

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

Testimony Presented 9/17/2021

Kayla Admire	1	Carol Hayward.....	69
Alaskans for Fair Redistricting	2	Lacey Hemming	70
Annette Alfonsi	14	Kristi Hendrickson	71
Lauren Last Name: Attanas	15	Andrea Hirsh.....	72
Kristen Baltz.....	16	Gavin Hudson	73
Tom Begich.....	17	Brenda Hurley.....	75
Keolani Booth	36	Laura Jackson	76
Kristina Booth	37	Eileen B John	77
Bruce Botelho	38	Marc Johnson	78
Andrew Burton	39	Alison Kelley	79
Jenna Buster	40	Dave Kiffer	80
Carol Cairnes.....	41	Ken Koelsch	81
Myra Callshan	42	Lallete Kistler.....	82
Gabrial Canfiled	43	Kathleen Light	83
Mathew Cannava	44	Heidi McCroskey Heimerl.....	84
Margaret Clabby	45	Ernest McReynolds	85
Sean Conley.....	46	Donna Mears.....	86
Kenneth Cook.....	47	Mountain View Community Council	87
Bev Davies.....	48	Cathy Muñoz	91
Jack Davies	49	Kevin Murphy.....	92
Dael Devenport.....	50	Tina Neal.....	93
Cynthia Davis	51	Jori Nicholson.....	94
Michelle Dyakanoff.....	52	Bonnie and Stan Oaksmith	95
Andrew Elliott	53	Jaimie Palmer	96
Denny Evans	54	Selyna Parks.....	97
Bruce Farnsworth.....	55	Lynda Paquette	98
Lea Filippi	56	James Phillips.....	99
Barbara Farris.....	58	Karen Pitcher.....	100
Roger Federer	59	Adam Pollock.....	101
Jenee Flanagan	60	Pat Race	102
Chelsea Foster	61	Taylor Redmond	103
Bob Fultz.....	62	Nico Reijns	104
Tara Geisler.....	63	Tyrell Rettke	105
Wendy Goldstein	64	Stephen (Doug) Robbins	106
Bruce Gordon	65	Wendy Robbins.....	110
Josephus Govaars	66	Jamelia Saied	111
Andrew Gray	67	Michael Salita.....	112
Jacob Guenther	68	Tami Schleusner.....	113

Sally Schlichting.....	114
Renee Schofield	115
Melody Scott	116
Elizabeth Serrano	117
TJ Sheffield	118
Sue Sherif	119
Dorothy Schockley.....	120
Yarrow Silvers.....	121
Peter Stanton	123
Shellie Tabb	124
Jess Tacker	125
Mary Thompson	126
Edward Toal.....	127
Quinn Tracy.....	128
Meghan Traudt	129
Donna Turner	130
Brett Watson	131
Tyler Watson	132
Roger Whitesides	133
Joe Williams, Jr.	134
Judy Williams	135
Stephen Wright.....	136

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 12:40 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Kayla**

Last Name: **Admire**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **TFC Parent - Therapeutic Foster Care Parent**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan Redistricting**

Public Comment: **It is entirely absurd to redistrict half of Ketchikan with another island, Ketchikan's district should reach to the limits of the island - that includes south tongass and Saxman. If redistricting should occur regardless, Ketchikan should be split into three separate districts of their own, not affiliated with Sitka, wrangell, or any other neighboring island. The three districts should include a point Higgins/north tongass school district, a Ketchikan city limits school district, and a saxman/south tongass district. Please take some time to consider the benefits of a three part district for Ketchikan.**

September 9, 2021

Submitted via Email

Alaska Redistricting Board
P.O. Box 240147
Anchorage, AK 99524
testimony@akredistrict.org


Dear Alaska Redistricting Board:

Alaskans for Fair Redistricting (“AFFR”) is a fiscally sponsored project of Alaska Public Interest Research Group, a 501(c)(3) organization. AFFR is a non-partisan coalition of community voices including Labor, Alaska Native Corporations, Non-Profit Organizations, Public Interest Groups and Community Leaders engaging in the redistricting process. After observing the Redistricting Board’s (“Board”) meetings on September 7 and 8, AFFR staff testified before the Board and spoke to some concerns to the Fairbanks area. We wanted to elaborate on that testimony and provide the board with some alternative mapping options for the Fairbanks region.

To reiterate our position, splitting the Fairbanks North Star Borough horizontally neglected existing communities of interest. We believe that the Western Fairbanks communities of Chena Ridge, Ester and Goldstream Valley are closely connected through the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Similarly, the Eastern Fairbanks Communities of North Pole, Salcha and Two Rivers are closely related, and Fort Wainwright and Eielson Air Force Base are major hubs of socio-economic activity in East Fairbanks.


Given that the Board’s map split these communities up and created North and South Borough districts, we wanted to offer Board members two different options. One which would break the Borough boundary slightly to result in zero net deviation, and one that would stay within the Borough boundaries. Both options we believe better reflect the existing socioeconomic units of East and West Fairbanks and their respective communities.

Fairbanks North Star Borough Draft Option 1: Zero Average Deviation



This option creates 5 House districts within the Fairbanks North Star Borough, including one that is entirely within the City of Fairbanks and one which is composed mostly of population within the City of Fairbanks. To result in zero net deviation with Fairbanks, a portion of the borough with a population of 2,980 would be included with a district outside of the borough.

East City District




Population: 18,330

Deviation: -5 (-0.03%)

The East City District is entirely within the City of Fairbanks and would include Fort Wainwright and the eastern portion of the city. The city limits would form the northern, eastern, and southern boundaries. Major boundaries on the west include the Richardson Highway, Airport Way, Danby Street, and Cowles Street. Neighborhoods within this district include downtown Fairbanks, Hamilton Acres, Island Homes, Lemeta, and Slaterville.

West City District




Population: 18,345

Deviation: 10 (0.06%)

This district includes the western portion of the City of Fairbanks as well as the most urban areas outside of the city limits. To the south of the city, it would include the South Van Horn area. To the west of the city, it would include the Geist and University West neighborhoods which are highly urbanized and have more in common with the City than with the neighboring community of Chena Ridge. Within the City, this district includes the neighborhoods of Aurora, Riverview, Executive Estates, and South Cushman.

Western Borough District




Population: 18,337

Deviation: 2 (0.01%)

This district contains the western portions of the Fairbanks North Star Borough north of the Tanana River. It includes the University of Alaska Fairbanks campus, and UAF is the economic and cultural bedrock for western Fairbanks. This district includes the communities of College, Chena Ridge, Ester, Goldstream, Lakeview, and Pike. Major boundaries include Farmers Loop Road, Ballaine Road, Goldstream Road, the Elliot Highway, the borough boundary, the Tanana River, and the Chatanika River.

East Borough District




Population: 18,332

Deviation: -3 (-0.02%)

This district contains the eastern portion of the Fairbanks North Star Borough north of North Pole and Eielson Air Force Base. This district includes many of the more rural portions of the borough including the communities of Fox, Two Rivers, and Chatanika. Major boundaries include Eielson Air Force Base, the Chatanika River, Badger Road, Farmers Loop Road, the borough boundary, and the City of Fairbanks limits.

North Pole




Population: 18,331

Deviation: -4 (-0.02%)

This district includes the City of North Pole and the greater North Pole area, as well as the unpopulated Tanana Flats south of the Tanana River. Major boundaries include Eielson Airforce Base, the City of Fairbanks Limits, and the borough boundary.

Eielson and Salcha (for inclusion in another district)




Population: 3,980

Deviation: -14,335 (-78.29%)


This partial district includes the community of Salcha and Eielson Air Force Base. It would be included in a district outside of the Fairbanks North Star Borough which would include Fort Greely allowing for these two military bases to be in the same districts.

