

**IN THE SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF ALASKA
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT AT FAIRBANKS**

In Re 2011 Redistricting Cases.) **CONSOLIDATED CASE NO.:**
) **4FA-11-2209-CI**
) 4FA-11-2213 CI
) 1JU-11-782 CI

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

**A.
INTRODUCTION**

1. Defendant Alaska Redistricting Board (“Board”) is a statutorily created board vested with the authority and responsibility of reapportioning the House and Senate districts immediately following the official reporting of the decennial census of the United States. The Board adopted its Proclamation Plan as required by the Alaska Constitution on June 13, 2011. On July 13, 2011, Plaintiffs George Riley and Ronald Dearborn (“Riley Plaintiffs”) filed a lawsuit, challenging certain aspects of the Proclamation Plan under the Alaska Constitution. The Fairbanks North Star Borough (“FNSB”) also challenged the Proclamation Plan, as did the City of Petersburg. However, the FNSB dismissed its case against the Board on November 3, 2011, and the court resolved the City of Petersburg’s sole remaining issue on summary judgment. Thus, only the Riley Plaintiffs participated at trial.

2. Trial was held in Fairbanks from January 9 through January 13, 2012, and January 16 through January 17, 2012.

3. In anticipation of trial and as required by Civil Rule 90.8(d), the Board filed with this Court and the Supreme Court a copy of the Board Record, which contained more than 13,000 pages of documents, on August 25, 2011. The Board Record consists of nearly every document either created or received by the Board throughout the entire process. It is a

complete record of the 2011 redistricting process. It contains meeting materials and transcripts from all board meetings and public hearings, and copies of all the third party plans adopted by the Board, as well as the Board's option plans. It also contains a copy of Dr. Handley's final report submitted to the Department of Justice in support of preclearance, as well as a complete copy of the Board's preclearance submission. The Board provided a hard copy and a searchable, electronic copy to this Court, and electronic copies to all the parties. The Board supplemented the Board Record as necessary, again providing both hard copies and searchable, electronic copies. A complete copy of the Board Record is also on file with the Supreme Court, under case number S-14441.

4. Based on the evidence in the Record as supplemented by the testimony and exhibits introduced at trial, this Court finds as fact the following:

B.
THE REDISTRICTING PROCESS

5. Article VI, section 4 of the Alaska Constitution vests in a statutorily created Board the authority and responsibility of reapportioning the House and Senate districts immediately following the official reporting of the decennial census of the United States. This Board, known as the Alaska Redistricting Board, consists of five individuals appointed by different political leaders as outlined in Article VI, section 8(b) of the Alaska Constitution. Article VI, section 4 requires the Board establish 40 single-member House districts and 20 single-member Senate districts, each composed of two House districts. The ideal population of each House district is determined by dividing the state's total population by 40. Article VI, Section 6 requires the House districts be contiguous and compact and contain, as nearly as practicable, a relatively integrated socio-economic area. Section 6 also requires Senate districts be composed as nearly as practicable of two contiguous House districts. Statutes and civil rules

dictate other aspects of the process, such as the planning committee responsible for handling administrative tasks prior to the Board's installation.

6. In the spring of 2010, the Planning Committee began preparations for the 2011 Redistricting Board. Board members and staff testified the Planning Committee submitted an RFP for redistricting software, to which Citygate responded and was ultimately chosen. The Planning Committee also purchased the laptops for the individual Board members, as well as rented office space. The Planning Committee also contacted Dr. Lisa Handley, who had served as the Voting Rights Act expert for the 2001 Redistricting Board, to give a presentation on the Voting Rights Act. She recommended what information the Board staff should gather in preparation for the Census data to be used by the Board's Voting Rights Act expert.

7. Eric Sandberg, a geographer with the Research and Analysis section of the Department of Labor, assisted the Planning Committee in selecting a software vendor and the appropriate hardware needed to run the specialty software. Mr. Sandberg's boss, Brynn Keith, was a member of the Planning Committee. The Department of Labor had provided a GIS specialist to assist the Board in the 1990 and 2000 redistricting cycle, and his boss recommended Mr. Sandberg to assist the 2011 Redistricting Board. Mr. Sandberg testified that he regularly works with GIS software, and would be able to answer any questions the Board members may have about the software. Mr. Sandberg also testified that as an analyst, he researches population trends throughout Alaska in preparing population projections. He was therefore familiar with the difficulties faced by the 2011 Redistricting Board.

