at Anchorage, it's -- you
know, visually, when you look at all of our House
districts, it's made up mostly of smaller, compact,
tightly populated urban districts, with a handful of
the much larger, much more rural districts in the
outskirts of the municipality.

And I think District 22 and District 9 are
both those large, more rural, and share a really
long, physical border. And that, to me, makes them
contiguous, as pointed out by everybody, that's
required by our constitution.

I also understand that the Eagle River
Valley and the Upper Hillside -- I think there was
some testimony, many people testified to this, were
formerly in a single Anchorage House district. So --
and that was adjudicated by the courts and found to
be compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically
integrated, which is a much higher standard than
we're really looking at for Senate districts that
must be contiguous.
And other points have been made that I just want to reiterate really are about JBER in District 23. And that's what I found one of the most compelling, as well, was that JBER physically extends into District -- from District 23 into District 24. And maybe if the underlying House districts had have been different, that could have been drawn differently. But the fact is, they do extend into there.

And it seems to be -- it's not disputed, or it seems to be undisputed, that there are really a great deal of active and retired military that reside in District 24, Chugiak, Peters Creek, the Eklutna area, and have that connection to 23.

There's also a direct, of course, highway connection between those two districts along the Glenn Highway, with gates into the military bases at the Arctic Valley and closer to town. And also Arctic Valley itself, recreational area with golf courses, hiking, skiing, all the sorts of things that are common to both.

We've also heard interesting testimony connecting JBER to North Muldoon. And I think that's -- that's got legitimacy. And I can see -- and I might have been comfortable when we were
looking at the House districts of -- or even the Senate pairings of connecting that direction. But that really wasn't an option that was presented to us, and we really didn't have an opportunity. It was just the two different pairings that we looked at, two different options to vet that with the public.

I don't find it compelling, the idea of JBER with downtown Anchorage. For 13 years I had an office in downtown Anchorage with the Alaska Cruise Association. I've owned a condo in that district, still do. I've also been involved with the Alaska Railroad for many, many years and have familiarity with the railroad infrastructure in that area.

And in my experience the downtown area that is part of District 17 is primarily defined by -- I think, Bethany, you pointed out some of that -- professional service, attorneys, accountants, those sorts of things. Tourism is very big in downtown Anchorage.

The arts, of course we have the performing arts center down in that area, shopping, entertainment, all those sorts of things. And also it has professional offices and professionals who live close by in that area. There are also large hotels down there, restaurants, convention centers,
all of the things that I mentioned, as well. So I just don't see in my own experience an enormous connection between those areas and the military population on JBER, as opposed to the military and JBER to the -- JBER to the military bedroom communities to the north.

I understand that the Court has found that -- Eagle River to be a community of interest, but I think the testimony has also established very clearly that the military community is also a community of interest, and I don't believe that we should be trading one community of interest for the other.

Several citizens have told us about how retired military in District 24 go to District 23 to shop on base, to get medical services there. We heard testimony that -- even from a former legislator in that area that the Eagle River High School would probably not even exist if it were not for the large military community that helps populate that -- that school.

So it seems to me that if a community of interest means anything, that a large group of people who, say, share the same employer, they serve the same common purpose, fortunately for us, in defending
our nation. They share the same uniform. They reside in close proximity, as I mentioned before the same medical care, they shop in the same places. That would fit the definition of a community of interest.

And I'm convinced that there are two overlapping communities of interest in north and northeast part of Anchorage, one that encompasses our military community, and then the one that encompasses Eagle River and Chugiak neighborhoods. But both are valid and important to the people in those communities, but there is not a way for us to put all of those interests into a single Senate district.

We've also heard concerns that putting the more conservative or swing district of the military base with downtown would drown out the military voters. That really echoes a concern that the Superior Court, I think, had in its decision about regional partisanship. I think they use that phrase, "regional partisanship."

And in the two districts that really made up Senate District K, I think we need to be very cautious that such a pairing wouldn't invite -- I think as other people have suggested, really invite a further legal challenge that would delay this
process.

So we've opted not to study the election returns or the election data. That was a decision we made together, so we have to take that testimony on the face value, without really looking at the data ourselves.

But if we are to take the Court's advice to heart, I believe we have multiple options. I think it is better to stay away from something that raises such a concern, and that's the case that I would state with 3B. I've not heard any criticism of option 3B for pairing districts with drastically different voting patterns together.

Ultimately, I found that both option 2, I believe, and option 3 are valid approaches. I respectfully disagree with the notion that one plan is right and the other plan is wrong, or that for -- people who prefer one plan have good motives, and maybe the people who prefer another plan have bad motives.

I would rather think that it's a hard choice. It's made all the more difficult by the tremendous amount of very compelling and competing information and testimony that we've received in the last week or week and a half. And I -- I really
believe that we've got two good options before us, and there are likely other options that we could have also looked at. But when I weigh the two, it's -- for me, I'm more comfortable with option 3B, and that's what I plan to support this afternoon.

Melanie, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I do appreciate the three of you actually putting some kind of rationale for us to digest in terms of how you're planning to vote on this motion.

One of the things I failed to mention earlier, that we have also considered as part of this process, is the expert testimony of Dr. Hensel. And there's been some conversation around socioeconomic integration throughout this process, and I just want to point you to that testimony that recognized Eagle River and Eagle River as a community of interest.

The option 3B, what option 3B has in common with the proposed maps from November -- and I'll read from the Superior Court ruling. This is another concern of mine.

So it says, "While the Court does not make this finding lightly, it does find evidence of secretive procedures evident in the Board's consideration and deliberation of the Anchorage
Senate seat pairings," dot, dot, dot. I'll skip through some of the other technical stuff.

But it does say, "The public portion of the record leads to only one reasonable inference: some sort of coalition or at least a tacit understanding between Members Marcum, Simpson, and Binkley. All three appeared to agree on all four of Member Marcum's maps with little public discussion." At least this time we're having -- we've had public discussions.

"Most surprising was at that time, it is unclear in the transcript, and was apparently also unclear to Member Borromeo, which of Member Marcum's maps the Board had apparently reached a majority on when the deliberative discussion was ended. It seems that what the three Board Members had reached a majority was the only element of the map that was consistent between them: that Eagle River was split and North Eagle River was paired with JBER."

And I'd like to point out that if we go with option 3B, we are adopting a plan that still, going back to November where there was some intent or motive or -- maybe that's not the word that was used -- evidence of secretive procedures.

And we'll be basically adopting a plan
drafted by Ruedrich, who was found to have supplied incumbent information to two members of the board, and then apparently to the whole board through our redistricting e-mail. But thankfully Juli redacted that information before it was distributed. And Bethany, who claimed to have not looked at that incumbent data but was found to have actually looked at it.

I have not looked at incumbent data. You mentioned -- you mentioned a few Republicans opposed 3B, so therefore it must be nonpartisan. I haven't looked at incumbent data. I have no understanding what the motives of those Republicans are who have called in to testify. I'm viewing this as a statesperson's perspective, not giving more weight to any person's testimony, looking at this logically, and from a matter of what abides by the constitution, what the Court found, what the Court has told us to do.

And if you want to go back to who was appointed by who, I mean, I think there's a reason why I was selected by the Supreme Court Justice of the state, because he probably thought that I could look at this objectively and not from a partisan perspective.
I just think it's very audacious for us to actually think that Judge Matthews isn't going to sniff this out. And I know that we don't have the votes. I don't think that -- again, when I said in my closing remarks in November I was discouraged for a moment, but then I was encouraged because this is going to shine a light on the public process and that we should expect more from our elected and appointed officials.

And I still feel that way. I feel like, you know, I'm not going to be deterred by this process. It is exhausting, like one of the people who testified said, but I'm not going to -- my stamina is probably boundless when it comes to ensuring that justice is served and that we do the right thing.

So I do hope that the Courts will correct this, because apparently we can't ourselves. We are like a hung jury of some sort.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Melanie.

Nicole.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. I'm going to just take a second to lower my hand here.

All right. I also want to echo Melanie's thanks that the three of you have at least put some
rationale on the record, which is what is required.
And so let's just go back and visit a couple of them.
The JBER thing, the military is not a protected class. This is just dog-whistle politics
to get people riled up that we're somehow
disenfranchising the Armed Services. It couldn't be farther from the truth. And I say that as a Navy wife, as a daughter of a Vietnam veteran, as the granddaughter of a veteran who served in Korea. I'm sorry, JBER is not protected. They are not entitled to any special consideration.

Also at this stage of the game, we shouldn't even be considering socioeconomic integration in factors. Our only job at this point is to follow Article VI, Section 6. That part is over. We did that already when we did the House maps.

Just pair as contiguous as practicable two districts. The two districts that are as contiguous as practicable are the two Eagle River districts.

Another justification that was brought up was the public testimony. And I don't say this lightly, but a good majority of it was canned, inconsistent, and at least one case that I have personal knowledge to, submitted without the knowledge of the person who submitted it supposedly,
because his wife was, quote, put up to it by Jamie Allard, who's also filed to run in the district. It's just -- you can't make this stuff up. To the point that the Court didn't say we had to pair Eagle River, true. What the Court said is to stop gerrymandering, and here we are back again, two-and-a-half weeks later, apparently not ready to quit robbing the bank of public trust, but we are brazen enough to come back in broad daylight without face masks. I don't understand. But at the same time, I'm hogtied in the back with Melanie and we can't stop the three of you.

John, you in November had a lot of trust that you were putting into Bethany's Senate pairings because you didn't have familiarity with Anchorage. Now come to find out that you own a condo in Ship Creek area. It's just mind-boggling to me.

The community of interest, again, with JBER, this is a transient community, okay? They get orders. They are not up here living in Alaska because they are necessarily doing it of free will. They are sent here by Uncle Sam. And in a lot of cases they leave. Sometimes they do come back and retire here, and I'm thankful to have them in the community.
But to have a community of interest, you have to have shared place based on experience and knowledge. And I submit to you, when you have enlisted personnel, officers that come up, doing rotation, check off their overseas box and leave, they do not share the same experiences and knowledge.

John, I can't even believe that you said that this board was not found guilty of looking at election data. It's true. Bethany was questioned about it in her deposition, said she didn't look at it, then, lo and behold, the East Anchorage plaintiffs pulled out a video of her and Budd looking at the election data that Randy sent to them.

The public doesn't believe us, especially when we're caught on tape doing what we say we're not going to do. So, yes, at least two of us looked at that data. And I will tell you, the only person -- the only person throughout this entire redistricting process that attempted to share incumbent data with me was Randy Ruedrich. It happened in Anchorage after the hearing.

And that's why I distanced myself from him. He was talking about Fairbanks North Star Borough and how we should just chop off the top because we'd be taking equal parts conservative and liberal.
I told him I don't care about the voter data. I want to break the borough boundaries at the place that makes the most constitutional sense. So it's just absolutely -- I don't want to use the word crazy, but it's the only one that comes to mind. I'm sorry.

And finally, John, to your point that you haven't heard any criticism regarding 3B in the voting powers, I don't know what redistricting board you've been in for the last couple of months, but it's a lot of what I've heard lately. And this process doesn't even feel Alaskan. I feel like I'm in 1950s Alabama. What are we doing here?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie, go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. I just want to make -- I just -- sorry. Go ahead, Mr. Chair. I didn't mean to cut you off.

CHAIR BINKLEY: No. Go ahead, Melanie. You have the floor.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I just want to make one thing clear, in terms of some kind of insinuation that option 2 would disenfranchise the military. I have the utmost respect for the military. Like Nicole, my father served in the Vietnam War, and I've got several relatives who are and have been in
I just don't think any group deserves special treatment at the -- you know, we shouldn't -- it's equal protection, not more voting powers for any groups. And I continue to look at splitting Eagle River and Eagle River as an attempt to provide Eagle River with two senators instead of the one that their population warrants.

And I feel like there were four ways that it was presented to be done in November. The majority of the board voted on one. We were told that that's not okay, so now the actions are going to be that we just found another way to still split Eagle River to guarantee it more representation.

And that's the part that I -- I am looking at, in terms of our constitutional responsibilities and being fair. So I want to make it clear that in no way am I suggesting that we harm the military community or do something, you know, to disenfranchise them at all. That's not the perspective and lens that I'm looking at this from.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Melanie. Is there further debate on the motion? If not, we'll call for the question on the motion.
Peter, could you please call the roll on the motion?

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIR BINKLEY: And the motion is to -- could you restate the motion, too just so we're clear?

MR. TORKELSON: The motion before the board is to adopt map option No. 2 for Anchorage Senate pairings.

Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. Because it's constitutional and complies with the Court's remand, I vote yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes, because it doesn't give Eagle River any more representation. It gives them the representation that they're due, which is one senator.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Member Marcum votes no on proposal 2.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Simpson?

MEMBER SIMPSON: No.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: No.
MR. TORKELSON: By a vote of two to three, the motion fails.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. The chair would entertain a motion on proposed adoption for senator -- Senate pairings.

Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to propose that the board adopt proposal 3B, as in Bravo, for Senate pairings.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I'll second.

CHAIR BINKLEY: There's a motion before us and seconded to adopt pairing 3B. Is there a discussion on the motion?

Bethany.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All right. So in looking back at the East Anchorage lawsuit, the East Anchorage plaintiffs challenged both Senate seats K and L. And per the remand from the Court, we are being asked to address Senate seat K.

Senate seat L, which is now comprised of District 23, JBER, and District 24, JBER, Chugiak, Peters Creek, Eagle River, it was found -- was not
found to be invalid. So Senate K was found to be invalid, which we are working on now, and Senate L was not found to be invalid.

Both of the proposals for the pairings that we are now considering, so proposal 2 and proposal 3B, both of those address the Senate K issue in the same way: by pairing Districts 20 with 21.

And this is what the East Anchorage plaintiffs wanted. So I find it really interesting that, even though the Muldoon/East Anchorage issue is addressed in both proposals in a way that seems satisfactory to the East Anchorage plaintiffs, those individuals continue to be very involved in advocating for one plan over the other.

Both of the plans address their issue in the same way, so why are they now so heavily investing themselves in what is essentially the business of Eagle River, JBER, and Chugiak? I have to conclude that there must be some political motive.

The existing pairing of District 23 and 24 plays a very important role in maintaining the community of interest of the Anchorage area military. And the best way to acknowledge that community of interest is to keep our current combination of District 23, JBER, with District 24, JBER, Chugiak,
Eagle River, Peters Creek.

So I object to the characterization that has been made by others that the military is just transients. As a 20-plus year member of the Guard and Reserve, the Military Guard and Reserve, I speak for thousands of full-time Alaska residents who serve this state and country in the military, Guard, and Reserve services as full-time, long-term residents of the state, many of whom live in District 23 and 34.

In the plan that we are discussing now, plan 3B, just as in the existing proclamation plan, there is a large amount of interplay between Districts 23 and 24, both of which contain portions of JBER. And then when combined, those two districts in one Senate seat create a full and complete JBER Senate district.

And that allows the military, which lives on base in District 23, to be combined with -- where much of the military and veterans live off base, in District 24.

During this process we also heard a lot of testimony about the Anchorage Muni redistricting process. We heard this testimony from the public. We heard this testimony was directed specifically to South Anchorage.
I took a look on Sunday at the most current assembly proposal for redistricting reapportionment, and I noticed that, lo and behold, it combines Eagle River with JBER, which conforms with the concept contained in the pairings we are now discussing, 3B.

I personally am very comfortable with combining Districts 9 and 22, and I feel that the Chugach Mountain district that is created there makes a lot of sense. And we've heard compelling testimony that supports this that's been referenced here by other members of the board.

I'd also like to state on the record that, contrary to what has been claimed here, I actually did not read incumbent data that was e-mailed to all members of the board. I did not then and I do not now care about incumbents. That is not our role, and I take that seriously.

Just because there is a legitimate difference of opinion does not make me or any other member of the board a gerrymanderer, and I won't be pressured to try to change my very reasonable views just because people want to call me names. So I firmly reject, and I also object to, attempts to characterize me in that way.

With that I'd like to explain why I support
each of the pairings in district -- I'm sorry -- in each of the pairings that are in the 3B proposal.
So I'd like to start with the response to the Court's ruling on Senate K. So the natural response to that pairing is what was laid out in both proposals, both proposal 2 and proposal 3B, by creating a Muldoon Road district. And this is a road district that combines Senate -- I'm sorry -- combines into the Senate House Districts 20, plus 21.

And that Muldoon Road district has a very wide mix of infrastructure. It's got zero lot lines, and single-family homes, mobile home parks. It's got plenty of big-box stores, small businesses. And it joins the residential neighborhoods that are now along the major east/west transportation boundary of DeBarr Road.

When we put 20 and 21 together, what we have is 22 that's now left with no partner. So it needs a new pairing. And so the natural pairing for 22 is District 9, which is another of the Anchorage Chugach Mountain districts. We've heard it said here on the record, as well as during public testimony, that there is over 30 miles of contiguity. Residents have their own road services that are separate from Muni services.
And also, as far as geography, it includes Ship Creek, which is in the east part of District 22, that winds itself through both districts to the Ship Creek drainage in District 9, near Bird Creek.

So that now leaves District 10 without a partner. So being able to put District 10 with District 13 creates a new pairing that unites neighborhoods along the three major north/south transportation arteries which travel the length of both districts. So you have the Old Seward Highway, you have C Street, and you have Minnesota.

That leaves District 14 stranded, so that's going to require a new pairing, and that allows us to take the two primary Midtown roads that travel east to west, Northern Lights and 36th Avenue, and allows those to be combined into one Senate pairing. Both of those districts have similar commercial infrastructure. They've got lots of hospital and medical buildings, high-rise offices.

So with that, then, you've got the four remaining districts, which are as they exist now in our population plan, that don't require any changes. You've got 23/23, which is JBER, and then Chugiak, Peters Creek.

There's also some geography that ties those
together, in addition to the military connections we've talked about. Both of those districts have very long boundaries along the Knik Arm waterway.

17 and 18, again, the same as in our current proclamation plan. And those -- that pairing unites those two districts that are around the Merrill Field infrastructure.

Districts 11 and 12, again, no changes, the same as in our proclamation plan. So you've got the shared boundary of Abbott Road that allows those two to be united. You've got lots of parks, greenbelts in that area.

And then Districts 15 and 16, again, the same as in our current plan. This is largely a Cook Inlet coastal district.

So, again, four changes that were -- that result from responding to the Court's ruling to make a change to District K, but then four districts that remain the same.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

And we had Melanie, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Just a second, Mr. Chair.

I'm not an East Anchorage plaintiff, but you asked why are they still so involved, Bethany.
I can tell you why I'm still so concerned about this matter of splitting Eagle River. Although it's a great step forward to pair Muldoon with Muldoon, as we were, you know, told to correct Senate District K, I don't think continuing to give Eagle River more -- more representation by simply splitting it in another direction is what's fair and what's right.

So at least for me that's why I continue to pursue this matter of not splitting communities of interest in an effort to give them more representation than they are due.

The most natural pairings, in my mind, would have been Eagle River and Eagle River and Muldoon and Muldoon. I do consider it a step forward in the right direction that we are at least pairing Muldoon with Muldoon.

But had we had a chance to discuss and deliberate the map that I had proposed in November, which -- option 1, which I voted to remove because I recognized that the Court directed us to only fix a certain part of the Anchorage maps. But had we had that chance, I don't think we'd be arguing that JBER and Eagle River is a great pairing comparatively.

Comparatively to the map that I had
presented in November, I think what we're stuck with
is narrow direction from the Court to fix one portion
of the map and not present the best possible map. So
I still don't think that the best possible map is
even one of the two options right now, but we're
limited, and I recognize that. I respect the Court,
I respect their directives, and I respect the
constitution.
So that's -- if you're asking me if I'm
doing this for partisan purposes, I am not. Just
because Muldoon and Muldoon are now rightfully
paired, why am I continuing to pursue this? Because
the same outcome is happening here. The stated
purpose of splitting Eagle River was to give it more
representation, and our end outcome is still going to
do that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you. It's been
asked by Bethany -- sorry.
Bethany started off that last round with:
Haven't the East Anchorage plaintiffs got what they
wanted?
No, they haven't got what they wanted. They
wanted us to stop gerrymandering and give Alaska a
fair map. We haven't done that. So I submit to the
board that the East Anchorage plaintiffs are far from
getting what they wanted.

The assertion, too, that they're all of a
sudden heavily investing themselves, all of a sudden,
Bethany, this is -- this is from -- I don't know if
you can see that date, August 13th, 2001 [as spoken].
The list of testifiers on here, Yarrow Silvers
testifying as an individual, but she also is a member
of the Scenic Hills Community Council. She did not
want East Anchorage combined with South Anchorage and
East Anchorage vote diluted.

Who testified after her? Major Felisa
Wilson, same thing.

So no, they didn't just pop out of thin air
all of a sudden. They've been here from the
beginning, and I guarantee you they're going to be
here until the end, so we'd better get used to it.

Bethany, please stop saying you didn't look
at incumbent data. You were already asked about this
in deposition. You were found to be untruthful in
the deposition. It is on page 56 of the Matthews
opinion. "[Randy] Ruedrich emailed the Board at its
designated email address as well as directly to
Members Marcum and Simpson separately, incumbent
information for each of the house districts."
"Member Marcum testified that while she had access to incumbent information provided to the Board by Ruedrich, she, 'didn't bother looking at the incumbent information,' and explained that such information was 'irrelevant to the process that we were tasked with, and it just muddied the waters...'

Then he went on to say when she was looking at the data presented in the deposition that she could, quote, "'Honestly say this is the first time that I have ever looked at the names that are on the document.' However, Marcum also admitted that she went to her computer to pull up the unredacted version of the incumbent information when speaking with Member Simpson."

So just because you say you did doesn't mean it's true, especially when you're caught on video. So thank goodness we had that Owl in the room.

I appreciate, Bethany, that you have been under a lot of public scrutiny, but the assertion that we are calling you names is absolutely false. I have called you a gerrymanderer, and if you want me to stop calling you a gerrymanderer, then, by all means, stop gerrymandering. That's how this will work.

The other assertion that you made here that
22 has no natural partner, the natural partner to 22 is 24. Look to the north. Quit trying to poach the Anchorage districts for Eagle River, to give Eagle River more power in the Senate. The jig is up. We see what you're doing. All of Alaska sees what the members of the majority are about at this point.

And, again, I'm going to strongly encourage the Court to exercise its Article VI, Section 11 powers and just draw the map itself.

And I will say, as a final point in this round, too, that if Alaskans want the Court to quit drawing the boundaries, then they need to make sure that the board is following the constitution so the Court doesn't have to. Our job is so simple. Ignore the socioeconomic integration stuff at this point. Just pair the two that are most practicable, okay? That's Eagle River. Eagle River all day long is the most natural pairing for itself.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I just want to clarify something. I think I heard you, Nicole, but maybe I was wrong, that you said that Bethany had perjured herself, that she had lied in -- before the Court.

Is that -- did I misunderstand that?

MEMBER BORROMEO: You did. You're putting
the word perjury in my mouth. I never said that.
I did say she lied, because she did. She
was deposed. She said she didn't have incumbent
data, she never looked at it, and then, lo and
behind, the East Anchorage plaintiffs brought up a
video recording.
All of this is public knowledge. I am not
making this stuff up. So I see the reaction here
that you guys are sort of, like, bewildered, like I
might be making it up. I'm not. Dig it up. It's
out there. It's in the record. We can watch it over
and over again, just like we can watch her when she
said she was splitting Eagle River to give Eagle
River more representation.
And, you know, this dumpster fire could have
been put out a long time ago by many different
people. I don't know why it's not. I don't
understand why we continue to go back and just
frustrate the purpose of the constitution.
We said in the beginning as a group of five
that we wanted a fair map that we could be proud of
that wouldn't get us sued. When did that change?
When -- I'm asking you guys, when did it change? No
answer.
CHAIR BINKLEY: It never changed for me, if
that's a question to me. Still is. I mean, I respect your opinion is different. We all have different opinions. We come at this differently. But that's my objective, as well.

Further debate on the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I have a question, John, that is it -- is it your position that we should wrap up our work before the June 1 filing deadline?

CHAIR BINKLEY: My position is there's a motion before us, and we should, if there's no more debate on the motion, vote on the motion.

MEMBER BORROMEO: And the --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Is there further debate on the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yes. I'm still talking.

Thank you.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll call the question.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. The question is --

MEMBER BORROMEO: And the reason that I'm asking that is because you were overheard on November 10th saying that it's going to be, quote, "incredibly difficult for the Court to change anything before the June 1 filing deadline."

CHAIR BINKLEY: I don't know -- overheard. I don't know what you're talking about. But it's
irrelevant. You have something --

MEMBER BORROMEO: It's --

CHAIR BINKLEY: -- to speak to the motion?

MEMBER BORROMEO: It's not irrelevant.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I mean, we can go on all day about -- we can go on all day about who said what or who thought they overheard somebody.

There's a motion before us. If there's no further debate on the motion, I think we should vote on the motion.

Peter, could you call the roll, please?

MR. TORKELSON: So the motion before the board is to adopt --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Restate the motion, to be clear.

MR. TORKELSON: Thank you. The motion before the board is to adopt Anchorage Senate pairings option 3B, 3 bravo. And I'll call the roll now.

Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: No.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: No. It's still a partisan gerrymander to give Eagle River more power.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?
MEMBER MARCUM: Member Marcum votes yes in support of option 3B.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Simpson?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: By a vote of three to two, the motion carries.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. On the agenda next is the potential adoption of revised proclamation. And I believe that, Peter, between you and Eric, the demographer, and counsel, you've drafted a couple of different proclamations in anticipation of either passing option 2 or passing option 3B. Do I have that correct?

MR. TORKELSON: We have a single proclamation. We did model the different Senate truncation scenarios, and able to inform the board about that if that's the board's desire.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you. Okay. So this -- the proc- -- let's see. That's the process report. Okay.

So the proclamation -- amended proclamation of redistricting would just include, then, that we had passed option 3B?
MR. TORKELSON: So the proclamation will include new metes and bounds to fix the Cantwell, as well as new maps which reflect the adopted Senate pairings. The proclamation itself doesn't say option this or option that. That will be reflected in the maps and the Senate truncation table and the Senate core constituency report.

So the new language to the proclamation is shown in highlighting. All the -- all the material above it here is the same as our original proclamation. But working with our legal team we added an additional "whereas" that just talks about the Court decisions and directions, and there is, of course, a new date. That's just highlighted there. I didn't know what day, so we'll fill that in.

And then there is a Senate label difference between option 2 and 3B. We have to correct that. And then the signature page. So it's just a very modestly changed proclamation, and I would defer to legal counsel if he wants to, you know, recommend any specific process, whether we can adopt this now or after I correct a few little things.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Matt, do you want to weigh in on this, please?

MR. SINGER: Mr. Chair, I would recommend
that Peter finalize the proclamation, then circulate
it for the board to approve. And then the board will
need to sign. The Alaska law allows electronic
signatures, so I understand members are -- some
members are remote, so it could be signed
electronically.

I think we need to be clear with the public
as to the date on which the proclamation is adopted,
whether that can be today or tomorrow. It should be
as soon as practicable. But the date of the
proclamation is important for anyone who's interested
in a legal challenge, to start calendaring that. And
then I want to be able to report to the Court as to
what we've done.

So I would encourage, Peter, if we could,
maybe we could stand at recess. We could finalize
the document and put it up on the screen and/or
e-mail it around. And the board, if interested,
could vote to adopt the proclamation.

And, Peter, maybe if you're prepared to
discuss the truncation issue, we could do that before
we finalize the document.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. Through the Chair --
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I think that's -- go

ahead, Peter.
MR. TORKELSON: I was going to say, through the Chair, I do have -- because we were limited to two options, I was able to work with Eric at the Department of Labor to run the Senate truncation report for both options, to have that available. And I am prepared to discuss that today in detail, whatever detail the board would like.

The net result is that in either option there were no changes to the truncation, in terms of -- you know, the population differences were such that there were no seats that didn't have to run that had to run before, and vice versa. So it's the same outcome, but we do have some different percentages that I can go into, at the board's pleasure, or a recess may be in order to prepare the proclamation.

CHAIR BINKLEY: All right. I would suggest that we do take a recess. And I think we have a couple of members with hands up, and we'll go to them. But I think that's sound advice, to take a brief recess and to have that drawn up.

Melanie, and then Nicole.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yeah. My -- I'd prefer to say what I have to say before we go to recess, because it will affect the signature page.

I'd like to request that we have a signature
It's important for me to sign this in person. I don't want to sign it electronically. I was nearly erased from the process of the proclamation in November. I'm hoping that that initial signature page that I signed in opposition has been retained, that the second one is retained, and then I'd like my actual signature noted in opposition on this one. So it would be great if we could move that forward today, if possible.

I also, in terms of record retention, again, I'm going to ask that we keep the portal open for people to provide public testimony. I think that was a mistake the first time around, after we thought that we were done with this proclamation. I think we would have received a lot of public comment after the first go around had we kept that portal open.

So those are a couple of my requests. I don't want to have to be filing some kind of a minority report or anything like that, so I'd like a signature page noting my opposition.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think that's very appropriate, Melanie. And we can instruct Peter to make certain that on the signature page, any opposition can be noted by members who did not
support the proclamation.

And I think if we can get it prepared, then,

Melanie, you can sign it in ink there and put

whatever notations you would like on there and you

feel appropriate, and it will be retained. That will

be the permanent record.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. I was going to

make the same two requests Melanie did, for the

signature block, and also for the opening -- or the

public testimony portal on our Web page to remain

open.

But I want to make an observation there,

because we've had a lot of conversations about "as

practicable" for contiguity sake of the Senate. And

our counsel here says we should hurry up and get this

signed as quickly as practicable, and we can use

electronic signatures to do that. Efficiency.

So, again, traveling between the two

districts that are now paired, District 29 and 22,

just because you can walk a signature over doesn't

mean that you shouldn't drive a signature over if you

had to. But that would, of course, require going

through five or six House districts, and that would

run afoul to Kenai.
So thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Hi. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just wanted to go on record saying that, as a person who is carefully like a steward of government funds, and we are being paid by government funds, in terms of all of our transportation costs, in terms of staff and personnel costs, that I appreciate the consideration of the board as far as doing the proclamation signatures electronically rather than requiring the high price of gas to be paid right now to drive.

Certainly if folks prefer doing it that way, that's fine, but I will be more than happy to sign electronically to save money. Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, I wasn't trying to suggest that everybody has to sign it in person. I would prefer to sign it in person, but I'm not imposing that -- I'm not suggesting that we impose that on all members.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

Why don't we take a brief at ease, come back
at 3:00.

Is that enough time, Peter, to get that finalized?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chair.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We'll stand at recess until 3:00. We are in recess.

(Off record.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: Peter and Matt, are you done? If so, we'll come back to order.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have a printed version of the proclamation that's been reviewed by our legal team, and the members have had it on their desk.

This is -- with the exception of two grammatical errors, this is the same document that I e-mailed out in draft form earlier today, so members who are virtual can reference that, and you'll have the substance of all of the changes, which primarily occurs in the final "whereas" clause. That's the new material. Everything else is essentially the same. Then there's a new signature page, of course, on the back.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I've got a hard copy of that here. I just -- I would propose if we're all going to sign it today, we use today's date. I know
the members locally there are expressing an interest
in signing it there. I can certainly sign it
electronically today.

I don't know about -- Bethany or Budd, are
you okay with signing this today?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I am. Thank you.

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I
certainly am.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. So why don't we use
today's date then as the date, and then we can --
those of us not in the office can do it
electronically, and those members in the room can
sign it in person.

Peter?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, at the
will of the board. It would be appropriate for us to
present the revised map with the Senate -- the House
numberings to match the pairings, then to talk about
the truncation, and then to talk about the Senate
terms table, to be sure that members are all up to
speed and in agreement with that process. So I'm
prepared to do that, at the board's pleasure.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. That makes sense.

Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
There's, I think, an amendment that needs to be made on the eighth "whereas." It says, "Whereas the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted this -- this final plan and proclamation of redistricting today, November 10, 2021, in conformity with the constitutional requirement that it do so within 90 days."

So it's confusing to me. It should say that we had adopted a plan --

MR. SINGER: Peter, let's write "adopted the 2021 final plan and proclamation."

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, that's correct. It should be --

MR. SINGER: Then we should delete -- instead of today, it should say "on November 10th, 2021."

MEMBER BAHNKE: And since it wasn't final, what do we refer to it as?

MR. SINGER: Again, we're going to call it, "the board adopted its 2021 plan and proclamation of redistricting on November 10th."

MR. TORKELSON: Let me bring that up so people can see what we're talking about.

MR. SINGER: Then, Mr. Chair, I would encourage, after the discussion of the items that
Mr. Torkelson suggested, that it would be appropriate for -- for there to be a motion to adopt the amended proclamation of redistricting as of today's date, and that -- I would encourage that that be done by motion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Matt, you're cutting out. At least for me, I can't -- I missed a lot of that.

MR. SINGER: Oh, sorry. I was suggesting that after Mr. Torkelson presents the items he is intending to present, that it would be appropriate to entertain a motion to adopt the amended proclamation of redistricting as of today's date.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. That's logical.

Peter, you've got your hand up to that issue.

MR. TORKELSON: No. I'm sorry. I neglected to lower my hand. Thanks.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Oh, I'm sorry. Same thing.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And by the way, good catch on that, Melanie.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I try to be vigilant.

CHAIR BINKLEY: So maybe, Peter, you could walk -- walk us through that, in terms of the truncation and pairings.
But before that, I see Nicole has got her hand up. Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thank you.

I want to draw the board's attention to yet more caution from Judge Matthews, which is that last November we had no debate on Senate pairings, and then came out and adopted Senate pairings without having the opportunity for the public to respond to what the board was going to do.

I don't see how we've changed course, unfortunately, in the new year. I thought we would turn a new page but here we are yet again, this time, though, taking public testimony but adopting a plan without giving the public a chance to respond to it.

I understand that we had two options, but we did not signal to the public which option we were going to go with as a majority, and I don't think that we should sign this today. I think we should leave it out for public comment tomorrow. Maybe -- maybe someone will change their mind and we can vote on a plan tomorrow.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to hear from legal counsel regarding the concept that was just presented, if we could.
MR. SINGER: Mr. Chair, I don't believe that -- Mr. Chair, would you like me to answer that question?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, please. Go ahead.

MR. SINGER: I don't believe the constitution requires the board to do more public hearings after it takes a final -- makes a final decision.

I think the Court was concerned that the Senate discussion in November was rushed. And so to remedy that the board met on April 2nd, heard public testimony. In the next meeting it adopted a process for hearing from the public and accepting public plans.

It's had seven hearings on the options that were presented by the public, and at some point the board has to make a decision. I think we have to balance the public process that's contemplated under the constitution with the limited time that's available, in light of statutory deadlines.

So certainly if the board wants to entertain more testimony, but it's -- it's -- I don't believe it's constitutionally required. I don't think that the judge was saying after you issue a final decision in every instance you need to have another round of
testimony.

I think the concern was that in November the plan adopted by the board had really never been fully, you know, articulated and presented in the way that the Court would have liked to see. So the difference here is that there are hundreds of public comments on option 2 and option 3B that helped to inform the board today.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, you're muted. I saw you just try to say something, but you were muted.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I apologize.

Budd, and then Nicole.

MEMBER SIMPSON: Yeah. Mr. Chair, I agree with Matt, as far as taking more public testimony on this. We are leaving the portal open for people to comment. If they want to, they're free to do that, and I'm sure they will.

But my further question for Matt has to do with the truncation, and the -- then the -- the election, re-election timing, whatever that's called. Do we need to take testimony on those issues? And if -- if so, we can roll that over to tomorrow. But I'm not sure we do. It may just be administerial. So just looking for advice on that one.
MR. SINGER: I really think it's --

CHAIR BINKLEY: Matt, if you could just speak right into the microphone instead of turning your head, that would be helpful.

MR. SINGER: The board previously adopted a cut-off point, that is, to determine whether changes in district populations were sufficiently great as to require a candidate to -- or the incumbent to re-run.

And I don't think that that decision needs to be revisited. It's been made. It was a -- Peter can remind me the exact number. It was 16 percent then, and --

MR. TORKELSON: 16.3.

MR. SINGER: 16.3 percent was the number that the board used as a cutoff, so I don't think there is a need to revisit that decision. It was made. It was part of the proclamation plan. It was not challenged.

And so I don't see -- I don't see this as the board making any additional, really, changes to the proclamation that would require further testimony. If the board wanted to invite it, it certainly could, and -- but it's -- what I would encourage is maybe have Peter present it to you, see what it looks like, and then the board can decide how
it wishes to proceed.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Nicole, did you have your hand up, or is it --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. I just want to reiterate that my batting average for the Courts are a little bit better than you guys, and I think that we should let this soak, let it set, let the public comment on what we're about to do.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just have a question.

I guess I'm a little confused. Are we -- what we're talking about is whether or not we're entertaining the idea of changing our cut-off percentage? Is that part of what we're discussing here, is whether or not we would consider doing that? I guess I just assumed we would go with the same cut-off percentage and everything kind of the same as the previous proclamation, but is that part of what we're -- is being discussed here?

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think that's part of the truncation process, is that number. We could choose a different number if there was some rationale for it. I don't think it was controversial. I think it
was -- I can't remember how we came up with the number, but I don't know that anybody's -- is anybody proposing to change that truncation number, the 16.3 percent? I don't think so.

Maybe what we could do -- Nicole, did you have a question on that?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. I don't understand if you guys have data that I don't, but I don't even have printouts of what the makeup of the new districts are, so I would like to at least see some data before we act on it. I think that would be prudent of the board.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I have it. It was put in front of my desk.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think we were just about to get to that. Peter was going to present that to us. So maybe let's just have Peter make that presentation to us, and then we can decide how to proceed.

Melanie, do you have a question on that before Peter makes that presentation?

MEMBER BAHNKE: No, not a question, but I think Bethany was confused about what we're talking about taking public testimony on.

My understanding from Nicole was the Senate
1 pairings, not the truncation. But can you please
2 clarify that, Member Borromeo?
3 MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. I would like to not
4 necessarily hold public hearings again, but leave the
5 portal open for the opportunity for Alaskans to weigh
6 in. And if the board is amenable to hearing some
7 public testimony before we adopt tomorrow's plan, I
8 am always down for more public testimony after the
9 board takes final action.
10 CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Let's go --
11 MEMBER BORROMEO: I need -- I need a new
12 map, Peter, of the -- of the numbers. That's what
13 I'm talking about, like the letter numbers.
14 CHAIR BINKLEY: Let's go ahead and let Peter
15 make his presentation, and then we can debate it and
16 talk about how to proceed after that.
17 Peter?
18 MR. TORKELSON: Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, so
19 in order to affect a new set of Senate pairings and
20 stay with the tradition of having sequential --
21 sequentially numeric districts to reflect the letters
22 that are associated with the Senate pairings, some
23 numbers would have to change in Anchorage in order to
24 accomplish that.
25 So this is obviously at the board's
discretion how they want to do that, but to model it, to see what would happen, this is the numbering scheme where 9 stays the same and then to be paired with the old 22 becomes 10, so it's 9 and 10.

Following the -- what I heard the board articulate, which is keep as much the same as you could, 11 and 12 stay the same.

The old 10 becomes 13, to pair with 14. 15 and 16 stay the same. 17 and 18 are together. 19 and 20 are together. Same pairing as before but with the numbers shifted. And then 21 and 22 together in Muldoon. 23 and 24, not shown here -- 24 is Chugiak -- stay together as they are now.

So this changes not even eight districts. Seven districts are renumbered -- well, more than that, but there were seven that had to change because of the new pairings, and then the others adjusted for it.

So these numbers then lead to the table, which I'll bring up next, the Senate terms table that I had Eric run. If you want different numbers, we can number it differently and run it again. The overall statistics won't change, because we're not changing the underlying House geography. Because the House shapes didn't change, the numbers on the terms
table, which I'll bring up next, just shuffled around. They don't actually move very much. And the net result is that no -- there's no new truncation decisions. Nobody would have to run who didn't have to run before, and vice versa.

Let me switch screens now. It's going to take me just a second to pull up the new table that those numbers would then feed into.

So I'll share the screen. So this is the report. Make sure everybody can see it. This is the report that Mr. Sandberg ran.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Can you enlarge that?

MR. TORKELSON: Yeah. It is very detailed. I'll zoom in in a sec. That is a very similar table to what -- the same calculus was run as we did in November. And what you're looking at is option 3 across the top, and the 2013 districts running vertically on the left-hand side.

And then these numbers are populations of voters who are retained in the various districts. So this cell I clicked on -- I'll zoom in so you can see it better. So to demonstrate so that everyone understands, this is for map option 3B.

The new Senate District I, for example, takes 23,000 people and change from the old Senate
District I. And then just to make a point, it takes 206 people from the old Senate District J. So that's how the math is done. It's called a cross-tab report. And Mr. Sandberg took those numbers and converted those into percentages. This is the percentage of the old District I that's retained by the new District I, 64 percent. What that means is if you subtract that number from a hundred, that's the percentage of overall voter change. So it's 25 plus all of these numbers. In that case it would be 35.8 percent total voter change in Senate District I. Because the board chose 16.3 percent as a cutoff in November, the new Senate District I must stand for election in 2022.

To take all these numbers and summarize them into a more human compatible table, we have this table, which is very similar to the one -- just make sure it's showing here -- very similar to the one that we did in November, and it highlights all of the different Senate seats from A to B -- to A through T, in this column.

Using the numbering sequence we have from November and slightly modified to reflect the changes necessary for option 3B, anyplace there's been a change I've highlighted the cell. So if you have the
table from the last cycle, which we can bring up, you'll see that some of these percentages have changed, some of them very little, some have shifted. But the net result is that 19 senators had to run again. The same 19 senators have to run again after this action today as had to run again in November. There's no net change in who runs again. There's a shuffling.

And you'll notice right here, in Senate J, there is our cutoff point, 16.3 percent. So because we didn't change the House geography, that number re-emerges, even though it might be in a slightly different row this time because of numbering changes. That's -- so this is the table.

And then the other thing that you'll notice is Senate seat O changed, as well as Senate seat R. Those are impacts from the Cantwell revision. Now, the percentage is -- the old percentage here, for example, is 60.9, from memory, so it's like a 2 percent change. But I highlighted those because those did actually change, in terms of their retained voter core percentage. But there's no actual functional change. They both have to run again because they are well over the 16.3 cutoff.

So I'd be happy to answer questions. I know
1 this is a technical topic.
2 CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. Melanie, go ahead.
3 MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't have any recommended changes to the 16.3 percent.
4 But I did just realize that our agenda for today and tomorrow noticed public comment, and we did earlier state on the record that we would take public comment after we made a decision. So I thought I'd point that out to you as our chairman, what we had noticed the public of.
5 CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I noticed the agenda that we adopted does not have public -- public testimony on it.
6 My understanding was that we were going to make a final decision. At some point we make a final decision, and that is the final decision. So I -- if we want to drag this out -- I wouldn't say drag it out, but if we want to extend this and extend public comment on what members have indicated that they might be supporting -- and I guess we have already made a decision on supporting option 3B. I'm not certain that public testimony is going to change that, so I'm not sure of the purpose of it.
7 MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair --
8 CHAIR BINKLEY: It would just, in my
opinion, serve to slow down the process.

MEMBER BAHNKE: May I respond?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Go ahead. Then we'll go to Bethany.

MEMBER BAHNKE: The top of the agenda said "public testimony at the LIO." It wasn't in the agenda in terms of an agenda item, but it does say public testimony and a number. And I do recall that we said we would make -- take a vote on Senate pairings, then take public testimony, and then adopt a proclamation. I thought that was the plan.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah. I -- that wasn't my understanding. I think this is a standard form, the part at the top -- Peter, you can correct me if I'm wrong -- that the LIO puts out.

MEMBER BAHNKE: Okay. Well, somebody had put in the chat: The board went on record earlier that they would allow public comments once a decision was made. So I don't have the minutes in front of me, but apparently we did supposedly.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you.

Peter, are you available?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. I just -- yeah. I just checked. There is -- it does say "public testimony" at the top of our agenda. It was a
standard form that I neglected to remove the notice.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. I think that was --

may indicate that that's prior to the agenda or would

be someplace on the agenda, so it really is in

conflict with the agenda.

But I think there is the opportunity, if

we're going to leave the portal open, for the public
to comment, not just today or tomorrow, but ongoing.

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Where are we with my

suggestion that we put off adopting a plan until
tomorrow and allow for the public to react to the
final decision of the board today?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Well, the public would -- if
this is the final decision of the board, the public
has not only tomorrow but, you know, for quite a
number of days to react to what the final decision
is. The final decision is the final decision.

That's the way I read it.

MEMBER BORROMEO: I don't understand your

math here, because a status report is due in two
days, so they don't have a great number of days. And
we have to tell the Court what we've done.

What is the harm in not signing the final
plan today and signaling to the public that the
three-member majority has approved map 3B and that
we're going to hold public testimony, as we said we
would at the beginning, and print it in the agenda?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It sounds like maybe what some members are
asking for is a motion to reconsider, and I would be
happy to entertain that. I mean, I'm sure that we'd
be willing to vote on that. If they would like to
make a motion to reconsider, we can certainly do
that. There is nothing stopping us from doing that
at this time.

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Is that -- Nicole, is that
what you're suggesting?

Melanie, I think you've got your hand up.

Go ahead.

MEMBER BAHNKE: I am not suggesting a motion
to reconsider. At this point I think that would be
an exercise in futility.

I am suggesting that we follow what we told
the public that we would do. We would make the
Senate pairing decision, take public testimony, and
then adopt a proclamation. I might be mistaken. My
memory is not always a hundred percent, but I thought
that was what we -- when we adopted a process and
dates, I thought that's why we had set aside two days
for this. And I thought that we had said that we
would take public testimony after adopting Senate
pairings.

Do other members have a different
recollection?

And, Peter, are the minutes done from that
day when we adopted a process?

MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chair, would you like me
to answer that?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, if you could respond,
Peter.

MR. TORKELSON: The minutes are in process,
but the audio recording and video recordings are on
the website. I don't have a summary of the minutes.
The contractor is working on those.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thanks.

Budd?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Mr. Chair, I don't have a
recollection one way or the other whether we said we
would take additional public testimony or not.

It concerns me that it is printed on the top
of our agenda that we would do that. But, again,
it's in conflict, because it's not an actual agenda
item that we voted on.

So, you know, I don't want to give the appearance that we're not interested in what the public has to say. I thought maybe it was a good compromise to simply leave the portal open so that anybody with further comments is free to make those -- those -- you know, the way it's been available all along. We keep that open until tomorrow and, you know, have that opportunity available.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Nicole, then Bethany.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Thanks. We did say that we were going to allow the public to react to our final decision. And for us to be disingenuous and fall back on Peter, who is our only staff member at this point and is doing the job of five people, it's just a cop-out.

Let's give the public time to react to what's been done today, to meaningfully respond. We didn't have to wait this long to adopt a final plan. The Supreme Court issued its decision March 25th. That next Monday I was saying: Let's go. Let's meet. Let's do this. We burned an entire week off the clock, so it's not the public's fault that the board refused to meet. That's on us. Let them react
to the plan.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Bethany?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear from legal counsel regarding the publication that was put out by the LIO that showed public testimony versus the agenda that we adopted that doesn't include public testimony. Thank you.

MR. SINGER: I think the key is that the board follow the process contemplated by the constitution. And generally that process, under Section 10, is for the board to adopt a proposed plan, then hold public hearings on the proposed plan, and then adopt a final plan. And so that's the process that the board has been undertaking.

There is no harm in additional -- hearing additional testimony, but at some point the board has to make a final decision. And it's also not -- it's a waste of public -- if the board has made a final -- has made up its mind and has voted and has a final decision, delaying the proclamation is also -- is also potentially concerning to the Court.

I think we need to wrap it up and report back to the Court that the board's work on remand has been completed.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you, Matt.
Nicole, further comment?

MEMBER BORROMEO: Yeah. Responding to Matt, the word that you just used there was plan, and that we should adopt a final plan and hold public hearing on the final plan. Up until moments ago we haven't had a final plan. We've had two options.

So I want to make litigation as swift as possible, as inexpensive as possible, and to comply with the spirit in which the last order was issued, that we not just take lip service from the public, but we give them an opportunity to react to our actions. And perhaps one of us will change his mind and adopt map 2.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Matt, is that what the Court said, to give the public an opportunity to react to our final plan?

MR. SINGER: I don't see that in -- in the Superior Court's decision, and I don't see that in the constitution.

So the -- I believe that by adopting options 2 and 3B, publishing those to the website, and having seven days of hearings on proposed -- on alternative solutions to the Court's remand, that the -- that the board complied with the process anticipated or contemplated under Section 10 of
the -- of Article VI of the state constitution.

So the idea is to propose solutions, but then make sure that the public gets an opportunity to provide its input. Then the board gets to come back and consider that public testimony and explain its reasons -- that's what happened today -- and the board needs to take action. So I believe the board has complied with the constitution.

Again, if the board's preference is to invite another day of written and/or spoken testimony, the constitution doesn't preclude that, but I -- I don't believe that the judge -- certainly not -- if there's nothing in the remand order with regard to process, again, going back to the judge's criticism of what occurred in November, you know, I think all of us realize in retrospect it would have been -- we have maybe spent too much time on the public road show and not enough time at the end of the process to make all of the different decisions that had to be made, and so that process was rushed. And that was the judge's concern.

And so the issue here is, you know, did the public know that the board was considering option 2 and option 3B, and did the public have an opportunity to express its views to the board so that the board
could take that testimony, those views, into
consideration before making a decision? That would
be the -- that would be the concern of the Court.

So I'm comfortable that, again, the board
has complied with the constitution, and that's my
conclusion.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Thank you.

Bethany, and then Nicole.

MEMBER MARCUM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I guess I would just like for us to consider
what the goal would be of further public testimony.
We have voted. We have a final vote. I've asked if
anyone wants to offer a motion for reconsideration
and no one does.

So if we're not reconsidering, you know, our
vote, then it is a final vote. And I feel like to
some degree we would be misleading the public by
letting them testify to us in person about a vote
that's final.

I think there's no harm in letting them
continue to provide online written testimony. Peter
can continue to compile that and send that to us. We
can continue to read that.

But I feel a little bit like we might be
misleading the public. If no one wants to offer a
motion for reconsideration and we're saying that this is a final vote, then what is the goal of continuing to let people testify on a vote that is 100 percent final?

Thank you.

CHAIR BINKLEY: I have Nicole, and then Budd.

MEMBER BORROMEO: So lots to unpack there, Bethany.

Seeing as you and Budd made the motion to pass B3, the motion would have to come from you or Budd to reconsider. So there's nothing that Melanie and I can do procedurally to get you to reconsider map B3. Now, if you and Budd want to make a motion to reconsider B3, then I'm here for it all day long.

The purpose of holding public testimony is allow the public to react to the final plan. Again, the final plan. Not one of two options that the board could have adopted.

And it also squares with what we told them we were going to do. I'm very concerned here with legal counsel's interpretation of the constitution, because last time around we were also told that pairing South Muldoon with Eagle River was perfectly permissible under the constitution, as well. So keep
that in mind.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Budd?

MEMBER SIMPSON: I think we need to bring
closure to all of this. I -- I think we should keep
the portal open to give people that want to comment
on the final plan an opportunity to make their
opinion known, but I am not inclined to seek
reconsideration or delay it further.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Short of a motion to
some extent or another, I don't see a consensus to
extend adopt- -- or reconsider our adopting the final
plan or of holding in-person public testimony on the
plan we just adopted.

I agree with Budd on the fact that there's
an opportunity for the public to react, I think,
Nicole, as you put it, to what the final plan is.
And I'm sure we'll hear that, you know, through the
portal and other methods that the public will seek to
inform us about and what their opinion is.

And there could be litigation, as well,
going forward, and that'll be an opportunity, of
course, to hear what those concerns are.

I think the quicker -- as you pointed out,
Nicole, the quicker we can get this to the Court so
that they can review it, the better. And being
consistent with that, I think we need to have the
final plan done today and move forward.
There still is the truncation before us.
Were there any other questions on that, the
16.3 percent, or how Peter had laid that out?
Bethany?
MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted
to say thank you to both Peter and Eric. It was
very -- they had a lot of foresight in going ahead
and running all of this for both of the proposals
that we had out there so we had everything ready and
were able to see this information thoroughly during
today's meeting, so I appreciate that.
I approve of what they've done. I think it
was, like I said, very good that they did this for
both plans so that we have this out there. And I am
definitely in support of the work that they've done
in this effort. Thank you.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Matt, would we need a motion
to adopt that -- that matrix that Peter had
presented?
MR. SINGER: It's incorporated in the
proclamation in the revised -- or amended
proclamation of redistricting. So I think the -- if
the board is satisfied with all of the information
contained therein that the motion would be to adopt
and execute the amended proclamation of redistricting
as of April 13th, 2022.
Bethany, and then Nicole.
MEMBER MARCUM: Mr. Chairman, I move that
the board adopt the amended proclamation of
redistricting as of April 13th, 2022.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. There's a motion
before us. Is there a second?
MEMBER SIMPSON: I'll second.
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. A motion before us
and seconded to adopt the amended proclamation.
Nicole?
MEMBER BORROME0: I don't understand what
we're doing here. The only map I have in front of me
is renumbering -- a renumbered map of Anchorage.
Where is the map that has the new Senate district
letters on it?
MR. TORKELSON: Mr. Chair?
CHAIR BINKLEY: Yeah, Peter, go ahead.
MR. TORKELSON: So the one -- the one you're
thinking about, the PDF maps, Eric will produce those
tomorrow, and they'll be attached to the proclamation
as an expression of the board's new plan.
So autoBound doesn't let me put letters next
to the numbers, so I don't have a way to do that. But they're sequential and in order, so page 2 of the proclamation --

MEMBER BORROMEO: Can I have five minutes then to bust out a Sharpie to draw all over the November proclamation and try to figure out what letters match up with the numbers?

CHAIR BINKLEY: That's fine with me. Is there any objection to taking a five-minute break?

Okay. Let's come back -- it's 3:44. Let's come back at 3:50. We'll stand in recess.

(Off record.)

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Let's go ahead and call the meeting back to order.

Nicole, have you had a chance to look over that and draw the connections between those House districts?

MEMBER BORROMEO: I have. Thank you very much. I think it's important that we review information before voting on it, so I appreciate the at ease to allow me to do that.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. We still have a motion before us to adopt the revised plan. Further discussion on the motion?

(Member Bahnke re-enters proceedings.)
MEMBER BAHNKE: I'm here.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Why don't we have a roll call vote if we could, please, Peter.

MR. TORKELSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Stand by.

The motion before the board is to adopt the 2022 proclamation as proposed.

Member Bahnke?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Yes. I thought we had five minutes. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to be absent for this part of the conversation.

Peter, I see we've got new numbered maps, but no numbers on letters on them?

MEMBER BORROMEO: We just --

MEMBER BAHNKE: And did you compare them against what's in the proclamation to make sure it's correct?

MR. TORKELSON: Yes. We just looked at them.

MEMBER BAHNKE: My vote is no, Mr. Chairman.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Borromeo?

MEMBER BORROMEO: My vote is also no. I'm concerned about the splitting of Eagle River. It still seems like a naked partisan gerrymander to me.

I'm sorry, but I can't vote in favor of this.
MR. TORKELSON: Member Marcum?

MEMBER MARCUM: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: I think you forgot Member Simpson.

MR. TORKELSON: I did. I'm going to come back to him.

MEMBER SIMPSON: I vote yes.

MR. TORKELSON: And Member Binkley?

CHAIR BINKLEY: Yes.

MR. TORKELSON: By a vote of three to two, the motion carries.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. It looks like we've adopted our final plan, the revised proclamation of 2022.

Is there any further business to come before the board?

Melanie?

MEMBER BAHNKE: I don't have further business, but I'd like to offer some closing remarks when it's the appropriate time, please.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Certainly. And this would
be the time to do that.

MEMBER BAHNKE: All right. Well, I just want to apologize to Alaskans again, because I don't think that we passed Senate pairings that comply with what the Court directed us to do. We still split Eagle River to give it more representation.

And I hope that the Courts move swiftly so that Alaskans can have an election under fair maps.

And I just want to thank everyone again who provided us with input and public testimony. Thank you very much.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Melanie.

Any further closing comments from board members?

Nicole?

MEMBER BORROMEO: A question. So is tomorrow's agenda no more? We don't need to meet anymore? I'm a little bit confused about the public notices that have gone out.

CHAIR BINKLEY: That's correct. We've concluded our business and we will not be meeting tomorrow.

MEMBER BORROMEO: Okay. In that case I do have some closing remarks.

And I'm going --
CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay.

MEMBER BORROMEO: -- to begin by once again thanking Alaskans for engaging in the process. It has been extremely rewarding to be in your communities. I was in 23 of the 26 public hearings that were held across the state.

And my experience there and the board's collective experience led to us adopting a very fair House map that I'm proud of, that I believe is going to serve as a benchmark for future redistricting boards to achieve as they move forward.

The next message is -- excuse me one second.

The next message, I'm sorry, is for my son Kellan, because the first time that he votes is going to be under maps that his mom drew.

So, Kellan, when you watch this later and you listen to it, I want you to know that in your own time you're going to be called to do things that are hard. But you have privilege, and with privilege comes great responsibility. So when you're asked to do something that requires you to step out of your comfort zone, to work hard, to make sacrifices that you don't think that you can make on a personal level, I want you to know that, just like Anna's been there to support me, I'm going to be there to support
you.

And in the process you're going to be tempted to sacrifice integrity. Don't do it. You will never, ever be able to get that back.

To Alaskans who are watching today and feeling discouraged by the process, don't be discouraged. This is why we have an independent judiciary. This is why a minority can come before you, as Melanie and I have, confident that our constitution is strong enough and flexible enough to give the Court the power to do what the five of us today couldn't.

Democracy isn't always easy, and it isn't always clean, but it must be fair. And reapportionment is nothing if it's not fair.

I can't sign on to a map today when one member said that she was splitting Eagle River to give Eagle River more representation, and two other members refuse to acknowledge her words time and time again. It's unfortunate that we've arrived at this place. It's not entirely surprising.

And I want to thank Alaskans again for having us in your communities. When the board comes back in another ten years, please invite them into your communities.
And if we've got nothing out of this process, we have a new State law that says the next time this board tries to engage in an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander, it will be struck down every time under Alaska's equal protection clause. And I'm happy and proud that that's something Melanie and I helped achieve.

Thank you. I appreciate the former speaker of the House reaching out to me and asking me to serve in this role. It has been the honor of a lifetime.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Thank you, Nicole.

If there's no further comments, the chair would entertain a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER BORROMEO: So moved.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Is there a second to the motion?

MEMBER SIMPSON: Second.

MR. SINGER: Motion before us and seconded to adjourn. Discussion on the motion?

MEMBER BAHNKE: Mr. Chair, just under discussion, I don't know if you can see in the chat box, and it's probably a moot issue at this point, but we have a member of the public who said that the video record shows that Mr. Simpson said on
April 6th, at two hours and 58 minutes, that the public should weigh in after the board makes a choice but before they take final action, and the person attached the video. So I wanted to bring that to your attention.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. And thank you. And just to further comment on that, I think that's what we did actually. We put the proposals out there to comment on it, and then took final action.

But we can, you know, all maybe remember it differently or have our difference of opinion. But with that --

MEMBER SIMPSON: Well, that's what we did do.

CHAIR BINKLEY: Okay. Any further discussion? Is there objection to the motion? Hearing none, the motion is adopted and we are adjourned. Thank you.

(Proceedings adjourned at 3:59 p.m.)
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wide 58:11
wife 48:8 49:1
wilderness 8:19
wildfire 37:21
wildlife 37:19
Wilson 63:13
winds 59:3
wishes 84:1
word 45:23 51:4 66:1 98:3
words 110:19
work 19:3 64:24 67:8 72:3 97:23
103:17 109:22
working 55:2 70:11 95:17
works 18:9
wrap 26:8 67:7 97:22
write 78:10
written 16:4,14,15,18 34:24
99:10 100:21
wrong 24:22 43:17 65:22 92:15
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Y

yada 28:17
Yarrow 63:7
year 28:21 56:4 80:11
years 32:6 36:20 40:8,12 110:24

Z

zone 109:22
zoom 2:5 13:15 88:14,21
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>All Persons</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,921</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
<td>-414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,048</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.56%</td>
<td>-287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,195</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.76%</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,122</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.16%</td>
<td>-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18,707</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18,434</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18,465</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,284</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18,205</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.71%</td>
<td>-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18,103</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
<td>-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,217</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
<td>-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18,523</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18,185</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.82%</td>
<td>-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18,168</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
<td>-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18,182</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.83%</td>
<td>-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18,239</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
<td>-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18,203</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
<td>-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18,243</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18,414</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18,285</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18,023</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
<td>-312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18,032</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
<td>-303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,822</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18,807</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18,799</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18,793</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,736</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18,294</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18,522</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>18,382</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18,367</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18,351</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>18,226</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
<td>-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>17,853</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-2.63%</td>
<td>-482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>17,453</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-4.81%</td>
<td>-882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>18,824</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assigned 733391
Total Pop 733391
Alaska Redistricting Video & Audio Links

April 13, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 9, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 8, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 7, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 6, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 5, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >

April 4, 2022
- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >
April 2, 2022

- Live Stream Video Recording >
- Zoom Video Recording >
- Audio Recording >
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PUBLIC COMMENT

Anna suggested that if the board considers any House district changes, House districts 14 and 16 should be paired together because West Anchorage and Midtown Anchorage have a fair amount of continuity. Northern Lights Blvd also connects the two districts. Spenard and Turnagain are similar neighborhoods with similar interests.
A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: April 6, 2022, 10:59 pm

First Name: Kasey

Last Name: Casort

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Fairbanks

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony (Call In)

Public Comment: Kasey urged the board to adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke and would like to see the redistricting process quickly and constitutionally completed soon.
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:03 pm

First Name: Nicky

Last Name: Eiseman

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Ester

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Nicky urged the board to adopt the Senate pairings suggested by Member Bahnke and would like the process to be done as soon as possible. Regarding the error of including Goldstream Valley residents in its current district, the residents are largely urban in nature and drive to work in Fairbanks everyday. They also play there; any other characterization is false. All testimony of Goldstream Valley supported the area being included with the Fairbanks district.

Nicky revisited the evening at the Carlson Center where public testimony was last taken where Nicky watched several people "being grilled" by board memberse; this resulted in her decision not to testify as she'd intended.
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:09 pm

First Name: Carolyn
Last Name: Cliff
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Carolyn lives in the new District 21 which borders Districts 20-J, 19-J, and 12-F. District 22-K is also grouped with District 21. Map 1 does not show a population area in their district because it's all on Elmendorf AFB. There is also no way to get from her district to Eagle River without traveling through 2 other districts. Carolyn's district and Eagle River are not contiguous or socioeconomically integrated.

Carolyn expressed support for Member Bahnke's proposed maps (no details specified).
In the last redistricting cycle, the board's decision to place then-District 38 of Fairbanks North Star Borough all the way to the west coast of Alaska. There were objections to this board decision and court action found that its boundaries did not mean the constitutional requirements.

Luke Hopkins has opposed and continues to oppose the board's action to place Goldstream Valley residents in a district that is non-contiguous, non-compact, and has little to no socioeconomic integration to the communities that are now in the House District 36.

Many Goldstream residents report back to the local government where their schools, libraries, and churches are, and for Luke, the other communities in District 36 can only be reached by plane.

Luke hopes the board will remove District 36 from the Cantwell appendage.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 11:26 pm

First Name: Elyse

Last Name: Guttenberg

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Fairbanks

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Elyse expressed concern about Goldstream Valley being placed in District 36 which places a suburban neighborhood with deep ties to Fairbanks into a rural district. Many Goldstream Valley residents attend or work at the university which is not a far drive. They also live, work, shop, and vote in Fairbanks. The Cantwell appendage creates a non-compact district that is unconstitutional and is not socioeconomically integrated. Like Cantwell, Goldstream Valley was gerrymandered.
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:28 pm

First Name: **Bernie**

Last Name: **Hoffman**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Fairbanks**

Board Meeting: **4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: **Bernie opposed the placement of Goldstream Valley into the rural district area. Goldstream is being treated like Cantwell and Bernie understands this is not being done properly per the Alaska Supreme Court. This seems unfair. Bernie asked the board to please consider Goldstream and Member Bahnke’s proposed plan to come up with new pairings and get the new elections going.**
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 11:41 pm

First Name: Mike

Last Name: Edgington

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Girdwood

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Mike Edgington thanked the board for creating a cohesive District 9 and went on to testify on the Senate pairings from his perspective on the southern part of Anchorage. At the November 8th meeting, Mike recalled Member Bahnke suggesting Senate pairings that paired Districts 9 and 11 together. Through discussions with his community that same evening, this pairing generally had wide local support and Mike was surprised to see a different pairing the following morning: House District 9 (rural) and District 10 (suburban).

Mike testified in favor of pairing Districts 9 and 11 that combine the southern parts (Hillside, Bear Valley, Glen Alps) with Whittier/Girdwood/Turnagain Arm. Mike also spoke in favor of pairing House Districts 22 and 24.

Mike strongly opposed pairing House District 9 (Turnagain Arm) with House District 22 (Eagle River) because these districts are non-contiguous due to the separation of the two districts by the Chugach Mountains.
Public Comment: David referred to the 2012 redistricting process where Goldstream Valley was placed in a rural district stretching out to the coast; this was declared unconstitutional and was changed. During the current process, the board has placed Goldstream Valley in a rural district contrary to the resolution adopted by the Fairbanks North Star Borough Assembly. This resolution was misrepresented by the board and David urged the board to fix this issue simply by doing so in the interior.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 6, 2022, 11:54 pm

First Name: Jamie

Last Name: Rodriguez

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jamie Rodriguez testified in favor of the "second to the left" Senate pairings that were presented by Member Bahnke. These pairings have already been considered on the record, takes into account the public testimony, makes sense geographically, upholds the idea of "one person, one vote", is socioeconomically integrated, does not affect the deviation, keeps Muldoon, West Anchorage, Hillside, and Eagle River together.

The board needs to act immediately and comply with the court's requirements to make the maps legal and minimize costs and time. It is in the public's interest to adopt legal maps that check all constitutional requirements as proposed by Member Bahnke.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 11:58 pm

First Name: Karen
Last Name: Williams
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: East Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: East Anchorage is diverse and pairing an East Anchorage district with a South Anchorage or an Eagle River district is unfair and does not allow the diverse community to have accurate representation. It is important for the community to elect a Senator that understands the community’s needs. Karen testified in support of the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke.
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:02 am

First Name: Rich

Last Name: Curtner

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska Black Caucus

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The Alaska Black Caucus is in support of pairing House Districts 20 (North and South Muldoon) in District K. Doing so is the simplest and best solution and should be done as soon as possible.
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:04 am

First Name: Kay
Last Name: Brown

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Kay urged the board to follow the Alaska Supreme Court's directions as expeditiously as possible. The court's directions are very straightforward and can be done quickly. This process needs to be completed as soon as possible as it negatively impacts elections, giving everyone uncertainty.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 9:20 am

First Name: Benny

Last Name: Wells

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Benny testified against the Goldstream Valley placement, the Cantwell finger, and the Senate pairings in Anchorage, particularly the Eagle River/Muldoon and North Muldoon/U-Med District. Encouraged to use the pairings proposed by Member Bahnke as they are consistent with the testimony given by the public. There were several testimonies also given from the Hillside and Eagle River communities asking the board not to pair these two communities. Benny suggested pairing Districts 9 and 11 and Districts 14 and 16.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 9:28 am

First Name: Yarrow

Last Name: Silvers

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Yarrow requested that the board redo the Senate pairings without delay so Alaskans can vote from a fully constitutional map. Yarrow spoke in support of the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke as they would fix the constitutional errors, has broad public support, and respects communities. The pairings also keeps Eagle River as one community, Muldoon as one community, connects the U-Med and Airport Heights areas, and reconnects the north and south sides of 4th Avenue in downtown.

Yarrow asked the board to develop a truncation process that is transparent and random. Yarrow stated that the public’s trust in the board was broken because the board stated that no members were knowledgeable about incumbent information when at least two members looked at and discussed the information on camera before voting. Additionally, the action on the South Anchorage pairing was done without discussion or reasoning as to why it was split apart at the last minute, making it seem as though someone reviewed political data the night before and decided the new pairing gave a partisan advantage.

Yarrow asked that the board follow the Alaska state constitution which does not allow politically based mapping, and asked board members attending public sessions virtually to turn on their cameras.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:33 am

First Name: Chris
Last Name: Stern
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: East Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Chris noted that the board should group based on communities as it is a relevant data point to be used in the redistricting process. Chris urged the board to quickly complete the adoption of the Senate pairings put forward by Member Bahnke; there is no need to begin a new map.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:34 am

First Name: Candace

Last Name: Oxford

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: South Muldoon - Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Candace spoke against South Muldoon being paired with Eagle River to give more representation to Eagle River; this is undemocratic and unfair to the Muldoon community. Candace implored the board to adopt Member Bahnke’s maps before the next election.
Public Comment: The board has an opportunity to repair the Senate pairings to fulfill their duty to Alaskans. There is no reason to delay the process with Member Bahnke's proposed Senate pairings on the record which gives the board the ability to swiftly complete the process. There has been public concern about the board's decision to present maps to the public for final consideration that did not include Senate pairings; the judge also called this out. This meeting could have been avoidable with all of the public testimony already given to the board.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:55 am

First Name: George

Last Name: Martinez

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: East Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: George testified on behalf of himself, but also noted that he is one of the plaintiffs in the East Anchorage lawsuit. Written testimony has been submitted on behalf of himself and the other plaintiffs, too. George hopes the board will consider that detailed testimony. George urged the board to move expeditiously and effectively to take the direction given by the courts and to consider the cost of this process to taxpayers and the erosion of the public’s trust.
Public Comment: The pairings adopted by the board only make sense if the goal is to water down the votes of eastside residents in Anchorage. To see the socioeconomic similarities, one would only need to drive from North to South Muldoon; there is no significant change and a working-class neighborhood that is very different from Eagle River. Bruce urged the board to adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 10:14 am

First Name: Matt
Last Name: Claman

Group Affiliation, if applicable: House of Representatives - State of Alaska

Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The Trial Court was specific about criticizing the board for not announcing the Senate pairings that were under consideration. The court's opinion makes it very clear that the board needs to publicly say what else is being considered and announce it in a manner that gives time for public comment. The window of time to propose a new map and obtain public comment is very limited.

Rep. Claman recommended that the board look at the affidavit from Chase Hensell who testified on behalf of East Anchorage plaintiffs; this affidavit gives detailed explanation into how North and South Muldoon are a single community of interest and how Eagle River and Chugiak are a single community of interest. The Hensell proposal notes that Chugiak-Eagle River is a single community of interest because it is the only community that has their own volunteer fire department, the municipal parks and funding are managed differently than the Municipality of Anchorage, and Chugiak-Eagle River has many residents who see themselves as a unified community separate from the rest of Anchorage.

Rep. Claman urged the board to adopt the pairings proposed by Member Bahnke.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:25 am

First Name: Celeste

Last Name: Hodge Growden

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska Black Caucus

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Celeste echoes the comments shared by Rich Curtner from the Alaska Black Caucus (ABC). ABC does not have permanent friends or enemies, what they do have is permanent interest. The main interest is championing the lives of black and BIPOC communities. At every turn, unfortunately, they have to fight for justice in economics, education, and health. Now, they are fighting for justice in redistricting. This is exhausting, old, and must stop.

Celeste urged the board to follow the court's direction now, not tomorrow or several days from now.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:32 am

First Name: David
Last Name: Dunsmore
Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFR
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: AFFR met and reviewed the Superior and Supreme Courts’ decisions and determined that the pairings proposed by Member Bahnke are the fairest pairings to address the concerns raised by the Supreme Court. The board has the opportunity to quickly make changes.

The following Senate pairings by Member Bahnke are supported for the following reasons:

- Districts 22 and 24: This is most logical.
- Districts 20 and 21: Muldoon area is an integrated community of interest.
- Districts 18 and 19: Keeps 2 Senate districts in East Anchorage.
- Districts 23 and 17: Keeps the historic neighborhoods of Downtown and Gov't Hill in the same Senate district.
- Districts 16 and 14: Keeps Spenard and Turnagain in the same district, often referred to as "Spenardagain" as it's looked at as one community
- Districts 13 and 12: Creates a midtown residential core district rather than splitting these communities into South Anchorage
- Districts 15 and 10: Keeps Southport, Bay Shore, and Klatt in one district and allows the pairing of Districts of 11 and 9, which the board had reached consensus on at one point in the process to keep the hillside in one district.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 12:47 pm

First Name: Liz

Last Name: Medicine Crow

Group Affiliation, if applicable: President/CEO, First Alaskans Institute

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: K̲éex' K̲w̲âjan

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Liz expressed appreciation for the testimonies given by the Alaska Black Caucus and encouraged the board to follow the court's directions immediately without delaying the process and voters during elections.

Liz testified in favor of the East Anchorage Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke that have already been vetted and do not diminish the population over the deviations that were already outlined.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 12:52 pm

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Fischetti
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Board Meeting: 4/2/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Over the last 40 years, the Eagle River population has more than doubled and has always been represented by 2 senators. Randy Phillips once represented Muldoon in Eagle River in the 80s and 90s - he did well and this worked fine. He attended community council meetings and supported schools and businesses, and East Anchorage as a whole. In 2000, they were paired with Hillside all the way to Hope, posing a “geographical nightmare”. Past senators tried to represent Eagle River but never connected to what was important to the community in Eagle River.

Now, Chugiak and Eagle River each have their own Senator and there have been no complaints. Eagle River is adjacent to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson and many Chugiak residents are in the military.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 7, 2022, 1:14 pm

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Ruedrich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFER

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/4/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Randy will be offering an alternate Senate district pairing map that preserves 3 of the existing districts: Senate Districts F-11 F-12, Senate Districts H-15 and H-16, and Senate Districts L-23 and L-24). They are now looking at a highlands district for East Anchorage.

Randy will return on April 5th to continue this testimony.
Date: April 7, 2022, 1:19 pm

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Fischetti

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Board Meeting: 4/4/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Susan agrees with Member Simpson that the board should allow more time to conduct this process the right way. On the April 4, 2022 ARB meeting, it became clear to Susan that the Senate pairings proposed by Member Bahnke are partisan gerrymandering and should not be adopted. The one-sided testimony on Saturday that the Bahnke pairings have been secretly orchestrated.

On April 4, 2022, Susan testified that the pairing of Eagle River with East Anchorage should be approved because it has been done before. Now that the judge has taken that option off the table to finalize a plan, Susan is now urging the board to pair Eagle River with South Hillside which has also been done previously. The two communities share the same socioeconomic profiles with local road services areas, wildfire and wildlife issues, avalanche, and public safety concerns. Additionally, you can't get to Chugiak-Eagle River without driving through Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson and many active-duty military and veterans live in Chugiak-Eagle River; it makes sense for these two communities to be paired together.
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Date: April 7, 2022, 1:24 pm
First Name: Jamie
Last Name: Allard
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Board Meeting: 4/4/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jamie testified against the "Bahnke plan" as it is clearly partisan in its current form, politically unbalanced and unfair, and does not accurately represent the people of Eagle River and Anchorage. The board re-evaluates the timeframe and gives enough time to have public input and produce a non-partisan plan that also incorporates the voices of constituents. The process needs to be fair to all, not just a small group of individuals, and Eagle River's voice deserves to be a part of the plan.

Jamie noted that on April 5th, 140 people were unable to testify due to the emergency declaration from the avalanche on Hiland Road. To not hear from these families is unreasonable.

Jamie urged the board to slow the process down. Pushing the process to be done by April 5th is gerrymandering.
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Date: April 7, 2022, 1:28 pm

First Name: David

Last Name: Dunsmore

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFR

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/4/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: In reviewing the court decision, the phrase the court used regarding the "Bahnke plan" was loud and clear that Member Bahnke’s pairings had clear public support - the board should consider this. The court has also acknowledged the board is aware of the public’s support for these pairings.

AFFR also participated in the municipal election process and one other municipal redistricting process. One issue that came up was that Chugiak-Eagle River did not have the population to meet the full ideal Assembly district. David thanked Assemblywoman Allard for her advocacy in keeping her community whole and intact.
Yarrow noted that it is not gerrymandering to keep communities together. When you split communities apart for political purposes, that is gerrymandering. Yarrow encouraged the board to review the testimonies from the recent reapportionment and look at what happened when the Municipality tried to pair Eagle River and South Anchorage. Eagle River belongs together - this was spoken loud and clear when they attempted this in the past. Jamie Allard had also stated this on the record.
Date: April 7, 2022, 1:32 pm

First Name: Denny

Last Name: Wells

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Board Meeting: 4/4/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: There has been substantial testimony from Hillside and Eagle River that pairing these two communities was not a good pairing. Eagle River should be kept as one.
Date: April 8, 2022, 6:06 pm

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Cliff

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: South Muldoon - Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Carolyn thanked the board for presenting the new map that places the North and South Muldoon areas into one Senate District K. Carolyn also noted that there is no contiguous transportation or socioeconomic integration between South Muldoon and Eagle River.

Carolyn urged the board to adopt the new map that links her the North and South Muldoon communities.
Date: April 8, 2022, 6:11 pm

First Name: Barbara

Last Name: Tyndall

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: North Pole

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Barbara testified against the “Bahnke Plan” or “Senate Minority Plan” and stated that a socioeconomic profile and more Senate alignment is needed. The proposed map seems to be politically motivated to change Senate seats.
Date: April 8, 2022, 6:38 pm

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Constant

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Anchorage Assembly

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Christopher Constant expressed concern about the Senate pairing of Districts 23 and 24. Christopher lives in House District 23. To get to the main body of the district, he must drive 20-30 miles and drive through multiple communities to do so. This is the same for others in his community. The finger in the north is a prime concern.

Christopher suggested the following:

1) Pair Districts 23 and 17 together, this would unite neighbors who live across the street

2) Make minimal changes to boundaries that make the map unconstitutional

Christopher described the reapportionment process in the Municipality of Anchorage. The city ran a robust public process with over 20 opportunities for public testimony, had a public portal to receive public comment, hired a contractor who proposed several maps and opened the mapmaking process to the public. The final map adopted was a map submitted by a member of the public. Two proposed maps paired Chugiak-Eagle River with Hillside Anchorage; this pairing resulted in a community uproar in overwhelming opposition.

The Anchorage Assembly listened to the community’s feedback and Christopher expressed hope for the board to do the same, too, with the testimonies given by the public and resolutions written by community councils that opposing the pairing of Chugiak-Eagle River with South Anchorage. Christopher referenced several public comments and resolutions by community councils that were written expressing this opposition.
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Date: April 8, 2022, 6:56 pm

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Fischetti

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The court decision was given 10 days ago, so there is no rush to adopt the pairings proposed by Member Bahnke right away. Because of the recent court decision, Susan's testimony has changed since her testimony on February 28, 2022. It seems as if this process is being used to promote their special interests rather than doing what is best for the state. Since 1974, Chugiak-Eagle River has been paired with the valley and the hillside, so this is not a new pairing. Chugiak-Eagle River has been represented by two Senate members since 1974.

Senate District K is what the judge would like to be reworked; the Bahnke plan changes almost every district.
Date: April 8, 2022, 7:09 pm

First Name: Patty
Last Name: Wisel
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Fairbanks

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Patty testified against the "Bahnke Plan" and requested the board to consider a plan that is more representative of similar socioeconomic profiles and equal Senate seat alignment.
Date: April 8, 2022, 7:28 pm

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Hockema

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Robert testified in favor of Member Bahnke's proposed Senate pairings because it keeps communities of interest representing Alaskans' interests. The suggested pairings connect North and South Muldoon, the best contiguous pairing. It is superior to the U-Med connection to the west and superior to the alternative Abbott Loop district with different community interests and priorities.

Although Muldoon and Eagle River have historically been paired, this does not mean it was a fair pairing because state and local official processes have consistently disenfranchised Muldoon.

This pairing also keeps important communities together that have repeatedly asked to remain together during old state and municipal reapportionment testimonies. The pairings include the following: Spenard and Turnagain (Districts 14 and 16), Airport Heights and Midtown (Districts 18 and 19), Hillside and Southside (Districts 9 and 11), Southport, Klatt, and Oceanview (Districts 10 and 15).

Lastly, the pairing shares JBER with Anchorage as opposed to handing it over to Eagle River by default as past reapportionments have done.

These pairings make sense, are defensible in court, have broad support, and deserve discussion by the board. Board members must be transparent. The process must be completed quickly considering the upcoming elections. The more clarity voters have, the better equipped they are to hold a fair, trusted election process.
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:50 am

First Name: Randy
Last Name: Ruedrich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Affer

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Regarding the pairing of East Anchorage and Chugiak-Eagle River, the two areas have always been paired in various ways for various reasons, primarily due to a “numbers game”.

Regarding the repair of the House districts, Randy suggested that the board only reassemble the map to the necessary extent and complete one repair as directed by the court. Changing districts may impact the people who have already declared that they are running for office.

Randy submitted a map on April 4, 2022 that represents eight of the Anchorage Senate seats, three of which are not changed: 1) Senate Seat F for Districts 11 and 12, Senate Seat H for Districts 15 and 16, and Senate Seat L for Districts 23 and 24. There is a remainder of 10 House seats.

Randy referenced a testimony he gave in November stating that South Eagle River could be paired with District 21 or 9 in the current map. If it was paired with District 9, municipal uplands would be placed together where the commonalities are road service and fire service areas and issues. This pairing was done in 2001 by combining parts of the Senate district. Randy referenced the 2001 instance where House District 18 went unchallenged after being redrawn after court action and went on to note that Eagle River is combined with South Anchorage to create a Senate seat now that they have grown large enough to each have a House seat; this will serve the areas well.

Next, House Districts 10 and 13 in South Anchorage would form Senate District G, an area that could potentially be bifurcated by Dimond Boulevard. To the north is Senate District I that pairs House Districts 14 and 17 in Central Anchorage. These two districts were the historical residential development area of the city, thus, redevelopment is a key component of this area making it a benefit to share a Senator with Spenard, through Chester Creek, into the South Addition.
District 18 has always been seen as the U-Med District while District 19 is often ignored as a U-Med District where the Alaska Regional complex sits. The Providence and Alaska Native health campuses are on District 18. Both districts together create a medical community for the surrounding residents, some of which have moved to the areas to be closer to healthcare facilities.