Fairbanks North Star Borough Option 2: No Breaking the Borough



This option draws five House districts completely within the Fairbanks North Star Borough. This requires an average upward deviation of 796 people (4.34%) within these districts and an ideal FNSB district in this scenario is 19,131 people.

East City




Population: 19,133

Deviation: 798 (4.35%)

Deviation from scenario ideal: 2 (0.01%)

With the additional population required, under this scenario the East City district goes farther west from downtown Fairbanks south of the Chena River.

West City




Population: 19,137

Deviation: 802 (4.38%)

Deviation from scenario ideal: 6 (0.03%)

Under this scenario, the West City district would get additional population south of the Robert Mitchell Expressway east of the airport as well as the Chena Small Tracts neighborhood and one census block across Chena Pump Road from the University West neighborhood.

Western Borough




Population: 19,134

Deviation: 799 (4.35%)

Deviation from scenario ideal: 3 (0.01%)

Under this scenario, the West Borough district would extend further east from the Elliot Highway to include population along the Steese Highway and the communities of Fox and Chatanika would be added to this district.

East Borough




Population: 19,130

Deviation: 795 (4.34%)

Deviation from scenario ideal: -1 (0.01%)

Under this scenario, the East Borough district would include Eielson Air Force Base and the community of Salcha and would extend north from Salcha to the City of North Pole limits.

North Pole



Population: 19,121

Deviation: 786 (4.29%)

Deviation from scenario ideal: 10 (0.05%)

Under this scenario, the North Pole district would extend north to the Chena River.

We would note that the final mapping plan AFFR submits to the Board is subject to change. As the Board's draft map develops, we are observing the process and continuing to make adjustments to our coalition's mapping plan that we look forward to presenting before the Board on September 17th.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input in this process. We recognize the difficulty of the work before the Board and appreciate the efforts of each member.

Sincerely,

David Dunsmore
GIS Mapper
Alaskans for Fair Redistricting

Robin O'Donoghue

Coordinator
Alaskans for Fair Redistricting

From: Annette A [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 1:57 AM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: redistricting testimony

To Whom It May Concern,
I am writing regarding the redistricting public comment period.

I grew up in Alaska and am proud to call Anchorage my home. In general, while people here have myriad political opinions, I have had faith in my community-elected local and state government. I have friends of many political leanings that may not always agree with each other about politics, but that have historically shared my faith. The one thing we all agreed upon was that elected leaders and people in positions of power have had our community's interests at heart, even if what that looks like is different between each person.

Recently, that faith has become rocky. I am concerned that the redistricting suggestions look decidedly unfair and would squeeze one elected person's district while making another too large to represent appropriately, and would disproportionately adversely affect elected leaders with specific political affiliations. My friends of various political leanings agree, and this agreement prompted my writing to you -- when people that don't typically agree can all agree that something looks "fishy", then it's important to speak up about it.

Right now I've heard multiple people in positions of authority talking about public trust, but not doing much to maintain or strengthen it. Seeing how divisive politics has become is disappointing, when simple steps could shift our state community back to one of mutual respect and trust. Redistricting will have significant outcomes that will last years, and must be apolitical in order to be fair and maintain trust on the part of the public. Moving quickly during a time of unprecedented health care and economic crisis does nothing to improve public trust in our system. I'd like to ask that we move not at the speed of convenience, or at the speed of politics - rather, I'd like to encourage us to move at the speed of trust. Right now, that means slowing down a moment.

Thank you,
Annette Alfonsi

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:15 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Lauren**

Last Name: **Attanas**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99709**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **District 35 (map Fairbanks v-1 and v-2)**

Public Comment: **I am concerned that you are lumping the entirety of Ester, Goldstream, and Steese/Two Rivers/Chena Hotsprings into one House district. It seems to me that such a plan is designed to dilute the traditionally left-leaning 4-B district. Overall, I'd say your maps are very hard for the general public to interpret because of the lack of place-name labels and a layer containing smaller roads; also, maps are printed at different scales making comparison harder. Please do better in this regard so that the public can make more effective comments. Thanks!**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 3:49 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Name: **Kirsten**

Last Name: **Baltz**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan Redistricting**

Public Comment: **It's absolutely absurd to split Saxman and South Tongass off from the rest of Revilla. We are highly integrated communities that really on each other, shop at the same stores, and send kids to the same schools. We are a single community even if we have multiple names.**

Additionally I can't help but notice that it seems who ever is drawing these maps is trying to isolate the native vote to a single district. That's super shady.

REDISTRICTING PROPOSAL

Redistricting Criteria

Socioeconomic Integration

- a. Priority of boroughs by definition
- b. Cities within and without boroughs
- c. Associational boundaries (ANCSA Corps, Economic zones, etc.)
- d. Historic relationships
- e. Other salient issues

Compactness

- a. Difficulty of some block shapes that artificially distort districts
- b. Population variances that traditionally lead to one vastly extended district

Contiguity

- a. Complications of distance
- b. Use of water and islands as appropriate and when necessary

Deviations from the ideal district size

- a. 5% in no urban environments
- b. .5% in urban environments
- c. Indeterminate as to which applies to “semi” urban environments
- d. Overall plan deviation

Issues to address with any map:

1. Mat-Su and Anchorage are **underpopulated** (Mat-Su under 6 House seats at 5.84 and Anchorage under 16 at 15.88). This means these two areas, bounded as Boroughs are entitled to **add** to their areas to meet their controlling populations.
2. Kenai Borough and Fairbanks North Star Borough (FNSB) are **overpopulated** (Kenai at 3.20 House seats and FNSB at 5.22 House seats). These Boroughs need to **shed** population.


Issues to address with any map:

3. Southeast has four House districts currently, and is **underpopulated**, so needs to **add** population, adding Yakutat and reconfiguring districts can get you four nearly identical districts with deviations between -1.6 and -1.3.

4. The **four rural districts** in the current plan are relatively intact in terms of population and **should be retained** to meet federal Voting Rights Act considerations (though these are less strict now).
- a. The North Slope Borough and Northwest Arctic Borough are **overpopulated**, but within the rural deviation (current District 40).
 - b. The Bering Straits District (Current district 39) is overpopulated and can shed population.
 - c. Districts 37 and 38 share similar populations, and with minor adjustments **can be made whole**.


This means you can start from these four assumptions:

Rural four
Western/
Northwestern
districts are
relatively intact
and slightly
more compact.





This means you can start from these four assumptions:

Southeast, with slight extension to Yakutat is intact.




This means you can start from these four assumptions:

Mat Su and Anchorage must **gather voters from outside of their boundaries** (so consequently cannot gather from each other without creating a more difficult map per constitutional criteria).





This means you can start from these four assumptions:

Kenai and Fairbanks **must shed population** to other districts.



If Valdez is moved to the Kodiak district and Cordova to an interior district, then populations can be stabilized for the final rural district – thus holding the Kodiak Borough intact.





Other Considerations

1. Per court decisions, **boundaries within Boroughs must respect city boundaries, but otherwise may be drawn without consideration of deeper perceived relationships** as by definition they are socioeconomically integrated already.
2. The **overall plan should be within an ideal deviation**, while meeting these other criteria. The Senate Minority Caucus has been able to draw maps that have **a maximum deviation of between +2.67** (on the Kenai) **and -1.60** (Southeast) for an overall deviation of 4.27%, while holding deviations in the Mat-Su, Anchorage, and FNSB under .5% plus or minus. This meets the strict deviations established by the courts, while minimizing borough disruption.
3. If you further break the overpopulated North Slope/Northwest Arctic Boroughs district, you can lower the overall deviation.

While we are choosing not to offer the full detail of a plan for the urban areas, we are offering you these maps and the tables related to them for your consideration as to how a plan might address the challenges you are likely to face. If you know you must move outside of Mat-Su and Anchorage, and not have one move into the other, and that Fairbanks and Kenai have to shed population to other areas, then you can move forward with a clear, integrated and legally defensible map. Further, you know how to build districts within these four populated boroughs as you know where the excess population is drawn in or shed.