8. On June 25, 2010, Governor Sean Parnell appointed John Torgerson of Soldotna, Executive Director of the Kenai Peninsula Economic Development District and former State Senator, and Albert Clough of Juneau, a retired commercial pilot, as the first

members of the Redistricting Board. Albert Clough resigned on February 23, 2011, when he accepted full-time employment with the State of Alaska. Governor Parnell appointed PeggyAnn McConnochie, a real estate broker from Juneau, to replace Mr. Clough on the same day. Senate President Gary Stevens appointed Robert Brodie, a real estate broker and former mayor of Kodiak, on June 25, 2010. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mike Chenault, appointed Jim Holm of Fairbanks, a business owner and former state representative, on July 8, 2010. Alaska Supreme Court Chief Justice Carpeneti appointed Marie Greene of Kotzebue, CEO of Nana, Inc., and an Alaska Native (Inupiat), on August 31, 2010. Board member John Torgerson was elected Chair.

9. The Record reflects, as supplemented by the testimony of Board members and Board staff, that the Board faced a difficult challenge given demographic changes in Alaska's population over the last ten years. Alaska Native population in the rural areas experienced a significant loss in population, with a large number of Alaska Natives moving to more urban areas, causing an out-migration. This trend left the Alaska Native districts, which must be maintained under the federal Voting Rights Act, severely under populated. Board members and staff testified this meant the Board was for the first time in Alaska redistricting history going to have to add urban population to a rural, Alaska Native district in order to meet the one-person, one-vote requirement. It was not a matter of "if" urban and rural population were going to have to be combined, only a matter of "where" that population would come from.

10. The Board held its first meeting on September 13, 2010, and met regularly through June 14, 2011. Pursuant to Article VI, Section 10 of the Alaska Constitution, the Board was required to adopt a draft plan or plans 30 days after the reporting of the decennial

census of the United States, and a final plan and proclamation no later than 90 days after the reporting of the census.

11. The Board hired Ron Miller to serve as Executive Director, who began work on October 26, 2010. Ron Miller then hired Taylor Bickford as assistant director on November 18, 2010, and Mary Core as an administrative assistant on January 3, 2011. Mr. Miller also hired Jim Ellis as an administrative coordinator on March 21, 2011.

12. Mr. Bickford testified he spent several weeks reviewing materials from the 2001 redistricting cycle in anticipation of the extremely accelerated process. He testified the official documents from the 2001 Redistricting Board were misplaced, so he relied on documents from the 2001 redistricting cases. He used these documents to create an electronic archive and set forth a timeline for the 2011 Redistricting Board.

13. All Board Members and Mr. Miller attended redistricting training at the National Conference of State Legislators ("NCSL") Redistricting Seminar in Providence, Rhode Island in September 25-28, 2010. Chair Torgerson, Mr. Miller, Mr. Bickford and Board counsel attended the NCLS Redistricting Seminar in National Harbor, Maryland on January 20-24, 2011.

14. Prior to the release of the Census data on March 15, 2011, Eric Sandberg began to collect and prepare election data as advised by Dr. Handley to the Planning Committee. Mr. Miller and Mr. Bickford began preparing a Request for Proposal for a Voting Rights Act expert. Chairman Torgerson testified that after the 2001 redistricting cycle, the budget for the Board was transferred from the legislature to the Governor's office. Under the Governor's office, the Board had to submit an RFP for every service it required, including legal counsel, a Voting Rights Act expert, and a redistricting software vendor. Board members and staff

testified this process inherently took more time to hire necessary components than if the budget had been under the legislature.

15. On March 15, 2011, the Board received block level census data from the U.S. Bureau of the Census. Thus, the Board had until April 14, 2011, to adopt a draft plan, and until June 13, 2011, to adopt a final plan. The Census Bureau provided the information electronically in a TIGER format. The Board's software vendor, Citygate, loaded the TIGER files into the GIS redistricting software, and sent the updated shapefiles to the Board. The 2010 census data showed a total statewide population of 710,231 people. Therefore, the ideal size of a House district was 17,755, the number obtained by dividing the total population by 40.

16. On March 16, 2011, the Board published its "Alaska Redistricting Board 2011 Redistricting Guidelines." These guidelines set forth, in order of priority, the criteria the Board used when adopting its Proclamation Plan so as to comply with federal and state constitutional and statutory requirements. The Board listed compliance with federal law first, beginning with the one-person, one-vote mandate, and then the federal Voting Rights Act. The Board next listed the state constitutional requirements of compactness, contiguity, and relative socio-economic integration. The Board encouraged all third parties who submitted plans to the Board to follow these same guidelines.