Lastly, House Districts 20 and 21 lie along either side of Muldoon Road into Senate District K in East Anchorage. This combines North Muldoon with the areas to the south.

Randy urged the board to review his proposed map because it only impacts five of eight Senators and allows the board to fix the issue raised by the Supreme Court.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:15 am

First Name: Yarrow

Last Name: Silvers

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self & East Anchorage Plaintiffs

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Yarrow Silvers testified in representation of herself, but the proposal introduced in her testimony is on behalf of the East Anchorage plaintiffs.

The "Bahnke Plan" respects communities and socioeconomic integration. The plan is not based on partisan data and is informed by public testimony; this is evident by the compact spaces, areas of contiguity, and general support - all of which have not been seen in the more partisan proposal that has caused strong opposition by the people impacted by these pairings. The Supreme Court has ordered the board to correct the constitutional areas and make other revisions to the proclamation plan.

The following pairings proposed by Yarrow and the East Anchorage plaintiffs are the following:

1) Senate District B - House Districts 9 and 10
2) Senate District F - House Districts 11 and 12
3) Senate District G - House Districts 13 and 14
4) Senate District H - House Districts 15 and 16
5) Senate District I - House Districts 17 and 23
6) Senate District J - House Districts 18 and 19
7) Senate District K - House Districts 20 and 21
8) Senate District L - House Districts 22 and 24

The above pairings contain the minimum changes necessary to fix the constitutional errors, are logical, respect communities, and were introduced during the initial Senate pairing process, where they had general support.

The East Anchorage plaintiffs have submitted additional details on this proposal via email.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:22 am

First Name: Tanner

Last Name: Amdur Clark

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Coalition of Doyon, Sealaska, Ahtna, Fairbanks Native Association, and Tanana Chiefs Conference

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The coalition supports the proposal put forth by the board at the April 4, 2022 meeting that puts Cantwell in District 30 instead of District 36 as the borders are being put back along the borough boundaries in a contiguous way.

The board was encouraged to make minimal changes necessary to comply with the court, particularly on the House side. New mapping proposals could open the court up to additional litigation.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:27 am

First Name: Celeste

Last Name: Hodge Growden

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska Black Caucus and NAACP

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Celeste agreed about an earlier comment observing "badgering testifiers" and noted that this should stop.

Celeste spoke in favor of pairing House Districts 20 and 21 with Senate District K and noted that there had been a very long history of federal, state, and local officials using the redistricting process as a mechanism for excluding voters of color. This unjust pairing happened with the late Senator Bettye Davis; it was wrong then, and it is wrong now.

For many reasons, groups of color cannot testify during business hours due to work and cannot break away to tend to their families on the weekends. Celeste noted that she was advocating for the BIPOC community and urged the board to correct the error of the Senate District K by pairing House Districts 20 and 21.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:34 am

First Name: George

Last Name: Martinez

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self & East Anchorage Plaintiffs

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: George congratulated the board because history was made. Several references to "fixing the error identified by the Supreme Court" have been made. This error is significant and historical because it results from partisan gerrymandering that the Supreme Court has found unconstitutional for the first time in Alaska. The error was also a direct violation of equal protection, the "one person, one vote" principle, and the right to political representation - all values must be aligned with the remedy to the error. So far, this alignment has not been made by the board or legal counsel.

The equal representation of East Anchorage is what is most important to George's family and neighbors. Gerrymandering must stop. Districts 20 and 21 must be combined. Muldoon deserves equal representation.
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Date: April 9, 2022, 1:35 am

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Ryan
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: North Pole

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Michael spoke in opposition of the Senate minority plan on the "Bahnke map" as it seems to be politically motivated and would result in the loss of two Senate seats.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:51 am

First Name: Tom

Last Name: Begich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska State Senate

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: There have been several references to a "Senate minority map" that is equated to the map adopted by the board and is also referred to as the "Bahnke map". Senator Begich clarified that these maps are not connected and that he has had no communication with Member Bahnke throughout the redistricting process. The map developed by Senator Begich with members of, not just the Senate Minority Caucus, but the Senate majority, was the map he'd hoped to have considered.

The Hickel process, along with others, were designed to prevent gerrymandering. The court now recognizes that there is a standard for political gerrymandering and the standard should be adhered to. Maps should be repaired in the least disruptive way possible.

Senator Begich referenced the Superior Court's decision that was upheld by the Supreme Court decision. On page 65 of the Supreme Court's decision, indicates that overwhelming testimony was against combining Eagle River and Muldoon. Further, it was clear to the court that most of the public comments were in favor of keeping Eagle River and Muldoon together in their own respective Senate seats. This implies that House Districts 22 and 24 (Eagle River) should be combined in a Senate seat and the two Muldoon seats should be combined into one Senate seat. These two pairings will reverse the error found by the courts and remove the political gerrymandering that has occurred in this process.

Senator Begich cited the Superior Court point on page 70 stating that the court found the board intentionally discriminated against East Anchorage residents in favor of Eagle River and further acknowledged that the two separate entities must be combined to remedy this issue.

Senator Begich addressed the text messages that were presented in court between him and Member Borromeo, clarifying that these were suggestions for pairings that were rejected by Member Borromeo. Any other assertions are false.
Date: April 10, 2022, 2:56 pm
First Name: Mike
Last Name: Robbins
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Mike testified in support of the revised redistricting plan as it supports districts with socioeconomic profiles by putting neighborhoods together that share the most common values and demographics.

Mike suggested the following pairings:

1) House Districts 10 and 13 (similar to current alignment)
2) House Districts 11 and 12 (declared by Board in November '21)
3) House Districts 14 and 17 (similar in business characteristics)
4) House Districts 15 and 16 (declared by Board in November '21)
5) House Districts 18 and 19 (shared diversity and socioeconomic linkages)
6) House Districts 20 and 21 (same roadway, neighborhoods, dynamics)
7) House Districts 22 and 9 (similar voter demographics)
8) House Districts 23 and 24 (several military members along highway, strong socioeconomic relationships)

Mike encouraged the board to not adopt the "Bahnke plan" and noted that his recommendations establish fair Senate pairings for Anchorage.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 3:03 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Baker

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Alex testified in support of House Districts 17 and 23 being a Senate pairing. Government Hill and Downtown share the same Anchorage Assembly members. As a Downtown resident, he is in Government Hill a couple of times per week, usually for the Anchorage Curling Club. The Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson and Government Hill communities are very integrated as many people come from the base into downtown from the bridge.

Alex spoke about the frequency of updates on written testimony. He checked what his neighbors and community members were putting on the written record, which hasn't been updated since April 2nd. The public testimony has not been updated in a few days, impacting transparency from the board to the public. Alex asked the board to update the website after every meeting so the public can be in a position to testify based on up-to-date information.
Date: April 10, 2022, 3:12 pm

First Name: Fred

Last Name: Brown

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Chair, District 9 Homeowners Association

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Fred testified in favor of Districts 22 and 9 being paired for the following reasons:

1) They supply and support their road service areas in the foothills of the Chugach Mountains and share the common need for road maintenance.

2) The two districts share the risk of fire and the need for fire protection.

The proposal outlined by Randy Ruedrich would satisfy the homeowner's associations' concerns.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 3:20 pm

First Name: Jamie

Last Name: Rodriguez

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jamie testified against the pairing of Districts 22 and 9. The court rejected the Northeast Anchorage pairing because it was a "wild overreach" of the constitutional requirements. The board discussed a proposed replacement on April 4, 2022, that would repeat the same overreach but worse. The replacement proposal pairs Districts 22 and 9 making it political gerrymandering by capturing another Senate seat for Eagle River to replace the Northeast Anchorage plan.

The driving distance between Eagle River and Southeast Anchorage is approximately 27 miles, Eagle River and Girdwood is 67 miles, Eagle River and Whittier is 87 miles, and Eagle River and Portage is 108 miles. All of the destinations mentioned are in District 9. To get from Eagle River to Southeast Anchorage, five to six unrelated House districts must be crossed.

Jamie urged the board to do their job fairly and correctly for all Alaskans regardless of political affiliation.
Public Comment: Dan testified powerfully against the "Bahnke Plan" and expressed concern about the rushed process giving the public limited time to review, analyze, and comment on the plan. This plan seems to be the product of planning by a subset of the board in a process hidden from public view. There also appears to be a coordinated effort to "ramrod this plan through by the sheer weight of public comments, sometimes the same person commenting a dozen or more times. That should be a perversion of the one person, one vote standard that should be at the heart of the redistricting process."

Dan testified in support of the revised map that pairs Districts 22 and 9 as offered by AFFER for the following reasons:

1) These residents share common interests through the foothills and the upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains.

2) These communities rely on their local road service boards to maintain their roads.

3) These communities face similar road conditions and hazards: bears, wildfires, rush reliable utility services, and extreme weather conditions.

4) These communities are socioeconomically integrated simply by being part of the Municipality of Anchorage.

5) These communities are contiguous and joined in the uplands of the Chugach mountains.

Please reject the "Bahnke plan" and approve a plan that pairs House Districts 22 and 9 to make one Senate pairing.
Gretchen is a District 9 resident and expressed understanding for House Districts 9 and 10 being paired because the two districts share an elementary school, middle school, and high school, and there is a bridge going over the Seward Highway that links the two districts well.

If the board chooses to pair House District 9 with another district other than House District 10, Gretchen asked the board to give the public time to provide comments and analyze the proposed change. Gretchen does not feel that District 9 would be paired well with any other district. Gretchen does not immediately agree with the idea of District 9 being paired with an Eagle River district.

The board must take the time to do the redistricting process well and not rush the process.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 3:43 pm

First Name: Ann
Last Name: Brown

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Ann testified against the "Bahnke Plan" as a resident of District 9 and testified in support of Districts 22 and 9.
Date: April 10, 2022, 3:54 pm

First Name: **Brian**

Last Name: **Hove**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Anchorage**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: The last testimony given by Brian Hove was in support of House Districts 15 and 16. Since then, much has happened with litigation and the courts identifying deficiencies. As a result, Districts 15 and 16 have been separated. As Brian reviews the proposed map, some pairings confuse him, such as Districts 14 and 16. With the map offered by Randy Ruedrich, Brian noticed that Anchorage House districts have long and short boundaries, and the communities are connected, by and large, on the long side with north and south pairings: Districts 15 and 16, 14 and 17, 13 and 10, 12, and 11, 18 and 19, 20 and 21. These pairings make sense due to the transportation and main roadways going north to south.
Date: April 10, 2022, 5:46 pm

First Name: Robin

Last Name: O'Donoghue

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFR/AKIPRG

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: AFFR urges the board to only adopt a constitutional plan that complies with the court ruling and pairs the Muldoon districts (Districts 20 and 21) together and the Eagle River (Districts 22 and 24) districts together. Doing so would address the constitutional error as identified by the court ruling outlined on the 69th page. These pairings are also consistent with most of the public testimony received by the board and were suggested to the board by AFFR.
Date: April 10, 2022, 5:49 pm

First Name: Kathy
Last Name: Hosford
Group Affiliation, if applicable: NA
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Dyea

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Kathy testified against the Municipality of Skagway being paired with Downtown Juneau because this pairing seems to be a partisan issue. Kathy hopes the board will consider the redistricting that is fair to everyone and not rush the process.
Date: April 10, 2022, 6:02 pm

First Name: Joanne

Last Name: Blackford

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Portage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/5/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The residents of Portage have unique experiences and lifestyles. They should not be part of the Municipality of Anchorage because Anchorage handles urban concerns. Anchorage does not understand high tides or low tides and how this impacts residents. Portage residents don't receive anything from Anchorage except for political planning that they are usually not part of.

Portage also does not have links to Girdwood. The State of Alaska, combined with Anchorage, spends about $1 million per year maintaining Girdwood, but nothing is done in Portage. Kathy gave an example of a dangerous curve she is aware of at Mile Post 89 at the right-hand turn. This curve was not designed for fifth wheels. Additionally, the Portage Valley Community Council does not meet because they have nowhere to meet.

Portage does not prefer to be paired with Girdwood as they do not share the same approaches. Portage prefers being paired with Kenai, where they have Attorney Generals who are privy to the impact of high tides. Kenai also has several locations along the Seward Highway. Portage would like to be defined as a rural village outside of Anchorage so they can request their proper needs and complete their planning.

As it currently stands, Portage is most understood by Eagle River as they are willing to take more calls and are overworked.

Kathy urged the board to equitably release Portage from their relationship with the Municipality of Anchorage.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 7:30 pm

First Name: Cristine
Last Name: Hinter
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Cristine urged the board to consider a plan that is more representative of the similar socioeconomic profiles and equitable seat assignments.
Date: April 10, 2022, 7:36 pm

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Roderick

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Elizabeth testified against pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River and encouraged the board to support the proposal for East Anchorage that is in most alignment with the court ruling.
Date: April 10, 2022, 7:38 pm

First Name: Leon
Last Name: Jaimes
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Leon testified against pairing Eagle River with South Anchorage and encouraged the board to take the solution proposed by the plaintiffs from East Anchorage to keep the Muldoon districts and the Eagle River districts together.
Date: April 10, 2022, 8:01 pm

First Name: Frank

Last Name: McQueary

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Frank gave some historical perspective as his company supplied technology to AFFR in the last redistricting process. During Frank’s involvement in this process, he has observed that the AFFR plan presents the least possible opportunities for additional litigation. Shuffling every pairing in Anchorage, as other proposals do, could potentially open the board up to further litigation.

Frank testified in favor of the AFFR plan and testified against pairing Districts 22 and 9. Frank urged the board to not reshuffle the map entirely.
Public Comment: Ray testified in support of AFFER's proposed Senate pairings and referred to the court rulings on the Senate districts that should be revisited. AFFER pairs House Districts 22 and 9 to create Senate District E in the East Anchorage uplands where local service areas and snow management are common and key issues in both House districts. Other similarities between these districts are the real estate, socioeconomic uniformity, and neighborhood settings. Additionally, these districts maintain their own roads and do not rely on the Municipality of Anchorage to maintain their roads. This pairing has also been done historically.

Three other Anchorage Senate districts had revised pairings to facilitate the court-required action and four districts were unchanged. The alternative "Bahnke pairings" disrupt all eight Anchorage Senate pairings.
Date: April 10, 2022, 8:13 pm

First Name: Ellen

Last Name: Jaimes

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Ellen encouraged the board to adopt a proposal that is most aligned with the Supreme Court ruling that creates the least amount of change.

Ellen testified against pairing House Districts 9 and 22.
Public Comment: **Steve testified in support of pairing House Districts 22 and 9 for the following commonalities:**

1. During the winter, snow is a more significant issue in the elevated areas than they are in the lowlands.

2. There is large fire risk with no hydrants in these areas.

3. There are non-standard roads that have not been passed by city codes, making it a challenge for water trucks to travel up and down the hills.

4. With aviation, is a challenge to complete water jobs in the mountain areas because of turbulence issues.

5. These areas run on septic systems, not on main city water systems.

Additionally, Steve believes that both of the districts may share Bicentennial Park. For anyone cross country skiing or hiking, city or constructed boundaries are not a factor. This is a great area for recreational users to share both sides during the summer and winter.
Date: April 10, 2022, 8:56 pm

First Name: Rachael

Last Name: Laiki

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Rachael testified against pairing Eagle River with South Anchorage because the communities are not contiguous, do not have many things in common, and are too far apart to troubleshoot the issues experienced from having common geographical traits.

Rachael testified in support of the East Anchorage plan as it is much more aligned with the court ruling.
Date: April 10, 2022, 9:36 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Doug testified against pairing House Districts 22 and 9 because these communities do not have many things in common, are not contiguous, and demographics published by the State of Alaska in 2017 show that Hillside Anchorage is a distinct community in terms of marital status, household income, voter turnout, and education. The communities he can walk or bike to are the communities that are contiguous and socioeconomically integrated with his own.

Doug referred to the unconstitutionality found by the Supreme Court for the Senate District K pairing. He expressed that he was amazed by what seemed like a lack of remorse from the "Republican mapmakers who willfully proposed an illegal map to leverage the Republican majority in Eagle River into an additional Senate seat."

Doug testified in support of Option 1 because it reflects the integrated communities, particularly in Hillside Anchorage. Option 2 represents the fewest number of changes to the pairings that the courts already approved; this option is also a reasonable choice.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 9:38 pm

First Name: Carl
Last Name: Berger
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Carl testified against pairing House Districts 9 and 22 as they appear to be two non-contiguous districts that go against the court ruling.

Carl testified in support of the Option 1 Map.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 10, 2022, 9:41 pm
First Name: Veronica
Last Name: Sajer
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Veronica testified in support of the East Anchorage proposal because it is most aligned with the court’s ruling and expressed strong opposition to pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River.
Date: April 10, 2022, 9:43 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Hunt

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Kimberly testified against pairing House Districts 9 and 22 because they are non-contiguous, separated by mountains, and represent cohesive communities that would be diluted. Kimberly supports a map that is in close alignment with the court rulings and has the smallest changes.
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Date: April 10, 2022, 9:45 pm

First Name: Joni

Last Name: Bruner

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Joni testified against pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River and encouraged the board to support the East Anchorage proposal that is most closely aligned with the court rulings and has minimal changes.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 10, 2022, 10:30 pm

First Name: Loy

Last Name: Thurman

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Big Lake

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Loy is a resident of District 8 (Big Lake), which has now been pushed out of the valley. Big Lake is the largest growing area with anticipation for continued growth. Even as such, Big Lake did not have any new representatives assigned. The old District 8 is now pushed into the Bush, which is "an irritation" to District 8 because it is on the west end of the valley. Currently, District 8 stretches from Point Mackenzie to Anderson in Fairbanks. Additionally, Cantwell has been gerrymandered across Glennallen, and Eagle River districts should remain together due to the socioeconomic factors differing from South Anchorage.

Loy testified against the "Bahnke Plan" due to Scott Kendall's involvement with this plan. (Note: Member Bahnke clarified that Scott Kendall or Tom Begich to develop this map.)
Date: April 11, 2022, 12:29 am

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Philips

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self, Former Representative

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Randy has previously represented North and South Mountain View, Nunaka Valley, Muldoon, Chugiak, Eagle River, Eklutna, and Fort Richardson. Randy offered his observations as a resource to the board:

1) Eagle River has a different road service area than Hillside Anchorage.

2) Hillside has 18-19 separate road service areas, and Eagle River has one.

3) The Chugach State Park is the only connector between Eagle River and Hillside.

4) Most Eagle River water sewers are public.

5) Chugiak Fire Service is separate from the Municipality of Anchorage.

6) When Randy represented Eagle River and Anchorage, Eagle River was a middle-class community, and East Anchorage was a working-class community.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 12:32 am

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Fisch
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: E

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Susan testified in support of pairing House Districts 9 and 22 as they are contiguous since they likely share more landmass along the district lines from the Chugach State Park than any other Anchorage district. The demographics of both districts are also very similar such as household, age, and marital status. Eagle River also has a separate road service area from Hillside and the Municipality of Anchorage.

Susan supports the Option 3 map because it has the least impact on all the other districts.
Public Comment: Denny pointed out that the board has two non-partisan board members, and three board members are connected to a specific political party. There are two maps proposed by non-partisan groups and one by a member who has been the chair of a political party. The public perception is that the board is not exercising diligence in being non-partisan, especially when being connected to a particular political party. Denny expressed the importance of the board proposing maps that are not politically gerrymandered, such as Options 1 and 2.

While Districts 9, 11, 22, and 24 have a demographic of high-income households over 75% white, what distinguishes them is that Districts 22 and 24 share the core of Eagle River. Districts 9 and 11 share the Hillside Homeowners Association. Districts 9 and 22 share the Chugach State Park but do not have a common political entity. Options 1 and 2 pair House Districts 22 and 24 and Districts 23 and 17 together; these pairings keep the Eagle River and Downtown Communities together.

Regarding keeping Districts 23 and 24 together due to the tie from JBER to the Chugiak-Eagle River area, through his real estate photography business, he has seen military households in the Chugiak-Eagle River reasonably often. Denny's Muldoon duplex is also usually rented out by enlisted military members.

Lastly, the Anchorage reapportionment process divided the community into six, and the Senate pairings were split into eight. Although they are different numbers, the same communities still share the same issues. During this process, several community councils and other groups opposed the pairing of Hillside and Eagle River. Denny encouraged the board to read the formal resolutions of the following councils: Huffman/O'Malley Community Council, Rabbit Creek Community Council, Home and Landowners Association, Baxter Community Council, and the Girdwood Board of Supervisors.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 12:59 am

First Name: **Judy**

Last Name: **Eledge**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Anchorage**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: Judy testified in favor of Option 3 because it is the fairest among the maps and believes that House Districts 15 and 16 should be paired together. These districts are closely related, as she has seen through her experience as a Sand Lake resident. Judy also testified in support of House Districts 22 and 9 being paired together as before, and both districts share similar interests.
Public Comment: Ted was pleased with the Supreme Court decision on the East Anchorage and Eagle River pairing and expressed concern about the board's work and perception of their decision.

Ted testified in support of House Districts 22 and 24 being paired together and gave some insight on his experience working in the Mat-Su Borough as an East Anchorage resident. Ted commutes through Districts 22 and 24 and sees the connections that could make both districts one Senate districts. This pairing is logical.

In Ted's skiing experience in the Arctic Valley (northeast of his East Anchorage home), it is hard to see Districts 9 and 22 as a logical pairing. If one drove from Ted's house to Districts 22 and 24, they would likely agree that the two districts are a logical Senate pairing. If one went on a ski tour in Arctic Indian, they would probably not see the connection between Districts 22 and 9 because there is mostly wilderness.

Ted cautioned the board on the perception of their decisions and expressed the importance to him, as an Alaskan citizen, that he feels the board's decision is fair.

Lastly, there are plenty of military members who live in East Anchorage by Ted which shows that not all live in Chugiak-Eagle River.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 11, 2022, 1:15 am

First Name: Jason
Last Name: Norris
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/6/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jason testified in support of Option 1. When the original Senate pairings were reviewed, one argument was that Eagle River residents shop in Muldoon, making it permissible to pair the communities. This same argument does not apply to Districts 22 and 9. The obvious connection is between Districts 22 and 24.

Jason testified against Option 3 as the map seems to be gerrymandered.
Date: April 11, 2022, 12:51 pm

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Rappoport

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Rabbit Creek Community Council

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The Rabbit Creek Community Council strongly opposes any redistricting that combines the Rabbit Creek and Hillside communities with Eagle River for the purposes of government representation. The council has also submitted extended comments on this matter when the Anchorage Assembly redrew districts; the same requirements held to the Anchorage Assembly also apply to the Alaska Redistricting Board.

Anchorage and Hillside are not contiguous, compact, or relatively socioeconomically integrated. Both communities are separated by an uninhabited area (Chugach State Park). Also, the constitution requires that local government boundaries are also considered and the Anchorage Assembly has kept Hillside together. East Anchorage neighborhoods should also be kept together.

The following reasons for opposing the Hillside and Eagle River pairing were also listed: Hillside frequently deals with water septic issues and wildfire risks, there are limited road service areas, Hillside students attend different schools than Eagle River students, and both communities travel on different roads to travel to Downtown Anchorage.

Ann referred to the 2010 Hillside District Plan that defines Hillside boundaries and included a public process. This plan speaks to the community’s preferences.

The Rabbit Creek Community urged the board to adopt a map that keeps neighborhoods together which can be done with the proposed Option 2 Map or the original map proposed by Member Bahnke.
Date: April 11, 2022, 1:11 pm

First Name: Cyndi

Last Name: Saunders

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Cyndi agreed with Ann Rappoport's testimony and testified in favor of the Option 2 Map. Some concern was expressed on prior board members' comments about making the map look beautiful as opposed to looking at voting boundaries. Cyndi asked for the board's explanation of this.

Cyndi testified against pairing Eagle River and Anchorage together.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 1:23 pm

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Fischetti

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Susan testified in support of a Chugach Mountain district as outlined in the Option 3-B Map for the following reasons:

1) Districts 22 and 9 are the two large districts with several acres of parks and mountains; there are no other districts like this.

2) Upper Hillside and Eagle River have previously been combined as a Senate pairing and it is still logical to pair them.

3) Anchorage has become more urbanized. Eagle River and Hillside residents chose a suburban lifestyle surrounded by mountains and wildlife rather than the city.

4) Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER) districts should remain intact and this map achieves that.

Susan agrees that there is public confusion with the Anchorage Assembly redistricting process where several community members testified to keep the Assembly districts separate. Now, the public is struggling with the changes being presented by the board and this may impact their willingness to call in.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 11, 2022, 1:29 pm

First Name: Leon
Last Name: Jaimes
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Leon noted that he is not confused by the municipal redistricting and Senate pairings and testified in support of the Option 2 Map. This map addresses the correction requested by the court to fix the Senate District K pairings and keeps communities of interest together such as Eagle River, Muldoon, and South Anchorage.

When Leon moved here in 2012, he researched neighborhoods to live in and many responses were given about living in Eagle River and no responses indicated that Eagle River was similar to South Anchorage. Muldoon and East Anchorage were seen as a community. Leon still follows some of the same online forums discussing moving to Alaska and the same discussions are still being held.

A geographic connection does not make two districts contiguous.
Judy testified in favor of the Option 3-B map for the following reasons:

1) The map revises Senate District K as the court ruling requests.

2) The map has a logical pairing of House Districts 9 and 22 that are most similar and were paired when Tom Bundy was elected.

3) House Districts 9 and 2 are contiguous districts with a long, common boundary and similar road and snow removal services.

4) House Districts 9 and 22 mainly consist of high-income single-family homes.

5) It may not be contiguous, but it keeps similar communities together. Based on testimony heard, that is what the general public wants.

Judy testified against the Option 2 Map as she believes that military voters should not be paired with Downtown Anchorage because it would diminish their representation.
Public Comment: Yarrow cautioned the board to avoid the appearance of gerrymandering and referred to the court ruling that found the Senate District K pairing to be unconstitutional as it split Eagle River into two districts to increase the majority party representation at the expense of East Anchorage voters.

Yarrow testified against Map 3-B because it would split Eagle River into two separate Senate districts again to increase the majority party’s representation at the expense of voters outside of Eagle River. The map swaps the voters' voices who will be silenced and does not correct the constitutional error. There have also been consistent public testimonies from Eagle River residents to keep their communities intact.

Yarrow cautioned the board to adopt pairings by an individual "who chairs the Alaskan Republican Party and uses political data to map but also sent this board a chart that shows how the political date relates to proposed pairings, who the incumbents are, and even a column that appears to indicate whether certain incumbents were electable or not - a chart which was referenced by at least two board members during the process and whose initial suggested Eagle River pairings were found to be unconstitutional."

Yarrow expressed support for a simple fix that keeps Muldoon communities intact and Eagle River communities intact and asked the board to reject politically motivated pairings that give other communities more representation at the expense of other communities of interest. Yarrow asked the board to stop utilizing contiguity of a type that has been described by the Supreme Court Justice as second-rate contiguity and what has been described by Budd Simpson as "basically affixion." For context behind her statement, Yarow referred to a quote by Member Simpson at the Alaska Redistricting Board meeting held on February 3, 2022: "And so I could not ever describe 33 as compact. It's barely contiguous, and by barely, I mean the part that connects the northern part of that to the southern part basically has almost no
people in it. It's basically affixion in my mind." Yarrow also referenced a discussion between Supreme Court Justice Matthews and the board's legal counsel, Matt Singer, on March 18, 2022, about salt contiguity being second-rate. In this discussion, Matt Singer stated the board's perspective to see salt contiguity as second-rate.

Yarrow referred to statements made by Member Marcum regarding the need to pair Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) with Eagle River to remain intact and represented together. Yarrow assured Member Marcum that the area is a block of trees with no infrastructure and likely has few residents. Thus, is no justification for breaking down Eagle River, Downtown, and South Anchorage using second-rate contiguity.

Yarrow pointed out that service members live all over Anchorage and are represented by their place of residence, not their workplace. Yarrow opposed the idea of JBER communities only being represented by Eagle River, where there is no access to JBER. However, there are access gates to JBER in Anchorage, where JBER residents are integrated with the surrounding communities in North Anchorage District 17.

Yarrow referred to the historical connections with past maps and noted that maps are recreated every ten years as the populations change. Back then, Eagle River's population was vastly different, requiring the community to be split into two Senate districts but now has an opportunity to be a single Senate District.

Yarrow testified in support of keeping Eagle River communities intact and encouraged the board to listen to Eagle River residents who have testified to preserve their communities. North Eagle River has the same independent road service areas and snow removal services as South Eagle River. Pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River opens the board up to further lawsuits from Eagle River and South Anchorage residents.

Yarrow expressed concern with political blocks urging people to testify based on politically motivated reasons, such as saving a certain number of Republican Senate seats. This action has resulted in submitting the same form letter daily and changing testimonies compared to what was said one month ago in the municipal redistricting process. The Anchorage Assembly's redistricting resulted in a 3.6% deviation in municipal maps based on public testimony. In contrast, the Anchorage pairings under consideration do not practicably change variations.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 3:06 pm

First Name: Jamie
Last Name: Rodriguez
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jamie is a House District 28 (soon to be District 9) resident and clarified that this district includes Southeast Anchorage, Girdwood, Portage, and Whittier. Jamie researched some numbers that were shared with the board:

1. Eagle River to Southeast Anchorage distance: 27 miles
2. Eagle River to Girdwood distance: 67 miles
3. Eagle River to Portage distance: 78 miles
4. Eagle River to Whittier distance: 87 miles (includes tunnel scheduling)

Depending on the route taken, one must cross 6-8 unrelated House districts from Eagle River to Southeast Anchorage.

Jamie testified in support of keeping Eagle River districts intact.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 3:12 pm

First Name: Lee

Last Name: Hammermeister

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Lee testified in favor of Option 3-B. Lee is a lifelong Eagle River resident and remembers attending school with students who lived on Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). A portion of JBER workers lived in Eagle River and their children attended school in Eagle River. Additionally, the distance between the district pairings in Option 3-B is closer than the long drive for the alternative pairing presented in Option 2, which would take over one hour.

Overall, it is more sensible for Eagle River to align with JBER as outlined in Option 3-B.
Date: April 11, 2022, 3:17 pm

First Name: Forrest
Last Name: McDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Forrest testified in support of Option 3-B and noted that this conversation was being held because board members were caught having discussions with individuals not on the board and gave the board members instructions on how to gerrymander the process.

Forrest expressed concern with the board hearing public testimony from the same person multiple times and treating each testimony as a new, separate one. Allowing non-board members to have more input on the process than other Alaskans disenfranchises the people who the appointed board members represent.
Date: April 11, 2022, 3:25 pm

First Name: Sandra

Last Name: Graham

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Sandra testified in support of Option 3-B as she taught at Birchwood ABC Elementary several years ago. During her time there, she saw many military families attend this school. Sandra also spent time in Girdwood at her father’s cabin growing up and knows that Girdwood and Eagle River have significant differences between the two communities.

Sandra encouraged the board to look at the differences between the communities.
Date: April 11, 2022, 3:32 pm

First Name: Jieun

Last Name: McDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jieun testified in support of Option 3-B because it gives the best representation of the Korean community.
Date: April 11, 2022, 5:17 pm

First Name: Roy

Last Name: Syren

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Roy testified in support of Option 3-B because it is the fairest map and districts should remain together.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 5:22 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Hunt

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Kimberly expressed concern about the credibility of her testimony on April 6, 2022, and noted that she is familiar with and misses the "pre-pipeline perspective."

Kimberly reiterated her support for the Option 2 map to avoid unnecessary delays and honor the court rulings. This map seems to keep contiguous communities intact.
Date: April 11, 2022, 5:58 pm

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Gray

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Andrew has been a resident of House District 19 since 2019, two weeks before deploying with the Alaska Army National Guard for ten months. Thus, Andrew has a relationship with the military and Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER).

During his deployment with another soldier from the trailer court across from Northway Mall, Andrew recounted a discussion. Andrew answered that he'd never met anyone who lived in a trailer park, and the other soldiers at the table during this discussion stated they'd lived in a trailer park at some point in their childhoods. Andrew recounted this story to tell the story of many military members joining in escaping the poverty from their childhood.

Andrew referred to a 2018 demographic analysis from the Council on Foreign Relations that shows over 60% of enlistments came from neighborhoods with a median household income between $38,000 to $80,000. Nineteen percent of recruits came from households of less than $38,000. The average annual pay in Eagle River is $129,768. More than 80% of military recruits come from families, unlike those in Eagle River. As more enlisted choose to live off base, they inevitably end up in lower-cost housing in Mountain View, North Muldoon, or Midtown. Yet, members of the board insist on pairing Eagle River with JBER.

Higher ranking officers are the military members that can afford to live in Eagle River. The Congressional Research Survey reports that 63% of military service members are white, and 37% are non-white. JBER is more diverse, with 60.7% of the voting-age population identifying as white and just under 40% identifying with non-white. However, 88% of senior military officers are white, and these higher-ranking officers can afford to Eagle River. Andrew also pointed out that the voting age population in Chugiak-Eagle River is over 73% white.

Andrew argued that the Senate district pairing Eagle River with JBER is egregiously unconstitutional, if not more so. The minority residents of JBER will be overridden by
Eagle River's wealthy, white residents as the goal is to increase the Senate representation of Eagle River. As Member Marcum stated on the record on November 5, 2021: "This allows Eagle River to have more representation."

On April 7, 2022, Chairman Binkley explained to a testifier that the state redistricting and the Anchorage reapportionment of Assembly districts are not the same processes. During Anchorage's reapportionment, Eagle River was guaranteed two Assembly members. The tactic was to minimize the population represented by both Eagle River Assembly members to increase representation. This was achieved by several public testimonies against pairing Eagle River with any part of Anchorage. The option most strongly considered was the pairing of Hillside and Eagle River.

Andrew referred to a quote stated by Assemblymember Jamie Allard at a town hall held on January 27, 2022: "It was brought up the fact that if we are connected to Hillside, or we are connected to Girdwood, you would literally have to ride a bald sheep in order to get to those areas - unless we drove approximately from our location almost an hour to get to Hillside and an hour and a half to get down to Girdwood. I would also point out that when folks are saying that we have things in common over there, look at who their elected officials are: Suzanne LaFrance and John Weddleton. Wonderful people, but you have to still ask, "What do we have in common with those areas?" We don't."

Andrew thanked Assemblywoman Allard for saving the business of the political process. Although the message is different in redistricting, the goal is not. By avoiding the pairing of two Eagle River House districts together, which by any metric is how you would create the most compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated Senate district - the board is seeking to expand Eagle River's influence in the Alaska Senate.

We know from numerous studies that voter participation increases family income. In the 2016 presidential family election, 48% of voters in the lowest income categories voted, while almost 86% of voters in the highest income categories cast a ballot. This is true in Eagle River, as they participate in elections at a significantly higher rate than the neighboring low-income voters. Therefore, if Eagle River receives two Senators, Eagle River will elect those Senators. Not the JBER House District or the South Anchorage.

There are no adverse consequences to the board adopting another unconstitutional gerrymandered map. There is a chance that no lawsuit will be brought forth, and the gerrymander could stand for another ten years. Even on an expedited schedule, it would take several months after an appeal to the Alaska Supreme Court before the board is sent back to re-work the Senate pairings. The November 2022 elections will approach, making it too late to print new ballots. No board members will be held personally liable for unconstitutional pairings and have nothing to lose but will gain continued Republican control of the Alaska Senate.
Andrew testified against the Option 3-B Senate pairings and testified in favor of the Option 2 Senate Pairings that keep JBER with Downtown Anchorage, South Anchorage intact, and Eagle River intact.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 6:11 pm

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Fischetti
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Susan testified in support of Option 3-B and clarified that her testimony on behalf of herself should not be confused with her testimony on behalf of the State of Alaska. Both testimonies outline two separate issues. This should also apply to the community councils who pass resolutions for the Assembly redistricting and are now carrying it over to the state. In Susan’s experience attending community council meetings, there are usually six to twenty attendees that may not always represent the thousands of voters in their areas.

Susan expressed concern about the "intimidation and attacks against private citizens in this office when they are nervous and fear of saying the wrong thing." Some testimonies have also gone over ten minutes and have become a numbers game while attacking Eagle River.

The Option 2 map has claims of gerrymandering, not Option 3.

Eagle River and Hillside Anchorage share landmass and miles along the Chugach Mountains, making them contiguous. Also, military members are prominent in Chugiak-Eagle River and should be paired with JBER. They are contiguous and have been historically paired for several years.
Date: April 11, 2022, 6:21 pm

First Name: Katie

Last Name: Nolan

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Home and Land Owners Association

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage Hillside

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: The Hillside Home and Land Owners Association (HLOA) has represented Hillside since 1970, several years before being incorporated into the Municipality of Anchorage. The Hillside District Plan (a set of planning documents) was created for the community in 2010. Hillside still consists of the same areas that have been represented with the addition of community councils in various areas.

The Hillside Home and Land Owners Association met on April 7, 2022, to review the revised proposed maps from the board and recognize that neither map is perfect, but the map that meets Hillside's needs is Option 2.

The idea that Hillside is contiguous with Eagle River ignores that one of the largest state parks in the nation is between the two communities. It is also quicker to get from Anchorage Hillside to Whittier in Kenai Peninsula than traveling to Eagle River. Additionally, there are separate road systems and different services; Eagle River has its own Parks Department, and there are things done with Eagle River that are not appropriate for Anchorage.

The most significant issue is that Hillside likes seeing their representatives from Juneau at their meetings when they are not in session. Their representatives can't effectively represent an area far away from Hillside adequately. This is not the best option for the representative or the community to build a relationship.

Katie referred to public comments about the Hillside community consisting of wealthy households. She stated that they also have high-density housing and workforce housing, just like other Anchorage residents.
Date: April 11, 2022, 7:42 pm

First Name: Joan

Last Name: Corr

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Soldotna

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Joan has several friends in Rabbit Creek in Anchorage and Eagle River. It seems to Joan they would have more in common than what is shown on the Option 2 map. Joan also does not see what military members would have in common with Downtown Anchorage.

Joan testified in support of the Option 3-B map.
Date: April 11, 2022, 8:00 pm

First Name: Briana
Last Name: Sullivan

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Girdwood

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Briana testified on behalf of herself but also currently sits in an elected seat on the Girdwood Board of Advisors. Briana spent several years living near District 22 and now calls District 9 home. For the same reasons cited about local government and acknowledging compact areas of town found during this process, the Senate redistricting could also follow identified voting areas of the municipality.

Over the last few weeks, several of the public have urged the board to quickly make a crucial decision, not waste time, not pair Eagle River with Girdwood, and take the Alaska Supreme Court ruling when making these considerations. It is prudent to solve the unconstitutional error in splitting Eagle River to give them more representation. Pairing House Districts 22 and 23 have been cautioned against by the courts. Thus, Briana urged the board to revert to pairing House Districts 22 and 24.

In the public process, we start with our roots, neighbors, communities, and representatives. These public offices are held by residents in the areas they live in who understand the nuances of their cities and have a vested interest in serving their constituents. Citizens can support and vote for their residents, so it makes sense for their representatives to be within reach. Contiguous districts make sense; please do not substantially break up communities.

The idea of connecting extremely distant House Districts 9 and 22, where thick forests, rivers, drainages, and mountains in between, causes confusion and is far-fetched when there is another logical option. These districts also have six to eight Senate districts in between. Most from Eagle River do not want to be paired with South Anchorage and Girdwood and vice versa.

The topography information is missing from district size considerations. Hillside and South Anchorage have more in common with the Turnagain Arm and Girdwood community than with Eagle River.

Briana urged Member Simpson to listen to the constitution as read, to the outpouring
of public support for Option 2, and the several people providing public testimony.

Briana testified against Option 3-B as it is unconstitutional and asked the board not to confuse the public with more maps.
Date: April 11, 2022, 8:07 pm

First Name: Phil

Last Name: Moser

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Juneau

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Phil is familiar with the history of gerrymandering in Alaska and feels. Option 2 is the map that most fairly represents Anchorage and has ramifications for the entire state.

South Anchorage is a diverse area, and the representation there represents the people of South Anchorage and adds a voice to diverse communities from Alaska, including Juneau. For this reason, Phil testifies in support of Option 2.
Leon referred to previous testimonies about the definition of "contiguous" and Article 6 of the Constitution. The last sentence of the article discusses drainage and other geographic features that should be used as boundaries when possible. Leon pointed out that when looking at the topography, the drainage for District 22 goes into both the Turnagain Arm and Knik Arm of the Cook Inlet. District 9 only drains into the Knik Arm. It is significant that drainage and other geographic features were included because if you look at the highest elevations between Eagle River and Whittier, that is a distinct boundary that should be considered.

Leon testified in support of Option 2 as it is the only map that is practicable for Senate District K.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 8:54 pm

First Name: Forrest
Last Name: McDonald
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Forrest addressed several comments made by the public and board members being critical of people in support of Option 3-B and accusing them of being the same people who were against the Assembly districting pairings. Through actions and commentary, it has been made clear that the voting power and footprint is trying to be reduced as much as possible.

Forrest also expressed he is upset about board members asking confrontational questions that push people to re-evaluate their opinions. Members of the public with different opinions, values, and priorities are trying to add to the equation so their voice is heard to result in a diverse array of views and opinions.

Forrest would like to know why it was appropriate for the Anchorage Assembly to not pair the two Eagle River districts and why Eagle River specifically has additional follow-up questions that are applied in the process and have not been applied to other areas in the state. There has been no explanation as to why this has happened.
Date: April 11, 2022, 8:20 pm

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Ruedrich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Randy submitted a map to the board that solely focuses on the new Senate E in Option 3-B, which clearly shows the entire length of the boundary where District 9, District 22, and District 12 meet. This boundary extends east in various segments to the far east side of the Municipality of Anchorage. This map is contiguous. Therefore, the words “being close to contiguous” are irrelevant. This map is also materially the same as a Senate district that has existed in the past and shows that the whole area is socioeconomically integrated with over 37 miles of contiguous territory.
Date: April 11, 2022, 8:31 pm

First Name: Judy

Last Name: Eledge

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Judy expressed that there seems to be a board member who has already decided on a map based on the nature of her questions, asking testifiers. Everyone should be respectful to one another, and the public should not be questioned about what they are saying.

Judy testified in support of Option 3-B and expressed concern about the board being accused of gerrymandering Senate District K. However, gerrymandering can be seen in another place to support Senator Tom Begich’s seat, who was also seen sending text messages to another board member about Option 2. Option 3-B is the most logical map that pairs House Districts 9 and 22. When you view the entire map, they both share common boundaries as the most contiguous districts. Judy recalled when Senator Cathy Giessel went from Hillside to Kenai in her first term, which seemed like a difficult task for her. Often, some districts were not easy to reach. Additionally, pairing House Districts 9 and 22 protects the interest of minority communities of East Anchorage, Muldoon, and Mountain View.
Date: April 11, 2022, 9:01 pm

First Name: Yarrow
Last Name: Silvers
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Yarrow testified against Option 3-B and stated that the burden of proof for using second-rate contiguity and salt contiguity, as described by Justice Matthews and Matthew Singer, combined with splitting the communities of Downtown Anchorage, South Anchorage, Eagle River, and Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER) falls on those who think these actions are logical and rational. There has been no sensible argument about using second-rate contiguity and salt contiguity.

Option 3-B splits every Anchorage community apart. Keeping communities together is not gerrymandering. Splitting communities is gerrymandering.
The Girdwood Board of Supervisors recently met to review the newly proposed three maps by the Alaska Redistricting Board. The Girdwood Board unanimously voted that Maps 1 and 2 represented more compact and contiguous Senate districts than Map 3. The board also supports similar maps that combine Eagle River with South Anchorage, Hillside, Turnagain Arm, and Girdwood. The main reason for keeping these maps is the contiguousness across the Chugach State Park.
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Date: April 11, 2022, 9:10 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage Hillside

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/8/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Doug quoted the Alaska Constitution describing the legal criteria for redistricting: "Range and other geographic features shall be used in describing boundaries whenever possible." This tells Doug that Option 3, as modified, contradicts the criteria defined in the constitution for designating Senate districts. To validate the pairing, you would have to consider that the Chugach Mountains are not a geographic feature, which is false, or that there is no other possible way to join districts, which is also incorrect.

Option 3 cannot stand, according to the constitution.
Michelle has lived in Anchorage for almost three decades in various locations: JBER, South Muldoon, Abbott, and now in proposed District 9 in Hillside. Michelle reviewed a timeline of her public comments and occurrences during the redistricting process:

1) September 18, 2021: Noted the importance of providing Senate district pairings early for public comment, then drew and submitted maps for Anchorage

2) November 7, 2021: Proposed Senate pairings, not including Eagle River districts because they are considered to be separate communities

3) November 8, 2021: Board discussion was quoted on Senate pairings that gave a sense that District 9 (now named District 11) would be paired with District 15; Michelle testified and applauded the board for proposing to pair District 9 with an O'Malley district.

November 9, 2021: The board emerged from the executive session to put a vote on the record with no justification given for Senate pairings for Anchorage; the pairings did not include the consensus of District 9 (now named District 11). Districts 9 and 10 were paired and unaligned with the unanimous public testimony from the day prior

April 5, 2022: Michelle submitted written testimony and ranked her support of the proposed maps placing Option 1 first because it pairs Districts 9 and 11. After becoming further educated, Michelle realized that Option 1, although aligned with the constitution, did not comply with the court’s ruling. Michelle applauded the board for removing the option for consideration. In the same written testimony, Michelle supported Option 2, too.

During the April 9, 2022, ARB meeting, Michelle testified in support of Option 2. While some board members may state that the contiguity is all that matters, if that is the case, Michelle asked how the courts could have found the pairing of Districts 22 and
21 to be illegal as they also touch through the Chugach Mountains.

Intent can be shown legally in ignoring the charge of the court remand and in the spirit of ignoring the will of the citizens whose testimonies include socioeconomic linkages in communities.

Michelle attempted to put herself in the board's shoes and noted that she would think the court reprimanded her actions based on intent. She would be concerned that her actions, especially in pairing Eagle River over a non-populated mountain range, would appear to be political gerrymandering to the court. Michelle would also be concerned that selecting District 9 with the Eagle River district could look like political gerrymandering.

The JBER and Chugiak-Eagle River pairings were presented in all four of Member Marcum's maps; this was also the case for the Hillside and O'Malley districts. Michelle asked what is so compelling about the Eagle River and JBER pairings that the board must maintain it at all costs? The board gives little consternation in breaking the verbal consensus expressed at the board meeting on November 8, 2021, to pair the O'Malley and Hillside districts. To attempt political gerrymandering again, the board must resort to the "Rank 3" Option 3-B to once again fragment Eagle River.
Public Comment: Julie was engaged in the reapportionment process and has not called to testify because she has been torn on the maps. During the reapportionment process, she and other community members fought hard to combine Eagle River with South Anchorage. The main issue is that, during reapportionment, a small population of South Anchorage was combined with a large Eagle River population, giving an inaccurate representation of South Anchorage residents. Julie can now support the pairing of Eagle River and South Anchorage because the South Anchorage population has been balanced to provide fair representation.

Julie struggles with Option 2 and Option 3-B because of the combination of Hillside and Eagle River since this is what she fought against in the Assembly districts. When you are making lines for Senate districts, it's much different than the Assembly because Senators tackle different issues than Assembly members.

Julie pointed out that, during the reapportionment process, there were many arguments that Eagle River and South Anchorage are contiguous by the Chugach State Park, but in this redistricting process, there are arguments about it not being contiguous.

Julie has lived in Eagle River for 20 years, South Anchorage for 15 years, and has lived on JBER. Through Julie's experience in Eagle River, Julie knows a heavy military population in Eagle River. Julie does not believe a Downtown Anchorage representative well represents the JBER community.

Julie cautioned the board against how they have been treating the public, which has intimidated the public into testifying.

Julie reminded the board that the point of public testimony is to ensure that the people are being represented.
Overall, Julie does not fully support any of the maps, but Option 3-B better represents JBER residents, and the South Anchorage area combined with Eagle River would also have fair representation. Also, there is a difference between the redistricting process and the municipal reapportionment process.
Date: April 13, 2022, 10:05 pm

First Name: **Denny**

Last Name: **Wells**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Anchorage**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: The board now has an opportunity to pair communities divided by the board into their House Districts. This has been a challenge in past decades because the Municipality of Anchorage did not separate in an even number of House seats. Still, this year, the board is fortunate that the Municipality of Anchorage is divided into an exact number of 16 House seats with the small addition of Whittier. Further, the Chugiak-Eagle River area now has two House seats, giving the board the maximum opportunity to bring the community back together. Future boards may not be as fortunate to have this situation and may need to pair Chugiak-Eagle River with South Anchorage or another district outside of their area. With the 2020 US Census data, the board does not need to divide Eagle River or South Anchorage.

The Superior Court found that the Senate K pair ignored communities of interest in Eagle River and South Muldoon with very little justification. The court reviewed the board's arguments (contiguity through the Chugach, JBER connection to Eagle River) for this pairing and still found little reason.

Denny noted the following:

- Downtown Anchorage is split along 4th Avenue. Denny lived at the district boundary on Barrow Street and noted it was easy walking to Downtown events. District 23 comprises 10,832 residents of JBER and 7,191 Anchorage residents - 2,389 of the Anchorage residents are in Muldoon, and the remainder is South Anchorage and Government Hill residents. If any place in Anchorage constitutes a community of interest, it is Downtown Anchorage - the city's heart. Downtown should be paired with Eagle River.

- Eagle River is split along the Glenn Highway and Eagle River Road. The board also divided along a residential street in Eagle River, a small neighborhood road where people know their neighbors and should be in the same district. Member Marcum stated on April 8, 2022, to a public member that there is only one Eagle River House seat while the other is a Chugiak/Peters Creek/JBER House seat. This is factually
inaccurate as District 24 has 7,586 residents of Eagle River and Eagle River Valley community councils - 33% of the total population of Eagle River community councils. The Eagle River Fred Meyer, business boulevard, and Carr's are all in District 24. District 24 is most certainly an Eagle River House seat.

- District 24 includes a small portion of JBER, but it has no population except for one census block that appears to be noise from the bureau's anonymization efforts. The block is bounded by Eagle River, the Inlet, and Otter Lake and has a population of 197 people with no visible infrastructure; it is 100% adult, 38.6% white versus 74% adult, and 58.9% white in JBER. Other anomalous census blocks like this were discovered in Anchorage bowl; the most obvious was between International Airport Road and Raspberry Road on Walter J. Hickel Parkway. The District 23 and 24 pairings have been justified through the military connection between JBER and Chugiak-Eagle River. Through Denny's experience in his photography business, he has seen this to be true.

- Denny has heard concerns that JBER is more similar to Chugiak-Eagle River than Downtown Anchorage. This argument ignores the 7,200 residents in District 23 who live in Muldoon and Downtown Anchorage, where the Muldoon residents have more in common with Downtown Anchorage than Chugiak-Eagle River. For example, the residents live in older houses on smaller lots, use the city water and sewer service, and use the city-maintained roads.

- Parts of Downtown and Muldoon in District 23 are 43% white, District 17 is 51% white, and District 24 is 73% white. The Downtown and Muldoon parts of District 23 are more similar to the population of District 17 Downtown than in District 24. The JBER part of District 23 is 59% white, closer to District 17's 51% white population. District 23 is 52% white; taking a minority population and combining it with a 73% white district when there are other available options is a sign of racial gerrymandering.

- The pairing of Districts 22 and 9 has been justified because both districts have rural road services, share the same roads, and use septic systems. These justifications also apply to the pairing of Districts 22 and 24. Several houses have wells and septic systems, a long contiguous border with the Chugach, and the same road service area.

- Denny has heard that the pairings in Option 3-B are justified through the Ship Creek hunting area, a tenuous claim because people from all over the state come there to hunt. The site is contained in District 22. If you rely on the constitutional verbiage about drainages justifying Senate pairings, the Ship Creek drainage would support Districts 22 and 23, not 23 and 24, making both pairs well due to the Eagle River drainage.

Denny testified in support of the Senate pairings in Option 2.
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Date: April 13, 2022, 10:16 pm

First Name: Jason
Last Name: Warfield
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Jason is a 40-year Anchorage and stated that Option 3-B joins Districts 22 and 9, and the Hillside community has generally spoken against this pairing. The municipal reapportionment committee made this case and took part of Hillside and put it into municipal District 2. Throwing a portion of District 6 (about 12K people) into Municipal District 2 would result in a far underrepresentation due to population disparity, thus not being an equal pairing.

The Option 3-B pairings, while not optimal, also represent the fairest map. The two districts share a 35-mile border and are demographically similar; an argument made during municipal reapportionment when trying to pair Districts 6 and 2. Both communities have a similar population and would equally be represented by their state senators. The map also puts JBER with Eagle River instead of pairing it with Downtown Anchorage. Through Jason's experience working at an auto shop in Downtown Anchorage, several military clients lived in Eagle River, not Downtown.

NOTE: District 6 = South Anchorage, District 2 = Eagle River
Date: April 13, 2022, 10:20 pm

First Name: **Queen**

Last Name: **Parker**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Sterling**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: **Queen testified in support of Option 3-B as it would be fair for all residents.**
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Date: April 13, 2022, 10:25 pm

First Name: Laura
Last Name: Bonner
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Laura testified in support of the following:

1) Pairing the two Eagle River House districts, Eklutna is closer, and it is illogical to pair Eagle River with Anchorage

2) Keeping Girdwood with South Anchorage since the only proximity to Eagle River is through a mountain range that can only be traveled by foot

3) Downtown Anchorage districts should be paired together.

Laura lives in Lower Hillside and prefers to be paired with her neighbors above her. Laura is unsure which map outlines her preferences but believes it may be Option 2.
Yarrow addressed various comments and characterizations heard over the last week:

1) Yarrow has heard that Map 2 is partisan. Yarrow introduced this map and it was arrived at by the East Anchorage plaintiffs with legal guidance who advised that pairing Muldoon with Eagle River, and then pairing the districts that were left unpaired was the method that most closely followed the remand order from the court which had ruled that the splitting of Eagle River, to increase representation, was a partisan gerrymander violating equal protection. No incumbent information or partisan data was accessed and Yarrow does know where incumbents live nor the districts they represent.

2) It is known that both independent makers of Option 3-B, Member Marcum and Randy Ruedrich, have seen incumbent information during the mapping process. In contrast, the Option 2 pairings were based on logic, reason, similarity between communities, the constitution, and the remand requirements.

3) Most of the testimony, which favored Map 1, to introduce Map 2 which the ADN has reported Cathy Giessel, who appointed John Binkley to the board, as stating that the map "was a very elegant solution" and one she prefers.

4) Most of the testimony backs up the non-partisan and inherently fair nature of Option 2 which has broad bipartisan support. There have been several testimonies about the irrationality of Option 3-B from organizations and individuals who are not partisan or left-wing. In contrast, the majority of the testimony for Option 3-B is based on partisan considerations, number of Republican Senate seats, specific incumbents, "do it because you can", or one-line statements with no reason included.

5) Despite the quick timeframe of the process and there being a significant amount of testimony against these pairings in the municipal process, Chairman Binkley has
indicated that those testimonies do not count because the numbers and considerations are different. Yarrow asked which numbers and considerations are different and stated the false contiguity, distance, broken communities, and lack of commonality are the same. The only difference is that the lowest deviations were sacrificed to have meaningful contiguity in municipal districts which resulted in a municipal map with deviations of 5% and where Eagle River was underpopulated by several thousand people. While it was originally believe by the mapmakers that South Anchorage and Eagle River had socioeconomic connections, both community's residents stated it was not and the Assembly listened.

6) In the redistricting process, Eagle River is being split despite having enough population for one Senate seat. Yarrow believes most people want effective local representation that reflects the unique communities regardless of political affiliation, and Map 2 reflects that. If the board chooses a map that uses second-rate or false contiguity for pairings, then the burden of proof falls on the board to show why a constitutional map is not possible.

7) Regarding the justifications heard for Option 3-B, Yarrow heard District 23 is actually not Eagle River, but the map does include the northern part of Eagle River including parts of its business district.

8) Yarrow has heard that Eagle River and South Anchorage share the longest border. She would like to ask the board to consider how long the populated area of the border is compared to the unpopulated area that Member Simpson has been heard referring to as "basically affixion" in another part of the map. Member Simpson's sentiments are true in this case, too. It is irrational to pair Districts 9 and 22 just because they touch when there is another logical pairing.

10) There have been statements about how JBER and Eagle River should be paired together while obtusely ignoring that the communities of Downtown Anchorage, Government Hill, and South Anchorage must be split in order to accommodate this false vision of JBER. JBER is integrated into the municipality, including Government Hill and Downtown Anchorage where a JBER access gate is located in Government Hill and is utilized by the majority of service members. Also, service members living off-base are already represented by the communities they reside in while on-base members are most connected to communities in the Anchorage proper outside of their respective gates - not Eagle River. Some say the pairing of JBER and Eagle River has been done historically, but this doesn't mean it should be done today.

In closing, Yarrow feels that East Anchorage residents have gained their voice back through legal remedy. Yarrow also feels deep regret that some members of the board seem tempted to shift the burden of harm and silence to another community. Yarrow implored the board to stop fighting for unconstitutional maps and choose the right thing instead.
Date: April 14, 2022, 9:55 am

First Name: Roger

Last Name: Holland

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska State Senate

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: South Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Senator Holland testified in support of Option 2 and noted that South Anchorage (District 28) and the Muldoon curve (District 27) have different family types with additional needs. During the tax proposals that Senator Holland worked on recently, everything in Muldoon had big-ticket intersection issues with much concrete work, and everything in South Anchorage was much smaller. A typical project in District 27 was millions of dollars, and a typical project in District 28 is hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Senator Holland understands that the Chugach mountain makes Eagle River and South Anchorage contiguous, but it is impassable. The constitution states contiguity as a factor, but contiguity also means access and flow, but there is no flow of trade or commerce between Eagle River and South Anchorage.

As a Senator, representing Eagle River and South Anchorage is challenging if a Senator's intentions are to be present and representative of the communities.

Option 2 has great pairings that solve many complications that Senator Holland has seen in District N (Districts 27 and 28, as stated above).
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Date: April 14, 2022, 11:37 am

First Name: Lora

Last Name: Reinbold

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Lora Reinbold spent 10 years as a Huffman resident, 15 years as an Eagle River resident, and spent time in Girdwood with family members who have cabins there. Thus, Lora knows these areas very well and testified against Option 3-B as it makes the political gerrymandering called out by Judge Matthews even worse.

Lora testified in support of Option 2 that pairs House Districts 22 and 24 together and strongly encouraged keeping Eagle River together.
Date: April 14, 2022, 12:13 pm

First Name: Lance
Last Name: Pruitt
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Lance has not heard much dialogue about JBER and military personnel, and this compelled Lance to testify. They do not have enough residents to make up a Senate district and are more tied to Eagle River and East Anchorage than other parts of Anchorage. The board is left with an option to ensure that military personnel are taken care of by keeping them in a Senate district pair with Eagle River.

One fact is that Eagle River High School would not exist if it wasn't for the military. If the military was not present, Eagle River High School could fit into Chugiak High School. Thus, you must tie the two together as they have the closest socioeconomic similarities. Also, the board must consider military personnel on voting ballots. There is usually a higher turnout from the military during the presidential elections.

Lance addressed comments about the long distance driving from Eagle River to South Anchorage and stated that a senator will likely spend more time in further districts as they want communities to know they are being considered and heard.

Lance testified in support of Option 3-B as it considers the military, a key group that has not had a strong presence in public testimonies. To support the military, you must pair JBER with Eagle River.
Date: April 14, 2022, 1:30 pm

First Name: Joelle

Last Name: Hall

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFR

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: AFFR testified in support of the recently withdrawn Map 1 and has read the court remand to the board to pair Muldoon and Eagle River. AFFR supports the move to withdraw Map 1 to narrow the scope down to Options 2 and 3-B.

Breaking apart Eagle River with no basis to pair it with another part of Anchorage in an attempt at gerrymandering is why we are here today. Unbelievably, the board appears to be giving real consideration to a map that does the same thing. Mathematically, Eagle River is entitled to one Senate seat.

Since the remand, Joelle has listened to contorted explanations attempting to justify Option 3-B pairings. What is more compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated than keeping a community whole?

The court has found that Eagle River is a community of interest whose needs can be considered with context to the larger Municipality of Anchorage. This leads to the debate on one of contiguity: the dividing line of Districts 22 and 24 is the majority of Eagle River Road, the heart of Eagle River that runs 13 miles. The neighborhoods on both sides attend the same elementary schools, recreate at the same parks, and shop at the same places. The contiguity of Option 2 is better than Option 3-B.

The board has made some tough contiguity calls in the process, such as Valdez, but Eagle River, South Anchorage, and Downtown Anchorage are not tough calls. There is a simple, rational, legal, constitutional solution.

Testifiers have continued to give the board rationales to break these communities apart, but the underlining constitutional question remains: What is more practicably contiguous? Is Option 3-B more practicably contiguous than Option 2? (It is not.)

Option 2 has side-by-side districts as the constitution envisions; there are no contortions required and no contiguity slights of hand. Joelle encouraged the board to adopt Option 2.
**ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD**
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Date: April 14, 2022, 1:44 pm

First Name: **Mike**

Last Name: **Edgington**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: **N/A**

Your ZIP Code: **Girdwood**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony**

Public Comment: **Mike testified in support of Option 2 as it is the most rational of the proposed options. Mike offered the following anecdotes:**

1) Mike reviewed some history in the last 4.5 years of visiting places. He rarely visited Eagle River and South Anchorage, often more than once per week. This is likely similar to most of his Girdwood neighbors.

2) Mike referred to a discussion on second-rate contiguity between Judge Matthews and the board's legal counsel, Matt Singer. In this discussion, the sea and unpopulated mountains are used as contiguity, and this type of second-rate contiguity has been used to justify Option 3-B. This does not make sense as there is no practical way of traveling along the Chugach Mountains between districts.

3) There have been discussions on the Municipality of Anchorage's reapportionment process. Several testifiers supporting Option 3-B have mentioned objections to a proposal in the reapportionment process to combine some of Hillside Anchorage with Eagle River; this was true later in the process, but at the beginning, the city's contractor proposed other maps. One of the maps combines South Anchorage, Girdwood, and Turnagain Arm with Eagle River. Mike heard several objections from his community to this combination as they felt the two communities were not connected.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 14, 2022, 1:51 pm

First Name: Judy
Last Name: Eledge
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Judy addressed Yarrow Silvers’ comments about political organizations supporting Option 3-B and noted that both Yarrow and Denny Wells have supported the Eagle River and Hillside combination during the Anchorage Assembly reapportionment. Judy believes this is documented.

Judy asked others not to accuse other testifiers about their reasons for testifying. Judy noted that Cathy Giessel made sure Eagle River was represented as meetings in Eagle River were well-attended by Cathy when she was a senator.

Anchorage and Eagle River residents share similar socioeconomic backgrounds. Also, Judy consulted with a friend who is an attorney and confirmed that the constitution does not state that there must be a transportation corridor. There must be a geographical link shared, not a road. If this was the case, rural Alaska would not be represented.

Judy testified in support of Option 3-B.
Date: April 14, 2022, 2:15 pm

First Name: Leighan

Last Name: Gonzales

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Leighan testified in support of Option 2 and noted that she did not intend to testify until she watched the April 8, 2022 hearing and saw how her neighbors were mistreated during the online and in-person verbal testimonies. Leighan expressed concern about the board asking testifiers questions who are not subject matter experts on constitutional law. The public is participating because they care about their communities.

Leighan asked the board to follow the constitution and the public's request to keep East Anchorage together, keep Downtown Anchorage together, and keep Eagle River together.
Date: April 14, 2022, 2:20 pm

First Name: Margarite

Last Name: Leeds

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Girdwood

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Margarite testified in support of Option 2, which pairs her community of Girdwood with South and Hillside Anchorage. These communities share common interests, allowing her to be fairly represented. This option also gives representation to East Anchorage and maintains representation in Eagle River.

Margarite testified against Option 3-B because the map pairs communities together with different concerns. For example, Eagle River has well-developed infrastructure while Girdwood has underdeveloped infrastructure, including police, fire, and emergency medical services. This option also violates the Supreme Court ruling splitting Eagle River would result in political gerrymandering. Overall, Option 3-B would damage her community of Girdwood.
Erik testified in support of Option 2 and testified against Option 3-B. It seems like there is an intent to dilute Girdwood's voting representation, and the board is trying to find reasons to hide blatant gerrymandering.
Date: April 14, 2022, 2:46 pm

First Name: Lisa
Last Name: Gentemann
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Lisa testified in support of Map 2 as it keeps the Eagle River districts together. Lisa lives on Eagle River Road and has been residing there for 25 years.

Lisa testified against Option 3-B which would only work "if we were mountain goats." In Lisa's experience supporting campaigns, door-knocking is already a challenge, and adopting Option 3-B would make campaign door-knocking hazardous. The houses in Eagle River are already far enough apart.

Constitution starts with "con" which means "together". Lisa hopes that the board considers keeping the community together.
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Date: April 14, 2022, 2:50 pm

First Name: Shelley
Last Name: Chaffin

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: N/A
Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Shelley testified in support of Option 2 and asked the board to follow the guidelines set forth by Judge Matthews and affirmed by the Alaska Supreme Court. Map 2 is the constitutional choice.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 14, 2022, 3:47 pm

First Name: Robert

Last Name: Hockema

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Robert noted an automatic assumption that JBER belongs to Eagle River and vice versa because many JBER families end up moving to Eagle River among other reasons. This is false, JBER belongs to all of Anchorage because JBER residents live and play in Anchorage. People often forget that there are two sides of JBER that have different social and economic behaviors.

JBER residents on the airport side are most associated with Downtown Anchorage and residents on the Fort Richardson side will most likely be seen in Muldoon and Eagle River. However, all JBER residents still travel to Anchorage. JBER does not belong to Eagle River.
Date: April 14, 2022, 3:48 pm

First Name: Corwyn

Last Name: Wilkey

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Corwyn spoke in favor of Option 2 as it is the consitutional choice and it makes sense to keep communities together. Option 3-B is an obvious attempt at political gerrymandering.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 14, 2022, 3:52 pm

First Name: Miles

Last Name: Baker

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Miles Baker testified in favor of Option 2 as it keeps District 24 paired with District 17. Miles has spent most of his life in Anchorage and feels he has a good understanding of Anchorage. He has lived in Turnagain, Rabbit Creek, and now owns a home in Government Hill, one of Anchorage's oldest neighborhoods. Government Hill is a sizeable community that does not work and lives on JBER, nor do they have access to JBER.

Miles does not intend to disenfranchise military members and veterans. The results of the September 11th tragedy have significantly limited public access to JBER, so it does not feel realistic to use a purely geographic bird's eye view to develop district boundaries.
Dan testified in support of Option 3-B as it pairs Districts 9 and 22 together in a single Senate district. District 22 includes the Eagle River Valley, a semi-rural area characterized by people living in or on the Chugach Mountains. District 9 encompasses a semi-rural area characterized by people living in or on the Chugach Mountains. The state constitution also requires continuity, and Dan has heard people from the public disqualifying the Chugach Mountains as contiguity. Dan reminded everyone that Alaska is a big state and Anchorage is a big municipality, so House districts and Senate pairings reflect these sizes.

Senators also have access to constituents by telephone, mail, teleconference, email, and the internet, which discounts the implications of pairing Eagle River and South Anchorage together, thus creating a long driving distance for senators.

Option 3-B better reflects the common interests between districts.

Dan testified against Option 2, which would pair Districts 23 and 17. Dan represented District 18 in the State House, which linked the two areas - this was when he learned that the two communities are different.

Dan cautioned everyone against characterizing the motive of board members and cautioned the board against inferring any partisanship on the part of testifiers.
Redistricting Board Members,
I hope to see the most simple and obvious correction to the Eagle River senate pairings. Eagle River with Eagle River and the two Anchorage districts together. I hope you will avoid a massive reshuffling of Senate pairings.

Thank you for your work on this,
Pat Race
Juneau
In addressing the issue surrounding District K, it is important that fixing this issue does not create new issues. Therefore, Districts 22 (Eagle River) and 24 (Chugiak and Eklutna) should be paired into one Senate Seat with Districts 20 (North Muldoon) and 21 (South Muldoon) paired into another.

This is also an opportunity to repair issues raised by the last minute change in Senate pairings produces in Executive Session. I am a resident of District 11 (Lower Hillside), which is currently paired with District 12 (Abbott Loop).

While I know that the Board is not as restricted by the Hickel Process on Senate pairings as it is on House District drawing, District 11 is a far better fit with District 9 (Upper Hillside, Turnagain Arm) than it is with District 12. Likewise, District 9 is a better fit with District 11 than it is District 10 (Bayshore/Klatt).

In short, I propose that Districts 9 and 11 be paired into a Senate seat, keeping the Anchorage Hillside in one District. Districts 10 and 15 are a fairly natural fit for one another in Southwest Anchorage and District 12 can easily be paired with either District 13 (Taku-Campbell) or 19 (U-Med) to accommodate this change.

Thank you for your time,
Jason Norris
Date: March 30, 2022, 2:47 pm

First Name: Elizabeth
Last Name: Newell

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairings: keep community council areas intact

Public Comment: I'm in House district 11 (O'Malley, Hillside, Independence Park). I support Melanie Bahnke's proposed pairings because it keeps more community council areas intact. If there are too many community council meetings per senator, they are unlikely to attend and so are less effective at representing their constituents.

The districts and community council areas are as follows:

District 9: Turnagain Arm, Girdwood, Rabbit Creek, Bear Valley, Glen Alps, Basher (shared with 21), Hillside (shared with 10), Huffman/O'Malley (shared with 10), and HALO (shared with 10 and 11)

District 10: Bayshore Klatt, Old Seward/Ocean view, Sand Lake (shared with 15), Taku/Campbell (shared with 13)

District 11: Huffman/O'Malley (shared with 9), Hillside (shared with 9), Abbott Loop (shared with 12), HALO (shared with 9 and 12)

District 12: Abbott Loop (shared with 11), Campbell Park (shared with 13 and 19), HALO (shared with 9 and 11)

To reduce overlap between community council meetings and keep communities intact, 9 (South Anchorage) should be paired with 11 (O'Malley) and 10 (Bayshore/Klatt) with either 13 (Taku/Campbell) or 15 (Sand Lake).
Date: March 30, 2022, 3:03 pm

First Name: Tyler

Last Name: Watson

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K

Public Comment: I'm writing as a resident of the current Senate District K and I urge the board to accept the senate pairings originally proposed by member Bahnke. It's in the board's and public's interest to get this resolved quickly and simply switching to her proposed senate pairings allows the redistricting work to quickly wrap up so campaigns and voters can learn the new map. We already have so many changes to our election system coming up this year, the board shouldn't needlessly drag on the process. As a resident of the new District 21, I think pairing my district with 20 makes the most sense for my neighborhood, allowing for a true East Anchorage(Muldoon) senate seat. Thank you for your hard work on this.
VIA EMAIL ONLY

March 30, 2022
Alaska Redistricting Board
c/o: Peter Torkelson
Executive Director

RE: Testimony related to Supreme Court decision and process on remand

Dear Board:

I write today in my personal capacity to provide public testimony regarding the Alaska Redistricting Board’s mandate on remand.

On March 25, 2022 the Alaska Supreme Court issued an order largely affirming the process this Board went through, and its outcome. However, there was one notable exception—the Board’s decision, on a 3-2 vote, to adopt a pairing for Senate District K was flatly rejected as a “partisan political gerrymander” and rightly so.

I reside in Anchorage, however I am not a resident of any of the house districts directly impacted by this pairing. Nevertheless, as someone who monitored the redistricting process closely, it was clear that the process and outcome of the Anchorage senate pairings resulting in District K was unacceptable and degraded the public’s trust in the entire process.

I watched that process live. When the Board came out of executive session and adopted a brand-new senate map for Anchorage without any publication, notice, public comment, or meaningful discussion it debased the entire process. It looked like what it was—a brazen attempt to manipulate the process for partisan purposes. This outcome diminished the representation of several communities, including minority communities. However, I wish to note a stark exception to this criticism—the efforts of Board Members Melanie Bahnke and Nicole Borromeo who spoke up, with courage and conviction, against this manipulation.

I write now to implore the Board to avoid going down a similar road on remand. Do not try to once again manipulate the senate pairings for partisan purposes. Do not try to once again run roughshod over the concerns raised by Board Members Bahnke and Borromeo. As the Supreme Court has concluded, their original concerns were absolutely correct and the other three members of the Board were wrong.
The time for debate has passed and the Board should swiftly perform the ministerial task of adopting the only logical senate map that the public has seen—the map offered by Board Member Bahnke, that was wrongfully rejected by the three-member majority of the Board.

Ms. Bahnke’s map would leave most of the current Senate pairings in place, and would only impose the following changes, pairing:
- House District 17 with 23;
- District 18 with 19;
- District 20 with 21; and
- District 22 with 24.
Such a map should have consensus support and will not raise any other issues related to suppressing minority votes or partisan gerrymandering.

In closing, I wish to acknowledge that the vast majority of this Board’s work was done properly, publicly, and in service of all Alaskans. The Senate District K process was unfortunate and absolutely cannot be repeated. I thank the Board for their service and ask that they avoid further controversy by promptly adopting the Senate pairings originally offered by Board Member Bahnke.

The public’s trust in the constitutional process of redistricting has been shaken by the issues surrounding District K. Please restore that trust by closely adhering to the Supreme Court’s decision and adopting the Bahnke map.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Scott Kendall
Attorney
(907) 222-7932 (main)
(907) 222-7938 (fax)
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: March 30, 2022, 3:51 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Baker

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Pairings

Public Comment: In light of the Supreme Court remand order, I support the following Senate pairings for Anchorage:

  22-24
  20-21
  18-19
  23-17
  16-14
  13-12
  15-10
  11-9

These pairings were discussed (briefly) during the November hearings. There was no logical argument in opposition. They are common-sense pairings that support the natural boundaries and feel of Anchorage neighborhoods. I encourage the board to settle this issue quickly to ensure the public has time to educate themselves ahead of 2022 election cycle. Voters need time to digest their new districts, precincts, and voting location, on top of learning ranked choice voting. Thank you for reading this testimony.
Date: March 30, 2022, 4:11 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Jorgensen

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99518

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Parings

Public Comment: I fully support the senate pairings put onto the record of my board member Bahnke at the November meeting. I support these pairings for the following reasons. First, it is imperative that the board adopt pairings that follow the guidelines set out by the constitution. Bahnke’s parings do just that. Second, as a lifelong Anchorage resident, these parings make geographic sense and keep neighborhoods together. When communities are kept intact, they are able to wield their collective voice in the political process.

I encourage the board to adopt these parings swiftly. Alaskans have been waiting long enough.
I write today to urge you to move quickly to adopt the Senate pairings posed by Member Bahnke in November of 2021. That map has been shown to be constitutional, which is important to avoid further lengthy litigation. It also just makes sense—my area of West Anchorage stays with West Anchorage districts, Muldoon with Muldoon, and Eagle River with Eagle River. After attending many of the sessions about the maps, I remember many individuals testifying about this. In other words, Member Bahnke’s map is constitutional and has the support of Anchorage communities. Again, I encourage you to take swift action on this decision by adopting Member Bahnke’s Senate pairings so that Alaskans can start the process of relearning their House and Senate districts before they participate in our upcoming elections. If you are able to do this, this board will have accomplished something not done in the last few cycles—giving Alaskans a map we can use for the entire decade. Thank you so much for your time.
Dear redistricting board,

My family and I live in Goldstream, which is a neighborhood in Fairbanks that you have tried to remove from the Fairbanks representation areas by creating a sprawling House District 36 covering various parts of rural Alaska. This is unfair and unjust, and the courts agree.

My kids go to school at Fairbanks area schools. My husband and I work in Fairbanks. We vote in local Fairbanks elections. We go to Fairbanks doctors. We drive on Fairbanks roads and shop in Fairbanks stores.

Your current plan to redistrict our Alaska House representation from a Fairbanks representative to someone representing a HUGE swath of rural Alaska does not make any logical sense. It is gerrymandering. We are Fairbanksans and should be represented in the state government by other Fairbanksans.

Please follow the Alaska Supreme Court’s order to redraw House District 36 so that Fairbanks residents in Goldstream, Murphy Dome, and Ester continue to be represented by other Fairbanks residents.

Best,
Kate Quick

Fairbanks, AK 99709
Date: March 31, 2022, 6:39 am

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Bronga

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Scenic foothills community council

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairings to fix gerrymandering

Public Comment: To correct the gerrymandering with senate districts I am asking that the board use the Senate pairings that Melanie Bahnke introduced in November. These pairings have been introduced to the public and received broad support. They are Constitutional and preserve two majority-minority districts in Anchorage. These pairings are respectful of Anchorage's communities rather than breaking them apart for partisan political purposes. Specifically, they keep Muldoon in East Anchorage together, they reconnect the North and South side of 4th Avenue downtown instead of separating downtown into 2 senate districts, they keep Turnagain and Spenard together, which has been requested by these communities, they keep Eagle River together, and they pair the two South Anchorage districts together as they were initially by consensus of the board before being split at the last minute.

Please redo the pairings quickly, without delay, so that we eliminate the confusion of having maps change mid-elections.
Date: March 31, 2022, 10:29 am

First Name: Jo Ann

Last Name: Gruber

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting - Senate Districts (Municipality of Anchorage)

Public Comment:

Dear Alaska Redistricting Board,

As you meet to ensure that you provide fair, equitable maps and senate pairings as directed by the court system, I would like to say Eagle River is a distinct, unique community. It should NOT be split into two different Senate districts for political gerrymandering purposes.

I live in Eagle River, and I expect fair representation. No more, no less. As a reasonable person, I do not expect more representation at the expense of others.

We have different land-use rules; and we currently maintain/manage our own roads and parks, too. Pairing a portion of Eagle River with South Muldoon made absolutely no sense.

I support the Senate pairings that were presented by Ms. Bahnke last fall. They were thoughtful, considerate, and fair to all communities within the Municipality of Anchorage.

Respectfully,

Jo Ann Gruber
Dear Redistricting Board Members,

Thanks for reopening public comments on Senate pairings following the Supreme Court decision. As we approach elections, I think it is in the public interest to finalize pairings consistent with the Court ruling so that voters can understand the legislative districts in which they’ll be voting in the upcoming state primary and general elections. Since Anchorage has an even number of House districts, and since the Supreme Court ruling effectively requires pairing the two Eagle River House seats into a Senate seat, the only remaining question is how to pair the remaining even number of Anchorage House seats. Fortunately, existing Board pairings in South Anchorage and West Anchorage neatly pair with proposed Bahnke pairings in East Anchorage and Downtown to complete the map. These pairings would be:

17+23 (Downtown, South Addition, Govt Hill, JBER)
14+13 (Midtown)
16+15 (West Anchorage)
18+19 (East Anchorage)
20+21 (East Anchorage)
11+12 (Abbott Loop/Lower Hillside)
9+10 (Ocean View/South Anchorage)

Conveniently, these pairings are the most logical in terms of compactness and socioeconomic integration of neighborhoods. These boundaries also respect underlying Constitutional guidance with respect to watersheds and natural features.

As someone who represents Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods in Anchorage, I certainly see how these pairings are the most logical for neighborhoods I represent.
Date: March 31, 2022, 12:44 pm

First Name: Brandon

Last Name: Calcaterra

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate seat pairings

Public Comment: I live in Eagle River and first want to state my support for Eagle River’s two House districts being unified in a Senate district as required by the recent Supreme Court ruling. Once the Eagle River House seats are paired, there is an even number of other House districts within Anchorage, so it is not difficult to pair these House districts into logical Senate districts. For example, the four East Anchorage House seats should break down into two Senate seats, and Downtown/Government Hill pairs into a Senate seat. This configuration leaves the other proposed Board pairings further south unchanged. Adopting this slightly revised map that fixes Eagle River and keeps East Anchorage seats together seems to meet Court requirements and would allow voters clarity on where they’ll be voting in elections that are coming up soon.
Date: March 31, 2022, 12:47 pm

First Name: Sergio F

Last Name: Acuna

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Hi, I live in Midtown near Lake Otis and Campbell Creek, and am writing to request that House Districts 13 and 14 be paired into a Midtown Senate district. This makes the most sense for our existing neighborhoods. It also makes sense to pair House Districts 18/19 and 20/21 into two East Anchorage Senate seats. These pairings would enable the Board to fix the Eagle River pairings as required by the Court, and maintain logical pairings in Anchorage.
As a voter from South Anchorage, I am writing to request that the Board adopt a synthesis of proposed Bahnke pairings and existing Senate pairings in South Anchorage. The two Eagle River House seats must be paired based on the Court ruling, and from there it makes sense to unify four East Anchorage House seats into two Senate seats. The Government Hill/JBER House seat then pairs with Downtown, leaving existing pairings in West and South Anchorage unchanged. This set of pairings keeps neighborhoods together to the maximum extent possible, and is the most compact arrangement. While compactness may not be required for Senate pairings, given the option of compact or non-compact pairings, all else being equal it is most fair to voters to establish compact and logical pairings so that people may easily understand their Senate as well as House districts.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: March 31, 2022, 12:56 pm

First Name: Wes

Last Name: Canfield

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Thank you for the opportunity to submit additional comments on Senate pairings. My family lives in South Anchorage and I would suggest that the Board make only modest changes to Anchorage pairings after linking the two Eagle River House seats into a Senate district. The Board has already proposed logical pairings for West Anchorage and South Anchorage, and these could be maintained by adopting Downtown, Government Hill, JBER, and East Anchorage pairings previously proposed by Board Member Melanie Bahnke.
Dear Redistricting Board,

As a resident of South Anchorage, I am writing to submit public comments on the revised Senate pairings. Thank you for accepting additional comment on this issue. It is important to get these boundaries resolved quickly, and I would suggest sticking with existing pairings proposed by the Board for South and West Anchorage. For Downtown/Government Hill and East Anchorage, using the pairings proposed by Board Member Bahnke would allow you to fix the Eagle River pairing as required by the Court and have logical pairings for the rest of the city.
The Bahnke map is fair and equitable. It should be adopted immediately to reduce voter confusion.
As a resident of Sand Lake, I'm writing to request that House Districts 15 and 16 continue to be paired in a West Anchorage Senate district. This makes far more sense than east-west pairings that would break up West Anchorage. While “socioeconomic integration” is more strictly required for House boundaries than Senate districts in the Constitution, keeping neighborhoods together in logical Senate districts is good for voters, and our West Anchorage neighborhoods clearly have more in common than other neighborhoods to the east.