If you understand that Rural and SE districts might be maintained with slight variations that account for population shifts, then these areas are quickly resolved, helping shape the context of the map.

Comments from Senator Tom Begich in response to questions from Board Counsel during 9/9/2021 testimony

Introduction

I want to thank the Board for an opportunity to present testimony on behalf of the Alaska Senate Minority Caucus recently. During the process I tried to succinctly present answers to some of the logistical obstacles the Board had identified, and to reiterate a process that might be used by the Board in its efforts to respond to the standards already adopted by the court.

After laying out those general provisions of the constitution, I was asked by Board counsel for specific citations of court cases. While I did not have them at hand, I took the opportunity this past few days to review those 2001 and 2011 cycle cases and offer both a summary of those cases and decisions (attached to this letter) and attempt to once again place these issues in context for your review and in hopes of minimizing future litigation that is easily avoidable. After reviewing the maps adopted by the Board on September 9, I feel even more compelled to offer these thoughts as I believe you will see that some of your preliminary maps violate some of these standards. Our Caucus will be offering further commentary as the process progresses.

Where do we start from?

In prior testimony in August I was asked by the Board Chair why not start from existing districts as they had already passed constitutional review. It is important to note that, as I said then, the reapportionment process starts anew each cycle. The plan must first start from a place that addresses the primary criteria presented in the constitution (further refined through court decisions). This process adheres to a principle defined by our courts as the *Hickel* process – an outcome of earlier lawsuits around reapportionment. An extensive discussion of this process may be found in *In re: 2011 Redistricting Cases*, 294 P.3d 1032 (Alaska 2013), pages 1035 - 1046 and throughout the opinion. A clear reading of this process would require starting from a blank map and beginning to draw a new map based on the criteria outlined in the constitution, applied to the new census data. In fact, the Court noted in that decision that:

“The superior court found that “[i]nstead of redrawing a new plan that focused on the Alaska Constitution, there is no dispute that the Board used most of the districts from the [original] Proclamation Plan” and that this “method did not comply with either the spirit or the letter of the Alaska Supreme Court's order and the *Hickel* process.” (294 P.3d 1032, p. 9.)

Later adding:

“...on remand the Board “painted itself into a corner” by leaving only a few blank areas on the map. This structure limited the Board's ability to consider a wide range of plans to achieve maximum constitutional compliance...”(294 P.3d 1032, p. 9)

While this discussion was aimed at the Board's consideration of Voting Rights Act (VRA) criteria before consideration of the Alaska constitutional requirements, the principle would hold true of any map, given that the current map was made invalid by the indication of malapportionment that the new census numbers provided once officially released. Essentially, this requires the board to begin its process from a blank map, rather than an existing one to be sure that as many options as practical to meet the constitutional requirements are considered. Starting from an existing map by definition – and prior court findings – significantly limits this.

Further, this process instructs the reapportionment board to begin from consideration of the three priority areas described in Article VI, section 6 of the Alaska Constitution: socioeconomic integration, compactness, and contiguity. In prior litigation (*In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3rd 141 (Alaska 2002) at 146), the Court has affirmed that boroughs/municipalities by their definition¹ are socioeconomically integrated. *See also Hickel v. Southeast Conference*, 846 P.2nd 38, 52 (Alaska 1992) Decisions by Boards, reaffirmed in court decisions underscore that, when practicable, borough boundaries should be respected, and excess populations should be, where practicable, accommodated and represented in one district:

“ “[W]here possible, all of a municipality's excess population should go to one other district in order to maximize effective representation of the excess group.” *In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d 141, 147 n.16 (Alaska 2002)

Maps showing practicable alternatives that minimize borough boundary breaks while adhering to other identified criteria would be considered constitutionally superior to those with unnecessary or multiple borough breaks, or diminishment of excess populations.

Determining Borough seat numbers

Given this consideration, the Board's first act would be to ascertain the ideal number of House Districts the larger boroughs could contain, and secondarily ensure that smaller boroughs are not divided unless there is no other practical way to make a district. While populations in boroughs may be combined, the Board must be open to considering options that might more strictly reach the constitutional standards. (*In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d at 144). Further, as described in *Hickel*, the Court found that "The division of a borough which otherwise has enough population to support an election district will be an indication of gerrymandering." If one starts from this premise, one starts from a strong constitutional basis. Thus, unless there is a compelling reason for it, Anchorage could legitimately expect 15 House seats fully within its boundaries and roughly 88% of a 16th House seat. If the accommodation adopted for the remaining 12% of that 16th seat, further reduces another Borough's ability to reach its population's threshold of representation, though other options might exist that allow for both areas to be fully represented, this would provide sufficient grounds for litigation. Further,

¹ The Borough Act, AS.29.05.031, requires a similar standard to form a borough from the Unorganized borough.

based on prior court rulings cited and attached here, it would seem likely that a court would see those less disruptive options, if they exist, to be constitutionally superior.

The Urban Deviation Threshold

In 2001, the Court focused on the Board's Anchorage Municipality's overall House district Deviation of 9.5% and concluded that this did not meet the constitutional standard adopted in the 1998 amended reapportionment article. In part, the Court found that:

"... the board believed that deviations within ten percent in Anchorage automatically satisfied constitutional requirements; plaintiffs established that the board failed to make any attempt to further minimize the Anchorage deviations"

and then ordered:

"Accordingly, the Anchorage deviations are unconstitutional, and require the board on remand to make a good faith effort to further reduce the deviations" (*In re2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d at 146).

Accordingly, the Board adopted a stricter threshold. The Board's final map produced an overall deviation in Anchorage of 1.35% which the court acknowledged:

"As to Anchorage,...: we ordered the board to make a good faith effort to reduce deviations across the Anchorage Bowl districts, and the board has clearly done so."

I was incorrect when I described a threshold of .5% as the ordered benchmark per district in Anchorage. Instead, that was a standard we adopted internally as a target to meet the Court's request, which was satisfied with the overall deviation of 1.35% in that map. However, with current technology, deviations can easily be lowered to that .5% threshold or even lower. Given the Court's observation in the 2001 cycle that:

"Newly available technological advances will often make it practicable to achieve deviations substantially below the ten percent federal threshold, particularly in urban areas. Accordingly, article VI, section 6 will in many cases be stricter than the federal threshold." (*In re2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d at 146).

It can be assumed that the Court will continue to seek further tightening of the deviation threshold and may seek to apply that to other areas of the state – especially if it might be shown that smaller threshold percentages are achievable within the bounds of the State's constitutional requirements. Currently Districts can be drawn in Mat Su, Anchorage, and Fairbanks which fall within .5% of the ideal House District +/-, and overall deviations within the Kenai Borough may also be held to under 1% relative to the other districts in the borough, though above the ideal district size by between 1.04% and 1.24%.