17. The Board then scheduled a series of eight "pre-plan" public hearings in the state's population centers from March 22 to March 31. The purpose of these "pre-plan" hearings was to solicit public testimony on existing election district boundaries, and to receive general advice, ideas, and comments from the public about redistricting issues to assist the Board in developing draft plans. At these hearings, the Board also provided interested groups and individuals with the opportunity to submit proposed plans. The Board held these public

hearings in Anchorage on March 22, in Wasilla on March 23, in Juneau on March 25, in Ketchikan on March 26, in Fairbanks on March 28, in Kotzebue on March 29, in Bethel on March 30, and via statewide teleconference at the Legislative Information Office in Anchorage on March 31.

18. Prior to the start of the March 31 statewide teleconference, the Board received scheduled plan presentations from a number of groups. The RIGHTS Coalition, Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting (“AFFER”), and Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (“AFFR”) all submitted statewide plans and made presentations about those plans to the Board. Several local government entities, including the City and Borough of Juneau, Bristol Bay Borough, and the City of Valdez, submitted regional or single district plans. On April 8, 2011, the Alaska Bush Caucus, a group made up of rural, primarily Alaska Native state legislators submitted four alternative plans for the Alaska Native districts.

19. The Board began deliberating on draft plans on April 4, 2011. Board members and staff continued working, in formal public meetings and in work sessions of no more than two Board members, until April 13, 2011. The Board reported and discussed the products of these work sessions at each meeting.

20. On April 8, 2011, the Board hired Dr. Lisa Handley to serve as its Voting Rights Act expert. Chairman Torgerson notified the Board of its choice at the April 4, 2011 board meeting. A handful of individuals responded to the RFP submitted sometime in the beginning of March, and the Board ultimately chose Dr. Handley.

21. On April 9, 2011, the Board adopted a resolution to create nine protected Alaska Native districts.

22. On April 11, 2011, Dr. Handley made a presentation to the Board consisting of a general overview of the Voting Rights Act as well as an outline of what work she would perform for the Board. During her presentation, Dr. Handley explained the type of analysis she would be performing for the Board over the next few weeks. She explained the Board would need to create the same number of districts that provided Alaska Natives the ability to elect their candidate of choice as the 2001 redistricting plan. This is known as the "Benchmark" for Department of Justice preclearance under the Voting Rights Act. From her Racial Bloc Voting analysis, Dr. Handley could determine the percentage of Alaska Native voting age population ("NVAP") necessary in each of these protected districts to provide Alaska Natives with the ability to elect their candidate of choice. She discussed with Eric Sandberg what information she would need in order to perform her Racial Bloc Voting analysis, which included the election data he had collected prior to receiving the Census data. Dr. Handley also strongly urged the Board to draft the Alaska Native Districts first given the demographic difficulties with which the Board was faced.

23. Dr. Handley was in Afghanistan at the time of the teleconference, working on a project for the United Nations. She testified that she did not return to the states until sometime near the end of April, at which time she began her Racial Bloc Voting analysis for Alaska.

24. On April 13, 2011, the Board adopted a total of five statewide plans to be submitted for public comment plus a number of regional and single district plans at its April 13, 2011, board meeting. Two of the five draft statewide plans were prepared by the Board and staff. These plans were designated Board Option 1 and Board Option 2, and included regional alternatives for the Mat-Su Borough and Southeast Alaska. The other three statewide plans adopted by the Board were the March 31, state-wide plans submitted by AFFR, AFFER, and

the RIGHTS Coalition on March 31. The Board also adopted the regional and single-district plans submitted by the City and Borough of Juneau, Bristol Bay Borough, the City of Valdez, and the Alaska Bush Caucus, in order to allow the maximum possible public input.

25. Prior to receiving Dr. Handley's Racial Bloc Voting analysis, the Board operated under the 2001 redistricting cycle's previous target percentage 35% Alaska Native VAP when drawing protected Alaska Native districts. At the April 11, 2011, board meeting, Dr. Handley explained ten years ago in Alaska, a district with 35% Alaska Native routinely elected a Native-preferred candidate. This number was deduced by performing a Racial Bloc Voting analysis, which she had not yet done. Thus, she informed the Board that the number could be higher or lower, or remain the same.