Thank you,

Greta Wade
Date: April 1, 2022, 8:51 am

First Name: Sheri

Last Name: Whitethorn

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508-3323

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Please adopt the Senate pairings map recommended by Melanie Bahnke from 11/10/21

Public Comment: Please adopt the Senate pairings that Melanie Bahnke introduced in November, I believe the map is dated 11/10/2021. The public has seen these pairings and have broadly supported them, and they are Constitutionally sound. They keep many of Anchorage’s communities together in reasonable and responsible ways. More specifically, this set of pairings keep Muldoon together in East Anchorage, they keep downtown Anchorage together, they keep Spenard and Turnagain together, and they keep Eagle River together. These pairings make good sense all-around. Please adopt this replacement map quickly without any further delay so that any confusion is avoided in upcoming elections that are already starting to get geared up. Thank you for all your diligent work on this process.
Hello,

I am writing today to encourage the Board to act immediately to adopt Member Bahnke’s senate pairing map. The elections are coming up fast and it is important that voters find out what their senate districts are as soon as possible. Member Bahnke’s map is a fair map that provides a great option for one person-one vote as well as common sense socioeconomic and geographic pairings. A failure to act quickly is likely to lead to voter disenfranchisement and confusion.

Thank you for your prompt attention to this matter.

Leon Jaimes
Dear Redistricting Board and Staff:

Thank you for all your hard work updating Alaska’s maps. With the upcoming elections, I urge the Board to act immediately to address the Court’s requirements. This will minimize voter confusion that would result from a long drawn-out process.

It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election. The redistricting board has an obligation to the public to resolve this quickly to avoid voter confusion and disenfranchisement.

Here in Anchorage, the Board should adopt the Bahnke senate pairings, instead of trying to come up with new pairings. These pairings have already been presented and considered on the record, and were informed by public input and testimony.

These pairings do not change the underlying deviation of districts, and they do uphold the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc, Eagle River w/ Eagle River etc.). I commented in favor of these pairing for my own neighborhood in the last round of public testimony.

Thank you again for your attention and efforts on this important work.

Sincerely,

Ellen Jaimes
Anchorage AK 99508
First Name: **Paula**

Last Name: **Sayler**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99508**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting**

Public Comment: Please adopt the court’s recent requirements in an efficient and speedy manner. Adopt the Bahnke senate pairings. Keep senate pairings: Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc., Eagle River w/ Eagle River.

Thank you.
Date: April 1, 2022, 12:36 pm
First Name: Mary
Last Name: Burtness
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: [ redacted ]
Your ZIP Code: 99709
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Gerrymandering Eagle River
Public Comment: I believe East Anchorage does not fit in with Eagle River. They should be separate
Date: April 1, 2022, 1:36 pm

First Name: Dennis J

Last Name: Knebel Jr

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please take action quickly on this supreme court ruling. We the voters deserve a fair map this coming election cycle.
Date: April 1, 2022, 1:38 pm

First Name: Izzy

Last Name: Farris

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I am writing to request that the board act immediately to comply with the Court’s requirements and to minimize confusion if this process is dragged out.

- In Anchorage, the board should adopt the Bahnke senate pairings, instead of trying to come up with new pairings.

- Board must act immediately: It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election. The redistricting board has an obligation to the public to resolve this quickly to avoid voter confusion and disenfranchisement

- The pairings, proposed by Melanie Bahnke, have already been presented and considered on the record, and were informed by public input and testimony. These pairings do not change the underlying deviation of districts, and upholds the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings.

I live in Muldoon and we are very different from Eagle River. Our children don’t go to school in Eagle River. We don’t shop or play in Eagle River. We don’t go to the doctor in Eagle River. We are a diverse community, which is very different from Eagle River.

Thank you for considering my concerns.
Date: April 1, 2022, 4:43 pm

First Name: Brent

Last Name: Nichols

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Personal

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99701

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: With election season nearly six months away now, it is important that we have a finalized map that gives voters enough time to understand and candidates enough time to prepare for. While the map is not perfect and no doubt has characteristics which many would view as flawed, it is one of the fairest maps we've had in decades. It is also important to note that this map has already been upheld in court and has relatively fair house-senate pairings. Voters will also have to learn ranked choice voting in the ensuing months, and the more complicated and drawn out the redistricting process is, the less fair it is to voters. Please let this map be finalized as is so that we can move on and prepare for a first of its kind election. I applaud the redistricting board for their efforts so far and hope that Alaska can benefit from a more rational drawing of the map.
I am testifying from Anchorage about the Anchorage Senate pairings because I believe in fair maps, and honest work on behalf of ALL Alaskans no matter one’s political affiliations.

I support going back to the second to the last Senate Pairings, the pairings presented by Ms. Bahnke.

These pairings have already been considered on the record, have been presented and meticulously explained, point by point by point, how they comply with the law and are fair to every Alaskan, no matter their political affiliation.

The Bhanke pairings consider public testimony, don’t change the underlying deviation of districts, uphold the one person, one vote principle, and have created the most common sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon together, West Anc. together, and Eagle River together, etc.).

The Redistricting Board must act immediately to comply with the Court’s requirements make our maps legal, and to minimize time, costs, and the confusion that will result if this process is dragged out. It’s in the public interest to adopt legal maps with final senate pairings that check every box as outlined in law.

Voters need time to familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, BEFORE then have to learn about the new election system (RCV). On top of all that, we have a special election. The Redistricting Board has created a bit of a train wreck and they now need to right the train.

As public officials, the Redistricting Board has a sacred obligation to the public to resolve this quickly and fairly for every voter. No more delays, no more games, just abide by the law.

Thank you for your consideration.
VIA EMAIL ONLY

March 30, 2022
Alaska Redistricting Board
c/o: Peter Torkelson
Executive Director

RE: Testimony related to Supreme Court decision and process on remand

Dear Board:

I write today in my personal capacity to provide public testimony regarding the Alaska Redistricting Board’s mandate on remand.

On March 25, 2022 the Alaska Supreme Court issued an order largely affirming the process this Board went through, and its outcome. However, there was one notable exception—the Board’s decision, on a 3-2 vote, to adopt a pairing for Senate District K was flatly rejected as a “partisan political gerrymander” and rightly so.

I reside in Anchorage, however I am not a resident of any of the house districts directly impacted by this pairing. Nevertheless, as someone who monitored the redistricting process closely, it was clear that the process and outcome of the Anchorage senate pairings resulting in District K was unacceptable and degraded the public’s trust in the entire process.

I watched that process live. When the Board came out of executive session and adopted a brand-new senate map for Anchorage without any publication, notice, public comment, or meaningful discussion it debased the entire process. It looked like what it was—a brazen attempt to manipulate the process for partisan purposes. This outcome diminished the representation of several communities, including minority communities. However, I wish to note a stark exception to this criticism—the efforts of Board Members Melanie Bahnke and Nicole Borromeo who spoke up, with courage and conviction, against this manipulation.

I write now to implore the Board to avoid going down a similar road on remand. Do not try to once again manipulate the senate pairings for partisan purposes. Do not try to once again run roughshod over the concerns raised by Board Members Bahnke and Borromeo. As the Supreme Court has concluded, their original concerns were absolutely correct and the other three members of the Board were wrong.
The time for debate has passed and the Board should swiftly perform the ministerial task of adopting the only logical senate map that the public has seen—the map offered by Board Member Bahnke, that was wrongfully rejected by the three-member majority of the Board.

Ms. Bahnke’s map would leave most of the current Senate pairings in place, and would only impose the following changes, pairing:

- House District 17 with 23;
- District 18 with 19;
- District 20 with 21; and
- District 22 with 24.

Such a map should have consensus support and will not raise any other issues related to suppressing minority votes or partisan gerrymandering.

In closing, I wish to acknowledge that the vast majority of this Board’s work was done properly, publicly, and in service of all Alaskans. The Senate District K process was unfortunate and absolutely cannot be repeated. I thank the Board for their service and ask that they avoid further controversy by promptly adopting the Senate pairings originally offered by Board Member Bahnke.

The public’s trust in the constitutional process of redistricting has been shaken by the issues surrounding District K. Please restore that trust by closely adhering to the Supreme Court’s decision and adopting the Bahnke map.

Sincerely,

Scott Kendall
Attorney
(907) 222-7932 (main)
(907) 222-7938 (fax)
Dear Redistricting Board,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on revised State of Alaska senate district pairings as result of the Alaska Supreme Court decision (In the Matter of the 2021 Redistricting Cases, Order No. S-18332, Mar. 25, 2022). As noted in the decision, pairing the two Muldoon (east Anchorage) districts with Eagle River districts was a political gerrymander that violated Alaska’s equal protection clause. My comments focus on two specific areas: 1) the optimal way to address the Supreme Court concerns is to adopt the senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke; and 2) the Board should revise its senate district pairings in a timely manner.

In its decision, the Alaska Supreme Court determined that the Board’s Senate K pairing of house districts (Eagle River with Muldoon) constituted an unconstitutional political gerrymander violating equal protection under the Alaska Constitution. The obvious remedy is to pair the two Eagle River districts (HD22 and HD24) together in one senate district. But this will result in “orphaned” districts HD21 and HD23 which cannot be paired because they are not contiguous; this required adjustment could result in a cascade effect of adjusting multiple senate district pairings. The easiest fix is the adoption of the senate pairings proposed by Ms. Bahnke:

The Bahnke map addresses the issues underlying the unconstitutional gerrymander identified by the Alaska Supreme Court. They are common sense pairings that keep similar communities together. Not only does it pair the two Eagle River district together and the two Muldoon districts together, it keeps west Anchorage, midtown, and hillside together. These pairings have been presented to the public and the public has been provided the opportunity to comment (and comments have been received). These pairings enjoy strong support from Anchorage residents as shown by public comments to the Board during the redistricting in late 2021. These pairings are more legally defensible than what the Board has previously adopted.

The Board should make a decision on senate pairings quickly. The Alaska State Constitution requires that a final redistricting plan be identified within 90 days of receipt of census data. As result of the Board’s constitutionally-flawed process and decisions, final determination of districts has been delayed well beyond that 90-day deadline. It is in the public interest and would avoid confusion and voter disenfranchisement for a final map to be swiftly adopted. Additionally, the Board needs to heed the Alaska Supreme Court’s rationale and endeavor to produce a redistricting plan that will satisfy the Court’s requirements. The Bahnke map can be adopted within 5 minutes of convening – it has been subject to notice and comment, it is legally defensible, and it enjoys wide support.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

In closing, the “fix” for the Board’s unconstitutional gerrymander is clear. The Board should immediately adopt the senate pairings proposed by Ms. Bahnke upon completion of public testimony.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Michelle Turner
Anchorage, AK  99516
Date: April 1, 2022, 6:39 pm

First Name: Andrew

Last Name: Gray

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): SENATE PAIRINGS

Public Comment: I support the senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board Member Melanie Bahnke in November 2021:

9E with 11F
10E with 15H
16H with 14G
13G with 12F
17I with 23L
18I with 19J
20J with 21K

These combinations are logical. Please support Ms. Bahnke's pairings.
Date: April 1, 2022, 7:06 pm

First Name: John

Last Name: Blaine

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Pairings

Public Comment: The pairings recommended by Melanie Bahnke appear to be the most reasonable and I hope you will move ahead with approval of her recommendations. Thank you.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 1, 2022, 7:06 pm

First Name: John

Last Name: Blaine

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Pairings

Public Comment: The pairings recommended by Melanie Bahnke appear to be the most reasonable and I hope you will move ahead with approval of her recommendations. Thank you.
Date: April 1, 2022, 7:14 pm

First Name: Holly

Last Name: Hill

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke district pairings must be adopted

Public Comment: The court has ordered a new redistricting map. The pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke have already been presented and considered on the record. They are fair. Please adopt them expeditiously so that voters and candidates know what to expect by the next election.
I am asking that you please adopt the following senate pairings:

9 and 11 lower and upper hillside
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
12 and 21 Abbott Loop and south Muldoon
14 and 19 midtown and UMed
17 and 18 downtown and Mountain View
20 and 23 north Muldoon and JBER
15 and 16 same as what you have already decided.

Thank you for your consideration.
Date: April 1, 2022, 7:26 pm

First Name: John
Last Name: Duffy
Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99645

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke

Public Comment: The Board should act immediately to comply with the court's requirements and minimize confusion if this process is dragged out. It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations.

I respectfully request that the Redistricting Board adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board Member Melanie Bahnke which have already been presented and considered on the record and were informed by public input and testimony.

Thank you.

John Duffy
Date: April 1, 2022, 10:03 pm

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Garvey

Group Affiliation, if applicable: ACLU of Alaska

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I submit this comment on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Alaska, an organization dedicated to protecting the civil rights and individual liberties enshrined in the U.S. and Alaska Constitutions, including the right to vote and equal rights and protection under the law. The ACLU of Alaska additionally represented six amici in litigation over the Redistricting Board’s decision to pair Eagle River/Chugiak and East Anchorage/Muldoon house districts to create Senate Districts K and L.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 1, 2022, 11:40 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Pairings, final map

Public Comment: I urge the Board to adopt the Anchorage Senate pairings proposed by commissioner Bahnke, to replace the pairings rejected by the Supreme Court as unconstitutional. There is no reason to delay implementation of the Court's ruling.
Date: April 2, 2022, 8:06 am

First Name: **Sandy**

Last Name: **Blomfield**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99507**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Senate Redistricting**

Public Comment: I *sincerely request the State of Alaska Redistricting Committee to wait until after the spring elections prior to proceeding. There is a lot of change in the entire electoral process, the ranked choice voting being the largest change, followed by the special election to fill the congressional seat of the Honorable Don Young. Putting a hold onto the redistricting issue would benefit all Alaskans who want to have their voices heard but are frankly overwhelmed with the new procedures, voting choices and trying to ascertain how to cast their votes with the new “Ranked Choice” voting. Your delay regarding this matter would be truly appreciated. I hope you will consider this urgent request of the board. Sincerely, Sandy Blomfield, (born in the territory, 67 years in AK)**
Date: April 2, 2022, 9:36 am

First Name: Ann

Last Name: Rappoport

Group Affiliation, if applicable: not applicable

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Supreme/Superior Courts Remand Orders - it's time to adopt the proposed Bahnke district pairings!

Public Comment: I urge the Redistricting Board to act immediately to implement requirements in the Supreme Court's Remand Order. Voters need time to familiarize themselves with their potentially new districts, as well as the applicable candidates.

I also want to urge the Board to swiftly adopt the Senate district pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke for the remaining district areas that need to be revised in order to avoid gerrymandering, as the Courts have ruled. These pairings were both informed and overwhelmingly supported by public testimony when they were presented to the public as well as being considered on the record. Most importantly, these pairings uphold the requirements for geographic contiguity, socioeconomic similarity, and reasonableness, upholding our overall American institution of one person, one vote. Eagle River needs to be paired with Eagle River (i.e., pair House districts 22 and 24 in one Senate district); Muldoon needs to be paired with Muldoon (i.e., pair districts 20 and 21 into one Senate seat; pair districts 18 and 19 into one Senate seat); etc. These pairings unite neighborhoods into compact areas as they should. NOTE - we recently went through an extensive redistricting process for the Anchorage Assembly and similar issues arose where people tried to pair Eagle River with South Anchorage - public comments proved that illogical and fortunately that attempt was overruled. We need similar common sense to prevail here!

For South Anchorage, house districts 9 and 11 should be paired as these Hillside areas share concerns around limited and rural road service areas, septic systems, private wells, geographic limitations (steep slopes) for development and drainage issues.
Date: April 2, 2022, 9:43 am

First Name: Jan Carolyn

Last Name: Hardy

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: The 2021 Board Proclamation for Anchorage was ratified on November 10, 2021. There has been a public hearing publicly presented with public input and testimony. This Board has the opportunity to be the first Redistricting Board in over 20 years to have a map that is viable for a full 10 years.

The Board did a good job with the overall house map and senate pairings in Southeast, Rural, Interior, and MatSu. Further delays would result in some candidates running three elections in a row. We have seen the chaos that creates both for the candidates and the voters. Some voters did not exercise the franchise because they did not know in which district they resided. This is unfair to the candidates and the voter.

We have a new system of voting: Rank Choice Voting. To complicate the matter further we will have special election to replace him. This is unprecedented. The voter needs time to reorient themselves to their new senate and house district. If questions surrounding our new Anchorage Municipality have not been resolved immediately the result could be voter disenfranchisement and failure of the system to protect one voter, one vote.

The Alaska Supreme Court has upheld the unconstitutional political gerrymander of Senate Seat K (Eagle River/East Anchorage) and remanded the pairing back to the Alaska Redistricting Board. Please act swiftly to adopt a map with final senate pairings. There is no time to waste.
Date: April 2, 2022, 9:52 am

First Name: **Sherri**

Last Name: **Jackson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99502**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting**

Public Comment: **Please adopt the following Anchorage Senate pairings. Two options are listed and either of these would work and make the most sense because they put together communities that share socioeconomic similarities so I ask you pick one of the two pairings below. We also ask the Redistricting Board to take their time. This decision is too important to make this decision so quickly. People need time to process and testify. **

(Anchorage is also in the middle of an important assembly seat and we ask that you at least wait until after that election next week).

9 and 22 lower hillside and Eagle River
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
11 and 12 same as you have now
14 and 19 midtown and UMed
15 and 16 same as you have now
17 and 18 downtown and Mountain View
20 and 21 north and south Muldoon
23 and 24 JBER and Chugiak

or these combos

9 and 11 lower and upper hillside
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
12 and 21 Abbott Loop and south Muldoon
14 and 19 midtown and UMed
17 and 18 downtown and Mountain View
20 and 23 north Muldoon and JBER
15 and 16 same as what you have already decided.
Date: April 2, 2022, 10:16 am

First Name: **Elizabeth**

Last Name: **Barry**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99517**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Court Remand Orders--Adopt the Bahnke District Pairings**

Public Comment: The Redistricting Board needs to act immediately to implement requirements in the Supreme Court’s Remand Order. Voters need time to familiarize themselves with their potentially new districts, as well as the applicable candidates.

I urge the Board to swiftly adopt the Senate district pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke for the remaining district areas that must be revised to avoid gerrymandering, as the Courts have ruled. These pairings were both informed and overwhelmingly supported by public testimony when they were presented to the public as well as being considered on the record. Crucially, these pairings uphold the requirements for geographic contiguity, socioeconomic similarity, and reasonableness, upholding our Constitutional mandates of one person, one vote. Eagle River needs to be paired with Eagle River (i.e., pair House districts 22 and 24 in one Senate district); Muldoon needs to be paired with Muldoon (i.e., pair districts 20 and 21 into one Senate seat; pair districts 18 and 19 into one Senate seat); etc. These pairings unite neighborhoods into compact areas as they should. The Anchorage Assembly recently went through an extensive redistricting process and similar issues arose where people tried to pair Eagle River with South Anchorage. Public comments proved that illogical and fortunately that attempt was overruled. We need similar common sense to prevail here.

Districts 23 and 17 should be paired to place Government Hill, Downtown, Fairview, and JBER in the same district. For populations, the Board had to divide Downtown into two districts; pairing these districts will ensure they are at least in the same Senate District. Government Hill is one of the oldest neighborhoods in Anchorage and has longstanding ties to the other historic neighborhoods in District 17. Service members from JBER regularly frequent businesses and services in Downtown.

The Spenard district (District 14) should be paired with the Turnagain district (District 16). Spenard and Turnagain are two very closely linked neighborhoods and residents often describe the whole area as "Spenard-Turnagain".
To the 2021 Alaska Redistricting Board:

Hello, My name is Mary E. Fenno, I live at 1630 Goldridge Dr. in the Goldstream Valley, and I have lived at this address since 1983. I have been an Alaskan since 1975. My children went to Fairbanks schools, I receive my mail through a post office in Fairbanks, and I live approximately ten miles from the city of Fairbanks.

I believe that my neighborhood in District 36 was deliberately gerrymandered to break up the Democratic vote in our district which SHOULD INCLUDE neighborhoods in our area. This totally violates the directions the redistricting board are to follow as stated in Section 6.6, District Boundaries, and I quote:

“Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area.”

My neighborhood and others in the Goldstream Valley have been taken out of our district and put with a very rural area, far from the Fairbanks area where we work and live.

To give those who are not familiar with District 36 as this redistricting board constructed it, the western border of district 36 includes Holy Cross and other communities others along the Yukon River, to the north Arctic Village, the western border is the Canadian border including Chicken and, and the southern border ripples around the McCarthy, Gulkana area and finally doglegs around Cantwell. Then the border goes north and includes Delta, Ft. Greely, and then goes around the Fairbanks districts, except for excluding part of the Goldstream Valley, and then heads south again to Nenana and Anderson.

I respectfully ask that the redistricting board change the border that deliberately slices our section of Goldstream Valley out of the Fairbanks districts and put us back in the district where we belong with our socio-economic area!

Also, I would also point out that, sadly, gerrymandering is always a part of the redistricting in our state, and this year’s maps reveal the usual decennial debacle of manipulation that, once again, promotes political partisanship. I believe this is because the Alaska Constitution is misinterpreted. It states in, Section 6.8 Redistricting Board, it’s plan for redistricting board members:

“Appointments shall be made without regard to political affiliation..."
The governor shall appoint two members of the board. The presiding officer of the senate, the presiding officer of the house of representatives, and the chief justice of the supreme court shall each appoint one member of the board.”

I believe that these words are misconstrued by politicians. I DON'T believe Alaska’s founders meant to give any administration and/or legislature the power to stack the redistricting board with their party members. The founders did not want five people who are appointed by politicians with regard, that is, with favor, to their political affiliation. I believe they wanted all Alaskans to be represented in this process.

Thank you for reading and listening to my testimony.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Fenno

Fairbanks, Alaska 99709
Date: April 2, 2022, 10:38 am

First Name: Andy

Last Name: Durny

Group Affiliation, if applicable: None

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99701

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redrawing Senate District K

Public Comment: Please adopt Senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke rather than coming up with new pairings. These pairings proposed by Ms. Bahnke are fair, logical, and sensible.
Date: April 2, 2022, 10:47 am

First Name: Beth

Last Name: Farnstrom

Email or Phone Contact: [Contact information redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Public Comment: I respectfully request one of the 2 following options for redistricting.

We want true representation of all and these 2 options consider the likeness of the citizens of the communities being represented. These communities usually have similar values, socioeconomic likeness, wants and desires.

Your decision needs to be what is best for Anchorage and Alaska not your personal bias. I ask you to please pick one of the 2 pairings below. Your decision should include as much public comment as possible since your decision impacts us for the next 10 years.

I strongly support one of the following redistricting plans.

9 and 22 lower hillside and Eagle River
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
11 and 12 same as now
14 and 19 midtown and U med
15 and 16 same as now
17 and 18 downtown and Mt view
20 and 21 north and south Muldoon
23 and 24 JBER and Chugiak

Or

9 and lower and upper hillside
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
12 and 21 Abbott loop and south Muldoon
14 and 19 midtown and Umed
17 and 18 downtown and mt view
20 and 23 north Muldoon and JBER
15 and 16 same as you have decided

Thank you for the opportunity to share my personal views on what is being decided.

Sincerely,

Beth Farnstrom
Dear Board,

Please waste no time in adopting the Bahnke plan and pairings as is because it followed all the precepts of fair and equitable means: the principle of one person to one vote.

It provides people the time to acquaint themselves with what may be their shifted district before very important voting opportunities. If allowed to drag on there would likely be further disenfranchisement of voters.

Thank you,

Anne Marie Moylan
To the Alaska Redistricting Board,

As you revisit unconstitutional district lines of House District 36, please take this opportunity to rectify the mistake of excluding the Goldstream area of the Fairbanks North Star Borough from a Fairbanks area House district.

Goldstream is entirely socioeconomically associated with Fairbanks, and it plainly defies compactness to associate an area dependent on, and integrated with, Fairbanks with communities hundreds of miles away instead.

My children attend school in a Fairbanks North Star Borough School District School, I work in Fairbanks, and have served on an FNSB commission. In the current foolhardy proposal for our house district alignment, I would have to travel through a couple Fairbanks House districts to visit other communities with whom we would be politically associated.

Take this opportunity to right a wrong and keep our community and House district whole.

Thank you,

John Perreault
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 2, 2022, 11:45 am

First Name: Jennifer
Last Name: Avila
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please adopt the following Anchorage Senate pairings. Two options are listed and either of these would work and make the most sense because they put together communities that share socioeconomic similarities so I ask you pick one of the two pairings below. We also ask the Redistricting Board to take their time. This decision is too important to make this decision so quickly. People need time to process and testify.

(Anchorage is also in the middle of an important assembly seat and we ask that you at least wait until after that election next week).

9 and 22 lower hillside and Eagle River
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
11 and 12 same as you have now
14 and 19 midtown and UMed
15 and 16 same as you have now
17 and 18 downtown and Mountain View
20 and 21 north and south Muldoon
23 and 24 JBER and Chugiak

or these combos
9 and 11 lower and upper hillside
10 and 13 Klatt and Taku
12 and 21 Abbott Loop and south Muldoon
14 and 19 midtown and UMed
17 and 18 downtown and Mountain View
20 and 23 north Muldoon and JBER
15 and 16 same as what you have already decided.
Date: April 2, 2022, 12:12 pm

First Name: Carolyn

Last Name: Clift

Group Affiliation, if applicable: na

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K

Public Comment: When I ran for Senate in 2020, I had to drive through two other House Districts to get from my home, in East Anchorage, to the southern part of the Senate District. I registered my complaint with the Board. Now, with the unconstitutional House pairing of Senate K, I would have to, again, drive through at least one other House District to get to the eastern (Eagle River) part of K. It would make sense for the two Muldoon districts to be paired together, and the two Eagle River districts to be paired together. I have heard that there are socioeconomic links to Eagle River, but there are no retail stores or restaurants in South Muldoon that do not already exist in Eagle River.
April 1, 2022

Alaska Redistricting Board
PO Box 240147
Anchorage, AK 99524

RE: Narrow Scope of Remand Authority to Correct Senate District K Pairings
Our File No.: 508532.2

Dear members of the Alaska Redistricting Board:

The purpose of this letter is to provide support and validation to the Alaska Redistricting Board as it explains to the public the Board’s limited discretion on remand as compared to the initial redistricting process. Unlike the initial redistricting process, the work of the Board is strictly limited to correcting the constitutional infirmities in House District 38 and Senate District K. Thus, while East Anchorage Plaintiffs genuinely appreciate the Board’s inclusion of substantial public testimony and multiple public hearings on remand, they fully acknowledge that the Board cannot reopen all Anchorage senate or house districts without directly violating the court order and the Alaska Constitution. Similarly, East Anchorage Plaintiffs also recognize that the Board must move quickly and that while public testimony is important, the scope of the remand order does not afford the Board weeks to cure an error that took only a day to make, especially where this delay impacts the upcoming election.

While East Anchorage Plaintiffs have advocated zealously for public participation in the redistricting process and continue to emphasize the importance of the public’s notice of and right to attend Board remand proceedings, the Board’s duty this Saturday is to act quickly, efficiently, and narrowly to correct the minimal errors identified by the court. East Anchorage Plaintiffs are hoping that this letter validates the Board’s narrow scope at the upcoming hearing and serves to remind the public that the Board does not have the authority to review the senate districts in Anchorage as a whole or more broadly reexamine house districts in addressing the “Cantwell Appendage,” even if presented with public testimony supporting such action. Instead, the Board must act within the narrow confines of the remand order or face further legal consequences.

Similarly, in addition to the limitations on the Board’s consideration on remand under the court order and the Alaska Constitution, East Anchorage Plaintiffs recognize that the ethical obligations of the Board, and the consequences that arise from the intentional violation of a court order or even undue delay in complying with such an order also inform the Board’s narrow and swift corrective action.
East Anchorage Plaintiffs have provided a more in-depth examination of the legal constraints facing the Board, to further explain the differences in process between this narrowly tailored hearing and the initial November 8, 2021 hearing on senate pairings.

The Board’s actions on remand are limited to the language of the court orders. The Alaska Supreme Court upheld the Board’s actions and proclamations regarding every senate district and every house district but for Senate District K and House District 38. In so doing, the Alaska Supreme Court expressly recognized the limited scope of its ruling and remand, asserting with precision that:

The superior court determined that Senate District K was unconstitutional on the grounds of equal protection, due process, and violating the public hearings requirement... We note that the superior court did not rule that the underlying house districts were unconstitutional and that no party asserts that the underlying house districts are unconstitutional. The superior court’s determination relates solely to the senate pairing of house districts. We AFFIRM the superior court’s determination that the Board’s Senate K pairing of house districts constituted an unconstitutional political gerrymander violating equal protection under the Alaska Constitution, and we therefore AFFIRM the superior court’s remand to the Board to correct the constitutional error. ¹

Similarly, in its Order Following Remand from the Alaska Supreme Court issued on March 30, 2022, the Superior Court remanded to:

1) Correct the Constitutional errors identified by this Court and the Supreme court in Senate District K; … and

3) To make other revisions to the proclamation plan resulting or related to these changes. ²

In its remand, the Superior Court was also careful to retain jurisdiction over the proceeding so that it could address any concerns on remand quickly.

In light of the limited scope of the remand by both the Alaska Supreme Court and the Alaska Superior Court, the only senate pairings that may be disrupted are those that will be paired and unpaired to correct the equal protection clause violation in Senate District K.

In conducting the remand, any decision to disturb a lawful and promulgated district must be weighed against the constitutional requirement that districts be adopted in the manner and within the time periods identified in the Alaska Constitution and Alaska Statute. In other words, any effort by the Board to throw open the senate districts in Anchorage or beyond for a “redo”

¹ In the matter of the 2021 Redistricting Cases, Supreme Court No. S-18322, Order Dated 3/25/22 at 5-6.
² Order Following Remand from the Alaska Supreme Court, March 30, 2022.
would be blatantly unlawful and would effectively result in a failure by the Board to comply with time constraints imposed by the Constitution.

Accordingly, the only correction that appears to preserve the Board’s adopted pairings while correcting the unconstitutional Senate District K is as follows:

**Senate District E (Marcum)**
House District 9: South Anchorage/Turnagain Arm/Whittier
House District 10: Oceanview/Klatt

**Senate District F (Marcum)**
House District 11: Lower Hillside
House District 12: Far North Bicentennial Park

**Senate District G (Marcum)**
House District 13: Campbell
House District 14: Spenard

**Senate District H (Marcum)**
House District 15: Sand Lake/Campbell Lake
House District 16: Anchorage Airport

**Senate District I (Bahnke)**
House District 17: Downtown Anchorage
House District 23: Government Hill/JBER/Northeast Anchorage

**Senate District J (Bahnke)**
House District 18: Mountainview/Airport Heights
House District 19: U-Med

**Senate District K (Bahnke)**
House District 20: North Muldoon
House District 21: South Muldoon

**Senate District L (Bahnke)**
House District 22: Eagle River Valley
House District 24: North Eagle River/Chugiak

While East Anchorage Plaintiffs recognized the value of pairings proposed by others at the initial November 8, 2021 hearing, the court order and the proclamation process simply do not authorize the Board to take action beyond the action mandated by the court.

Finally, East Anchorage Plaintiffs commend the Board for not only adopting a predominately fair and effective proclamation plan, but for acting quickly and lawfully to make the
small corrections to that plan identified by the court. Each of the Board members should be extremely proud of this accomplishment and the great service they have provided all Alaskans.

Sincerely,

BIRCH HORTON BITTNER & CHEROT

Holly C. Wells
Mara E. Michaletz
Zoe A. Danner
I urge the Redistricting Board to act immediately to comply with the Supreme Court's Remand Order. Voters need time to familiarize themselves with their new districts, as well as the candidates for office representing their districts.

I also urge the Board to adopt the Senate district pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke for the districts that need to be revised to correct the improper gerrymandering. The Bahnke pairings are supported by previous public testimony and information of record. Most importantly, these pairings uphold the requirements for geographic contiguity, socioeconomic similarity, and reasonableness, upholding our overall American institution of one person, one vote. These pairings unite neighborhoods into compact areas as they should (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc., Eagle River w/ Eagle River etc.).
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 2, 2022, 12:49 pm

First Name: Camilla

Last Name: Dalton

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): MOA redistricting

Public Comment: I ask the Board to comply with the Court's requirements. There will only be confusion and more confusion if this process is allowed to drag out. In my opinion, the Board should adopt the Bahnke senate pairings, instead of trying to come up with new pairings. It is in the public interest to adopt a map with final senate pairings ASAP!! so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, besides an unprecedented special election.

PLEASE just Adopt the Bahnke pairings NOW. They have already been presented and considered and informed by public input and testimony. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings. Thank you
Dear Members of the Re-Districting Board:

I am writing on behalf of our board, staff, volunteers, and supporters of Alaska Community Action on Toxics, a statewide public interest non-profit environmental health and justice organization. We also work to ensure voter rights and uphold democratic principles. We appreciate the opportunity to provide comments on the critical issue of re-districting and write to ensure that voting districts are representative, fair, and equitable for all Alaskans. Thank you for your careful deliberations. The redistricting board must be responsible to the public by resolving this expeditiously to prevent voter disenfranchisement and confusion.

Given the urgency of this issue, we respectfully request that the Alaska Re-Districting Board immediately fulfil the Court’s requirements. We assert that it is necessary and in the public interest to prevent further confusion by expeditiously adopting a map with final Senate pairings. This is necessary to provide voters with timely understanding of their new districts, precincts, and voting locations. This is especially important and timely given the new ranked choice voting election system and complications of the upcoming and unprecedented special election.

We further recommend that the Board should adopt the Bahnke Senate pairings in Anchorage rather than attempting to create new pairings. These pairings were informed by public input and testimony and uphold the “one person, one vote principle.” In addition, they provide common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Pamela Miller
Executive Director
Date: April 2, 2022, 1:23 pm

First Name: Camilla

Last Name: Hussein-Scott

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River Senate Pairing

Public Comment: Good afternoon,

I have called Eagle River my hometown for over 15 years; I own my home and have raised my three children, who attended local public schools in this community. I have always enjoyed living in Eagle River and cannot imagine living somewhere else.

My concern is splitting Eagle River districts apart and pairing one community with a part of Anchorage that is so very different demographically and geographically from the CER community. The Public and the courts have recognized the gerrymandering nature and deemed it dishonest and unethical.

Please do the right thing and embrace the Senate pairings that Ms. Melanie Bahnke introduced in November. These pairings have been introduced to the Public and are supported by the majority of both communities. The pairings are respectful to both communities and stay clear of breaking communities apart for partisan political gain.

Ms. Bahnke’s recommendations keep Eagle River together instead of separating the town.

I am kindly asking the Board to redo the pairings without delay so that we can eliminate the confusion of having a change in maps during the mid-election season, or at least at the onset of special elections. We don’t want to discourage voters from voting on a technicality that you can fix.

Respectfully,

Camilla Hussein-Scott
Eagle River
Date: April 2, 2022, 1:24 pm

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Jones

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99709

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): District 36-R

Public Comment: Do not understand why the Murphy Dome area and Goldstream area are no longer part of the Fairbanks area. We are an Alaska "suburb" of Fairbanks. That is the closest commercial district to us. While we are all Alaskans, we are more like Fairbanks than the rural areas we have been placed with in the new redistricting map. Please put us back with Fairbanks as before.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 2, 2022, 1:46 pm

First Name: Bonnie

Last Name: Bladow

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Melanie Bahnke Senate Pairings

Public Comment: Please act swiftly to comply with the court's requirements and adopt the redistricting senate pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke. These pairings are the result of prior public input and testimony and make the most sense for the Municipality of Anchorage. Furthermore, they do not change the underlying deviation of districts and uphold the one person, one vote principle. I believe that the current map disenfranchises minority votes from the South Muldoon by combining portions of this area with Eagle River. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
Date: April 2, 2022, 1:54 pm

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Geddes

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage pairings

Public Comment: I am an Anchorage resident and homeowner who has lived in Alaska since 1984. I vote in every election. I wish to express my support for the Senate pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke. Her proposal reflected public input and the pairings are the most sensible reflection of geographical and socioeconomic criteria.

Sincerely,

Mary Geddes
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 2, 2022, 2:28 pm

First Name: Yarrow
Last Name: Silvers
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99504
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): District K

Public Comment: It's not too late to place the Alaskan people and one person/one vote principles above partisan maneuvering.

Please redo the senate pairings without delay so that Alaskans can vote using a fully constitutional map for the full ten years, thus avoiding the confusion and disenfranchisement that a constantly changing map creates. Considering how past maps have changed over several elections, this would be an amazing accomplishment for the board and something to be proud of.

I want to advocate for the adoption of the pairings that Melanie Bahnke put forward during the redistricting process, as necessary to fix the constitutional errors. These pairings have been introduced to the public and enjoyed broad support because of the way they respect communities instead of breaking them apart for political partisan purposes.

Specifically, the 4 pairings of interest keep Eagle River as one community, Muldoon as one community, connect the Umed/Airport Heights area and reconnect the North and South sides of 4th Avenue downtown.

Please develop a system for truncation that is transparent and random. The actions of this board around truncation - voting down a random coin toss while stating that board members didn't know incumbent information, when at least two members looked at and discussed this information, on camera, before this series of votes - broke public trust, even amongst those that don't have a full understanding of truncation.

Also breaking trust was the actions taken around the South Anchorage pairing, which initially enjoyed board consensus, but was then inexplicably split apart at the last minute with no discussion or reasoning.

It seems likely that someone looked at political data over the weekend and decided that the new pairing gave a partisan advantage while splitting this community apart. These were egregious actions, and I ask that in fixing the errors, you follow our Alaska State Constitution, which does not allow for politically based mapping. These are people that you silenced with your actions, not tools in a partisan toolbox.

The public and the courts have seen and recognized the gerrymander and the truncation fix, both carried out dishonestly and unethically, still it is not too late to do the right thing and embrace the positive accomplishments of this board, while rejecting the actions taken that were unconstitutional and of questionable ethic.
Date: April 2, 2022, 5:00 pm

First Name: Diane

Last Name: Herrmann

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99709

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): District 36 and Goldstream Valley, Fairbanks

Public Comment: I urge you to reconsider the inclusion of Goldstream Valley in District 36, a rural district. Goldstream Valley residents are members of the Fairbanks community: they work, go to school, and shop in Fairbanks, similar to those who live in Ester, off Farmers Loop, or much of Chena Hot Springs Road. In looking at the map for 35R and 36R, the west side of Fairbanks has been carved up and divided among those districts as well as 34Q. This does not follow the constitutional rule that calls for “relatively integrated socioeconomic area.” Please fix this.
Hi good afternoon again,
My name is Alyssa Quintyne from Fairbanks. I'm not able to call in today, but did want to email in my thoughts to this board.

I've mentioned in previous emails the cultural and community nuances of Interior Alaska, as it is everywhere, is imperative to how we vote. I explained that even though Farmer's Loop and Eielson AFB are in the same borough and only 10 minutes away from each other, that those communities are drastically different and have drastically different needs and impacts, and that to ask an elected leader to represent both of those communities would become competitive and harmful to both those communities and to the representative. I explained that this current 2021 map felt obviously politically motivated and gentrified, and how this broke my trust in this process that will impact me for the next decade. I and several other organizers worked hard to rally our friends and neighbors to engage in this process, and it is not clear how, or even if our feedback was taken seriously. None of the changes we advocated for are reflected on your website. I don't see how putting College road, Downtown, and all of South Cushman - the historic and current Black and Native neighbors, our military families, and the area with the highest and most diverse population density in the entire Borough into the 2 smallest districts in the Interior is fair or constitutional. I don't see how putting Farmer's Loop with Eielson AFB is fair and constitutional. I don't see removing the Goldstream and Ester communities from our broader communities to somehow represent Rural Alaskans is fair and constitutional. None of this is clear to me.

What is clear is this;
It is clear that this board has no regard for how this will impact communities, just money and politics. It's clear that our Fairbanks member has succeeded in representing their fantasy community that fits their socio-political and financial needs, but has failed to represent the actual needs and thoughts of their community. It is clear that there is no room for Black, Brown, Indigenous, Disabled, LGBTQ, Military, Migrant, or young voters to truly have a say or have any meaningful representation in this process and in our own government. This map proves it, and this Boards' comments have proved it.

I am happy this board is working so hard to achieve their personal goals, but now, I and so many other people will have to work to undo the harm and confusion and frustration and inequities this Board will cause us. You sit there and argue and banter and crunch numbers, I have to be out there on the streets, neighborhood to neighborhood, explaining to this entire borough how to vote again and why this Board chose the way they did. Our fights and worlds are different. You all had a chance to understand that, you asked people to engage, and our words fell on closed ears. I sincerely hope you at least take that into consideration for future endeavors.

~ Alyssa
It is best to put Eagle River with Eagle River in one Senate district and North Muldoon with South Muldoon in one senate district. All other districts need to be paired in the same configuration as before. The AK Supreme Court addressed the Eagle River with Eagle River and Muldoon with Muldoon. Residents have spoken and East Anchorage should remain intact.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 8:09 am

First Name: Amy

Last Name: Woodward

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Corrupt Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard Please slow the process down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 8:10 am

First Name: Jamie

Last Name: Allard

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan.

Public Comment: Don't adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals.
Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 8:28 am

First Name: Tiffany

Last Name: Quirk

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is flawed and clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard. Please slow the process down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 8:38 am

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Allard

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke plan

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard. Please slow the process down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 8:39 am

First Name: James

Last Name: Wojciehowski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke redistricting

Public Comment: Please do not support this redistricting move. It's not fair or balanced
Date: April 4, 2022, 8:47 am

First Name: Joyce
Last Name: Wojciehowski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke pairing

Public Comment: I feel that this is an unfair and unbalanced redistricting. I urge you to vote against it.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 8:48 am

First Name: Tammy

Last Name: Smith

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): DO NOT ADOPT THE BAHNKE PLAN

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of East Anchorage we as a community deserve to be heard. Please slow the process down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 8:53 am

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Welsh

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99654

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan Map

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:01 am

First Name: Kristen

Last Name: Bush

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke plan

Public Comment: I am total disagreement with this Bahnke plan, the people of these communities deserve to have ample time for public input. Adopting these boundaries is an intentional political maneuver designed to isolate and de-power the people of Eagle River-Chugiak.

Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 9:10 am

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Woodward

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Partisan Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Please do not adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard Please slow the process down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 9:14 am

First Name: Florence
Last Name: Preston

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99654

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): DONT ADOBT THE Bahnke PLAN

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:18 am

First Name: Trina
Last Name: Johnson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99509

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): DO NOT ADOPT BAHNKE PLAN

Public Comment: The public has a right to participate in this redistricting and pushing this through without that process and the time needed is not fair. More time to inform more people about this is needed.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:22 am

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Cross

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan/Redistricting

Public Comment: Do not approve this without greater public participation. It currently appears that only those with a specific agenda have been part of the decision making process. The desires of a few should not outweigh the rights of the many.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:24 am

First Name: Brandon

Last Name: Welsh

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99654

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 9:26 am

First Name: Jeremy

Last Name: Tompkins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
First Name: **Dustin**  
Last Name: **Sherman**  
Group Affiliation, if applicable:  
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]  
Your ZIP Code: **99507**  
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Do not adopt the Bahnke plan.**  
Public Comment: **Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan.** The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down. If things aren't equal you are not listening to your constituents.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 9:32 am

First Name: Curtis
Last Name: Randle

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:38 am

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Keiffer

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: The Bahnke plan should not be adopted. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan and in its current form is politically unbalanced, politically unfair, and does not accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. The Board should reevaluate the timeframe and incorporate enough time and public input to produce a plan that reflects a nonpartisan effort that incorporates the constituents wants (not political party wants) of the communities involved. When rushing a political process driven by board members political beliefs, instead of the community’s wants, produces a sloppy product such as the Bahnke plan. In order to provide a fair and just plan the process should slow its tempo so community involvement can be used in the development of a plan. By rushing the process you are denying our rights as citizens to govern our government. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River our community deserves to be heard and our comments incorporated into the plan.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:41 am

First Name: Meredyth

Last Name: Richards

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 9:52 am

First Name: Brittany

Last Name: Tompkins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): District map

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
First Name: **Dawn**

Last Name: **Merryfield**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Map district**

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard Please slow the process down.
First Name: Stephen
Last Name: Romanelli
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don't adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard Please slow the process down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 10:29 am

First Name: Roxana

Last Name: Castaneda

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Please DO NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Rushing the redistricts is partisan and does not allow actual representation of the people of Anchorage and Alaska.
Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 10:41 am
First Name: Dan
Last Name: Zipy

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99511

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): House District 36 or Senate District K

Public Comment: Do not pass as this district needs more time to process. Let the people of Eagle River have more say to elaborate on issue.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 10:53 am

First Name: Stephanie
Last Name: Williams

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan.

Public Comment: Do NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan.
Date: April 4, 2022, 10:54 am

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Ruedrich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFER

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern: Proposed Anchorage Senate Pairing

Public Comment: Time for another look at the Anchorage Map. In November 2021 I testified that HD 22 could be paired with HD 20, HD 21 and HD 9. These are the contiguous districts that satisfy the Alaska Constitutional requirement for senate district pairing. Let’s explore the third option HD 9.

Three 2021 Map Senate Districts are acceptable as paired: District F: HD 11 & 12, the Anchorage Lower Hillside; District H: HD 15 & 16, Western Anchorage and District L: HD 23 & HD 24, Northern Muni Districts.

Senate District E pairs HD 9 & HD 22 which are the Muni uplands. Road service areas and snow management are common upland issues. 2001 Map combined major parts of this senate district in a single House District. Higher price single family homes are typical throughout District E.

Senate District G pairs HD 10 & HD 13 lie mostly west of Seward Highway. More than 75% of this proposed district is in District L today. Medium-priced single-family homes are present throughout proposed senate District G. The Dimond Blvd shopping and recreation is the focus of District G.

Senate District I pairs HD 14 & HD 17 in the center of Anchorage. Mid-town and Downtown share more multi-unit housing. Significant shopping in D 14 is used by D 17 residents.

District I covers the historical residential development of Anchorage. Redevelopment has been featured recently.

Senate District J pairs HD 18 & HD 19 in East Anchorage. The district boundary between 18 & 19 splits these similar neighborhoods. Each district has significant health care facilities.

Senate District K pairs HD 20 & D 21 in Muldoon/Baxter. This area is closely tied to JBER for jobs and off base housing. The commercial activities along Muldoon Road serve the entire Senate District.
Date: April 4, 2022, 11:00 am

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Williams

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan.

Public Comment: Do NOT adopt the Bahnke Plan.
Date: April 4, 2022, 11:18 am

First Name: Nick

Last Name: Arnold

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Do NOT adopt the Bahnke plan

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation.

This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 12:08 pm

First Name: La quen nay Elizabeth

Last Name: Medicine Crow

Group Affiliation, if applicable: First Alaskans Institute

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Adopt Bahnke Senate Pairings

Public Comment: Sangay 'laa uhlaang, the day is getting good! I write to submit my comments on behalf of First Alaskans Institute to encourage the Redistricting Board to quickly and without delay follow the Alaska Supreme Court Ruling and adopt the Bahnke Senate Pairings which have already been vetted by this Board and the Public. Complying with the court order is essential for letting Alaskans know that you understand your duty to not violate equal protections any further by delaying this process. There is no reason to not comply immediately with the court order and immediately adopt the Bahhnke Senate Pairings. Gunalchesh, Híw’aa for your time.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
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Date: April 4, 2022, 12:50 pm

First Name: Robyn

Last Name: DiLorenzo

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard. Please slow the process down.
Date: April 4, 2022, 1:45 pm

First Name: Joe

Last Name: Wright

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K

Public Comment: The Bahnke plan is partisan and should not be adopted. Please take the time to review all the options to meet the conditions outlined by the courts and develop a map that represents all including Eagle River.
Date: April 4, 2022, 1:54 pm

First Name: Terri

Last Name: Gagne

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke plan

Public Comment: Needs more time for discussion and public comments
Date: April 4, 2022, 2:07 pm

First Name: Ronnie

Last Name: Clark

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Ronnie Clark

Public Comment: Here is a sample note... reword it to match your style and send to the email below:

Please end the partisan gerrymander that is linking Downtown Anchorage and Government Hill to a senate district that primarily represents Chugiak, Eagle River, and Eklutna. This is unfair and will cause our neighborhood to be unrepresented. We have to drive through three house districts to connect with another populated section of our district at the far edge of Muldoon and then 25 miles to the next population in our district. Those people have distinctly different values and ways of living. The only fair pairing is House District 23 to House District 17.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD  
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 2:08 pm

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Saddler

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River Senate district pairing

Public Comment: I encourage the Redistricting Board to adopt a revised district map that links House District 9 (South Anchorage) with House District 22 (Eagle River Valley). These districts share common characteristics justifying their inclusion in the same Senate District K:

- Each district encompasses many residents living on the foothills and upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains. As a result, one of the most significant common issues residents in these districts face is access to their homes, and their connections to the rest of Anchorage.

- While much of the rest of Anchorage relies on municipal and state road maintenance, residents of these two districts rely to a great extent on Local Road Service Boards to provide for maintenance of their roads, including snow removal, graveling and repair.

- Residents in each district face the challenge of managing the risks inherent in living along the urban-wildland fire interface, planning for and responding to wildlife incursions and hazards, less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, and other common issues.

- The recent snow avalanche that has isolated District 22 residents in the Hiland Road area is a dynamic that is familiar to residents of District 9, who have themselves experienced the hazards of snowslides, traffic halts, and risk to property and personal safety.

- It should go without saying that these two districts are socio-economically integrated by virtue each being fully within the Municipality of Anchorage. They are also contiguous, being joined in the uplands of the Chugach Mountains a standard that has already been found valid in earlier district maps that linked an Eagle River Valley House district across the Chugach Mountains to an adjoining House district to the south.
Date: April 4, 2022, 2:34 pm

First Name: Bob

Last Name: Griffin

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: As a longtime former Eagle River resident I’m asking to not adopt the Bahnke plan. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 2:30 pm

First Name: Robert

Last Name: French

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Gerrymandering of Downtown and Government Hill

Public Comment: I urge you to revise the currently planned Senate district boundaries that combine Downtown and Government Hill with Chugiak, Eagle River and Eklutna. The currently planned boundaries are an egregious example of partisan gerrymandering, and does not comply with the Alaska Constitutional guidelines of "compactness and contiguity", and "socioeconomic integration".

People in Downtown and Government Hill would have to drive through 3 different house districts before we would connect to the east Muldoon portion of the proposed district, and then drive another 20 or more miles to Chugiak, Eagle River and Eklutna! That is neither compact nor contiguous. Residents cannot drive or even walk through JBER to get to the rest of the district.

People in Downtown and Government Hill have drastically different properties, values and lifestyles, and have no socioeconomic factors in common.

I urge you to pair House District 23 to House District 17, as the only pairing that would meet the Constitutional Guidelines.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 2:38 pm

First Name: Margaret
Last Name: Hughes

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting hearing

Public Comment: Downtown / Government Hill/ JBER areas of Anchorage should not be included in the same district as Chugiak, Eagle River and Eklutna. This method is including very urban neighborhoods with much more rural areas. The mind frame and priorities of people in these areas are vastly different and those three communities’ populations vastly outnumber the areas in Anchorage. These Anchorage neighborhoods will not receive proper representation and is akin to partisan gerrymandering. Please consider pairing House District 23 to House District 17.
Please DO NOT ADOPT THE BAHNKE PLAN The Board should take its time to carefully consider the future impact on the affected citizens! The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. Redistricting should be balanced, fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process should be fair to all; not just a small group of partisan individuals.

Voting for the current Municipal election is tomorrow! To expedite this process, so quickly, shows a clear disregard for the opinions of the majority of the citizens that will be impacted! Expedited Redistricting plans are totally inappropriate and contrary to good public policy! The process should be informed by thorough public comment, input and discussion!
Date: April 4, 2022, 3:18 pm

First Name: jason

Last Name: alward

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): redistricting

Public Comment: As a resident of hillside I oppose a Senate pairing with Eagle River. We are different communities with our own respective issues and such a pairing makes little sense. We would be better paired with lower hillside or another South Anchorage district. I hope that you will take this testimony into consideration and not pair hillside and Eagle River. Thank you, Jason Alward
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 3:25 pm

First Name: Hans

Last Name: Thompson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting issues

Public Comment: Please end the partisan gerrymander that is linking Downtown Anchorage and Government Hill to a senate district that primarily represents Chugiak, Eagle River, and Eklutna. This is unfair and will cause this neighborhood to be unrepresented. They have to drive through three house districts to connect with another populated section of our district at the far edge of Muldoon and then 25 miles to the next population in our district. Those people have distinctly different values and ways of living. The only fair pairing is House District 23 to House District 17.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 3:48 pm

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Nelson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke pairings against

Public Comment: I am against Bahnke pairings as proposed by Melanie Bahnke, Scott Kendall, Sen Tom Begich.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 3:54 pm

First Name: Brooklynn

Last Name: Clinton

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Republican

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 4:16 pm

First Name: Belinda-Jane

Last Name: MacIntire

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Government Hill Community Council Member

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): currently planned Senate District Boundaries

Public Comment: I urge you to please revise the currently planned Senate district boundaries that combine Downtown and Government Hill with Chugiak, Eagle River and Eklutna. The currently planned boundaries are an example of partisan gerrymandering, and does not comply with the Alaska Constitutional guidelines of "compactness and contiguity", and "socioeconomic integration".

People in Downtown and Government Hill would have to drive 20 or more miles to Chugiak, Eagle River and Eklutna! That is neither compact nor contiguous. Residents cannot drive or even walk through JBER to get to the rest of the district.

People in Downtown and Government Hill have drastically different properties, values and lifestyles, and have no socioeconomic factors in common.

I urge you to please pair House District 23 to House District 17, as the only pairing that would meet the Constitutional Guidelines.

Thank you so much for doing the right thing.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 4:44 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Collins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Pairings Revision

Public Comment: Please adopt the Senate District revision map introduced by Member Borromeo on April 4, 2022, ‘2022 Proposed Revision: Bahnke v1.’ It represents an excellent solution to correcting the gerrymander that was challenged and found to be unconstitutional. Thank you.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 4:48 pm

First Name: Christopher
Last Name: Wright

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Please do not adopt the Bahnke Plan. This partisan plan should not be adopted and citizens should be heard through public comment.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 6:26 pm

First Name: Jeffrey

Last Name: Schroeder

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I'm not interested in having a district that joins two separate areas like Eagle River and downtown or Girdwood. Eagle River residents deserve to be represented by their neighbors, not someone from the other side of the municipality.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 6:42 pm

First Name: George

Last Name: Snodgrass

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Eaglexit

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River

Public Comment: Eaglexit is completing its petition to the Local Boundary Commission to detach Assembly District 2 from the Anchorage Muni. A new borough will be created from AD2 for the communities of JBER, Eagle River, Chugiak, Birchwood and Eklutna. Districts 23 & 24 should be comprise the new Chugach Regional Borough. District 22 should stay in the Anchorage muni.
Date: April 4, 2022, 6:44 pm

First Name: Jesse

Last Name: Venable

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99708

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): gerrymandering

Public Comment: We live in the Goldstream hills and do not like being placed in a rural district. We are suburban Fairbanks and demographically and politically we should be in the same district as UAF. We are being gerrymandered!
Please see the attached proposal for senate pairings.

Thank you,
Yarrow Silvers

MAXIMUM PRESERVATION PROPOSAL

Yarrow Silvers, George Martinez, and Felisa Wilson (the “East Anchorage Plaintiffs”) hereby reiterate the proposed senate pairings included in their April 2, 2022 written testimony and officially present those pairings as an alternate proposal for senate pairing corrections. This proposal is designed to preserve the Anchorage senate districts adopted in the Proclamation Plan to the maximum extent possible, only substituting revised senate pairings when necessary to correct unconstitutional Senate District K. The intent of this “Maximum Preservation Proposal” is to ensure efficient and tailored correction of the court-identified error without inadvertently or intentionally making new ones, or unnecessarily delaying the Board’s court-directed duties on remand.

Like the preliminary corrections adopted by the Board for consideration on April 4, 2022, this “Maximum Preservation Proposal” also advocates for the adoption of senate districts proposed by Board member Bahnke. However, unlike the Board’s preliminary corrections, this proposal maximizes preservation of the Anchorage senate districts adopted by the Board, only substituting Anchorage senate districts proposed by Board member Bahnke in four out of the eight Anchorage senate districts and only when necessary to correct the unconstitutional pairing of House Districts 21 (S. Muldoon) and 22 (Eagle River Valley). East Anchorage Plaintiffs identified the four districts requiring revision by unpairing Senate District K and pairing its house districts with contiguous districts resulting in the least amount of disruption to other promulgated and constitutional senate districts. East Anchorage Plaintiffs substituted Board member Bahnke’s pairings into its proposal as these were the only pairings presented during the initial redistricting hearings that were clearly presented, lawful, and enjoyed substantial support by Board member and public testimony. During the November 8 hearing, four out of five of the Board members raised no objections to these pairings. Indeed, even Board Chair Binkley acknowledged during that hearing that Board member Bahnke’s proposed pairings were legally justified. Board members Borromeo and Bahnke vehemently supported the Bahnke pairings and provided constitutional and rational bases in support of these pairings.

For all of these reasons, and in an effort to narrowly and fully comply with the court order and to preserve the constitutionally promulgated senate districts to the maximum degree possible, East Anchorage Plaintiffs propose the following combinations of connected and preserved Anchorage senate districts:
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

**Senate District E (Board Adopted: Marcum Proposed)**
House District 9: South Anchorage/Turnagain Arm/Whittier
House District 10: Oceanview/Klatt

**Senate District F (Board Adopted: Marcum Proposed)**
House District 11: Lower Hillside
House District 12: Far North Bicentennial Park

**Senate District G (Board Adopted: Marcum Proposed)**
House District 13: Campbell
House District 14: Spenard

**Senate District H (Board Adopted: Marcum Proposed)**
House District 15: Sand Lake/Campbell Lake
House District 16: Anchorage Airport

**Senate District I (Bahnke Proposed)**
House District 17: Downtown Anchorage
House District 23: Government Hill/JBER/Northeast Anchorage

**Senate District J (Bahnke Proposed)**
House District 18: Mountainview/Airport Heights
House District 19: U-Med

**Senate District K (Bahnke Proposed)**
House District 20: North Muldoon
House District 21: South Muldoon

**Senate District L (Bahnke Proposed)**
House District 22: Eagle River Valley
House District 24: North Eagle River/Chugiak

These proposed corrections preserve all promulgated senate pairings that were not challenged in the Application to Correct Error process or rejected by the court, except where revisions are necessary to correct the unconstitutional Senate District K. This includes both the direct pairing of House District 21 and House District 22 as well as pairings resulting from the creation of that district. The corrections proposed in this “Maximum Preservation Proposal” align with public testimony for the revised districts. To the extent the Maximum Preservation Proposal deviates from public testimony supporting the adoption of all of Board member Bahnke’s proposed senate pairings and not just her proposal for Senate Districts I-L, it does so.
only to the extent necessary to preserve the senate districts adopted by the Board in the Proclamation Plan.

East Anchorage Plaintiffs fully acknowledge that Board member Bahnke presented senate pairings that serve the interests and needs of affected voters. Again, this Maximum Preservation Proposal is submitted based upon the limited scope of the court’s order and is by no means intended to undermine the Bahnke Anchorage senate district pairings as a whole.
Date: April 4, 2022, 6:52 pm
First Name: Marcy
Last Name: Tompkins
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99516
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): DON'T ADOPT BAHNKE PLAN!

Public Comment: Please Don't adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.

Thank you for your time and assistance!

Dixie Banner

Anchorage and Eagle River are two different locations and cultures! Allowing a selected few to decide where the lines drawn is totally wrong! Poor management decisions is why succession of ER is a must!
Date: April 4, 2022, 7:22 pm

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Keys

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99708-1087

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): House District 36

Public Comment: I live in the Goldstream Valley. Your decision to remove the Goldstream Valley from Fairbanks and call it a rural district is gerrymandering, and does not meet the constitutional requirement that a house district be compact, contiguous, and socio-economically integrated. The Goldstream Valley should not be included in House District 36. It should be with Fairbanks.
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down. Thank you.

Public Comment: Please follow the list No and post in favor of 9/22 and 23/24 maps that include these changes and no to the Bahnke map. 9/22 and 23/24 maps that include these changes and no to the Bahnke map.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 4, 2022, 8:08 pm

First Name: Keith's

Last Name: Manternach

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
From: Randy Ruedrich <rgrundeg@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, April 4, 2022 7:34 PM
Subject: AFFER Anchorage Senate District pairings.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:18 pm

First Name: Judy

Last Name: Eledge

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K

Public Comment: I encourage the Redistricting Board to adopt a revised district map that links House District 9 (South Anchorage) with House District 22 (Eagle River Valley). These districts share common characteristics justifying their inclusion in the same Senate District K:

Each district encompasses many residents living on the foothills and upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains, and as such, one of the most significant common issues residents in these districts face is access to their homes, and their connections to the rest of Anchorage.

While much of the rest of Anchorage relies on municipal and state road maintenance, residents of these two districts rely to a great extent on Local Road Service Boards to provide for maintenance of their roads, including snow removal, graveling and repair.

Residents in each district face the challenge of managing the risks inherent in living along the urban-wildland fire interface, planning for and responding to wildlife incursions and hazards, less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, and other common issues.

The recent snow avalanche that has isolated District 22 residents in the Hiland Road area is a dynamic that is familiar to residents of District 9, who have themselves experienced the hazards of snowslides, traffic halts, and risk to property and personal safety.

It should go without saying that these two districts are socio-economically integrated by virtue each being fully within the Municipality of Anchorage. They are also contiguous, being joined in the uplands of the Chugach Mountains a standard that has already been found valid in earlier district maps that linked an Eagle River Valley House district across the Chugach Mountains to an adjoining House district to the south.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:22 pm

First Name: Randy

Last Name: Eledge

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K

Public Comment: I encourage the Redistricting Board to adopt a revised district map that links House District 9 (South Anchorage) with House District 22 (Eagle River Valley). These districts share common characteristics justifying their inclusion in the same Senate District K:

Each district encompasses many residents living on the foothills and upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains, and as such, one of the most significant common issues residents in these districts face is access to their homes, and their connections to the rest of Anchorage.

While much of the rest of Anchorage relies on municipal and state road maintenance, residents of these two districts rely to a great extent on Local Road Service Boards to provide for maintenance of their roads, including snow removal, graveling and repair.

Residents in each district face the challenge of managing the risks inherent in living along the urban-wildland fire interface, planning for and responding to wildlife incursions and hazards, less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, and other common issues.

The recent snow avalanche that has isolated District 22 residents in the Hiland Road area is a dynamic that is familiar to residents of District 9, who have themselves experienced the hazards of snowslides, traffic halts, and risk to property and personal safety.

It should go without saying that these two districts are socio-economically integrated by virtue each being fully within the Municipality of Anchorage. They are also contiguous, being joined in the uplands of the Chugach Mountains, a standard that has already been found valid in earlier district maps that linked an Eagle River Valley House district across the Chugach Mountains to an adjoining House district to the south.
Date: April 4, 2022, 9:42 pm

First Name: **William.** Last Name: **Sola**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99501**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Senate redistricting**

Public Comment: Please end the partisan gerrymandering proposal that is attempting to link a small amount of Downtown Anchorage, and all of Government Hill to a senate district that primarily represents Chugiak, Eagle River, and Eklutna. This is unfair and will cause our neighborhood to be misrepresented, or vastly underrepresented.

Government Hill is much like South Addition, Fairview, Mountain View and even Muldoon; a quasi-urban area with a lifestyle and accessibility that are directly linked with each of these areas.

Under the current ill-advised proposal, we would have to drive through three other house districts to connect with another populated section of our district at the far edge of Muldoon and then 25 miles to the next population in our district. The people of the northern side of Eagle River, Chugiak, Eklutna and beyond have distinctly different lifestyles and resource wants and needs. Several times in the past they have actually tried to secede from the Municipality of Anchorage.

Government Hill is moments away from the very epicenter of downtown Anchorage, while the “far north neighborhoods” are as far away as possible, there are very little true commonalities between us and them, with regards to issues such as planning and zoning, infrastructure, and even typical residential lot sizes.

Government Hill and Downtown each share an enormous amount of frontage with the industrial zone: heavy commercial, railroad yard, port of Alaska, and oil tank district that basically split us apart. Still, we face similar issues when dealing with that area, while the “northern neighborhoods” virtually have no interest in what goes on in the downtown area.

To put us in the same group with Chugiak, et. al., would make Government Hill nearly voiceless and not involved with any issues that would affect the Hill and its proximity, while the proposed northern communities would have no interest in our concerns. Likewise, we would have little in common with them.

Please support the fair pairing is House District 23 to House District 17.

Regards, Will Sola
Date: April 4, 2022, 10:33 pm

First Name: Matthew

Last Name: Barth

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Map

Public Comment: I humbly request the board reject “2022 Proposed Revision: Bahnke v1” The Alaska Supreme Court affirmed the vast majority of the map submitted by the commission, and as such, the board should attempt to retain as much of the current map as possible. The Court clearly outlined three issues the redistricting committee should address. These issues are limited to Senate District K and House District 36. The Bahnke map goes way beyond the scope of the problems presented by the courts and adoption of Bahnke would undermine the countless hours of prior public input, due diligence, and due process. The board should attempt to resolve the three issues brought forward by the Courts with minimal impact. Additionally, focusing solely on the problems presented by the Court will limit further legal challenges and delays.

In essence, the public has thoroughly vetted the current map and the board should do what is minimally required by the courts to protect the public process respectfully.

Sincerely,

Matt Barth
Date: April 4, 2022, 11:38 pm

First Name: Diamond

Last Name: Metzner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99654

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Maps make Anchorage too blue, backed by democrats

Public Comment: Our redistricting process should be fair and the lines drawn equally to benefit neither party. The new lines and comments are a partisan chop shop to benefit Democrats.
Date: April 5, 2022, 12:39 am

First Name: **Heather**

Last Name: **Clopton**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99516**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Don't Adopt Bahnke plan**

Public Comment: *Don't adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.*
Date: April 5, 2022, 7:10 am

First Name: Vera

Last Name: Crews

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: My name is Vera Crews. I live at 2201 Romig place, Anchorage AK 99503. I encourage the Redistricting Board to adopt a revised district map that links House District 9 (South Anchorage) with House District 22 (Eagle River Valley). These districts share common characteristics justifying their inclusion in the same Senate District K:

Each district encompasses many residents living on the foothills and upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains, and as such, one of the most significant common issues residents in these districts face is access to their homes, and their connections to the rest of Anchorage.

While much of the rest of Anchorage relies on municipal and state road maintenance, residents of these two districts rely to a great extent on Local Road Service Boards to provide for maintenance of their roads, including snow removal, graveling and repair.

Residents in each district face the challenge of managing the risks inherent in living along the urban-wildland fire interface, planning for and responding to wildlife incursions and hazards, less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, and other common issues.

The recent snow avalanche that has isolated District 22 residents in the Hiland Road area is a dynamic that is familiar to residents of District 9, who have themselves experienced the hazards of snowslides, traffic halts, and risk to property and personal safety.

It should go without saying that the two districts are socio-economically integrated by virtue each being fully within the Municipality of Anchorage. They are also contiguous, being joined in the uplands of the Chugach Mountains a standard that has already been found valid in earlier district maps that linked an Eagle River Valley House district across the Chugach Mountains to an adjoining House district to the south.
Date: April 5, 2022, 7:33 am

First Name: Carleta

Last Name: Schroeder

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairings in Eagle River

Public Comment: I have been a resident of Eagle River for over 10 years. I am very much AGAINST any Senate pairing that puts my house with downtown Anchorage instead of with my community and neighbors. Our home is immediately across the street from the other House seat which I consider my community. I want to be represented by someone who represents the issues of my community. Eagle River should be paired with Eagle River. Thank you.
Date: April 5, 2022, 7:34 am

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Norris

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate K and Cantwell

Public Comment: I write in support of the "Cantwell Fix" that aligns with the borough boundaries for the MatSu and Denali Boroughs. I also write in support of "Banhnke V1" for the Anchorage Senate Districts.

I also humble offer the following for future consideration, partially as a fix for the issues surrounding Valdez/MatSu and Juneau-Skagway. Though I will not go into detail here, there is sound reasoning behind it and considers the four Hickel Process criteria as well as issues like Alaska Native representation. Thank you.

https://districtr.org/plan/122886
Date: April 5, 2022, 7:51 am

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Carhart

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99623

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): How does one fight Gerrymandering.

Public Comment: The redistricting committee was so biased in their approach to limit the voice of the conservative limited government rule. From day one in this process, we had to fight every single proposal, every map, every judge ruling, and now with only a couple weeks the entire makeup of all districts. I don't agree with any part of this.
Date: April 5, 2022, 8:31 am

First Name: Rodney

Last Name: George

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard. Please slow the process down.
Date: April 5, 2022, 8:34 am

First Name: reid

Last Name: bahnson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Proposed map by AFFER putting Girdwood and southern Eagle River in the same district is an obvious attempt by the Republican party to dilute the influence of non-republican voters in Girdwood.

Public Comment: The pairing of Girdwood and Eagle River in a single voting district is absurd.

Disparity in voting records and demographics between the two distinct communities are patently obvious. If there were ever a blatant case of attempted gerrymandering this potential pairing proposed by the former head of the Alaskan Republican party is it.
The Alaska Supreme Court ruled that Senate District K (House 21 & 22) be revisited.

The proposed AFFER map pairs House District 22 and 9, creating Senate District E for east Anchorage and neighboring uplands. These districts share local service areas and snow management. The 2001 map combined major parts of the senate district in a single House District.

Making this change impacted four other Anchorage senate districts to make this action possible. Three Anchorage senate districts are unchanged. The proposed Bahnke map simply revises the entire Anchorage map, which the Alaska Supreme Court opinion did not call for. It appears that the Bahnke simply takes advantage of a court-opening as an excuse to redraw the boundaries Anchorage-wide, which was neither ordered nor requested.

The proposed AFFER Senate District K (combining House 22 and 9) are contiguous, economically similar districts which meet Alaska Constitutional requirements for Senate District parings/

Please approve the AFFER map. Thank you.

AG
John A (Alex) Gimarc
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 5, 2022, 9:26 am

First Name: Winthrop

Last Name: Faulkner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): New district pairings

Public Comment: I live in West Anchorage and oppose the new Bahnke map which redraws all Anchorage pairings. The court ruled on just several pairing that are unfair - lets work on those and try not to impact ALL the others. If we are going to start the process entirely over each judges decision, we may never get through the process and will face endless court challenges. JUST FIX THE PROBLEM the court asked. House District 9 (South Anchorage) and House District 22 (Eagle River) have a lot in common. Pair those two.
Date: April 5, 2022, 9:35 am

First Name: Brett

Last Name: Watson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Use High Schools for Anchorage Senate Pairing

Public Comment: I would urge the board to adopt a KIS (Keep It Simple) principal in Anchorage Senate pairings, and generally follow the High School boundaries. High school boundaries are how many folks think of neighborhoods in the city. In ascending order: pairing 9 & 11; then 10 & 15 would align with South High. 12 & 13 paired would roughly align with Service HS. 14 & 16 paired; then 17 & 23 paired would align with West HS. 18 & 19 paired would align with East HS. 20 & 21 paired would align with Bartlett HS. Pairing 22 & 24 would capture ER and Chugiak HS students.
Date: April 5, 2022, 10:34 am

First Name: Randall

Last Name: Hagenstein

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 2022 proposed revision Bahnke V1

Public Comment: This looks like a sensible and defensible pairing. I fully support Bahnke v1
Date: April 5, 2022, 10:52 am

First Name: Alyce

Last Name: Hanley

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support of AFFER proposed Senate Map

Public Comment: The court ruling that District K should be re-visited does not justify changes to all 8 senate districts. As a long time resident of District 15, I support The AFFER Senate map which preserves the pairing of Districts 15 and 16.
Date: April 5, 2022, 10:58 am

First Name: Joelle

Last Name: Hall

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairings

Public Comment: I am listening to the public comment being given on April 5, 2022 and want to make some observations about the characterizations of previous ER pairings with Anchorage. In previous decades ER did not have enough populations to justify having a single senate seat. As a result of the 2020 census ER now has enough population to have their own seat. I live in this Senate seat and can see no justification to pair my house (24) with 23 (Muldoon JBER Govt Hill) when I can be paired with 22 the other half of my community ER/Chugiak. There is NO reason to break apart ER. We have sufficient population to merit our own seat, we are contiguous, shop at the same stores and go the same schools. Observations about previous decades pairings are moot in 2022 based on the fact that our community has enough population and does not need to pull from Anchorage or the Valley to make a whole senate seat. What is the opposition to pairing ER with ER? Any justifications to break up my community are unjustified.
Eagle River should not be split into two Senate Seats. It's inconsistent and done purely to advantage the political power of that largely conservative community. You wouldn't consider giving Juneau two senate seats and this is just as ridiculous. Be consistent. Make good and fair decisions.

As I understand it there is only one plan for Senate pairings on the table for public comment at the moment, the Behnke plan. I'll support that.

Pat Race
Juneau, AK
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 5, 2022, 12:24 pm

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: McClear

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate paring for Eagle River (House 24 and 22)

Public Comment: I live in the Eagle River valley. My Senator should represent both the town center that I am closest to, House District 22 and the residential district I live in, House District 24. Eagle River Police and Fire services, Eagle River access to the Glenn Highway, and Eagle River/Chugiak parks are all much more relevant to my life than the services and parks of House District 9.

My community deserves representation based around my neighborhood, not to be paired with a community an hour away by car. Please pair House Districts 24 and 22.
Date: April 5, 2022, 2:35 pm

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Phillips

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting Girdwood

Public Comment: I am writing today to oppose any Senate pairings that pair Girdwood with Eagle River. I am in support of the November 2021 proposed Senate pairings that keep Girdwood with South Anchorage.

I have lived in Girdwood for 27 years and drive the Seward Highway everyday. I do my shopping in South Anchorage. I have enjoyed South Anchorage representation at the local level and the state level.

Girdwood and Eagle River are very different communities and I would have to drive all the way through Anchorage just to get there. That makes no sense.

I urge the board to choose a plan that keeps Girdwood with South Anchorage, like the November 2021 pairings put on the record by Member Bahnke.
Date: April 5, 2022, 2:44 pm

First Name: **steve**

Last Name: **gerlek**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99501**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I *do not support redistricting Downtown Anchorage and Government Hill into a senate district that primarily represents the rural communities of Chugiak, Eagle River, and Eklutna. The effect of this will be to suppress the voice of many Alaskan families that live in our states urban core. The only fair pairing is House District 23 to House District 17.*
Date: April 5, 2022, 3:08 pm

First Name: Stephanie

Last Name: A Kesler

Group Affiliation, if applicable: None

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Government Hill House District gerrymandered to Eagle River

Public Comment: Please end the mind blowing gerrymander that links Downtown Anchorage and Government Hill to a senate district that primarily represents Chugiak, Eagle River, and Eklutna. It is a blatant attempt at diluting Government Hill and Downtown and results under-representation of our issues and concerns. We have to drive through three house districts to connect with another populated section of our district at the far edge of Muldoon and then 25 miles to the next population in our district - which is absolutely ridiculous and unconstitutional. Clearly, the obvious fair and constitutional pairing is House District 23 to House District 17.
Date: April 5, 2022, 4:22 pm

First Name: William

Last Name: Nye

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I support the Bahnke plan. Please adopt it. There is no relation between Chugiak/ER and Girdwood. It takes over an hour to drive between them and the communities are radically different.
Date: April 5, 2022, 4:52 pm

First Name: **Patrick**

Last Name: **Klump**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99503**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Democrat favorable map**

Public Comment: **Must read Alaska recently published an article stating democrats are coming droves to try to push through a democrat favorable map. I am sending this email in opposition. I believe the people of Anchorage need to have have free, fair, and equal elections. I support a map that gives favorability to no party. We should have equal representations.**
Date: April 5, 2022, 5:51 pm

First Name: Jody

Last Name: Sola

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Government Hill Community Council, president

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Please support the Bahnke redistricting map

Public Comment: First, thank you for your service, to our state and itâ€™s residents. I know you have given a tremendous amount of time, not only in meetings, but in “homework” as well. Know, also, that it does not go unnoticed.

Your job is not an easy one, however, balancing the districts by sheer numbers alone does not give any of us “fair representation.”

I am representing the Board of Directors from Government Hill. We are, respectively, asking you to support Melissa Bahnke’s proposed changes to the redistricting map as it is the only one that makes sense for our residents. The South Chugiak area is rural Alaskan in distance, lifestyles, and values, and does not represent Government Hill, JBER, or downtown Anchorage. Please consider pairing house district 23 with 17.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak up, and thank you for your consideration.
Date: April 5, 2022, 6:10 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Collins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Testimony of or input from Randy Ruedrich

Public Comment: I am opposed to the Board considering any input or testimony from Randy Ruedrich. He has violated the Ethics Act in Alaska for having committed abuses of office. He also advocated for the Senate District K pairing that was found to be gerrymandering, and therefore unconstitutional. For this reason, I believe the Board should disregard his testimony and any advice he has to offer regarding maps for any District other than his own. Thank you.
Dat: April 5, 2022, 6:37 pm
First Name: Teri
Last Name: Lembeck
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99508
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting
Public Comment: V1
Good Morning. My name is Craig Campbell. I am a 40 year resident of Eagle River. Today I want to provide testimony concerning Alaska redistricting and offer a suggested plan for the Anchorage area that preserves the unified senate district of Eagle River and Chugiak and creates equitable Senate seats for ethical representation.

I strongly recommend the redistricting board consider another approach, one that is based on the very values of fair elections and not one that is reconfiguring districts in favor of a political party, incumbents, or potential candidates. To that end I offer this proposal to create justifiable Senate seats that require no population adjustments. Specifically, I recommend:

-- Districts 22 and 24 (Eagle River and Chugiak) remain combined. This pairing aligns two very similar areas within a single Senate seat, and area that share common socio-economic and cultural characteristics.

-- Districts 20 and 23 (JBER and North Muldoon) should be combined as they represent an integrated community located both on-base and immediately adjacent to the military installation.

-- Districts 18 and 19 (Mountain View and Airport Heights) have similar housing patterns and are comprised of close-knit family units, also sharing a similar characteristic as the JBER and North Muldoon area. Neighbors work,
shop, go to school, and share recreational activities in this area, making it a well aligned district.

-- Districts 15 and 16 (Sand Lake and Airport), should remain combined as is the original plan. This should not be changed.

-- Districts 14 and 17 (Downtown and Midtown). These two areas are heavily business and commercial oriented which allows a single Senate seat to fairly represent the interest of all voters. While the housing stock is varied through the two areas, the characteristics of businesses and neighborhoods is very similar.

-- District 10 and 13 (Bayshore and Taku). This district was deemed satisfactory by the court and should not be changed.

-- Districts 11 and 12 (O’Mally and Abbott Loop). This district also need not be adjusted.

-- Districts 9 and 21 (South Hillside and South Muldoon). These two areas have been paired for the most current election cycles, in what is now known as Senate seat N and is considered a legal combination. To create this pairing, a minor change must be made swapping an area with no population, which is currently assigned to House District 22, and putting that area into House District 9. To reiterate, no population is affected.

Your task is daunting. You have received a lot of testimony from those who are demanding that you pass a partisan plan that is not characteristic of fair and equitable representation. I do not believe that in politics, “The Loudest Voice Should Rule The Day. Rather, your job is to provide balance and fairness in determining the election districts for Alaska that will be law for the next decade. I ask that you move forward with a fair and equitable plan that serves the best interest of all Alaskans.

Thank you for your time this morning.
For the record, I support Option #2 pairing Districts 20 and 21 in order to keep Muldoon intact and bring the neighborhoods into a single united district. I spent years living in East Anchorage with my family near my mom who has lived in East Anchorage (Glencaren Court) since 1992. I value the socioeconomic diversity of the community; they deserve to elect a Senator that represents their united community. In addition, Mountain View, Russian Jack, Reflection Lake, and Chester Valley must be in the same district and allowed to elect a Senator that represents this unique diverse community; I support pairing Districts 18 and 19. The proximity of JBER, downtown, Fairview, and Government Hill should be paired based on proximity and shared areas; personnel living on JBER frequent downtown businesses and always have; I support pairing Districts 17 and 23.

Thank you,

Melissa Mayer
99517
Date: April 5, 2022, 8:20 pm

First Name: Lois

Last Name: Epstein

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River Senate districts

Public Comment: Thank you for taking public comments at this time (my comment is dated April 5, 2022). I am out of state and unable to make this comment orally.

Following the Anchorage public hearing on October 4, 2021 where I testified, I was speaking with Cliff Groh when Senator Lora Reinbold of Eagle River approached us. I introduced myself and Senator Reinbold said she liked parts of my testimony. I then asked Senator Reinbold about whether she wanted the Eagle River house districts to be paired together which I assumed she did and she strongly agreed. I am recounting this conversation which Cliff Groh heard as well because of its potential importance for the Alaska Redistricting Board's decision this week regarding the pairing of house districts. Given that Eagle River's current Senator wants the two Eagle River house districts to be combined, please do so. It is a commonsense outcome and any other approach would be an unacceptable political gerrymander. Thank you.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 5, 2022, 8:41 pm

First Name: Terry
Last Name: Drake

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Don’t adopt the Bahnke plan. The Board should take its time and do it right. The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn’t allow proper public participation. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. Eagle River should be heard, as a community they deserve for the process to be slowed down.
To: Alaska Redistricting Board
From: Gary Newman, Fairbanks
Date: April 5, 2022
Re: Response to Superior Court Remand of 2021 Proclamation following the Supreme Court’s ruling.

I have participated for many months observing the activities of the Redistricting Board in creating a redistricting plan for Alaska for the next decade. It has been challenging and time consuming. Technology has made this process much more transparent and overwhelming at the same time. Not receiving the census results in a timely fashion added to the challenge. I thank the board members and staff for their time and diligence.

The rulings of the Supreme Court seemed pretty clear.

1. Put Cantwell back in the Denali Borough.
2. Address the gerrymandered pairing of Eagle River with two separate Senate seats, including one with Muldoon.

Cantwell

I believe the Board appears to be in agreement in resolving the Cantwell issue. While the original intent to respect ANSCA boundaries in this case with Ahtna, those are legally corporate boundaries and the Supreme Court found that government boundaries per the Constitution had precedent.