Voting Rights Act Consideration

The Court in 2011 identified the importance of the *Hickel* standard when drawing a map with consideration of both the Voting Rights Act and the State Constitution. While the applicability of the VRA has changed since then, the general principles remain:

“Priority must be given first to the Federal Constitution, second to the federal voting rights act, and third to the requirements of article VI, section 6 of the Alaska Constitution. The requirements of article VI, section 6 shall receive priority *inter se* in the following order: (1) contiguousness and compactness, (2) relative socioeconomic integration, (3) consideration of local government boundaries, (4) use of drainage and other geographic features in describing boundaries. (*In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d 141, 143 n.2 (Alaska 2002))

The court further refined this position in the 2011 cycle:

“In *Hickel v. Southeast Conference*, we considered a Proclamation Plan that, like the Plan in this case, “accorded minority voting strength priority above other factors, including the requirements of article VI, section 6 of the Alaska Constitution.” We cautioned that while compliance with the Voting Rights Act takes precedence over compliance with the Alaska Constitution, “[t]he Voting Rights Act need not be elevated in stature so that the requirements of the Alaska Constitution are unnecessarily compromised.” We then described the process the Board must follow to ensure that our constitutional redistricting principles are adhered to as closely as possible. After receiving the decennial census data, “[t]he Board must first design a reapportionment plan based on the requirements of the Alaska Constitution. That plan then must be tested against the Voting Rights Act. A reapportionment plan may minimize article VI, section 6 requirements when minimization is the only means available to satisfy Voting Rights Act requirements.” (*In re 2011 Redistricting Cases*, 274 P.3d 466, 467 (Alaska 2012))

Further in that decision:

The *Hickel* process provides the Board with defined procedural steps that, when followed, ensure redistricting satisfies federal law without doing unnecessary violence to the Alaska Constitution. The Board must first design a plan focusing on compliance with the article VI, section 6 requirements of contiguity, compactness, and relative socioeconomic integration; it may consider local government boundaries and should use drainage and other geographic features in describing boundaries wherever possible. Once such a plan is drawn, the Board must determine whether it complies with the Voting Rights Act and, to the extent it is noncompliant, make revisions that deviate from the Alaska Constitution when deviation is “the only means available to satisfy Voting Rights Act requirements.”

The *Hickel* process assures compliance with the Alaska Constitution's requirements concerning redistricting to the greatest extent possible. The *Hickel* process also diminishes the potential for partisan gerrymandering and promotes trust in government. We have previously noted that the article VI, section 6 requirements were designed to prevent gerrymandering by ensuring “that the election district boundaries fall along natural or logical lines rather than political or other lines.” A redistricting plan that substantially deviates from these constitutional requirements undermines trust in the process. (*In re 2011 Redistricting Cases*, 274 P.3d 466, 467-68 (Alaska 2012))

Even with a diminished VRA, these principles underscore how we prioritize the building of a plan.

Conclusion

While these comments have been long, they are designed to address the question of prior court decisions and how they affect what you as a Board do. It is essential that these matters be understood to ensure a minimum of litigation. I apologize for not having the cases before me at the time, but I provide them to you and your counsel for your use as this process moves forward.

Links to cases:

2001 Redistricting Lawsuits

In re 2001 Redistricting Cases v. Redistricting Board, No. 3AN-01-8914CI (3rd Dist. Anchorage, Feb. 1, 2002) : Of Alaska's 40 House districts, a judge found two of them to be unconstitutional. One was faulted for failing to be sufficiently compact. The second was a more complex matter, not meeting the requirement in article 6, § 6 that districts be "as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area." Pending appeal to Alaska's Supreme Court, the ruling was stayed.

- [Case link](#)

In re 2001 Redistricting Cases, No. S-10504, 44 P.3d 141 (Alaska Mar. 21, 2002) : The Supreme Court vacated the lower court's stay, affirming the decision with exceptions. The case was remanded to the superior court with instructions that it be further remanded to the Redistricting Board. Overall, the Supreme Court found that two districts violated compactness, two violated § 6, and a further 16 violated the equal rights guarantee, a level that occurred because Alaska's state constitution requires a higher standard than federal law. Lastly, the court found a 6.9 percent deviation from an ideal district was not justified under the Voting Rights Act.

- [Case Link](#)

2010 Redistricting Lawsuits

[In re 2011 Redistricting Cases, 274 P.3d 466 \(March 14, 2012\)](#) On February 3, 2012, Judge Michael McConahy of Alaska's Fourth District Superior Court ruled that state House Districts 1, 2, 37 and 38 violated the Alaska Constitution. McConahy found that Districts 1, 2, and 37 violated the compactness criterion of the state constitution. In addition, he found that District 37 violated the contiguity condition and that District 38 violated the socioeconomic integration condition. McConahy was less sympathetic toward the plaintiffs' claims of partisan gerrymandering, but he noted that the Voting Rights Act justifications offered for the districts were wanting.

On March 14, the court ruled that the Redistricting Board had to redraw the plan with a priority on following the Alaska Constitution. The court did not specifically rule on Districts 37 and 38. Instead, it instructed the Board to first attempt to rectify the districts with the state constitution, then adjust for compliance with the Voting Rights Act. Only then, argued the court, would the justices be able to evaluate which deviations from the constitution were truly necessary.

- [Case Link](#)

[In re 2011 Redistricting Cases, 282 P.3d 306 \(May 22, 2012\)](#) On May 10, 2012, the Alaska Supreme Court rejected the Alaska Redistricting Board's revised redistricting map. The court ordered the Board to redraw House Districts 31 through 34 and Senate Districts P and Q. The Board had until May 15 to revise the plans.

On May 22, 2012, the Alaska Supreme Court selected an interim redistricting plan for the 2012 elections. The Alaska Redistricting Board's first revised plan was approved as the interim plan. The Board's second and latest revisions were not selected. While the court did not formally rule on the latter plan, it was expected to issue instructions for revising the plan's southeast districts. The court expressed concern that the latest version would not pass muster under the Voting Rights Act.

On May 25, the Redistricting Board submitted the interim redistricting plan for DOJ pre-clearance. Plaintiffs in the redistricting lawsuit asked the court to stay the implementation of the plan until the DOJ reached a decision.

- [Case Link](#)

[In re 2011 Redistricting Cases, 294 P.3d 1032 \(December 28, 2012\)](#) On December 28, the Alaska Supreme Court affirmed the superior court's ruling invalidating the redistricting plan and remanded the case to the Redistricting Board to draft a new plan based on the Hickel process. The court reversed the superior court's rulings that the board must make specific findings on the constitutionality of each house district and the plan must be submitted at each stage of drafting for review.

Judge Carpeneti: "We accept the petition for review and, because the board failed to follow the process that we ordered upon remand, we affirm the decision of the superior court and require the board to draft a new plan for the 2014 elections. We agree with the board that it is not required to make specific findings about each individual district relating to the requirements of the Alaska Constitution nor to submit a plan to the superior court at each stage of drafting."

- [Case Link](#)

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 12:56 pm

First Name: **Keolani**

Last Name: **Booth**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Metlakatla Indian Community**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99926**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting in southern southeast Alaska**

Public Comment: **I am a civil servant as a councilman in my community and our partnerships and potential partnerships with the surrounding areas Ktn and Prince of Wales and Hyder are crucial to a successful and prosperous outcome for everyone in our area. I do not see any positive outcome in this decision to be made. I AM IN OPPOSITION OF THIS ACTION AND I AM SAYING NO TO REDISTRICTING IN SOUTHERN SOUTH EAST ALASKA**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:52 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Kristina**

Last Name: **Booth**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting of Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **It's come to my attention that the Alaska Redistricting Board wants to redistrict the south end of Ketchikan and place it with Sitka. This makes absolutely zero sense and would impact schools, mail, and people's lives. Please reconsider and leave Ketchikan the way it is.**

From: Bruce Botelho [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 9:01 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: HD #3 and #4 boundaries

Bruce M. Botelho
[REDACTED]
Douglas, Alaska 99824

September 16, 2021

Alaska Redistricting Board
P. O. Box 240147
Anchorage, Alaska 99503

Dear Board Members:

I write to urge you to redraw boundary lines between proposed House Districts 3 and 4 so that the residences that are encompassed by Cross Street, and Seaview and Bayview Avenues are incorporated into House District 4 and the integrity of the neighborhood is maintained.

As it now stands, the census blocks incorporated here exclude an incumbent from her district and this exclusion appears to have been done deliberately. The action is a textbook example of gerrymandering. While redistricting is not intended to favor incumbents over new candidates, it should not be used as a cudgel against incumbents either.