26. Sometime in late April, Dr. Handley asked Eric Sandberg to create a chart that showed the population deviations in the current districts. Mr. Sandberg testified he used the shapefiles from the 2000 redistricting provided by the Census Bureau and used the 2010 population data to determine the current population of the current districts. This chart, identified as Joint Exhibit J38, showed several of the Alaska Native districts were drastically under populated. Dr. Handley therefore advised the Board begin drawing the Alaska Native districts first given the severity of the situation.

27. Between April 18 and May 6, the Board held public hearings on the draft plans in 32 communities across Alaska. During this time period, the Board and its staff logged nearly 60,000 air miles. These hearings, attended by over 640 people, were held in Anchorage, Fairbanks, Juneau, Cordova, Healy, Palmer, Delta Junction, Nome, Dutch Harbor, Kotzebue, Tok, Cold Bay, Bethel, Glennallen, Galena, Barrow, Kodiak, Sitka, Craig, Ketchikan, Wrangell, Seward, Petersburg, Homer, Kenai, Skagway, Haines, Valdez, Angoon, King

Salmon, Dillingham, and Hoonah. The full Board attended both hearings in Anchorage, as well as the hearing in Fairbanks and Juneau. For the other hearings, the Board and staff split into three teams made up of two Board members and/or staff. The staff drafted written reports summarizing testimony received at each public hearing and presented those reports to the full Board on May 16, 2011.

28. Throughout the process, the Board received thousands of pages of written comment on the redistricting process and proposed plans in addition to comments at public hearings. The Board updated its website on a daily basis to include the public comments it received. A number of governmental entities, Alaska Native Corporations, Tribal Councils, and Alaska Native villages passed resolutions either supporting a regional plan or formally acknowledging its preferred district. Private plans were updated via email throughout the process, and two governmental entities, the Ketchikan Gateway Borough and the Mat-Su Borough, submitted regional plans for the Board's consideration.

29. The last public hearing was a statewide teleconference held in Anchorage at the Legislative Information Office on Friday, May 6. The Board invited groups to submit any new or revised plans. AFFR, AFFER, the RIGHTS Coalition, and Calista Corporation all submitted revised statewide plans, while the Municipality of Anchorage and FNSB both submitted revised regional plans. The teleconference also provided a forum for people from communities not visited by the Board to call in and provide comment.

30. The Board and staff testified that throughout the process, many of the third parties submitted plans with incomplete and incorrect population data, including using total Alaska Native population numbers instead of NVAP population numbers for their Alaska Native protected districts. This meant that many of the third party plans incorrectly stated the

number of protected Alaska Native districts contained in their proposed plans. As a result, Board staff routinely had to download the shapefiles from the third parties into the Board's redistricting software and calculate the NVAP percentage for the third party plans so that the plans could be properly analyzed by the Board.

31. For example, Mr. Sandberg testified the RIGHTS Coalition used a different software program than the Board that was not directly compatible with the Board's software. As a result, he routinely had to convert the data from text files to shapefiles in order to download it into the Board's redistricting software. All of the Statewide Plans submitted by the three major third party groups, AFFR, AFFER and the RIGHTS Coalition on May 6 used total Native Population and not NVAP. As May 6th was the end of a long three week public hearing process, Board staff was given the weekend off and did not convert the third party plans expecting to do it the following week.

32. On Sunday May 8, 2011, the Board's Executive Director Ron Miller unexpectedly passed away. In addition to the emotional effect on the Board and its staff, Mr. Miller's death had the expected disruption to the Board's administration and process, requiring the appointment of a new executive director. Importantly, Mr. Miller had served as the point of contact between the Board and Dr. Handley, and had planned on providing Dr. Handley with the third party plans received on May 6. As a result of his death, the responsibility fell to Taylor Bickford, who was immediately made acting Executive Director and tasked with quickly coming up to speed on all of Mr. Miller's responsibilities.

33. The following week, Dr. Handley was advised of Mr. Miller's passing. On May 10, 2011, Mr. Bickford sent copies of the third party plans in their original format to Dr. Handley. Defendant's Exhibit S contains copies of the emails from Mr. Bickford to Dr.

Handley which establishes that the third party plans attached for her to analyze. Mr. Bickford testified that the staff had not yet had an opportunity to convert or complete the third party data when he sent the plans given Mr. Miller's unexpected passing over the weekend. Therefore, Dr. Handley was analyzing the retrogressive effect of the third party plans submitted on May 6 based on total Native population percentages instead of NVAP.