Muldoon

It seems that the Redistricting Board is accepting of the need to pair Muldoon North and South House Districts 20 and 21 into a single Senate seat. Do it.

Eagle River

Eagle River – it never made sense to split Eagle River into two Senate seats. Providing ‘more representation’ wasn’t a valid reason in my view and the view of others. That community should be kept together. The logic is to pair Districts 22 and 24 into a single Senate seat leaves where to put District 23. The suggestion of pairing District 24 and 9 opens the plan to further litigation.

Adjustments following Muldoon-Eagle River fixes

Several proposals have been put forth. While I would have offered further pairings, my recommendation would be to make as few changes as possible from the 2021 Proclamation while respecting the rulings of the Superior Court and Supreme Court. This will minimize the opportunity for further litigation and acknowledges the previous voluminous public testimony and the extensive work and deliberation that the Board has already invested in this process.

Pair Districts 23 and 17

Pair Districts 18 and 19

Because of the short timeline before the upcoming elections, I do recommend an expeditious effort at a revised proclamation following the report to the Superior Court, if possible in advance of the April 15 deadline. The public record is already quite long and the Board has heard many suggestions and alternates with many hours of testimony.

My suggestions are detailed on the map on the next page. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this historic process.
4/5/2022

To: Alaska Redistricting Commission
From: Assembly Member Christopher Constant, Reapportionment Committee Chair
Re: Public Comments to Municipal Reapportionment Process

Dear Commissioners:

I am writing in follow up to my testimony at the public hearing held on April 2, 2022. In this communication I will begin where I ended, expressing my gratitude for your hard work in generating a map that was found for the very most part to be constitutional and well crafted. I will expand on my concern with one senate pairing. I will begin concluding by describing the nature of the public comments received by the Anchorage Assembly during the 2022 Reapportionment process that has just concluded. And finally, I will share with you a table of public comments from individuals as well as community councils submitted to the public record.

First, the house maps you adopted in your final plan have proven to be workable for the vast majority of the 40 house districts. Having chaired the process for the Municipality of Anchorage, a subdivision of the State of Alaska, I can commiserate on how challenging it is to set a proportional map that respects historic boundaries, communities of interest, and maintains contiguity and compactness. Ours was a substantially smaller scale project and it took us scores of hours. Collectively hundreds. Thank you for your diligence.

I still maintain substantial concerns about the senate pairing of House Districts 23 and 24. In particular the stranding of a tiny population of Anchorage voters in a district centered 20 and 30 miles away separated by mountains and a secure military base. They will not be represented, no matter what gilded promises are made by political actors attempting to sustain this gerrymander. The harm, for the most part, is undone by simply pairing House District 23 with House District 17.

You have the power to right this.

I recognize the interest in opening up the map and shifting pairings across Anchorage. I believe the Bahnke map is the fairest approach. I think the board is bounded by two borders in its decision making. Either adopt the map previously presented or act narrowly to update only the unconstitutional pairing and the minimum number of pairings to correct the infirmity.

I believe restraint is in order here. That Superior Court Judge Matthews maintains jurisdiction over this matter should be a caution to all parties. It is a mandate to exercise restraint in the final stage of this process, exercising only the minimum level of action necessary to achieve the constitutional goal. This likely means adopting the principle of maximum preservation of all district pairings ruled constitutional, except for those that must be repaired to accommodate the mandatory change as a result of the court’s finding that the adopted East Anchorage/Eagle River senate district is unconstitutional.
I ask you to be the hero by pairing House Districts 17 and 23 into a single senate district to protect two small neighborhoods whose interests are threatened to be subsumed into a larger district with completely different needs.

Now, I will share a bit about the Anchorage Reapportionment Process. The Municipality is a subdivision of the State of Alaska and organized as a First Class Municipality exercising the maximum level of self-government allowed under the State Constitution. As such, the Municipality began its Charter required reapportionment mere days after the publication by this body of the State Final Plan map on November 10, 2021. We ran a robust public process with more than 20 opportunities for the public to be heard. We also had a public comment portal and received emails in our regular method of receiving public comments. We hired a contractor who proposed several maps and opened the map making process up to the public, from whom we receive several viable maps. In fact, the final adopted map was submitted by a member of the public.

One of the maps drafted by the contractors and an additional map submitted by a member of the public paired Chugiak Eagle River with Hillside in South Anchorage. That pairing was a lightning rod causing scores and scores of comments in opposition from the public. The comments came in through all channels. Phone calls to members, emails through our regular email system. Comments posted to the portal, and substantial in person testimony in opposition. The opposition was overwhelming that the pairing of Eagle River and Hillside is inappropriate and shouldn’t be promulgated. The Assembly listened.

It is my hope the Alaska Redistricting Board will incorporate the comments of members of the public and community councils duly submitted to a subdivision of the State under a substantially similar and coordinated process. By including a sample of comments received by email, a near complete table of comments submitted via the portal, and the Community Council resolutions passed relating to the pairing of Eagle River and Hillside, the Redistricting Board will have substantive record of concerns and overwhelming oppositions from the public to an irrational pairing of Chugiak, Eagle River and South Anchorage Hillside. Comments opposing the pairing are highlighted in yellow.

Now, I will conclude where I started. Having walked through a similar process recently, I thank you for the diligence exhibited by members of the Board in crafting a redistricting plan map that meets the needs of most Alaskans. Please complete this process and let’s get on with implementation of your new districts.

Respectfully,

Christopher Constant, Vice Chair
Anchorage Assembly, District 1
(907)787-9989
Appendices

1. Sample email public comment via email
2. Community Council resolutions opposing Eagle River/Hillside Pairings
3. Select table of comments received through Assembly Reapportionment Comment Table

Appendix 1.: Example of public comments via email:

Appendix 2 and 3 follow.
Resolution 2022-01
Northeast Community Council (NECC)

January 20, 2022

Assembly Reapportionment

WHEREAS, the Northeast Community Council (NECC) is the Community Council that is the voice of the people of Northeast Anchorage and includes the following boundaries:

WHEREAS, according to Census data, Northeast Anchorage has one of the most ethnically and racially diverse populations in the United States;

WHEREAS, according to Census data, the Northeast Community Council area has a population of 29,266;

WHEREAS, The target population per district is 48,541. The total deviation in actual population to target population must be less than 10% (federal law), and ideally less than 5%.

WHEREAS, Northeast Anchorage is a distinct and socioeconomically integrated area with strong neighborhood identities very different than that of Eagle River;

WHEREAS, Northeast Anchorage is home to many active-duty service members and Veterans who frequent the businesses and services provided along Muldoon Rd and near the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER) Muldoon Rd. gate;
WHEREAS, in the past, portions of Northeast Anchorage have been included within the Eagle River district that is not socioeconomically similar and have very different legislative interests;

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, the NECC respectfully asks the Anchorage Assembly to:

1. Protect our neighborhoods and maintain our neighborhood ties by including the entire NECC boundaries within one Assembly District;

2. Include Bartlett High School in our District to keep it connected to the families it serves.

Date: January 20, 2022

Votes for: 10    Votes Against: 0    Abstain: 1

Motion Passes  /  Motion Does Not Pass

President: T’Shalla Baker    Secretary: Rachel Boudreau
HALO Reapportionment Resolution
Resolution to Defend the Representation of the Hillside

WHEREAS, the HOME AND LANDOWNERS ORGANIZATION is dedicated to the advancement of issues related to living in the Hillside area of the Municipality of Anchorage. We promote the Anchorage Hillside rural way of life in a community of low density so that the character of the community experience remains; and

WHEREAS, our community is bound by the Hillside District Plan and represented by five Community Councils; and

WHEREAS, our community bond relies on our shared community experience and location. Lot size, drinking water source, nor street maintenance source are not an important factor in our community definition. Our community is linked by lifestyle, shared location, and homestead history; and

WHEREAS, the Hillside has no community connection i.e., schools, churches, parks, shared stores, coffee shops, or community activities with Eagle River; and this connection between Hillside and Eagle River is only similar to any other part of the Municipality; and

WHEREAS, the population of Eagle River far outweighs the population on the Hillside proposed to move and therefore would divide our community and not represent the residents of the Hillside; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage Assembly must conduct Reapportionment after declaring itself malapportioned November 23, 2021, and has six months to reapportion itself and the Anchorage Assembly’s Reapportionment Committee has presented ten maps for review; and

WHEREAS, Reapportionment must consider 1) Districts must be compact, contiguous and a relatively integrated socioeconomic area, 2) The principle of equal protection and “one person, one vote” must be maintained; and

WHEREAS, five of the maps remove portions of the Hillside and joins them with District 2 (Eagle River) which would remove a compact and contiguous district, and does not maintain ‘one person one vote’; and

WHEREAS HALO does not support maps that divides our community citing lot size as a division in our community. We do not support bringing all or portions of Hillside into District 2; and

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that HALO urges the Assembly to support our community identity and allow the Hillside to stay separate from Eagle River in our representation urging the support of maps that keep the Hillside in District 6.

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that HALO supports maps that keep the Hillside Districts together in one assembly district. Maps presented which keep the lower and upper Hillside together represent our community and forms a compact, contiguous, and socioeconomic integrated district.

Resolved this 3rd day of February 2022 by unanimous vote

Katie Nolan
President Home and Landowners Organization
February 8, 2022

To: Anchorage Assembly
    Assembly Reapportionment Committee Members

RE: Reapportionment of the Anchorage Hillside neighborhood

The Hillside Community Council (HCC) Board of Directors appreciates the opportunity to provide input on the process of Municipal Reapportionment. We understand that the Draft Maps are still under consideration and revision; therefore, the HCC is not endorsing a specific map at this time. Our comments in this document are specifically intended to address any Draft Maps that divide the Anchorage Hillside by removing a portion of its residents from District 6 and reapportion them into District 2 (Eagle River).

The Hillside is a cohesive, well-established neighborhood within the city of Anchorage, with many shared connections among its residents, including but not limited to schools, programs, community outreach groups, sports and neighborhood organizations, and more.

We believe that Eagle River is its own separate and unique community within the municipality, with its own specific needs and issues. Additionally, Eagle River has no common community connections with Hillside residents.

We believe that combining an estimated 12,000 Hillside residents with the population of Eagle River will produce a disproportionate district. As a result, the reapportioned Hillside residents would be unfairly underrepresented in the new district, and their Assemblyperson would likely be someone unfamiliar with their neighborhood and community’s specific needs.

In addition, representatives from the Boards of HCC, Huffman/O’Malley Community Council, Rabbit Creek Community Council and the Anchorage Home and Landowners Organization (HALO) attended a District 6 Constituents’ meeting on February 5th, to discuss reapportionment. All representatives in attendance expressed support for keeping the Hillside neighborhood intact, and opposed grouping a portion of the Hillside residents with Eagle River.

The HCC Board of Directors respectfully requests that the Reapportionment Committee and Anchorage Assembly keep the Hillside’s cohesive neighborhood intact, and not approve or recommend a map(s) that combines a portion of the Hillside with Eagle River.

Respectfully submitted,

Carmela Warfield, President
Hillside Community Council Board of Directors
HOCC Reapportionment Resolution
Resolution to Support the South Anchorage and Hillside Community

WHEREAS, the Huffman O'Malley Community Council (HOCC) is dedicated to the advancement of issues related to living in the South Anchorage and Hillside area of the Municipality of Anchorage. We promote the character of our shared community experience and interests; and

WHEREAS, the Hillside is a well-established, cohesive neighborhood whose residents share neighborhood road connections and many common community connections; and

WHEREAS, Hillside is one neighborhood and our community is bound by the Hillside District Plan and represented by five Community Councils; and

WHEREAS, our community bond relies on our shared community experience and location. Neither lot size, drinking water source, or street maintenance source are important factors in our community definition. Our community is linked by lifestyle, shared location, close road access, and homestead history; and

WHEREAS, the Hillside has little community connection i.e., schools, churches, parks, shared stores and coffee shops, or community activities with Eagle River; and this connection between Hillside and Eagle River is only similar to any other part of the Municipality; and

WHEREAS, the population of Eagle River far outweighs the population on the Hillside proposed to move and therefore would divide our community and not represent the residents of the Hillside; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage Assembly must conduct Reapportionment after declaring itself malapportioned. That declaration was made November 23, 2021, and the deadline is to complete activity within six months to reapportion itself. We do not understand the rush to adopt maps with little time for boundary review. Anchorage Assembly’s Reapportionment Committee has presented ten maps for review on February 9th, but these maps may not be the maps under consideration. This process seems rushed; and

WHEREAS, Reapportionment must consider 1) Districts must be compact, contiguous and a relatively integrated socioeconomic area, 2) The principle of equal protection and “one person, one vote” must be maintained.

WHEREAS, five of the maps remove portions of the Hillside and joins them with District 2 (Eagle River) which would remove a compact and contiguous district, does not keep common community interests together, and does not maintain ‘one person one vote’; and

WHEREAS HOCC does not support maps that divide our community citing lot size as a division in our community. We do not support bringing all or portions of Hillside into District 2.

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that HOCC urges the Assembly to support our community identity and allow the Hillside to stay separate from Eagle River in our representation. HOCC supports maps that keep the Hillside in District 6.

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that HOCC supports reapportioned districts which keep the lower and upper Hillside together forming a district with boundaries similar to the Hillside District Plan and with road access to support community functions and a compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated district.

Resolved this 9th day of February 2022

Signature
President
O'Malley Community Council

Title
RESOLUTION AND COMMENTS FROM THE RABBIT CREEK COMMUNITY COUNCIL ON THE 2022 ASSEMBLY REAPPORTIONMENT PROCESS

At our February 10, 2022 meeting, the Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) discussed draft maps currently under consideration for the required Assembly Reapportionment process. In doing so, the RCCC reminds the Assembly Reapportionment Committee that: legal requirements compel the Committee to create districts which are "compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socioeconomic area" (Municipality of Anchorage Code of Ordinance, Part I, Article IV, Section 4.01). By a vote of 26 yeas, 3 nays, and 1 abstention, RCCC approved the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

The Rabbit Creek Community Council:

- Affirms that the re-apportionment closely follow the legal requirements to create compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated districts.
- Opposes combination of any portions of the Hillside with Eagle River.
- Emphasizes that Chugach State Park does not create contiguity between the populations of the Hillside and Eagle River, as it is uninhabited. Therefore, reapportionment maps should display it as a distinct, unpopulated area.
- Supports continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.

JUSTIFICATION

The RCCC strongly opposes any map that would combine the Rabbit Creek and neighboring Hillside areas with Eagle River because these two distinct, separate areas are not integrated through socio-economic interactions, land use patterns, businesses, roads and traffic patterns, or schools. Additionally, these areas are neither compact nor contiguous, thus further failing to meet the requirements of Section 4.01. Travel from the Hillside to Eagle River requires traversing several intervening districts. It is inappropriate to use the large, steep, uninhabited, and in some areas or to some people inaccessible, Chugach State Park as justification to combine Eagle River and Hillside into one Assembly district.

Common issues that distinguish the Hillside from most other parts of the Anchorage Bowl include resident concerns around wildfires and high winds, on-site water and septic systems, Limited Road Service Areas, drainage, water supply and other watershed features on steep slopes. Eagle River has different watersheds, an integrated road service district, its own park district, and facilities that have little or no daily relevance to Hillside residents, including a
Community College, its own branch library, a Wal-Mart, and a central business district. The local roads, trails, and recreation areas we use throughout the Hillside are completely different from the local roads, trails, and recreation areas used by Eagle River residents; the roads we travel to schools and local shopping/businesses, as well as to destinations in Midtown and Downtown, are completely different from the roads used by Eagle River residents.

We remind the Assembly that the 2010 Hillside District Plan (HDP) defines the boundaries of the Hillside. Much thought, effort, and an iterative public process were involved throughout the development of that Assembly-approved plan. The HDP sets a strong precedent for maintaining the cohesion of the RCCC area and the larger Hillside area in one district, with no part of the Hillside combined with Eagle River.

While maintaining a low population deviation between districts is of obvious importance, it is not outlined as a consideration in Section 4.01, and therefore should not be granted more importance than the criteria that are included in Municipal ordinance. Respecting neighborhood continuity is more important than pushing for the smallest deviation in size of each Assembly district and will best achieve fair representation. We do appreciate the difficulty of this effort.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with Anchorage Municipal Ordinance and the strong precedent set by the Hillside District Plan, the RCCC area and larger Hillside of south Anchorage should remain in a single Assembly district with no part of the Hillside combined with Eagle River on the northeast side of Anchorage. Moreover, RCCC recommends that the Assembly take similar care to not split up other neighborhoods throughout Anchorage, and instead, support neighborhood continuity. The Assembly's overarching goal should be to ensure fair and effective representation for all residents.

Ann Rappoport, Co-chair
Rabbit Creek Community Council

Michelle Turner, Co-chair
Rabbit Creek Community Council

Signed: February 13, 2022
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12/31/2021</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Elizabeth Forsman</td>
<td>Map 3. I don’t believe JBER should be included in downtown. I do believe the port should be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Cheryl Lovegreen</td>
<td>I just looked through the map proposals for reapportionment. I may have more comments after I have studied the maps more closely, but today I am concerned about District 5, East Anchorage. In the recent state Redistricting process, East Anchorage was pasted onto Eagle River in a way that diluted the power of its diverse population. In the reapportionment, a similar thing happens in Map 3 by adding some South Anchorage residents and in Map 5 by Eagle River absorbing a section east of Muldoon Road. I hope the committee is sensitive to the integrity of our neighborhoods and “relatively integrated socioeconomic area” of each district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/11/2022</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Cheryl Lovegreen</td>
<td>I just looked through the map proposals for reapportionment. I may have more comments after I have studied the maps more closely, but today I am concerned about District 5, East Anchorage. In the recent state Redistricting process, East Anchorage was pasted onto Eagle River in a way that diluted the power of its diverse population. In the reapportionment, a similar thing happens in Map 3 by adding some South Anchorage residents and in Map 5 by Eagle River absorbing a section east of Muldoon Road. I hope the committee is sensitive to the integrity of our neighborhoods and “relatively integrated socioeconomic area” of each district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>After reviewing my Map A and thinking about the shortcomings of some of the other maps, I made a second map:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Denny's Map B:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="https://districtr.org/plan/103441">https://districtr.org/plan/103441</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Even smaller population deviation than Denny's Map A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Compact, mostly following major roads and other natural boundaries, except at the 3-way intersection of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Districts 1, 4, and 5, where the boundary follows 36th to Elmore, then across 40th, and finally follows the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Fork of Chester Creek to Boniface.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- District 5 includes Russian Jack, as in the current districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- District 4 is more mid-town and less SW Anchorage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- The District 1/ District 3 boundary is at West Chester rather than the railroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map One Greene</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>Map 1: Matching Eagle River/Chugiak and upper Hillside with Girdwood/Indian is problematic because those</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>areas are not only discontiguous, but they are significantly culturally different with significantly different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>Map 2: This map, with almost surgical precision, increases the voting power of Eagle River at the expense of Muldoon by putting disparate population sizes in each district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>Map 3: As with Map 2, this map surgically increases the voting power of Eagle River at the expense of Muldoon. But it takes that disparity a step further by including lower Hillside with Muldoon. District 5 in this map is both discontinuous and merges significantly different populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>Map 4: This map seems specifically targeted at fracturing the voting power of Muldoon. It splits the current Muldoon district into 3 sections – giving one section each to the Downtown and Eagle River districts, and then adding the significantly un-diverse U-Med area and lower hillside to the remaining skeleton of the diverse Muldoon district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Denmer Wells</td>
<td>Map 5: This takes the problems of Map #4 and amps them up significantly. It is again specifically targeted at splitting the Muldoon district. This time, it gives even more of the district to Eagle River, and adds JBER to the remaining (even smaller) skeleton of Muldoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Denner Wells</td>
<td>Regarding all 5 proposed maps: In all 5 of the proposed reapportionment maps, my neighborhood along the north shore of Campbell Lake is included in District 6 with south Anchorage and the hillside rather than being included in District 3 with Sand Lake. This is irrational. The area South of Dimond, West of Arlene and North of Campbell Lake should be included in the same district with Sand Lake, as it is now. This area is zoned for Kincaid Elementary school, with our neighbors in Sand Lake. This area is in legislative districts (both current and pending with the new redistricting) with our neighbors in Sand Lake. In order to go from this area to South Anchorage and the rest of the district, we would literally have to transit the Sand Lake district. I understand that someone may draft a proposal with the Sand Lake/South Anchorage boundary at Dimond instead of at Campbell Lake, but that ALL FIVE of the current proposals make this change is irrational and speaks to an underlying problem in the process used to draft these maps. My neighborhood, bounded by Campbell Lake to the south and Dimond Blvd to the north should be included with Sand Lake for our Anchorage Municipal Assembly district. All 5 of these maps are gravely problematic, all in very similar ways. They ALL include the north shore of Campbell Lake with South Anchorage, they ALL advantage Eagle River or pair Eagle River with another dis-similar community in the municipality, and all but Map 1 explicitly disadvantage Muldoon. There is a pattern here. These plans should not be adopted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>Denner Wells</td>
<td>For your consideration, I propose the following map (made using the state redistricting board's tool). Let's call it Denny's Map A <a href="https://districtr.org/plan/101570">https://districtr.org/plan/101570</a> My proposed map has the following characteristics: - Smaller population deviation from the target than all but the original Map 1 proposal. - It follows major roadways and/or bodies of water for boundaries. No wonky carve-outs. Very compact. - Eagle River is in a district with JBER and Stuckagain Heights. JBER is rational, as it is currently in the Eagle River district, and Eagle River is a bedroom community for JBER. Stuckagain Heights is discontinuous, which is unfortunate, but the demographics and issues there are very similar to the demographics and issues in the neighborhood around the upper reaches of the South Fork of Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Denner Wells</td>
<td>As a real estate photographer, I have spent time in the homes of families all over Anchorage. I have shot more than 2000 homes in the municipality, in all parts of town, from the tiniest run down single-wide trailer to the most amazing million dollar homes, from places in the densest parts of South Addition to the furthest reaches of the Eagle River valley, from homes so new the paint was not yet dry to homes so old they are on historic building registers. I was mindful of that experience as I crafted my maps. I encourage you to be mindful of the whole community as you craft your final official maps. I urge you to adopt a map that is fair and compact. None of your initial 5 drafts fit those criteria. I believe my proposed maps are a step in the right direction. They are certainly more fair than the current 5 drafts, and much more compact than the 2012 district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21/2022</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>Briana Sullivan</td>
<td>I am addressing any maps that include Military Land: Does it matter how many people are registered voters? Does it matter if population is considered Alaska Residents?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/26/2022</td>
<td>Public Comment Process</td>
<td>Gretchen Stoddard</td>
<td>Please provide an email address to submit comments. I can not find an email for comments in your information. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Diane Shellenbaum</td>
<td>I live on the lower Hillside, currently in District 6. I have reviewed maps 1-10, and am strongly against any map that groups Eagle River with portions of the Hillside (maps 1 and 8 are the worst.) The issues of Eagle River are very specific and that population should be represented by Assembly members who can represent those. Hillside issues are different and I believe would be overwhelmed by Eagle River issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/27/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Diane Thompson</td>
<td>Re Map 5: I am concerned about assigning East Anchorage east of Muldoon to Eagle River. I've lived on JBER (back when it was Ft. Richardson) and in Eagle River and Muldoon east of Muldoon road in the impacted area. My experience was that Ft. Rich/JBER was more similar to Eagle River than Muldoon is. I believe people living east of Muldoon Road, but in Muldoon, most closely resemble and would be better served by the same Assembly member as East Anchorage residents west of Muldoon Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Diane Thompson</td>
<td>I am concerned about assigning East Anchorage east of Muldoon to Eagle River. I've lived on JBER (back when it was Ft. Richardson) and in Eagle River and Muldoon east of Muldoon road in the impacted area. My experience was that Ft. Rich/JBER was more similar to Eagle River than Muldoon is. I believe people living east of Muldoon Road, but in Muldoon, most closely resemble and would be better served by the same Assembly member as East Anchorage residents west of Muldoon Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/27/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Elizabeth Ellis</td>
<td>Hello, I support adopting map number eight for Anchorage. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Proposed Map#1 makes no sense for anything besides numbers. Picking off the southernmost part of District 6 and putting it into District 2, with which there is no contiguous road, is absurd. I suppose the residents of Goldenview and Potter Valley should hike 2 days to meetings through the Chugach? (sorry, being sarcastic) Why do you want to move JBER into District 1 anyway? Maps 3 and 4 combine Basher (Stuckagain Heights) into District 1, again with no contiguous road. Slightly shorter hike, though. :-D Why? And why on earth would you want to split JBER, which has clear and consistent interests and is administered as a Joint Base? Map 5: Again, why include Basher in District 6? And why put Muldoon in with District 2? If there were concerns about having a driving connection to the rest of the district, neither of these makes any sense. Map 6: Not sure why Independence Park needed to be carved out of District 6. Map 7: I am absolutely opposed to having East Hillside lumped in with District 2. I live in Anchorage, not in Eagle River or Chugiak. Same for Map 8. If the intent is to combine neighborhoods by socioeconomic status, there are plenty of similar places in Anchorage to combine. Has anyone done that sort of analysis, by the way? It would be interesting to see it. Please especially refer my comments to my two assembly members, John Weddleton and Suzanne LaFrance. Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map One Greene</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Proposed Map#1 makes no sense for anything besides numbers. Picking off the southernmost part of District 6 and putting it into District 2, with which there is no contiguous road, is absurd. I suppose the residents of Goldenview and Potter Valley should hike 2 days to meetings through the Chugach? (sorry, being sarcastic) Why do you want to move JBER into District 1 anyway?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Maps 3 and 4 combine Basher (Stuckagain Heights) into District 1, again with no contiguous road. Slightly shorter hike, though. :-) Why? And why on earth would you want to split JBER, which has clear and consistent interests and is administered as a Joint Base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Maps 3 and 4 combine Basher (Stuckagain Heights) into District 1, again with no contiguous road. Slightly shorter hike, though. :-) Why? And why on earth would you want to split JBER, which has clear and consistent interests and is administered as a Joint Base?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Map 5: Again, why include Basher in District 6? And why put Muldoon in with District 2? If there were concerns about having a driving connection to the rest of the district, neither of these makes any sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Map 7: I am absolutely opposed to having East Hillside lumped in with District 2. I live in Anchorage, not in Eagle River or Chugiak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>I live in Anchorage, not in Eagle River or Chugiak. Same for Map 8. If the intent is to combine neighborhoods by socioeconomic status, there are plenty of similar places in Anchorage to combine. Has anyone done that sort of analysis, by the way? It would be interesting to see it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Public Comment Process</td>
<td>Helene Mikes</td>
<td>Please especially refer my comments to my two assembly members, John Weddleton and Suzanne LaFrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/28/2022</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Darryl Parks</td>
<td>Within the maps, map 4 makes the most sense from a boundary standpoint. The problem lies that by including JBER in any of the districts, you do that district a disservice. Many, a large portion, of the population on JBER are not registered voters in the state of Alaska, as many service members maintain residency in their home state, even though they benefit from the services provided by the municipality. JBER residents are a transient population with most serving for 3 years, then moving on to their next assignment. Including JBER impacts the voting power of any district that includes portions of the base since many of the residents are not eligible to vote in the district where they reside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>I would like to strongly advocate for the adoption of Map #6 proposed by Anchorage Action for many reasons including the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Highly compact and contiguous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Closely resembles the current map except for the District 1, which understandably extends into Midtown due to the addition of a second representative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Better than Map #2, the next best map, for reasons that include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Lower total deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o District 4 in Map #6 includes the U-Med area while District 4 in Map #2 instead includes areas that nearly all people would normally consider to be associated with South Anchorage (e.g., O'Malley and Birch area in the present District 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Not compact--e.g., District 5 in Map #3 extends over an unacceptably large and varied area from the Glenn Highway all the way to Huffman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None of the proposed maps is perfect, but I believe Map #6 proposed by Anchorage Action is the best option for the reasons mentioned above. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Municipality of Anchorage--Reapportionment
#### Public Comment Portal Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River/Hillside</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following: - Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>- Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>- Not compact--e.g., District 5 in Map #3 extends over an unacceptably large and varied area from the Glenn Highway all the way to Huffman Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>District 4 in Map #2 instead includes areas that nearly all people would normally consider to be associated with South Anchorage (e.g., O'Malley and Birch area in the present District 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map One</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following: - Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights - Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map 7</td>
<td>Hockema  C</td>
<td>Curtis Smith All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following: - Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights - Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map 9</td>
<td>Wells A</td>
<td>Curtis Smith All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following: - Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/2022</td>
<td>Map 10</td>
<td>Wells B</td>
<td>Curtis Smith All of the remaining maps have substantial issues including the following: - Not contiguous--e.g., Map numbers 1, 7, 9, 10 all pair Eagle River / Chugiak with parts of South Anchorage and/or Stuckagain Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>- Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>- Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>Placing all or part of JBER in Districts 1 or 5 (e.g., Map numbers 1, 4, 5, 7, 8) when JBER is best placed within District 2, an area that also has a significant presence of military personnel/families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>District 4 in Map #6 includes the U-Med area while District 4 in Map #2 instead includes areas that nearly all people would normally consider to be associated with South Anchorage (e.g., O’Malley and Birch area in the present District 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/31/22</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Curtis Smith</td>
<td>I would like to strongly advocate for the adoption of Map #6 proposed by Anchorage Action for many reasons including the following: - Highly compact and contiguous - Closely resembles the current map except for the District 1, which understandably extends into Midtown due to the addition of a second representative - Better than Map #2, the next best map, for reasons that include: o Lower total deviation o District 4 in Map #6 includes the U-Med area while District 4 in Map #2 instead includes areas that nearly all people would normally consider to be associated with South Anchorage (e.g., O’Malley and Birch area in the present District 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After the initial rounds of public feedback, I'd like to offer a revised map selection. Let's call this Denny's Neighborhood Cohesion map. I'd like to specifically offer it as a replacement for Denny's Map A, currently hosted as Map 9 on the reapportionment page. This map can be found at it can also be found at https://districtr.org/plan/107533 and an image of it is attached to this comment.

The message I heard at the public hearings, and through people who have reached out since, is that keeping neighborhoods together is a high priority for the community. I heard this at last Wednesday's meeting from Assembly Member Zalatel regarding Rogers Park. I heard this from residents who spoke at Thursday's meeting about keeping Hillside together. I heard this from Assembly Member Allard at Thursday's meeting regarding maps that paired Eagle River with distant communities along Hillside or Turnagain Arm. I heard this from Stuckagain Heights residents who reached out expressing a desire to stay connected with Anchorage districts. The public comments online also are generally critical of various Anchorage-Eagle River or Anchorage-JBER pairings.

I know that Alaskan's for Fair Redistricting has advocated an extremely low per-district deviation to achieve as much voter-parity as possible. But their map makes clear that holding rigidly to such a target results in a deep disregard for neighborhood integrity. In addition to their unusual boundary splitting neighborhoods across the north end of Russian Jack and Muldoon, their low deviation target drove a really unusual break through the middle of Bayshore, the carving off of a single block in the neighborhood around Vernon Street south of Dimond, a circuitous cut through Goldenview, drawing a line through the middle of the neighborhood south of Campbell Elementary, and they cut Airport Heights in half. I appreciate the precision with which they achieved a low deviation, but I believe their map demonstrates the unintended consequences of only focusing on one measure of equitable districts (low deviation) without considering other measures.

Some of the other maps were less concerned with deviation, but they also missed some neighborhood cohesion elements.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2/1/2022| Eagle River\Hillside| Denner Wells   | The message I heard at the public hearings, and through people who have reached out since, is that keeping neighborhoods together is a high priority for the community. I heard this at last Wednesday’s meeting from Assembly Member Zalatel regarding Rogers Park. I heard this from residents who spoke at Thursday's meeting about keeping Hillside together. I heard this from Assembly Member Allard at Thursday's meeting regarding maps that paired Eagle River with distant communities along Hillside or Turnagain Arm. I heard this from Stuckagain Heights residents who reached out expressing a desire to stay connected with Anchorage districts. The public comments online also are generally critical of various Anchorage-Eagle River or Anchorage-JBER pairings. With my Neighborhood Cohesion map, I stayed with major roadways and waterways as boundaries as much as possible, as with my earlier proposal. I made the districts as compact as possible. Unlike the other maps which extend District 1 either north into JBER or south into Midtown, I paired the existing Downtown district with Turnagain and South Spenard, with the additional boundaries being Minnesota Blvd and International Airport Way. This map also has a couple of possible revisions which could be considered, in case you want to further reduce deviation: or further enhance compactness. Variation 1: Deviation Reduction Swap Stuckagain Heights from District 5 to District 2, and swap the census track that encompasses the northern half of Russian Jack Park from District 1 to District 2. This reduces deviation to 3.22%. It retains 2 majority-minority districts. But it does impart significant road travel for the District 2 representatives to visit Stuckagain Heights. Swapping the census track that encompasses the Tikahtnu Commons retail complex from District 2 to District 5 further reduces deviation to 3.19% Variation 2: Compactness Enhancement. Swap the area around Reka and East High with the area around Wesleyan between districts 4 and 5, making the new boundary a north-south line along the Pine Street corridor, bordered by parks on one side of the boundary through its entire course. You could also swap Far North Bicentennial Park from District 5 to either District 4 or District 6 this would be entirely about the appearance of compactness, as there is no population there. Deviation is still 4.22%, but district 5 is now only 49.7% minority, so there is only one majority-minority district. Variation 3: Combine Variation 1 and Variation 2. Deviation is now 3.19%. We again have 2 majority-minority districts, but just barely district 5 is now 50.1% minority. The only way to get a deviation lower than this is to combine Eagle River with some other significant population center either combining Eagle River with a portion of Muldoon, or with a portion of Hillside, or with Girdwood and Indian. The public feedback we have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>The standards for drawing fair Anchorage reapportionment maps should be the same as the criteria for State Districts in the Alaska constitution. Districts should be near equal population, compact, contiguous, and represent related neighborhoods. By those criteria, the best proposed map is Map 6, submitted by Anchorage Action. The districts in this map are compact, contiguous, and connect related neighborhoods. Proposed Map 2 is also good, but has a higher overall population deviation than Map 6. Map 6: Good. Districts are contiguous and compact, connecting related neighborhoods, with a better population deviation than Map 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>The standards for drawing fair Anchorage reapportionment maps should be the same as the criteria for State Districts in the Alaska constitution. Districts should be near equal population, compact, contiguous, and represent related neighborhoods. By those criteria, the best proposed map is Map 6, submitted by Anchorage Action. The districts in this map are compact, contiguous, and connect related neighborhoods. Proposed Map 2 is also good, but has a higher overall population deviation than Map 6. Map 2: Good. Districts are contiguous and compact; connecting related neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>By no means should Eagle River be connected to the Anchorage Hillside, Girdwood, or Stuckagain Heights. These neighborhoods use entirely different municipal infrastructure than Eagle River, have different problems, and cannot be represented well by a single Assembly representative. You shouldn't have to drive through other districts to get from one side to the other side of a district. Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map One Greene</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River. Map 1: Bad. Joins SE Anchorage and Girdwood to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 3, 4 and 5 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods across Bicentennial Park, or unrelated neighborhoods from north to south across east Anchorage. Map 3: Bad. District 5 extends across unpopulated Bicentennial Park, connecting unrelated neighborhoods north and south from Glenn Highway to South Anchorage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 3, 4 and 5 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods across Bicentennial Park, or unrelated neighborhoods from north to south across east Anchorage. Map 4: Bad. District 5 is not contiguous or compact; it extends across Bicentennial Park, connecting unrelated neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 3, 4 and 5 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods across Bicentennial Park, or unrelated neighborhoods from north to south across east Anchorage. Map 5: Bad. District 5 is not compact; it connects JBER with a neighborhood adjacent to Dowling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River. Map 7: Bad. Stuckagain Heights and the Upper Hillside are connected with Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River. Map 8: Bad. Lower &amp; Upper Hillside, and Stuckagain Heights are connected to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River. Map 9: Bad. Stuckagain Heights is connected to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Doug Robbins</td>
<td>Maps 1, 7, 8, 9 and 10 are bad because they connect unrelated neighborhoods to Eagle River. Map 10: Bad. Stuckagain Heights is connected to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>After studying the maps presented, Maps 3 and 5 are the most reasonable reapportionment suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1) JBER is a unique part of our community. JBER falls under a single community commander who is responsible for everything that happens on the base. Dividing JBER into more than one district, whether 1, 2, or 5, will not allow for the base commander to create a unified and cohesive base. The responsibilities of the base commander stretch into the community. The base commander should be focused on their &quot;constituents&quot; and not the juggling the responsibilities associated with multiple districts. Also, one needs to examine the actual number of Alaskan voters on JBER. Dividing them into multiple districts may not provide them with the best representation possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) I also disagree with dividing the Hillside into district 2 or 6. The assumption is that Hillside voters align with ER voters due to lot size among other factors. If the Upper Hillside to Girdwood is placed in District 2, I believe that those in Bird thru Girdwood will be underrepresented. Should they become part of District 2, their representation will be invisible due to the strength of ER. The Hillside should closely mimic the school boundaries set by ASD creating a unified interest. It is nonsensical to have the district 2 representative drive every district to reach both ends of their district. Logic needs to drive the reapportionment, not creating the most favorable boundaries for elections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Three</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>After studying the maps presented, Maps 3 and 5 are the most reasonable reapportionment suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>After studying the maps presented, Maps 3 and 5 are the most reasonable reapportionment suggestions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>My concerns are limited to the general neighborhood in which we live, the Upper Hillside. We have nothing in common with Chugiak / Eagle River (CER) but elevation. Therefore I categorically reject any pairing of our neighborhood with CER. This limits my support to Denny Wells A and B, maps #9 and #10, as well as Anchorage Action map #6. Maps 2 &amp; 4 could be tolerated, but the rest are unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>My concerns are limited to the general neighborhood in which we live, the Upper Hillside. We have nothing in common with Chugiak / Eagle River (CER) but elevation. Therefore I categorically reject any pairing of our neighborhood with CER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>My concerns are limited to the general neighborhood in which we live, the Upper Hillside. We have nothing in common with Chugiak / Eagle River (CER) but elevation. Therefore I categorically reject any pairing of our neighborhood with CER. This limits my support to Denny Wells A and B, maps #9 and #10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>My concerns are limited to the general neighborhood in which we live, the Upper Hillside. We have nothing in common with Chugiak / Eagle River (CER) but elevation. Therefore I categorically reject any pairing of our neighborhood with CER. This limits my support to Denny Wells A and B, maps #9 and #10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>Maps 2 &amp; 4 could be tolerated, but the rest are unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map Four</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>Maps 2 &amp; 4 could be tolerated, but the rest are unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Patrick Hoffmann</td>
<td>Therefore I categorically reject any pairing of our neighborhood with CER. This limits my support to Denny Wells A and B, maps #9 and #10, as well as Anchorage Action map #6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Catherine Larrea</td>
<td>After review of the proposed redistricting maps, I am strongly against any boundary changes that would lump any part of the Hillside area with Eagle River/Chugiak areas. These are completely different communities. The maps proposals I appose are Map 1, Map 7 and Map 8. I oppose any other current or future redistricting that combine any or all of the Hillside with Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map One Greene</td>
<td>Catherine Larrea</td>
<td>The maps proposals I appose are Map 1, Map 7 and Map 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>Catherine Larrea</td>
<td>The maps proposals I appose are Map 1, Map 7 and Map 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Catherine Larrea</td>
<td>The maps proposals I appose are Map 1, Map 7 and Map 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Deirdre Schwartz</td>
<td>I have reviewed the redistributing maps and want to express concern over extending District 2 into the South Anchorage Hillside beyond the military boundary as shown in Map 8 and others. Eagle River and the non-military areas of Anchorage Hillside are very different politically, demographically, and environmentally. I would not expect an elected Assembly member to be able to fairly represent such diverse interests and priorities. Please do not dilute representation for either community by combining these disparate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Deirdre Schwartz</td>
<td>I have reviewed the redistributing maps and want to express concern over extending District 2 into the South Anchorage Hillside beyond the military boundary as shown in Map 8 and others. Eagle River and the non-military areas of Anchorage Hillside are very different politically, demographically, and environmentally. I would not expect an elected Assembly member to be able to fairly represent such diverse interests and priorities. Please do not dilute representation for either community by combining these disparate areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Cathy Foerster</td>
<td>The constituency and needs of the Upper Hillside are very different from those of Eagle River and Chugiak. Please do not lump their representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Cindy Lelake</td>
<td>Listening to the first (virtual) muni redistricting conversation, I was struck by the fact that Independence Park, where I reside, seems to move at whim from map to map. The precise &quot;character&quot; of Independence Park, which seems to be a perennial question, also permeates state redistricting maps and efforts. In the current state redistricting plan, it joins the Lower Hillside in District 11. My perspective is that, as far as muni redistricting goes, the high-density housing situation of most of Independence Park makes it a poor candidate for combination with the Hillside assembly district, which for the most part consists of individual dwellings on relatively large property parcels. Thanks for considering my input! Cindy Lelake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Stephanie Cornwall-George</td>
<td>Leave Eagle River and Chugiak as they are. We are nothing like hillside or Girdwood. We each have our own concerns, a rep trying to speak for both would not be representative and would limit access. ERCC includes Birchwood, Peters creek, Eklutna and these areas are one of the few places left for anchorage to really grow. Eagle River already wants to separate, lumping us in with another community that has their own unique needs would only push that desire further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2/3/2022 | Eagle River\Hillside | Richard Emanuel | To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to strongly object to Maps 1 and 8, which would put my home and neighborhood, presently in Dist 6, into Dist 2. I live in the mid-Hillside, near Huffman and Birch Roads. I know little about local issues as they affect Eagle River, which represents the heart of Dist. 2. Nor do I believe many residents of Dist. 2 know much about where I live. "Contiguous" means "being in actual contact or sharing a common boundary." My neighborhood is NOT in contact with Eagle River. That is an absurd assertion. If there is a "common boundary" here, it seems to be Chugach State Park. Are there any voters in the Park? Are there voting precincts in the Park? No, there are not. Now, I like Eagle River just fine. But the last time I was there was when I stopped at Jitters once last summer. I have friends in Eagle River who consider it a big deal to drive into "Anchorage," by which they usually mean Muldoon, or maybe the Center for the Performing Arts or the 5th Avenue Mall. They don't shop in South Anchorage, at the Dimond Center or anywhere else. They might visit the Alaska Zoo, but even so, neither the Zoo nor the Dimond Center are in Dist. 2 on either Maps 1 or Map 8. These proposals stretch the concept of "contiguous" well beyond the breaking point. Just because you can color in a section of Chugach State Park as if it were part of Dist. 2 does not establish a meaningful connection between Eagle River and my mid-Hillside neighborhood. Maps 1 and 8 are blatantly bogus reapportionment schemes, drawn for reasons I cannot fathom and without regard to reality. They are absurd. At present, I feel very well represented by the assembly persons for District 6. Please do not put me in District 2. The Hon. Jamie Allard would not well represent me or my family on the Assembly. And the representation works both ways: Believe me, Ms. Allard would not want me as a constituent. Vote NO on Map 1 and Map 8!

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map One Greene</td>
<td>Richard Emanuel</td>
<td>To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to strongly object to Maps 1 and 8, which would put my home and neighborhood, presently in Dist 6, into Dist 2. Now, I like Eagle River just fine. But the last time I was there was when I stopped at Jitters once last summer. I have friends in Eagle River who consider it a big deal to drive into &quot;Anchorage,&quot; by which they usually mean Muldoon, or maybe the Center for the Performing Arts or the 5th Avenue Mall. They don't shop in South Anchorage, at the Dimond Center or anywhere else. They might visit the Alaska Zoo, but even so, neither the Zoo nor the Dimond Center are in Dist. 2 on either Maps 1 or Map 8. These proposals stretch the concept of &quot;contiguous&quot; well beyond the breaking point. Maps 1 and 8 are blatantly bogus reapportionment schemes, drawn for reasons I cannot fathom and without regard to reality. Vote NO on Map 1 and Map 8!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/3/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>Richard Emanuel</td>
<td>To Whom It May Concern: I am writing to strongly object to Maps 1 and 8, which would put my home and neighborhood, presently in Dist 6, into Dist 2. Now, I like Eagle River just fine. But the last time I was there was when I stopped at Jitters once last summer. I have friends in Eagle River who consider it a big deal to drive into &quot;Anchorage,&quot; by which they usually mean Muldoon, or maybe the Center for the Performing Arts or the 5th Avenue Mall. They don't shop in South Anchorage, at the Dimond Center or anywhere else. They might visit the Alaska Zoo, but even so, neither the Zoo nor the Dimond Center are in Dist. 2 on either Maps 1 or Map 8. These proposals stretch the concept of &quot;contiguous&quot; well beyond the breaking point. Maps 1 and 8 are blatantly bogus reapportionment schemes, drawn for reasons I cannot fathom and without regard to reality. Vote NO on Map 1 and Map 8!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/4/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Kenneth Kugel</td>
<td>I support Map 2. The new districts as drawn are compact and maintain neighborhood cohesiveness. There is minimal movement of the existing district boundaries so as to be the least disruptive to the voters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/5/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Matt Burkholder</td>
<td>Please keep neighborhoods whole and districts contiguous. Please leave Eagle River in Eagle River and don't drag it down into South Anchorage. Thanks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Julie Coulombe</td>
<td>I strongly object to any of the Hillside being combined with District 2. It is not contiguous. We are also our own separate community with shared interests and history. Eagle River has its own unique identity and issues that will overshadow the small population being proposed on the Hillside for District 2. Eagle River should be combined with JBER instead of Muldoon or the Hillside. Eagle River has a high percentage of military population living there, and is a much more obvious fit with JBER. I also urge you not to just focus on the variance, but community cohesion. It makes more sense for the Midtown District to move South and West into District 6, than to take off the Hillside to District 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>charles springer</td>
<td>The idea of combining Eagle River and the Hillside is absurd. Now if your reason is to dilute the representation of the Hillside then it represents the best in gerrymandering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Jodi Taylor</td>
<td>Maps that join South Anchorage and Eagle River are putting together two communities with separate needs. Eagle River is clearly a bedroom community of Anchorage vs South Anchorage is part of the city - wishes of residents will be too varied and poor fit. Maps that leave Eagle River with JBER, were families go to school, shop, sports have worked and make sense. Leaving South Anchorage as a group also makes sense for families that shop, children attend same schools and use the same community areas therefore have stronger overlapping concerns. Please keep South Anchorage alone, and group JBER w Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2022</td>
<td>Map Two</td>
<td>Paula Davis</td>
<td>Hi Reapportionment Committee, Thanks so much for including the public in this very important process, since it could affect us all so much. I'd like to go on record for a preference for Map 2 of the options displayed recently at the library. I had a hard time trying to figure out the districts from the movable map on line, so I really appreciated the nice visual, which I'm sure you must display from time to time. In a nutshell, Map 2 seems the best because it seems least disruptive and doesn't stretch out districts to include areas that do not seem related. Thanks for all your hard work. Sincerely, Paula Davis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/7/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River/Hillside</td>
<td>Cynthia Wentworth</td>
<td>Dear Assembly members, I strongly oppose creating District 2 Chugiak/Eagle River to include much of the eastern Hillside. These are two areas which differ socioculturally and which have very different issues. I feel the Hillside residents would be outnumbered and misrepresented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map Five</td>
<td>Bryan Silva</td>
<td>I would be willing to accept all the apportionment maps as presented except #5. However, Eagle River should not be part of the Muldoon district. These are very different neighborhoods and need to be separated for voting purposes. Let the two neighborhoods be part of more similar voting districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>John Yeafoli</td>
<td>Districts should be contiguous to the greatest extent possible, allowing citizens and representatives to focus on common issues. Maps 7 &amp; 8 propose merging parts of District 6 Hillside and District 2 Eagle River. The Hillside has unique traits and issues and I am not in favor of mixing these two districts in order to make the numbers work. There are several other map proposals that balance the numbers without breaking up the District 6 hillside area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>John Yeafoli</td>
<td>Maps 7 &amp; 8 propose merging parts of District 6 Hillside and District 2 Eagle River. The Hillside has unique traits and issues and I am not in favor of mixing these two districts in order to make the numbers work. There are several other map proposals that balance the numbers without breaking up the District 6 hillside area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 8 Alaskans for Fair Redistricting</td>
<td>John Yeafoli</td>
<td>Maps 7 &amp; 8 propose merging parts of District 6 Hillside and District 2 Eagle River. The Hillside has unique traits and issues and I am not in favor of mixing these two districts in order to make the numbers work. There are several other map proposals that balance the numbers without breaking up the District 6 hillside area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Katie Nolan</td>
<td>I am hesitant to endorse any map as these are not yet set in stone; however, the version submitted by Anchorage Action and the A &amp; B versions of Denny Wells map are the only choices for the Anchorage Hillside. The Anchorage Hillside is a compact, cohesive and well-established area represented by the Hillside District Plan for well over a decade. It has little in common with Eagle River, and attempts to fly over the mountains and combine the two areas are obscene. Unlike the Anchorage Hillside, Eagle River has their own Parks &amp; Rec department and their own road service area. Please ensure that the Anchorage Hillside is kept in one area, united as we have always been. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Katie Nolan</td>
<td>I am hesitant to endorse any map as these are not yet set in stone; however, the version submitted by Anchorage Action and the A &amp; B versions of Denny Wells map are the only choices for the Anchorage Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>Katie Nolan</td>
<td>I am hesitant to endorse any map as these are not yet set in stone; however, the version submitted by Anchorage Action and the A &amp; B versions of Denny Wells map are the only choices for the Anchorage Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Katie Nolan</td>
<td>I am hesitant to endorse any map as these are not yet set in stone; however, the version submitted by Anchorage Action and the A &amp; B versions of Denny Wells map are the only choices for the Anchorage Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>I believe that the combining of the hillside and Eagle River marginalizes the voters of these areas. For this reason, I would like to oppose this reapportionment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mazzolini</td>
<td>Nick Mazzolini and household</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>John Kaufman</td>
<td>This is John Kaufman of Hillside O'Malley HOCC. I have read the maps and comments. The maps and comments for maps A and B are excellent. Map 10 is also excellent. Above all, please observe the boundaries of the Hillside District Plan. Do not merge Eagle River with any portion of Hillside. Few population changes or movements exist that would justify dividing our traditional associations and boundaries into separate districts. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>John Kaufman</td>
<td>The maps and comments for maps A and B are excellent. Map 10 is also excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/8/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>John Kaufman</td>
<td>The maps and comments for maps A and B are excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Huffman O'Malley Community Council</td>
<td>The Huffman O'Malley Community Council board met on 2/8/22 and unanimously passed a resolution related to Municipal Reapportionment. The HOCC supports reapportioned districts which keep the lower and upper Hillside together forming a district with boundaries similar to the Hillside District Plan and with road access to support community functions. The signed resolution is attached and has sent by email to the municipal assembly email addresses. Thank you Gretchen Stoddard President, Huffman O'Malley Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Katie Nolan</td>
<td>The addition of several new potential reapportionment maps has provided a map that meets the Hillside's unique needs. The John Weddleton Map 11 meets the needs of the Anchorage Hillside, most follows the boundaries of the Hillside District Plan, and keeps our distinct neighborhoods together. I urge endorsement of this map. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/12/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Peter Johnson</td>
<td>I have been following the reapportionment map proposals and am very concerned about maps that join Eagle River (district 2) with parts of the Anchorage Hillside (district 6). Because of the population density of Eagle River and the low density of the Hillside, those from district 6 being placed in district 2 would lose any political voice they now have. Additionally, the Anchorage Hillside is a coherent community with common interests and values. Splitting the hillside into different districts does not make sense and must not be done. Of the maps presented, I support Anchorage Action V2. I am adamantly against the Robert Hockema V2 and the Anchorage for Fair Redistricting maps. Both of those maps will result in beefing up Eagle River’s political influence and decrease South Anchorage’s political voice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Kim Mazzolini</td>
<td>I strongly disagree with the re-apportionment concept of combining Eagle River and the hillside. The very fact that these two communities are on polar opposite sides of multiple issues and the demographics are drastically different are reason enough not to force them into the same voting district. In addition, growth in the anchorage area is in the direction of eagle river which will quickly create an imbalance. The combining of these two districts will also lead to a drastic marginalization of many of these citizens' votes and is not in the best interest of either of these districts. Reapportionment is not to be used as a political tool in an attempt to strengthen a liberal majority. Once again your push to control the Anchorage area voters needs to be called out. Unfortunately this constant conflict the assembly creates with the people of Anchorage is outrageous and needs to stop!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>EG Paul Mazzolini</td>
<td>I strongly disagree with the re-apportionment concept of combining Eagle River and the hillside. The very fact that these two communities are on polar opposite sides of multiple issues and the demographics are drastically different are reason enough not to force them into the same voting district. In addition, growth in the anchorage area is in the direction of eagle river which will quickly create an imbalance. The combining of these two districts will also lead to a drastic marginalization of many of these citizens' votes and is not in the best interest of either of these districts. Reapportionment is not to be used as a political tool in an attempt to strengthen a liberal majority. Once again your push to control the Anchorage area voters needs to be called out. Unfortunately this constant conflict the assembly creates with the people of Anchorage is outrageous and needs to stop!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Courtney Weaver</td>
<td>As the deadline draws near for the approval of new district maps for Anchorage, I would like you all to consider approving district map 10. This map draws the boundaries of the districts at distinct and specific road systems. Anchorage residents can rely on map 10 because the boundaries are laid out along most major roadways and intersections. This map ensures all residents are equally represented on the assembly regardless of political leaning, beliefs, or creed. Please consider the approval and use of district map 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Vicki Herman</td>
<td>I do not support combining Eagle River and the Hillside into one district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>To whom it may concern:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I would like to place a rank order for preference of the remaining three reapportionment maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Weddleton map. Boundaries are clear and concise between districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Anchorage Action v2. Maintains integrity within the hillside. District 4 boundaries between Lake Otis and New Seward create some confusion in an otherwise cohesive area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Hocksma v2. District 4 boundary has the same issue as the Anchorage Action map. Also, a portion of Hillside is placed in district 2. Not optimal for fair representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>2. Anchorage Action v2. Maintains integrity within the hillside. District 4 boundaries between Lake Otis and New Seward create some confusion in an otherwise cohesive area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Nicole Branch</td>
<td>3. Hockema v2. District 4 boundary has the same issue as the Anchorage Action map. Also, a portion of Hillside is placed in district 2. Not optimal for fair representation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Scott Herman</td>
<td>I oppose combining the hillside and eagle river into one voting district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Irene Bortnick</td>
<td>As residents of the Rogers Park Community Council, our preference is for map 11 which leaves most of our community council intact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.

Irene and Alex Bortnick
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Sandra Blomfield</td>
<td>Reapportionment Committee, I have reviewed the criteria and maps presented for consideration. I would like to endorse MAP #6. However, you might consider minor changes to the midtown area. Boundaries for a midtown area logically could include: NORTH BOUNDARY DEBAR ROAD SOUTH BOUNDARY TUDOR ROAD EAST BOUNDARY BONIFACE ROAD WEST BOUNDARY MINNESOTA The above boundaries offer Midtown residents their own representation and is not included with the Downtown district. Downtown district should include the port JBEAR should be included with Eagle River Strong opposition to moving the Upper Hillside to Eagle River. Thank you for your consideration. Sandy Blomfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Sandra Blomfield</td>
<td>Strong opposition to moving the Upper Hillside to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>Sandra Blomfield</td>
<td>JBEAR should be included with Eagle River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Nathan Andrews</td>
<td>I support the adoption and approval of proposed Map 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Brad Chastain</td>
<td>I own four properties within the Municipality of Anchorage and fully support Map 12 offered by Assemblywoman Allard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>David Ferriera</td>
<td>I support map 6 and 7!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>David Ferriera</td>
<td>I support map 6 and 7!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/15/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Daisy Smith</td>
<td>I support Map 11b for the strongest consideration. I see no cause for concern in this map. Districting lines stay mostly along natural lines and none of the current districts are carved up in some radical way. Thanks-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Rebecca Judd</td>
<td>I'm very concerned that our rabbit creek hillside area is being considered in the same district as Eagle River. We have very little in common with people who live in ER other than some of us live in the mountains. We don’t share the same services, roads, stores or schools. Their interests and ours are different and sometimes in conflict. Neither area will be represented fairly by the same individual. (I know there are several map revisions taking place, so I am not able to keep track of all of them.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Claire Steffens</td>
<td>I live in South Anchorage and request that the South Anchorage area be retained as a single, cohesive district, not broken into parts and pieces with other areas. I also request that the prevailing philosophy in re-districting returns to the values supporting what is good for our residents, not what is good for an individual Assembly member’s political philosophy. Our grand children and great grand children deserve high integrity from political servants (which is what each Assembly member is - a political servant of his/her constituents). Let’s get back to what is good in the long run, and makes common sense, not what is expedient at the moment. Thank you for listening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>JOHN RILEY</td>
<td>I oppose the combination of any portions of the Hillside with Eagle River. I want to emphasize that Chugach State Park does not create contiguity between the populations of the Hillside and Eagle River, as it is uninhabited. Therefore, reapportionment maps should display it as a distinct, unpopulated area. I support continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>JOHN RILEY</td>
<td>I support continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>JOHN RILEY</td>
<td>I support continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Scott Bailey</td>
<td>I am submitting comments on Map 11b. This map should be adopted maintaining five contiguous communities including those of Eagle River/Chugiak. These communities have different neighborhood issues, infrastructures and are under a separate Chapter of Title 21 from the rest of Anchorage. Birchwood, Peters Creek and Eklutna anchor the NE section of this Assembly District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2</td>
<td>Scott Bailey</td>
<td>I am submitting comments on Map 11b. This map should be adopted maintaining five contiguous communities including those of Eagle River/Chugiak. These communities have different neighborhood issues, infrastructures and are under a separate Chapter of Title 21 from the rest of Anchorage. Birchwood, Peters Creek and Eklutna anchor the NE section of this Assembly District.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Cindy Lelake</td>
<td>Map 6v.2 is my favorite so far, because it preserves the integrity of Independence Park as a member of Abbott Loop rather than the Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Jennifer Harlos</td>
<td>I support Map6v2. It keeps things more continuous, stays true to historic districts, and just makes sense. Putting this section of Anchorage with Eagle River makes no sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Marc June</td>
<td>As a 35 year Hillside resident, I am outraged at Map 7.v.2 which puts my neighborhood in an Eagle River Assembly district. Effectively, this will mean I am unrepresentative as the Hillside has few, if any, local government issues in common with Eagle River. I encourage you to vote against Map 7.v.2. I support Assembly person Weddleton’s proposed map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Marc June</td>
<td>As a 35 year Hillside resident, I am outraged at Map 7.v.2 which puts my neighborhood in an Eagle River Assembly district. Effectively, this will mean I am unrepresentative as the Hillside has few, if any, local government issues in common with Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Jennie Bostick</td>
<td>I do not support any map that joins South Anchorage/Hillside with Chugiak/Eagle River. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/17/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Gennifer Moreau</td>
<td>OPPOSE redistricting Glen Alps to be part of Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Shannon Wileman</td>
<td>I have looked at the maps that are for up for consideration for reapportionment. Please do not combine Hillside with Eagle River. Those communities are not contiguous and have vastly different needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Trina Lovdahl</td>
<td>I am opposed to linking Hillside and Eagle River together in the reapportionment maps. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>sage cohen</td>
<td>I strongly support Map 11 Version 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I strongly opposed Map 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>sage cohen</td>
<td>I strongly opposed Map 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/18/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>James Wileman</td>
<td>If you’re going to combine south anchorage and eagle river—which is a stupid idea, just make all assembly seats at large.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/19/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Sandy Blomfield</td>
<td>As you continue to refine the reapportionment maps, and after review I endorse: Map #12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/19/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Catherine Coward</td>
<td>To whom it may concern, Thank you for taking public testimony regarding assembly boundaries. I have reviewed version 2 of the proposed maps and hope that you will approve Map 11, Version 2 (the John Weddleton map), as it appears to have the most clean cut and compacted districts. I live in East Anchorage, and appreciate that the my district boundaries are sensible. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Catherine Giessel</td>
<td>Dear Assembly members, I am writing in SUPPORT OF MAP 11v2. I believe it keeps well-identified neighborhoods intact, which is very important. A second choice is MAP 6v2. This is very much like our Assembly districts are today. It keeps the Hillside District Plan areas together and also seems to align with Community Council areas, which makes sense. I am OPPOSED to combining any portion of the Anchorage hillside with any portion of Eagle River. Thank you for your diligent work on this important issue. Best regards, Cathy Cathy Giessel, MS, RN, APRN, FAANP <a href="mailto:cgiessel@me.com">cgiessel@me.com</a> 907.242.5450 12701 Ridgewood Rd, ANC 99516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Catherine Giessel</td>
<td>A second choice is MAP 6v2. This is very much like our Assembly districts are today. It keeps the Hillside District Plan areas together and also seems to align with Community Council areas, which makes sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/20/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Catherine Giessel</td>
<td>I am OPPOSED to combining any portion of the Anchorage hillside with any portion of Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Robert Polley</td>
<td>To whom it may concern: I’m writing to voice my strong opposition to the potential redistricting which could allocate a portion of the Glen Alps neighborhood to the Eagle River district. As a resident of Glen Alps for the past 10 years, I can tell you we have zero connection to Eagle River, geographic or otherwise. Thank you for considering my input. Robert Polley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Michele Martin</td>
<td>Comment on Map 7v2: Against my better judgement, I’m submitting this comment regarding the idiocy of combining the residents of Glen Alps with Eagle River. Why against my better judgement? Because the assembly is going to do what it wants to do so I’m basically wasting my time and energy on this. I have served on the Glen Alps Road Service Area (GARSA) Board of directors, since 2010, and intend to serve another 3-year term. The residents of Glen Alps have totally different issues than the residents of Eagle River. Just because the land &quot;touches&quot; does not mean they should be joined and put into the same pot. For those who don’t live in either Eagle River or the Glen Alps area, you really don’t know what you are talking about and you should leave well enough alone. You should rethink this decision; however, I know you won’t.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>I do not support map 7 version 2. Please do not divide Hillside community by combining it with Eagle River. Districts should be contiguous, not interrupted by other districts. Constituents should be able to drive across their home district without crossing through another district. Maps 6v2, 11 and 12 are acceptable. I prefer map 11. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Please do not divide Hillside community by combining it with Eagle River. Districts should be contiguous, not interrupted by other districts. Constituents should be able to drive across their home district without crossing through another district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Maps 6v2, 11 and 12 are acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Maps 6v2, 11 and 12 are acceptable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Maps 6v2, 11 and 12 are acceptable. I prefer map 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Carolyn Gove</td>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I have reviewed the proposed maps and consider Map 11, Version 2 to be the best alternative, as its boundaries are compact and follow natural divisions between neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Judy Caminer</td>
<td>I support Assembly Member Weddleton's map. There is no reason to include Glen Alps and areas north of Glen Alps Road in the Eagle River district. His option makes sense and keeps interests aligned with neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Julie Coulombe</td>
<td>I'm opposed to Map 7. I will echo what many have been saying, do not combine the Hillside with Eagle River. It does not create equal representation for the people on the Hillside. I favor Map 11 v2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Julie Coulombe</td>
<td>I will echo what many have been saying, do not combine the Hillside with Eagle River. It does not create equal representation for the people on the Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 7 Hockema</td>
<td>Julie Coulombe</td>
<td>I'm opposed to Map 7. I will echo what many have been saying, do not combine the Hillside with Eagle River. It does not create equal representation for the people on the Hillside.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Gene White</td>
<td>After reviewing the proposed redistricting maps, I highly recommend map #11, revision 2. This seems to be the most compact and makes the most sense. Thank You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Maria Williams</td>
<td>I support the Weddleton map. I was born and raised in Fairview and live in South Fairview. I support this approach because it is bipartisan and aligns with geographical boundaries that reflect current Anchorage demographics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Kathy Kuletz</td>
<td>I am a 30 year resident of Government Hill (Downtown). I have reviewed the proposed redistricting maps and I want the assembly to know that I support Map 11 (v2, Weddleton). This map makes the most sense. I reiterate my strong opposition to any gerrymandered map that was previously proposed, which tried to link a portion of the downtown district to Eagle River. Sincerely, Kathy Kuletz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Kathy Kuletz</td>
<td>I reiterate my strong opposition to any gerrymandered map that was previously proposed, which tried to link a portion of the downtown district to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Gene White</td>
<td>After reviewing the proposed redistricting maps, I highly recommend map #11, revision 2. This seems to be the most compact and makes the most sense.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Please do not reapportion any part of the Anchorage Hillside area to Eagle River as depicted in map 7 version 2. Of the remaining maps, 6v2, 11 and 12, I prefer map 11. Any reapportionment should maintain district integrity; constituents should not have to cross into or through other districts to access any and all parts of their own district. Keep districts contiguous and do not combined Hillside with Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Of the remaining maps, 6v2, 11 and 12, I prefer map 11. Any reapportionment should maintain district integrity; constituents should not have to cross into or through other districts to access any and all parts of their own district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Of the remaining maps, 6v2, 11 and 12, I prefer map 11. Any reapportionment should maintain district integrity; constituents should not have to cross into or through other districts to access any and all parts of their own district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Of the remaining maps, 6v2, 11 and 12, I prefer map 11. Any reapportionment should maintain district integrity; constituents should not have to cross into or through other districts to access any and all parts of their own district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/22/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Joy Boston</td>
<td>Please do not reapportion any part of the Anchorage Hillside area to Eagle River as depicted in map 7 version 2. Keep districts contiguous and do not combined Hillside with Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2/22/2022| Map 7v2 Hockema| Joseph Connolly| To all who are part of the district reapportionment process. I will keep my thoughts simple and brief about the 3 different plans that have been proposed. Specifically, Map 7v.2 should either be amended or removed from consideration for the following primary reasons: 1) This plan would apparently use Glen Alps Road as a dividing line between District 2 and 6, and divide our neighborhood in half. Essentially, The people across the street from us would be in district 2, and those of us south of Glen Alps road would be in District 6. This creates a host of issues - the obvious being.. if, for example, we are trying to alleviate a concern in our neighborhood, we would have to contact two different assembly members and assume they would work in unison to solve our problems. 2) It also dilutes the voting power of our neighborhood considerably. 3) Eagle river is a 45 minute to an hour drive, depending on where you’re coming and going from.. which is extremely far away. This would be like pairing Eagle River with Big Lake, or Sutton. We are not very far geographically, but by road and community it is a long way. 4) We are very much a "South Anchorage" community and in no way do we want to be forced to participate in Eagle River meetings or with Eagle River assembly members if we want our voice heard. Thank you for the consideration. Joe Connolly  
• Glen Alps Resident  
• Glen Alps Road Service Area Board of Supervisors Chairperson |
Honorable Members of the Anchorage Assembly,

I am a resident of District 3 and an endorser of Map 11 v2 for the Anchorage Reapportionment of District Boundaries.

1. The Population Deviation Summary indicates there is a fair balance of population numbers in each District without giving preference to any individual group. The Boundaries are logical divisions by major roads and thoroughfares. There is an acceptable deviation of 4.16% +/- for each Districts population count. The shapes of the Districts are compact bounded by straight lines.

2. JBER is in one District as befits a more transient population.

3. East Anchorage is whole. There is no annexation of Stuckagain Heights into the Eagle River District. Stuckagain Heights is not contiguous with Eagle River.

4. Midtown remains its own District. Midtown is distinct from Downtown and South Anchorage.

5. Eagle River and Chugiak remain in their own distinct and unique geographical area.

Map 11 v2 respects the integrity of Anchorage’s diverse and distinct geographical areas. Neighborhoods and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2</td>
<td>Jan Carolyn Hardy</td>
<td>I am a resident of District 3 and an endorser of Map 11 v2 for the Anchorage Reapportionment of District Boundaries. 1. The Population Deviation Summary indicates there is a fair balance of population numbers in each District without giving preference to any individual group. The Boundaries are logical divisions by major roads and thoroughfares. There is an acceptable deviation of 4.16% +/- for each District's population count. The shapes of the Districts are compact bounded by straight lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2</td>
<td>Jan Carolyn Hardy</td>
<td>JBER is in one District as befits a more transient population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River/Hillside</td>
<td>Jan Carolyn Hardy</td>
<td>East Anchorage is whole. There is no annexation of Stuckagain Heights into the Eagle River District. Stuckagain Heights is not contiguous with Eagle River. Eagle River and Chugach remain in their own distinct and unique geographical area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2</td>
<td>David Kohler</td>
<td>I support the Weddleton Map for redistricting because it appears to be the most sensible and least partisan of the options. Thank you David Kohler Anchorage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Tyler Watson</td>
<td>As a resident of East Anchorage I’m writing in support of Map 11. It’s important to me that assembly districts represent actual communities in our city. The maps that pair parts of East Anchorage, Stuckagain Heights, and even Hillside with Eagle River divide communities and make the work for assembly members harder. By keeping common sense boundaries for communities constituents get better representation and assembly members can focus their work more effectively. Thanks for considering my testimony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Sergio ACUNA</td>
<td>Dear Assembly members, I appreciate the opportunity to comment on proposed Assembly district boundaries. I live in Midtown and believe the Weddleton redistricting map is the strongest in terms of compactness and logical district boundaries. Using Dimond/Abbott as southern boundary of the new Midtown district creates a clear and understandable boundary, and the Weddleton map as proposed respects Midtown neighborhoods, including where I live near Lake Otis and Campbell Creek. Thank you for work to update Assembly district boundaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>James Dahl</td>
<td>I appreciate that there is an opportunity granted to weigh in on draft redistricting maps. My family and I reside in South Anchorage, and believe that the Weddleton proposal (Map 11) does the best job in establishing compact, logical districts with boundaries that will be clear and understandable for voters. I do not support the Allard gerrymander, which seems clearly designed to manipulate district boundaries for partisan purposes. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>James Dahl</td>
<td>I do not support the Allard gerrymander, which seems clearly designed to manipulate district boundaries for partisan purposes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>D. Matt Duncan</td>
<td>Dear Assembly Members, I want to thank you for this convenient online forum for everyone to make public comment, as well as thank you for all your hard work serving the citizens of our town. I have looked at the four maps very closely and would like to make comment as a homeowner in Anchorage, a member of Spenard Community Council (SCC) and most importantly community organizer for the Old Hermit Park Neighborhood. I am advocating in this public comment for the adoption of map 6v2. The guiding principle for my advocacy understands that the work of the community councils is vital to the success of our city. Each community council's work and identity is extremely valuable to the city and it is highly desirable to maximize representation for the community councils by not dissecting or diluting them into multiple assembly districts. Map 6v2 is the best map for maintaining integrity of Spenard. Map 7v2 is OK, but not as good as 6v2. Map 11v2 and 12 are unacceptable. The intent and function of maps 11v2 and 12 is to dissect and dilute the SCC. There is no place on earth like Spenard, and it is important that we protect Spenard's voice and identity. Thank you for your time and efforts dealing with these difficult topics. D. Matt Duncan, TSGT, AKANG Vice President Spenard Community Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>D. Matt Duncan</td>
<td>Map 7v2 is OK, but not as good as 6v2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/23/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>D. Matt Duncan</td>
<td>Map 11v2 and 12 are unacceptable. The intent and function of maps 11v2 and 12 is to dissect and dilute the SCC. There is no place on earth like Spenard, and it is important that we protect Spenard's voice and identity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River/Hillside</td>
<td>Victoria Parks</td>
<td>I oppose Map 7v2, which lumps the East Hillside in with Eagle River. I'm currently in District 5, and I'm happy there. I don't think the East Hillside/Stuckagain Heights area is anything like Eagle River. Eagle River has its own set of problems which should stay in Eagle River. The active Eagle River secession efforts just highlight that; why would you lump Anchorage voters in with a district that might secede? That's completely unfair to voters who don't identify at all with Eagle River, and who are, in fact, geographically, a long way away from Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Dorothy Parks</td>
<td>I'm opposed to map 7v,2. I live in Stuckagain Heights and consider it part of Anchorage and not Eagle River. I feel that East Anchorage and Stuckagain Heights should not be lumped with Eagle River. Geographically we may seem close but politically we are far apart. I have read comments from people in South Anchorage and the Hillside who also do not want to be lumped with ER and I agree it is a very bad idea. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Dorothy Parks</td>
<td>I live in Stuckagain Heights and consider it part of Anchorage and not Eagle River. I feel that East Anchorage and Stuckagain Heights should not be lumped with Eagle River. Geographically we may seem close but politically we are far apart. I have read comments from people in South Anchorage and the Hillside who also do not want to be lumped with ER and I agree it is a very bad idea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2/24/2022  | Map 11v2 Weddleton                  | Jillian Simpson      | Greetings Anchorage Assembly,
I live in Glen Alps in Anchorage and support either Map 11v2 (Weddleton) or Map 6v2 (Anchorage Action). Both keep our neighborhood fully intact and part of South Anchorage. I encourage you to throw away Map 6v2 as it pairs us with Eagle River. We are not part of the Eagle River community. In fact, I haven't been to Eagle River since 2015. I have been up the Dalton Highway more frequently than I have taken the exit ramp to Eagle River. While we may have a mountain range in common, that is it. I would like to be represented by an Assembly member who is familiar with the issues and needs of my neighborhood- and preferably one who shares my values. Thank you for your consideration. |
| 2/24/2022  | Map 6v2 Anchorage Action            | Jillian Simpson      | I live in Glen Alps in Anchorage and support either Map 11v2 (Weddleton) or Map 6v2 (Anchorage Action). Both keep our neighborhood fully intact and part of South Anchorage. |

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Jillian Simpson</td>
<td>Encourage you to throw away Map 6 v2 as it pairs us with Eagle River. We are not part of the Eagle River community. In fact, I haven't been to Eagle River since 2015. I have been up the Dalton Highway more frequently than I have taken the exit ramp to Eagle River. While we may have a mountain range in common, that is it. I would like to be represented by an Assembly member who is familiar with the issues and needs of my neighborhood- and preferably one who shares my values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 7v2 Hockema</td>
<td>Colby Parks</td>
<td>Concerning area 7V.2: To merge my area (Stuck Again Heights) with Eagle River, is a disgraceful attempt to prevent local government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Alex Baker</td>
<td>As a resident of Fairview, I am in favor of adopting Map 11. Map 11 keeps me in a district with my downtown neighbors and similar neighborhoods to the east. Map 11 draws common-sense districts for each of Anchorage’s distinct geographic areas. The lines are straight and the districts are compact. I believe this map would give each district a fair opportunity to elect the representatives that fit their community and its needs. Thank you for reading my testimony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/14/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Gabriel Hardy</td>
<td>As a resident of the Sand Lake area, I am writing to request the Assembly implement map 11 (Weddleton). Map 11 has the most logical boundaries for my district (West Anchorage), compared to other maps that have more jagged boundaries separating West Anchorage and Midtown from South Anchorage. I recognize it is a challenge to maintain fairly equal population and have boundaries that logically follow major roadways or drainages, but Map 11 seems to do the best job compared to other maps that have been advertised for public comment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Greg Groeneweg</td>
<td>Sirs, I have resided in Anchorage since before statehood and have lived on the hillside (area by Hilltop Ski) since 1985. I have turned to my Assembly reps and community counsel from time to time over the years with assistance needed or that I offered. I am very concerned that I would be moved out of my district to Eagle River. That is a different area with different concerns. Please leave our hillside community intact. It is comforting to be connected with my physical neighbors. To be able to share &quot;over-the-fence&quot; so to speak. Please preserve our neighborhood representation. Thank you, Greg Groeneweg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Kathy Privratsky</td>
<td>We live in Stuckagain Heights and have for 25 yr. We do not want to be part of the Eagle River district or south district. We want to support the interests of the East side of Anchorage. We DO NOT SUPPORT map number 12. We DO SUPPORT map 11 or any map that does not have us part of Eagle River. Thank you. Kathy and Ken Privratsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Kathy Privratsky</td>
<td>We DO NOT SUPPORT map number 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Kathy Privratsky</td>
<td>We DO SUPPORT map 11 or any map that does not have us part of Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2/24/2022**  
**Map 7v2**  
**Hockema**  
**Todd Carroll**  

Hello,  
I have lived in various locations including JBER, Eagle River, Chugiak, West Anchorage, NE Anchorage, and the Hillside in the last 40 years so my interest once I looked at the proposals went further afield than I initial expected. With that in mind I have the following comments.

Map - Robert Hockema 7.V2 - Makes little sense to me. If you want to know a bit more why, keep reading, otherwise, that is it. I don't support it. It would move Anchorage neighborhoods into the northern communities district 2. Simply geographically speaking this is a dead end for me. How would our Assembly member be attending meetings, including community council meetings on the Anchorage Hillside, Basher, and Northern Communities? How would I attend these meetings? Further, there is a completely different prioritization for someone that lives in Anchorage and drives, rides a bus, bikes, uses trails, or otherwise in Anchorage from someone living in the Northern Communities. I do not commute on the Glenn Highway and don’t rely on it as the sole source of road travel to Anchorage. I also don't use Campbell Airstrip road as my sole means to access work and business in Anchorage. I have lived in those areas and they deserve their own separate representation.

District 5 should keep Basher.

Map 6.v.2 - seems ok. I like that District 6 goes direct down current boundaries and the other districts maintain close to their prior boundaries, although I would have cut district 1 at Northern Lights instead of south to 36th and left that in District 4.

Map 11.v.2 Weddleton - seems ok. Similar comments to 6.v.2.