Under the Board's composite versions #1 and #2, the deviation for House District 3 is -522 or -2.85%. [Note that under composite version #1 the percentage deviation is noted as -2.8%]. The deviation for House District 4 is -486 or -2.65%. The Board can rectify the exclusion without materially altering the deviations. A slight downward adjustment to House District #4 would improve the deviation for House District #3.

I urge you to take that action.

Bruce Botelho

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 11:16 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Andrew**

Last Name: **Burton**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan redistricting**

Public Comment: **Please reconsider your proposal to split the Ketchikan area into different districts.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE


Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 4:31 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jenna**

Last Name: **Buster**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting Southeast Towns**


Public Comment: **Redistricting any towns close to Ketchikan to lump into Sitka seems asinine. Especially, Metlakatla, Saxman (really?) Gravina (Our airport) Prince of Wales (seriously)?! Here's a thought why not just clump us all together with Anchorage while you're at it! please address more important issues for our state rather than mess with such ridiculous notions.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: September 14, 2021, 8:03 am

First Name: **Carol**

Last Name: **Cairnes**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Do NOT split up the Ketchikan Gateway Borough. Also, Sitka and Ketchikan should not be in the same district.**

Public Comment: **Everything within the Ketchikan Gateway Borough and Annette Island need to and should be in the same district. Sitka and Ketchikan do not need to be within the same district.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 6:21 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Myra**

Last Name: **Callshan**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Changing representation**

Public Comment: **Public hearings are an absolute must! I hardly believe the towns affected wish this to proceed without their input. Public hearings and adequate time to respond effectively.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 8:50 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Gabrial**

Last Name: **Canfield**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting map splits Ketchikan in half**

Public Comment: It goes without saying that people in Ketchikan are one community. Southern southeast Alaska relies on the hub of Ketchikan for supplies and for travel, and are all highly connected when it comes to jobs, education and community. In towns like these, everyone in the region is my neighbor. To split up this region by imposing borders on it that make absolutely no sense, dividing the community up even though it is the same place, is doing Ketchikan and southern southeast Alaskans a huge disservice. Another map is absolutely necessary for this region, and one that keeps the people of southern southeast Alaska together as they do in community.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: September 15, 2021, 9:16 am

First Name: **Mathew**

Last Name: **Cannava**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99669**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **That I live in Soldotna but my Senator is in ANC per your maps**

Public Comment: **I can't find what you've proposed most recently. But it is the height of silliness that I live down Mackey Lake Road in Soldotna...but my Senator is in Anchorage. I am a physician. When I tell my patients how much I dislike going to ANC...they universally agree with me. But...per the republican maps...my senator is in ANC? This is lunacy and serves only one purpose...to accommodate a political party. What are republicans afraid of that they can't draw a map without carving it up in such a ridiculous fashion that it makes no sense at all geographically?**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: September 15, 2021, 4:52 pm

First Name: **Margaret**

Last Name: **Clabby**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Board Composite v.2--Specifically Southeast Alaska--Border between Dist. 1 and 2 in Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **1. The current District 36 should have been retained intact and renumbered as District 1. It would have only a deficit of 238 from ideal population and best meets the other criteria. The 3 other current districts in Southeast could be retained with some adjustments between them. The overall net deficit for the 4 southeast districts if left similar to current districts would be 1716 , which is not an unreasonable deviation, given the need to meet the other criteria. Single districts up near Anchorage deviate by 863, so it's obvious that all criteria need to be considered**

2. My very specific gripe with the proposed division between districts 1 and 2 has to do with my home (which is in Ketchikan) being moved out of the Ketchikan district and put into the bizarre looped around district 2 where I will be joined with Sitka, Yakutat, etc, which are hundreds of miles away. I live 8 mi. out S Tongass Hwy from town in the bizarre strip of land that your map removes from Ketchikan. It is about 7 miles long and mostly less than 200 yards wide. All of my work, shopping, business takes place in Ketchikan. My neighbors across the street will stay in the Ketchikan district 1.

I have heard that this is a mistake which needs to be corrected. You really need to zoom in on the map to see how weird it is.

3. Other problems with areas being removed from the Ketchikan district include:

Gravina and Pennock Islands across from Ketchikan are shown as being put in district 2 (with Sitka, etc.) even though they are part of the Ketchikan community, with all socio-economic links being to Ketchikan. I used to live on Gravina Island across from Ketchikan and it was less than a 5 minute skiff ride to town. Metlakatla is also so connected to Ketchikan and it was good that southern Prince of Wales Island, including Hydaburg is in our district.

I do hope you put Southern Southeast Alaska back together as coherent, contiguous district 1 (probably very similar to current district 36) and readjust the other S.E. districts and allow for some deficit in order to meet other needs.

Thank you.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:49 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **sean**

Last Name: **conley**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **why is ketchikan split in two**

Public Comment: **these maps show that residents of ketchikan will be split into two. if you live on the south end of town you are in a different district then if you live on the north end of town. How does this make any sense at all? how could one come up with a map drawn in this manner. seems like something fishy is going on. this issue needs to be addressed and should not happen at all. so silly. hopefully this is a computer error and oversight and not the doing of a human.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 2:17 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Cook**

Last Name: **Kenneth**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Eagle River Valley**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99577**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Both of the provided maps eliminate Eagle River Valley including South Fork as a contiguous community.**

Public Comment: **Eagle River Valley including South Fork is gerrymandered by both maps to eliminate it as the contiguous community that it is. Have lived for 44 years in Eagle River Valley and to cut up our community with it's unique geography, culture and shared experiences into three pieces is gerrymandering pure and simple.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:07 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Bev**

Last Name: **Davies**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Inappropriately removing close geographic areas from the Ketchikan District**

Public Comment: **Please don't remove close geographical areas such as Metlakatla, Gravina Island and Hydaburg from the Ketchikan District. We share one small hospital and airport in this area and other issues are closely related too.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:08 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jack**

Last Name: **Davies**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Moving Metlakatla, Gravina and Hydaburg to the Sitka District**

Public Comment: **I am opposed to moving these locations to the Sitka District as they are all closely affiliated and share common interests with Ketchikan.**

From: Dael Devenport <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:34 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: AK Redistricting Maps

Alaska Redistricting Board:

Please revise your proposed district maps to reflect community boundaries and more fairly and accurately represent the population.

The proposed maps fail to respect existing borough and city boundaries. Option 1 has parts of the Anchorage Municipality and Matsu Borough combined. This plan puts rural Matsu population south of the Knik river into the Municipality of Anchorage. It is not constitutional to combine portions of the Anchorage Municipality and MatSu Borough into the same house district. Anchorage and Mat Su are entitled to control 16 and 6 seats, respectively, but both lack a small amount of population, which if practicable should be added from elsewhere and not by taking from another borough that is also short of needed population.

The Municipality of Anchorage and the MatSu Borough cannot be treated as one entity. The Anchorage Municipality and the Mat Su Borough both have strong, distinct identities. The borough and the municipality are distinct socio-economic entities and entitled to the legal presumption the courts have established that local boundaries will be respected if possible. In reality it appears that socio-economic integration between Mat Su and Anchorage is limited. It can be argued that virtually every part of the state has some integration with Anchorage because of its role as the state's major economic hub - many Alaskans shop in Anchorage and visit Anchorage when making connections to travel outside the state. However, this casual integration due to shopping, occasional travel and some commuter employment is not sufficient to overcome established local government boundaries and other non-similar characteristics (e.g. urban v rural). The Matsu Borough is not a suburb of Anchorage, it has its own distinct culture, healthcare infrastructure, identity, and economy.

