



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

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

Agenda

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

Call to Order

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

Public Testimony

Public testimony was given as follows:



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

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

Executive Session with Legal Counsel

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

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

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

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Review Map Corrections

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Assignment of House District Senate Pairs

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

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

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In favor: Members Binkley, Marcum, Simpson

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

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

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

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

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

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

In favor: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

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

In favor: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

Opposed: Members Binkley, Simpson, Marcum



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

Adoption of Senate Truncation Cutoff

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

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

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

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

98.1	1.9
98.3	1.7
100.0	0.0

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

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

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

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

Adoption of Senate Election Cycle Table

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

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

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

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

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

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

The motion failed 2 to 3.



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

The motion failed 2 to 3 (by voice vote)

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

The motion passed 3 to 2 (by voice vote)

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

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

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

Adopt Final Proclamation of Redistricting

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

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

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

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

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

Member Borromeo requested a roll call vote.

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Opposed: Members Bahnke, Borromeo

Signing of Final Proclamation

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

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

Members Bahnke and Borromeo signed in opposition of the Proclamation.

The Board gave final statements prior to adjournment:

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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



ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

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

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



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

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

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

Simpson moved to adjourn. Borromeo seconded the motion.

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