34. Sometime in early May, Dr. Handley completed her preliminary Racial Bloc Voting ("RBV") analysis. She communicated the results of her analysis to Mr. Bickford and Board counsel Michael D. White telephonically sometime between May 10 and May 13.

35. Dr. Handley's RBV analysis found that voting in Alaska had become more polarized over the past decade (2002-2010). Accordingly, she advised that the overall statewide standard for creating an "effective" Alaska Native district had increased from 35% NVAP to a minimum of 41.8% NVAP. Dr. Handley also found that a more district-specific analysis was warranted in two areas: Benchmark House Districts 37 and 6. Because most contests in Benchmark District 37 were not as polarized, it consistently elected minority-preferred candidates despite having less than 41.8% NVAP. On the other hand, Benchmark House District 6, which was well over 41.8% NVAP, failed to elect the Alaska Native-preferred candidate in the 2010 election due to higher incidents of racially polarized voting and lower than statewide average of white crossover vote. Dr. Handley's analysis found that 49.7% NVAP was needed in Benchmark House district 6 in order to offer Alaska Natives an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

36. After learning of Dr. Handley's analysis, Mr. Bickford and Mr. White informed Chair Torgerson of Dr. Handley's analysis and recommended that the Board have Dr. Handley explain her analysis on the record for the public, preferably in person and that the Board reopen

its public hearing process to allow third parties to submit revised plans based on the new NVAP standard.

37. On May 17, 2011, Dr. Handley appeared telephonically before the board and explained the findings from her RBV analysis as set forth in paragraph 35 above. During this meeting Dr. Handley also made passing reference to several third party plans as possibly meeting the benchmark. The evidence is clear that at the time Dr. Handley made these remarks, she had only had time for a cursory review of the third party plans and was reviewing plans that used total Alaska Native Population and not the proper NVAP standard.

38. In light of Dr. Handley's RBV analysis, the Board invited all groups that had previously submitted plans for the configuration of Alaska Native districts to participate in a public work session on May 24, 2011, at the Board's office in Anchorage. The purpose of the work session was to provide these groups the opportunity to present any final thoughts, ideas, revisions, or amendments to their plans. A number of groups responded to the invitation, including AFFR, AFFER, the RIGHTS Coalition, and Calista Corporation, and made formal presentations to the Board. The Board also received new and revised plan submissions from the Bering Straits Native Corporation and Tom Begich, a consultant to several Alaska Native interests.

39. Dr. Handley attended the May 24 board meeting in person. At this meeting Dr. Handley made two presentations: One a primer on the federal Voting Rights Act, and another on the results of her RBV analysis. She then listened to the presentations of all of the third party plans.

40. After the public hearing, Dr. Handley sat down with Board counsel and Mr. Bickford and they reviewed each of the new plans presented for compliance with the VRA. Dr.

Handley advised Board counsel that none of the third party plans met the Benchmark and thus each was retrogressive and did not comply with Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act. Board staff subsequently prepared a spreadsheet report that showed the number of Alaska Native districts as represented by each third party, and calculated the Alaska Native VAP for each plan. A copy of this report is located in the Board Record at ARB00000407. At trial, Dr. Handley testified that she ultimately determined they were all retrogressive and therefore did not comply with the Voting Rights Act.

41. Given no viable third party option, the Board had to create its own plan for the Alaska Native Districts. Board members PeggyAnn McConnochie and Marie Greene, an Alaska Native, took the lead in drafting the Alaska Native districts needed to comply with the Voting Rights Act. Mr. Bickford testified Ms. McConnochie and Ms. Greene were taking longer than expected, so he also attempted to draft a plan that complied with the Voting Rights Act. His plan, referred to as the TB Plan, took the unique approach of changing the historical make up of District 40 (even though it was only -1.35% from the ideal district size) by dividing the North Slope Borough and the Arctic Northwest Borough into separate districts and picking up population from more urban areas in and around Fairbanks and along the southeast border of the state. Although Dr. Handley advised the TB Plan may not be retrogressive by the numbers, this plan had a number of other potential problems including the pairing of several important Alaska Native incumbents. The proposed plan also received overwhelming criticism from Alaska Native groups who felt that due to low voter registration and turn out on the North Slope, that new proposed North Slope District would very likely not provide Alaska Natives with the ability to elect their preferred candidate of choice. Board members and staff testified that if the Board had adopted the TB Plan, Alaska Native groups and leaders would have

objected to the Department of Justice, thereby seriously jeopardizing Alaska's chances for preclearance.