East Anchorage and Eagle River are two distinct communities, the representation of these communities should reflect that. Eagle River should be kept together. Eagle River has almost enough population for two House seats and one Senate seat. It makes more sense to fill out Eagle River with the population from JBER, a community that has far closer socio-economic ties to Eagle River than the Valley or Muldoon. Community members have testified that this makes sense. Chugiak/Eagle River has an organized movement that is attempting to split from the Anchorage Municipality, which argues for keeping this community intact. It is a realistic possibility that Eagle River could be in a separate borough during the life of this plan.

Again, please revise your drafts to respect community boundaries and more fairly and accurately represent the population.

Thank you,
Dael Devenport
Anchorage, AK

With compassion for all beings

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:18 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Cynthia**

Last Name: **Davis**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Ketchikan Citizen**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **Please do not split up our town or island community when redistricting. We are one community in Ketchikan and on the island. To redistrict us in such a way that splits up the community makes no sense.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 2:59 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Michelle**

Last Name: **Dyakanoff**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Separation of contiguous areas of Ketchikan in current redistricting plans**

Public Comment: **As a resident of Ketchikan Gateway Borough living on South Tongass Highway, I am appalled at the current plans submitted for redistricting of our area. We belong with Saxman and Ketchikan, as well as with nearby neighboring communities of Metlakatla and all of Prince of Wales Island, and possibly Wrangell. Both current proposals do not make sense, and one can only guess as to the intentions of the redistricting board. The intentions do seem highly suspicious, when realizing that they break up current local political areas, and isolate native populations from various areas that are far apart in one district. I ask you to please reconsider, and make changes to your current plan, and put the contiguous areas on our Island and neighboring areas back together in one district.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 11:14 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 11:13 pm

First Name: **Andrew**

Last Name: **Elliott**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Myself**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Mat-Su map idea**

Public Comment: **I have created a plan which is viewable here:**

<https://www.akredistrict.org/create/view.html?p=47103>

The Denali Borough should not be with the Mat-Su. Of greater issue is how large of populations the interior districts are. Equal representation should not be sacrificed in favor of economic links. the Dillingham district is way too under populated. District 36 on your proposed maps is way too geographically big and over populated compared to the Dillingham and Bethel districts. the Mat-Su should be something along the lines of what I submitted, (similar to what it is now) take a little of Anchorage for the Mat-Su and give some of the Kenai to Anchorage if necessary (maybe hope). How is Valdez and Holy Cross socioeconomically linked? They are 445 miles apart. One is in-land and one is on the coast. I know That Alaska is big state, but they are not even remotely similar. Lastly, Fairbanks is getting completely under represented. All 4 districts are over 19000 people. That is the most outrageous part of your maps. I believe that it can all be fixed only minor changes. I think your maps are a good starting point.

Online Plan ID: **47103**

URL to view Plan ID: <https://www.akredistrict.org/create/edit.html?p=47103>

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 4:17 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Denny**

Last Name: **Evans**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Forest park south Tongass highway Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **No way for redistricting to Sitka would not help us**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date/Time: Thursday, September 9, 2021 12:17 PM

Name: Bruce Farnsworth

Email: [REDACTED]

Zip Code: 99504

Issue of Concern: Anchorage Districts 26, 27 & 28

Public Comment: Dear Redistricting Board Members;

As a 20+ year resident of District 27 I have strong feelings about apparent efforts to shave off a piece of the district and merge it with another district with very different lifestyles and socioeconomic levels. East Anchorage is one of the poorest districts in the municipality while district 28 is one of the wealthiest. Moving voters out of 27 and into 28 would significantly dilute the voting influence of district 27 residents. The idea of shifting residents from D-27 to D-28 has a whiff of partisanship about it and appears to be contrary to the constitutionally embedded intent to prevent gerrymandering.

Respectfully,

Bruce Farnsworth
District 27 Resident

From: Lea Filippi [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 17, 2021 1:15 AM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Public Testimony regarding proposed redistricting

Dear Board Members,

Both proposed redistricting maps fail to appropriately respect borough and city boundaries. Both proposed maps present districts which are not appropriately compact and do not appropriately respect established connections between communities and the principles of socioeconomic integration.

For example, the Kenai Peninsula Borough includes Tyonek which is connected to the rest of the Borough not just by the fact that Tyonek's students are served by the Kenai Peninsula Borough School District but also by mutual interest in the petroleum industry. Tyonek is within the footprint of CIRI, not BBNC or Aleut Corp.

Both of the proposed maps present Southeast Alaska in a configuration which is contrary to the requirements of compactness and socioeconomic integration. It's not sensible or necessary, for example, to pair Craig, Hydaburg, and Thorne Bay and other communities on Prince of Wales with areas as far away as Yakutat when they could instead be paired with areas immediately to their east and inland such as Ketchikan to which they are much more connected by established transportation routes. Furthermore, the city of Ketchikan and its airport should be paired, not split apart.

Eagle River should be together for one Senate seat. Eagle River is most socioeconomically integrated with itself and with Chugiak. If additional population is needed to fill out an Eagle River District then that population should come from JBER which has closer ties to Eagle River than Muldoon.


The coastal communities of Seward and Homer belong together in a single district. It makes more sense to pair those communities with Kodiak, which is also a coastal community with shared industries, values, and the connection of ferry service, than it does to stretch the Kodiak District past them over to Cordova. The district for Kodiak as drawn in the proposed maps is not appropriately compact. Doing so would also appropriately put Seldovia and Nanwalek in the same district as Homer to whom they are much more socioeconomically connected than Tatitlek or Cordova.

Particularly in Proposed Map 1, the lines drawn within Anchorage do not match existing patterns of community or sense of neighborhood. Look, for example, at my own neighborhood where I live just off the far western end of Northern Lights Boulevard. In Proposed Map 1 Under the proposed map, a couple of small streets immediately to the west of my house abutting Jones Lake would be split away from their nearest residential neighbors to connect them instead to a large nonresidential area including the airport and related commercial businesses such as Fed Ex, etc. No one lives on Aircraft Drive or Lake Hood Drive or Helio Place. That's not residential. How can it possibly make sense to require the residents of Jones Ave and Katalla Circle and half of the residents of Wendy's Way to vote separately from the rest of the residents of Wendy's Way by pulling them into what's marked in Proposed Map 1 as District 11? Their children go to Turnagain Elementary School, Romig and West. All of the families on Wendy's Way are part of the same neighborhood as me, immediately to their east on Woronzof Drive in what's marked as District 16. It makes no sense to split the end of Wendy's Way off into District 11 and pair them with the Taku/Campbell area. Looking past that specific detail regarding the

inappropriateness of splitting Wendy's Way as proposed, it would be more appropriate to pair together the neighborhoods in Turnagain and Spenard whose children will together attend Romig Middle School than to lump my Turnagain West neighborhood together with downtown and South Addition, whose kids go to Inlet View or Denali and then on to Central Middle School. It likewise makes no sense to split the Sand Lake area to peel the residents to the west living in the area from Jodhpur and the Westpark community in the old gravel pit away from the other families who sent their children to Kincaid and the community surrounding Sand Lake as reflected in Proposed Map 1. The fact that the proposed lines for western Anchorage in Proposed Map 1 are so divorced from the on the ground realities of community patterns recognized by the school district in establishing its middle school attendance zones seems to suggest that the attempt to pair Turnagain together with South Addition and downtown rather than Spenard is merely a nakedly partisan attempt to force Democratic Representatives Claman, Drummond, and Fields to vie for the same legislative seat in the future.

Proposed Map 2 does not mistreat the residents of the southern end of Wendy's Way the way that Proposed Map 1 does. But Proposed Map 2 is also flawed. It makes no sense to split South Addition from Downtown or to use Fish Creek as a boundary rather than letting all of Spenard to the West of Minnesota be in one district together and using either the railroad tracks or Minnesota as the division between Spenard and Midtown. District 10 in Proposed Map 2 is not appropriately compact. Why make it C shaped? Or have District 11 take a bite out of its middle? Why not extend the lower line of District 11 to the West along Dimond? Or keep everything to the south of the airport, everything south of the West end of Raspberry Road all one district?