Map 11.B - (12?) - prefer 6.v2 or 11v2, but this is ok. I would keep District 3 closer to its current boundaries. Seems like Turnagain is more an airport neighborhood than a downtown neighborhood and south of Campbell Lake, especially south of Klatt is more suited to District 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 6v2 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Todd Carroll</td>
<td>Map 6.v.2 - seems ok. I like that District 6 goes direct down current boundaries and the other districts maintain close to their prior boundaries, although I would have cut district 1 at Northern Lights instead of south to 36th and left that in District 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Todd Carroll</td>
<td>Map 11.v.2 Weddleton - seems ok. Similar comments to 6.v.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/24/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Todd Carroll</td>
<td>Map 11.B - (12?) - prefer 6.v.2 or 11v2, but this is ok. I would keep District 3 closer to its current boundaries. Seems like Turnagain is more an airport neighborhood than a downtown neighborhood and south of Cambell Lake, especially south of Klatt is more suited to District 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Diane Schenker</td>
<td>As a resident of the Stuckagain Heights/Basher community for over 25 years, and a lifetime Anchorage resident, I strongly oppose any plan to group our neighborhood with Eagle River, such as redistricting proposal 7. I support proposed redistricting maps 6 or 11, which keep us with adjacent neighborhoods that I visit, shop in, travel through, walk through, and regularly visit. I have not set foot in Eagle River for years, and have no reason to visit it. I will not be fairly represented by any person who is trying to address the needs of Eagle River, since I never go there, and I have no knowledge of or interest in the issues unique to that area. Likewise, my distant neighborhood would get short shrift from someone concerned with the majority of his/her constituents, Eagle River residents, who have no knowledge of or concern for my neighborhood or the areas physically around it. Residents of nearby neighborhoods do come to Stuckagain Heights to hike our trails or just enjoy a sightseeing drive, and therefore care about our road, crime, littering, vandalism, trailheads, wildlife, and other issues affecting all of us who spend time in the area. I doubt that most Eagle River residents even know where we are located, while residents of adjacent neighborhoods like Muldoon and Scenic Park, or anywhere else in East Anchorage are at least familiar with our location. Likewise, I am directly affected by what happens in East Anchorage neighborhoods adjacent to my neighborhood. I visit them daily or at least weekly to shop; I care about the same roads/traffic/transportation issues they do, and we share interest in issues such as location of homeless services in the area, parks improvements, zoning, housing projects, businesses where I shop regularly, and of course, crime. Look at an aerial map of Eagle River’s huge, significant physical separation from Stuckagain Heights and tell me that grouping us with Eagle River isn’t the very definition of gerrymandering, a blatant effort to rob us of fair representation on our Assembly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Diane Schenker</td>
<td>I support proposed redistricting maps 6 or 11, which keep us with adjacent neighborhoods that I visit, shop in, travel through, walk through, and regularly visit.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Diane Schenker</td>
<td>I support proposed redistricting maps 6 or 11, which keep us with adjacent neighborhoods that I visit, shop in, travel through, walk through, and regularly visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Map 12 Allard</td>
<td>Britton Goldberg</td>
<td>After reviewing the maps, map 12 seems to be the best of all the presented options. It makes sense, and has fewer strange borders that seem targeted to keep some houses in certain districts arbitrarily.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Shannon o'neal</td>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on draft Assembly maps. I live in East Anchorage and believe that Map 11 does the best job keeping neighborhoods together, and has the district boundaries that will be most easily understandable for local residents. It makes sense for district lines to follow major roadways, and Map 11 keeps JBER together, which is a good thing for service members living on base. Thank you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/25/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Greg Groeneweg</td>
<td>Sirs, I have resided in Anchorage since before statehood and have lived on the hillside(area by Hilltop Ski) since 1985. I have turned to my Assembly reps and community counsel from time to time over the years with assistance needed or that I offered. I am very concerned that I would be moved out of my district to Eagle River. That is a different area with different concerns. Please leave our hillside community intact. It is comforting to be connected with my physical neighbors. To be able to share &quot;over-the-fence&quot; so to speak. Please preserve our neighborhood representation. Thank you, Greg Groeneweg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Richard Fuller</td>
<td>I am referring to map 6 and map 11. The combining of Stuckagain Heights with Eagle River follows no logical reasoning in regards to infrastructured shared, issues directly affecting both areas, or maintaining voting integrity. Stuckagain Heights needs to remain in District 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2022</td>
<td>Map 6 Anchorage Action</td>
<td>Richard Fuller</td>
<td>I am referring to map 6 and map 11. The combining of Stuckagain Heights with Eagle River follows no logical reasoning in regards to infrastructured shared, issues directly affecting both areas, or maintaining voting integrity. Stuckagain Heights needs to remain in District 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/26/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2 Weddleton</td>
<td>Richard Fuller</td>
<td>I am referring to map 6 and map 11. The combining of Stuckagain Heights with Eagle River follows no logical reasoning in regards to infrastructured shared, issues directly affecting both areas, or maintaining voting integrity. Stuckagain Heights needs to remain in District 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Margaret Nelson</td>
<td>I support putting my neighborhood with the Anchorage Hillside or with Eagle River, as it does seem we have more in common with these neighborhoods. I would have liked to have seen those options. Nonetheless, I do believe the overwhelming support is for as close to the status quo as possible which it appears that is the way the assembly is leaning. However, I object to the carving out of Forrest Dunbar's house to another district. If this passes then I do believe that he should not be able to run again for assembly in a different district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/2022</td>
<td>Map 11v2</td>
<td>Laura Bonner</td>
<td>I support Map 11 version 2 (Weddleton). It keeps me in a district with my neighbors on the Hillside and South Anchorage. It keeps Stuckagain Heights as a part of East Anchorage while respecting the common community interests of Eagle River and Chugiak. It has compact shapes and uses major roads and thoroughfares as common sense boundaries. The deviation of 4.16% is acceptable. I think it is the best and fairest map proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Sandra Thompson</td>
<td>As a longtime resident of the Muldoon area, I am in favor of the adoption of Map 11. I have lived in both Fairview and Muldoon in my 50 years in Anchorage. These are culturally diverse neighborhoods, and socio-economically different from Eagle River. Map 11 draws common-sense districts. I believe this map would give each district a fair opportunity to elect representatives that fit their communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/28/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Elizabeth(Lizzie)</td>
<td>I live in Independence Park(Abbott Loop CC; O'Malley/Hillside house district; HALO district 1) I have a strong preference for map 11 v2. It was made with community input and it's the best for keeping communities together. The problems with the other maps are as follows: Maps 6-7: Split Morningside Loop neighborhood(between Old and New Seward just south of Scooter) This is a dense neighborhood that probably is multiethnic and which has been underrepresented in the past. To my knowledge, these voters aren't very engaged, probably because their neighborhood has been split for years. Map 7: Fractions of Hillside and of Basher lumped with Eagle River. For assembly members to attend that number of community council meetings(6 in Eagle River 2 in Anchorage) is a logistical nightmare. Along with the impossibility of understanding the issues facing these 3 very different communities. Map 12: Splits Abbott Loop, cutting into the heart of the community council area. Map 11 does split off Independence Park, but it's along the logical boundary of Abbott, the same as the boundary between house districts 11 and 12. The best Map 11 v2: Keeps intact: Morningrise Loop, Abbott Loop, Hillside, and Basher.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Jo Ann Gruber</td>
<td>After spending time reviewing the four (4) maps, it appears to me that Map 7 is the most reasonable and fair; and it’s the one that I support. Since Eagle River and its surrounding areas’ populations are too small for a full district, they’ve always needed to pull population from portions of Anchorage. There are individuals who support leaving areas of Muldoon or other areas of Anchorage out of the district completely. This would be simply unfair to everyone in the Municipality since it would leave District 2 significantly underpopulated and violating the principle of one person, one vote. I live in Eagle River, and I believe it’s extremely important to have equally populated districts to ensure that all districts have the same voting power. Leaving District 2 significantly underpopulated would give them more voting power than other districts in Anchorage. I understand that communities in Muldoon have felt disenfranchised by being included in the same district as Eagle River, so it’s time to consider another pairing. I believe that Eagle River and the Hillside share much more in common than Eagle River does with any portion of Muldoon. Both communities (Eagle River &amp; Hillside) are mainly rural with larger building lots. Both have limited road service areas and use well and septic systems. In addition, at an assembly meeting last year, I heard Mr. Weddleton and Ms. Allard discuss how similar both areas were. So, for the reasons stated above and the fact that it has the lowest deviation of the four maps still being considered, I support the boundaries proposed in Map 7 Version 2 submitted by Robert Hockema. Thank you for allowing us an opportunity to comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Sandy Blomfield</td>
<td>I have studied all twelve redistricting maps proposed to the assembly. The maps that the assembly has determined as semi-finalists need clarification and clear boundaries. It appears the redistricting process is being fast-tracked by the assembly in an effort to pass, once in a decade redistricting, for the benefit of sitting assembly members rather than for the good of our city. I studied the maps and worked within the confines of the semi-final maps which were pre-approved by the Anchorage Assembly Members who are also THE REAPPORTIONMENT COMMITTEE! Now there is a conflict of interest if I ever seen one! Moving geographical boundaries to secure your own assembly seat rather than what is in the best interest for the City of Anchorage. I do appreciate the considerable time and energy for residents and leaders who did make logical decisions to keep neighborhood boundaries intact. Ethnicity should not be a consideration as it has no relevance within the confines of neighborhoods. People want their representatives to properly decide on issues within congruent neighborhoods and geographical boundaries which include main arterial roads, secondary roads, limited road service districts, and community councils. The Anchorage Hillside and Eagle River residents have made their voices heard regarding placing both communities in the same non-contiguous district. The voices were a resounding NO! Likewise, Anchorage’s Downtown needs to remain independent of any other neighborhoods. Release the proposed JBER stronghold by attempting to join our military base within the density of downtown Anchorage. This action does not make sense as the needs of Downtown are far different than the unique needs of JBER Military base. Combining Eagle River and JBER is the solution and meets the population density goals. I strongly suggest an amendment is made to extend the entire redistricting process and do a proper job rather than push this process through prior to the April 5, 2022 Municipal election. Assembly members, please approach this task as the finale of your terms and please do it right! Redistrict the Municipality of Anchorage properly for the next decade, through the 2030 Census.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Chris Twiford</td>
<td>Like 12 best. 11 is good 6 version 2 is acceptable NO WAY on #7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Robin Brewster</td>
<td>After looking at the maps I am in favor of map 11. As second choice I would pick map 6. I DO NOT support Map 7 at all!! Eagle River should not be combined with Hillside. Keeping Eagle River with JBER makes the most logical sense to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Michael Vechter</td>
<td>Hello, I would like to express my support of two reapportionment maps; Map 6 v2 (by Anchorage Action) – AO 2022-37 and Map 11 v2 (by Weddleton) – AO 2022-37(S-1). These maps consider sameness of areas, and historical placement. I do NOT support other maps that attempt to gerrymander Anchorage to a more conservative minority as a false representation of our fair city. These maps are not legal, do not consider public comments, and are an obvious ploy to entrench a minority position as a force in city politics. Thank you, Mike Vechter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3/1/2022  | Unclassified | LuAnn Piccard | I am a member of the Basher Community Council, living in Stuckagain Heights. Our BCC voted overwhelmingly (65 to 5) to keep Stuckagain Heights with District 5 and NOT to join us with District 2-Eagle River (Map 7-Hockema). Specifically, I favor Map 11 v2 (Weddleton). I feel Map 11 represents balanced and proximate representation across Anchorage. I know this reapportionment process is challenging and I appreciate the hard work of the Reapportionment Committee and everyone that has participated in this process. I want to be represented by people that live in Anchorage proper, not people living 45 minutes away in Eagle River. I want representatives who will show up, engage actively, and empathize with, understand and appreciate concerns within and across our adjacent East Side and South Hillside neighborhoods regarding traffic & roads, fire and safety, crime prevention, parks and recreation, and land-use. For example, I do not support a Mass Homeless Shelter at Elmore/Tudor, and I want local representatives who understand the negative impact this $35M white elephant project will have on the East side of Anchorage and the community as whole. While supporters claim this project will benefit our homeless people, most informed experts agree that no-threshold mass shelters don't work. Smaller, tailored facilities that meet people where they are at, where some level of accountability can be maintained, and that are spread across a community do work. Our experience with Sullivan and Brother Francis/Beans facilities, the people served, and the resulting impacts on the surrounding neighborhoods and community resources provide factual evidence. Why would we support repeating the same doomed approach? Bronson's $35M megashelter vanity project will increase traffic incidents/deaths along one of our busiest and most dangerous traffic corridors. It will increase crime and safety issues for 10,000's of residents living in adjacent neighborhoods, at UAA APU, and healthcare facilities, and will compromise recreational facilities and trails nearby. It will increase the already dangerous wild-fire risk on the Hillside. It will simply transfer to East Anchorage the very same issues that we've seen at Sullivan and Brother Francis/Bean's locations. So far the concerns voiced by experts and the people most impacted have been met with indifference and fallen on the deaf ears of the current D2 representatives. The current representatives from D2 Eagle River have demonstrated that they don't care about East Anchorage. They do not listen to or appreciate our concerns, despite significant public testimony at Assembly meetings and other forums when these issues have been discussed in depth. In fact I have never heard either
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3/1/2022 | Unclassified | Leon Jaimes | Hello, I support pairing Eagle River with Hillside in order to ensure that the district is as close as possible to 48,541 people. I oppose pairing Eagle River with Muldoon or Downtown because those are demographically different than Eagle River. The 2020 Census shows that Eagle River is 76% White, it shows that Muldoon is only 43% White. If we assume that the current Assembly Member from Eagle River accurately represents Eagle River right now, with ties to white supremacist groups like the Three Percenters, and with defensiveness of hateful symbols such as license plates that celebrate Nazi's then it would not make sense to pair an area with a large percentage of non-White people with a community who has elected a representative who is a threat to them. While this is certainly an unfortunate circumstance, and we would all hope to have an anti-racist Assembly Member for every district in our Municipality, we can not escape the racist reality in which we find ourselves. In conclusion, I will share some quotes from the private Save Anchorage group which Member Jamie Allard is a member of. These were in response to a story in the Alaska Watchman about the non-partisan group The Alaska Black Caucus who was organizing a march in September 2020 to commemorate the 57th anniversary of the March on Washington. G.O. said: "Wow. I cant believe just how many supporters of the terrorist organization there are in alaska" T.T. said: "So they think we have some store to loot? That won't go well for them." C.B. said "They better not come here at all if they know whats good for them!" C.P. said "lets meet them on the other side of the street..........we are not Calif. They showed up in other places and they were meet with guns, we can do the same" AND "Black lives don't matter, you are rioters not protesters" T.K. said "September 7th makes sense. Night has returned to Alaska. Easier to cause mayhem under the cover of darkness. BLM: Burn, Loot and Murder." P.W. said "Just a reminder to this BLM group. We are not Seattle or Portland. As much as our Mayor would like us to be." L.A. said "We are also heavily armed." T.K. said ""I have a dream! I dream of a country where a black man can loot Walmart and Target stores and there are no oppressive white police around to stop him!""
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Barbara Gingell-Farris</td>
<td>I urge you to keep Muldoon and any area in East Anchorage out of the Eagle River apportionment. Eagle River has nothing in common, socio-economically, with those of us who live in Muldoon. We don't share the same services, stores or recreational opportunities. We in Muldoon are a diverse population. And including Muldoon with Eagle River, white-washes and dilutes that diversity. Please consider adding a portion of the hillside to Eagle River. They are more similar physically and socio-economically to Eagle River.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Julie Barrow</td>
<td>After carefully looking at each proposed map, I believe map 11 would be the best choice for Anchorage Residents. Map 7 is absolutely ridiculous and should be thrown out, combining Hillside and Eagle River would be a last two I would even think about combining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Jeffrey Sperry</td>
<td>Weddleton Map 11 v2 is the best choice of all of the maps. It maintains the current districts as much as possible and is very reasonable. It is the map that should be chosen above all of the others All of the other maps should be thrown away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/2/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Sandy Blomfield</td>
<td>Endorsement of Map #11, V3 with minor accommodations to keep neighborhoods intact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Date** | **Topic** | **Commenter** | **Comment**
--- | --- | --- | ---
3/15/2022 | Unclassified | Jonathan and Margaret Isaacs | March 14, 2022

Dear Assembly Members: Re: AO 2022-37(S-1) Assembly Redistricting of Turnagain and West High Neighborhood

With regard to Ordinance No. AO 2022-37(S-1), we are contacting you to express our opposition to include the Forest Park Drive-West High neighborhood, west of Minnesota Drive and south of Westchester Lagoon, in the Downtown Assembly District as part of the redistricting process. We have lived at our current address for the past 45 years.

Our neighborhood has had nothing in common with the Downtown District for decades. During that period, we have been actively part of the Turnagain District and neighborhood, participating in neighborhood issues related to West Northern Lights Blvd traffic, Ted Stevens International Airport, Fish Creek and Turnagain Bog Wetlands, and Safe Routes to School Committees, among many other Turnagain area issues. Our community involvement is consistently reflected in Turnagain Community Council records. The character of our neighborhood – residential single family and duplex housing stock, lot size and zoning - has more in common with the Turnagain area than the Downtown area. In talking with our friends and neighbors, few are aware of the proposed assembly district change and how it will affect our neighborhood; once informed, they are uniformly opposed.

We sympathize with the difficulties faced by the Assembly in the redistricting process, and understand that the current proposed redistricting leaves a lot of people dissatisfied. We have nothing but respect for the Downtown Assembly members, but feel that our neighborhood interests have been and will remain best represented by our two West Anchorage Assembly members. Therefore, we request that the assembly district boundaries for our neighborhood remain part of Assembly District 3, rather than as shown in Assembly Redistricting Map 11V2. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully

Jon and Marnie Isaacs 2418 Forest Park Drive Anchorage, Alaska 99517 isaacs@gci.net
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Cami Dalton</td>
<td>I realize that it is complicated and messy and is never going to be perfect, but after reviewing all the maps, complaints, etc., I am in favor of the reapportionment maps devised by John Weddleton.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/15/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Less Hultquist</td>
<td>I want map 11 first to be approved and/or then map 6 but NO WAY map 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Shelly Dalton</td>
<td>My vote is map 11... Seems very commonsensical and no on map 7!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Brenda Bergsrud</td>
<td>I would like to testify in favor of Chris Constant’s amendment. I believe that this amendment takes into consideration public testimony as well the concerns that the Assembly members identified in work sessions. It is responsive to public testimony that asks for Turnagain to remain whole in West Anchorage, it keeps East Anchorage whole, and puts East High in East Anchorage, and keeps Rogers Park and upper Airport Heights in Midtown. Please accept the amendment put forward by Chris and continue the process so that we can move forward with the election of our new downtown assembly member.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3/16/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Timbi Barron</td>
<td>I support Christopher Constant’s amendments to Map 11.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Barry Piser</td>
<td>I would like support the Constant Amended Map 11 v2. This amendment takes into consideration public testimony and concerns identified during community work sessions. The amendment summary does a good of job of highlighting the reasoning and positive outcome: moving three high schools back into their namesake districts. I am specifically opposed to the Kennedy Amended Map 11 v2. This amendment shows a lack of understanding regarding community identity in the proposed areas of change, while illegally splitting census blocks. Please accept the amendment put forward by Assemblyperson Christopher Constant. As a resident of District 1, please move forward as quickly as possible so that my district can achieve the equal representation that was overwhelmingly approved by Anchorage voters in 2020 with the passage of Propostion 12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/17/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Tiffany Ma</td>
<td>I would like support the Constant Amended Map 11 v2. As a mother of three children, I like that three high schools back into their namesake districts. I am specifically opposed to the Kennedy Amended Map 11 v2. As a former resident of College Village until 2020, I can see those working on this amendment do not understand some of the neighborhoods they propose splitting. Please approve Christopher Constant’s amendment of Map 11v2. As a District 1 resident, I ask that you move quickly so that my district can have equal representation as intended by the passage of Propostion 12 in 2020.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Sheri Whitethorn</td>
<td>Dear Anchorage Assembly: I have heard generally good comments about the Reapportionment Map 11 V2 Constant Amendments in the various sections that are proposed for changes from that, with the exception of the proposed change to the Airport Heights area. Please do NOT accept this section of the Constant Amendment. Dividing Airport Heights in two does nothing helpful for the neighborhood or for Anchorage as a whole. Either leave this area as it currently is in Map 11 v2, without this amendment, or amend this section of the amendment’s map in this area of town to make Northern Lights BLVD. the straight dividing line from West/District 3 through Midtown/4 all the way to District 3/East. This would make for clean, easy to understand and follow lines between districts. Because we are adding a new Assembly member to District 1, this reapportionment is more broad than the more usual tweaks that are done every ten years. Let’s do this carefully in ways that make sense for specific areas as much as possible, while taking a broader view of what works best for Anchorage as a whole. Thank you all for your diligent work on this big project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Gretchen Stoddard</td>
<td>Thank you for all your work. It sounds like a lot of productive discussion in the reapportionment meeting this morning, that was adjourned at 3/18/22 by 10:50 or soon before 11 am. I am very appreciative the meeting is available online for viewing, thanks. Can we please have an update to the reapportionment timeline on the website? This is in Timeline and Participation Options. I told some people the wrong time for the reapportionment meeting today. That is not a significant problem, but I am not sure where we are going on the meetings. When I look now, 3/18 afternoon, I see a ”2022-0228, Updated Reapportionment Timeline.pdf” This appears to be a press release from 2-28-22. It says there is a worksession today at 1 - 3 pm, and I think the meeting was adjourned before that time. Current information I see from the Muni Reapportionment website. This is a cut &amp; paste from the Muni Reapportionment website I see now and the time of the 3/18 meeting probably changed. Not a problem, but it would be great to confirm the path forward here: • March 15: Public Hearing #3 at Regular Assembly Meeting, 6pm at Assembly Chambers at Loussac Library • March 18: Assembly Worksessions on Reapportionment, 1-3pm at City Hall, Suite 155 • March 23: Special Assembly meeting re: Reapportionment and process for filling new Assembly seat, 6pm at Assembly Chambers at Loussac Library.....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/20/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Yarrow Silvers</td>
<td>I am strongly opposed to the Meg/Felix amendment for a couple reasons. This amendment was turned in after the public comment period, limiting public participation. Furthermore, unless someone specifically goes to the committee page, they would have no idea that this amendment had even been introduced for consideration as it is past the agreed upon and publicized period for introduction. This is way too important of a process to have last minute amendments sprung on the public, that they are unable to fully participate in. I oppose this amendment as well as any other last minute amendments, particularly anything that may be brought up during the assembly debate process. In the state redistricting process, the senate pairings were brought to vote without public comment, damaging public trust by springing on the public a gerrymander that the board knew would be unacceptable to the public; the courts found that this action was a violation of section 10 and remanded the maps back to the board to be redrawn. Please do not make this same mistake in your process. I also oppose this map because of the finger carving apart diverse neighborhoods in East Anchorage. This has the appearance of a gerrymander. East Anchorage is tired of fingers, tired of being gerrymandered, and tired of being treated as 2nd class citizens because of our largely low income residential status. I am in support of Chris Constant’s amendment because it ticks all the boxes for the requests by the different areas of town - upper Airport Heights and Rogers Park in Midtown, East high, Bartlett and the Muldoon corridor in East Anchorage, and West High/Forest Park in West Anchorage, while keeping districts compact and with lines that make sense. I like the way East Anchorage appears very compact with no fingers or gerrymanders. After a multitude of public and assembly input that upper Airport Heights has a distinct Midtown identity, it defies reason that it has suddenly been thrust into downtown in this last minute amendment. Thank you for your consideration and for your hard work in this process. I continue to invite assembly members to consider Anchorage as a whole and to consider the importance of following a proper process, rather than approaching this with a Laser like focus on their own districts. Yarrow Silvers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Andrew Gray</td>
<td>I support Constant Amended Map 11 V2. I agree with the logic of restoring high schools to their namesake districts. Although the Kennedy Amended Map 11 V2 also restores high schools to their respective districts, the deviations benefit District 2 at the cost of all other districts; the Constant version benefits District 1 and 5 as well as District 2. To my mind, it is not fair to have a map that only benefits one district. Please note, I live in District 4 which actually is much closer to the goal number on the Kennedy version; so my comment is not selfish -- I still prefer the Constant version. I also believe that more than enough time has been given for consideration of the maps (almost three months with 16 different chances for the public to testify); I do not believe that additional time would make much difference at this point. I encourage the Assembly to vote yes on Constant Amended Map 11 V2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/22/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Michael Schechter</td>
<td>I am a West Anchorage resident and I support the Constant Amended S-1 as the best map for ensuring current communities are represented as districts. Kennedy S-1 makes the problems of the prior round of mapping worse and seems designed solely for the benefit of Eagle River rather than Anchorage as a whole.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/23/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Irene Bortnick</td>
<td>As a 33 year member of the Roger’s Park Community Council, I ask that you adopt AO 2022-37(S-1), Constant Amended Map 11 v2. The RPCC has been an active and engaged council for many years and it should be kept intact. In addition, keeping the high schools in the districts they are in now is important. It is time to take a vote and finalize the map. The more delays, the more amendments are proposed which leads to more delays. The public has had enough time to weigh in. The committee has had enough time to debate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Julie Coulombe</td>
<td>The Board of HALO has passed, with unanimous vote, the attached resolution against combining any or part of the Hillside with Eagle River (District 2).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
RESOLUTION AND COMMENTS FROM THE RABBIT CREEK COMMUNITY COUNCIL ON THE 2022 ASSEMBLY REAPPORTIONMENT PROCESS

At our February 10, 2022 meeting, the Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) discussed draft maps currently under consideration for the required Assembly Reapportionment process. In doing so, the RCCC reminds the Assembly Reapportionment Committee that: legal requirements compel the Committee to create districts which are "compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socioeconomic area" (Municipality of Anchorage Code of Ordinance, Part I, Article IV, Section 4.01). By a vote of 26 yea, 3 nay, and 1 abstention, RCCC approved the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

The Rabbit Creek Community Council:
- Affirms that the re-apportionment closely follow the legal requirements to create compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated districts.
- Opposes combination of any portions of the Hillside with Eagle River.
- Emphasizes that Chugach State Park does not create contiguity between the populations of the Hillside and Eagle River, as it is uninhabited. Therefore, reapportionment maps should display it as a distinct, unpopulated area.
- Supports continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.

Comments highlighted in yellow oppose the Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Commenter</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2022</td>
<td>Map 10 Wells B</td>
<td>Ann Rappoport, Co-chair</td>
<td>Supports continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2022</td>
<td>Map 9 Wells A</td>
<td>Ann Rappoport, Co-chair</td>
<td>Supports continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/13/2022</td>
<td>Eagle River\Hillside</td>
<td>Ann Rappoport, Co-chair</td>
<td>While maintaining a low population deviation between districts is of obvious importance, it is not outlined as a consideration in Section 4.01, and therefore should not be granted more importance than the criteria that are included in Municipal ordinance. Respecting neighborhood continuity is more important than pushing for the smallest deviation in size of each Assembly district and will best achieve fair representation. We do appreciate the difficulty of this effort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/21/2022</td>
<td>JBER</td>
<td>Rachel Boudreau</td>
<td>Please see the attached resolution from the Northeast Community Council. Resolution 2022-01 Northeast Community Council (NECC) January 20, 2022 Assembly Reapportionment WHEREAS, the Northeast Community Council (NECC) is the Community Council that is the voice of the people of Northeast Anchorage and includes the following boundaries: Northeast Community council 8 WHEREAS, according to Census data, Northeast Anchorage has one of the most ethnically and racially diverse populations in the United States; WHEREAS, according to Census data, the Northeast Community Council area has a population of 29,266; WHEREAS, The target population per district is 48,541. The total deviation in actual population to target population must be less than 10% (federal law), and ideally less than 50/0. WHEREAS, Northeast Anchorage is a distinct and socioeconomically integrated area with strong neighborhood identities very different than that of Eagle River; WHEREAS, Northeast Anchorage is home to many active-duty service members and Veterans who frequent the businesses and services provided along Muldoon Rd and near the Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER) Muldoon Rd. gate, WHEREAS, in the past, portions of Northeast Anchorage have been included within the Eagle River district that is not socioeconomically similar and have very different legislative interests; NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED the NECC respectfully asks the Anchorage Assembly to: 1. Protect our and maintain our ties by including the entire NECC boundaries within one Assembly District; 2. Include Bartlett High School in our District to keep it connected to the families it serves. Date: January 20, 2022 Votes for: 10 Motion Passes President: Votes Against: 0 Abstain: 1 Motion Does Not Pass Secretary: T'Shalla Baker Rachel Boudreau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Margaret Nelson</td>
<td>The Basher Community Council supports maps 6 and/or 11, per the attached resolution. We appreciate your consideration of the community's position. FYI about 70 people in the community were surveyed and the vote was overwhelming that the Stuckagain Heights area served by the Basher Community Council remain within Anchorage proper.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/1/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Margaret Tyler</td>
<td>Please see attached resolution from the Girdwood Board of Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/18/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Gretchen Stoddard</td>
<td>Dear Chair LaFrance and Assembly Members: Huffman O'Malley Community Council thanks you and the reapportionment committee for the work toward redistricting efforts. After looking at the Amendments submitted and active on 3/17, we voted to strongly support the Weddleton map 11 v2. HOCC has monitored and commented on the redistricting process. We have studied each proposed map, and would take this opportunity to thank you for listening to our community concerns. The Huffman O'Malley Community Council had our monthly meeting on Thursday 3/17 starting at 7 pm. We voted unanimously to support the Weddleton map 11 v2. Thank you. Gretchen Stoddard Huffman O'Malley Community Council President Note/ Addition on 3/18. I apologize to the community and community council members. Last night (3/17 or 3/18 am) I thought I entered comments before the apportionment committee meeting on 3/18 am. I did not successfully enter the comments correctly, and that was my operator error when using the commenting website. Our community council members evaluated 3 maps at our 3/17 meeting. We thought that was the total of the current maps. We evaluated (Weddleton) Map 11 v2; Kennedy S1 map 11 v2; and Constant S1 map 11 v2. I now see an addition to the website with an amended map from Zalatel Rivera S1 map 11 v2, and our council did not evaluate that map. If this is a current map to evaluate, we would appreciate a view of that map, but it seems these changes are north of our community council area and district. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Commenter</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/21/2022</td>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>Anna Brawley</td>
<td>This comment is re-affirming Turnagain Community Council’s priorities and position on AO 2022-37, Municipal Reapportionment, and amendments to be considered at this Wednesday's special meeting. Our original testimony is re-attached, expressing concerns with the current map under consideration (Map 11 v.2, Constant Amendment S-1) and also with Map 12, which has since been archived. Our original testimony at the March 1, 2022 meeting is attached for reference. Turnagain Community Council supports the proposed changes in the Constant amendment to restore the West High and Forest Park area of Turnagain in District 3, and opposes the increased amount of community council area removed from District 3 in the Kennedy amendment. We urge the Assembly to adopt the Constant amendment in the final map. Our reasons for supporting the Constant amendment are outlined in our original testimony, because we support keeping our community council area within the same district, and this particular area is strongly integrated with and identified as an important part of West Anchorage. Similarly, while the Kennedy amendment does not go as far as the prior Map 12 did in splitting up our district, is removes more of our council area from District 3, which conflicts with keeping our council area within one district. Again, we urge the Assembly to adopt the Constant amendment, then promptly approve that amended map as the final Reapportionment maps for Anchorage for the next decade. Thank you for the opportunity to engage in this thorough and complex process, and finding a balance that promotes fair representation in Anchorage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: April 5, 2022, 11:11 pm

First Name: Katherine

Last Name: McDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable: n/a

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate

Public Comment: Good evening,

I would like to put on the record my thoughts regarding to Senate pairings.

First, I want to commend the Redistricting Board staff on their recent work on getting the Options 1, 2, and 3 maps on the website. They are easy to understand and the color coding showing the variances between the 2021 and the 2022 pairings is informative.

I've lived in the following Anchorage districts from least to most recent.

23 (JBER) 3 years

21 (South Muldoon) 1 year

12 (Abbott) 23 years

9 (Hillside) 2 years - Current

I did provide Senate pairing feedback on November 7th related to Anchorage and didn’t even list districts 24 (Chugiak) and 23 (Eagle River) because I saw these districts as definitively distinct from the Anchorage bowl and therefore, they would unequivocally belong together.

Back in November when the Board was first discussing Anchorage Senate pairings, as a current district 9 resident, I was appreciative when the board on the morning of November 8th had determined that then numbered districts 9 (Hillside) and 15 (O’Malley/Huffman), which is now numbered as district 11, had unanimously been verbally agreed to be paired by the board. This aligns with my written testimony on November 8th applauding the board for proposing to pair these two districts. This was before the board went into executive session for hours that evening and the next
morning and came out with pairings with no justification on the record that no longer included the singular agreement of all the members of a Hillside and O’Malley/Huffman district pairing. This is because in my experience living in Anchorage, the needs, schools, roads, and community of these two districts best fit together. I have four households and 16 individuals within my immediate family that live in the proposed district 11, and the community concerns between our households are similar. We shop at the same establishments and have our children recreate at the same community places off of O’Malley and Old Seward.

However, I understand that Anchorage is more than just my district and that the top ranked pairing logically for my district may not fit within the pairings of other house districts to make the most sense of Anchorage as a whole. For that reason, I would look to the surrounding districts to rank which ones logically make sense to pair with it based on which districts physically touch. In order: district 11 (O’Malley/Huffman), district 10 (Klatt/Bayshore), district 12 (Abbott/Elmore), district 22 (Eagle River).

Therefore, the plans I support in order are:

Option 1: As a district 9 resident, my needs are most aligned with district 11. Many of the homes have septic and private wells, roads are shared, school boundaries are shared, community councils are shared, and I would come into contact with my neighbors at the playgrounds our children frequent and the Huffman Carrs many in our area shop.

Option 2: As noted above, I believe district 9 would fit second best with district 10. These areas both attend South Anchorage High School and Goldenview, shop at the Carrs on Huffman, and frequent the same stretch of the Seward Highway on our drives into work. I can understand how some testifiers would support this map over Option 1 as changing the least amount of Senate districts from the 2021 plan, while performing the necessary changes to comply with the court ruling, and importantly still ensuring districts pair with a logical house district to avoid similar legal issues that arose in the unconstitutional pairing in the lawsuit.

Option 3: I do not support this plan. As previously noted, Eagle River districts belong together. If you take politics out of it and ask a lay person who is not intricately involved in redistricting the following questions, the reason to not support the pairing of District 9 (Hillside) and District 22 (Eagle River) is apparent.

1. Within an urban community environment, does it make sense to pair a district with another district across a mountain range that would take driving through 7 other districts along the Seward to Glenn or 5 other districts along Huffman to Elmore to Martin Luther King to Muldoon to the Glenn?
2. Within an urban community environment, does it make sense to try to pair districts together so there is some overlap in any type of school (elementary, middle, or high) environment?

3. Within an urban community environment, does it make sense to try to pair districts together where residents frequent the same supermarkets, community recreation areas, events, and community councils?

In an urban environment, it is inconceivable that South Anchorage be paired over a mountain range with no shared community places where one would run into members from the other district that share a Senator. The only times I venture into Eagle River is for an event like the Bear Paw festival that the entirety of Anchorage would also attend.

I implore the Board to please try to be non-partisan and logical from a lay person’s perspective. This would be to support rather Option 1 if trying to best pair Anchorage districts from a clean slate or Option 2 if trying to maintain the least amount of change from the 2021 map while best aligning the house districts that touch the districts noted in the litigation.

Thank you for your consideration.

Katherine McDonald
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 7:43 am

First Name: Steven

Last Name: Carhart

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [

Your ZIP Code: 99652

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): WE MUST STOP THE BAHNKE PLAN FROM BEING ADOPTED.

Public Comment: This is blatant gerrymandering by the Senate minority. They disregard any sensible approach to redistricting. Please defeat the Bahnke Plan.
Date: April 6, 2022, 7:51 am

First Name: Randy. Last Name: Ruedrich

Group Affiliation, if applicable: AFFER

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99501-4495

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Corrected Final Map of Anchorage Senate District - Replaces prior comments on topic

Public Comment: Time for final look at the Anchorage Senate Map. In November 2021 I testified that HD 22 could be paired with HD 20, HD 21 and HD 9. These three pairing create the contiguous districts that satisfy the Alaska Constitutional requirement for senate district pairing. Let’s explore the third option HD 9.

The entire Anchorage Municipality is socio-economically integrated as a matter of law. Hence all sixteen Anchorage Municipality House Districts are socio-economically integrated.

Four 2021 Proclamation Map Senate Districts are acceptable as paired: District F: HD 11 & 12, the Anchorage Lower Hillside; District H: HD 15 & 16, Western Anchorage; District I: HD 17 & 18, Downtown/ Mountain View and District L: HD 23 & HD 24, Northern Muni Districts.

Senate District E pairs HD 9 & HD 22 which are the Muni Eastern uplands. Road service areas and snow management are common upland issues. 2001 Map combined major parts of this senate district in a single House District when their populations were smaller. Higher price single family homes are typical throughout the proposed District E.

Senate District G pairs HD 10 & HD 13 lie mostly west of Seward Highway. More than 75% of this proposed district is in District L today. Medium-priced single-family homes are present throughout proposed Senate District G. The Dimond Blvd shopping and recreation is the focus of District G.

Senate District J pairs HD 14 & HD 19 in mid-town Anchorage. Spenard and U/Med share higher density housing. These mid-town districts have been paired in prior Redistricting Board Proclamations

Senate District K pairs HD 20 & D 21 in Muldoon/Baxter. This district is closely tied to JBER for jobs and off base housing. The commercial activities along Muldoon Road serve the entire Senate District.
Date: April 6, 2022, 8:47 am

First Name: Elyce

Last Name: Santerre

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairings, Chugiak and the bases

Public Comment: I hadn’t commented previously because I didn’t think Chugiak had a dog in the fight about whether south Eagle River paired with South Anchorage (although I have to say, that seems to make sense culturally). I didn’t realize that the other alternative being proposed was not to pair them with another section of Muldoon, or with the bases, but to take the bases away from pairing with us and pairing them with a downtown Anchorage district. That’s just blatant gerrymandering. The bases have historically leaned conservative, but with low turnout. Democrat planners apparently can’t stand the thought of them being paired with another conservative district, never mind the close cultural links between the bases and all the military retirees and off-base personnel in Eagle River/Chugiak. They’re trying to nab an “extra” liberal senator for Anchorage, at the cost of the greater Eagle River/Chugiak area. I thought such concerns weren’t allowed? I thought decisions were supposed to be made based on cultural affinity and contiguous geography? I and many of my neighbors work or worked for years on the bases. I still shop there. I don’t want to see them “hijacked” for a political agenda. That’s just not right. I’d testify in person, but I’m home sick and don’t want to bring my coughing and sneezing out in public.
Hello,

I oppose the pairing of Eagle River and South Anchorage. I support the map proposed with the least amount of changes which would keep the Eagle River districts together and I believe the Muldoon District to gather that was proposed by the east Anchorage plaintiffs.

Thanks,

Leon Jaimes

Anchorage, Alaska 99508
Date: April 6, 2022, 9:35 am

First Name: **Claiborne**

Last Name: **Porter, AIA**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **A very concerned citizen**

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99518**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **The lack of recognition of the Downtown core as unique to the city’s viability.**

Public Comment:
Date: April 6, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Glen

Last Name: Biegel

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Affected voter in Anchorage

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): The banke map upends previous work and does not meet the instructions of the court

Public Comment: The banke map upends previous work and does not meet the instructions of the court. Why try to rewrite all of Anchorage? The court didn't ask for that, and the process did not forward this map on.
As a lifelong Alaskan I am abhorred by the choices we are being given as Eagle River residents. Being lumped in with other communities that do not match our demographic is really unfair.

Please accept my testimony as requesting you listen to an Eagle River resident that prefers Option 3 as the only choice left that is suitable for our demographic.

Thank you,

Andra Holmstrom
My name is Burt Bomhoff. I encourage the Redistricting Board to adopt a revised senate district map that links House District 9 (South Anchorage) with House District 22 (Eagle River Valley). These districts share common characteristics justifying their inclusion in the same Senate District K:

- Each district encompasses many residents living on the foothills and upper slopes of the Chugach Mountains, and as such, one of the most significant common issues residents in these districts face is access to their homes, and their connections to the rest of Anchorage.

- While much of the rest of Anchorage relies on municipal and state road maintenance, residents of these two districts rely to a great extent on Local Road Service Boards to provide for maintenance of their roads, including snow removal, graveling and repair.

- Residents in each district face the challenge of managing the risks inherent in living along the urban-wildland fire interface, planning for and responding to wildlife incursions and hazards, less reliable utility service, extremes of weather, and other common issues.

- The recent snow avalanche that has isolated District 22 residents in the Hiland Road area is a dynamic that is familiar to residents of District 9, who have themselves experienced the hazards of snowslides, traffic halts, and risk to property and personal safety.

- It should go without saying that these two districts are socio-economically integrated by virtue each being fully within the Municipality of Anchorage. They are also contiguous, being joined in the uplands of the Chugach Mountains a standard that has already been found valid in earlier district maps that linked an Eagle River Valley House district across the Chugach Mountains to an adjoining House district to the south.
Jodi Taylor <[redacted]>  
Wed 4/6/2022 10:49 AM  
Redistricting Board,  

I support option 3 for the Senate seat redistricting. While not ideal compared to the first approved option, is best suits the needs of my South Anchorage community to be combined with Eagle River.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jodi Taylor
Greetings. I am a long-time resident of East Anchorage and a lifelong citizen of Anchorage. The Board should act immediately to comply with the court’s requirements and minimize confusion if this process is dragged out. It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election. The redistricting Board has an obligation to the public to resolve this quickly to avoid voter confusion and disenfranchisement.

In Anchorage, the Board should adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke instead of coming up with new pairings. These pairings, proposed by Melanie Bahnke, have been presented and considered on the record and were informed by public input and testimony. These pairings do not change districts’ underlying deviation and uphold the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc, Eagle River w/ Eagle River, etc.).

Thank you for taking testimony and standing up for rational districts in Anchorage.
Date: April 6, 2022, 10:57 am

First Name: John

Last Name: Gaydos

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I am against pairing House District 17 and 23 (downtown and JBER) into one Senate seat.

I am against the "Bahnke pairings", that is obvious gerrymandering.

Thank you,

John Gaydos
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:02 am

First Name: Randall

Last Name: Hagenstein

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Following the AK constitution and the AK Supreme Court directive

Public Comment: I'm tracking the hearings and public testimony. The shenanigans around pairing Eagle River with S. Anchorage are exactly the sort of thing that forced the Supreme Court to toss the previous senate map as unconstitutional partisan gerrymandering.

Please cut the partisan shenanigans and do your damn job in a way that is non-partisan and honors the constitution. Jeez!
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 11:06 am

First Name: Jason

Last Name: Norris

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate Pairings

Public Comment: The original Senate K pairing was struck down as a political gerrymander. These ongoing attempts to split Eagle River are the same effort. It is hypocritical that the original pairing was defended on the basis that some Eagle River people shop in Muldoon, but now they are trying to defend pairing Eagle River with South Anchorage, which have no such connection. While the guidelines for Senate pairing are fairly nebulous, the Supreme Court has determined these efforts to be political gerrymandering. The two Eagle River house districts should be paired. That is the obvious, simple solution. The only plans suggesting splitting Eagle River are proposed by those who stand to gain politically, and that speaks volumes not just about motives, but how splitting Eagle River would be viewed by the courts should a plan splitting Eagle River be adopted.
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:16 am

First Name: Dan

Last Name: Allard

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: (no subject)

Submitted the following:

Please DO NOT ADOPT THE BAHNKE PLAN The Board should take its time to carefully consider the future impact on the affected citizens! The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. Redistricting should be balanced, fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process should be fair to all; not just a small group of partisan individuals.

Voting for the current Municipal election is tomorrow! To expedite this process, so quickly, shows a clear disregard for the opinions of the majority of the citizens that will be impacted! Expedited Redistricting plans are totally inappropriate and contrary to good public policy! The process should be informed by thorough public comment, input and discussion!

We've had muni elections and an avalanche that impacted those that should have input, yet had no utilities, phone service or internet service until Saturday. I'm in favor of the map which supports 9/22.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 11:19 am

First Name: Jamie
Last Name: Allard
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact:
Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: (no subject)

Submitted the following:

Please DO NOT ADOPT THE BAHNKE PLAN The Board should take its time to carefully consider the future impact on the affected citizens! The Bahnke plan is clearly partisan. Redistricting should be balanced, fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. By rushing the process, it doesn't allow proper public participation. This process should be fair to all; not just a small group of partisan individuals.

Voting for the current Municipal election is tomorrow! To expedite this process, so quickly, shows a clear disregard for the opinions of the majority of the citizens that will be impacted! Expedited Redistricting plans are totally inappropriate and contrary to good public policy! The process should be informed by thorough public comment, input and discussion!

We’ve had muni elections and an avalanche that impacted those that should have input, yet had no utilities, phone service or internet service until Saturday. Support map which includes paring of Eagle River and Jber. 23/24
Date: April 6, 2022, 11:42 am

First Name: Cindy

Last Name: Allred

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Government Hill resident

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Government Hill pairing

Public Comment: Dear Redistricting Board,

I am a resident of Government Hill and I support the logical choice of pairing Government Hill with downtown Anchorage.

I do not support Government Hill being paired with Eagle River. The two areas are very diverse and it doesn't make sense.

Best,

Cindy Allred, Government Hill resident
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:00 pm

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Coumbe

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Keep Downtown Anchorage in Same Senate District

Public Comment: Downtown Anchorage has been separated into two House Districts by this Redistricting Board. As a resident in this part of town for more than 30 years, this makes no sense to me. However, since this wrong choice appears to be moving forward, the right choice for a Senate district is to keep downtown all in one district. I live downtown. I work downtown. I walk downtown. Downtown Anchorage is one compact and historic part of the city. Please do not separate this core of the city into separate Senate districts. Maintain Downtown Anchorage in one Senate district. Thank you.
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:12 pm

First Name: **tom**

Last Name: **brice**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99803**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Eagle River and Downtown**

Public Comment: **In the Senate, keep Eagle River House Districts paired for the Senate District and the two Downtown House Districts in a single Senate District**
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:15 pm

First Name: Matthew

Last Name: Moser

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Breaking of Downtown Anchorage, splitting of Eagle River

Public Comment: I would like to make a comment in support of version 1, the Bahnke map.

Eagle River should be in a single Eagle River Senate district.

Downtown Anchorage should not be split into two Senate districts. And, finally, South Anchorage should not be paired with Eagle River.

The proposal to pair Eagle River and South Anchorage is clearly being driven by partisan motivations. Please reject this gerrymandering and let common sense prevail.
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:18 pm

First Name: Brooke

Last Name: Dudley

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I believe map 2 is the more fair and legal map.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 12:20 pm

First Name: Jon
Last Name: Cecil

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please consider any proposed pairings of Downtown Anchorage, Eagle River, and South Anchorage as separate, individual (stand alone) districts. Thank you.
Hello,

I am appalled that Member Simpson would further delay the remedy required by the court by entertaining Member Marcum's motion. If this stands, then it means that the board will need to entertain any submission by the public, regardless of whether or not they are constitutional. This disenfranchises the public, and it dishonors my time, and the time of other testifiers.

Thanks,

Leon Jaimes
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:22 pm

First Name: Serena

Last Name: Green

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501-5722

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): V1 - Banhke

Public Comment: I am a lifetime Alaskan and I support the V1 map for several reasons. First there already has been a public hearing, which was Publicly presented and considered on the record and Informed by public input and testimony. Second, and more importantly, it does not change underlying deviation of districts and upholds one person, one vote principle. And finally, it adopts common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc. Eagle River w/ Eagle River etc.). Pairing Eagle River with Girdwood makes no logical sense and should be rejected. Instead, V1 map Banhke should be adopted. Thank you.
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:25 pm

First Name: **Patrick**

Last Name: **FitzGerald**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Teamsters Local 959**

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99503**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Eagle River**

Public Comment: Please keep districts within logical boundaries. It makes no sense for someone from Girdwood to be represented by a senator from Eagle River. Not only for representative purposes but access to their law maker.
Date: April 6, 2022, 12:48 pm

First Name: Lizzie

Last Name: Newell

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support senate pairing maps 1 or 2. NO to 3

Public Comment: I strongly oppose pairing South Anchorage with Eagle River. Doing so would split community council areas in both South Anchorage and Eagle River. South Anchorage has 9 community councils with 3 of them split (shared with my district). Eagle River HD22 has 3 community councils with 2 of them split with the other half of Eagle.

South Anchorage has 9 community councils with 3 of them split (shared with my district). Eagle River HD22 has 3 community councils with 2 of them split with the other half of Eagle.

River. It's physically impossible for 1 senator to attend these 12 community meetings, not when it involves driving 70 miles or more through, or touching, on 11 other community council areas. Its a burden I don't want to place on anyone. A senator simply can't effectively represent both South Anchorage and Eagle River.

While I prefer plan 1 (lower number of split CC areas) plan 2 is acceptable. Splitting and lumping South Anchorage and Eagle River communities is not. Such a pairing is not compact, contiguous, or socially integrated.
Date: April 6, 2022, 1:33 pm

First Name: Dennis J

Last Name: Knebel Jr

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: This is pretty simple like playing connect the dots. Eagle River is Eagle River, South Anchorage is South Anchorage and the Hillside is the Hillside. So connect the dots and get this done. It’s so easy you should have been done yesterday. It’s what the residents of Southcentral Alaska deserve.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 1:34 pm

First Name: Betsy

Last Name: Connell

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Girdwood Resident

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Combining Girdwood and Eagle River into One District

Public Comment: I strongly OPPOSE the redistricting map that combines Girdwood and Eagle River into one district. It makes far more sense to combine the areas that are connected by the Seward Highway - the Hillside/Rabbit Creek/Potter Marsh areas, Indian and Bird Creek, Girdwood, and Portage. Many issues in this area involve the Seward Highway. Issues that are important to areas along the Turnagain Arm are quite different than those related to suburban Eagle River. I look forward to you accepting a redistricting map that DOES NOT have Girdwood and Eagle River in the same district. Thank you.
Date: April 6, 2022, 2:00 pm

First Name: Spencer

Last Name: Moore

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Bahnke Plan

Public Comment: Please do not adopt the Bahnke plan, it seems partisan to me and does not represent the people of East Anchorage/Eagle River. I'd like to see more public debate on the issue and allow the public to decide the matter. Thanks!
Date: April 6, 2022, 2:10 pm

First Name: **Sally**

Last Name: **Kneeland**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99577**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting plan**

Public Comment: **Support option 2 which is a logical plan. It makes NO sense to pair Eagle River with Girdwood and South Anchorage.**
To whom it may concern,
Please consider my comments regarding the redistricting boards proposals on the Anchorage senate pairings this week. Option 2 represents the most contiguous and compact senate pairings of Anchorage house districts. Option 3 pairs Eagle River with the South Anchorage/Girdwood house districts, which is neither compact nor contiguous. Please select the option 2 pairing which complies with the Alaska State Constitution requiring districting to be compact and contiguous, respecting natural boundaries.

Thank you,
Catherine Coward
Anchorage 99507
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 2:15 pm

First Name: Catherine

Last Name: Coward

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate pairing of house districts

Public Comment: In favor of the selection of "option 2" of the senate pairings of house districts:

Option 2 represents the most contiguous and compact senate pairings of Anchorage house districts. Option 3 pairs Eagle River with the South Anchorage/Girdwood house districts, which is neither compact nor contiguous. Please select the option 2 pairing which complies with the Alaska State Constitution requiring districting to be compact and contiguous, respecting natural boundaries.

Thank you
Redistricting Board,

Please consider Option #3 as the best you have offered to the public at this point.

Sandra Blomfield
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 4:07 pm

First Name: Patricia
Last Name: Dooley

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting for Senate - proposed corrections for previously gerrymandered map

Public Comment: Option #2 appears the most representative and provides more equal representation.

It is straightforward and meets redistricting criteria. Option 3, which pairs Eagle River with South Anchorage/Girdwood (!) seems to be on par with the clearly gerrymandered Eagle River/East Anchorage pairing previously proposed and rejected by the judiciary. I believe Option 2 complies with Constitutional directives to respect natural boundaries (e.g. waterways) in drawing such district lines. The Eagle River/South Anchorage pairing in Option 3 is not a compact or contiguous pairing that respects constitutionally-required guidelines.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 4:41 pm

First Name: Jan Carolyn

Last Name: Hardy

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: The 2021 Board Proclamation for Anchorage was ratified on November 10, 2021. There has been a public hearing publicly presented with public input and testimony. This Board has the opportunity to be the first Redistricting Board in over 20 years to have a map that is viable for a full 10 years.

The Board did a good job with the overall house map and senate pairings in Southeast, Rural, Interior, and MatSu. Further delays would result in some candidates running three elections in a row. We have seen the chaos that creates both for the candidates and the voters. Some voters did not exercise the franchise because they did not know in which district they resided. This is unfair to the candidates and the voter.

We have a new system of voting: Rank Choice Voting. To complicate the matter further we will have special election to replace him. This is unprecedented. The voter needs time to reorient themselves to their new senate and house district. If questions surrounding our new Anchorage Municipality have not been resolved immediately the result could be voter disenfranchisement and failure of the system to protect one voter, one vote.

The Alaska Supreme Court has upheld the unconstitutional political gerrymander of Senate Seat K (Eagle River/East Anchorage) and remanded the pairing back to the Alaska Redistricting Board. Please act swiftly to adopt a map with final senate pairings. There is no time to waste.
Date: April 6, 2022, 4:46 pm
First Name: John
Last Name: Finley
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: 
Your ZIP Code: 99508
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Favor 2022 Proposed Parings: Option 2
Public Comment: Option 3 putting Eagle River and South Anchorage together is illogical
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: April 6, 2022, 5:17 pm

First Name: Robin
Last Name: Smith

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please make Senate pairings to keep Downtown together, Hillside together and Eagle River together. The rational fix is obvious, pair Eagle River with Eagle River, Gov Hill/JBER with Downtown and Hillside with Hillside. Those pairings are 20/21 and 17/23 and 22/24 (Eagle River).

I oppose Option 3 (Reudrich/Marcumn plan) and support Option 2. Eagle River deserves its own Senator.

Thank you for considering my thoughts.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 5:43 pm

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Harun

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Downtown Anchorage needs
to be kept together in the Senate plan downtown

Public Comment: Any senate pairing should keep downtown Anchorage whole. North
of Fourth Ave. downtown Anchorage is in a Senate district with Chugiak. This makes
no sense and will not provide for adequate representation under the Constitution.
Date: April 6, 2022, 8:32 pm

First Name: David

Last Name: Kohler

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Option 2 preference

Public Comment: I am in support of Option 2 for Senate District K. Thank you.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 6, 2022, 8:58 pm

First Name: James

Last Name: McDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate

Public Comment: I'm writing to share my input on the Senate district pairings. I've lived in Anchorage over three decades, mostly in the O'Malley district 11 near the zoo. I currently live in district 9 in south Anchorage.

I am in support of Option 2. I'm a teacher in the Anchorage School District and I believe most individuals tend to think of Anchorage divided by the high school boundaries. I student taught at Chugiak High School and from 2014–2017 I taught at Gruening Middle School in Eagle River. I unequivocally believe the two Eagle River districts (22/24) should remain together in a single Senate district. While some of my students came from military families, I don’t think that supersedes the connection that Eagle River has together as a whole.

I have lived on the Anchorage hillside most of my life and currently live in district 9. My parents home on the hillside in district 11 is on septic and a well, a commonality on the upper hillside. The hillside is unique from Eagle River and should not be paired together. These two districts are literally on the opposite outskirts of Anchorage.

Thank you for your time.
I am opposed to the redistricting proposal of including Girdwood and Eagle River in the same district. These communities have vastly different needs as well as population sizes, this would essentially eliminate the voice of Girdwood voters who are already lacking critical infrastructure in a growing community. Please do not lump these two communities together.
Dear Redistricting Board -

Please accept the attached comments from the Rabbit Creek Community Council documenting our strong opposition to combining any parts of the Hillside with Eagle River for the purposes of government representation.

While our comments were submitted February 13, 2022, to the Anchorage Assembly as our position on the subject of Assembly redistricting to accommodate a new, 12th Assembly member and results of the 2020 census, they are completely applicable and also hold for your current task of redistricting for State and House representation in the Alaska Legislature. The Alaska Constitution provides requirements for the update of Legislative districts that occurs once each decade in response to the once each decade U.S. Census. Article VI of the Alaska Constitution, Section 6, outlines how House and Senate districts should be formed. The Constitution requires certain characteristics of the districts, noting that they should be:

- Contiguous
- Compact
- Nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area
- Contain equal population “as near as practicable”
- Each senate district shall be composed as near as practicable of two contiguous house districts

Additionally, consideration may be given to local government boundaries.

Please note, the Anchorage Assembly, Anchorage Code of Ordinance, Part 1, Article IV, Section 4.01 uses the same requirements of compact, contiguous, socioeconomically integrated, and of near equal population. Additionally, the Constitution's consideration to local government boundaries also speaks to the need to pay attention to the Anchorage Assembly districts which were decided in favor of keeping Eagle River with Eagle River neighborhoods; Hillside neighborhoods together with adjacent areas, and East Anchorage neighborhoods together with East Anchorage neighborhoods. As we emphasized in the attached comments, Chugach State Park is uninhabited; it does not create contiguity between the Hillside and Eagle River.

Given these considerations, as detailed in our attached letter, we urge the Redistricting Board to adopt a map that keeps our neighborhoods together! This can be accomplished with either the current proposed map for Senate Pairings, Option 2, or by going back to the original map proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke.

Thank you for your serious consideration of our comments.

Sincerely,

Ann Rappoport, Co-chair & Michelle Turner, Co-chair

Rabbit Creek Community Council
1057 W. Fireweed Lane, Ste. 100
Anchorage, AK 99503
RESOLUTION AND COMMENTS FROM THE RABBIT CREEK COMMUNITY COUNCIL ON THE 2022 ASSEMBLY REAPPORTIONMENT PROCESS

At our February 10, 2022 meeting, the Rabbit Creek Community Council (RCCC) discussed draft maps currently under consideration for the required Assembly Reapportionment process. In doing so, the RCCC reminds the Assembly Reapportionment Committee that: legal requirements compel the Committee to create districts which are “compact and contiguous territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socioeconomic area” (Municipality of Anchorage Code of Ordinance, Part I, Article IV, Section 4.01). By a vote of 26 yeas, 3 nays, and 1 abstention, RCCC approved the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

The Rabbit Creek Community Council:

- Affirms that the re-apportionment closely follow the legal requirements to create compact, contiguous, and socioeconomically integrated districts.
- Opposes combination of any portions of the Hillside with Eagle River.
- Emphasizes that Chugach State Park does not create contiguity between the populations of the Hillside and Eagle River, as it is uninhabited. Therefore, reapportionment maps should display it as a distinct, unpopulated area.
- Supports continued work with maps proposed by Denny Wells and Brice Wilkins that: work to keep neighborhoods intact across Anchorage; are considerate and encompassing of other Assembly member concerns; and keep the Hillside together in one district, separate from Eagle River.

JUSTIFICATION

The RCCC strongly opposes any map that would combine the Rabbit Creek and neighboring Hillside areas with Eagle River because these two distinct, separate areas are not integrated through socio-economic interactions, land use patterns, businesses, roads and traffic patterns, or schools. Additionally, these areas are neither compact nor contiguous, thus further failing to meet the requirements of Section 4.01. Travel from the Hillside to Eagle River requires traversing several intervening districts. It is inappropriate to use the large, steep, uninhabited, and in some areas or to some people inaccessible, Chugach State Park as justification to combine Eagle River and Hillside into one Assembly district.

Common issues that distinguish the Hillside from most other parts of the Anchorage Bowl include resident concerns around wildfires and high winds, on-site water and septic systems, Limited Road Service Areas, drainage, water supply and other watershed features on steep slopes. Eagle River has different watersheds, an integrated road service district, its own park district, and facilities that have little or no daily relevance to Hillside residents, including a
Community College, its own branch library, a Wal-Mart, and a central business district. The local roads, trails, and recreation areas we use throughout the Hillside are completely different from the local roads, trails, and recreation areas used by Eagle River residents; the roads we travel to schools and local shopping/businesses, as well as to destinations in Midtown and Downtown, are completely different from the roads used by Eagle River residents.

We remind the Assembly that the 2010 Hillside District Plan (HDP) defines the boundaries of the Hillside. Much thought, effort, and an iterative public process were involved throughout the development of that Assembly-approved plan. The HDP sets a strong precedent for maintaining the cohesion of the RCCC area and the larger Hillside area in one district, with no part of the Hillside combined with Eagle River.

While maintaining a low population deviation between districts is of obvious importance, it is not outlined as a consideration in Section 4.01, and therefore should not be granted more importance than the criteria that are included in Municipal ordinance. Respecting neighborhood continuity is more important than pushing for the smallest deviation in size of each Assembly district and will best achieve fair representation. We do appreciate the difficulty of this effort.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with Anchorage Municipal Ordinance and the strong precedent set by the Hillside District Plan, the RCCC area and larger Hillside of south Anchorage should remain in a single Assembly district with no part of the Hillside combined with Eagle River on the northeast side of Anchorage. Moreover, RCCC recommends that the Assembly take similar care to not split up other neighborhoods throughout Anchorage, and instead, support neighborhood continuity. The Assembly's overarching goal should be to ensure fair and effective representation for all residents.

Signed: February 13, 2022

Ann Rappoport, Co-chair
Rabbit Creek Community Council

Michelle Turner, Co-chair
Rabbit Creek Community Council
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Peter,

Here is the URL for the article I cited in my public testimony this morning.


I misspoke when citing the article - it is from 2019, not 2017.

Doug Robbins
ALASKA ECONOMIC TRENDS
APRIL 2019
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ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT
Public, private sectors both vital to workforce development

By Dr. Tamika L. Ledbetter, Commissioner

The public and private sectors — we need both!

Inviting private industry to the discussion on how to better train Alaskans for existing and future job opportunities is an important part of a comprehensive workforce development plan. For decades we have highlighted the excellent work labor unions have done to prepare workers through on-the-job training and apprenticeships, and we must also recognize the many contributions private education and training providers have made in giving people the necessary skills to enter the workforce.

Government and the private sector have a great opportunity in our shared responsibility to skill or reskill people for first jobs, better performance in their current work, or wage progression. This collective approach gives workers a range of choices for education and job training, and it creates more qualified workers and high-paying jobs to help strengthen our economy. Now is the time for an all-hands-on-deck approach, because the possibilities are enormous if we work together to ensure Alaskans are prepared for a broad range of industry opportunities.

The Department of Labor and Workforce Development serves all workers, all employers, and all education and training providers. We are invested in building strong partnerships statewide, and I’m excited to create a welcoming environment that’s considerate of many perspectives.

I’ve spent my first three months as commissioner reaching out to business and industry leaders, labor unions, and educators to listen to their concerns, offer ideas for improvement, and celebrate successes. I have been encouraged by the positive reception, pointedness of discussions, and creative suggestions. Further, I sensed a willingness to forge new partnerships and renew commitments to work with the department.

I will continue to demonstrate this openness to all feedback, because it helps us better understand industry needs. Education and training providers invest in the workforce by giving job seekers necessary skills. Let us know how we can better support your employment and training plans or bolster local workforce development strategies. We are here for you!

Contact Dr. Tamika L. Ledbetter, Commissioner, at (907) 465-2700 or commissioner.labor@alaska.gov.

Follow the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development on Twitter (twitter.com/alaskalabor) and Facebook (facebook.com/alaskalabor).
This public domain image shows Alaska’s state flower, the forget-me-not.
Alaska’s Voting Districts

How legislative seats are determined and how areas differ

By ERIC SANDBERG

The next decennial census will be conducted early next year. While the census provides a multitude of statistics and is used to distribute government funds, its primary purpose is the reapportionment and redistricting of the U.S. House of Representatives and state legislatures across the country. This once-a-decade process is a good barometer for how the population’s distribution has changed.

Reapportionment is the distribution of a determined number of legislative seats to states or districts whose boundaries don’t change, while redistricting is the redrawing of legislative district boundaries, based on population.

Each state redraws its own congressional boundaries after the census reapportions its number of U.S. House seats. States also control the redistricting of state legislatures.

After the 2020 count and by the end of the year, the U.S. Census Bureau will announce the initial statewide numbers for reapportioning the number of districts per state in the U.S. House of Representatives. In spring 2021, the bureau will release the 2020 Census results down to the smallest level of geography, the census block. From that release date, the Alaska Redistricting Board will have 90 days to finalize a plan for new districts in the Alaska Senate and Alaska House of Representatives.

How seats are determined in the U.S. House of Representatives

House districts at the national level were the original reason for conducting a census. (Each state always has two seats in the U.S. Senate regardless of population.) Article One of the U.S. Constitution requires a population count every 10 years for the reapportionment of seats in the U.S. House of Representatives. The total number of House seats has remained at 435 since 1913.

Every decade, 385 out of the 435 voting seats in the chamber are reapportioned to states based on population — 385 because each of the 50 states gets one seat automatically.

After each state gets a seat to start, the Census Bureau calculates a “priority value” for each state based on population and its updated number of seats. The state with the highest priority value gets the next seat on the list, and then the bureau recalculates priority values and repeats the process until all available seats have...
## Historical Number of Seats in the U.S. House, by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Census Year</th>
<th>1789*</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Alabama
- 1789: 7 seats
- 2010: 7 seats

### Alaska
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 1 seat

### Arizona
- 1789: 8 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Arkansas
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### California
- 1789: 53 seats
- 2010: 43 seats

### Colorado
- 1789: 7 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Connecticut
- 1789: 5 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Delaware
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 1 seat

### Florida
- 1789: 27 seats
- 2010: 25 seats

### Georgia
- 1789: 14 seats
- 2010: 11 seats

### Hawaii
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### Idaho
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### Illinois
- 1789: 18 seats
- 2010: 19 seats

### Indiana
- 1789: 9 seats
- 2010: 11 seats

### Iowa
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 5 seats

### Kansas
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 5 seats

### Kentucky
- 1789: 6 seats
- 2010: 8 seats

### Louisiana
- 1789: 6 seats
- 2010: 8 seats

### Maine
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### Maryland
- 1789: 8 seats
- 2010: 8 seats

### Massachusetts
- 1789: 9 seats
- 2010: 10 seats

### Michigan
- 1789: 16 seats
- 2010: 18 seats

### Minnesota
- 1789: 8 seats
- 2010: 8 seats

### Mississippi
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Missouri
- 1789: 8 seats
- 2010: 9 seats

### Montana
- 1789: 3 seats
- 2010: 3 seats

### Nebraska
- 1789: 3 seats
- 2010: 3 seats

### Nevada
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### New Hampshire
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### New Jersey
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### New Mexico
- 1789: 3 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### New York
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### New Mexico
- 1789: 3 seats
- 2010: 3 seats

### New York
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### North Carolina
- 1789: 13 seats
- 2010: 11 seats

### North Dakota
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 2 seats

### Ohio
- 1789: 16 seats
- 2010: 18 seats

### Oklahoma
- 1789: 5 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Oregon
- 1789: 5 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### Pennsylvania
- 1789: 18 seats
- 2010: 21 seats

### Rhode Island
- 1789: 2 seats
- 2010: 2 seats

### South Carolina
- 1789: 7 seats
- 2010: 6 seats

### South Dakota
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 2 seats

### Tennessee
- 1789: 9 seats
- 2010: 10 seats

### Texas
- 1789: 36 seats
- 2010: 30 seats

### Utah
- 1789: 4 seats
- 2010: 3 seats

### Vermont
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 1 seat

### Virginia
- 1789: 11 seats
- 2010: 10 seats

### Washington
- 1789: 10 seats
- 2010: 9 seats

### West Virginia
- 1789: 3 seats
- 2010: 4 seats

### Wisconsin
- 1789: 8 seats
- 2010: 9 seats

### Wyoming
- 1789: 1 seat
- 2010: 1 seat

* Seats were apportioned by the U.S. Constitution in 1789, then reapportioned according to census results thereafter.

Note: Alaska and Hawaii became states in 1959, Congress briefly added two seats before the next census.

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
been given out. Essentially, the equation gives states with more population a higher priority value, but that priority value decreases the more seats a state gains.

Since statehood in 1959, Alaska has never had a large enough population to get additional seats in the U.S. House. Exhibit 1 shows how many seats the U.S. House of Representatives would need to have before Alaska would receive a second seat.

Just after statehood, the U.S. House would have had to be two-and-a-half times larger for Alaska to get another seat. Over the next three decades, Alaska steadily moved closer to an additional seat as our population grew much faster than the nation as a whole. However, growth cooled after 1990, and Alaska’s population has grown at about the same rate as the U.S. overall, stalling Alaska’s momentum toward a second congressional seat and keeping us in about the same place through the 2000 and 2010 censuses.

In 2010, for the first time, Alaska’s total population was larger than the population of the average U.S. House district. Despite this, Alaska would have needed a population over a million to get a second seat, assuming all other states’ populations remained the same. Our population was only about 70 percent of that.

Since 2010, the state’s population has grown slower than the national population, so a second congressional seat is now further away than it was at the beginning of the decade.

Legal history of Alaska’s legislative districts

With only one U.S. House district in its history, Alaska has always focused on the Alaska Legislature for redistricting. All references to the House or Senate in the rest of this article will be at the state level.

The legislature consists of two bodies, the Alaska Senate and Alaska House of Representatives, which contain 20 and 40 seats, respectively. Since the early 1990s, each seat in the Senate has contained two adjacent House seats. House districts are numerical and the Senate is alphabetical.

During the territorial days, Alaska’s four judicial districts stood in as election districts. Larger cities within the districts often dominated their respective regions. In the Alaska Constitutional Convention of 1955-56, the state’s founders drew new districts, based on geographic areas and allowing for multiple members to be elected from...
Current Districts in the Alaska Legislature

Source: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section
the same district, and wrote them into the state constitution. (So, for example, Anchorage originally had one large district with multiple representatives, and so did Juneau.) The intent was that the geographic distribution of Alaska Senate seats would remain the same for good, and House districts would largely keep the same boundaries but the number of seats within each would be reapportioned with each census.

Events outside Alaska nullified this plan, though. In 1964, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in *Reynolds v. Sims* that all state legislative districts in any chamber must be roughly equal in population ("one person, one vote"). Alaska’s governor then reapportioned both chambers using the same method, after the decennial census, based on recommendations from a five-member reapportionment board.

Through the next few decades, questions about the reapportionment process were debated both in and out of Alaska courtrooms on issues such as multi-member versus single-member districts, the counting of non-resident populations such as the military, and the maximum allowable population deviation from “one person, one vote.”

In 1998, Alaska voters approved a constitutional amendment that replaced sections of the Alaska constitution made redundant by various court rulings and changed the way the process worked. The amendment required single-member districts, with two House districts nested within a Senate district. Instead of the governor drawing the maps, the responsibility shifted to an independent redistricting board. Finally, the new amendment required the state to base districts on the decennial population, disallowing adjustments such as removing military populations.

Population history and area changes in total legislative seats

Exhibit 3 shows the number of Alaska House seats for each of the six economic regions in all state election years since statehood. For districts that cross region boundaries, the exhibit uses the economic region with the majority or plurality of voters. Alaska has always adjusted the House for population on a per the decennial census, holding the first election under the new changes during years that end in two.

Over time, the Anchorage/ Matanuska-Susitna Region has gained seats while the other five regions have lost seats. In the original plan from the constitutional conference, Anchorage/Mat-Su had the same number of seats as Southeast Alaska, at nine. Following a large population jump in the 1950s, Anchorage/Mat-Su’s tally rose to 15 seats after the 1960 Census. Each subsequent decade brought the region one to two new seats, with the exception of the 1990s. After passing 50 percent of the state’s population in the mid-’90s, Anchorage/Mat-Su grew to half of the Alaska House during the 2000s. Currently, the region holds 22 of the 40 seats.

For each of the other regions, the current number of House seats is less than what they started with in 1958. Southeast’s decline has been steepest. The region went from nine seats in the beginning to six seats through the 1970s and 1980s, five seats during the 1990s and 2000s, and finally four seats today.

The other two regions off the road system, Northern and Southwest, also successively declined from their original allotments to their current two seats each. The Northern Region has had two seats since the first reapportionment in the 1960s while Southwest fell to two seats during the 1980s.

In the last two regions, Interior and Gulf Coast, the total number of seats has fluctuated. The Interior, which includes Fairbanks, initially gained a seat over its constitutional allotment to maintain eight seats through 1972. Then the region fell to seven seats through the rest of the 1970s and remained there until a further decline to six in the current decade. The Gulf Coast’s seats declined early, from six in the Alaska constitution to four during the 1960s. It remained there for several decades un until growing to five seats during the 1990s. After 2002, the Gulf Coast again seated at four House seats.

The current Alaska districts and what each covers

Exhibit 4 is a map of the current legislative districts with inset maps to zoom in on the Anchorage bowl, Fairbanks, and the Eagle River/Mat-Su area. Each district is labeled with the House district number and the Senate district number.

House districts 1 through 5 are completely within the Fairbanks North Star Borough. HD 6 runs from the Delta Junction through the upper Yukon area and down through Tok and part of the Copper River Basin. Most of HDs 7 through 11 are entirely within the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, with the exception of HD 9, which includes the Delta Junction area and parts of the Richardson Highway down to Valdez. HD 12 straddles Mat-Su...
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2010 Census

Dist Incumbent

Sq Miles

Comparably Sized Geographic Feature

1
2
A
3
4
B
5
6
C
7
8
D
9
10
E
11
12
F
13
14
G
15
16
H
17
18
I
19
20
J
21
22
K
23
24
L
25
26
M
27
28
N
29
30
O
31
32
P
33
34
Q
35
36
R
37
38
S
39
40
T

8.0
34.6
42.6
58.5
805.1
863.7
1,331.8
120,916.2
122,247.9
26.5
571.0
597.5
25,244.4
11,869.2
37,113.6
55.5
899.2
954.7
65.0
332.2
397.3
22.0
3.0
25.0
4.4
4.2
8.6
2.6
5.4
8.0
20.9
5.3
26.2
6.2
9.2
15.4
9.7
7.9
17.5
6.9
611.0
617.9
3,020.1
75.5
3,095.6
2,568.2
31,819.0
34,387.3
8,176.6
679.5
8,856.1
12,308.9
9,307.9
21,616.8
96,772.7
30,396.7
127,169.4
65,806.1
146,773.7
212,579.7

Hartsﬁeld-Jackson Int Airport (GA)
Vashon Island (WA)
The Bronx (NY)
Staten Island (NY)
Great Smokey Mountains Nat Park (TN)
Dallas County, TX (Dallas)
Rhode Island (US)
Poland
New Mexico (US)
Oxnard, CA
Phoenix, AZ
Island of Oahu
Ireland
Taiwan
Liberia
Bryce Canyon National Park (UT)
Orange County, FL (Orlando)
Luxembourg
District of Columbia (US)
San Diego, CA
Hong Kong
Manhattan Island (NY)
Logan International Airport (MA)
San Marino
McCarran International Airport (NV)
SeaTac Airport (WA)
Paterson, NJ
Gibraltar
Key West (FL)
Fort Meade (MD)
Bermuda
Los Angeles International Airport (CA)
Arlington, VA
Mercer Island (WA)
Inglewood, CA
Alexandria, VA
Macau
Miami Beach, FL
Hartford, CT
Andrews Air Force Base (MD)
Oklahoma City, OK
Sequoia National Park (CA)
Puerto Rico
Catalina Island (CA)
Cyprus
Brunei
Austria
Hungary
Massachusetts (US)
Kings Canyon National Park (CA)
New Hampshire (US)
Netherlands
Rwanda
Croatia
Ecuador
Czech Republic
Malaysia
Uruguay
Montana (US)
Kenya

Barton LeBon
Steve Thompson
Scott Kawasaki
Tammie Wilson
Grier Hopkins
John Coghill
Adam Wool
Dave Talerico
Click Bishop
Colleen Sullivan-Leonard
Mark Neuman
David Wilson
George Rauscher
David Eastman
Mike Shower
Delena Johnson
Cathy Tilton
Shelley Hughes
Sharon Jackson
Kelly Merrick
Lora Reinbold
Gabby LeDoux
Ivy Spohnholz
Bill Wielechowski
Andy Josephson
Harriet Drummond
Elvi Gray-Jackson
Geran Tarr
Zack Fields
Tom Begich
Matt Claman
Sara Rasmussen
Mia Costello
Chris Tuck
Chuck Kopp
Natasha Von Imhof
Josh Revak
Laddie Shaw
Chris Birch
Lance Pruitt
Jennifer Johnston
Cathy Giessel
Benjamin Carpenter
Gary Knopp
Peter Micciche
Sarah Vance
Louise Stutes
Gary Stevens
Sara Hannan
Andi Story
Jesse Kiehl
Jonathan Kreiss-Tomkins
Dan Ortiz
Bert Stedman
Bryce Edgmon
Tiﬀany Zulkosky
Lyman Hoﬀman
Neal Foster
John Lincoln
Donny Olson

, 2010 2018

Total
Population
17,726
17,738
35,464
17,673
17,786
35,459
17,837
17,807
35,644
17,703
17,830
35,533
17,739
17,827
35,566
17,716
17,671
35,387
17,678
17,818
35,496
17,672
17,806
35,478
17,797
17,925
35,722
17,692
17,718
35,410
17,642
17,755
35,397
17,809
17,702
35,511
17,924
17,693
35,617
17,678
17,778
35,456
18,026
18,021
36,047
17,971
18,077
36,048
17,635
17,668
35,303
17,825
17,874
35,699
17,448
17,546
34,994
17,677
17,323
35,000

2018 Estimate

Ideal Sz
Percent
District Deviation
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510
17,755
17,755
35,510

-0.2%
-0.1%
-0.1%
-0.5%
0.2%
-0.1%
0.5%
0.3%
0.4%
-0.3%
0.4%
0.1%
-0.1%
0.4%
0.2%
-0.2%
-0.5%
-0.3%
-0.4%
0.4%
-0.0%
-0.5%
0.3%
-0.1%
0.2%
1.0%
0.6%
-0.4%
-0.2%
-0.3%
-0.6%
0.0%
-0.3%
0.3%
-0.3%
0%
1.0%
-0.3%
0.3%
-0.4%
0.1%
-0.2%
1.5%
1.5%
1.5%
1.2%
1.8%
1.5%
-0.7%
-0.5%
-0.6%
0.4%
0.7%
0.5%
-1.7%
-1.2%
-1.5%
-0.4%
-2.4%
-1.4%

Total Ideal Sz
Percent
Population District Deviation
17,010
18,533
35,543
17,168
17,912
35,080
17,673
17,365
35,038
19,944
23,684
43,628
19,331
20,402
39,733
20,124
19,763
39,887
17,060
17,908
34,968
17,718
18,263
35,981
17,844
17,566
35,410
17,353
17,763
35,116
17,374
18,429
35,803
17,854
18,012
35,866
18,752
18,980
37,732
18,323
18,384
36,707
18,989
18,711
37,700
19,377
17,583
36,960
18,026
18,447
36,473
17,579
18,301
35,880
17,024
18,710
35,734
18,930
18,070
37,000

18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810
18,405
18,405
36,810

-7.6%
0.7%
-3.4%
-6.7%
-2.7%
-4.7%
-4.0%
-5.7%
-4.8%
8.4%
28.7%
18.5%
5.0%
10.9%
7.9%
9.3%
7.4%
8.4%
-7.3%
-2.7%
-5.0%
-3.7%
-0.8%
-2.3%
-3.0%
-4.6%
-3.8%
-5.7%
-3.5%
-4.6%
-5.6%
0.1%
-2.7%
-3.0%
-2.1%
-2.6%
1.9%
3.1%
2.5%
-0.4%
-0.1%
-0.3%
3.2%
1.7%
2.4%
5.3%
-4.5%
0.4%
-2.1%
0.2%
-0.9%
-4.5%
-0.6%
-2.5%
-7.5%
1.7%
-2.9%
2.9%
-1.8%
0.5%

*Ideal district size is the standard state redistric ng boards use when redrawing district boundaries. It’s the state’s popula on divided by the total number of seats in a chamber.
Souirce: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Sec on
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Northern Alaska

Southwest Alaska

Southeast Alaska

Ketchikan, Wrangell, and Metlakatla.

It would be the third largest state by area. Alaska's largest district is the state's entire area. Alaska is the second largest state by area and the third largest state by area. The district in Alaska is the district in the state. The district is the district in the state. The district is the district in the state.

Some Alaska districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

Costa Rica.

Districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.

The state's districts are as vast as entire states or counties.
east Region, or more remote parts of the road system.

At the other end, half of the House districts and seven of the Senate districts are less than 100 square miles. The smallest is HD 19 in Anchorage at 2.6 square miles, about the size of Gibraltar. Ten other Anchorage HDs cover less than 10 square miles. Outside of Anchorage, the smallest districts are in the urban parts of Fairbanks, Mat-Su, and Kenai-Soldotna.

### The current state population and the ‘ideal’ district size

The redistricting process, under “one person, one vote,” divides the total state population by the total number of seats in a legislative chamber to get an ideal district population. This ideal is how many people a redistricting board tries to put in each district when drawing them.

Though not set in law, the general standard for state legislative districts is they shouldn’t differ from the ideal district size by more than 5 percent in either direction. When a new redistricting cycle ensues, at a minimum, districts too far below ideal will have to add people while population in districts well above the ideal will be redistributed to another. With Senate districts made up of two House districts apiece, the ideal district size in the Senate is merely double the House ideal.

Exhibit 5 gives the population of current legislative districts from the 2010 Census and the Department of Labor and Workforce Development’s 2018 estimates. In 2010, the ideal House district size was 17,755 people. That was more than 2,000 people above the year 2000 ideal (15,673), which itself had been nearly 2,000 more people over the ideal from 1990 (13,751). During the 1990s and 2000s, the ideal district grew more than 1 percent a year.

Since 2010, population growth has been low. Based on our 2018 population estimates, the ideal district size in the Alaska House would now be 18,405, a gain of only 650 people and representing yearly growth of just 0.4 percent.

When the current legislative districts were drawn with 2010 numbers, no district deviated from the ideal more than 2.4 percent, with the entire redistricting plan having an overall range of deviation (highest minus lowest) of 4.2 percent.

The population changes for Alaska since 2010 have, not surprisingly, caused district sizes to diverge. The overall range of deviation in the districts, from the highest above to the lowest below zero, is now over 36 percent, with the highest individual district deviation at around 29 percent, suggesting what types of changes will come after the 2020 Census.

Barring a large population shift before 2020, the overall range of deviation will likely still be less than it was in recent decades, however. At the end of the 2000s, the legislative districts in place had an overall deviation of 68 percent, and at the end of the 1990s, it was 84 percent.

With the Mat-Su Borough having the fastest growth rate in the state, the region’s legislative districts have gained the most population (see Exhibit 6). The top three Senate districts and top five House districts for deviation above the ideal are all completely or mostly in Mat-Su, led by HD 8 at 29 percent above the ideal size. Two other Mat-Su districts, SD D and HD 10, are more than 10 percent above the ideal. Outside of Mat-Su, the only district more than 5 percent over the ideal district size outside is HD 31 on the Kenai Peninsula. This means Mat-Su will continue to gain district representation with the next decennial redistricting cycle.

Twenty-four Alaska House districts and 13 Alaska Senate districts have smaller-than-the-ideal populations and will likely lose representation. HD 1 in downtown Fairbanks is the furthest below ideal at -7.6 percent, followed by HD 37 in Southwest Alaska at -7.5 percent and HD 13 in Eagle River at -7.3 percent. Overall, districts in Anchorage and the Interior predominate among those under ideal, though districts in Southeast and rural Alaska are included.

Because of the lower population growth this decade, the least populated district is closer to ideal than earlier decades. Before redistricting after the 2010 Census, the district furthest below ideal was in rural Southeast at -22 percent while 10 years earlier it was district covering the Aleutian Islands, at -28 percent.

### Mat-Su continues to grow and gain representation

Exhibit 7 further illustrates Mat-Su’s growth in legislative representation. These maps take the 2010 census population and 2018 estimated population by borough/census area and convert them to how many “ideal size” Alaska House districts they would roughly equal, with the ideal as the state population divided by 40 seats.
The labels under each area name represent fractions of an ideal district, rounded to the nearest fourth. In both decades shown, only six boroughs/census areas had enough population for a full district.

The colors on the map show increases or decreases since the prior census as the area’s population converted to equivalent district gains or losses. The change for most areas came out to less than a quarter of an ideal district.

Between 2000 and 2010, Mat-Su’s population growth represented an increase of more than an entire district in the Alaska House. In 2000, Mat-Su had enough population for three full districts and three-fourths of another. Ten years later, the borough’s population was enough for five districts. The only other borough with a substantial increase was Fairbanks, with an increase of a quarter of a district.

Populations in six areas outside the Railbelt, and especially in Southeast, declined by at least a quarter of a House district from 2000 to 2010. These included Juneau and Ketchikan. Ketchikan, along with Kodiak Island, no longer had enough population for a full House district by 2010.

The 2020 decennial census that will launch the next redistricting process hasn’t begun, but the 2018 estimates give a glimpse at how population changes since 2010 will likely affect House representation.

As the second map shows, Mat-Su’s growth this decade will largely be at the expense of Anchorage and Fairbanks, in contrast to the 2000s. Mat-Su’s population is now large enough for five full districts plus three-quarters of another and it has overtaken Fairbanks as the second-largest borough. This drops Fairbanks to five and one-fourth districts, which would be a return to its 2000 representation level.

The biggest loss is set to fall on Anchorage, whose population now amounts to 16 districts, a decline of half a district from 2010. Anchorage still represents the largest number of districts by far of any borough or census area.

### How race, education, and marriage status vary by Alaska district

The Census Bureau conducts an ongoing survey, the American Community Survey, to gather more frequent and detailed social and economic data. The bureau replaced the old long form census sheet, conducted once every 10 years, with a periodic survey throughout the decade. At more detailed levels of geography such as legislative districts, the data represent five years of surveys. It’s important to note these survey data have en-substantial margins of error.

Exhibit 8 shows select social statistics for each Alaska House and Senate district by race, educational attainment, and marital status between 2013 and 2017.

### Racial makeup

Racial makeup varies widely among districts. Alaskans who mark their race as “white alone” constitute about 65 percent of the population statewide and are the majority of the population in 35 out of 40 House districts and 17 out of 20 Senate districts. The House district with the highest percentage of white alone residents is HD 4 in Fairbanks, at nearly 90 percent, while the lowest numbers are in western Alaska with HDs 38 and 39 at 11 and 12 percent white, respectively. The only districts outside western Alaska where white alone residents are not the majority are HD 19 and SD J in Anchorage, though whites are a plurality in both (not the majority but still the largest racial group).

Alaska Natives are the majority in three western House districts and two Senate districts, with a plurality being Alaska Native in HD 37 in Southwest. HDs 38 and 39 are over 80 percent Native. Outside western Alaska, the highest Native proportions are in Southeast and the rural Interior. The district with the lowest percentage of Alaska Natives is HD 13 in Eagle River, at 2 percent.