42. A second Alaska Native district plan known as the PAME Bethel/Kodiak plan was created by Board members McConnochie and Greene with input from staff and other Board members, and was adopted unanimously in concept by the Board. Dr. Handley reviewed this plan and advised that it met the numbers and therefore was likely not retrogressive. This plan, however, included a Senate district which combined Kodiak with Bethel, thereby pairing one of the most powerful Alaska Native incumbent members of the Senate, Lyman Hoffman, with the current Senate president, Gary Stephens. Alaska Native groups in both the Bethel and Kodiak areas, and the Kodiak Gateway Borough, severely criticized this pairing. The Calista Corporation in particular notified the Board of its serious objections to this pairing and even suggested the Board split the Aleutians if necessary to prevent this pairing. Board member Greene was also very uncomfortable with this pairing. As with the TB Plan, the Board was concerned that such objections by Alaska Native groups would have seriously jeopardized its ability to obtain preclearance from the Department of Justice.

43. Additionally, the Board was faced with the reality that its redistricting plan had already paired Alaska Native Incumbent Senator Kookesh, due to the demographic changes in Southeast Alaska. Thus, if it adopted a plan that paired Senator Hoffman, the co-chair of Senate Finance, and the most influential and powerful Alaska Native incumbent, it would present a plan to the Department of Justice that paired 2 of the 7 Alaska Native incumbent Legislators. Given that the Board had the burden of establishing its plan for redistricting had neither the purpose nor the effect of discriminating against Alaska Natives' voting rights, the

Board determined it faced a substantial risk of not obtaining preclearance if it did not avoid this pairing.

44. As a result, Board members McConnochie and Greene went back to the drawing board and created a third plan, the PAME Kodiak/Aleutians plan. Although this plan split the Aleutians, Dr. Handley advised it was not retrogressive and it also avoided the offensive Senate pairing.

45. Board members and staff testified it had been advised by counsel and thus was well aware of the Alaska Supreme Court's decision in *Hickel* that found splitting the Aleutian Islands was a per se violation of the Alaska Constitution, unless necessitated by federal law, such as Section 5 of the federal Voting Rights Act. Yet, given the objections and concerns expressed by the Alaska Native community, the Board felt it had to at least try to avoid pairing Senator Hoffman and Senator Stephens especially since the Board was already forced to pair Alaska Native incumbent, Senator Kookesh. The Board was concerned such pairings would cost the plan preclearance. Thus, the Board adopted the PAME Kodiak/Aleutians plan into its final plan by a unanimous 5-0 vote on June 6, 2011.

46. On June 10, 2011, Dr. Handley provided the Board with a draft report that summarized and synthesized the advice she had provided to the Board up to that time.

47. Despite using some different nomenclature in her advice to the Board, Dr. Handley ultimately advised the Board that the "benchmark," which is the number of Alaska Native protected districts which the Board had to create in its new redistricting plan, was five effective House districts, one influence House district, and three effective Senate districts. Dr. Handley's conclusion is supported by the Plaintiffs' own Voting Rights Act expert, Dr.

Theodore Arrington. This Court has already concluded the Board used the correct benchmark standard in creating its redistricting plan.

48. While working out the difficulties with the Alaska Native districts, the Board simultaneously worked on regional plans for Southeast Alaska, Fairbanks, Kenai, Mat-Su and Anchorage. Board member Jim Holm testified he drew the regional plan for Fairbanks because he was from that area and had lived there for much of his life. Each Board member presented their plan for the different regions they were tasked with drawing, and explained their reasons for drawing the districts as they did on the record. Board member Holm testified his goal for drawing Fairbanks was to maximize its representation. As a former representative from Fairbanks, Board member Holm felt South Central Alaska had gotten things over the years that Fairbanks could not get. He was interested in getting Fairbanks their fair share. With this goal in mind, Mr. Holm drew the Fairbanks districts using natural boundaries such as roads and streams to obtain as nearly as practicable an ideal population. Mr. Holm also testified the Alaska Native districts limited his configuration options for Fairbanks given that the Board was required to take approximately 5,500 residents from the western portion of the FNSB as explained in further detail below.

49. The Board eventually unanimously adopted each of the regional plans, including Fairbanks, in concept.

50. On June 6, 2011, the Board unanimously adopted its Final Plan in concept. On June 7, the Board also unanimously adopted its Senate pairings, and directed staff to make necessary technical corrections, produce maps, and prepare written metes and bounds description of district boundaries in preparation for the formal adoption of its Proclamation Plan on June 13.