Lea Filippi


Anchorage, AK 99517

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date: September 14, 2021, 1:27 am

First Name: **Barbara**

Last Name: **Farris**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **None**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **The first map**

Public Comment: **I have reviewed the map that you have drawn which includes part of Eagle River in my house district, which is HD 27. I am writing to say that Eagle River is a very different and distinct community from East Anchorage, socio-economically. Since they constitute an integrated community of their own, they should not be included in our house district.**

It is clear that the map was drawn to gerrymander our district in order to reflect the political bias of the majority of the redistricting board. This is illegal and wrong.

Many people in HD 27 are carefully watching how the redistricting is being done.

We want the board to provide a fair and level playing ground when making redistricting decisions.

I hope you will continue to work to ensure that this happens.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:22 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Roger**

Last Name: **Federer**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99801**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Saxman/Borough of Ketchikan being part of Sitka District's**

Public Comment: ***Staff Note: This field was left blank.***

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 8:11 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jenee**

Last Name: **Flanagan**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: **How does it even make sense to redistrict those of us who live on South Tongass right outside the city of Ketchikan? Sitka is on a whole other island! I vote NO as a resident of south Tongass and ask that common sense prevail in this matter. As you represent the people of Alaska, I hope you listen to our voices.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 12:52 pm

First Name: **Chelsea**

Last Name: **Foster**

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 do not accept version one or version two of these maps. This is nothing less than gerrymandering and it is unacceptable to push a party agenda on the state, while conservatives already have a true majority. Please do not submit either version as a final! Thank you for your time.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Staff note: Mr. Fultz sent two emails related to redistricting – the newer message was sent after the board statement clarifying that Ketchikan contained a drafting error.

First Name: **Bob**

Last Name: **Fultz**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99577**

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 9:13 PM

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Adding Southern Southeast communities to Sitka**

Public Comment: **I understand Hyder, Hydaburg and Metlakatla will be redistricted to Sitka. It's my opinion they should stay within the boundaries where they can be best served, i.e. Ketchikan. Can you please tell me how, by adding to Sitka, this adds up please? Thank you.**

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:36 AM

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Re-districting**

Public Comment: **I understand that Saxman and South Tongass is going to be placed in Sitka's district and NOT Ketchikan's. Please explain why. Makes no sense to me but most things with politics don't anymore. Thanks.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:35 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Tara**

Last Name: **Geisler**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **South tongass and saxman redistricting**

Public Comment: **Changing the south tongass and saxman residents to the Sitka district makes no sense at all! Sitka is a city on a different island and a day and half ferry ride away from the current district of Ketchikan- which is the city they are right outside and on the same island. Don't redistrict us!**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 10:25 AM

A website response from the Contact Us form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Wendy**

Last Name: **Goldstein**

Email or Phone: [REDACTED]

Comments or Concerns: **I am very concerned with the redistricting placing Valdez with the Interior. Valdez belongs in a district with the rest of Prince William Sound, and other coastal communities, since it has everything in common with them and Nothing in common with the Interior region.**


ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 7:36 PM

A website response from the Contact Us form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Bruce**

Last Name: **Gordon**

Email or Phone: 

Comments or Concerns: **District 6, currently has most of the eastern Alaska villages but also has N. Pole and a military Base which can eliminate the Native vote, please fix it. Thanks**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 6:38 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Josephus**

Last Name: **Govaars**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan Area Redistricting**

Public Comment: **We cannot have 2 house districts representing Ketchikan. How is it compact spanning hundreds of miles?**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 12:21 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): **HOUSE DISTRICT 17**

Public Comment: **In both maps currently proposed, my current House Rep would change from who it currently is, Rep. Andy Josephson. In Map 1, I move into D15 with Rep. Nelson; Map 2, I stay in D17, but Rep. Josephson gets moved into a different district with Rep. Chris Tuck, who are of the same party. Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution states: "Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area." I consider my home, which is close to Elmore and Tudor, to be more socio-economically integrated with our neighbors to the immediate East and West rather than to the South (as Map 1 would group us). Map 2 is gerrymandering two democratic reps into the same district and should not be allowed. Thank you for taking my testimony into account.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 3:33 pm

First Name: **Jacob**

Last Name: **Guenther**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Southern southeast redistricting draft v2**

Public Comment: **Metlekatla and Yakatat should not be in the same district. The proposal does not meet the requirements layed out in Artile VI section 6 of the Alaska constitution particularly "Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area" The proposed district is neither "compact" or a "relatively integrated socio-economic area."**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 11:35 AM

A website response from the Contact Us form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Carol**

Last Name: **Hayward**

Email or Phone: 

Comments or Concerns: **Please leave Metlakatla with Ketchikan and under Ortiz / we are ok there/ why change !!! Thank you for hearing me out**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date/Time: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 10:19 PM

Name: Lacey Hemming

Email or Phone: [REDACTED]

Zip Code: 99504

Issue of Concern: keep districts integrated

Public Comment: The Alaska state constitution directs the legislature districts be formed of relatively integrated socioeconomic areas. Having district 27 doesn't make sense, south Muldoon is a completely different socioeconomic area than south Anchorage with different needs and a different community.

All of Muldoon should be represented together and not have us cut into pieces and moved to random districts. This is a constitutional necessity if we want to keep are districts integrated so our elected officials can more easily represent us.

Thank you for making an opportunity to testify on this topic, I appreciate your time and diligence.

Thanks

Lacey Hemming

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Staff note: Ms. Hendrickson sent two emails related to redistricting on 9/10/2021 – the newer message was sent after the board statement clarifying that Ketchikan contained a drafting error.

First Name: **Kristi**

Last Name: **Hendrickson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:21 PM

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting of Metlakatla, Hyder, Hydaburg and Gravina**

Public Comment: **To have Metlakatla, Hyder, Hydaburg, and Gravina join Sitka does not make sense. Metlakatla and Gravina especially are within 3 miles of Ketchikan and over 180 miles from Sitka. It makes much more sense to keep them within the same district as Ketchikan.**

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:24 AM

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting South Tongass Hwy Ketchikan, AK**

Public Comment: **It does not make sense to redistrict South Tongass Highway and Saxman with Sitka instead of leaving it with Ketchikan. Sitka is approximately 184 miles from Saxman by air. Ketchikan is directly next to Saxman and South Tongass Hwy.**

From: Andrea Hirsh [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 2:02 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Public comment about redistricting plans

Hello,

My name is Andi Hirsh and I'm a resident of Juneau Alaska. I am writing to comment on the proposed house districts 3 and 4, specifically in the Juneau area. The redistricting board has an obligation to the people of Alaska to be nonpartisan and fair, and to appear nonpartisan and fair. To do otherwise degrades the public trust in elections, a cornerstone of democracy, and elected officials.

Carving out 6 houses on one side of the street in district 4 that "just-so-happens" to include the incumbent and moving it to district 3 appears both partisan and unfair. Please, do better.

Thank you.
Andi Hirsh

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 10:10 am

First Name: **Gavin**

Last Name: **Hudson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99926**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Board Composite V.1**

Public Comment: **I am writing to oppose the dubious plan proposed by the Alaska Redistricting Board that, if approved, would put Metlakatla in the same district as Sitka and Yakutat, while separating us from our closest neighbors, Ketchikan and Saxman.**

This begs the question, are there any local interests shared between Metlakatla and Sitka? Sitka is some 200 miles away from Metlakatla. That would be like putting Anchorage and Fairbanks in the same district, or putting Seattle in the same district as Eugene, Oregon. That is the same distance as New York City is from our nation's capital, Washington D.C.