Although no other racial group has a majority or plurality in a district, various parts of the state have substantial populations of other groups. Those marking Asian alone have their highest percentage in Southwest, with HD 37 at 18 percent Asian. Three other districts are at least 15 percent Asian, two of which (17 and 23) are in Anchorage while HD 32 is along the Gulf Coast. Black alone residents make up 10 percent of the population in four House districts and one Senate district, while Pacific Islanders represent 10 percent in one House district. All of these are in Anchorage.

### Level of education and marital status

Educational attainment by legislative district also varies widely, particularly among the percentages of residents 25 and older who have at least a bachelor’s degree. In HD 28 on the outskirts of Anchorage, 60 percent of adults have a bachelor’s or higher. Four other House districts and one Senate district are at over 40 percent. The district with the smallest college-educated percentage is HD 39, which contains the Seward Peninsula and lower Yukon River villages, at 11 percent.

The two highest and lowest House districts for educational attainment diverge on marital status as well. The Anchorage district has the highest number of married

---

Text continues on page 22
2010 Population Converted to Number of ‘Ideal’ House Districts

Numbers show 2010 population as roughly the size of:

1 = One full House district (17,755)
¼ = Three quarters of a House district
½ = Half a House district
¼ = One quarter of a House district
<¼ = Less than a quarter of a House district

Change from 2000-10 equivalent to:

- Increase by more than ¼ of a district
- Increase by ¼ of a district
- Increase, but by less than ¼ of a district
- Decrease, but by less than ¼ of a district
- Decrease by ¼ of a district
- Decrease by more than ¼ of a district

Source: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section

2018 Population Converted to Number of ‘Ideal’ House Districts

Numbers show 2018 population as roughly the size of:

1 = One full House district (18,405)
¼ = Three quarters of a House district
½ = Half a House district
¼ = One quarter of a House district
<¼ = Less than a quarter of a House district

Change from 2010-18 equivalent to:

- Increase by more than ¼ of a district
- Increase by ¼ of a district
- Increase, but by less than ¼ of a district
- Decrease, but by less than ¼ of a district
- Decrease by ¼ of a district
- Decrease by more than ¼ of a district

Source: Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section
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80.6% (±1.6%)
89.4% (±2.1%)
85 0% (±1.6%)

71 8% (±3.3%) 9.3% (±2.3%)
67 8% (±3.6%) 19.6% (±0.7%)
69 9% (±2.5%) 14.2% (±1.2%)

80.7% (±1.9%)
86 3% (±2.4%)
83 2% (±1.4%)

84 8% (±2.0%)
83 2% (±2.1%)
84 0% (±1.4%)

82 0% (±1.2%)
84 5% (±1.5%)
83 3% (±1.2%)

76 2% (±3.3%)
83 8% (±1.8%)
80.1% (±1.3%)

HD 3
HD 4
SD B

HD 5
HD 6
SD C

HD 7
HD 8
SD D

HD 9
HD 10
SD E

HD 11
HD 12
SD F

HD 13
HD 14
SD G

Other

7.0% (±2.1%)
4.9% (±2.0%)
6.0% (±1.5%)

9.9% (±2.0%)
8.8% (±2.2%)
9.4% (±1.5%)

8.5% (±0.3%)

2+ races

7.2% (±1.9%)
7.9% (±2.0%)
7.6% (±1.3%)

8.0% (±1.3%)
7.8% (±1.8%)
7.9% (±1.1%)

7.9% (±1.8%)
8.2% (±1.3%)
8.0% (±1.1%)

2 8% (±1.5%) 12.6% (±3.1%)
3 2% (±1.4%) 8.7% (±2 8%)
3 0% (±1.1%) 10.7% (±1 8%)

62 5% (±1.3%)
66.7% (±2.8%)
64.6% (±1.6%)

HD 21
HD 22
SD K

9.6% (±3.3%)
5.5% (±2.6%)
7.6% (±2.2%)

36 8% (±3.8%) 14.9% (±3.7%) 10.6% (±3.6%) 12 3% (±4.4%) 10.7% (±3.5%) 3.9% (±1.7%) 10.7% (±2.7%)
56 2% (±2.2%) 13.4% (±3.0%) 8.4% (±1.9%) 6 2% (±1 5%) 3.4% (±1.5%) 3.7% (±1.7%) 8.7% (±2.0%)
46 8% (±2.2%) 14.1% (±2.0%) 9 5% (±1.9%) 9 2% (±2 2%) 6.9% (±1.8%) 3.8% (±1.1%) 9.7% (±1.6%)
0.8% (±0.6%) 2.6% (±1 8%) 9.1% (±2.1%)
1.8% (±1.8%) 3.8% (±2 0%) 10.3% (±2.7%)
1.3% (±0.9%) 3.2% (±1 2%) 9.7% (±1.6%)

9.5% (±2.6%)
7.9% (±1.9%)
8.8% (±1.6%)

HD 19
HD 20
SD J

2.8% (±1.6%) 2.8% (±1 3%)
3.8% (±2.4%) 1.7% (±0 9%)
3.3% (±1.3%) 2.3% (±0.7%)

55 2% (±3.5%) 11.6% (±2.9%) 3 2% (±1.1%) 14 9% (±4.4%)
56 3% (±3.6%) 9.1% (±2.8%) 10 0% (±3.7%) 11.1% (±2.7%)
55.7% (±2.5%) 10.4% (±1.8%) 6 5% (±1.8%) 13.1% (±2.7%)

6.1% (±3.0%) 1.5% (±0.6%) 11.6% (±3.0%)
2.4% (±1.6%) 0.9% (±0.7%) 13.5% (±3.1%)
4.1% (±1.5%) 1.2% (±0 5%) 12.5% (±2.2%)

1.0% (±1.2%) 2.8% (±1.4%)
0.0% (±0.0%) 0.4% (±0.4%)
0.5% (±0.6%) 1.6% (±0.7%)

0.4% (±0.2%) 0.5% (±0 2%)
0.0% (±0.1%) 0.6% (±0 3%)
0.2% (±0.1%) 0.5% (±0 2%)

0.2% (±0.2%) 0.6% (±0 3%)
0.3% (±0.2%) 1.0% (±0.7%)
0.2% (±0.1%) 0.8% (±0.4%)

0.2% (±0.2%) 0.5% (±0.6%) 10.4% (±1.7%)
0.0% (±0.1%) 0.4% (±0 5%) 7.6% (±2.1%)
0.1% (±0.1%) 0.4% (±0.4%) 9.2% (±1.3%)

0.3% (±0.3%) 0.2% (±0 3%) 10.1% (±2.5%)
0.1% (±0.2%) 1.7% (±1.6%) 7.5% (±1.9%)
0.2% (±0.2%) 0.9% (±0 8%) 8.8% (±1.5%)

0.0% (±0.1%) 0.5% (±0 5%)
0.2% (±0.3%) 0.0% (±0.1%)
0.1% (±0.2%) 0.3% (±0 2%)

1.2% (±1.2%) 1.5% (±1 2%)
1.2% (±1.0%) 2.0% (±1 2%)
1.2% (±0.5%) 1.7% (±0 9%)

1 2% (0.1%) 1.4% (±0 2%)

Pac Islander

93.0% (±2 5%) 36.6% (±2.9%)
95.5% (±2.1%) 35.6% (±4.1%)
94.2% (±1.6%) 36.1% (±2.4%)

85.5% (±3 5%) 21 3% (±3.4%)
90.6% (±2.1%) 33 8% (±3.0%)
88.4% (±1 9%) 28.4% (±2.3%)

91.3% (±2 3%) 29 9% (±3.0%)
90.4% (±2 2%) 30 5% (±3.7%)
90.8% (±1.7%) 30 2% (±2.2%)

93.3% (±2.4%) 19 3% (±3.1%)
94.0% (±1.6%) 35 8% (±3.6%)
93.5% (±1 3%) 28.6% (±2.3%)

94.8% (±1 9%) 31 9% (±4.1%)
97.9% (±0 8%) 43 2% (±4.1%)
96.8% (±0 9%) 38 3% (±3.1%)

95.0% (±0.7%) 26 9% (±1.5%)
96.1% (±0 8%) 27 0% (±2.7%)
95.6% (±0 5%) 27 0% (±1.6%)

92.1% (±1 3%) 25.7% (±2.4%)
91.6% (±1 3%) 18 8% (±1.9%)
91.8% (±0 9%) 22 3% (±1.5%)

91.7% (±1.7%) 18.1% (±2.1%)
90.0% (±2 3%) 14.4% (±2.0%)
91.0% (±1 5%) 16.4% (±1.3%)

94.4% (±2 2%) 40 8% (±4.4%)
92.9% (±1 0%) 27 3% (±3.3%)
93.7% (±1 3%) 34.4% (±2.9%)

95.0% (±1.7%) 23.7% (±3.2%)
96.9% (±1.7%) 45 9% (±5.1%)
96.0% (±1.1%) 35.4% (±2.8%)

90 3% (±2 0%) 23.1% (±2.8%)
95.4% (±1.7%) 30.1% (±4.0%)
92.6% (±1.4%) 26 3% (±2.4%)

92.4% (±0 5%) 29 0% (±0.5%)

Bachelor’s
or above

Education (Ages 26+)
HS diploma
or above

2017

HD 17
HD 18
SD I

5.6% (±2 0%)
1 8% (±0 8%)
3.7% (±1.1%)

1 2% (±0.4%)
1 0% (±0 5%)
1.1% (±0 3%)

2 3% (±0.7%)
0.7% (±0.4%)
1 5% (±0.4%)

1.6% (±0.7%)
1.6% (±0 9%)
1.6% (±0 5%)

4 2% (±2.1%)
2.4% (±0 8%)
3 3% (±1.1%)

0.7% (±0.4%)
1 9% (±1.1%)
1 3% (±0 5%)

4.4% (±1.4%)
5.1% (±1.1%)
4 8% (±0 9%)

6 2% (±0.1%)

Asian

, 2013

52 9% (±3.1%) 5.9% (±2.5%) 12 5% (±2.7%) 9 5% (±4 0%)
53 0% (±2.6%) 10.2% (±2.6%) 8 5% (±2.0%) 11 5% (±3 5%)
53.1% (±1.8%) 8.3% (±1.7%) 10 3% (±1.3%) 10 5% (±2.4%)

5 3% (±1.9%)
1.7% (±1.0%)
3 5% (±1.0%)

2.1% (±0.6%)
1.4% (±0.9%)
1 8% (±0.4%)

1 0% (±0.4%)
0 3% (±0.3%)
0.7% (±0.2%)

1 3% (±0.7%)
0.1% (±0.1%)
0 8% (±0.4%)

4.1% (±2.0%)
0 9% (±0.6%)
2.6% (±1.1%)

3.1% (±1.2%)
0 2% (±0.3%)
1.6% (±0.6%)

7 3% (±1.8%)
8 2% (±1.6%)
7 8% (±1.2%)

3 2% (±0.1%)

Black

Race

,

HD 15
HD 16
SD H

1.9% (±1.1%)
4.5% (±1.3%)
3.0% (±0.9%)

5.8% (±0.9%)
4.6% (±1.3%)
5.2% (±0.8%)

3.3% (±0.7%)
6.3% (±1.6%)
4.8% (±0.8%)

5.2% (±1.2%)
4.0% (±1.0%)
4.7% (±0.8%)

8.1% (±3.6%)
3.3% (±1.6%)
5.7% (±1.8%)

63 0% (±3.7%) 12.6% (±1.8%)
71.4% (±3.2%) 3.2% (±1.3%)
67 3% (±2.5%) 7.9% (±1.0%)

Alaska Native

HD 1
HD 2
SD A

District

65 3% (±0.2%) 14.2% (±0.2%)

White

8

Alaska

R ,

Demographics by Alaska Legisla ve District

Widowed

Divorced

Separated

Never
married

45 5% (±2 9%) 4.0% (±0.9%) 14.6% (±2 2%) 1.4% (±0.7%) 34.5% (±2.4%)
47.1% (±3 9%) 2.7% (±1.1%) 12.6% (±2 2%) 1.8% (±0.9%) 35.9% (±3.6%)
46 3% (±2 5%) 3.4% (±0.7%) 13.6% (±1 5%) 1.6% (±0.6%) 35.1% (±2.1%)

39.4% (±4.1%) 4.4% (±1.6%) 11 9% (±2.4%) 2.1% (±1.0%) 42.3% (±3.7%)
32 9% (±3 3%) 5.6% (±1.3%) 15 8% (±2 5%) 2.2% (±0.8%) 43.5% (±3.1%)
35 8% (±2.6%) 5.1% (±1.1%) 14 0% (±1 8%) 2.2% (±0.6%) 43.0% (±2.4%)

39 3% (±3.1%) 2.7% (±1.0%) 12.4% (±2 2%) 1.9% (±0.9%) 43.7% (±3 3%)
35 9% (±3.6%) 3.8% (±1.1%) 17 8% (±2.4%) 2.6% (±0.9%) 40.0% (±3 5%)
37.6% (±2.4%) 3.3% (±0.8%) 15 0% (±1.6%) 2.2% (±0.6%) 41.9% (±2.1%)

46 9% (±3.7%) 1.5% (±0.7%) 8 3% (±2.1%) 2.2% (±1.2%) 41.0% (±3.6%)
47 3% (±3 5%) 2.9% (±1.0%) 10.1% (±1 8%) 1.6% (±0.8%) 38.1% (±3.1%)
46 8% (±2.6%) 2.4% (±0.6%) 9.6% (±1 3%) 1.9% (±0.7%) 39.3% (±2.4%)

57 5% (±3.6%) 2.4% (±1.2%) 7 0% (±1.7%) 1.1% (±0.6%) 32.0% (±3 3%)
61.6% (±3 5%) 2.8% (±1.1%) 10.1% (±2 0%) 1.0% (±0.6%) 24.4% (±2.7%)
60 0% (±2.4%) 2.4% (±0.8%) 8 3% (±1.4%) 1.1% (±0.4%) 28.2% (±2 0%)

49 9% (±1 8%) 3.9% (±0.9%) 11 9% (±1 0%) 2.0% (±0.5%) 32.3% (±1.7%)
57 3% (±3 0%) 3.1% (±0.8%) 11.1% (±1.7%) 0.6% (±0.3%) 27.8% (±2.7%)
53.6% (±1 8%) 3.5% (±0.6%) 11 5% (±1.1%) 1.3% (±0.3%) 30.1% (±1.6%)

51 9% (±2 8%) 3.2% (±0.7%) 11.7% (±1.7%) 1.5% (±0.5%) 31.7% (±2 5%)
50 5% (±2.1%) 3.8% (±0.8%) 12.4% (±1 8%) 2.6% (±0.8%) 30.7% (±2 3%)
51 2% (±1.7%) 3.5% (±0.5%) 12.1% (±1 2%) 2.0% (±0.5%) 31.2% (±1.7%)

45.1% (±2 5%) 5.7% (±1.2%) 13.7% (±1.7%) 1.9% (±0.7%) 33.6% (±2.4%)
51 9% (±3 0%) 3.7% (±0.9%) 12.6% (±1 9%) 1.9% (±0.6%) 30.0% (±2 8%)
48 2% (±1 9%) 4.8% (±0.7%) 13 2% (±1 3%) 1.9% (±0.5%) 32.0% (±1 5%)

45.1% (±3 5%) 1.9% (±0.8%) 10 9% (±2 3%) 1.2% (±0.7%) 40.8% (±3 3%)
49.4% (±3 3%) 3.3% (±0.9%) 8 5% (±2 0%) 2.2% (±0.9%) 36.6% (±2.6%)
47.1% (±2.6%) 2.5% (±0.6%) 9 8% (±1.6%) 1.7% (±0.6%) 38.9% (±2.4%)

57.6% (±4.1%) 2.6% (±1.1%) 11 8% (±2 8%) 2.4% (±1.1%) 25.5% (±3 3%)
57 3% (±4.4%) 2.3% (±0.9%) 7.4% (±2 0%) 0.4% (±0.5%) 32.5% (±4 0%)
57 5% (±3 2%) 2.5% (±0.7%) 9.6% (±1.7%) 1.4% (±0.6%) 29.1% (±2.6%)

38 0% (±2 8%) 5.1% (±1.3%) 15 9% (±2.1%) 2.1% (±1.0%) 38.8% (±2.7%)
56 8% (±3 8%) 2.4% (±1.1%) 6 3% (±1.6%) 1.0% (±0.6%) 33.5% (±3 3%)
47 2% (±2.4%) 3.8% (±0.8%) 11 2% (±1 2%) 1.6% (±0.6%) 36.2% (±2 0%)

48 9% (±0 5%) 3.7% (±0.2%) 11.6% (±0 3%) 1.7% (±0.1%) 34.1% (±0.4%)

Married

Marital Status (Ages 15+)
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62.1% (±2.6%)
67 3% (±3.4%)
64.7% (±1 8%)

61 5% (±2 8%)
84.7% (±1.7%)
73.1% (±0 8%)

83 2% (±2.1%)
82 3% (±2.7%)
82.7% (±1 0%)

88 9% (±1.7%) 4.1% (±0.9%) 0.3% (±0.2%) 0.9% (±0 3%) 0.2% (±0.3%) 0.7% (±0 3%)
55.7% (±1.6%) 16.2% (±1.5%) 0.2% (±0.2%) 16.7% (±0 8%) 1.1% (±0.3%) 1 9% (±1.1%)
72 0% (±1.6%) 10.2% (±0.9%) 0.2% (±0.1%) 8.9% (±0.4%) 0.7% (±0.3%) 1 3% (±0.6%)

71.1% (±1.7%) 11.9% (±1.8%) 1.0% (±0.5%)
69 3% (±1 9%) 9.9% (±1.9%) 1.0% (±0.4%)
70 2% (±0 8%) 10.9% (±0.9%) 1.0% (±0.2%)

63.6% (±0.7%) 18.7% (±1.0%) 1.0% (±0.3%)
61.1% (±0 8%) 21.7% (±1.1%) 0.4% (±0.2%)
62.4% (±0.6%) 20.2% (±0.7%) 0.7% (±0.1%)

23.7% (±1.1%) 43.6% (±1.3%) 2.9% (±0.8%) 18.4% (±0 9%) 1.2% (±0.2%) 3 2% (±0 8%)
10.6% (±0.6%) 82.2% (±0.9%) 0.6% (±0.2%) 0 9% (±0 2%) 0.0% (±0.0%) 0 5% (±0.6%)
16 9% (±0.6%) 63.4% (±0.8%) 1.7% (±0.4%) 9.4% (±0 5%) 0.6% (±0.1%) 1 8% (±0 5%)

11 5% (±0.4%) 81.6% (±0.8%) 0.7% (±0.3%)
23.4% (±0.7%) 65.0% (±0.9%) 0.7% (±0.4%)
17 3% (±0.4%) 73.5% (±0.5%) 0.7% (±0.2%)

HD 25
HD 26
SD M

HD 27
HD 28
SD N

HD 29
HD 30
SD O

HD 31
HD 32
SD P

HD 33
HD 34
SD Q

HD 35
HD 36
SD R

HD 37
HD 38
SD S

HD 39
HD 40
SD T

Other

1.2% (0.1%) 1.4% (±0 2%)

Pac Islander
8.5% (±0.3%)

2+ races

8.2% (±1.6%)
9.5% (±2.2%)
8.9% (±1.3%)

5.0% (±1.0%)
8.3% (±1.8%)
6.7% (±1.0%)

5.9% (±1.4%)
6.5% (±1.7%)
6.2% (±1.0%)

9.6% (±3.0%)
8.0% (±2.0%)
8.8% (±1.6%)

1 0% (±0 2%) 0.2% (±0.1%) 0.1% (±0.1%)
3.6% (±0 3%) 1.0% (±0.2%) 1 2% (±0 5%)
2.3% (±0 2%) 0.6% (±0.1%) 0.6% (±0.3%)

4.9% (±0.7%)
5.0% (±1.1%)
5.0% (±0.6%)

7.2% (±0.9%)
5.2% (±0.9%)
6.1% (±0.6%)

5.1% (±0.6%) 0.5% (±0.3%) 0 5% (±0 3%) 10.6% (±1.1%)
6.6% (±0.6%) 0.2% (±0.1%) 0.6% (±0 3%) 9.4% (±0.9%)
5 9% (±0.4%) 0.3% (±0.2%) 0 5% (±0 2%) 10.0% (±0.7%)

6 5% (±1 5%) 0.7% (±0.5%) 0.6% (±0.4%)
7.4% (±1.7%) 1.0% (±0.5%) 2 0% (±1.6%)
6.9% (±0.6%) 0.9% (±0.2%) 1 3% (±0 8%)

2.2% (±1 0%) 0.1% (±0.1%) 0 5% (±0.4%)
1.2% (±0 8%) 0.6% (±0.4%) 1.1% (±0.7%)
1.7% (±0.4%) 0.4% (±0.2%) 0 8% (±0.4%)

8.6% (±3 2%) 4.2% (±2.3%) 0 9% (±0 8%)
2.8% (±0 9%) 0.0% (±0.1%) 1 3% (±1 0%)
5.7% (±1.7%) 2.1% (±1.2%) 1.1% (±0.6%)

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey

7.3% (±1.5%) 0.8% (±0.2%)
7.7% (±1.9%) 0.5% (±0.4%)
7.5% (±1.0%) 0.7% (±0.2%)

5.3% (±1.9%) 9.9% (±3.8%)
1.8% (±0.7%) 1.4% (±0.9%)
3.6% (±1.0%) 5.6% (±2.0%)

6.6% (±2.4%) 5.2% (±2.3%) 11.9% (±2 9%) 0.6% (±0.6%) 2 3% (±1 5%) 11.5% (±2.6%)
6.4% (±2.3%) 5.0% (±2.8%) 10.5% (±2 9%) 0.5% (±0.6%) 2 9% (±2 5%) 7.4% (±2.5%)
6.5% (±1.7%) 5.1% (±1.8%) 11.2% (±2.1%) 0.5% (±0.5%) 2.6% (±1 5%) 9.4% (±1.9%)

Bachelor’s
or above

82 8% (±1.1%) 10.9% (±1.3%)
85.4% (±1.2%) 13.6% (±1.6%)
84.1% (±0.9%) 12.3% (±1.0%)

87 2% (±1.1%) 15.2% (±1.1%)
80 2% (±1.4%) 12.3% (±1.8%)
84 0% (±0.8%) 13.8% (±1.1%)

91 5% (±1.0%) 26.8% (±1.7%)
91.4% (±0.9%) 22.1% (±1.7%)
91.4% (±0.7%) 24.5% (±1.3%)

95.6% (±1.0%) 41.4% (±2.1%)
96 2% (±1.4%) 37.7% (±3.5%)
95 9% (±0.9%) 39.6% (±1.9%)

93 9% (±1.1%) 30.3% (±2.4%)
90.6% (±1.4%) 26.6% (±3.1%)
92 3% (±0.9%) 28.5% (±2.1%)

92 3% (±1.5%) 18.8% (±2.5%)
91 2% (±1.6%) 23.5% (±2.6%)
91.7% (±1.1%) 21.1% (±1.6%)

93 3% (±2.2%) 35.3% (±3.5%)
97.6% (±0.8%) 60.4% (±3.6%)
95 5% (±1.1%) 47.9% (±2.6%)

91 5% (±2.0%) 32.6% (±3.1%)
95.4% (±1.4%) 38.3% (±3.7%)
93 5% (±1.3%) 35.5% (±2.3%)

91.6% (±1.8%) 23.3% (±2.5%)
94.1% (±2.1%) 37.4% (±3.9%)
92 9% (±1.4%) 30.4% (±2.3%)

92.4% (±0.5%) 29.0% (±0.5%)

HS diploma
or above

Education (Ages 26+)

2017

8.9% (±2.3%) 2.3% (±0.9%) 16.9% (±3.4%) 2.1% (±1.5%) 3 9% (±2 0%) 11.6% (±2.6%)
3.9% (±1.5%) 1.7% (±1.1%) 8.4% (±3 2%) 0.5% (±0.4%) 0.4% (±0 3%) 12.0% (±3.2%)
6.4% (±1.5%) 2.0% (±0.7%) 12.7% (±2 2%) 1.3% (±0.7%) 2.1% (±1 0%) 11.8% (±2.2%)

6.2% (±0.1%)

Asian

54.4% (±4.1%)
73 2% (±2.7%)
63 8% (±2 9%)

Black

HD 23
HD 24
SD L

Alaska Native

, 2013

65 3% (±0 2%) 14.2% (±0.2%) 3.2% (±0.1%)

White

Race

,

Alaska

District

8

R ,

Demographics by Alaska Legisla ve District, con nued

Widowed

Divorced

33.3% (±1.4%) 5.4% (±0 5%)
42.0% (±2.0%) 3.7% (±0 5%)
37.7% (±1.2%) 4 5% (±0.4%)

6.9% (±0.7%)
8.8% (±1.2%)
7.9% (±0.7%)

43.3% (±1.6%) 4.4% (±0 5%) 10.0% (±0.7%)
37.7% (±1.9%) 4 5% (±0.6%) 6.2% (±0.9%)
40.6% (±1.3%) 4 5% (±0.4%) 8.2% (±0.6%)

48.6% (±2.2%) 5.7% (±0.6%) 14.5% (±1.3%)
49.8% (±1.9%) 4.1% (±0.6%) 13.7% (±1.1%)
49.2% (±1.5%) 4 9% (±0.4%) 14.1% (±0.8%)

47.4% (±2.7%) 4 2% (±1 0%) 13.7% (±1.8%)
55.3% (±3.2%) 3 5% (±1.1%) 9.8% (±1.9%)
51.4% (±2.1%) 3 8% (±0 8%) 11.8% (±1.4%)

54.8% (±2.3%) 4 8% (±0 8%) 13.1% (±1.6%)
49.6% (±2.9%) 3 3% (±0.6%) 12.0% (±2.2%)
52.2% (±1.8%) 4 0% (±0 5%) 12.5% (±1.4%)

50.2% (±3.1%) 5 8% (±1.4%) 12.7% (±1.9%)
50.3% (±3.1%) 4 2% (±1 2%) 16.5% (±2.3%)
50.3% (±2.1%) 5 0% (±0 9%) 14.6% (±1.5%)

46.3% (±4.8%) 3.6% (±1 0%) 13.9% (±2.6%)
65.4% (±2.6%) 2.7% (±0 8%) 6.8% (±1.5%)
55.7% (±2.8%) 3 2% (±0.7%) 10.4% (±1.6%)

54.5% (±3.4%) 4.1% (±1 3%) 10.7% (±2.1%)
56.8% (±3.3%) 2 5% (±0 8%) 12.3% (±2.8%)
55.7% (±2.5%) 3 3% (±0.7%) 11.5% (±1.9%)

45.5% (±3.7%) 4 3% (±1 3%) 12.8% (±2.1%)
54.8% (±3.6%) 4 3% (±1 3%) 10.4% (±2.1%)
50.2% (±2.5%) 4 3% (±0 9%) 11.6% (±1.5%)

48.9% (±0.5%) 3.7% (±0 2%) 11.6% (±0.3%)

Married

Never
married

2.5% (±0.5%) 52.0% (±1 3%)
1.7% (±0.6%) 43.8% (±1.7%)
2.1% (±0.4%) 47.8% (±1.1%)

2.7% (±0.5%) 39.5% (±1.4%)
3.5% (±0.7%) 48.1% (±1.7%)
3.1% (±0.4%) 43.6% (±1.1%)

1.8% (±0.5%) 29.4% (±1.4%)
1.7% (±0.4%) 30.6% (±1.4%)
1.8% (±0.3%) 30.0% (±0 9%)

1.7% (±0.6%) 33.1% (±2.7%)
1.9% (±0.8%) 29.5% (±2.4%)
1.8% (±0.5%) 31.3% (±1.7%)

1.4% (±0.6%) 25.9% (±1 8%)
1.4% (±0.6%) 33.8% (±2 2%)
1.4% (±0.4%) 29.8% (±1 5%)

2.0% (±0.7%) 29.3% (±2.3%)
2.3% (±0.9%) 26.7% (±2 2%)
2.2% (±0.6%) 28.0% (±1.4%)

0.7% (±0.5%) 35.5% (±3.8%)
0.9% (±0.5%) 24.2% (±2.3%)
0.8% (±0.4%) 30.0% (±2.3%)

1.4% (±0.7%) 29.2% (±2.7%)
1.2% (±0.7%) 27.2% (±3.0%)
1.3% (±0.5%) 28.2% (±1.9%)

1.8% (±0.9%) 35.6% (±3.1%)
1.9% (±0.9%) 28.6% (±3.5%)
1.8% (±0.6%) 32.1% (±2.2%)

1.7% (±0.1%) 34.1% (±0.4%)

Separated

Marital Status (Ages 15+)


## Worker Characteristics by Alaska Legislative District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population 16 and over</th>
<th>Labor force participation</th>
<th>Employment to pop. ratio</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>Median income, avg minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>571,453 (±413)</td>
<td>70.1% (±0.4%)</td>
<td>62.0% (±0.4%)</td>
<td>7.7% (±0.2%)</td>
<td>$76,114 (±$979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 1</td>
<td>14,018 (±668)</td>
<td>68.4% (±2.5%)</td>
<td>58.1% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>10.7% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>$59,693 (±$4,963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 2</td>
<td>13,374 (±678)</td>
<td>78.6% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>47.2% (±3.9%)</td>
<td>7.8% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>$69,863 (±$7,628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDA</td>
<td>27,392 (±464)</td>
<td>73.4% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>52.8% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>9.4% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>$64,064 (±$5,641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 3</td>
<td>14,344 (±842)</td>
<td>74.7% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>62.9% (±3.2%)</td>
<td>9.5% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>$83,399 (±$4,473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 4</td>
<td>15,414 (±21)</td>
<td>71.8% (±3.6%)</td>
<td>67.9% (±3.6%)</td>
<td>4.4% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>$85,431 (±$10,685)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDB</td>
<td>29,759 (±1,111)</td>
<td>73.2% (±2.5%)</td>
<td>65.5% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>6.9% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>$84,137 (±$3,955)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 5</td>
<td>14,735 (±869)</td>
<td>72.6% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>66.5% (±3.1%)</td>
<td>6.9% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>$85,773 (±$7,661)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 6</td>
<td>12,674 (±932)</td>
<td>71.2% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>52.8% (±3.2%)</td>
<td>12.2% (±3.4%)</td>
<td>$70,938 (±$6,144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD C</td>
<td>27,409 (±1,179)</td>
<td>72.0% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>60.1% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>9.1% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>$89,101 (±$4,499)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 7</td>
<td>16,516 (±533)</td>
<td>61.3% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>53.7% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>11.0% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>$74,878 (±$7,112)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 8</td>
<td>13,799 (±760)</td>
<td>59.8% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>53.0% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>10.7% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>$71,860 (±$3,832)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD D</td>
<td>30,315 (±865)</td>
<td>60.5% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>53.4% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>10.9% (±1.5%)</td>
<td>$75,000 (±$8,599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 9</td>
<td>14,671 (±557)</td>
<td>63.6% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>55.0% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>10.4% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>$80,388 (±$5,435)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 10</td>
<td>14,622 (±636)</td>
<td>63.9% (±2.2%)</td>
<td>56.9% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>10.2% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>$74,345 (±$3,855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDE</td>
<td>29,293 (±806)</td>
<td>63.7% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>56.0% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>10.3% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>$78,632 (±$3,439)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 11</td>
<td>14,970 (±509)</td>
<td>64.9% (±1.5%)</td>
<td>59.1% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>7.4% (±1.2%)</td>
<td>$89,516 (±$5,619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 12</td>
<td>15,025 (±773)</td>
<td>68.5% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>61.9% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>8.2% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>$84,022 (±$3,314)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDF</td>
<td>29,995 (±730)</td>
<td>66.4% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>60.5% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>7.8% (±1.2%)</td>
<td>$75,000 (±$8,599)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 13</td>
<td>13,889 (±725)</td>
<td>77.4% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>47.7% (±3.3%)</td>
<td>5.9% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>$113,617 (±$5,203)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 14</td>
<td>14,374 (±618)</td>
<td>69.0% (±3.1%)</td>
<td>61.0% (±3.2%)</td>
<td>6.0% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>$94,497 (±$5,160)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD G</td>
<td>28,071 (±877)</td>
<td>73.6% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>54.8% (±2.2%)</td>
<td>6.0% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>$67,966 (±$5,228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 15</td>
<td>12,986 (±840)</td>
<td>78.4% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>57.9% (±3.6%)</td>
<td>7.0% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>$80,872 (±$5,206)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 16</td>
<td>14,023 (±953)</td>
<td>72.9% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>69.3% (±3.2%)</td>
<td>5.8% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>$72,165 (±$2,931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD H</td>
<td>27,181 (±1,114)</td>
<td>75.0% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>62.1% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>6.3% (±1.5%)</td>
<td>$76,900 (±$2,858)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 17</td>
<td>14,798 (±763)</td>
<td>72.0% (±2.5%)</td>
<td>64.3% (±2.5%)</td>
<td>9.0% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>$54,310 (±$4,600)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 18</td>
<td>14,512 (±853)</td>
<td>72.8% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>66.4% (±3.3%)</td>
<td>8.1% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>$62,101 (±$3,228)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD I</td>
<td>29,310 (±1,110)</td>
<td>72.4% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>65.4% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>8.5% (±1.5%)</td>
<td>$66,118 (±$5,504)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 19</td>
<td>12,005 (±863)</td>
<td>70.5% (±3.5%)</td>
<td>63.5% (±3.8%)</td>
<td>8.9% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>$86,875 (±$5,189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 20</td>
<td>14,525 (±754)</td>
<td>64.9% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>59.7% (±3.1%)</td>
<td>5.8% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>$86,875 (±$5,189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD J</td>
<td>26,530 (±1,048)</td>
<td>67.4% (±2.2%)</td>
<td>61.4% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>7.3% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>$86,263 (±$4,660)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 21</td>
<td>14,469 (±519)</td>
<td>75.4% (±2.5%)</td>
<td>71.1% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>5.1% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>$84,629 (±$5,007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 22</td>
<td>13,542 (±807)</td>
<td>75.7% (±3.3%)</td>
<td>71.3% (±3.3%)</td>
<td>5.1% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>$86,875 (±$5,189)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD K</td>
<td>28,011 (±1,003)</td>
<td>75.6% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>71.2% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>5.1% (±1.1%)</td>
<td>$86,263 (±$4,660)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Worker Characteristics by Alaska Legislative District, continued

### Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Population 16 and over</th>
<th>Labor force participation</th>
<th>Employment to pop. ratio</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>571,453 (±131)</td>
<td>70.1% (±0.4%)</td>
<td>62.0% (±0.4%)</td>
<td>7.7% (±0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 23</td>
<td>14,368 (±335)</td>
<td>75.6% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>71.2% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>4.8% (±1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 24</td>
<td>14,373 (±336)</td>
<td>73.0% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>68.6% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>5.4% (±1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD L</td>
<td>28,741 (±984)</td>
<td>74.3% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>69.9% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>5.1% (±1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 25</td>
<td>14,309 (±779)</td>
<td>77.3% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>73.0% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>4.9% (±1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 26</td>
<td>14,417 (±767)</td>
<td>75.8% (±3.2%)</td>
<td>70.8% (±3.5%)</td>
<td>4.8% (±1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD M</td>
<td>28,726 (±897)</td>
<td>76.6% (±3.1%)</td>
<td>71.9% (±2.1%)</td>
<td>4.9% (±1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 27</td>
<td>14,850 (±555)</td>
<td>73.2% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>69.2% (±3.0%)</td>
<td>3.4% (±1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 28</td>
<td>14,485 (±537)</td>
<td>73.7% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>71.2% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>3.1% (±1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD N</td>
<td>29,335 (±1028)</td>
<td>73.4% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>70.2% (±2.0%)</td>
<td>3.3% (±0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 29</td>
<td>14,987 (±492)</td>
<td>54.7% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>50.2% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>8.3% (±1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 30</td>
<td>14,968 (±559)</td>
<td>66.3% (±2.8%)</td>
<td>60.8% (±2.9%)</td>
<td>8.1% (±2.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD O</td>
<td>29,955 (±665)</td>
<td>60.5% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>55.5% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>8.2% (±1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 31</td>
<td>15,066 (±561)</td>
<td>60.7% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>54.8% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>8.9% (±2.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 32</td>
<td>14,931 (±336)</td>
<td>75.8% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>68.3% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>5.4% (±1.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD P</td>
<td>29,977 (±690)</td>
<td>68.2% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>61.5% (±1.8%)</td>
<td>7.0% (±1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 33</td>
<td>14,875 (±369)</td>
<td>70.8% (±2.3%)</td>
<td>66.9% (±2.4%)</td>
<td>4.0% (±1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 34</td>
<td>14,663 (±356)</td>
<td>75.7% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>70.7% (±2.7%)</td>
<td>5.6% (±1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD Q</td>
<td>29,318 (±189)</td>
<td>71.3% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>68.8% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>4.9% (±0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 35</td>
<td>14,788 (±177)</td>
<td>67.9% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>62.5% (±1.6%)</td>
<td>7.2% (±1.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 36</td>
<td>14,501 (±310)</td>
<td>66.3% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>60.0% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>8.0% (±1.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD R</td>
<td>29,289 (±523)</td>
<td>67.1% (±1.0%)</td>
<td>61.3% (±1.2%)</td>
<td>7.6% (±0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 37</td>
<td>14,040 (±294)</td>
<td>75.6% (±1.2%)</td>
<td>70.4% (±1.3%)</td>
<td>6.0% (±0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 38</td>
<td>12,550 (±977)</td>
<td>61.4% (±1.4%)</td>
<td>49.4% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>19.5% (±1.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD S</td>
<td>26,590 (±320)</td>
<td>68.9% (±0.9%)</td>
<td>60.5% (±1.1%)</td>
<td>11.7% (±0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 39</td>
<td>12,798 (±100)</td>
<td>61.9% (±1.0%)</td>
<td>49.2% (±1.2%)</td>
<td>21.5% (±1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD 40</td>
<td>13,231 (±168)</td>
<td>72.9% (±1.3%)</td>
<td>62.8% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>13.3% (±1.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD T</td>
<td>26,017 (±187)</td>
<td>67.4% (±0.8%)</td>
<td>55.6% (±0.9%)</td>
<td>17.0% (±0.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Class of Worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class of Worker</th>
<th>Median income (Household)</th>
<th>Percent below poverty</th>
<th>Commute, avg minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed civilian</td>
<td>$76,114 (±$979)</td>
<td>10.2% (±0.4%)</td>
<td>18.8 (±0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector worker</td>
<td>$75,139 (±$7,552)</td>
<td>6.1% (±2.6%)</td>
<td>16.2 (±1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government worker</td>
<td>$114,336 (±$9,316)</td>
<td>4.9% (±0.2%)</td>
<td>16.9 (±1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-employed</td>
<td>$91,694 (±$5,027)</td>
<td>5.5% (±1.5%)</td>
<td>16.5 (±0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid family worker</td>
<td>$106,334 (±$10,031)</td>
<td>4.9% (±1.7%)</td>
<td>16.5 (±1.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median income</td>
<td>$97,434 (±$12,204)</td>
<td>7.0% (±3.1%)</td>
<td>18.3 (±1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent below poverty</td>
<td>$102,901 (±$7,866)</td>
<td>6.0% (±1.9%)</td>
<td>17.4 (±0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>$154,261 (±$8,017)</td>
<td>2.6% (±0.6%)</td>
<td>21.6 (±1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>$113,700 (±$6,191)</td>
<td>4.0% (±1.0%)</td>
<td>20.6 (±1.2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey
Gaunging Alaska’s Economy

The state has registered over-the-year job gains for two consecutive months after losing jobs for the prior 39 months.

The gains are small but could signal the end of the state’s recession.

U.S. job growth remains strong and has been positive since 2010, with the strongest growth in 2015.

Alaska’s rate has been level at 6.5 percent for the last seven months.

Unemployment rates are complicated economic measures and generally less telling than job or wage growth as indicators of broad economic health.

Wages have been up for four consecutive quarters after being down the prior seven.

Wage growth accelerated from first quarter 2018 to second quarter, which hints at a strengthening economy.
Gauging Alaska’s Economy

For a variety of reasons, initial claims are well below the 10-year average despite job losses.

Gross domestic product is the value of the goods and services a state produces. Alaska’s GDP has grown for the last eight quarters after declining for 15 out of the prior 16.

Personal income includes wages as well as transfer payments (such as Social Security, Medicaid, and the PFD) and investment income. Growth has resumed and is now well above the 10-year average.

Home prices include only those for which a commercial loan is used. This indicator tends to be volatile from quarter to quarter.

Foreclosure rates remain very low, highlighting how different the current recession is from the ’80s recession when foreclosure rates exceeded 10 percent.

The state’s population has remained mostly stable during the state’s recession, although 2016 was the second year of small population declines since 1988.

The state had net migration losses for the sixth consecutive year in 2016, although natural increase (births minus deaths) offset those losses until 2017 and 2018.
Unemployment Rates

Percent change in jobs, February 2018 to February 2019

Regional, not seasonally adjusted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Prelim. 02/19</th>
<th>Revised 01/19</th>
<th>Revised 02/18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interior Region</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denali Borough</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbanks N Star Borough</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Fairbanks Census Area</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukon-Koyukuk Census Area</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Region</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nome Census Area</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Slope Borough</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Arctic Borough</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage/Mat-Su Region</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchorage, Municipality</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mat-Su Borough</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Region</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleutians East Borough</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aleutians West</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Census Area</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol Bay Borough</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillingham Census Area</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusilvak Census Area</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake and Peninsula Borough</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulf Coast Region</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenai Peninsula Borough</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak Island Borough</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdez-Cordova Census Area</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Region</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haines Borough</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoonah-Angoon Census Area</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juneau, City and Borough</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ketchikan Gateway Borough</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petersburg Borough</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince of Wales-Hyder Census Area</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitka, City and Borough</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skagway, Municipality</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrangell, City and Borough</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yakutat, City and Borough</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Alaska Ranks

Unemployment Rate\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Job Growth(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Job Growth, Private(^2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50th</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Economic Indicators

### Urban Alaska Consumer Price Index (CPI-U, base yr 1982=100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year ago</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>227.992</td>
<td>219.131</td>
<td>+4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Commodity prices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year ago</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crude oil, Alaska North Slope,* per barrel</td>
<td>$65.02</td>
<td>$66.20</td>
<td>-1.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural gas, residential, per thousand cubic feet</td>
<td>$10.18</td>
<td>$10.66</td>
<td>-4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold, per oz. COMEX</td>
<td>$1,326.30</td>
<td>$1,360.90</td>
<td>-2.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silver, per oz. COMEX</td>
<td>$15.47</td>
<td>$16.68</td>
<td>-7.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper, per lb. COMEX</td>
<td>$2.86</td>
<td>$2.97</td>
<td>-3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc, per MT</td>
<td>$2,832.00</td>
<td>$3,260.50</td>
<td>-13.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead, per lb.</td>
<td>$0.92</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
<td>-15.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Bankruptcies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year ago</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Q3 2018</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Q3 2018</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Unemployment insurance claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Year ago</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial filings</td>
<td>4,320</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>4,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued filings</td>
<td>40,737</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>49,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claimant count</td>
<td>10,836</td>
<td>Feb 2019</td>
<td>13,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Federal, state, and local

\(^1\)February seasonally adjusted unemployment rates

\(^2\)February employment, over-the-year percent change

\(^3\)February hours and earnings

Sources: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics and Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Research and Analysis Section
ALASKA’S VOTING DISTRICTS
Continued from page 12

adults at 65 percent, while the western Alaska district is the only one where over 50 percent of adults have never married. This is partly because western Alaska is young overall, with a median age far below that of the state as a whole.

Types of workers and other economic statistics by district

Exhibit 9 on pages 16 and 17 gives economic and labor market statistics by district. The survey is for five years (2013 to 2017) and conducted by the Census Bureau, so these statewide numbers do not match some of the other data we produce. The American Community Survey is the only source for this type of economic data at the legislative district level.

Participation in the labor force

The various employment status statistics highlight the difference between much of urban and rural Alaska. Labor force participation, which is the percentage of the population 16 and older working or looking for work, is highest in military-dense areas such as HDs 2 and 15. The lowest labor force participation rate is on the Kenai Peninsula, in HD 29, at 55 percent. This district has a high median age so likely has more retirees.

Employment-to-population ratio

The employment-to-population ratio is slightly different in that it’s a measure of the civilian working age (16 to 64) labor force divided by the total population at those same ages. In this case, the heavily noncivilian military bases give HDs 2 and 13 the lowest rates, along with HDs 38 and 39 in western Alaska. The highest employment-to-population ratio are in Anchorage. HD 25 on the Anchorage hillside ranks highest at 73 percent, followed by HDs 22 and 23 in west Anchorage. Alaska’s largest city also has the only three Senate districts with ratios above 70 percent.

Unemployment rates

Western and rural Alaska have the highest unemployment rates. HD 39 has the highest rate at 22 percent, followed by HDs 38 and 40. The rural exception is HD 37 in Bristol Bay and the Aleutians, which at 6 percent falls below the statewide rate. The lowest unemployment rate in Alaska is just over 3 percent in the Anchorage hillside in HDs 27 and 28, followed by HD 33 in Southeast which encompasses downtown Juneau and Douglas plus Haines and Skagway.

Types of workers and income

By type of worker, the majority of all House and Senate districts’ working civilians are in the private sector except HD 39 in western Alaska. The highest is HD 23 in west Anchorage. HDs 38 and 39 in western Alaska have the highest share of government workers (federal, state, or local) as a percentage of their workforce, at around 50 percent and 47 percent, respectively. Besides western Alaska, the highest percentage of government workers is in HD 34 in Juneau’s Mendenhall Valley. HD 31 on the Kenai Peninsula has the highest percentage of self-employed workers, at 14 percent.

In Alaska, the difference between the House district with the highest median household income and the lowest is nearly $110,000. HD 28 on the Anchorage hillside is above $154,000, while households in HD 39 have a median around $46,000. Four House and two Senate districts, all in Anchorage and Eagle River, have median household incomes above $100,000.

The percentage of the population below the poverty level by legislative district is mostly the inverse of median household income. The poverty threshold for an individual varies by family size and number of children, but while the level is adjusted for inflation, the dollar amount does not vary by geographic location, either within Alaska or nationally. Because federal poverty levels don’t take area costs of living into account, they tend to be less reliable in Alaska.

The highest percentages of people below the federal poverty level are mainly in western Alaska in HDs 39 and 38, at around 31 and 27 percent. Anchorage has some high poverty levels as well, at over 21 percent in HD 19 in the Anchorage bowl. The lowest level of poverty is 2.6 percent in HD 28, which includes parts of the Anchorage hillside, Turnagain Arm, and Girdwood.

Average daily commutes

One last telling comparison among districts is how long it takes residents to get to work, on average. The longest daily commutes are in Mat-Su districts, where many residents work in Anchorage. HD 8’s is the longest at 40 minutes. Four others are over half an hour, something not found anywhere else in the state. The shortest daily commutes are in western Alaska, where all four House districts and their parent Senate districts have average commutes under 10 minutes.

Eric Sandberg is a demographer for Research and Analysis in Juneau. Reach him at (907) 465-2437 or eric.sandberg@alaska.gov.
SAFETY MINUTE

How to mitigate common hazards brought on by spring thaw

As Alaskans’ activity increases during the spring, injuries and fatalities can ramp up as well. Many people hit the road for recreational or family activities, begin or continue DIY projects, or de-winterize summer tools and toys. Stay safe during this brief season by learning to recognize and mitigate the most common Alaska spring hazards.

Roads
Motorcycles, bicyclists, and pedestrians increase in number and are often difficult to see. Remember to keep your eyes moving while driving and get the big picture at intersections. Many roads dry up quickly but corners, bridges, and overpasses can be coated with black ice, especially in shaded areas. Slow down and avoid braking or accelerating when turning corners or crossing bridges and overpasses.

River/lake ice
Ice thickness isn’t uniform. The frozen surface may be three feet thick in some places and one inch thick just a step away. During breakup, ice is thickest in the center of lakes and ponds. Although edges may appear stable, edge ice likely can’t support even a single person. Ice is strongest where it’s clear and weakest where it’s cloudy or full of large bubbles. Snow cover insulates ice, making it thinner. Check with the National Weather Service for current ice thickness measurements before venturing onto a frozen water body. The best prevention is to avoid ice covered rivers, lakes, and ponds during the spring thaw.

Wildlife
Big animals such as moose often pass through populated areas and roads, and spring increases their presence. When encountering moose, keep your distance, never feed them or other wildlife, keep pets on a leash, and respect mothers with young. In bear country, be noisy when hiking. Give bears space and if carrying a firearm for protection, know how to use it confidently and safely.

Hazardous debris
Snow melt reveals a variety of debris and some of it can be hazardous. Watch for broken glass and sharp objects. Used hypodermic needles are often discarded on roadsides and in parking lots. If you find needles, never attempt to break or recap them. Pick them up carefully while wearing gloves, and don’t allow children to dispose of them. Place needles in a puncture-proof, lidded container. Take the container to a local medical clinic or fire station.

Gas and electric tools
Tune up and adjust power tools and equipment properly, and always wear appropriate personal protective equipment. Confirm all safety guards are installed and functioning properly. Read or review owner’s manuals to operate the tool or equipment safely and as designed. When operating power tools and equipment, keep children and others at a safe distance. Bystanders can be injured by flying debris or through the operator’s loss of control.

The Department of Labor and Workforce Development’s Occupational Safety and Health Section provides free safety consultations for employers. AKOSH consultants visit the workplace to evaluate hazards and recommend corrective measures. To request a consultation, call (800) 656-4972 or visit http://labor.alaska.gov/lss/oshhome.htm.

Safety Minute is written by the Labor Standards and Safety Division of the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

EMPLOYER RESOURCES

New Section 503 landing page a resource center for federal contractors

The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs protects workers, promotes diversity, and enforces the law. OFCCP holds federal government contractors and subcontractors responsible for complying with the legal requirement to take affirmative action and not discriminate on the basis of a protected class, including disability.

OFCCP promotes equitable workplaces and recognizes that this is a team effort, which is why they’re committed to strengthening partnerships with federal contractors they assist.

OFCCP has launched a new Section 503 Focused Review Landing Page. The landing page is a resource center for federal contractors that provides information and assistance for implementing best practices and increasing employment of people with disabilities. Contractors can access disability inclusion best practices, documents explaining what to expect during a focused review, and OF-CCP contact information.

In Alaska, once federal contractors have self-identified on the state job bank or ALEXsys, or to Alaska Job Center staff, they will receive focused help finding applicants, including those with disabilities who meet minimum qualifications. Through their many partnerships, job center staff seek out applicants who fit the employer’s affirmative action goals. ALEXsys provides a federal contractor check-box to help job center staff identify and know how to best assist the employer with recruitment.

If you are a federal contractor, contact your local Alaska Job Center Business Connection staff for assistance with all your employment needs.

Employer Resources is written by the Employment and Training Services Division of the Alaska Department of Labor and Workforce Development.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Nancy Pease

Wed 4/6/2022 11:15 PM

To Re-districting Board:

I support the Option 2 Re-districting Map for new Senate Districts boundaries in the Anchorage area. I am adamantly opposed to any of the options that would combine parts of the Anchorage Hillside or South Anchorage with Eagle River.

Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution requires that legislative districts be compact, contiguous, and represent areas that are socially and economically integrated. Those criteria are met by Option 2. Those criteria are not met by pairing any part of the Hillside or South Anchorage with Eagle River.

Hillside and Eagle River have entirely different infrastructure and community institutions. Eagle River has its own library, parks district, local road authority, schools, a community college, a central business district, etc. There is no social and economic integration. In addition, there is no way to call those two areas contiguous, because Chugach State Park is the only land linkage and it has only primitive, non-motorized trails through rugged terrain. Travel on the road system between Eagle River and the Hillside requires crossing intervening legislative districts. Hillside/South Anchorage and Eagle River are not contiguous, nor compact.

I am a long-time resident of the Rabbit Creek area of South Anchorage. Our community council works collaboratively with nearby councils on the Hillside and along Turnagain Arm. Please respect and support our communities by including us all in the District shown in Option 2.

Nancy Pease
Under Alaska law, there are requirements that districts be contiguous, compact, relatively socioeconomically integrated, and as near as possible to the ideal population.

The NE Anchorage pairing was rejected by the courts as being a wild overreach. Of those requirements. The board then listened to a proposed replacement which, if adopted, would repeat the very same egregious overreach, only worse!!!

This replacement proposal, which would attach SE Anchorage’s HD9 to Eagle River’s HD22, essentially accomplishing the same goal of capturing another Senate seat for Eagle River to replace half of the NE Anchorage plan.

Egregious, yes, but now even more so! Because if they did not know better the first time, they certainly do now.

And Ridiculous! That’s a good summation of pairing the farthest south in-town district with Eagle River. The argument that the two districts are contiguous is baloney. A high mountain might as well be a brick wall if there are no roads through. The only way to Eagle River is via the Glenn Highway.

Next, let’s talk numbers as they’d affect the two districts:

The driving distance between HD11 in Eagle River and HD9 in SE Anchorage is 27 miles.

The driving distance between HD11 in Eagle River and HD9’s Girdwood is 67 miles!

The driving distance between HD11 in Eagle River and HD9’s Portage is 78 miles!

The driving distance between HD11 in Eagle River and HD9’s Whittier is 87 miles! (and don’t forget to plan your travel schedule for tunnel closures! You may want to come prepared with a sleeping bag and a tent!)

An insanely long distance to get to the opposite end of one’s mostly urban House District 87 miles!! Let that sink in for a moment.

And that’s not all! There’s more!

Depending on the route taken, one must cross through 6-8 unrelated House Districts to get from Eagle River to SE Anchorage.

An impassable mountain is not contiguous and neither is the necessity to traverse 6-8 other House Districts.
If the pairing in NE Anchorage was found to be unfair and in violation of state Redistricting rules, then how would it be fair to pair Eagle River with SE Anchorage? This is a brazen assault to the people of both HD22 & HD9!

This is not about politics for those testifying. This is about fairness and a fight against gerrymandering and potential disenfranchisement. This is a demand to respect election law and to do so in an honest and reasonable way. Alaska’s election laws, have long been respected as amongst the most fair in the country. They should not be under assault!

We know why you’re doing this. And we see you, Randy and Tuckerman, peeping out of that closet. You’re not on the board, so go home. And let this board conduct its business.

I urge the Redistricting Board to do its job fairly and correctly, as outlined by law. And I leave you with one last thought. 87 miles. And that danged mountain!
I am emailing you to provide testimony regarding the current redistricting situation.

As a lifelong Alaskan I feel like Eagle River barely matches the demographics in any of the choices presented.

Please accept my testimony as requesting you listen to an Alaska resident that prefers Option 3 as the only choice left that is suitable for our demographic.

Thank you,

Lanet Spence

Financial Security Professional
Alaska Team Leader

www.cohofinancialgroup.com
Dear Committee

This is a note to support Senate district K which included districts 9 and 22, South Anchorage and Eagle River.

They do have a continuous boundary. One of the largest of any Senate seats. There is a community that looks to overlap both 9 and 22. Stuckagain. Someone said that South Anchorage was a well-off community and Eagle River not so much. Another one of your Rich person's bad progressive stories. There are many connections between these areas as raised by the testimony. Fire, water systems, lot size, roads, or lack of roads, and recreation. Income, come on.

The reasons presented for not using these combinations was exactly what you did with the old District 8 now 30. A fast growing area around Big Lake is attached with included areas not linked by roads. Large distances between communities. The district has one of the largest population rankings in the state. Areas without a common cultural link. Some subsistence, some commuters, and clearly no connections between most of the communities in the new District 30. Blatant gerrymandering by the committee for District 30.

There seems to be a do only as the Big Ol lawyer Scott Kendal tells you to do. He has an agenda that he uses the threat of expensive lawsuits to include his whims.

I ask that you relook at this pairing before final submission.

Thanks for your time. Steve
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Jonathan Lang <[redacted]>
Thu 4/7/2022 7:36 AM

The Court's decisions have been clear. Unlike the other options, Option 2 clearly meets what the Courts have ordered with the fewest amounts of districts disturbed.

Please support Option 2.

Respectfully.

- Jon

Jonathan "Bearded Jon" Lang, Muldooner
--
[redacted] - always on; not always answered
Date: April 7, 2022, 8:36 am

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Tavoliero

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: I support the Alaska Senate District Option 3B.
Date: April 7, 2022, 8:59 am

First Name: Sherri

Last Name: Jackson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please support Option 3 b

It makes the most sense for everyone
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:28 am

First Name: Paul

Last Name: Berger

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Public Testimony on Redistricting

Public Comment: Option 3B is our choice. I'll keep this brief. Thank you for your consideration.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:34 am

First Name: Laura

Last Name: Bonner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River districts

Public Comment: I live in South Anchorage. The most logical and fairest map to comply with the Supreme Court's decision is to pair the two House districts for Eagle River area into the same Senate district. Keep Girdwood in the south Anchorage district since the only proximity to to Eagle River Valley is through a mountain pass that can only to crossed by foot weather permitting. Pairing Eagle River with Anchorage Hillside is illogical when Eklutna is closer and should be the same district as the Eagle River area district. Keep Eagle River with Eagle River area, East Anchorage with East Anchorage, Hillside Anchorage and Girdwood with South Anchorage, and Anchorage downtown with Anchorage downtown. This is the fairest mapping for the residents of those areas.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:37 am

First Name: Charles
Last Name: Jolin

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]
Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3b
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:37 am

First Name: Chris
Last Name: Twiford

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: Na

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I have reviewed the maps and am aware of the current redistricting situation. I SUPPORT MAP 3B please.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:38 am

First Name: Tawana

Last Name: Jolin

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:39 am

First Name: Dwight
Last Name: Hill

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I support Map 3B
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:39 am
First Name: Linda
Last Name: Hill
Group Affiliation, if applicable:
Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]
Your ZIP Code: 99515
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting
Public Comment: I support Map 3B
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Tim

Last Name: Toth

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Lois

Last Name: Turinsky

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Laura
Last Name: Bonner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:
Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River districts

Public Comment: I live in South Anchorage. The most logical and fairest map to comply with the Supreme Court’s decision is to pair the two House districts for Eagle River area into the same Senate district. Keep Girdwood in the south Anchorage district since the only proximity to to Eagle River Valley is through a mountain pass that can only to crossed by foot weather permitting. Pairing Eagle River with Anchorage Hillside is illogical when Eklutna is connected by the highway and should be in the same district as the Eagle River area district. Keep Eagle River with Eagle River area, East Anchorage with East Anchorage, Anchorage Hillside and Girdwood with South Anchorage, and Anchorage downtown with Anchorage downtown. This is the fairest mapping for the residents of those areas.
Dear Alaska Redistricting Board Members,

I support the 2022 proposed pairings that are shown on the Option 2 map. It contains the most logical, fair, and equitable pairings.

I’ve watched the board meetings and have reviewed the two proposed Senate district revision maps that were unanimously adopted by the Board yesterday. Here are just a few of the reasons why I support Option 2 and oppose Option 3B.

- I live in Eagle River, and I support pairing Eagle River with Eagle River. I also support keeping downtown Anchorage paired together and keeping the Hillside paired together. These pairings make the most sense. The pairings in Option 3B do not make sense to me and appear to be more of the same political gerrymandering that got us to the point we find ourselves in today.

- I’ve heard and read many testimonies from those not wanting to be paired with Eagle River; and frankly, I don’t blame them. A small, vocal group in my community wishes to secede from Anchorage and has made some very disparaging remarks about the rest of Anchorage. That small, vocal group does NOT represent the view of everyone in our community; but they certainly are the ones being heard. It’s no wonder that people in Anchorage don’t want to be paired together with another community in the Municipality that appears to have little to no respect for them.

- Chugiak/Eagle River doesn’t have a reasonable claim to JBER either. Military members and their families, who do not live on JBER, live in various areas throughout the Municipality of Anchorage. People who live on JBER frequent businesses throughout Anchorage, too.

For these reasons and others, I urge you to adopt and approve the Option 2 pairings. Please show that the Board is committed to providing fair, equitable, non-gerrymandered Senate pairings.

Respectfully,

Jo Ann Gruber
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:04 am

First Name: Lee

Last Name: Hammermeister

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Eagle River, Citizen

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River + JBER Map

Public Comment: Eagle River is only minutes away from JBER. As opposed to over an hour away Girdwood. Eagle River and JBER and been closely related via demographics with a substantial military population living in eagle river and attending the school system. For these reasons, Eagle River and JBER should be grouped together, instead of Eagle River and Girdwood as the former pairing makes the most sense geographically and demographically, which is the entire purpose of organizing the districts to begin with.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:21 am

First Name: Christopher

Last Name: Constant

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self (also an Anchorage Assembly member)

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage (New House District 23)

Public Comment: Looking closely at the map, there is a small residential section on the west southern portion of House District 23 with a couple of thousand residents. On the far east southern corner of the same district, there is a tiny neighborhood on Muldoon with a few hundred residents. That population borders Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson and now these residents are suddenly part of South Eklutna. To get from one end of the southern portion of the district, you have to move through three Senate districts to get there - this division is harmful.

The North Anchorage district should include Districts 17, 18, 20, and 23. The House districts work well, but the board was asked the consider how the narrow populations of the district in the two corners mentioned are in any way associated with the Chugiak-Eagle River community.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:23 am

First Name: Cliff

Last Name: Grove

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage

Public Comment: The board has heard some incisive and well-thought-out comments that Chris agrees with. The board's action items, in Chris's opinion, are short and simple.
As a 45 year resident of Girdwood community, I am writing to support option 2 to see a continued coherent district 9 and 11. Girdwood needs to stay paired with South Anchorage district 11. I strongly oppose pairing Girdwood with (too far away) Eagle River.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:33 am

First Name: Kenneth

Last Name: Graham

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting maps

Public Comment: I wish to submit strong opposition to the idea of pairing the community of Goodwood with Eagle River. I strongly support option two which is keeping a coherent district 9 contiguous to district 11. I have lived in Girdwood since 1977.
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:34 am

First Name: Stephanie

Last Name: Williams

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I support map 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
To the Redistricting Board:

My name is William Dougherty. I am a resident of Anchorage. My home is just off Upper DeArmoun Road in South Anchorage.

I’m taking time from a very busy day to write to oppose the ill-intentioned and unconstitutional redistricting proposal to pair Eagle River with South Anchorage. This is such a transparently partisan effort to increase Republican control of the Anchorage legislative delegation that you should be ashamed, but apparently that does not come naturally to you.

Allow me to state, as many already have, the blindingly obvious:

Eagle River voters should be with Eagle River voters. There is no legitimate justification for splitting them except to try to increase their political power by suppressing the political influence of other voters with entirely different interests and needs. If you attach Eagle River voters to South Anchorage, using the specious argument that they are “contiguous” – contiguous except for the huge wilderness between them – you will effectively disenfranchise myself and my neighbors. A politician who depends on majority support in Eagle River is not going to represent my interests. This would be an act of political sabotage done without any concern for the rights to which I am entitled under both the state and federal constitutions. Does that mean nothing to you?

So, I oppose Option 3B (the "Reudrich/Marcum plan") and support Option 2.

I understand you’ve received some testimony arguing that South Anchorage and Eagle River north are “similar” because we have limited road service areas. This is ludicrously irrelevant, but it’s also a distortion. Both Eagle River house districts have the same service area -- called Chugiak, Birchwood, Eagle River Rural Road Service Area (CBERRRSA). South Anchorage has completely different road service areas -- multiple Limited Road Service Areas -- with no connections between South Anchorage and Eagle River.

I’ve also heard the absolutely asinine argument that because there is a moose hunt in the Ship Creek valley, that constitutes common ground for residents of Eagle River and South Anchorage. Are you kidding? That is a contention so dumb the only consideration it deserves is ridicule.

If you are familiar with Anchorage, you know that people in Eagle River and South Anchorage do not regularly work, shop or play together. People from Eagle River do work and shop in Midtown and downtown. People from Anchorage – downtown, midtown or South Anchorage – do not work or shop in Eagle River. I personally haven’t been to Eagle River for any purpose, except to drive through on my way north, in the last 20 years. Eagle River does not have anything I want or need that I can’t get far closer to home.

Similarly, the people of Eagle River seem to view themselves as Eagle River residents, as much or more than as Anchorage residents. Some ER residents are proposing to completely separate
Eagle River from the municipality. I’m not sure how I feel about that in general, but it would be irrelevant to South Anchorage in particular.

I resent the three obviously partisan Republicans on the redistricting board for their relentless effort to gerrymander, to disenfranchise, to cheat – and that’s what it is: cheating. It’s anti-democratic, unpatriotic and purposely hurts real, live, human beings. Why can’t you just straighten up and do the right thing?

Keep Downtown together, Hillside together and Eagle River together. Don’t split apart communities for partisan purposes. The obviously rational pairings are 20/21 and 17/23 and 22/24 (Eagle River).

I can see that you’re trying to use a map drawn by a professional partisan using partisan data. I’ve been watching Randy Ruedrich do this for 30 years. His plans are your plans. His plans were the pairings the court threw out as an unconstitutional gerrymander. Don’t replace one of his gerrymanders with another.

Before moving to South Anchorage, I lived on Government Hill for 20 years, then I became the landlord for a rental property there for another 20 years. I have had a wide variety of tenants, from newspaper reporters to lawyers to soldiers. Government Hill should not have an Eagle River senator. An Eagle River senator cannot adequately represent an affluent rural district and an urban, commercial and industrial district. To split downtown along 4th Avenue with the north half effectively under the political thumb of an entirely different kind of community 30 miles away would be, in my judgment, a form of civic vandalism.

Instead of these cockamamie plans, you should follow the direction of the court. Only change the affected districts and those touching them. Making major, unconnected or controversial changes such as pairing Eagle River and South Anchorage only invites additional lawsuits.

I could go on, but I need to get on to my other responsibilities.

Sincerely,

William Dougherty
Date: April 7, 2022, 10:54 am

First Name: Cecelia

Last Name: Donelson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map B3

Public Comment: I support map B3
As a concerned resident of East Anchorage I see only one reasonable pairing for East Anchorage, Eagle River, Hillside and Downtown and that is Option 2.

The Eagle River Comprehensive plan is for Eagle River and does not include either Downtown or Hillside. Hillside has its own unique interest group - HALO and breaking that up to pair part of it with Eagle River does not make sense.

Please vote to pair the following house districts in one senate district 20/21 and 17/23 and 22/24.

Susan
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:13 am

First Name: Nicholas

Last Name: Romeijn-Stout

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Map 2 Support

Public Comment: I am a Girdwood resident. The proposal to pair us with Eagle River for a Senate district makes NO SENSE. It is a ridiculous and clearly partisan proposal. Stop it.

Option 2 makes sense. It is simple. Vote for option 2.

Duh. We all see what you are trying to do. Stop it.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 11:14 am

First Name: **Tim**

Last Name: **Delarm**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99523**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **3B**

Public Comment: **I support map 3B**
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:18 am

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Brewster

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): MAP 3B

Public Comment: I support Map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:21 am

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Kircher

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:24 am

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Johnson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: April 7, 2022, 11:26 am

First Name: Mary

Last Name: Berger

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment:
Good Morning Redistricting Board,

I am writing today to OPPOSE map 3B and SUPPORT map option 2. As a South Anchorage resident for the past 28 years, and as someone whose family lived in Peters Creek for over 30 years, CER (Chugiak Eagle River) and the Hillside of Anchorage are socioeconomically diametrically opposite. Not only are they dramatically different socioeconomically but we are also not contiguous in any shape or form.

CER (Chugiak Eagle River) and its representatives have spent the past two years stating how dark and disgusting Anchorage is, CER campaigns CER regularly on “not Inheriting Anchorages problems”

How can they effectively represent a part of Anchorage they loathe?

Jamie Allard a representative of CER is on record stating that she does not represent anyone that does not vote for her. Another reason we are not compatible, South Anchorage has a traditional history of transparency and integrity in its representatives, something Jamie Allard and Lora Reinbold have proven they are incapable of.

Also CER does not have a good friendly history with Anchorage, CER has tried many times to succeed from Anchorage, including currently at this time there is a push to succeed. The representatives in CER have made it clear, we are not compatible.

Do not continue gerrymandering this process in an attempt to gain more conservative control. It is obvious based on current litigation decisions that this board has a biased agenda, there will be more lawsuits should this board continue to go down this path. Which is not fiscally conservative. Do not waste any more tax payers money or time. Choose map 2.

Thank you for your time

--
Chelsea Foster
Alaskan Activist

Dena'inaaq een'aq' gheshtnu ch'q'u yeshdu. (Dena'ina)
I live and work on Dena'ina land.
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:33 am

First Name: Kelley

Last Name: Russell

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I want to share my thoughts on senate pairings within Anchorage. I currently live in proposed House District 12 in the Abbott Loop area and have been in this district over two decades. I work off of Muldoon, doing therapy with Veterans. My patients live all over Anchorage, Eagle River, JBER and the Matâ€™ Su valley and so I get to see socioeconomic variances in patients from specific areas.

I support Option 2 for the following reasons:

1. Districts 20 and 21 in Muldoon make sense together due to their shared shopping, Bartlett High School, recreation areas.

2. Districts 24 and 22 both in Eagle River make sense together due to their shared shopping and recreation areas. They are buffered from the City of Anchorage from many miles of nonresidential land along the Glenn. In my work with former service members, while there are some service members who live in Eagle River, the same can be said for many areas of Anchorage. It isnâ€™t enough to warrant pairing districts 23 and 24 over pairing Eagle River with itself.

3. District 9 (Hillside) should never be combined with an Eagle River district. They share no common roads or schools. They merely share an uninhabited mountain range, a tenuous connection at best.

Thank you for hearing my concerns.
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:36 am

First Name: michelle

Last Name: hough

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99518

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:42 am

First Name: Heidi

Last Name: Jolin

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:53 am

First Name: Shannon

Last Name: Wileman

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map 3b! Thanks so much!
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:00 pm

First Name: Marie

Last Name: Boyd

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 95404

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map B

Public Comment: I support Map B
Jodi Taylor

Thu 4/7/2022 12:17 PM

Redistricting Board,

Let's get a balanced, fair shake on the senate seats, plan 3B offers that. Let's move forward in a common sense fashion, ER should be paired w South Anchorage (zoning similarities, demographics, and like minded on issues).

Thanks,

Jodi
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:19 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Baker

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Option 2 support

Public Comment: I support option 2. As a resident of HD 17, the best senate pairing from my community is HD 23. Additionally, pairing South Anchorage (and Girdwood and Whittier!) with Eagle River makes little to no logical sense. It has the appearance of a partisan gerrymander and its adoption would compromise the integrity of the redistricting process.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 12:28 pm

First Name: Cindy
Last Name: Lelake

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): In support of map 2

Public Comment: I urge the Redistricting Board to adopt current Map 2 Senate pairings, and reject Map 3b. South Anchorage should not be paired with Eagle River.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 12:30 pm

First Name: Deanne
Last Name: Warburton
Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:
Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map B3

Public Comment: I support map3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:37 pm

First Name: Sandra

Last Name: Graham

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 62 year resident

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please consider Option B as the most workable plan!
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:38 pm

First Name: Alice
Last Name: Sullivan

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Redistricting Proposals

Public Comment: I URGE you to accept Option #2 which KEEPS Eagle River together and KEEPS Girdwood with their closest neighbors in South Anchorage. Pairing Eagle River with Girdwood--two communities that, geographically, could not be further apart, and a pairing is NOT LIKELY to be successful, primarily for communication and common concerns specific to each area.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 12:41 pm

First Name: Sandra

Last Name: Graham

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 62 year resident

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please adopt option 3B!
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:52 pm

First Name: Matt
Last Name: Davis

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3b

Public Comment: I support map 3b. Thank you
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:57 pm

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Hersh

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99518

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please option B

Thank you
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:57 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Hays

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support V2

Public Comment: I support version 2 as it keeps South Anchorage with South Anchorage, Downtown with Downtown, and Eagle River with Eagle River. Let's move this map and get everything settled.
Date: April 7, 2022, 12:59 pm

First Name: Aaron

Last Name: Hersh

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99518

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please adopt option B
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 1:07 pm

First Name: Sarah

Last Name: Crosswhite

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B.
Date: April 7, 2022, 1:25 pm

First Name: Adam

Last Name: Hays

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map versions

Public Comment: I support map version 2 because it keeps neighborhoods together. As someone who grew up in Eagle River and then spent my young adult years in Girdwood, I can't fathom connecting any part of Eagle River with Girdwood. These are two very disparate communities. Map 2 keeps Eagle River with Eagle River and South Anchorage with Girdwood, which makes sense. Please adopt this map.
Good afternoon,

I am writing in support of approving and using Map 2 as this map pairs districts with similar interests and goals together. Map 3 is not representative of the city nor does it make an effort to ensure citizen’s voices and goals are well met. Option is a very obviously gerrymandered to overshadow the voices of people of color and give higher credence to Eagle River.

Please move forward with these comments in mind and approve map 2.

Thank you,

Courtney Weaver
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 1:49 pm

First Name: Rebecca
Last Name: Berger
Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Alaska Redistricting

Public Comment: Keep map 3B
Hi Peter, here is my testimony from today with citations to the quotes.
Thank you

Yarrow Silvers
99504

I want to start off by thanking the board for your responsiveness in proposing maps that re-unite Muldoon. I also would like to thank the board for outlining a clear process with set dates, deadlines and expectations.

Now let's talk about the rest of the map. I just want to say that, if I was a board member, I would proceed with extreme caution to avoid the appearance or action of replacing what was found to be one unconstitutional gerrymander with another. The court order makes one thing very clear. Senate District K was unconstitutional because it split Eagle River into two separate senate districts for the purpose of increasing majority party representation and at the expense of East Anchorage voters.

If Plan 3B is adopted, the Board will once again split Eagle River into two separate senate districts for the purpose of increasing majority party representation at the expense of voters outside Eagle River. The Board's refusal to correct the gerrymander and its willingness to jeopardize everything to hold onto this gerrymander would not only be irrational, it blatantly and directly violates the court order.

Plan 3B does not correct the gerrymander, it only swaps out the voters who will be muffled. It also continues to tear Eagle River in two, despite consistent testimony from many in Eagle River who put their Eagle River community above their party and have asked that Eagle River remain united.

I would be cautious about adopting pairings that were introduced by an individual who not only chaired the republican party and uses political data to map, but also sent this board a chart that showed how that political data relates to proposed pairings, who the incumbents are, and even a column that appeared to indicate whether certain incumbents were electable or not, a chart which was referenced by at least two board members during the process, and whose initial suggested Eagle River pairings were found to be unconstitutional.

I believe that the most simple fix is the best; Keep Eagle River with Eagle River and Muldoon with Muldoon. Do not undo senate and house districts the Board already adopted unless necessary to keep Muldoon as one and Eagle River as one.

Please reject politically motivated pairings that circle all around the map, pairings that continue splitting apart communities and that continue to give Eagle River more representation at the expense of other communities of interest and please stop utilizing contiguity of a type that has been described by Supreme Court Justice Mathews as “second rate contiguity”, and what has been described by Bud Simpson as basically a fiction. I will give you the full quotes here for context:

Located in the Feb 3, 2022 trial transcript at lines 1850-1851 is the following statement by Bud Simpson:
"And so I could not ever describe 33 as compact. It's barely contiguous. And by barely I mean the part that connects the northern part of that to the southern part basically has almost no people in it, so it's just—it's basically a fiction, in my mind."

And in the Friday 3/18 video of Supreme Court arguments at 11:23 is the following conversion:

"Supreme Court Justice Matthews: I do like your concept of false contiguity when you said for example linking Girdwood with downtown Anchorage [inaudible] would be contiguous maybe if you went out into the salt water but would be false contiguity, doesn't that imply there would be a sort of natural scheme of things when you look at a map and when you instead use links that are unpopulated wilderness, use saltwater [inaudible] that really is 2nd rate in a way."

Singer: "that really was the board's perspective that it's 2nd rate."

So I think that if this board wanted to continue this trend of splitting apart communities and giving Eagle River more representation than they have population for, that they would need to have pretty good justification for why doing so was necessary. But I have read the testimony and listened to the testimony and the board members and I have not heard any rational justification for doing this, much less good justification.

I've heard Bethany Marcum state concerns that a section of JBER is in North Eagle and so they need to be paired so that all of JBER is represented together. I would like to assure Ms. Marcum, that, having looked at a map of this section, this area is a swath of trees with no infrastructure and likely no to few people living in it. Having the consistent representation for a swath of trees is not justification for breaking apart Downtown, Eagle River and South Anchorage using second rate contiguity.

I've heard concerns about service members living in Eagle River and the type of representation they recieve. I want to point out that service members live all over Anchorage and that they are represented in accordance with their place of residence, not their work place. Military service members living in Eagle River are already represented by an Eagle River representative.

I want to push back on this idea that the gated and inaccessible community of JBER that includes service members who both work and live on base can only be represented by Eagle River, when there is not even an Eagle River gate. There is a Government Hill Gate and a Muldoon gate however, as well as other Anchorage gates, where residents of JBER are closely integrated with the surrounding communities included in the North Anchorage district 17.

My point being that the connection between JBER service members who already live and receive representation in Eagle River is not adequate justification for splitting downtown, Eagle River, and South Anchorage neighborhoods, as well as splitting residents of JBER from their communities outside of the gates.

I've heard remarks about historical connections and how maps have looked in the past. I really just want to remind you that there is a reason that maps are changed every 10 years and that we are not mapping for the past, we are mapping for the people that are living here now. Also, in the past Eagle River's population was vastly different, requiring Eagle River to be split between two senate districts when now it finally has the opportunity to be in a single district.
Now let’s move to the justifications for splitting South Anchorage apart. I’ve heard people talk about how South Anchorage and Eagle River both have limited road service areas and independent snow removal and thus should be paired. I would like to support the many Eagle River residents who have testified for the preservation of their Eagle River community, and encourage the board to listen to them as they have pointed out the obvious: North Eagle River also has limited road service areas and independent snow removal and not only that but they have the same independent LSRA as South Eagle River, not a completely different LSRA which is not connected in any way physically or in implementation or funding.

I’ve heard that the two areas share a hunting route over Ship Creek. I would like to point out that there are 100 permits issued per year for the Ship Creek moose hunt. So this idea that people mingling over hunting routes creates a justification for this pairing when these people do not work, shop, eat or play in the same area is tenuous at best and this pairing absolutely opens up the board for further lawsuits from negatively affected South Anchorage residents as well as Eagle River residents and proponents of Eagle exit.

I’ve also heard this idea that basic contiguity and the barest of a fix is all that matters and I’d like to remind the board that this idea of we will do it because we can has been said before and look where it got us.

Finally I want to discuss a rather more cynical thing that is happening in the background that I hope this board can, as professional public servants to the community in this mapping process, rise above. This involves political blogs that are urging people to testify based on politically motivated reasons such as saving a certain number of Republican senate seats.

This involves people calling from outside of Anchorage and quoting these statements and then hanging up because they do not have actual knowledge of the Senate pairings they are calling in to support and are unable to respond to even the most basic clarifying questions, like “why do you support this district.”

This involves people sending the same form letter each day and completely changing their testimony from what they said just one month ago in the municipal process, testimony that the Assembly listened to and that in doing so resulted in a built in 3.6% deviation in the municipal maps. In contrast, the Anchorage pairings under consideration here do not practicably change deviations.

So while this is inherently a political process, our constitution does not allow for political gerrymandering, which was recently reaffirmed by the courts. I hope that you can rise above the political noise and employ rational, logical justification for your actions while looking at communities and not parties in your final map.
Date: April 7, 2022, 2:07 pm

First Name: Mari
Last Name: Wood

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99688

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I support map 3B

Public Comment:
Date: April 7, 2022, 2:18 pm

First Name: Bruce

Last Name: Graham

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Please adopt option 3B
Hi, thanks for the updates.

It looks like Option 1 has been eliminated so I now would like to state that I favor Option 2. Whatever the conclusion, it would be unfair and inconsistent to give Eagle River two Senate Seats.

Eagle River may be within the larger Anchorage municipality but they resemble many other contiguous communities in Alaska which you have not and would not considered splitting with a straight face. It's inconsistent and unfair to split Eagle River.

Pat Race
Juneau, AK
Date: April 7, 2022, 2:31 pm

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Meyer

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Fair redistricting

Public Comment: The result of the Republican-slanted redistricting board's earlier failed gerrymander was struck down by the Alaska Supreme Court. The court chastised the redistricting board for ignoring public comments supporting fair redistricting maps.

In this current round, the are still trying to cheat. Please support fair redistricting.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 2:57 pm

First Name: John

Last Name: Gruber

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate Pairings - Support for Option 2

Public Comment: I have lived in Eagle River for 46 years. I’m writing in support of the senate pairings shown in Option 2.

I support keeping the two Eagle River house districts together. It also keeps the Hillside communities together as well as the downtown Anchorage communities. Option 2 is the most reasonable, non-partisan option of the two options proposed.

Option 3B, which I do not support, appears to be another politically motivated gerrymander that was generated by someone utilizing partisan data along with information about incumbents.

I encourage you to adopt Option 2.

John B. Gruber
Dear Redistricting Board,

I SUPPORT Option 2 and OPPOSE Option 3B.

I am a resident of Stuckagain Heights in Anchorage. During the Assembly Reapportionment process, our Basher Community Council voted overwhelmingly in favor of our community remaining part East Anchorage District 5 and against our neighborhood being attached to Eagle River District 2.

For the same reasons, I support Option #2 which aligns our neighborhood with other Hillside neighborhoods in South Anchorage, and I oppose Option 3B which would join us and other South Anchorage Hillside neighborhoods with Eagle River. Stuckagain Heights is not connected to Eagle River except by an uninhabited mountain range, and we are separated by almost 20 miles and 30 minutes driving time. From South Anchorage Hillside neighborhoods, the time and distance to Eagle River is even greater. We are also socio-economically consistent with South Anchorage Hillside and have many similar neighborhood concerns including Hillside wildfire risk, public safety, education, development, roads, traffic, and land use. For example, Stuckagain Heights and many South Anchorage Hillside neighborhoods have uniquely operated LRSAs, none of which are physically connected to Eagle River. Both Eagle River House Districts share the same LRSA so it would seem obvious for them to remain together.

To have fair and balanced representation we need to keep contiguous communities with similar needs, objectives, and concerns together. Option 2 keeps the Anchorage Hillside together, Eagle River together, and Downtown together. Option 3B creates irrational boundaries to bias voting and consolidate political power rather than keeping physically connected communities with similar needs together. Any new plan should address the court's concerns and not invite additional lawsuits due to making major, disconnected, and controversial changes to neighborhood groupings. Eagle River is almost 20+ physical miles away from Downtown and even farther away from the Anchorage Hillside, and worlds apart in the basic and common understanding of the daily needs and issues of those communities.

I want representation that listens, understands our needs, advocates for us, and shows up when we need them to address issues in our communities, not people who simply drive by or bypass our neighborhoods altogether on their way to somewhere else. I also want representatives that treats us with respect rather than contempt, which is unfortunately consistent with statements made about Anchorage by currently serving representatives from Eagle River along with many community members there that want to secede from Anchorage altogether. I suspect if someone from South Anchorage was elected to represent Eagle River, residents there would share the same concerns about lack of understanding and representation.

Thank you for considering my testimony and feedback.

Respectfully,

LuAnn Piccard
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 3:22 pm

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Carhart

Group Affiliation, if applicable: None

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99670

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate district k. 3b

Public Comment: I support map 3b. The one with 9 and 22. These are a contiguous connected and have people associated by fire issues, lot sizes, septic, road, and recreation.
Date: April 7, 2022, 3:39 pm

First Name: Angela

Last Name: Lopuhovsky

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map B3
Date: April 7, 2022, 3:43 pm

First Name: Andria
Last Name: Dolan

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska Republican Party

Email or Phone Contact: 
Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 3:47 pm

First Name: Suzette
Last Name: Mizelle
Group Affiliation, if applicable: No group affiliation
Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99611
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Option 2

Public Comment: As a former resident of both Muldoon and Eagle River, I am not in favor of splitting these two districts for the sake of an additional Senator for Eagle River.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 3:48 pm

First Name: brian

Last Name: evans

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I support 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3 B
Date: April 7, 2022, 3:57 pm

First Name: Carolee

Last Name: Gause

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I am in support of B3
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 4:20 pm

First Name: Michael
Last Name: Williams
Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]
Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: I SUPPORT MAP 3B
The 2021 Board Proclamation for Anchorage was ratified on November 10, 2021. There has been a public hearing publicly presented with public input and testimony. This Board has the opportunity to be the first Redistricting Board in over 20 years to have a map that is viable for a full 10 years.

The Board did a good job with the overall house map and senate pairings in Southeast, Rural, Interior, and MatSu. Further delays would result in some candidates running three elections in a row. We have seen the chaos that creates both for the candidates and the voters. Some voters did not exercise the franchise because they did not know in which district they resided. This is unfair to the candidates and the voter.

We have a new system of voting: Rank Choice Voting. To complicate the matter further we will have special election to replace him. This is unprecedented. The voter needs time to reorient themselves to their new senate and house district. If questions surrounding our new Anchorage Municipality have not been resolved immediately the result could be voter disenfranchisement and failure of the system to protect one voter, one vote.

The Alaska Supreme Court has upheld the unconstitutional political gerrymander of Senate Seat K (Eagle River/East Anchorage) and remanded the pairing back to the Alaska Redistricting Board. Please act swiftly to adopt a map with final senate pairings. There is no time to waste.
Date: April 7, 2022, 5:22 pm

First Name: Kay
Last Name: Brown

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): senate pairings

Public Comment: I support Option 2. Option 2 keeps the neighborhoods and communities of interest together, and is the most logical and legally defensible. Option 2 keeps together Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, Downtown with Downtown and southside with southside. Option 2 best complies with the court's decision and direction. Option 3 is not legally sound as it continues to divide and over-represent Eagle River.
I’m writing to express my support for redistricting Option 2. It makes the most sense to keep Downtown together, Eagle River together and Hillside together. Each of those districts has its own character, its own general social and economic characteristics. Each district should have the right to elect representatives who best represent its citizens. To divide them, as Option 3b would do, is classic gerrymandering……creating illogical districts in order to increase the voting power of one party.

Gerrymandering undermines democracy. Do the right thing, the thing that best supports our democratic system. Support Option 2.

Susan Soule
Anchorage
The driving distance between Eagle River’s HD22 and SE Anchorage is 27 miles.

The driving distance between River’s HD22 and HD9’s Girdwood is 67 miles.

The driving distance between River’s HD22 and HD9’s Portage is 78 miles.

The driving distance between River’s HD22 and HD9’s Whittier is 87 miles, (including the need to schedule one’s time to get back & forth through the tunnel w/o being locked out or in)

ADDITIONALLY…

Depending on the route taken, one must cross through 6-8 unrelated House Districts to get from Eagle River’s HD22 to SE Anchorage’s HD9.

Please keep that in mind that an HD22/HD9 Senate pairing, especially where there are other possibilities available, 87 miles long urban district disenfranchises communities and makes no sense.

87 Miles!

Thank you for keeping this in mind
Date: April 7, 2022, 5:36 pm

First Name: Julie

Last Name: Barrow

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support Map B3

Public Comment: I have lived in Anchorage for 38 years, I believe map B3 would be the most appropriate option.
As a 28 year Anchorage resident who has lived most of that time in the Abbott area (district 12), I am writing to support Option 2. Option 2 is the best map because communities of interest remain together. It is illogical to attempt to pair districts in Eagle River and the Hillside/Girdwood into a single senate district. While they touch on the maps presented because all land must be accounted when creating house districts, the areas that touch are through an unpopulated state park. How can anyone legally justify that as bordering when the border they share does not have anyone living in it? Please keep communities together in Anchorage when creating Senate districts.
Joclyn Reilly

Thu 4/7/2022 5:49 PM

Dear Redistricting Board,
I am a homeowner in South Anchorage, and I support Option 2. Eagle River should be paired with Eagle River, not South Anchorage.

I don't appreciate the delay tactics, which wastes taxpayer money and time. The sooner this is done, the sooner candidates and voters can prepare for a fair election.

Thank you,

Joclyn Reilly
Dear esteemed members of the Alaska Redistricting Board,

To start, I'd like to thank you all for the extensive work you have done on the current house district map and your continued efforts to find a fair and constitutional plan for Anchorage's senate pairings. I know this is a herculean task and I am deeply grateful for your service to our state.

I am writing today regarding the proposed senate pairings adopted by the board. I'd like to start by saying I celebrated my first Birthday in Eagle River and have called it home for nearly 28 years. From personal experience, I can say that the idea that Eagle River should be paired with South Anchorage seems outrageous to ordinary Eagle River - Chugiak residents, including myself.

As can be noted in the Anchorage Municipal redistricting process, there was broad opposition to pairing these communities together with overwhelming testimony that these communities have little in common, do not live, work, or play in the same areas, and are not logical pairings. In fact, the few members in Eagle River who recently have called in to testify whose name's I recognize were among the loudest champions against these pairings during the municipal redistricting process. It seems that the only justification for such a pairing is to benefit a specific political interest at the expense of the Alaskans, which is antithetical to the duties of the Alaska Redistricting Board and why the Alaska Supreme Court threw out the prior Eagle River - Muldoon district.

The most logical, and I believe what the Alaska Supreme Court indicated would be more constitutionally sound, would be pairing the two Eagle River house districts, #22 and #24, together (as has been the case since 2013 with great success and no complaints from community members.) Of the current maps, Option 2 seems to be the best and I strongly encourage members to adopt this or another map that keeps Eagle River - Chugiak intact as one Senate District.

Respectfully,
Erik Gunderson
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 8:05 pm

First Name: Penny

Last Name: Johnson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: In order to conform with fair redistricting reqs, map 3B is my choice. Far more equitable than the others.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:21 pm

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Anderson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3b

Public Comment: I support map 3b
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:24 pm

First Name: Sean

Last Name: Murphy

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Eaglexit

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern: pairing of Eagle River communities with Anchorage

Public Comment: I am a resident of House District 22-Eagle River Valley under the promulgated 2021 redistricting plan.

I came to Alaska while serving in the Army. I met my wife in 1989 and we started a family in East Anchorage. We moved to Eagle River with two daughters 22 years ago. I am a retired Anchorage School District educator and administrator. We enjoy our time with two grandchildren who live in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough with their parents.

I am testifying on behalf of Eaglexit because I feel very strongly, as an Eagle River resident and an active volunteer in promoting the interests of Eagle River, that Eagle River districts should be paired with one another and our unified and very independent community preserved.

The Eagle River community is a unique unified community with interests and priorities that do not align with the other districts in Anchorage.

Based upon my personal experience and knowledge, the physical separation between Eagle River Valley and South Muldoon Road is very real. Not only are these two areas separated by about 15 miles and a stretch of highway, two bodies of water (a creek and Eagle River) and a sizeable valley, there is no way to get from here to there, or vice versa, without going through another district. Eagle River is our own community, boxed in between JBER and the Chugach Range and separated from Anchorage with the only bridge on the highway system that connects North Alaska and South Alaska. This connection is part of Eagle River’s culture and commerce, but not at all a part of Anchorage.

Eagle River Valley and South Muldoon are very different places socially. It is my opinion that Eagle River residents are generally more affluent and educated per capita than East Anchorage and that Eagle River residents have the same or very similar religious beliefs, which can be seen in Eagle River’s many long-standing churches.

Eagle River has its own commercial and cultural center. The store owners rely upon Eagle River resident shoppers, out-of-state tourists, and customers traveling from Anchorage to
the Valley. Eagle River businesses do not rely upon Anchorage customers.

Unlike Anchorage, Eagle River commerce continued to grow and thrive.

I am also very proud of the clubs, organizations, festivals, and activities that Eagle River sponsors and maintains. We have an Eagle River Elks Club, a VFW, and a Lions Club. It is Eagle River residents that support and rely on these clubs, not residents of Anchorage.

Culturally our community is different with its own Chamber of Commerce. We have the Bear Paw Festival during the summer. Boy Scouts still put up USA flags on our downtown strip. We are on the Iditarod historic trail, where the original dogs ran serum to Nome over the Crow Creek Pass from Girdwood to the Eagle River Science Center at the end of Eagle River Valley, almost. The holidays bring us the Merry Merchant Munch which has a long history of highlighting our local Eagle River businesses.

Economically, we have more land to develop than Anchorage. We have a separate Parks and Rec Department with its own budget separate from Anchorage. We have a private partnership with a local company to maintain roads. Most of our communities are covered by a volunteer fire department. Our homeowners love their larger properties. While Eagle River residents live in housing that includes large lots, zero lot lines, and apartments, Eagle River does not have many trailer parks or homeless camps.

We have six Eagle River area Community Councils, the majority of which are very active in promoting and preserving the interests and needs of Eagle River residents.

I thought Anchorage and Eagle River were separated and different before I even realized it. I would explain to family and friends visiting from all over, who voiced their disbelief when I explained our communities out here are all under the Municipality of Anchorage.

Our school's communities have different needs. I saw first hand as an educator in Eagle River then as an administrator on the east side of Anchorage. Take a walk-through Chugiak or Eagle River high schools, then walk through Bartlett High School. The needs are different.

As an administrator on the east side and a resident in Eagle River, I saw road maintenance was different. My personal neighborhood in Eagle River is plowed and clean within a day or two at most. The streets around our walking only school on the east side would be a week or more before they were cleared. We have different needs than Anchorage.

Our communities of Eagle River, Chugiak, Birchwood, Peters Creek, and Eklutna are a community of interest. Why join with another district outside our communities? We are different and deserve our own representation, independence and self-governance.
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:46 pm

First Name: Tamera

Last Name: English

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:48 pm

First Name: Scott

Last Name: English

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting Anchorage

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Date: April 7, 2022, 9:50 pm

First Name: Brian
Last Name: Ashley

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I Support Map 3B
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 10:00 pm

First Name: William
Last Name: Sola

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate District K Options 4/7/22

Public Comment: Thanks to all for going back to the drawing board! Plan 2 looks great overall, and as a resident of Government Hill this makes a lot of sense to be a part of the downtown area, and JBER. As previously stated, being a part of North Eagle River and beyond would make no sense at all, so Plan 3B would be ill-advised and minimize any of our neighborhood’s issues or needs.

Thank you once again for allowing us to comment.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 7, 2022, 10:56 pm

First Name: Mary
Last Name: Andrus

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I support map 3b

Public Comment: I support map 3b
At an April 5th Special Meeting, the Girdwood Board of Supervisors passed a unanimous resolution opposing option 3 / 3b and supporting options 1 or 2 for the Anchorage area Senate pairings.

The resolution is attached as a PDF

Thank you,

Mike Edgington
Co-Chair, Girdwood Board of Supervisors
Resolution 2022-08

Of the Girdwood Board of Supervisors

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD SENATE PAIRING MAPS 1 OR 2, AND OPPOSITION TO SENATE PAIRING MAP 3 OR ANY SIMILAR PROPOSED PAIRINGS WHICH COMBINE EAGLE RIVER AND GIRDWOOD

WHEREAS, the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) is the duly elected Anchorage municipal board representing the residents and tax payers of Girdwood Valley Service Area in the provision of multiple local services, and is also recognized under AMC 22.40.035 as representing the Girdwood community in an equivalent capacity to a Community Council; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board issued a 2021 Proclamation of Redistricting on November 10, 2021; and

WHEREAS, several legal challenges were filed to the 2021 Proclamation and, after rulings by the Superior and Supreme Courts, the Alaska Redistricting Board is now reconsidering senate pairings for the Anchorage area; and

WHEREAS, GBOS reviewed the proposed senate pairing plans (Maps 1, 2 & 3), which were the Alaska Redistricting Board’s adopted draft senate pairing plans as of April 5th 2022; and

WHEREAS, maps 1 & 2 maps combine the geographically contiguous and culturally & socio-economically coherent communities of the Hillside, South Anchorage and Turnagain Arm/Girdwood/Whittier into senate seats; and

WHEREAS, map 3, or any similar map which combines Turnagain Arm/Girdwood with Eagle River, does not combine communities of similar interests, nor in any meaningful sense are the house districts contiguous, requiring traversing the width of the roadless Chugach Mountain Range to get from the northern to southern communities.

THEREFORE, the Girdwood Board of Supervisors supports the senate pairings represented by maps 1 or 2, and opposes the senate pairings represented by map 3, or any similar proposal that combines Eagle River with South Anchorage/Hillside/Turnagain Arm/Girdwood.

Passed and approved by a vote of 5 in favor to 0 against this 5th day of April 2022.

Mike Edgington, GBOS Co-Chair
Briana Sullivan, GBOS Co-Chair
Date: April 7, 2022, 11:32 pm

First Name: Yvonne

Last Name: Goldsmith

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Option 2 Map

Public Comment: I support the Option 2 map, which treats the 2 Eagle River house districts and the 2 East Anchorage districts as separate entities under Senate representation. As a former East Sider, I believe the two areas have very different personalities. The residents should be represented by people who understand their needs.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:29 am

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Templeton

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map 3B.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 8, 2022, 5:08 am

First Name: Tracy

Last Name: Johnston

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3B.
Date: April 8, 2022, 5:09 am

First Name: Kristi

Last Name: Johnston

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3B.
Date: April 8, 2022, 6:27 am

First Name: Geri

Last Name: Cannon

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map 3b
Date: April 8, 2022, 7:24 am

First Name: Ricarda

Last Name: Lebman

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting Anchorage Hillside

Public Comment: I support option 2 for Anchorage hillside redistricting. I do not support other redistricting options that place us in communities that have no idea what are roads, sewer, schools, etc need. Compactness is vital and should be utilized to the highest degree.
Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Re-districting plan

Public Comment: I support the Bahnke plan (Option 2) for re-districting. Eagle River must be paired with Eagle River. Combining Eagle River with South Anchorage and Girdwood makes no sense and is as contrived as the Eagle River-Muldoon pairing recently rejected by the Court.
Date: April 8, 2022, 8:05 am

First Name: Kevin

Last Name: Apgar

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): redistricting proposals

Public Comment: I urge the board to support Option 2, combining downtown Anchorage with the military bases in a Senate district. There is more economic and social cohesion between downtown and the military bases than there is in the other option, which would combine part of Eagle River with the Seward Highway.
Date: April 8, 2022, 9:09 am

First Name: Teresa
Last Name: Sherwood

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting Option 3B

Public Comment: I strongly oppose option 3B which would combine Girdwood with Eagle River. I support option 2. Girdwood and Eagle River are pole opposites politically and culturally. Girdwood's high school students attend school in south Anchorage as well as participate in sport clubs. It is where we shop and bank. We have very close ties to Whittier as well. I am the direct of Girdwood's Food Pantry and we make monthly deliveries to Whittier. Many Girdwood residents work or recreate in Whittier. Please do not pass option 3B and support option 2.
Date: April 8, 2022, 10:13 am

First Name: Cheryl

Last Name: Lovegreen

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Eagle River

Public Comment: Thanks to the board for their many hours of service. I appreciate the time you've put into this process.

I am still concerned about pairing Eagle River with other areas instead of the logical pairing of Eagle River with Eagle River. Please keep the two Eagle River House districts together, and make pairings with neighborhoods that have physical and socioeconomic connections to each other.
Date: April 8, 2022, 10:30 am

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Courtnage

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting options impacting Eagle River

Public Comment: I fully support/endorse option 2. Option 3b effectively dilutes my geographic representation and for that reason I oppose it.
Date: April 8, 2022, 11:08 am

First Name: Scott

Last Name: Bailey

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Proposed Map 3B

Public Comment: I support the adoption of Map 3B to continue Senate representation for Eagle River.
Date: April 8, 2022, 11:42 am

First Name: Gretchen

Last Name: Stoddard

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Is there a time for testimony without questions?

Public Comment: Hi

Will there be a time for testimony that is more traditional.... Like you can talk up to 3 minutes and it does not involve all the questions from the board? This is kind of intense to listen to. Thank you for all your work.
Date: April 8, 2022, 11:59 am

First Name: Jodie

Last Name: Menish

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: We support pairing Girdwood with Eagle River, Option 3B
ate: April 8, 2022, 12:00 pm

First Name: **Doug**

Last Name: **Menish**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99587**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: **We support pairing Girdwood with Eagle River, Option 3B**
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:02 pm

First Name: Melissa

Last Name: Bell

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Redistricting

Public Comment: I am in support of option 3B as a Girdwood property owner.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:15 pm

First Name: Gerald
Last Name: Fox

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Favor Option 2 and Oppose option 3

Public Comment: I am in favor of the option 2 redistricting map and opposed to the option 3 map. I live in Girdwood and have no link to Eagle River. I have been in Alaska for 42 years and have been in Eagle River proper once. I have gone by Eagle River on my way to the fair or to Fairbanks many times but not into Eagle River. I do my shopping in South Anchorage. Any medical issues I have are done in Anchorage. I have many friends in South Anchorage. To me it only makes sense to link South Anchorage and Girdwood in the same districts. Eagle River and Girdwood have very little in common. My understanding is that districts are supposed to be contiguous, compact, and represent areas that are socially and economically integrated. Option 3 does not meet these requirements. There is nothing that is socially and economically integrated between Girdwood/South Anchorage and Eagle River. Girdwood/South Anchorage and Eagle River are not contiguous as Chugach State Park is in between the 2 areas. It is over 60 miles from Girdwood to Eagle River. I believe that option 3 does not meet the courts requirement and would be found to be unconstitutional. We don't need more lawsuits and confusion as which politician is running for which seats. Thanks for considering my testimony.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:27 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99057

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Geographic Features as boundaries for Senate Pairings -- Option 3B

Public Comment: The Alaska Constitution requires that Senate District pairings should be contiguous, and consideration may be given to local government boundaries. But the constitutional requirement closes with the words, "Drainage and other geographic features shall be used in describing boundaries whenever possible." The Chugach mountain range is a geographic feature that is a practically impassible barrier between South Anchorage and Eagle River. And it is certainly possible to join the two Eagle River districts together, and South Anchorage districts together. Option 3B under consideration by the Board clearly violates the geographic requirement for Senate pairings in the Alaska Constitution.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:29 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Community connections - Option 3B

Public Comment: The Constitution’s criteria for compactness, contiguity, socio-economic integration, and respect for local government boundaries are a long-winded way of saying community. The Constitution’s broad intent is to create districts that represent communities. District option 2 respects communities in Anchorage, and Option 3B does not. The following list of community organizations, service areas, plans, councils, partnerships and residential areas shows communities which would be joined under Option 2, and violated by option 3B.

There are a large number of plans and organizations that support the community approach of Map 2 which respectively keeps the areas of Eagle River-Chugiak, East Anchorage, and Downtown Anchorage together. There has been a lot of anecdotal testimony, but this demonstrates the firm reality of community cohesiveness. This list is not exhaustive.

House districts 22 & 24

Eagle River, Birchwood, Chugiak, Peter’s Creek, and Eklutna.

CEBERRRSA - Chugiak, Birchwood, Eagle River Rural Road Service Area

https://www.muni.org/Departments/operations/streets/Service/Pages/CBERRRSARoadBoard.aspx

Municipality of Anchorage map â€“ Street Owners and Maintenance Providers

https://munior.org.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=5cb0fa58740e4fdca9e209644110edfc&fbclid=IwAR1wSzZfD4B4bKvHSh3FhJizXADx-LoY2p7u31kwb_0JugVzeOGzynNpqyU

Eagle River/Chugiak Parks & Recreation

https://www.muni.org/Departments/ERparks/Pages/default.aspx?fbclid=IwAR0Vrms9ttEcQXJYNCBrvFkJB Zdzm8xqAMPmpvSkN4CiQF8olRcOk2eii4
Anchorage Park, Greenbelt and Recreation Facility Plan “Volume II: Chugiak-Eagle River-Eklutna 1985 (link not available)

Chugiak Eagle River Chamber of Commerce. www.cer.org/

The 6 Community Councils in this area frequently reference each other’s work, and members collaborate on the Chugiak-Eagle River Advisory Board

https://onboard.muni.org/board/3916?fbclid=IwAR2DDSE-slShy1NOcUVe3xyl84oFcbORKeJxw7yrlzU zyKjl2d2iRkB78A

Anchorage’s Land Use code has a separate chapter for Chugiak-Eagle River

21.10.010 PURPOSE

The purposes of chapter 21.10 are to provide standards and regulations to implement the comprehensive plan elements of Chugiak-Eagle River, preserve and enhance the distinctive rural character, abundant natural environment, and unique lifestyle(s) of the community, while planning for growth and development, and to avoid overlap with standards and regulations applicable to other districts of the municipality.

https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Projects/t21/Documents/Chapter%2010.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0EM ViOvOxXukZenhKhNDaxPK69GRcEGyXu3Akmf3 5ojj6EiAGMZbnzg

There is even a Chugiak-Eagle River Comprehensive Plan. The first version of that plan was adopted in 1979, an update in 1993, and the latest in 2006, demonstrating decades of community cohesiveness.

Excerpt: “Chugiak-Eagle River is a unique, dynamic community. Over the past half century, it has experienced continuing population growth and change. In response to rapid change, the community initiated development of its first comprehensive plan in the mid-1970s. The Eagle River-Chugiak-Eklutna Comprehensive Plan was adopted in 1979, providing direction for development decisions and future growth in the Chugiak-Eagle River area.”


North Anchorage Land Agreement (NALA) link not available

JBER “the large non-residential areas of JBER are within house districts 22 & 24
House Districts 9, 10, 11, and 12
The Hillside Area Land Owner’s organization, known as HALO encompasses the area east of the Seward Highway, and south of Dowling through Potter Marsh. This encompasses the entire residential areas of 11 and 12 as well as the bulk of 9’s residents and an eastern portion of 10.

Map Option 2 keeps all of the districts served by HALO together.
https://anchoragehalo.org/

Map - https://img1.wsimg.com/blobby/go/21ca44fb-dded-4339-aba2-01cda3eaf790/downloads/1cbb2h8fm 62812.pdf?ver=1649190153804&fbclid=IwAR34owxhGZFShJu1KNqDc9Hz3bsorGrscIs5WVTsqjTQ1rHKW7cvjMXow

Hillside Wastewater Management Plan 1982

Hillside District Plan ALTERNATIVES: A Framework for Public Discussion 2008
https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Publications/Hillside%20District%20Plan/Framework%20Plan%20Final.pdf#:~:text=The%20Hillside%20District%20Plan%2C%20which%20was%20called%20for,will%20also%20replace%20the%20Hillside%20Wastewater%20Management%20Plan.

Hillside District Plan 2010
https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Publications/Pages/HillsideDistrictPlan2010.aspx

House Districts 17 & 23 â€“ Downtown, Government Hill, JBER, NE Muldoon

House District 23 is made up of 4 distinct areas with low populations. Government Hill (pop ~1350), North Downtown (pop ~2200), JBER (pop ~11,500), and Northeast Anchorage (pop ~1800). The residential areas of JBER are within this district, Government Hill is a distinct neighborhood within this district, North Downtown is contiguous with Downtown, and NE Anchorage is a spillover from the Muldoon Senate district since the area’s population is too large for one Senate district. House District 17 & 23 is the most logical pairing option for continuity and keeps downtown Anchorage together.

Anchorage Downtown Comprehensive Plan
https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Publications/Pages/CBD CompPlan Final07.aspx

Anchorage Downtown Partnership
https://anchoragedowntown.org/about/
Government Hill Neighborhood Plan
https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Publications/Pages/GovernmentHillNeighborhoodPlan-2013.aspx


East Anchorage District Plan
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:39 pm

First Name: Doug

Last Name: Robbins

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Unconstitutional Gerrymandering

Public Comment: The Board's pairing in Senate District K was ruled an unconstitutional partisan gerrymander by both the Superior Court and the Alaska Supreme Court. I'm really struck by the complete lack of remorse on the part of the Republican mapmakers for willfully proposing an illegal map, with the intent to leverage the Republican majority in Eagle River into an additional Senate seat. The lack of remorse is shown by the new proposal 3B, which repeats the error already ruled unconstitutional by the courts. The attitude of the Republican mapmakers then, and still, is to do whatever you can get away with. The remand to the Board was not a license to pursue new ways of unconstitutional gerrymandering. The remand is to fix the previous error. Option 3B is clearly the same kind of gerrymandering that was already rejected by the courts under the Equal Protection Clause of the Alaska Constitution.

The Board has a reasonable alternative in the pairings represented by option #2.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:39 pm

First Name: Rosa

Last Name: Meehan

Group Affiliation, if applicable: voter

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): redistricting choices

Public Comment: I reside in South Anchorage and I support Option 2 as that best represents voter interests in my district. I do not see any logic in splitting the two Eagle River districts as proposed in Option 3b. So I strongly support Option 2.
Date: April 8, 2022, 12:45 pm

First Name: Sally

Last Name: Gates

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I OPPOSE redistricting option 3B

Public Comment: My name is Sally Gates. I am a resident of Girdwood. I am writing in OPPOSITION to the senate redistricting plan 3B which connects Eagle River with Girdwood and South Anchorage. This plan is nonsensical. I spend little to no time in Eagle River. I rarely spend any money there. I do however spend much time and money in South Anchorage and Girdwood.

If a senator is required to serve a disconnected piece of Eagle River, it will dilute that person’s ability to serve both Eagle River and South Anchorage/ Girdwood/ Whittier. Eagle River is impacted far more by what happens in East Anchorage than South Anchorage. Eagle River cares about the Glenn Highway more than the Seward Highway. And reasonably so, it impacts their lives far more. It serves no one to make one senator advocate against one part of their district in favor of another part.

It is clear the plan to plan to combine Eagle River with South Anchorage serves political motivations, but it doesn’t serve the people of Eagle River or the people of South Anchorage/ Girdwood/ Whittier. This is not a complicated issue. Voting districts should serve constituents, not political parties (regardless of the party.) Voting districts should be practical geographically, make it easy for people to connect with those elected and serve the interests of the constituents in the district. Option 3B does NOT accomplish any of these goals.

I am writing in SUPPORT of redistricting OPTION 2. Option 2 makes sense.
Date: April 8, 2022, 3:01 pm

First Name: Steve

Last Name: Strait

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support Pairing HD 9 & 22

Public Comment: I am submitting testimony in support of joining House Districts 9 and 22 into a common Senate District as part of 2022 Redistricting plan.

My name is Steve Strait, a long time resident of Anchorage who has lived on Anchorage’s hillside for years.

First the Legal....
Alaska Constitutional Provisions - Article VI

§ 6. District Boundaries The Redistricting Board shall establish...Each senate district shall be composed as near as practicable of two contiguous house districts. Consideration may be given to local government boundaries. Drainage and other geographic features shall be used in describing boundaries wherever possible.

The pairing of House Districts 9 and 22 does meet the legal standard for one senate seat by combining H.D. 9 & 22 because they are in fact Contiguous. Since these two districts are contiguous

1. H.D 9 and H.D.22 share a common boundary and therefore are contiguous.

2. Both H.D. 9 & 22 include large areas of elevated terrain and are substantially different from most other Anchorage bowl neighborhoods. Eagle River and Hillside to Girdwood include mountains that range from 2,000-7,000 feet. Both districts share large portions of Chugach State Park, a distinction not shared by other Anchorage house districts.

3. The history of Anchorage government jurisdiction and Chugach State Park is significant by being included into the City (former Borough of Anchorage ) since the parks establishment. Chugach State Park reaches from Portage and Girdwood, includes the Anchorage Hillside through onto Eagle River and Knik bridge. The inclusion of Chugach State Park in the Muni of Anchorage is by design. The pairing
of H.D. 9 with 22 in a senate seat is consistent with the historical recognition the Park was and continues to be included in Anchorage boundaries.

4. What do Eagle River and South Anchorage share in common? -Chugach State Park

5. Elevated Terrain

-Winding narrow pioneer homestead roads with associated independent local Road Service Areas of self taxation.

-Life threatening avalanches as recently occurred in E.R, associated with mountains not experienced in the Anchorage lowlands.

-Fire Danger. Spruce Bark Beetles have turned forested elevated hills above Anchorage into huge life threatening fire zones. How do you fight fires... with water of course. However both elevated areas of Eagle River and hillside south anchorage share a common problem.. non existent city provided water/sewer. Homeowners compensate with private water wells and septic systems. Fire hydrants are almost non existent in both elevated areas. Fire trucks must tanker in water up winding roads to fight home and wild fires. In the case of a wild fire residents are predicted to evacuate to lower elevation towards safety as the water trucks head uphill into fire zones leading to traffic conflicts. This known life safety fire danger is an existential threat not shared with lower suburbs of Anchorage or much of the MatSu valley.

-Also shared between HD 9 and 22 are the recreation trails between Girdwood, South Anchorage and Eagle River through Chugach State Park. Travel paths include bicycles, hiking, skiing between both communities

Chugach State Park was created in 1970, it is the third largest Park in the United States. While the Chugach State Park is common between H.D. 9 & 22. The historic Iditarod Trail (Crow Pass Trail) travels 28 miles connecting Girdwood to Eagle River as it traverses the Chugach Mountains. Today E.R and South Anchorage higher elevations are connected by hiking, skiing and bicycle trails. These Chugach mountains provide alpine water to both Eagle River and Hillside to Girdwood.

In 1975 the City of Anchorage merged with the Greater Anchorage Area Borough creating the Municipality of Anchorage. Municipal Anchorage includes almost all of Chugach State Park, because of this less than 10% of the Muni is populated. Much of Chugach State Park was intentionally included in the Muni so there is a history of the Park being geologically and politically part of Anchorage.

In summary I support joining House Districts 9 and 22 into one Senate District as part of 2022 Redistricting plan.

Steve Strait
2500 Douglas Drive, Anchorage 99517
Date: April 8, 2022, 5:37 pm

First Name: Jenny

Last Name: Iwinski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 2022 proposed pairings option 3B

Public Comment: I am writing in support of district map 3B, pairing house districts 9 and 22.
Date: April 8, 2022, 5:58 pm

First Name: Michael

Last Name: Williams

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistrict

Public Comment: I support Map 3B
Date: April 9, 2022, 5:51 am

First Name: Shannon

Last Name: Keegan

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting of Girdwood

Public Comment: Please keep Girdwood in option 2 for redistricting purposes. This pairing has worked just fine. I strongly oppose being paired with Eagle River as proposed in option 3B. Girdwood is so small and so different than Eagle River. We will completely lose our voice. I vote in every election but if option 3B is chosen, my vote will never matter. Please go with option 2.
Date: April 9, 2022, 8:53 am

First Name: **Sheamus**

Last Name: **Lamb**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Map 3B**

Public Comment: I live in the new district 19 in east Anchorage. We are more closely related to district 21 or 18 for Senate representation. We share local schools such as East High School, Wendler and Clark Middle Schools. We also are in the same district for Anchorage Assembly. Combining our neighborhood with a Spenard district 14 would make it harder for our neighborhood concerns to be addressed.
Date: April 9, 2022, 9:54 am

First Name: Brittany

Last Name: Petry

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: ************

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Keep Downtown together, Hillside together, and Eagle River together. The pairings that are the most logical are 20/21 and 17/23 and 22/24

I oppose Option 3B (Reudrich / Marcum plan) and support Option 2.

It is not partisan to keep communities together. It is partisan gerrymandering to crack them apart because you don't like the way they vote. I am an independent voter who doesn't want to see partisan gerrymandering in any direction hamstring our community in favor of some people's apolitical agendas and ideologies. I want to see commonsense and fairness prevail here.

Thanks for your time
To Members of the Redistricting Board

My name is Courtney O'Byrne King and I am lifelong Alaska resident born in Fairbanks (College) and currently living in the Oceanview neighborhood in Anchorage. I have had the opportunity to reside in the following Alaska communities - College, Nome, Juneau, and Anchorage.

The redistricting plan process, to the extent the actual deliberative process has been available to the public for consideration, is so disturbing that it compels me to provide written comment for the first time in my life. In terms of the options currently before the Redistricting Board (the board), I vehemently oppose option 3B and support option 2.

As anyone who has lived in multiple communities throughout Alaska knows, the socioeconomic and cultural factors often differ wildly within the space of a few "road miles". The proposal (option 3B) to join an Eagle River district with South Anchorage, rationalized as being contiguous via hunting opportunities in the Ship Creek Valley and limited road service districts, is spurious and should not move forward.

In addition to the joining of an Eagle River district and South Anchorage in option 3B, the inclusion of downtown areas like Government Hill in an Eagle River District flies in the face of logic. Eagle River is not contiguous, nor does it experience any commonality with downtown neighborhoods such as Government Hill. Eagle River districts should stay with Eagle River districts!

The ill-informed and clearly partisan proposal to pair Eagle River with South Anchorage appears to fly in the face of the recent judicial order regarding the board's unconstitutional gerrymandering and basic common sense.

It seems a lot of energy has been expended toward diluting the votes of diverse districts (e.g., South Anchorage & Government Hill). That energy would be more appropriately expended toward proffering a plan (e.g., option 2) that addresses both the letter and the spirit of the established Alaska redistricting process and the recent judicial order. This is the right thing to do for all Alaskans, not just Alaskans belonging to a particular political party.

The residents of Eagle River and South Anchorage do not regularly work, shop, or play together. While Eagle River residents may travel to work or shop in downtown or midtown Anchorage, South Anchorage residents do not travel to shop or work in Eagle River. Additionally, with the recently publicized sentiment of Eagle River residents’ desires to separate from the Municipality of Anchorage, it is ludicrous to suggest those same residents represent highly diverse Anchorage communities. Eagle River districts should stay with Eagle River districts! (The NCAA rivalry between Duke and North Carolina comes to mind as an appropriate comparison.)

Please, let your actions demonstrate that the board is not a purely partisan entity and that it values the inherent differences among Alaskans and keep downtown together, Hillside together, and Eagle River together by supporting option 2.

Sincerely,

Courtney O'Byrne King 730 Bounty Drive Anchorage, AK 99515
Dear members of the Alaska Redistricting Board:

The purpose of this letter is to provide further information about the Eagle River community of interest to aid in the work of the Board on remand. We will use the term Eagle River to mean Proclamation District (“PD”) 22 and PD 24: Eagle River, Eagle River Valley and Chugiak, which together constitute the Eagle River community of interest. Currently, there are two plans before the board: Plan 2, which preserves the Eagle River and East Anchorage communities of interest, and Plan 3B, which splits the Eagle River community of interest and pairs PD 22 with PD 9. In light of the information discussed herein, it is our strong belief that the Eagle River community of interest, like the East Anchorage community of interest, can and should be preserved in a single, cohesive senate district in order to best comply with the narrow orders issued by both the Superior Court and Alaska Supreme Court. For these reasons, it is our belief that Plan 3B should be rejected.

As you will recall from the trial court proceedings, Dr. Hensel testified as an expert witness for East Anchorage Plaintiffs. Dr. Hensel has a B.A. from Cornell University, an MA from the University of Alaska Fairbanks in Anthropology, and a Ph.D. from the University of California Berkeley in Anthropology. Dr. Hensel has worked extensively on a variety of consulting projects throughout the state, including a previous redistricting case. Dr. Hensel worked on the constitutional challenge to the Alaska Official English Initiative. Dr. Hensel is a retired Associate Professor of Anthropology, University of Alaska Fairbanks.

Dr. Morrow has also consulted on community-based projects throughout Alaska and in a variety of legal cases. Dr. Morrow has a B.A. from Harvard University, and M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Cornell University. She is Professor of Anthropology and Dean of Liberal Arts, Emerita, from the University of Alaska Fairbanks.

About Communities of Interest

The degree to which a community has shared interests that are relevant to their political representation is key to the redistricting process. To determine the existence, geographic extent, and strength of a community of interest we need to consider qualitative and quantitative data as indicators of commonality.
Eagle River has all the characteristics of a clearly defined community of interest, not only in terms of its socioeconomic profile, with which the board is familiar, but in terms of its historical continuity and consistent representation as a distinct and separate entity. It is represented as such by both the members of the community and people outside of the community.

Sharing a community of interest is not just a matter of visibly similar demographic characteristics or voting patterns. More fundamentally, it is about shared needs for representation with respect to issues rooted in the experience of living in a specific location. In other words, members of a community of interest approach the political process with common experiences and needs. History, culture, geography and the accumulation of personal choices – all the opportunities and constraints that people live with – make places and their needs unique. This is why the notion of communities of interest is relevant to the political process.

Because a large data set informs the question of whether and to what degree a population constitutes a community of interest, it can be a judgment call as to where the boundaries of a community of interest lie. In the Eagle River case, however, there is no question: all the signposts point in the same direction.

**The Eagle River Community of Interest**

PD 22 (Eagle River Valley) and PD 24 (Eagle River/Chugiak) comprise a single community of interest.

Eagle River and Chugiak share a boundary that is largely along rugged geography, thus limiting points of access. To get from one to the other, however, the Glenn Highway provides an easy and direct route. With no competing routes or other main roads leading elsewhere, the highway links these two places more than the geography separates them. While the same highway also connects to Anchorage, the distance is approximately three times as far.

Where people have local infrastructure to allow them to pursue most of their routine activities, their primary sphere is generally close to where they live. The connections among people become denser and more continuous within such areas, reinforcing their orientation toward the local area. Residents of Eagle River may need to come to the Anchorage urban area to work or to obtain services unavailable near home, but they orient to their immediate community through schools, worship, recreation and shopping for sundries and groceries.

Though there is good road connection between urban Anchorage and Eagle River, residents of urban Anchorage, with its dense and diverse infrastructure, do not routinely travel there. Residents of urban Anchorage have the densely connected city as their sphere of activity, with access to resources within their own and surrounding sectors. The
one-way flow is significant: between well-connected populations, a reciprocal flow is to be expected.

In practice, Eagle River is treated as a separate community. When the Covid-19 epidemic led to travel restrictions between communities in the spring of 2020, the State of Alaska understood Eagle River to be a separate community within which most “critical personal needs” could be met, “common sense” dictating that discrete place names and local perceptions of “geographic separation” define a community. Covid-19 Health Mandate 11 was structured in the form of FAQs. Concerning travel during lockdown, the answer to “How is ‘community’ defined?” was this:

The prohibition on travel between communities is designed so that people must use the closest available services to fulfill critical personal needs. Common sense applies – normal usage of location names and understanding of geographic separation applies when asking about community boundaries. For instance, Eagle River, Palmer, Wasilla, and Anchorage are all separate communities. You may only travel to another community for critical personal needs if you cannot meet those needs in your community.

Even if one had to go to Anchorage for some essential purpose, the mandate instructed, e.g., filling the gas tank and getting food locally before leaving one’s community. For epidemiological purposes, Eagle River was considered a closed community. This was, in other words, a situation in which, excepting critical needs, residents of Eagle River and Muldoon had no access to each other’s areas.

As another example, although Eagle River schools are part of the Anchorage School District, the bus service has a different transportation provider, Reliant Transportation – Chugiak/Eagle River.

In a variety of contexts, Eagle River residents represent themselves as a highly distinct community that is focused on place-based issues within the area they consider theirs:

The public Facebook page “Chugiak - Eagle River Area News and Info” has 2,400 members. A sense of community, sharing of information and a reference to the U.S. Constitution are all expressed in the group’s dedication to: “All things Chugiak - Eagle River area. This local news and information Facebook group is ‘for’ the local community

---

and ‘by’ the local community including those with local information to share that may be of interest to those in the community."

The area has a newspaper, the Alaska Star. Its description as a “weekly community newspaper that has served Chugiak-Eagle River for more than 35 years” expresses longstanding identity as a distinct place. The newspaper’s Instagram site identifies the area served as “Chugiak, Eagle River, Peters Creek, Eklutna and Thunderbird Falls” recognizing the interconnections of subscribers/readers/residents in these named places. People orient to each other within this local area.

The Chugiak-Eagle River Professionals Group refers multiple times to the distinctiveness of the community and its common interests. The opening statement “About Us” is that “The Chugiak-Eagle River Community is unique!” The group’s goal is that “Individuals who live, work, raise families, and play in our community will have a forum to meet others of like-minded interests, educate themselves both professionally and personally, stay up-to-date with local events & opportunities for coordinated volunteer/service projects, become familiar with our community’s unique past and assist in making their own positive footprint in the future.”

Local festivals are also an expression of place-based identities. The 2021 Official Guide to the Bear Paw Festival frames the event in terms of “coming together as a community to celebrate our successes, acknowledge the work we still have to do, and to enjoy a week in July that makes the Chugiak-Eagle River area the best place to call home.” This characterization explicitly ties local needs for action with a sense of shared community in a shared place. Self-described as “the largest and longest running community event in Chugiak-Eagle River,” the festival features distinctively local events including “Slippery Salmon Olympics” and the “Chopped Salmon Throwdown.”

The Chugiak Eagle River Advisory Board, “constituted in order to review and make recommendations on actions regarding potential changes in land use issues that impact multiple Community Council areas in the Chugiak Eagle River area,” is another indication that the residents of the area share a set of distinctly place-based concerns.

---

3 https://www.facebook.com/groups/407722959839121.
4 https://www.alaskastar.com/.
5 https://www.instagram.com/starnewspaper.
8 https://www.facebook.com/BearPawFestival/.
The language of EaglExit also appeals to shared history and to the sense of an enduring and distinct community that shares common needs in place:\textsuperscript{10}

The Village of Eklutna was the beginning of local governance in our area. The homesteaders that came later also showed a strong desire for our own city separate from Anchorage. A Chugiak-Eagle River Borough existed for two years in the early 70s. Now our journey continues with a strong desire to form an independent local government built on the vision of its people. The new government and school district would be built from the bottom up, focusing on the very basic needs of our local residents.

That EaglExit’s goals echo multiple efforts over the decades, since the 1970s, to detach the area from Anchorage and form a separate governmental entity indicates an ongoing local dialogue around topics of autonomy and interdependence.\textsuperscript{11}

From these sources, it is evident that Eagle River residents take as a given their historical continuity as a separate community. A strong community of interest tends to be a self-reinforcing entity: people are drawn there because of its character and they stay there because that character suits them.

In the extensive testimony on redistricting, adjectives people used to describe their areas were consistent with those that appeared in the non-political contexts cited above. Notably, people who identified as living in Eagle River recurrently used descriptors that suggested self-containment or self-sufficiency, like “separate,” “stand alone,” “separate on its own,” “an independent community” and “unique.”

\textbf{Conclusions}

Eagle River forms an obvious and clearly defined community of interest. It is our opinion that dividing a community of interest creates both dilution and friction in the political process.

Division of the Eagle River community of interest would dilute its voting power by splitting it between two districts. This harms the community thus divided. Residents would lose the ability to have their collective interests efficiently and effectively represented.

An undivided community of interest gets a senator’s undivided attention. As an example, if a plurality of Eagle River community of interest residents wanted to form a separate borough, they would rely on concerted support from their state senator.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{10} https://eaglexit.com/about/.
\item \textsuperscript{11} https://www.adn.com/alaska-news/anchorage/2019/04/18/chugiak-eagle-river-residents-renew-effort-to-separate-from-anchorage/.
\end{itemize}
Divided, a community of interest must compete for the attention of two Senators, each responsible for a broader, less cohesive district’s concerns. Because Eagle River’s interests are so collectively defined, any population outside of that community of interest with which half of Eagle River might be paired would also find itself competing for attention. This creates more friction among voters.

It is not that constituents in a single community of interest have the same opinions; it is that they share concerns about what is important to the people of their community, even when they have different approaches to dealing with those concerns. In a pairing of differing communities of interest, there is tension in the priorities as well as the possible approaches for addressing them.

It would be harmful to intentionally create districts that have a distinct fault line, with Eagle River constituents continuing to orient towards the collective needs of the Eagle River community of interest. Pairing Eagle River with any other house district risks dividing other communities of interest.

Pairing options are not always this clear cut, but when they are, the path of action is obvious. To divide Eagle River and pair the pieces with even more distant and disparate house districts would be to entirely disregard community of interest requirements.

Sincerely,

Dr. Chase Hensel

Dr. Phyllis Morrow
Dear Commissioners,

Attached is a draft resolution authored by Assembly Leadership as testimony for inclusion in the record of your proceedings.

We are scheduled to deliberate and adopt this resolution supporting map #2 on Tuesday April 12, 2022 at our next regular meeting. A final version will be presented to the board shortly thereafter.

Upon adoption, it will be the formal policy of the Municipality of Anchorage.

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher Constant, Vice Chair

Anchorage Assembly
A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY SUPPORTING ANCHORAGE SENATE DISTRICTS REVISION OPTION #2 BEFORE THE ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD THAT PAIRS HOUSE DISTRICT 17 WITH 23, AND HOUSE DISTRICT 22 WITH 24.

WHEREAS, Alaska State Redistricting happens once a decade, concluding with the Alaska Redistricting Board (ARB) adopting a Final Proclamation of Redistricting (Proclamation) affecting communities for a decade; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of the Proclamation on November 10, 2021, triggered a Charter provision requiring the Anchorage Assembly to determine whether it was malapportioned and also triggered a Charter amendment passed by voters in 2020 directing the Assembly to add a 12th member. On November 23, 2021, with the passage of AR 2021-382 the Assembly declared itself malapportioned and began the reapportionment process; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly conducted extensive public outreach and recorded substantial public testimony between November 23, 2021 and March 23, 2022, concluding when Anchorage Ordinance AO 2022-37 (S-1), As Amended, was approved containing the new apportionment map; and

WHEREAS, in a legal challenge to the 2021 Redistricting Proclamation the Alaska Superior Court in Case No. 3AN-21-08869CI found that the Alaska Redistricting Board’s pairing of House Districts 21 and 22 into Senate District K is unconstitutional and that this pairing must be changed on remand to the ARB; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Supreme Court on March 25, 2022 affirmed the superior court’s determination that “the Board’s Senate K pairing of house districts constituted an unconstitutional political gerrymander violating equal protection under the Alaska Constitution” and the remand to the ARB to correct it; and

WHEREAS, on remand, the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted proposed revisions to the 2021 Proclamation Plan Anchorage Senate District K (https://www.akredistrict.org/2022-proposed-revisions/), and as of April 8, 2022, Options 2 and Option 3B remain for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, Proposed Option 3B joins south Eagle River with South Anchorage, Girdwood, Turnagain Arm including Portage, and even beyond the borders of the Municipality into Whittier in the Chugach Census Block; and

WHEREAS, during the recent Municipality of Anchorage Reapportionment process,
residents from Eagle River, South Anchorage and Girdwood spoke out overwhelmingly against proposals that would combine these communities with scores of comments opposing the combination; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board should not contemplate a pairing of House districts like presented in Option 3B, that combine geographically and demographically distinct areas and simply shifts the constitutional infirmity into other areas; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage Reapportionment Committee heard from five community councils and scores of individuals regarding their opposition to grouping Eagle River and South Anchorage on the basis that these are distinctly different regions with few shared communities of interest; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board’s Proposed Anchorage Senate Districts Option 2 combines House District 23 which is the Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson area with House District 17 covering the downtown area; and House District 22, the south Eagle River area, with House District 24, the north Eagle River area; and

WHEREAS, Option 2 more closely joins neighboring communities off common interest that interact through direct road access to shop, work, and play in their respective areas, in clear compliance with the Superior Court’s Constitutional directives to respect natural boundaries where possible in describing boundaries (e.g. drainages and mountain ranges), and the testimony from communities of interest, while maintaining contiguity and compactness in drawing such district lines;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Anchorage Municipal Assembly supports the Alaska Redistricting Board’s Proposed Anchorage Senate Districts Option 2 which pairs House Districts 17 and 23 to form one Senate district, and House Districts 22 and 24 to form another Senate district.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this _______ day of ______________, 2022.

Chair

ATTEST:

Municipal Clerk
Date: April 8, 2022, 7:26 pm

First Name: Thomas
Last Name: Iwinski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Proposed map 3B

Public Comment: I am writing in support of map 3B and combination of districts 9 and 22.
Hello, I'm submitting additional testimony since Option 1 was withdrawn. I urge the board to vote in favor of Option 2. As a resident of the south Muldoon area, I was pleased to see the court's decision striking down the pairing with Eagle River. Option 3 feels like the same attempt proposed by some to "increase" the influence of Eagle River. The most straightforward, simple, and common sense approach is to keep Eagle River unified in its own senate seat, along with keeping Downton, and the south Anchorage/Hillside area unified respectively. Pairing Eagle River with the sprawling Upper Hillside to Portage district will not serve either community well in terms of representation in addition to making the work of the future senator harder. Please move quickly to support Option 2 so we as can move on to the election and know who are candidates will be. It's already an extremely busy year for elections and changes to our system, don't make this harder for voters.
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:08 am

First Name: Stephen

Last Name: Romanelli

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: I support 3B
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:10 am

First Name: Brittany

Last Name: Tompkins

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): B3

Public Comment: I support purposed map B3
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:11 am

First Name: Scott

Last Name: Myers

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: I support 3B
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:11 am

First Name: Jamie

Last Name: Donley

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. It’s the only redistricting map that makes sense. The other redistricting maps look like they were put together by people with a political agenda. Thank you for your time.

Jamie Donley
As a 45 year resident and home owner in Girdwood, I remember when Mike Hawker’s House district included South Eagle River, South Anchorage and Girdwood. Even though Mike Hawker was an open minded, fair, interested in serving and good representative, Girdwood still and little in common with Eagle River.
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:19 am

First Name: Mike

Last Name: Keiffer

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I am from Eagle River and I support plan 3b.
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:28 am

First Name: Wayne

Last Name: DeVore

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99654

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I'm a business owner in Wasilla and I'm concerned about the political agenda going on with the Redistricting board. Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The other maps look fishy they were put together with a political agenda. Thank you for your time. Why are more people not calling out the redistricting board for being manipulating and using it as a political tool to further one party or the other.

Wayne DeVore

[Redacted]

[Redacted]
Girdwood doesn't have much in common with Eagle River except that both are outliers.

Girdwood has been MOA's fastest growing economic district for the last few yrs and it is accelerating. Our closest neighbors - South Anchorage - is a much better match. It's where our High School is, where our contractors come from and where we shop. South Anchorage is willing to share representation.

On the other hand Eagle River has voted down every single Girdwood bond proposition going back over 20 yrs....even though they didn't have to pay for it!! Whereas Girdwood usually supports all bond props because it realizes that infrastructure is necessary for a civil society.

Girdwood will have better representation if aligned with South Anchorage
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:32 am

First Name: Tammy

Last Name: Smith

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): SUPPORT 3B FOR OUR REDISTRICTING MAP

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of East Anchorage we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:38 am

First Name: Rodney
Last Name: George

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:45 am

First Name: Rachel

Last Name: Ries

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Supper for 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Anchorage we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 9, 2022, 11:49 am

First Name: Crystal

Last Name: Kennedy

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support of 3B and Opposed to Option 2

Public Comment: Option 2 is one of the most egregious attempts to minimize representation in the Chugiak Eagle River area ever devised. For at least the past 40 years, as the community of Chugiak Eagle River has grown, the area has been represented by two senators. For almost three of those decades the community was represented in these seats by people who lived in either Chugiak, Peters Creek or Eagle River specifically. With Option 2, all of the Chugiak Eagle River area becomes encased in one senate district and essentially the entire area (MOA's District 2) will have one senator.

The Chugiak Eagle River area was recently acknowledged by the Municipality of Anchorage's own reapportionment plan as a compact and cohesive community by which it maintained its individuality and identity as a whole community. This recognized community is now being threatened with a significant decrease in representation in the Alaska State Senate that it has never been threatened with before should Option 2 be adopted. For over 50 years the community has jointly shared some of its representation with either Anchorage or with the Mat-Su Borough thereby allowing two senators to represent the entire area. To allow the reduction of that representation by 50% is unprecedented and unconscionable.

Option 3B, though not ideal, at least maintains Chugiak Eagle River's historical and current levels of representation in the Senate. Please be very conscious of the damage that could be inflicted, a precedence that would be undone, and the history that would be ignored with Option 2. Instead, please support the fairness and continuation of the level of representation that this community has experienced and relied on and was apparently, at least up till now, entitled to by supporting Option 3B.

Thank you!

Crystal Kennedy
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:53 am

First Name: Kristen

Last Name: Bush

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:54 am

First Name: Bernice

Last Name: Rhornton

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 11:55 am

First Name: Peter

Last Name: Bush

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: April 9, 2022, 12:05 pm

First Name: **Christine**

Last Name: **Banfield**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99577**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Map 3B**

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:06 pm

First Name: Stephanie

Last Name: Taylor

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Anchorage, we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:09 pm

First Name: Gordon

Last Name: Banfield

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:10 pm

First Name: Makayla

Last Name: Banfield

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Hello,

I heard testimony yesterday from an in-person testifier that technology makes travel a non-issue with contiguity. I would contest that opinion strongly. These hearings have been fraught with technology issues, as is evidenced by the beginning of today's meeting. I also keep hearing that people say that 3B makes sense because everyone at JBER lives in Eagle River. Eagle River is a population of about 35,000 and JBER staffs about 32,000. Only 36% of Eagle River are classified as "Governmental" workers, so I would point out that that argument that many, or even most, of JBER staff live in Eagle River is false. The option 2 map is constitutional, and option 3b is not.

Thank you for your work on the board, and for serving honestly and with integrity, following our constitution.

Leon Jaimes
First Name: Karen

Last Name: Carson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I prefer map 3B

Public Comment:
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:29 pm

First Name: Melissa

Last Name: Hickey

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support 3b
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:35 pm

First Name: Lawrence

Last Name: Marshall

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Please support plan 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for the best representation for the Eagle River community on the redistricting map!
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:47 pm

First Name: Ryan

Last Name: Peterson

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99517

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting plans

Public Comment: I support option 2
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:52 pm

First Name: Eric

Last Name: Steinfort

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Girdwood Resident

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I Oppose option 3B and support option 2

Public Comment: Option 3B would put Eagle River in the same voting district as Girdwood among others. This is an obvious intent to dilute Girdwood voters into Eagle River's obvious difference in political affiliation. I support option 2 that will allow the proper democratic process to flow.
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:56 pm

First Name: Terrence

Last Name: Shanigan

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Support map 3B
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:04 pm

First Name: Donna

Last Name: Reisinger

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: No changes should be made and no districts should be redrawn. We don't have enough equitable representation as it is.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:04 pm

First Name: Meredyth

Last Name: Richards

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Eagle River we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:16 pm

First Name: Robin

Last Name: Platt

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map.
As a Girdwood resident and constituent of proposed Senate District K, I would like to express strong opposition to Proposed Pairing: Option 3B, combining House Districts 9 and 22, and support for Option 2, joining Districts 9 and 10.

Districts 9 and 22, supposedly "contiguous", share a border only in the rugged Chugach Mountain wilderness. They are not contiguous in any practical sense. In order to drive from Girdwood to Eagle River one must drive many miles and traverse seven legislative districts (10, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, and 23).
Date: April 9, 2022, 1:27 pm

First Name: Lou Ann

Last Name: Poage

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I support option 2 and I oppose option 3.
My name is Briana Sullivan. I am a lifelong Alaskan and currently a Girdwood resident, who also sits in an elected seat on our Girdwood Board of Supervisors. Maybe trivial, but I spent my formative years living in close proximity to District 22 and now call District 9 Home.

Thank you for all of your work and time, and for holding additional meetings online, phone, and in person, in order to listen to thoughtful Public Testimony, to allow more weigh in, from Alaskans who care about the present - and future of their communities, small and large, and ostensibly the process of governance in across our great State. There have been numerous valid points brought forward to the Board. The task for you right now is to fix a problem, identified by the Superior and Supreme Court; to correct the Senate redistricting to be constitutional and not gerrymandered.

I know a lot of Girdwood residents, of all ages. Most of my peers are starting families or caring for theirs - they are busy working and enjoying their days. I am too, but unlike most of them, I paid attention to the Reapportionment by the Anchorage Assembly, because of my involvement in community and the significance of the potential changes for the coming decade. For the same reasons cited in reference to local government and acknowledging compact areas of town found during this thorough process, the Senate Redistricting could also reasonably follow identified/voting, contiguous areas of the municipality.

Regarding the Senate Redistricting:

From the few written testimonials I read from various dates, and oral public testimonials I have heard over the last week, it seems apparent countless individuals have urged you to quickly make this next crucial decision, to not waste time, to not pair Eagle River with Girdwood, and to take the Alaska Supreme Court ruling into utmost consideration, when making these decisions. For example,
The Supreme Court ruled that Eagle River should not be split, as this would unfairly give them more representation. Solving this issue would be prudent. Pairing districts 24 and 23 does what the Court already cautioned against. I urge you to revert to the pairing of 22 and 24.

Where the court urged against breaking districts and therefore their representation, please advise.

In public process, with the ideals of living fairly, equitably, and to allow for change and growth, enabling communities to operate to their best capacity through proper functioning and addressing the needs of society, begins with our roots, our neighbors, and then our communities and representatives. These public offices are held by residents of the areas in which they live, who understand the nuances of their towns and cities and thus have a vested interest in serving their constituents. Citizens have the opportunity to support and vote for their representatives, so it makes sense that these individuals be within reach, to be in contact - and physically be in places of need, to support, to represent.

Contiguous districts make sense and as such, do not substantially disrupt, break up, or divide communities. I acknowledge the uniqueness of communities and neighborhoods within the expansive Municipality of Anchorage. Because they are all connected by roads and bridges and similarities, it’s possible to group them within the Constitutional definition. The commonalities they share, are the proximity, culture, and most often, the terrain.

People feel tied to their communities, and identify with them, whether it’s tangible or a line on a map.

The idea of connecting extremely distant districts, 9 and 22, where thick forest, rivers, drainages, and mountains stand firmly in between - causes confusion and seems far-fetched, when there is an alternative, practical option, in the way that the MOA is developed.

Moreover, having a representative of Girdwood, or Whittier, living in Eagle River, or a representative of Eagle River, living in Girdwood or along Turnagain Arm makes a very challenging and undesirable job for a representative. I’d like representatives to run for office that want to work for their constituents. Constituents need a voice and fair representation.

The communities of South Anchorage, Girdwood, (and farther South) and Eagle River exhibit distinctive and obvious differences already explained, and have a very long and unnecessary drive by car, with plenty of construction lately, connecting them. Also noted, 9 and 22 have 6-8 densely populated Senate Districts squished between. Based on public testimony, most comments from Eagle River do not want to be paired with South Anchorage and Girdwood and vice versa. We are humans with
habits and we are bound to roadways and plying the City of Anchorage for transportation, business, and commerce. Anchorage not only connects us, but the largest population in South Central Alaska, separates us. We are not wildlife that roam among or above the Chugach Mountains.

Regarding testimony on the size of the districts when looking at the horizontal map, some missing information is the topography. Hillside and South Anchorage have more in common with the Turnagain Arm and Girdwood Community than the majority of suburban Eagle River.

Last fall, Girdwood and the communities south of us - on the Kenai Peninsula - experienced a record Atmospheric River Event during our shoulder season, where our dominantly dirt roads and drainages and myriad culverts were overflowing and flooded, breaking records, making a massive mess, and making history. Our representatives had a challenging time speaking for us, in our state of emergency and disaster, as we were also cut off from the only access [road] to our Water Treatment Facility, our Transfer Station, and our Industrial Yard, where local operators store their heavy equipment. This heavy equipment was desperately needed to provide critical aid during and after this disaster. Girdwood is still repairing damage from the October 31st- November 2nd storm, and we haven't forgotten how close, and distant our representatives are physically, and virtually.

To the point of driving to speak with our Senators: For practical reasons, close to no one drives to their Senator unless they live in Juneau. The Senators mainly work and operate out of Juneau, the city without roads to the rest of the great state of Alaska. Our Senators have been working hard and are very available to us, all via the telephone and internet during this digital age. Most Alaskans can call and email our US Senators when reaching out. Technology today saves time, energy, and connects us.

I urge Board Member Simpson to strongly consider the Constitution as read, to listen to the outpouring of public and Representative support for Option 2, and to the countless people who are providing public testimony on this important issue. Furthermore, I encourage all Board Members to oppose Option 3B, which is unconstitutional, and support Option 2. Keep East Anchorage Districts together as they request, and Eagle River Districts together, as they request. Honor ethical and honest representation. The latter would obviously maintain most satisfaction and better functioning, already established of a healthy society. Do not further confuse anyone with more maps and please do not delay this process.

Thank you so much for your efforts and time in this matter.
I am writing about the redistricting decisions. I am appalled that once again, Eagle River has one plan to split it.

It seems that this is political to increase representation for Eagle River at the expense of other areas.

Eagle River is a unit. Muldoon is a unit. The Hillside is a unit. Please keep Downtown together, Hillside together, and Eagle River together. Do not separate these units.

JBEAR is no more similar to Eagle River than to downtown. Many at JBEAR are not Alaskan residents; they retain their home residency and vote there. Other JBEAR military live throughout our communities and these, if they become Alaskan residents, are represented by their home district elected officials. Putting JBEAR with an Eagle River district makes as much sense and with downtown.

Penny Goodstein
Public Comment: Good afternoon,

I’m writing in support of option 2, and against option 3b. As a long time resident of Girdwood, option 2 pairs me with South Anchorage/Hillside, people who have similar experiences and concerns, allowing those issues to be represented fairly. Option 3b pairs me in Girdwood with people who have very different concerns, who are demographically very different than I and live a very different experience. For one example, Eagle River has well developed infrastructure whereas Girdwood has underdeveloped critical infrastructure. Because Eagle River so outnumbers Girdwood, option 3b leaves me unrepresented.

Considering other neighborhoods, option 2 also gives representation to East Anchorage and maintains representation of Eagle River.

Option 3b violates the Alaska Supreme Court ruling, that Eagle River should not be split, as this represented partisan gerrymandering. This map would give no representation of my concerns at all and this may damage my town of Girdwood.

Sincerely,

Marguerite Leeds,

Girdwood resident
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:01 pm

First Name: Jennifer

Last Name: Van der Slice

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting Option 2

Public Comment: I support the redistricting Option 2 map. The other 3b map is an attempt to gerrymander districts for political gain and would disenfranchise voters and is absolutely dispicable. Please support the Option 2 pairing of districts.
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:10 pm

First Name: James

Last Name: Wojciehowski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting map 3-B

Public Comment: I support map 3-B. Eagle River deserves equal representation
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:12 pm

First Name: Joyce

Last Name: Wojciehowski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting map 3B

Public Comment: I support map 3-B
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:14 pm

First Name: Kimberly

Last Name: Hunt

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Hi- I commented before, and I was a little anxious. I support staying closest to the court’s decisions as far as not combining districts and as far as keeping east Anchorage, Eagle River, and Hillside areas as their own communities. Combining the south Anchorage Hillside area and Eagle River as districts does not conform with the districting principles of geographical integrity. I also called on April 8th to clarify that I have had connections to Alaska since the pre-pipeline days; a member of the commission asked me what it was about the communities in pre-pipeline days I wanted to preserve. I'd like to maintain districts as close to the ones stipulated by the court; the ones without combining districts 9 and 22 in order to keep intact the “these are my neighbors” and “we have dinner with eachother’s families” sense of community, along with the sense of "we're in this together," down-to-earth people who built and staffed award-winning libraries, designed cities with wonderful amounts of green space and public spaces, developed a highly politically active citizenry, and fostered a community that served its’ citizens rather than one where neighborhoods are chopped up and neighbors can't work together for the needs of their particular areas. I'd like for the Anchorage area to be a community where neighbors take walks and have each other over for dinner, where libraries are not only award-winning, but they serve the community in meaningful, culturally respectful, and rele vant ways, and where we can focus on issues and human comfort instead of privatizing the care of people without their own homes. When people lose their voices because their neighborhoods are split up and they don't have someone who truly represents them, it's possible to put profits before people. My impression of Alaska was that we’re just not like that up here so I support not combining districts and following the court ruling as closely as possible. I challenge you to look your fellow citizens in the eye and say hello and please and thank you. According to Chade Meng Tan, that's where world peace starts. Thank you for reading.
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:16 pm

First Name: Cindy

Last Name: Spanyers

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99821

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate Pairings

Public Comment: The most judicious way to accomplish the senate pairings and abide by the court decision is to keep downtown Anchorage together and keep Eagle River together. Option Two appears the best way to accomplish that. I oppose Option Three. Thank you.
Date: April 9, 2022, 2:44 pm

First Name: Louis

Last Name: Imbriani

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3-B

Public Comment: I urge the adoption of Map 3-B. As an Eagle River resident I want to be fairly represented in Juneau. This map does that. Combining parts of Anchorage with Eagle River will cause some residents voices to be silenced. They life styles and needs of those living in East Anchorage are different than those of Eagle River residents. Please adopt map 3-b.
Date: April 9, 2022, 3:46 pm

First Name: Karrsen

Last Name: Brannon-Young

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99503

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 3B

Public Comment: Please support 3B for our redistricting map. The plan should be balanced and fair and accurately represent the people of Anchorage and Eagle River. This process needs to be fair to all not just a small group of individuals. As a resident of Anchorage we as a community deserve to be heard and request you support 3B for our redistricting map.

Thank you!
Date: April 9, 2022, 3:52 pm

First Name: Jan Carolyn

Last Name: Hardy

Group Affiliation, if applicable: self

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99502

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: The 2021 Board Proclamation for Anchorage was ratified on November 10, 2021. There has been a public hearing publicly presented with public input and testimony. This Board has the opportunity to be the first Redistricting Board in over 20 years to have a map that is viable for a full 10 years.

The Board did a good job with the overall house map and senate pairings in Southeast, Rural, Interior, and MatSu. Further delays would result in some candidates running three elections in a row. We have seen the chaos that creates both for the candidates and the voters. Some voters did not exercise the franchise because they did not know in which district they resided. This is unfair to the candidates and the voter.

We have a new system of voting: Rank Choice Voting. To complicate the matter further we will have special election to replace him. This is unprecedented. The voter needs time to reorient themselves to their new senate and house district. If questions surrounding our new Anchorage Municipality have not been resolved immediately the result could be voter disenfranchisement and failure of the system to protect one voter, one vote.

The Alaska Supreme Court has upheld the unconstitutional political gerrymander of Senate Seat K (Eagle River/East Anchorage) and remanded the pairing back to the Alaska Redistricting Board. Please act swiftly to adopt a map with final senate pairings. There is no time to waste.
Date: April 9, 2022, 3:58 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Bortnick

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): option 2

Public Comment: Please support option 2, the best option for Anchorage

I strongly oppose option 3
Date: April 9, 2022, 4:05 pm

First Name: Margaret

Last Name: Nelson

Group Affiliation, if applicable: 

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3b
I would like to respond to various comments and characterizations that I’ve heard over the past week.

First I want to discuss this idea that I’ve heard that map two is partisan. I introduced this map, which was arrived at by the East Anchorage plaintiffs with the benefit of legal council who advised us that the approach of pairing Muldoon, pairing Eagle River, and then pairing the districts that were left unpaired was the method that would most closely follow the remand order from the court, which had ruled that the splitting of Eagle River in order to increase their representation, at the expense of muffling the voices of East Anchorage residents, was a partisan gerrymander violating equal protection.

No partisan data nor incumbent information was accessed, nor do I care to access it. Other than my own representatives in 21, I have no idea where any incumbent lives, nor what districts they represent for the vast majority of them. It is, however, a known fact that both independent makers of map 3B, Ms Marcum and Mr. Ruedrich, have looked at political and incumbent information during the mapping process.

By contrast, the pairings for map 2 were based solely on logic, reason, pairing like communities and the constitutional as well as remand requirements. In fact, I bucked the trend of a majority of testimony which favored map 1 to introduce map 2, which the ADN has quoted Cathy Geissel - who appointed John Binkley to the redistricting board by the way - as stating was "a very elegant solution", and one that she prefers.

I believe that the majority of support & testimony backs up the non-partisan and inherently fair nature of this map which has indeed has broad bipartisan support. I've heard well reasoned and passionate testimony detailing in clear terms why map 3B is irrational from HALO, Girdwood board of supervisors, RCCC, Sean Murphy of EagleExit, Lloyd Thurman, Randy Phillips and many others, all of whom are obviously not partisan left-wing organizations or individuals.

In contrast, the majority of the testimony favoring map 3 is based on partisan considerations - number of Republican senate seats, specific incumbents, do it because you can, or one liners based on no reasoning at all.

Despite the quick time frame of this part of this process, we have the benefit of mounds of testimony against this same pairing in the municipal process. And yet, Mr. Binkley has indicated that all this testimony (from the municipal process) should be discounted because the numbers and the considerations are different and I ask, what numbers, what considerations, are different other than the clearly partisan ones? The false contiguity, distance, broken communities and lack of commonality are all the same.
The one thing that is different is that lowest deviations were sacrificed in order to use meaningful contiguity in the municipal districts - which resulted in a municipal map with deviations of 5% and where Eagle River was underpopulated by several thousand people.

While it was originally believed by the mapmakers that South Anchorage and Eagle River had socio economic connections, South Anchorage and Eagle River residents were quick to correct this impression and the municipality listened. I also want to point out that this same compromise of deviations will not be required here. In municipal maps, population was being added to Eagle River to equalize population. In this process, Eagle River is being split despite having enough population for one senate seat.

I believe strongly in an inherently honest, ethical and fair process that hues closely to the constitution and I believe that most people want effective, local representation that reflects their unique communities regardless of their political affiliation, and map 2 reflects that. If this board instead chooses a map that does not provide these things, and that must use second rate or false contiguity for pairings, then the burden of proof falls on them to show why a more rational and constitutional map is not possible.

Now let's have a quick review of the justifications I've heard for the unconstitutional map 3B. Some are, quite frankly, beyond ridiculous. I heard yesterday that District 23 was actually not Eagle River. Well, pulling up the map I can clearly see that yes, district 23 does indeed include the northern part of Eagle River, including parts of its business district. Come on now, let's be honest please. Eagle River is literally cleaved in half and the only justification for that is an attempt at a false narrative? This is ridiculous.

I've heard that SA and ER share the longest border. I would like to ask the board to now consider how long the populated area along that border is as compared to unpopulated area - which Bud Simpson referred to as basically a fiction in reference to another part of the map. That number is not one single inch of populated area, and Bud's sentiment holds true here as well.

Even if it is possible to pair 9 and 22 just because they touch, it is wholly irrational to pair them when there is a pairing available that has meaningful contiguity.

Some people have said in reference to JBER and Eagle River that like communities should be paired together, while obtusely ignoring that the like communities of Downtown, Eagle River and South Anchorage have to be split apart to accommodate this false vision of JBER. Let's not forget that JBER is integrated heavily into all of the municipality, including government hill and downtown. In fact, there is a Government Hill gate that is used by the majority of service members that utilize the Elmendorf half of the joint base.
Let's also not forget that Service members who live off base are already represented in their community of residence, while those living on base are most strongly connected to the communities within Anchorage proper outside their respective gates, not far away North Eagle River.

This supposed justification falls flat in the face of reality.

Some say it's been done historically. That doesn't make it the right choice for today and in fact one of the legislators that represented one of these past districts has testified about the irrationality of pairing 9 and 22.

The rest of the justifications for map 3B I have heard are mostly based on partisan considerations, which I briefly mentioned earlier, but will not spent any time refuteing due to the simple fact that partisan considerations are not permitted in our Alaska State Constitution.

I just want to close with this. I feel relief that through the legal remedy, East Anchorage residents have received their voice back, however I feel deep regret that in repairing one wrong, some members of this board seem tempted to simply shift the burden of harm and silence to another community. I implore this board to stop wasting time and money fighting for maps that you know to be unconstitutional and to choose to do the right thing instead.
Date: April 9, 2022, 5:04 pm

First Name: Sarah

Last Name: Paulus

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:  

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Senate Districts â€“ Option 3B

Public Comment: First thank you for taking the time to allow for public comment on this issue. Think combining Eagle River with Girdwood for Senate Districts poorly represents to these two very distinct communities. Girdwood and Eagle River have very different needs. Girdwood is a mountain/coastal ski resort town with an active hippy forest vibe. Eagle River and the community up Eagle River road, are hard working people most work in Anchorage, and commute in. Eagle River is known for conservative values, bedroom communities and Girdwood is known for liberal values and outdoor recreation year round. Politically, Economically, Geographically and Socially these two communities are vastly different and combining them on the Senate level does a disservice to both unique township. I am against this proposed option, and would prefer to see other combinations which do not combined these vastly different communities.
Alaska Redistricting Board:

Thank you for allowing me to testify on Friday morning, April 8th, at 10 am. I promised to send my testimony along with my references (please see below). I would like to make two points first:

After my prepared remarks, Ms. Marcum questioned me for several minutes. During our exchange, I asked her: "What is the harm of pairing Eagle River with Eagle River?" (House District 22 with 24). She replied, "There is only one Eagle River." Presumably House District 22. However, after reviewing the maps, I see that actually House District 24 includes the Eagle River Carrs, the Eagle River Fred Meyers, the Eagle River Business Blvd, and an entire residential area of Eagle River between Old Glenn and New Glenn highways between the main ER exit and North ER exit. So I believe there are indeed two Eagle River house districts, not one.

Ms. Marcum stated in our exchange that she feared JBER would be "orphaned" with Downtown (in a 23-17 pairing), and "There certainly can be no greater differences than Downtown and JBER," according to Ms. Marcum. She went on to discuss the similarity in values between JBER and Eagle River (I believe the similarities are exaggerated, seeing as JBER is much more racially diverse and lower income than Eagle River). But my question is: what about Girdwood being "orphaned" with Eagle River (in a 22-9 pairing)? Girdwood and Eagle River are completely different vibes -- more different in my opinion than JBER and Downtown. Where is the concern about Girdwood being ignored?

Having said all that, I know you must abide by what the constitution says. And as far as that goes, it has been demonstrated over and over again that travelling between house districts 9 and 22 is long and inconvenient. I agree with Bud Simpson who called contiguity across uninhabited land "basically a fiction." 9 and 22 are not practicably contiguous, and thus should not be a valid senate pairing.

Please support Map Option 2: Pair 24 with 22; 23 with 17; and 9 with 10.

Thank you for your service to Alaska.

Respectfully,
Andrew T. Gray
resident, House District 19

REDISTRICTING TESTIMONY 04/08/2022
My name is Andrew Gray, and I speak for myself only; I do not represent my employers in any way. I live in new house district 19 in Anchorage. My family moved into our home there in 2019 just two weeks before I deployed with the Alaska Army National Guard for 10 months, so I have a relationship with the military and with JBER and that’s the bulk of what I will be testifying about. While on that deployment, I was having lunch with some enlisted soldiers in the dining facility, and I asked one where he had grown up. He said the trailer park across from the Northway Mall here in Anchorage. I remarked that I had never met anyone who had grown up in a trailer park, and after a pause all 4 enlisted soldiers I was seated with explained that they too had spent at least part of their childhoods in trailer parks.

I tell this story to illustrate a fact about the US military. Many young people who sign up to serve in the military do so to escape the poverty of their childhoods. You see, I as someone unfamiliar with trailer park living, was the anomaly; those with firsthand knowledge of it were the majority. “Three hots and a cot” is a popular saying describing the promise of food and shelter which for many 18-year-olds would not be a given without the military’s help. A 2018 demographic analysis by the Council on Foreign Relations showed that over 60 percent of enlistments came from neighborhoods with a median household income between $38,345 and $80,912. 19% of recruits came from households with an income of less than $38,000 a year.[i] The average annual household income in Eagle River is $126,943, while the median household income sits at $111,388 per year.[ii] This means more than 80% of military recruits come from households unlike those in Eagle River. And if lower enlisted choose to live off base, they inevitably end up in lower-cost housing in Mountain View, north Muldoon, or even in my neighborhood in midtown.

And yet members of this board are insisting on pairing Eagle River with JBER.

What military members can afford to live in Eagle River? Higher ranking officers. The Congressional Research Service reports that 63% of enlisted service members are white; 37% non-white;[iii] JBER is actually even more diverse with 60.7% of the voting age population identifying as white; and just under 40% identifying as non-white. However, 88% of senior military officers are white, and it is these higher ranking officers who can afford to live in Eagle River. I should point out that the voting age population in Chugiak Eagle River is over 75% white.[iv] In recent litigation that made its way to the Alaska Supreme Court this Redistricting Board was found guilty of an unconstitutional gerrymander for creating a Senate district pairing an Eagle River House District with an East Anchorage house district. You may remember that case from a few weeks ago. I would argue that a Senate District pairing Eagle River with JBER is just as egregiously unconstitutional if not more so. The poor minority voices of JBER will be overridden by the rich white residents of Eagle River.

And that is what the goal is here: to increase the Senate representation of Eagle River. As Board Member Bethany Marcum so eloquently stated on the record, on November 5, 2021: “This actually gives Eagle River the opportunity to have more representation.”
Why? Why would anyone want Eagle River of all places to have “more representation?” Well, the Chugiak Eagle River area has been a conservative stronghold since prior to Alaska Statehood. In fact, the area is so conservative that they actually opposed statehood in the 1950s. So if there were a way to increase their representation, one could enshrine a conservative advantage in the makeup of the Alaska Senate for the next ten years.

Yesterday Chairman Binkley explained to a testifier that she couldn’t compare Anchorage reapportionment of Assembly Districts with Alaska Redistricting, that these were two completely different processes. Although the processes may be different, the conservative objective is the same: increase Eagle River’s representation. During Anchorage reapportionment, Eagle River was guaranteed from the start two assembly members. So in that case in order to increase representation, the tactic was to minimize the population represented by those two Eagle River Assembly members. This was achieved by fierce testimony against pairing Eagle River with any other part of Anchorage. The option most strongly considered was a pairing of Chugiak-Eagle River with Hillside in South Anchorage. I would like to quote some of that testimony from a Town Hall held on January 27, 2022. Eagle River Assembly Member and current unopposed candidate for state house Jamie Allard said: “It was brought up the fact that if we are connected to Hillside or we are connected to Girdwood, you would literally have to ride a Dall sheep in order to get to those areas, unless we drove approximately from our location almost an hour . . . to get to hillside and an hour and a half to get down to Girdwood. I would also point out that when folks are saying that we have things in common over there, look at who their elected officials are: Suzanne LaFrance and John Weddleton, wonderful people, but you have to still ask what do we have in common with those areas? we don’t.”

Although I personally disagree with Ms. Allard’s assessment that the only means of direct transport between these two districts is the riding of Dall sheep, I want to thank her for explicitly stating that this is a political process. And although the method is different here in redistricting, the goal is not.

By avoiding pairing the two Eagle River house districts with each other -- which by any metric is how you would create the most compact, contiguous, socio-economically integrated Senate district -- the Redistricting Board is seeking to expand Eagle River’s influence on the Alaska Senate. We know from numerous studies that voter participation increases with family income. In the 2016 presidential election, 48% of voters in the lowest income category voted, while almost double that, a whopping 86% of voters in the highest income category cast a ballot.[v] This trend holds true for Eagle River. Eagle River consistently participates in elections at a significantly higher rate than their lower income neighbors. So, if Eagle River gets two senators, you can bet it will be Eagle River electing those senators, not the JBER house district nor the South Anchorage House District. We will get Two Lora Reinbolds; not two Bill Wielechowskis.
Please allow me to again quote Bethany Marcum: “This actually gives Eagle River the opportunity to have more representation.” She is absolutely right, and that’s why this plan is absolutely wrong. Giving Eagle River extra representation is unconstitutional and should not be allowed.

So why is this board continuing with this ill-intentioned plan? Because there are no adverse consequences to the board adopting another unconstitutional gerrymander. There is only upside: There’s a chance that no lawsuit will be brought forth and therefore the gerrymander will stand for the next ten years. Alternatively, litigation could be pursued, but it will take time. Even on an expedited schedule, it would take several months after an appeal to the Alaska Supreme court before you are sent back here to rework the senate pairings, and by then the November election would be approaching and it might be too close to print new ballots.

No one on this board will be held personally liable for unconstitutional pairings, so what have you got to lose? Nothing. What have you got to gain? Continued Republican control of the Alaska Senate.

With that knowledge I know I make my plea in vain, but nevertheless, I ask all five of you to please oppose the senate pairings in map 3B; please support the senate pairings in map Option 2, which keeps like parts together: Eagle River with Eagle River; South Anchorage with South Anchorage; and JBER with Downtown.

Thank you for allowing me to testify, and thank you for your service to the state of Alaska.


[ii] https://www.point2homes.com/US/Neighborhood/AK/Eagle-River-Demographics.html


[iv] https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/AK/RHI125220

[v] https://econofact.org/voting-and-income
Date: April 9, 2022, 7:41 pm

First Name: William

Last Name: Devine

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map Option 3

Public Comment: I am writing to give my support to Map Option 2.

Map option 3 pairs communities that do not share enough in common, and would dilute the voter base to give greater representation to one political party.

Splitting Eagle River and pairing it with Girdwood/South Anchorage and Downtown Anchorage as well as pairing Taku/Campbell with South Anchorage does not make sense in a geographic or socioeconomic basis.

Map Option 2 pairs communities with similar demographics and socioeconomic status that are in geographic proximity to each other, providing fairer representation.
Date: April 9, 2022, 7:44 pm

First Name: Alex

Last Name: Lindeman

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99743

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: I support option 2. I think option 3 opens itself to blatant charges of partisan gerrymandering, which will cost the state time and money to deal with in court. just use the best and least objectionable one
Date: April 9, 2022, 7:52 pm

First Name: Ellen

Last Name: Devine

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3

Public Comment: I am wiring to give my support to Map 2.

Map 2 pairs communities that are aligned across geographic, political, and economic lines.

Map 3 pairs communities that do not share enough in common and could lead to residents being disenfranchised as their votes could be diluted from other districts in their pairings.

Map 2 is a fair map and is best for Alaska.
Date: April 9, 2022, 8:02 pm

First Name: Susan
Last Name: Scherwin

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): The pairing of Districts 9 and 10 with Eagle River

Public Comment: I strongly oppose pairing Girdwood’s current voting district with that of Eagle River. Instead, I support contiguous districts 9 and 10 remaining together as originally proposed, without the addition and inclusion of a geographical entity with which we have no connection except a hiking trail though Crow Pass. I myself know no one personally in Eagle River, nor have I been there for at least 40 years, yet I consider South Anchorage an extension of my personal and business life: previously for employment, and currently for goods, services, healthcare, entertainment, and social interactions. I can see no reason to combine our small community with that of a large population district 2 hours away by car, except for obvious political gerrymandering that would render Girdwood opinions and voting irrelevant! Please reinstate and maintain Option 2. Thank you.
Date: April 9, 2022, 8:38 pm

First Name: Elizabeth

Last Name: Beavers

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99755

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting- select Option 2

Public Comment: Anchorage district groupings in option 2 make geographic sense and should move forward. Discard option 3B which tries to split up Anchorage neighborhoods and group them with far flung areas. Option 3B looks like gerrymandering
Attached is a written version of my spoken testimony today, with a small post-script.

Thank you,

Denny Wells
To the State of Alaska redistricting board:

My name is Denny Wells. I’m a lifelong Alaskan. Born in Anchorage, raised in Fairbanks, back living in Anchorage for more than 20 years. I live in Sand Lake, but have also lived in Spenard, Muldoon, and Downtown. I have rental properties in Muldoon and Sand Lake and I am a real estate photographer regularly shooting houses throughout the Municipality of Anchorage.

As the board approaches the end of this initial round of Senate pairing testimony, I would like to focus in on what the court directed, and the realities of the shared boundaries in the house districts.

In creating the house districts, you were constrained by the number 18,335. That was your target number of residents per district. In the urban core of Anchorage, that number was small enough that it necessitated many neighborhood-splitting districts. You did your best to make those neighborhood divisions rational and equitable.

Now, with the Senate pairings, you have the opportunity to pair some of those communities that you divided in the house districts.

In decades past, this chore has also been a challenge because the population of Municipality of Anchorage did not divide neatly into an even number of house seats. This year, you are lucky. With the small addition of Whittier, the Municipality of Anchorage divides neatly into 16 house seats. Further, the Chugiak/Eagle River area fit neatly into 2 house seats. This gives you the maximum possible opportunity to bring communities back together with your senate pairings. Future boards may not be so lucky and may again need to pair Chugiak or South Anchorage with some community outside the municipality, or Eagle River may grow so large they need 3 house seats and will necessarily be divided again in the Senate. But today you are lucky. With the 2020 census data, you have no need to divide Eagle River or South Anchorage nor the need to pair one of them with another community.

The superior court said “Senate District K pairs two districts that, while contiguous in the strict definition of the word, ignore communities of interest in Eagle River and Muldoon.” The court further stated “The Court sees the Senate Districts ignore the Muldoon and Eagle River communities of interest with very little justification.” The court specifically reviewed your arguments, laid them out in their findings – the arguments you are still making today, that there is a JBER connection to Eagle River and that the mountains make contiguity – and still found they were “very little justification” for splitting both Eagle River and Muldoon.

So, what can you do? What communities are split by your House Districts that you could put together in your Senate pairings?

Both of the plans on the table put Muldoon together again, so let’s start with Downtown Anchorage. You split Downtown Anchorage along 4th Avenue. This is the traditional startline of the Iditarod and Fur Rondy. This is the home of my favorite camera shop. For several years I
lived right on the boundary of this district at 315 Barrow St. I definitely lived downtown.

This is 4th avenue, splitting House Districts 23 on the left from 17 on the right. The ends of the chain holding the Iditarod sign in the air should be in the same Senate district.

District 23 is comprised of 10,832 residents of JBER and 7191 residents of Anchorage. 2,389 of those Anchorage residents are in Muldoon, and the remainder in Downtown and Government Hill. If anyplace in Anchorage constitutes a community of interest, it is downtown – the heart of the city. You should pair Downtown with Downtown.

Next, let’s consider Eagle River. You split Eagle River along the Glenn Highway, Old Glenn Highway, and Eagle River Road, but you also split along a residential street in the Eagle River Valley – War Admiral Road. I’ve shot the listing photos of houses on this road. It is a small neighborhood road where people definitely know their neighbors.
In this image, the houses on the left are in House District 24 and the houses on the right are in House District 22. The neighbors in this picture should be in the same Senate district.

In conversation with a community member at public testimony yesterday, Board Member Marcum stated “There’s only one Eagle River House seat, the other seat is Chugiak, Peters Creek, and JBER.” This is factually inaccurate. District 24 has 7,586 residents of the Eagle River and Eagle River Valley community councils, including the residents on the left side of this image. That’s 33% of the total population of the Eagle River community councils. The Eagle River Carrs, Eagle River Fred Meyer, and the Eagle River Business Blvd are all in District 24. That is most definitely a second Eagle River seat.

The claim that District 24 is a district of JBER is true only in the most obscure academic sense. District 24 includes a small portion of JBER. But this portion of JBER has exactly 0 population, except in precisely one census block. That block appears to be noise from the census bureau’s anonymization efforts. (For a discussion of the noise in the Census block level data, this is a pretty good article, and it links to the more academic discussion from the Census laying out the impacts of the data noise. https://fullstackeconomics.com/why-the-2020-census-has-9-fake-people-in-a-single-house/) That block has a stated population of 197 people, but no visible infrastructure in which those people might live. Further anomalies in the data for that block include that the population is 100% adult and 39% white (versus 74% Adult and 59% white for the rest of JBER). In my map drawing for Anchorage Assembly seats, I spotted several other anomalous census blocks like this in the Anchorage Bowl. The most obvious was a block that covered the Minnesota Dr/Hickel Pkwy between International Airport and Raspberry roads. It is not a census block that encompasses surrounding land, just the road itself. Yet it has a population of 19.
This image is a satellite view of Block 1013, Census Track 9802. When reviewing in the Census' own mapping tool at https://data.census.gov/cedsci/map?q=&y=2020&d=DEC%20Redistricting%20Data%20%28PL%2094-171%29&tid=DECENNIALPL2020.H1&mode=thematic&loc=61.3071,-149.7448,z12.2129&vintage=2020&cid=H1_001N you get the population of 197 when selecting the various race data sets, but when selecting the Occupancy data set, the value is 0, suggesting no residences, further reinforcing the fact that this block represents a data anomaly.
While State statute (Article 2, Section 15.10.200 (b)) precludes you from ADJUSTING the census numbers in your work, it does not preclude you from putting the census numbers in context. The context, in this case, is that District 24 is only a “JBER” district in as much as it has a single census block with a population of 197 which appears to be anomalous. In all likelihood, there will be no one living on JBER who will be able to provide the state an address that places them in District 24.

I have heard the District 23-24 pairing justified because Eagle River and Chugiak have a strong military connection. Anecdotally, I agree. I shoot a lot of homes of military officers in Eagle River. Also anecdotally, I shoot a lot of homes of military families in Anchorage. On Thursday, while you were hearing public testimony here, I shot military homes in both House District 22 and House District 18. I currently have military tenants in my duplex in District 21. I’ve had military tenants in my 3-plex in District 15 in recent years. Those people are all represented where they live.

I have heard the concern that demographically and socially JBER is more similar to Chugiak/Eagle River than Downtown. There are two problems with this argument. First, it ignores the 7200 residents of District 23 who live in Downtown and Muldoon. Those residents unequivocally have more in common with Downtown than Eagle River and Chugiak. They live in houses that are smaller, older, on smaller lots, on city water and sewer, on city maintained roads, versus the larger lots and newer houses and high frequency of wells and septic and local road maintenance in Eagle River and Chugiak. The parts of Downtown and Muldoon inside District 23 are only 40% white (43% if you restrict to Voting Aged Population). District 17 is 51% white (55% VAP). District 24 is 73% white (76% VAP). The Downtown and Muldoon parts of District 23 are absolutely more similar to the population of District 17 than District 24. The JBER part of District 23 is 59% white (60% VAP) – again, 59% is closer to District 17’s 51% than District 24’s 73%. As a whole, District 23 is 52% white. Taking a substantial minority population like that and burying it in a 73% white district when there are other good options available is a classic sign of a racial gerrymander.

The concern that JBER is more similar to Chugiak/Eagle River when it is demographically more similar to Downtown seems a weak justification for splitting two established communities like Downtown and Eagle River.

I have heard the District 22-9 pairing justified because both districts have rural road service, wells and septic, and they share a long contiguous border through the mountains. These exact same justifications also support pairing the Eagle River Districts 22 and 24. Districts 22 and 24 also both have many homes with wells and septic and they share a long contiguous border through the mountains. But the District 22 and 24 connection is even stronger because they not only share rural road service.... they share the EXACT SAME ROAD SERVICE AREA.

I have also heard the argument that the pairings in 3B are justified due to the Ship Creek hunting area. This is a really tenuous claim for 3 reasons. (1) People from all over the state can
apply for that hunt. (2) This hunt area is entirely contained in District 22. And (3) if you are relying on the constitutional verbiage about drainages to justify Senate pairings, the Ship Creek drainage would support pairing Districts 22 and 23 rather than 23 and 24. In fact, if you are using Drainages for justification, Districts 22 and 24 certainly belong together due to their sharing of the Eagle River drainage.

In the end you have house districts that divide communities by necessity and Senate districts that can pair those communities. Imagine if we were discussing pairings in my old home town of Fairbanks. Imagine you drew house districts which divide downtown Fairbanks along the route of the classic Open North American start line on 2nd Avenue. You would want to pair those two house districts in one Senate district if you could.

Or imagine we were discussing pairings in Nome and you had house seats that divided it down Front Street under the Iditarod Burled Arch. You would pair those house districts in one Senate District if you could.

Or imagine we were discussing Juneau and you had house districts that divided along North and South Franklin Street. You would pair those house districts in one Senate District if you could.

You have an option on the table that clearly corrects the error the court saw in splitting Eagle River and Muldoon. It puts together clear neighborhoods. It brings Muldoon together. It brings neighbors on War Admiral Street in Eagle River together. It puts the ends of the chain of the Iditarod sign on 4th avenue into one district. You should adopt Senate Pairings Map #2.

Thank you for your hard work and consideration. As a fellow map maker in the Municipality of Anchorage reapportionment process, I genuinely appreciate how hard this work is.

Denny Wells

Post Script:

There were two factual inaccuracies presented by subsequent speakers today that I would like to address.

1 - Jason Warfield (sp?) testified that the Municipality of Anchorage advocated for pairing Hillside with Eagle River during the Anchorage Reapportionment process. To be precise, neither the Municipality nor the Assembly ever advocated for such a pairing.

Early in the Anchorage Reapportionment process, there were 12 maps, including 4 provided by their mapping contractor, 6 presented by residents and various public interest groups (2 of
them were mine), and 2 provided by Assembly members (one was a map I helped draft). 4 of
the 6 resident & interest group maps contained pairings of various parts of Anchorage Hillside
or Turnagain Arm with Eagle River. The proponents of those maps, including at least one
assembly member, presented similar arguments about lot sizes and road service and mountain
contiguity that you are hearing here. One of those Eagle River-Anchorage pairing maps was
mine, pairing Stuckagain Heights with Eagle River, which I defended as an unfortunate artifact
of maintaining low deviation and because it was the closest part of Anchorage to Eagle River
which shared the rural road and water service characteristics. I received a substantial amount of
direct feedback against this particular detail, and moved on to drafting and advocating for
maps that maintained neighborhood integrity even if they produced slightly higher deviations.

It is inaccurate to state that the Municipality or the Assembly argued in favor of these maps. The
Assembly’s Reapportionment Committee eliminated 3 of these Anchorage-Eagle River pairing
maps (including mine) early on. Only one such map made it to the Assembly floor, and it was
not forwarded by the Assembly for final consideration. The Assembly listened to the public
testimony, and at the end of the process, even the Assembly Member who argued in favor of the
Anchorage-Eagle River pairings voted for the final map which kept Eagle River and South
Anchorage intact in their own districts.

2 - Representative Lance Pruitt stated that JBER students go to Eagle River High School. This is
a factually accurate but misleading and incomplete statement. JBER High School boundaries are
not included in maps from the Anchorage School District, but if you look up JBER addresses via
the Anchorage School District School finder, you will see that addresses in the Richardson
portion of the base, accessed via the Richardson gate, are zoned to Eagle River, while the
addresses in the Elmendorf portion of JBER accessed via Government Hill, Boniface, and
Muldoon gates are zoned to Bartlett. The Downtown and Government Hill portions of District
23 are zoned to West High School. In total, in district 23, the populations in the various High
School boundaries are these:

Bartlett High School (inside District 23) – 8733 people
West High School (inside District 17) – 4802 people
Eagle River High School (inside District 22) – 4488 people

Two items of note in this data: (1) Eagle River is the smallest (by population) High School
connection for District 23, and (2) even if you find the connection to Eagle River High School
persuasive, Eagle River High School is the High School of District 22. The High School of
District 24 is Chugiak High School. In fact, the school district boundary between Chugiak High
School and Eagle River High School is very similar to the boundary you defined between
District 22 and 24. If this High School argument is granted any weight, it should weigh in favor
of pairing District 23 with 17 first, and District 23 with 22 second, and it establishes no
particular connection between District 23 and 24.
As a ten year resident of Girdwood, our home and Eagle River should not be paired.

The resort community balances seasonal changes to foster an outdoor recreation economy. Eagle River does not.

We have our own land use code to reflect our climate and our values. Eagle River does not.

As a service area, we have ad hoc advisory committees and a local public process for new developments. Eagle River does not.

We act as the gateway to the Kenai Peninsula, the Chugach State and National Forests and host passenger train stations in Girdwood and Portage. Eagle River does not.

We have 1500+ fulltime year residents with the majority being low wage service industry personnel. Eagle River does not.

Do not pair us. It is not tenable nor reflective of our community.

Christina Hendrickson
Date: April 8, 2022, 9:40 pm

First Name: Kari

Last Name: MacDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 2022 option 3B

Public Comment: In evaluating the consideration of remapping I firmly support 3B. This allows a solid mix of diversity and political affiliation to represent Alaska while maintaining the voice of our precious military. I support 3B and I hope you will support this as well.

Thanks

Kari
Date: April 9, 2022, 12:39 am

First Name: Tim

Last Name: Silvers

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support of Map option 2, Map 3b is inexcusable

Public Comment: I have been following the redistricting process from the beginning. I strongly support the proposed map Option 2 to redraw Anchorage Senate districts in compliance with the supreme court order to adhere to the law of our state constitution. Option 2 very efficiently pairs similar socio-economic districts in an equitable and logical manner.

Allow me to add some background to my decision. At first I was optimistic that Alaska has a supposedly "independent" commission to draw redistricting maps after census. I soon learned that part of the board is not independent at all, rather it was clearly attempting to skew the pairings to gerrymander in support the Republican party. I used to vote almost exclusively Republican, but lately find myself doing so much less often. Why? Precisely because of these dishonest underhanded tactics to grasp at control, rather than putting forward a platform that appeals to the majority of people. I would be ashamed to call myself "conservative" these days as those conservatives I respected in my youth have vanished and been replaced by something unrecognizable.

The supreme court rightly declared the previous map an egregious gerrymander, diluting the voice of East Anchorage and giving Eagle River representation beyond its numbers. There can be no other reason for some board members to continue to push for "gerrymander redux" in the form of map 3b, other than they have implicit orders to deliver a result favorable to Republicans. People in Eagle River don’t want this pairing. South Anchorage doesn’t want it. The rest of Anchorage doesn’t want illogical pairings spanning across the city and in the case of units 22 and 9 across a mountain range. That people in Eagle River or South Anchorage would feel properly represented by a Senator from the other unit is absurd on it's face.

Please do the right thing and quickly move to adopt Map Option 2. Restore faith that the redistricting board respects our constitution and believes that one person, one vote principles still rule our land. Restore my faith that conservatives can once again put honestly above political gain. Thank you, Tim Silvers
Date: April 9, 2022, 9:27 pm

First Name: Doug
Last Name: McBride

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate District K Pairing

Public Comment: I am a resident of District 22, support Option 2 and vehemently oppose Option 3B.

Prior to submitting this testimony, I reviewed all written testimony from the Recent April 7-8 packet to learn if there was any testimony in favor of Option 3B that would sway me. There is not a single point made or any evidence offered in any written testimony in support of Option 3B. Conversely, every written testimony in support of Option 2 provides some rationale for that position. The most compelling include: Districts 22 and 9 are not meaningfully or realistically adjacent; and Districts 22 and 24 comprise the actual and recognized community of Eagle River-Chugiak which are meaningfully and realistically adjacent.

In the absence of any provided rationale for Option 3B and the overwhelming rationale provided for Option 2, I strongly urge you to choose Option 2. To do otherwise (Option 3B) leaves this decision open to the same criticism of gerrymandering rendered by the recent Alaska Supreme Court ruling.

Thank you for considering my testimony.
ate: April 10, 2022, 8:40 am

First Name: Jasmine

Last Name: Boyle

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 2 and 3

Public Comment: I support Map 2 which keeps communities together who have similarities and who are communities in name, location and activity - Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon and so on. The board needs to listen to the people who have overwhelmingly said repeatedly that communities do not want to be separated. Map 3 is not acceptable.
Date: April 10, 2022, 8:42 am

First Name: Wade

Last Name: Boyle

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3b

Public Comment: The idea of pairing across a mountain range does not make sense. Keep communities together. I support Map 2.
Date: April 10, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Jon

Last Name: Grace

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B not appropriate

Public Comment: As a resident of South Anchorage I strongly and unequivocally support map 2 which keeps my contiguous community intact and does not use an uninhabited mountain range to pair my community with the unrelated 30+ minute distant south Eagle River community. I understand that redistricting may not always follow common sense boundaries in order to follow constitutional law of even division of the population but map 2 adheres to this rule with more logical boundaries and is clearly the superior option that will allow me to be more appropriately represented by my state representative. Thank you for your consideration.
Date: April 10, 2022, 10:04 am

First Name: Jeff
Last Name: Allen

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Basher Community (Stuckagain Heights)

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): None

Public Comment: I support map 3-B
Date: April 10, 2022, 10:05 am

First Name: Idamarie

Last Name: Piccard

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Personal; Anchorage resident for 46 years

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3b

Public Comment: Please support map 2 which keeps Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. Map 3b breaks communities apart for no good reason and should not be done when there are better options. Map 2 is a better option.
Date: April 10, 2022, 10:22 am

First Name: Julie
Last Name: Saddoris

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support Map 2

Public Comment: I support Map 2 over 3B in the redistricting because it keeps communities together. I don’t see how adding part of south Anchorage to Eagle River makes any sense, other than they are both Republican leaning (which seems like gerrymandering). These communities are separated by mountains and miles apart. Map 2 keeps communities together, which is more sensible than splitting them.
Date: April 10, 2022, 10:57 am

First Name: Kathleen

Last Name: Worthley

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Redistricting

Public Comment: I support map 2 which keeps the communities of Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. Map 3b should not be considered as it breaks communities apart for no good reason and makes pairings over an uninhabited mountain range, which should not be done when there are better options. Map 2 is a better option.
Date: April 10, 2022, 12:38 pm

First Name: Katie

Last Name: McBride

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B

Public Comment: It makes no sense to group Eagle River with south Anchorage and Girdwood. To suggest that Eagle River is connected to Girdwood via Crow Pass is a stretch to say the least. Please adopt Map 2 of the redistricting maps.
Date: April 10, 2022, 1:38 pm

First Name: Amelinda

Last Name: Grace

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 2 is the best

Public Comment: While I am relatively new to Anchorage I have lived on both the west and south parts of town and seen how different they are. I have visited Eagle River and considered moving there before moving to South Anchorage and can firmly state my opposition to map 3B which inexplicably links these two distinct communities together. Please make the only reasonable decision and adopt map 2 which keeps my community together, appropriately represented, and distinct from Eagle River. If I had wanted to move there I wouldn't have moved 40 minutes away in the other direction!
Date: April 10, 2022, 1:51 pm

First Name: Diane

Last Name: Schenker

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support Map 2

Public Comment: I live in Stuckagain Heights and shop, visit, recreate, and drive in adjacent districts, including East and South Anchorage. I do not drive to, shop, visit, or do anything else in Eagle River, ever. I consider Eagle River to be "out of town". To choose to put my neighborhood in a district with Eagle River, an area from which we are physically separated, which we can only get to by driving through other adjacent districts and traveling by highway, appears to be blatant gerrymandering for purposes the courts have already rejected. By comparison, I can and do walk to the South Anchorage district on the beautiful Chugach forest trails that join our neighborhoods; I also drive to, shop at, dine in and visit businesses in South Anchorage every week. My political interests would be better served by a Senator representing us and South (or East, although from what I see, that is not an option) Anchorage than us and Eagle River.
Date: April 10, 2022, 3:10 pm

First Name: Christina

Last Name: Neal

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact:

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate pairing

Public Comment: Dear Board: Regarding senate pairings, please adopt map 2 which keeps Anchorage Downtown with Anchorage Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. This approach follows the constitutional intent of representation, keeps established communities intact, and does not attempt to dilute voter type.

Map 3b is a blatant gerrymander. It breaks communities apart and makes inexplicable pairings over an uninhabited mountain range.
Date: April 10, 2022, 3:52 pm

First Name: Irene

Last Name: Bortnick

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support for Map 2

Public Comment: Map 2 which keeps the communities of Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage has my endorsement. Map 3b breaks up communities and pairs communities that are not geographically contiguous. Please accept Map 2. Please settle this issue soon, it has gone on for too long.
Date: April 10, 2022, 7:49 pm

First Name: Amy

Last Name: McFarlane

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Map 3B makes no sense at all; adopt Map 2

Public Comment: Option 3B makes no sense at all. The communities of South Anchorage and Eagle River are not “contiguous” in the sense of a shared neighborhood. South Anchorage and Eagle River may share an essentially roadless boundary in the Chugach mountains, but that does not mean the interests of the constituents in the two areas are aligned. Eagle River is a separate community, with many residents pushing for Eagle Exit. It should not be paired with South Anchorage. I strongly urge the Redistricting Board to adopt Map 2, instead of Map 3B.
Date: April 10, 2022, 8:32 pm

First Name: Brittany

Last Name: Petry

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map 2; communities should be kept together: Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. Why have a map (3B) that breaks communities apart for no good reason, making totally illogical pairings over geography that naturally separates them. Breaking communities up would erode public trust and demoralize their citizens. Please, let common sense and fairness prevail.

Thank you
Reapportion Board Members:

I have reviewed the two current maps that are under consideration, and find many compelling reasons to support Map 2 and to oppose Map 3B.

Map 2 has logical pairings and makes sense with strong rationales behind each pairing. It keeps Downtown Anchorage paired with Downtown, it keeps Muldoon paired with Muldoon, it keeps South Anchorage paired with South Anchorage, and it keeps the Eagle River/Chugiak/Birchwood areas together with the other parts of the Eagle River area. It makes overall sense with the pairings of communities of interest. It also leaves intact four of the eight pairings from the previous submitted map, just correcting the court-declared illegal gerrymandered areas with re-pairing of the other four.

This is all contrasted with the pairings in Map 3B, which are pairings that cannot legitimately make the same claims. These pairings split up the Eagle River/Chugiak/Birchwood area for absolutely no good reason, split downtown Anchorage and then make for a strange pairing of Eagle River with South Anchorage. Then, it pairs JBER with the Chugiak/Eagle River area which makes little to no sense as JBER interacts with the areas where their gates are, which are NOT into Chugiak or Eagle River.

The gerrymandering that was identified by the courts in the previously submitted Senate pairings map is still present in Map 3B. Map 3B does not correct and eliminate the partisan gerrymandering, it just replaces the prior gerrymandered map with a different gerrymandered map.

Please do the right thing and keep communities of interest together and eliminate gerrymandering by adopting Map 2; it is fair and rational and is likely to meet legal muster to be acceptable to the courts.

Thank you,

Sheri Whitethorn
Anchorage, AK
Date: April 10, 2022, 10:16 pm

First Name: Dolores
Last Name: Collins

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting - Support for Option 2 & Opposition to Option 3B

Public Comment: Good evening.

I have been part of the Eagle River community for 47 years, and I am writing in support of Option 2. In my opinion, it contains the most logical and fair pairings for all people who live in the Municipality. I do NOT support Option 3B.
Date: April 10, 2022, 11:44 pm

First Name: Ashley
Last Name: Kobylinski

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support map 3B
Penny Goodstein

Mon 4/11/2022 12:47 AM

I sent the message below on April 9.

What I did not do was reference the appropriate map that I think you should use.
I SUPPORT MAP 2. It keeps the communities together.

Please do NOT CONSIDER MAP 3b! It breaks apart these communities. It is designed as a political tool to keep specific representatives in power, not as a tool to make voting equal and fair.

Map 2 is the fair and equitable map.

Penny Goodstein

----- Forwarded Message -----
From: Penny Goodstein < >
To: testimony@akredistrict.org <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Sent: Saturday, April 9, 2022, 01:43:51 PM AKDT
Subject: the new redistricting plans

I am writing about the redistricting decisions. I am appalled that once again, Eagle River has one plan to split it.

It seems that this is political to increase representation for Eagle River at the expense of other areas.

Eagle River is a unit. Muldoon is a unit. The Hillside is a unit. Please keep Downtown together, Hillside together, and Eagle River together. Do not separate these units.

JBEAR is no more similar to Eagle River than to downtown. Many at JBEAR are not Alaskan residents; they retain their home residency and vote there. Other JBEAR military live throughout our communities and these, if they become Alaskan residents, are represented by their home district elected officials. Putting JBEAR with an Eagle River district makes as much sense and with downtown.

Penny Goodstein
Dear Redistricting Board,

I am writing to you today to urge you to adopt the Senate pairings proposed by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke instead of coming up with new pairings. These pairings, proposed by Melanie Bahnke, have been presented and considered on the record and were informed by public input and testimony. These pairings do not change districts’ underlying deviation and uphold the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc, Eagle River w/ Eagle River, etc.).

It is crucial that the voices of the Muldoon area are not watered down, and that each district receives fair and just representation. I also ask that you do this in a timely manner, as it is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election.

Thank you for your time. Please vote to approve the pairings put forth by Redistricting Board member Melanie Bahnke.

Sincerely,

Eden
Date: April 11, 2022, 9:42 am

First Name: Joe

Last Name: Banta

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support for Current Map 2

Public Comment: Dear Redistricting Board: I now support map number two which keeps the communities of Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. As a south Anchorage resident, it’s important to keep us together. Map 3b should not be considered as it breaks communities apart for no good reason and makes pairings over an uninhabited mountain range, which should not be done when there are better options. Map 2 is a better option. If you use map 3b, we will once again see the process in court which is a waste of money. Thank you. Sincerely, Joe Banta
Date: April 11, 2022, 1:23 pm

First Name: Susan

Last Name: Fischetti

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Eagle River

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/7/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Susan testified in support of a Chugach Mountain district as outlined in the Option 3-B Map for the following reasons:

1) Districts 22 and 9 are the two large districts with several acres of parks and mountains; there are no other districts like this.

2) Upper Hillside and Eagle River have previously been combined as a Senate pairing and it is still logical to pair them.

3) Anchorage has become more urbanized. Eagle River and Hillside residents chose a suburban lifestyle surrounded by mountains and wildlife rather than the city.

4) Joint Base Elmendorf Richardson (JBER) districts should remain intact and this map achieves that.

Susan agrees that there is public confusion with the Anchorage Assembly redistricting process where several community members testified to keep the Assembly districts separate. Now, the public is struggling with the changes being presented by the board and this may impact their willingness to call in.
Date: April 11, 2022, 4:52 pm

First Name: Karen

Last Name: Williams

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: Map 2 should be the map chosen by the board. This map is truly nonpartisan, unlike map 3b. Map 2 keeps the communities of Downtown with Downtown, Eagle River with Eagle River, Muldoon with Muldoon, and South Anchorage with South Anchorage. Please DO NOT consider map 3b because it breaks communities apart for truly no apparent reason. 3B is clearly a partisan map attempting to strengthen one political party. This map, if passed, will once again be litigated. We do not have the time nor the resources to waste. Please do the right thing and pass Map 2!
Date: April 11, 2022, 7:06 pm

First Name: Annika
Last Name: Wolner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: PO Box 1218

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting of South Anchorage and Eagle River

Public Comment: I support Option 2 and oppose Option 3B because Girdwood is politically and culturally different from Eagle River, and the pairing would not be beneficial for the Girdwood community. Option 3B would only be beneficial for Eagle River, and not giving Girdwood a voice at all.
Anchorage Downtown Partnership passed a resolution about keeping the downtown connected. Please weigh this public testimony.

Christopher Constant
Anchorage Municipal Assembly, District 1
ANCHORAGE DOWNTOWN PARTNERSHIP, LTD.

A resolution of the Anchorage Downtown Partnership, Ltd. (ADP) Board of Directors expressing concern regarding the House District pairing between House District 23 (North Downtown) and House District 24 (Eagle River) for Senate District L.

Whereas, the United States Constitution empowers Congress to carry out the census every 10 years to count every person living in the United States and use that count to determine representation in Congress;

Whereas, the Alaska Constitution sets new boundaries for the Alaska house districts and senate districts after the decennial census of the United States;

Whereas, the Downtown Improvement District is currently represented by one House District and one Senate District;

Whereas, the final 2021 redistricting maps divide the Downtown Improvement District into two separate House seats;

Whereas, House District 17 includes the south side of 4th Avenue and stretches to Fireweed Lane;

Whereas, House District 23 includes the north side of 4th Avenue, Ship Creek, Government Hill and Joint Base Elmendorf and Richardson (JBER), and parts of Mountain View;

Whereas, House District 23 is paired with House District 24 to form Senate District L;

Whereas, House District 23 includes parts of the Central Business District, Downtown Improvement District, Port of Alaska and Alaska Railroad, JBER, and a commercial district of Mountain View;

Whereas, House District 24 includes Eagle River, which is predominately rural and residential;

Whereas, Downtown Anchorage has unique and specific issues as the urban core of our community is separate from rural and residential areas;

NOW, THEREFORE, RECOGNIZING THAT DOWNTOWN ANCHORAGE IS UNIQUE WITHIN THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE AND THE STATE OF ALASKA AS A STRONG URBAN CORE AND SHOULD HAVE COMPACT AND COHESIVE REPRESENTATION AS SUCH THE ANCHORAGE DOWNTOWN PARTNERSHIP, LTD, BOARD OF DIRECTORS RESOLVES:

SECTION 1: ADP will work to find ways to advocate for compact and cohesive maps to best reflect the interest of downtown.
PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Downtown Partnership, Ltd. Board of
Directors this 18th day of November 2021.

SIGNED: __________________________
Board President
Gretchen W. Fauske

ATTEST: __________________________
Board Secretary
Laile Fairbairn
Date: April 12, 2022, 9:49 am

First Name: Curtis

Last Name: Smith

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I would like to strongly advocate for the adoption of the Option 2 senate pairing map, which has a much more natural pairing than Option 3B. There is no serious justifiable reason to split Eagle River by pairing District 22 with Girdwood and portions of South Anchorage. Such a pairing is in no way contiguous in the reasonable sense of the term since it requires many miles of driving through multiple other districts to travel from Eagle River to South Anchorage. It is significantly more logical to pair the two Eagle River districts.

Frankly, I am embarrassed by our state. Over the years, I have read with disgust about all the gerrymandering in other states only to realize the same lack of integrity exists in Alaska. The last minute change in fall 2021 that paired Eagle River with South Muldoon was clearly an example of gerrymandering, and the Alaska Supreme Court agreed. Please avoid making the same mistake again. Adopt the Option 2 senate pairing map.

Sincerely,

Curtis Smith
ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: April 12, 2022, 11:48 am

First Name: Lynne'  
Last Name: Langevin-Doran  
Group Affiliation, if applicable:  
Email or Phone Contact:  
Your ZIP Code: 99587  
Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistricting

Public Comment: Briefly - Girdwood should remain in the same district at South Anchorage and Bayshore. To combine Girdwood with Eagle River makes no sense, we are more than an hour away from that community. Communities that are in close proximity should be represented together not the opposite.
Dear Alaska Redistricting Board,

This message is to support Board Option 2 for the Anchorage Senate districts (particularly Senate District K). Board Option 2 keeps downtown, the Hillside, and the Eagle River together in a coherent and sensible way.

And I oppose Board Option 3B, particularly with how it pairs South Anchorage with Eagle River, which is not coherent or sensible, and appears to be gerrymandering.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.
Date: April 12, 2022, 9:29 pm

First Name: **Brett**

Last Name: **Barringer**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: **99507**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting**

Public Comment: *I'm writing in support of map 3-B. Thank you.*

Tue 4/12/2022 10:55 PM

Juli & Peter:

Please deliver the attached comments to the Board in advance of Wednesday’s meeting.

Thanks,
Matt Claman
Dear Chair Binkley and Members of the Board:

Since I provided public testimony on 2 April 2022, the Board adopted two proposals for public review and discussion: Option 2 and Option 3B. This letter updates my public testimony and provides specific comment on both Option 2 and Option 3B. It also provides my perspective on the Superior Court’s Findings and Fact and Conclusions of Law (15 February 2022), affirmed by the Alaska Supreme Court (25 March 2022).

Option 2 comes as close as reasonably practicable to meet all the constitutional requirements of the remand from the Supreme Court and the Superior Court. There are 5 reasons for this conclusion:

1. Option 2 keeps Eagle River as a single senate district and does not separate this community of interest in violation of the equal protection clause.¹
2. Option 2 makes HD 20 (North Muldoon) and HD 21 (South Muldoon) a single senate district, consistent with their community of interest, and protects those districts from the vote dilution that made the 2021 Board Proclamation for the Municipality of Anchorage unconstitutional.²
3. Option 2 satisfies the socio-economic integration requirement.³
4. Option 2 satisfies the compactness requirement.⁴
5. Option 2 takes into consideration “local government boundaries.”⁵

³ Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
⁴ Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
⁵ Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
In contrast, Option 3B constitutes another "unconstitutional political gerrymander violating equal protection under the Alaska Constitution."\(^6\) This option appears to be driven by the goal of pairing HD 23 (JBER) with HD 24 (North Eagle River/Chugiak) even though military base population has never been a protected class under either state or federal law. While a portion of the southern border of HD 22 shares a portion of the northern border of HD 9, enough satisfy a minimum level of "two contiguous house districts,"\(^7\) it fails to satisfy the other constitutional requirements for a senate pairing. There are four reasons for this conclusion:

1. Option 3B fails to satisfy the socio-economic integration requirement.\(^8\)
2. Option 3B fails to satisfy the compactness requirement.\(^9\)
3. Option 3B divides the Eagle River community of interest in violation of the equal protection provisions of the Alaska Constitution.\(^10\)
4. Option 3B fails to take into consideration "local government boundaries."\(^11\)

I write as a sitting legislator, former member of the Anchorage Assembly, and former Acting Mayor. In many of Alaska’s rural legislative districts, it often quite difficult to visit some of the smaller communities. For example, the senator for Proclamation District S can reasonably visit some of the larger communities such as Bethel and Dillingham from time to time; but regular visits to the smaller, more remote communities like Sand Point, Unalaska, and Adak are difficult in the best of circumstances. In contrast, with eight senate pairings in the Municipality of Anchorage, constituents can and should reasonably expect to see their senator shopping in the local grocery store, dining in local restaurants, and patronizing local businesses. Pairing HD 9 with HD 22 will have the effect of depriving one of those two house district of having a senator who lives “in the neighborhood.”

While the courts have not, to my knowledge, considered the “local government boundaries” provisions of Art. 6, § 6 in the context of Anchorage senate districts, the Municipality of Anchorage has long considered communities of interest in its six assembly districts. The Municipality has never even attempted to pair Eagle River (Assembly District 2) with the Hillside (Assembly District 6). As both an Assembly Member and as Acting Mayor, I always knew that Eagle River had distinct interests and concerns that frequently did not align with other parts of the Municipality. Indeed, in recent years, there has even been talk of Eagle River seceding from the Municipality. Consideration of how the local government has grouped communities of interest compels the conclusion that it is unconstitutional to pair an Eagle River house district with a Hillside house district into a single senate district that is divided by the Chugach Mountains: it is the least practicable senate pairing within the Municipality.

\(^{6}\) In the Matter of the 2021 Redistricting Cases, Supreme Court No. S-18332, p. 6 (Alaska 25 Mar. 2022).
\(^{7}\) Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
\(^{8}\) Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
\(^{10}\) In the Matter of the 2021 Redistricting Plan, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law at 39-73, Case No. 3AN-21-08869CI (15 Feb. 2022).
\(^{11}\) Alaska Constitution Art. 6, § 6.
Finally, I am also an active biker. I have frequently ridden my bike on the roads and trails throughout the Municipality, including Eagle River and the Hillside. To ride from my home on the north side of HD 16 (Turnagain) to the south side of HD 15 (Bayshore) takes 30-40 minutes. To ride on Muldoon Road from the north side of HD 20 (near the Glenn Highway) to the south side of HD 21 (near the curve where Muldoon turns into Tudor Road) takes 15-25 minutes. But to ride from downtown Eagle River in the north side of HD 22 to downtown Girdwood in the south side of HD 9 would take 3-4 hours—and riding to the entrance of the Whittier Tunnel would take another hour from Girdwood. From the perspective of a bicycle seat (I recognize that bicyclists are not a protect class), combining HD 9 with HD 22 into a single senate seat is not compact.

In his work as a trial attorney, Abraham Lincoln often counseled parties and other lawyers to find compromise and avoid trial. Adopting Option 3B will lead to further litigation and further uncertainty for Alaskans. The Board earlier removed Option 1 from consideration, which makes more changes across the Municipality than Option 2. Adopting Option 2, in contrast to Option 3B, is unlikely to lead to further litigation because the East Anchorage plaintiffs have proposed this option.

To provide certainty to Alaskans and move the redistricting process forward as expeditiously as practicable, I urge the Board to unanimously adopt Option 2.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Matthew W. Claman
Date: April 12, 2022, 11:35 pm

First Name: Eric

Last Name: McCallum

Group Affiliation, if applicable: none

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99515

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I Support Map 2

Public Comment: The rational fix is obvious, pair Eagle River with Eagle River, Gov Hill/JBER with Downtown and Hillside with Hillside. Any plan must follow the direction of the court closely, only changing the affected districts and those touching them. Otherwise the court could send Map 3 back to the board yet again.

Eagle River is a separate community. It deserves its own senator. This is evidenced by the fact that they are currently moving forward on plans to secede from the municipality. Current Sens. Roger Holland and Lora Reinbold both oppose Map 3 saying it is unworkable for numerous reasons. Additionally there was overwhelming public testimony against pairing parts of South Anchorage and Eagle River during Anchorage Municipal reapportionment.

Thank you for providing an opportunity to share my thinking.
Date: April 13, 2022, 1:30 am

First Name: Mike

Last Name: Edgington

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99587

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Adopt Senate pairing map 2

Public Comment: I have heard the argument that Chugiak/Eagle River "loses representation" under map 2 since they "currently have 2 senators", and those 2 senators would be preserved under 3B. This is misleading.

It is true that the 2013 proclamation map does split Chugiak/Eagle River across 3 House districts, 12, 13 & 14.

2013’s HD13 & 14 cover Eagle River (with some of JBER) but HD12 has most of its population in Mat-Su and only a few thousand in the Chugiak/Birchwood/Peters Creek neighborhoods. So 2013’s HD12, part of Senate seat F, should rightly be considered a Mat-Su Senate district since ~80% of Senate seat F’s population resides in Mat-Su.

The 2021 proclamation does a better job associating House districts with communities. Chugiak/Eagle River has almost the perfect population for exactly two House districts and one Senate pair and the House map does in fact draw 2 House districts for Chugiak/Eagle River: the new HD22 & HD24.

Map 2 neatly pairs those two House districts into a Senate seat, whereas Map 3B pairs disparate House districts to artificially create 2 Senate seats for Chugiak/Eagle River.

I urge you to support the Senate pairings of Map 2 and avoid unnecessary additional legal challenges.
Date: April 13, 2022, 10:35 am

First Name: Ric

Last Name: Davidge

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Alaska Roundtable

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 98002

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): I support the adoption the proposed Map 3B.

Public Comment: I have watched this closely and believe that 3B is the correct choice consistent with the law.
First Name: Burton
Last Name: Bomhoff

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [红acted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I support Map B-3
Constant, Christopher christopher.constant@anchorageak.gov

Wed 4/13/2022 12:38 AM

To the Alaska Redistricting Board:

On behalf of Assembly leadership, attached is a copy of AR 2022-112(S) a Resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly supporting Anchorage Senate Districts Revision Option 2 Before The Alaska Redistricting Board That Pairs House District 17 with 23, and House District 22 with 24.

The Assembly adopted this resolution with a vote of 8 yes votes and 2 no votes and is the official testimony of the Municipality on this question. I would note it is somewhat amended from the version previously submitted.

I am submitting without the signature as the clerk will not have time until morning to get the signed version. Once it is available, a signed copy will be provided.

It is worth noting that this item is adopted, but it is possible that the Mayor exercises his Charter granted right to veto within the next 7 days. The Assembly would have 21 days thereafter to convene to override.

I anticipate Chair LaFrance will be attending the hearing on April 13 to deliver remarks on passage and approval of this item.

Christopher Constant
Anchorage Municipal Assembly, District 1
ANCHORAGE, ALASKA
AR No. 2022-112(S)

A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY SUPPORTING
ANCHORAGE SENATE DISTRICTS REVISION OPTION #2 BEFORE THE ALASKA
REDISTRICTING BOARD THAT PAIRS HOUSE DISTRICT 17 WITH 23, AND
HOUSE DISTRICT 22 WITH 24.

WHEREAS, Alaska State Redistricting happens once a decade, concluding with the
Alaska Redistricting Board (ARB) adopting a Final Proclamation of Redistricting
(Proclamation) affecting communities for a decade; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of the Proclamation on November 10, 2021, triggered a
Charter provision requiring the Anchorage Assembly to determine whether it was
malapportioned and also triggered a Charter amendment passed by voters in 2020
directing the Assembly to add a 12th member. On November 23, 2021, with the passage
of AR 2021-382 the Assembly declared itself malapportioned and began the
reapportionment process; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly conducted extensive public outreach and recorded
substantial public testimony between November 23, 2021 and March 23, 2022,
concluding when Anchorage Ordinance AO 2022-37 (S-1), As Amended, was approved
containing the new apportionment map; and

WHEREAS, in a legal challenge to the 2021 Redistricting Proclamation the Alaska
Superior Court in Case No. 3AN-21-08869CI found that the Alaska Redistricting Board’s
pairing of House Districts 21 and 22 into Senate District K is unconstitutional and that
this pairing must be changed on remand to the ARB; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Supreme Court on March 25, 2022 affirmed the superior court’s
determination that “the Board’s Senate K pairing of house districts constituted an
unconstitutional political gerrymander violating equal protection under the Alaska
Constitution” and the remand to the ARB to correct it; and

WHEREAS, on remand, the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted proposed revisions to
the 2021 Proclamation Plan Anchorage Senate District K
(https://www.akredistrict.org/2022-proposed-revisions/), and as of April 8, 2022,
Options 2 and Option 3B remain for its consideration; and

WHEREAS, Proposed Option 3B joins south Eagle River with South Anchorage,
Girdwood, Turnagain Arm including Portage, and even beyond the borders of the
Municipality into Whittier in the Chugach Census Block; and

WHEREAS, during the recent Municipality of Anchorage Reapportionment process,
residents from Eagle River, South Anchorage and Girdwood spoke out overwhelmingly
against proposals that would combine these communities with scores of comments
opposing the combination; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board should not contemplate a pairing of House
districts like presented in Option 3B, that combines geographically and demographically
distinct areas and simply shifts the constitutional infirmity into other areas and provides only second-class contiguity; and

WHEREAS, the Anchorage Reapportionment Committee heard from five community councils and scores of individuals regarding their opposition to grouping Eagle River and South Anchorage on the basis that these are distinctly different regions with few shared communities of interest; and

WHEREAS, the Alaska Redistricting Board’s Proposed Anchorage Senate Districts Option 2 combines House District 23 which is the Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Government Hill and downtown Anchorage area with House District 17 which is the main [covering the] downtown area; and House District 22, the south Eagle River area, with House District 24, the north Eagle River area; and

WHEREAS, the record demonstrates that a plan is possible which adopts all highly contiguous pairings that maintain communities of interest, keeping neighbors with neighbors, including Government Hill and North Downtown Anchorage with South Downtown Anchorage, Chugiak with Eagle River, and South Anchorage with Southwest Anchorage in Option 2; and

WHEREAS, Option 3B offers pairings with only second-class contiguity that connects Chugiak with Government Hill and Downtown, Eagle River with Girdwood, Portage, and Whittier which all have substantial geographic barriers including the Chugach Front Range Mountains, the federally secured borders of JBER, and in some cases hours of highway time; and

WHEREAS, the Assembly has heard no constitutional arguments that are persuasive in justifying the breaking up of natural contiguous communities of interest that can stand in the face of the overwhelming public testimony it received to the contrary; and

WHEREAS, Option 2 more closely joins neighboring communities of[f] common interest that interact through direct road access to shop, work, and play in their respective areas, in clear compliance with the Superior Court’s Constitutional directives to respect natural boundaries where possible in describing boundaries (e.g. drainages and mountain ranges), and the testimony from communities of interest, while maintaining contiguity and compactness in drawing such district lines;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Anchorage Municipal Assembly supports the Alaska Redistricting Board’s Proposed Anchorage Senate Districts Option 2 which pairs House Districts 17 and 23 to form one Senate district, and House Districts 22 and 24 to form another Senate district.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this 12th day of April, 2022.

ATTEST: 
Chair

Municipal Clerk
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:04 pm

First Name: Steven
Last Name: Aufrecht

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]
Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): How to evaluate and use public testimony in the Board's decision making process

Public Comment: In the Board’s brief to the Supreme Court, Matt Singer wrote:

"The trial court places quantity of testimony over quality. This provides incentive for political parties, partisans, and interest groups to pack public hearings and file volumes of pre-written testimony."

Actually, the judge's ruling was a lot more subtle than that. He explained his decision and reasoning in detail from page 131 - 143 of his ruling. He concludes the discussion thus:

"If the Board adopts a final plan contrary to the preponderance of public testimony, it must state on the record legitimate reasons for its decision." (p. 143)

It’s encouraging to know that the Board, through its attorney, believes that politics should not be involved in this process and is worried about “special interest groups who mobilize partisans to attend hearings and hijack the process.”

Singer also wrote:

--There is no legal standard for determining the clear weight of public comment. If only one person testifies on a topic, is that the weight of public testimony that trumps the judgment of the five Board members?

While there may not be a legal standard, there is a well developed field of qualitative research analysis to help review testimony in a more meaningful way than just counting those for and against. And just like any other expert testimony, it is accepted by the court. Matt Singer himself has said he himself has hired the East Anchorage plaintiff’s expert witness Dr. Chase Hensel to be an expert witness. He does qualitative research. Here’s a brief description:

--Data collected in qualitative research are usually in narrative rather than numerical form, such as the transcript of an unstructured, in-depth interview. Analysis of qualitative data organizes, summarizes and interprets these nonnumerical observations." (From National Library of Medicine)
Evaluating public testimony doesn't need to be a complicated social science dissertation. We can use simple principles of qualitative research to get something reasonably useful for the Board.

I'd like to offer the Board a professional way to evaluate the large amount of public testimony it has received.

How Should The Board Evaluate The Data?

A first step is to go through the testimony and identify the concepts/ideas/points made and codify them. This doesn't have to be as complicated as it sounds. Having heard most of the oral testimony and having looked at much of the written testimony, I'd say we can divide the testimony into:

- For Option 2
- For Option 3B
- Other Issues

Here, “Other” would include comments that don't choose an option or that discuss other redistricting issues than the Senate seat K pairing. Yes, that sounds a little like what attorney Matt Singer was warning about, but this is just the first step. While we will divide the comments into those three categories, we won't stop there. Then we'll go through them to see the extent to which they add information to the discussion that is relevant to the decision.

The Board's attorney warned it would turn into a simple partisan drive to drum up testimony. He obviously doesn't think that's a good idea and neither do I. The Board shouldn't just make a pile for Option 2 and one for Option 3B, count how many in each pile, and then say that equals the preponderance of public testimony. I'd like to offer a way to think about the comments.

Here's basic idea. Attorney Singer pointed out the dangers of quantifying public opinion. This is not a vote, it's information gathering. The Board is responsible for creating a plan that meets all the constitutional and other legal requirements. Then, as the judge wrote: â€œit must state on the record legitimate reasons for its decision.

The purpose of public testimony is:

To raise issues - often local ones - that the Board overlooked to add to their decision making
To provide preferences that can be taken into consideration once the Board has some clear, constitutional plans.
To avoid making politically partisan decisions by creating districts that are less constitutional but favor one particular political party.
Process for evaluating comments

First we divide the comments based on topics. In some cases there will be several topics in one comment. We can put those into a "multi topic' pile and then go through them later. Second, divide the comments in each group based not on content, but how the content is conveyed. For example:

Opinion - unsupported - basically "a vote"
Opinion - Supported
by Feeling
by Facts
by Concepts/Principles
Legal
Other
by argument that combines principles and supporting facts that logically show how an option is fact based.
Other factors that could be considered
Does it add new data?
Does it raise issues and data that have not been discussed before?
Does it add new data that supports or counters previous testimony?
Is it accurate?

This is pretty much a technical job. Sure, different objective people might categorize comments slightly differently, but the point is to organize that data for the decision makers. If there are questions, Board members can help decide.

Third, is to review the information to see how it affects the decisions the Board is going to make. When you put all the data together does it change assumptions that Board members made about a community or about whether a constitutional requirement is met?

Then the Board can make its decision based on the constitutional requirements supported by facts.

If the Board has two or more options that appear equally good or at least equally constitutional, then the Board can assess whether there is an obvious public preference for one option over others. But remember, that the Board took feedback about Cantwell and then broke some basic redistricting rules - breaking borough boundaries and compactness - to accommodate the suggestion. The Court overturned that decision.

Final Notes
One of the criticisms of the Board from the courts was that they made decisions based on personal preferences. It was pointed out that the Board members are not professional redistricting experts. They don't have special technical, professional training in this field.
Merely stating personal preferences is not enough. They need to test the validity of those preferences. Do the facts support them? For example: Is there a unique military connection between districts? Personal perception needs to be tested against hard numbers about where military live, their age, income, ethnicity, etc.

For most districts meeting constitutional requirements that don't upset the communities was not much of an issue. For a few it was and the Board was challenged. And if the Board doesn't do it right this time the Court likely will reject their decision again.

What about "the preponderance of public opinion" that Judge Matthews mentioned? The judge wrote that a Board member's personal preference does not override a preponderance of public opinion.

So this process reviews that public opinion, tests the assertions and the facts presented, then writes up the reasoning for making the decision the Board makes. It's not a popularity contest. It's not a vote. It's not an invitation for political parties to get their supporters to simply say they support one plan or another without any reasons given. The point is for the Board to make a more informed and defensible decision and document how they did it, so the court can review it.

Thank you for all the work you've put into this and I'm hoping your decisions in the next couple of days will be approved by the court and that further litigation will not arise.
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:39 pm

First Name: Emma

Last Name: Hill

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Adopt the Bahnke senate pairings

Public Comment: The Board should act immediately to comply with the Court’s requirements and to minimize confusion if this process is dragged out. In Anchorage, the Board should adopt the Bahnke senate pairings, instead of trying to come up with new pairings. The senate pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke. Board must act immediately: It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election. The redistricting board has an obligation to the public to resolve this quickly to avoid voter confusion and disenfranchisement

Adopt Bahnke pairings: These pairings, proposed by Melanie Bahnke, have already been presented and considered on the record, and were informed by public input and testimony. These pairings do not change the underlying deviation of districts, and upholds the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc, Eagle River w/ Eagle River etc.).
First Name: Amy

Last Name: Demboski

Group Affiliation, if applicable: Municipality of Anchorage Municipal Manager

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99519

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Veto of Anchorage Assembly Resolution RE: Redistricting Maps

Public Comment: 4/12/22 The Anchorage Assembly passed AR 2022-112(S) relating to AK Redistricting. Today, 4/13/22, Mayor Bronson delivered the below veto of AR 2022-112(S)

"Date: April 13, 2022

To: Anchorage Assembly

From: Mayor Dave Bronson

Subject: Veto of AR 2022-112(S)

Pursuant to Section 2.30.100 of the Anchorage Municipal Code (AMC) and Section 5.02 of the Municipal Charter (Charter), I hereby veto AR 2022-112(S), passed at the Assembly’s regular meeting of April 12, 2022.

I have reviewed the resolution and heard the arguments presented for and against the resolution. It is apparent that Anchorage Senate District Revision Option #2 (Option #2) before the Alaska Redistricting Board unlawfully reduces the representation of Chugiak-Eagle River in the Alaska Legislature's State Senate. For this reason, this veto should not be overridden.

The Chugiak-Eagle River area has, for several decades, been represented by two senators in the State Senate and, at least, three representatives in the State House. Option #2 significantly reduces the historical level of representation for the Chugiak-Eagle River area. Chugiak-Eagle River has already lost one representative in the Alaska House of Representatives in the recent redistricting efforts. Further reduction in representation in the Alaska Legislature would leave Chugiak-Eagle River underrepresented in the state capital.

Anchorage Senate District Revision Option #3B (Option #3B) allows for a demographically accurate representation of the Chugiak-Eagle River area. That map
maintains the split of Eagle River, pairing the district with the South Anchorage/Girdwood district. The Eagle River and South Anchorage map is preferrable because both communities face similar issues, like road service areas, fire dangers, and bears.

For the reasons stated above, I hereby veto AR 2022-112(S). I encourage the Assembly to review these concerns and ask that they adopt a resolution encouraging the Alaska Redistricting Board to adopt Option #3B."
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:41 pm

First Name: Steven

Last Name: Todd

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99567

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: I am a resident of Chugiak-Eagle River in the Peters Creek neighborhood, 99567. I am also a veteran of the U.S. Military. As a proud citizen of this country, and resident of Alaska, I'm sure to vote. But I'm not deeply involved in the political processes. I've never held office in any political party. I was prohibited from doing so while I was on active duty. Now that I'm a veteran, I could, but it's not how I choose to use my free time. I guess you could say I'm just a normal voter. However, I felt compelled to call today to testify because I was made aware of something which greatly disturbs me. I saw that proposal #2 is being considered which would link together the JBER military base with the neighborhoods in downtown Anchorage for a state Senate seat.

I cannot think of any combination which would be more disrespectful to us as veterans. Active duty operations are 24/7 while in state, being sent TDY out of state for training, and long deployments overseas, makes it tough for military members to get ballots mailed in on time. But we do our best, because it is yet another way that we serve our communities, state and country.

Downtown Anchorage is a world away from JBER. Downtown is comprised of mostly white collar workers with very high incomes worried about which restaurant to dine out. JBER is middle to low income families clipping coupons to buy groceries at the commissary, or even sometimes taking out payday loans in order to fill the gas tank. There is just no justification for combining these distinct and separate communities. In my twenty plus years living in Eagle River and Chugiak, the majority of my neighbors have been active duty and veterans.

I see there is another better alternative senate plan, 3B, which is based upon logic. I am one of thousands of veterans and military members who live in Eagle River-Chugiak, Peters Creek is the only reasonable pairing for JBER is with my district, #24. This is simply pairing the military in district 23 with the military in district 24. Choosing to separate us by sticking us with a district that is widely different than us would be a great disservice.

I urge you to reject the disjointed proposal, #2, and instead support the alternative plan, #3B. Thank you.
Hello,

As someone who grew up in Eagle River and has lived in south Anchorage, combining these two communities is another obvious gerrymander by the board. Map option 2, while not perfect, is the best and most just option of the two. While I am aware that this opinion will fall on John Binkley’s and Bethany Marcum’s deaf ears, I hope that Budd Simpson will not be persuaded by the illogical arguments that Mr. Binkley & Mrs. Marcum come up with.

The arguments against 3B are many and obvious, and the only reason to vote for it is blatantly political (i.e, Eagle River is accustomed to having more representation).

Please vote for fairness, I plead with you to select option 2.

Thank You,

John
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:45 pm

First Name: keenan

Last Name: plate

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99508

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): East Anchorage

Public Comment: I am writing to urge the redistricting board to adopt the Bahnke senate pairings as soon as possible and keep the East Anchorage district separate from Eagle River. They are very different communities with different needs and it would be unfair to the residents in both areas to combine their districts into one seat.
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:53 pm

First Name: Roger

Last Name: Holland

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Support Map Plan 2

Public Comment: Plan 2 is the logical, reasonable, and fair plan. Pairing 9 and 10 in south Anchorage is such a common sense and legal solution. I imagine Plan 3B would also be challenged and fail. The "contiguous border" between 9 and 22 might as well be the Berlin Wall because there is no crossing and no connection there. You have to pass through or touch 11 districts to travel between the two districts. Even the 2010 pairing of D-27 and D-28 was seen as in need of improvement, but 3B is a step in the wrong direction.
Date: April 13, 2022, 12:59 pm

First Name: Gene

Last Name: White

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99501

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Compact representation

Public Comment: Please keep our representation in small compact areas. I live close to downtown Anchorage. All of downtown and Government Hill are a very small area and it makes only sense to keep it together in one district. Thank you.
Hello,

I had planned to testify at today's redistricting meeting, but the LIO told me when I called in that public testimony had been cancelled. So, here are my comments:

My name is Kasey Casort, I'm a lifelong Alaskan, and I'm testifying today on behalf of myself in support of board option 2.

It's so important to me that our elections are fair at every step in the process. I've been a voter registrar since I was 18, and I used to work for a non-partisan civic education organization because I believe that fair, transparent elections and democratic processes are essential to our state's future and the wellbeing of all Alaskans.

I've been following redistricting since the beginning of this process, and I know the remaining decisions are not where I live in the Interior, but it still feels important to call in because anyone who has spent any time in Anchorage knows that one of these maps is splitting up communities that everybody knows live, work, and recreate together.

We've all seen the headlines about so-called "Eagle Exit," so it seems obvious that Eagle River would not want to be represented in a district that goes across the mountains to include part of Anchorage. You don't have to spend much time in Anchorage or Eagle River to know that the people in Eagle River have more in common with their neighbors in Eagle River than they do with South Anchorage. And I know you have heard that from public testimony already.

Most important of all, though, is the fact that the court has directed you all to fix the unconstitutional parts of your original map. My understanding is that changing these districts is outside that purview and seems likely to lead to MORE lawsuits, which I would be frustrated to see more state money wasted on since I know you have the opportunity to wrap this up constitutionally by adopting board map 2.

It's important to me, to our Alaska constitution, and to the future of our state that the redistricting committee adopts the best possible map. That is why I am asking the committee to adopt board map 2, which is the least overtly partisan and most sensible map.

Best,

Kasey Casort
Here is written testimony to support the phone calls I made to redistricting meetings:

I support Option 2 because residents of Eagle River, Hillside, and Downtown live, work and recreate together, so they should be represented together.

The court has found that both Eagle River and Muldoon are separate communities in terms of interest; these distinct communities are respected in option 2.

Option 2 is the only option on the table that complies with the court decisions.

There has been no specific reason as to why Eagle River should be split as a community of interest, so I oppose Option 3B, the Reudrich/Marcumn plan.
Date: April 13, 2022, 3:18 pm

First Name: Yarrow

Last Name: Silvers

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): JBER

Public Comment: In light of today's discussion I would like to put the following on record:

I have read through the testimony files and listened to the testimony.

Not one single JBER resident that I can see has testified and asked to be placed with Eagle River.
Date: April 13, 2022, 3:36 pm

First Name: Daniel
Last Name: Casner

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99504

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Anchorage Redistricting

Public Comment: The Board should act immediately to comply with the Court’s requirements and to minimize confusion if this process is dragged out. In Anchorage, the Board should adopt the Bahnke senate pairings, instead of trying to come up with new pairings. The senate pairings proposed by Melanie Bahnke are attached to this email, and an additional explanation of these main points are below. Board must act immediately: It is in the public interest to swiftly adopt a map with final senate pairings so that voters can familiarize themselves with their new districts, precincts, and voting locations, on top of a new election system (RCV) and an unprecedented special election. The redistricting board has an obligation to the public to resolve this quickly to avoid voter confusion and disenfranchisement.

Adopt Bahnke pairings: These pairings, proposed by Melanie Bahnke, have already been presented and considered on the record, and were informed by public input and testimony. These pairings do not change the underlying deviation of districts, and upholds the one person, one vote principle. In addition, they are the common-sense geographic and socioeconomic pairings (keeping Muldoon w/ Muldoon, West Anc. w/ West Anc, Eagle River w/ Eagle River etc.).
Dear Commission,

I urge the Commission to adopt "Option 2" for the Anchorage Senate Districts pairings, as set forth here (https://www.akredistrict.org/2022-proposed-revisions/). I oppose the adoption of "Option 3B."

I am a resident of East Anchorage, and reside in House District 21 and Senate District K. I was deeply opposed to the original Senate District the Commission adopted for Senate District K, which paired East Anchorage/South Muldoon with Eagle River. While geographically connected, it would have been impossible for residents of either House District 21 or 22 to travel between the two Districts without traveling through at least two other House Districts or by hiking over the Chugach Mountains (which would require trespassing on JBER and through a live fire training ground). Furthermore, East Anchorage/South Muldoon and Eagle River are distinct communities that do not share close socio-economic ties. Moreover, the manner in which the Commission adopted this pairing was suspect, leading the District Court and the Supreme Court to correctly determine that this pairing was an unlawful political gerrymander, leading us to this process.

Option 2 best reflects the Commission's obligations under the State and United States Constitutions, the Voting Rights Act, and the District Court and Supreme Court's opinions and orders. Pairing North Muldoon and South Muldoon (HD 20 and 21) makes sense, as both districts share close social, economic, and political ties. Pairing all of Eagle River, Chugiak, and Eklutna (HD 22 and 24) likewise makes sense. These communities share close social, economic, and political ties. HD 20 and 21 already comprise the same Anchorage Assembly district, just as HD 22 and 24 comprise the same Anchorage Assembly district.

Finally, I am opposed to the Commission adopting Option 3B. While Option 3B maintains the HD 20 and 21 pairing, it pairs Upper Hillside (HD 9) with Eagle River (HD 22). In order to facilitate this pairing, Option 3B pairs Fort Richardson (HD 23) with Eagle River (HD 24). The Upper Hillside-Eagle River (HD 9 and 22) pairing is unacceptable and is most likely an unlawful political gerrymander for the same reasons the original Senate District K pairing (HD 21 and 22) was an unlawful gerrymander. Like with the unlawful Senate District K pairing, while HD 9 and HD 22 are technically geographically contiguous, unless a resident of either district scales the Chugach Mountains, they are not meaningfully contiguous. Residents cannot travel between the districts without having to travel through a minimum of five other districts (while the ability to easily travel between house districts in the same senate paring should not be the per se standard, as that would make it impossible to ever pair rural house districts, when pairing urban districts or districts on the road system, the inability of residents of these districts to actually travel between the two districts without leaving the senate district should be weighed in considering whether the pairing was reasonable). Moreover, Upper Hillside and Eagle River are district communities and do not
share social, economic, or political ties. To be sure, both communities are within the Municipality of Anchorage, but anyone who has spent more than five minutes in the Bowl knows that Eagle River and Hillside are vastly distinct communities. The logic employed by the Commission in this pairing could justify pairing Chugiak and Eklutna with Girdwood, which would be absurd (much like the Commission's pairing of Whittier with the Greater Mat-Su).

Eagle River/Chugiak/Eklutna are represented by two House Districts. No one seriously doubts the close social, economic, and political ties between these communities, indeed public testimony from Eagle River residents during the last round overwhelmingly opposed the (now unlawful) HD 21 and 22 pairing (as did residents of South Anchorage/Muldoon). The proposed HD 9 and 22 pairing is no better. The undeniably close ties of HD 22 and 24 all but require the Commission to pair these districts together in a Senate district. Considering the close ties of these communities, the Commission would need to provide a well-reasoned explanation for why HD 22 and 24 should not be paired together. During the last round, the Commission was unable to provide such an explanation, instead stating only that the unlawful pairing was designed to increase Eagle River's/Chugiak's/Eklutna's representation, a reason found to be an unlawful political gerrymander.

Option 3B's pairing of HD 9 and 22 (as well as HD 23 and 24) suffer the same fatal flaws as the original map that was held unlawful. Balanced against HD 22's and 24's close ties, it is manifestly unreasonable for the Commission to pair Upper Hillside (HD 9) with Eagle River (HD 22). Moreover, Option 3B would disproportionally increase Eagle River's/Chugiak's/Eklutna's representation in the Senate. Based on the 2020 Census, the Commission correctly determined that Eagle River, Chugiak, and Eklutna made enough residents for only two House Districts. Since Senate Districts are comprised of two House Districts, and considering the close ties of these communities, Eagle River, Chugiak, and Eklutna should naturally be represented by a single Senate seat. The District Court and Supreme Court correctly found that the Commission's stated goal of increasing Eagle River's, Chugiak's, and Eklutna's representation by splitting these communities between two Senate districts was an unlawful political gerrymander. While Option 3B fixes this unlawful defect with regard to the HD 21 and 22 pairing, it suffers the same fundamental flaw by pairing the two Eagle River/Chugiak/Eklutna districts with the Fort Richardson and Upper Hillside districts, thereby disproportionally increasing Eagle River's/Chugiak's/Eklutna's Senate representation. Weighed against the close ties between HD 22 and 24, the only plausible explanation for the Commission pairing HD 9 and 22 and HD 23 and 24 is to increase Eagle River's/Chugiak's/Eklutna's representation in the Senate, a goal the Courts have already found to be an unlawful political gerrymander.

In conclusion, I strongly urge the Commission to adopt Option 2 and I am deeply opposed to Option 3B. I thank the Commission (it's staff and members) for its continued hard work on this critically important endeavor, and for considering these comments.

Respectfully,

Wesley James Furlong
Date: April 13, 2022, 3:57 pm

First Name: Ed

Last Name: Boudreau

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [Redacted]

Your ZIP Code: 99577

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Redistrict of Eagle River Dis 23

Public Comment: I could not believe what I read about combining District 23 with 17. The first thing that came to mind was the purposeful attempt in the nullification the military families voices, both active duty and especially Vets like myself. It is well known that the vast majority of the military families live in Eagle and Chugiak and not in S. Anchorage and our voices differ in so many ways then S. Anchorage. Who will be our voice? Will these elected officials even come out to our area to be heard? I do not believe they would. I further believe the creators of map 2 are clearly trying to manipulate the regions for political influence and I am wholly against it. Therefore I call upon the board to support map 3b as this is the fairest way that all parties will be heard as it should be.
I am writing in support of Option 2 and I strongly oppose Option 3B (Reudrich / Marcumn plan).

The residents of Eagle River work live and recreate in Eagle River, they should be represented together and option 2 is the only version that accomplishes this. Option 2 is the only option on the table that complies with the court decisions. Option 2 respects the socio-economic integration of Eagle River; the court has found that both Eagle River and Muldoon are separate communities of interest; these distinct communities are respected in option 2. Option 2 is the only option that logically keeps Eagle River paired with Eagle River and does not split up Eagle River unnecessarily.

There has been no specific reason as to why Eagle River should be split as a community of interest.

Option 3 breaks existing communities of interest and contains illogical pairings that do not represent where residents of East Anchorage and Eagle River live, work and play.

By splitting Eagle River, option 3 does not comply with the supreme & superior court ruling given that the court decision mandates a fix for both east anchorage, this means the board must pair eagle river with eagle river and muldoon with muldoon.

Thank you.
Barbara Gingell
Date: April 13, 2022, 4:08 pm

First Name: Andrew
Last Name: Brennan

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: 99516

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Senate district pairings

Public Comment: Please do not pair South Anchorage and Eagle River into the same senate district. We are two entirely different communities with separate interests. We do not go to the same store, schools, etc. We have separate issues and concerns that cannot be represented by the same senator.
Date: April 13, 2022, 4:53 pm

First Name: Cindy
Last Name: Lelake

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: 99507

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): Extreme disappointment and a ray of hope

Public Comment: I’m disappointed by the Redistricting Board’s final decision to adopt map option 3B. I’m also disappointed in myself for my sincere belief, before today, that another decision was possible. However, I am encouraged that this time the two dissenters were allowed their own signature page without extended and acrimonious debate. Progress is possible, even if it comes in baby steps.
Dear Alaska Redistricting Board,

Anchorage neighborhoods should share political representation with the same communities where they live. Board Option 2 maintains the integrity of Anchorage communities and keeps together the downtown communities, the Hillside communities, and the Eagle River communities.

I oppose Board Option 3B, which splits up the community in a way that doesn’t make sense to Anchorage. It is the same deceit voted by the Board that failed to pass muster with the Supreme Court.

Sincerely,

Kevin Banks
To the Alaska Redistricting Board:

As residents of Anchorage District 9, South Anchorage, we do not wish to be joined with District 22 Eagle River. The pairing makes no sense. Google Maps estimates my fastest transit from my home at 16920 Tideview Dr. to Arctic Valley in District 22 to be 43 minutes and 15 miles. It requires going downtown and around the mountains. I have made the traverse on foot but it took me a weekend of camping out and skis to do it. It would make sense to pair us with our adjacent district 10 which is contiguous with us by street and foot traffic. We support 2022 proposed revision 2 and oppose 3B.

Thank you.

William and Beth Saltonstall
16920 Tideview Dr.
Anchorage, Alaska
99516
907-338-7615
willsaltonstall@gmail.com
Date: April 13, 2022, 9:16 pm

First Name: Katherine

Last Name: McDonald

Group Affiliation, if applicable: N/A

Email or Phone Contact: N/A

Your ZIP Code: Anchorage

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): 4/9/2022 ARB Meeting Verbal Public Testimony

Public Comment: Michelle has lived in Anchorage for almost three decades in various locations: JBER, South Muldoon, Abbott, and now in proposed District 9 in Hillside. Michelle reviewed a timeline of her public comments and occurrences during the redistricting process:

1) September 18, 2021: Noted the importance of providing Senate district pairings early for public comment, then drew and submitted maps for Anchorage

2) November 7, 2021: Proposed Senate pairings, not including Eagle River districts because they are considered to be separate communities

3) November 8, 2021: Board discussion was quoted on Senate pairings that gave a sense that District 9 (now named District 11) would be paired with District 15; Michelle testified and applauded the board for proposing to pair District 9 with an O'Malley district.

November 9, 2021: The board emerged from the executive session to put a vote on the record with no justification given for Senate pairings for Anchorage; the pairings did not include the consensus of District 9 (now named District 11). Districts 9 and 10 were paired and unaligned with the unanimous public testimony from the day prior.

April 5, 2022: Michelle submitted written testimony and ranked her support of the proposed maps placing Option 1 first because it pairs Districts 9 and 11. After becoming further educated, Michelle realized that Option 1, although aligned with the constitution, did not comply with the court's ruling. Michelle applauded the board for removing the option for consideration. In the same written testimony, Michelle supported Option 2, too.

During the April 9, 2022, ARB meeting, Michelle testified in support of Option 2. While some board members may state that the contiguity is all that matters, if that is the case, Michelle asked how the courts could have found the pairing of Districts 22 and
21 to be illegal as they also touch through the Chugach Mountains.

Intent can be shown legally in ignoring the charge of the court remand and in the spirit of ignoring the will of the citizens whose testimonies include socioeconomic linkages in communities.

Michelle attempted to put herself in the board's shoes and noted that she would think the court reprimanded her actions based on intent. She would be concerned that her actions, especially in pairing Eagle River over a non-populated mountain range, would appear to be political gerrymandering to the court. Michelle would also be concerned that selecting District 9 with the Eagle River district could look like political gerrymandering.

The JBER and Chugiak-Eagle River pairings were presented in all four of Member Marcum's maps; this was also the case for the Hillside and O'Malley districts. Michelle asked what is so compelling about the Eagle River and JBER pairings that the board must maintain it at all costs? The board gives little consternation in breaking the verbal consensus expressed at the board meeting on November 8, 2021, to pair the O'Malley and Hillside districts. To attempt political gerrymandering again, the board must resort to the "Rank 3" Option 3-B to once again fragment Eagle River.
Announcements

Litigation Action Updates
See our Litigation page for updates on current court filings and orders. See Litigation Page>

Board Adopts Revised Senate Seats
After seven days of public hearings, the Board met on April 13, 2022 and adopted proposed Anchorage Senate Seat Pairings Option 3B. Jump to 2022 Proclamation>

Supreme Court Decision
The Alaska Supreme Court Affirms 39 of 40 House Districts and 19 of 20 Senate Districts while remanding the Board to re-work the boundary of House District 36 and Senate District K. Litigation Details>

Superior Court Decision
Superior Court Judge Thomas Matthews published his decision on the five legal challenges to the 2021 Proclamation Plan. Litigation Details>

Get Involved

Stay Informed
Signup for email updates to receive advanced notice of upcoming board meetings and activities. Signup Now>

Make Your Voice Heard
Submit your comments on Court remanded changes to House District 36 or Senate District K. Submissions become part of the public record and will be printed in the public comment section of the next Board Packet. A valid Alaska zip code is required. Submit Public Comment Now>

Map Gallery

2021 Final Redistricting Map
At a public hearing on November 5th, 2021 the Board adopted a final redistricting map which will be expressed in metes and bounds in a Proclamation of Redistricting due Nov 20, 2021. See Final Map>

Past Proposed Plans
At a public hearing on September 20th, 2021 the Board adopted Proposed Plan v.3 and v.4 which replaced the previously adopted Plans v.1 and v.2 and maps from four third-party drafters. See Past Proposed Plans>

Proposed Plans Interactive
Use the Multi-Plan Interactive to compare the six adopted proposed plans. Toggle on and off each plan to compare districts. Note: open sidebar on left to toggle visibility. Launch Multi-Plan Interactive>
2022 April Proclamation

During a public hearing on April 13, 2022 the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted a Proclamation of Redistricting removing Cantwell from District 36, addressing errors with Senate District K, and making other necessary adjustments.

- Jump to Map Gallery >
- Interactive 2022 April Proclamation Map >
- 2022 April Proclamation, signed PDF >
- 2022 April Proclamation Packet, signed PDF >
  24mb - 74 pages, includes regional and district maps
- 2022 April Proclamation Metes and Bounds >
- 2022 April Proclamation Shapefile >
- 2022 April Autobound.ezip >
  Requires GIS software to open and view
- 2022 April House Core Constituency Report PDF >
- 2022 April House Core Constituency Report Excel >
- 2022 April Senate Core Constituency Report PDF >
- 2022 April Senate Core Constituency Report Excel >
- District Population & Deviation Table >
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISTRICT</th>
<th>All Persons</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Dev.</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,921</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-2.26%</td>
<td>-414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18,048</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.56%</td>
<td>-287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,195</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.76%</td>
<td>-140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18,122</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.16%</td>
<td>-213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18,707</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.03%</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18,434</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>18,465</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.71%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>18,471</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18,284</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.28%</td>
<td>-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18,205</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.71%</td>
<td>-130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>18,103</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.26%</td>
<td>-232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>18,217</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.64%</td>
<td>-118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>18,523</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18,185</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.82%</td>
<td>-150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18,168</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.91%</td>
<td>-167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18,182</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.83%</td>
<td>-153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18,213</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.66%</td>
<td>-122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>18,239</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.52%</td>
<td>-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18,203</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.72%</td>
<td>-132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>18,243</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.50%</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>18,414</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>18,285</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.27%</td>
<td>-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>18,023</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.70%</td>
<td>-312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18,032</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-1.65%</td>
<td>-303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>18,822</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>18,807</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>18,799</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18,793</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.43%</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>18,736</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.19%</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>18,294</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.22%</td>
<td>-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>18,522</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>18,382</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18,367</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>18,351</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>18,226</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-0.59%</td>
<td>-109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>17,853</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-2.63%</td>
<td>-482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>17,453</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>-4.81%</td>
<td>-882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>18,824</td>
<td>18,335</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2022 April Proclamation Population Tabulation
2022 Proposed Revisions

UpdAtE: The Board adopted revised redistricting on April 13, 2022.

During public hearings on April 4, 5, and 6, 2022, the Board unanimously adopted two proposed Senate district revisions to the 2021 Proclamation Plan, which will be subject of public feedback and discussion at future meetings.

Anchorage Senate District Options

The following two proposed Anchorage Senate maps — Option 2 and Option 3B — were unanimously adopted as proposed plans for public review and discussion during hearings on April 4, 5, and 6, 2022. Option 1, which was previously adopted for discussion, was removed from consideration by unanimous consent during a public hearing on April 6, 2022.

Anchorage Senate Districts — Option 2

Click map to enlarge

Anchorage Senate Districts — Option 3B

Click map to enlarge

Cantwell Revision

These graphics illustrate the original 2021 Cantwell assignment to District 36. The second graphic illustrates the revisions to Districts 29, 30, and 36 adopted by unanimous consent of the Board during a public hearing on April 6, 2022. The changes were made in response to the Alaska Supreme Court order of March 25, 2022.

This changes were made in response to the Alaska Supreme Court order of March 25, 2022. Click map images to enlarge
What do you think?

Use this form to provide public input on issues related the re-drawing of House District 36 or Senate District K under reconsideration by the Board after the Supreme Court remand order. Your comments will be printed out and included with the public testimony packet at the next Board meeting.

CAUTION: What you write will become part of the public record attributed to you by name. Anonymous comments will be not be included in the public record. Profane or inappropriate comments will be immediately deleted. Do not disparage another person – you may be held liable for any slanderous statements.

First Name *

Last Name *

Group Affiliation, if applicable

Email or Phone Contact *

Your ZIP Code *

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable)

Public Comment

Submit
Announcements

**Board Meeting CANCELLED for Apr 14**
The Board meeting previously scheduled for Thursday, April 14 has been cancelled. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 13**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Wed, April 13 at 1pm. The public may listen via Zoom, teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 9**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Saturday, April 9 at Noon. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 8**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Friday, April 8 at 10am. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 7**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Thurs, April 7 at Noon. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 6**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Wed, April 6 at 10am. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 5**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Tues, April 5 at 10am. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 4**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Mon, April 4 at 8am. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]

**Board Meeting Scheduled for Apr 2**
The Board will meet via Zoom on Sat, April 2 at 2pm. Public testimony will be taken by teleconference or in-person at the Anchorage LIO, 1500 West Benson Blvd, Anchorage. [See Public Notice >]
Litigation Action Updates
See our Litigation page for updates on current court filings and orders. See Litigation Page >

Board Adopts Revised Senate Seats
After seven days of public hearings, the Board met on April 13, 2022 and adopted proposed Anchorage Senate Seat Pairings Option 3B. Jump to 2022 Proclamation >

Supreme Court Decision
The Alaska Supreme Court Affirms 39 of 40 House Districts and 19 of 20 Senate Districts while remanding the Board to re-work the boundary of House District 36 and Senate District K. Litigation Details >

Superior Court Decision
Superior Court Judge Thomas Matthews published his decision on the five legal challenges to the 2021 Proclamation Plan. Litigation Details >

Redistricting Proclamation Adopted
During a public hearing on Nov 10, 2021 the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted a Final Proclamation of Redistricting defining new legislative districts for the coming decade. Proclamation Resources >

Senate Assignment Table
During a public hearing on Nov 9, 2021 the Board adopted senate seat pairings, set senate constituency truncation cutoff and assigned a new table of Senate election terms. See Assignment Table >

2021 Final Redistricting Map
During a public hearing on November 5, 2021 the Board adopted a 2021 Final Redistricting Map. Jump to Map Gallery >

Board Approves Proposed Plans
On Sept 20 the Alaska Redistricting Board adopted six proposed redistricting plans which will be the basis of public meetings across Alaska. Full Story >

Public Map-Drawing Tool Launches
The Board is pleased to highlight our web-based redistricting tool which allows anyone with a browser and connectivity to try their hand at drawing new legislative districts. The system uses a paint-brush method to color in each district with 1 of 40 colors. Give it a try >

First look at 2020 Census Data
Reports are posted on 2020 Census data. Compare 2010 to 2020 precinct populations statewide and see how the current house district populations compare to the new ideal district size of 18,335. Learn more >

Alaska Redistricting Board Announces Next Steps
Today the Alaska Redistricting Board received legacy-formatted PL 94-171 Redistricting data electronically from the United States Census Bureau. Full Story >

Redistricting Data coming Aug 12
The Census announced on Aug 5th that legacy-formatted redistricting data will now be published Thursday, August 12, four days earlier than the previously announced August 16 target date. Census Info >

Board Retains Voting Rights Act Expertise
The Board has executed a contract with seasoned Voting Rights Act consultant Bruce Adelson who will be assisted by Dr. Jonathon Katz and Dr. Douglas Johnson. In the 2011 cycle, Mr. Adelson provided VRA expertise to the Alaska Division of Elections. See Full RFI >

Census Releases Statewide Population
Alaska’s resident population as of April 1, 2020 was 733,391 which means the target population for each of Alaska’s 40 House districts will be 18,335 for the coming redistricting cycle. More U.S. Census Info >

Census Redistricting Data Update
On April 1, the U.S. Census notified the Board that Redistricting data will be available the 3rd week of August in a "legacy format", weeks earlier than the previous Sept 30 deadline. See U.S. Census Info >

Redistricting Board Adopts Policies
In public meetings on Dec. 29 and Jan. 26 the Board unanimously adopted a revised procurement code and suite of open meetings, records, compensation and travel policies. See Board Policy Page >

Alaska Redistricting Board Retains Key Staff
Today the Alaska Redistricting Board is pleased to announce the hiring of Peter Torkelson as Executive Director and TJ Presley as Deputy Director. Full Story >