If that sounds extreme, hold onto your seats because this one will really get you, consider that Yakutat is a whopping 565 miles away from Metlakatla! That would be like Anchorage being in the same district as Nome. If that measure was used to draw districts down south, we would have to force Seattle, Washington into the same district as San Francisco, California! That is the same distance as New York City is from Charlotte, North Carolina. What "local" interest could residents of of the Big Apple possibly have with those in Charlotte?

Meanwhile, Ketchikan and Saxman, just 15 miles, a short stone's throw away from Metlakatla, would be separated from us completely. This is especially baffling when one considers that Ketchikan's economy is tied directly to Metlakatla's. Ketchikan is our hub, it is where we go for access to shopping, hospitals, eyecare, haircuts, automotive repair, federal offices, U.S. District Court, Ketchikan International Airport, Alaska Marine Highway, not to mention all our friends and relatives, and air taxis and the Inter Island Ferry to our next nearest neighbors on Prince of Wales Island.

I propose a better way. Within a 100-mile radius of Metlakatla we can find Wrangell, Meyers Chuck, Loring, Ketchikan, Saxman, and all the towns and cities on Prince of Wales Island. A district made up of these communities makes a lot more sense for several reasons:

1. Geography. Just one glance at a map and you can see the communities that comprise the area known as Southern Southeast are a natural fit. Our proximity to one another is exemplified by the great old basketball rivalries we have with our neighbors.

2. Economy. Ketchikan, POW, and Metlakatla share converging economic interests. Many of the residents of POW commute to Ketchikan for the same reasons Metlakatlans do. If we want to catch the latest Marvel superhero movie, we go see it at the Coliseum Twin Theater in downtown Ketchikan. Millions of dollars every year flow between these nearby towns.

3. Energy. We are closer than we have ever been to completing the long-awaited electrical intertie between Ketchikan and Metlakatla. Just when the finish line is within sight, the Redistricting Board would divorce us, adding further complications to a vital project that is long overdue.

There can be no doubt that the challenges we are facing demand our communities rely upon one another to pull through tough times, neighbor helping neighbor, working toward a mutual benefit for the region of Southern Southeast Alaska. We need a redistricting plan that reflects that common sense.

Thank you.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:01 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Brenda**

Last Name: **Hurley**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistributing map, South Tongass Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **It is my understanding that with the new map proposal those that reside on South Tongass and Saxman in Ketchikan will be linked with Sitka. This makes no sense. We are on an island and are a part of Ketchikan. Please take another look at the plan and keep South Tongass and Saxman part of the Ketchikan district.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 6:13 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Laura**

Last Name: **Jackson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting in Southeast**

Public Comment: **Please reconsider BOTH versions of the redistricting of the SE area, or please clearly explain why dividing a community up and putting part of it in the same district as Sitka makes any sense.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 10:11 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Eileen B**

Last Name: **John**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99926**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: **Why remove us (Metlakatla) from your (Ketchikan) district that seems kind of stupid when we are next door to you?? I don't think it's right at all!!!**

From: Marc Johnson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:03 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
[REDACTED]

Subject: Comments re: proposed districts 12 & 16

TO: Alaska Redistricting Board
FROM: Marc Johnson

I am writing to express my opposition to the version 1 map for proposed district 16 and version 2 map for proposed district 12. These maps do not appear to take into consideration the requirement in the Alaska Constitution (article VI, section 6) that “each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socioeconomic area.”

I urge you to reject these two proposed districts and instead develop districts that are formulated in a nonpartisan manner.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments and of others who live within the boundaries of the proposed districts.

Sincerely,

Marc Johnson

[REDACTED]
Anchorage AK 99517
[REDACTED]

From: Alison Kelley [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 8:38 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Comments on proposed district maps

Hello,

I am a business owner in Spenard writing to oppose the two proposed district maps that fail to represent our communities.

Not only do the maps fail to meet the constitutional requirement that "each house district shall be formed of *contiguous and compact* [emphasis mine] territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socioeconomic area."

The constitutional process was designed and intended to be non-partisan; the proposed maps fail in both design and intent. I urge you to reject these maps and produce a map that fulfills the mandate to achieve districts that are contiguous, compact, relatively integrated socioeconomic areas.

Respectfully,

Alison Kelley
Owner, fuse& traverse, LLC
[REDACTED]
Anchorage, Alaska 99517

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:37 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Dave**

Last Name: **Kiffer**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Proposal to split Ketchikan Borough into different legislative districts**

Public Comment: **It seems that this came up before, the idea that Saxman and South Tongass had more in common with smaller rural areas than with the community of Ketchikan that it has been a part of since 1895. It remains a an ill-thought out idea. It would be like suddenly deciding the south end of Sitka should be lumped in with Ketchikan. I get that redistricting is hard. But continuity is one of your goals. This goes opposite from that. Dave Kiffer, former Mayor, Ketchikan Gateway Borough.**

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 6:36 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Redistricting testimony

I appreciate the opportunity to provide testimony to the 2020-2021 Alaska Redistricting Board.

My wife and I have been residents of Juneau since 1968. After teaching US History and Government at Juneau Douglas High School for almost 30 years, I served on the Juneau Assembly and was also elected Mayor of Juneau where I had the pleasure of working with the elected officials of Haines and Skagway and frequently visiting the communities. Our daughter lives and works in Skagway but travels to Juneau often for business and to see her Juneau family.

It was not a surprise to me that because of population shifts over the past 20 years, Juneau has not had enough population in its Borough for one entire Senate district and has had to add extra population from Haines and Skagway, our immediate neighbors to the north. What was a big surprise to me is how the map was drawn in the last redistricting. It never looked right and I never understood the rationale for looping Haines and Skagway into downtown Juneau for House representation. Haines and Skagway are located at the head of Lynn Canal, closer geographically by far to Juneau District 34's Lynn Canal precinct and other Valley precincts than they are to downtown Juneau.

When the ferry sails for Haines and Skagway, it does not leave from downtown Juneau docks. It leaves from a ferry terminal on the "north" end of town. There is a good possibility that the ferry terminal could be moved in the future to Cascade Point which is even closer to Haines and Skagway. Catamaran traffic also between Haines, Skagway and Juneau utilizes Auke Bay in the Valley.

Also located on that "north" end of town is the dock where shuttles take Juneau workers to the Kensington Mine. When I was Mayor, several residents of Haines were also employed by the Kensington which one can see on the east (mainland) side side when sailing Lynn Canal for Haines or Skagway. The majority of employees that work in either the Greens Creek or Kensington mines that live in Alaska reside in the Valley area of Juneau or Haines or Skagway.

Please consider drawing a map that makes geographic sense and recognizes the Haines and Skagway and the more rural "northern" Juneau Valley precinct connections.

respectfully,

Ken Koelsch
[REDACTED] Juneau

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE


Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:37 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Lallette**

Last Name: **Kistler**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Metlakatla**

Public Comment: **Ketchikan is the closest city to Metlakatla, and there are numerous family and friends in both places. Ketchikan is where they shop. Their only road out, the Marine Highway, only goes to Ketchikan. They should definitely not be grouped in with Sitka. They need to stay with Ketchikan.**

issues are closely related too.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 12:18 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Kathleen**

Last Name: **Light**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **South Tongass Highway residents being "re-districted" to Sitka**

Public Comment: **The citizens living on South Tongass and in the City of Saxman are residents of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough, on the island of Revillagedo. I strongly object to the concept of "re-districting" Ketchikan residents to Sitka. It not only make absolutely no sense, it would further fracture our community's sense of self. Please use your heads and do what is right for the citizens, not what you consider is right for your political aspirations.**

From: Heidi McCroskey Heimerl [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 11:40 AM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Redistricting concern

Hello,

I am a concerned citizen worried about the increasing partisanship in our country, to which partisan redistricting has contributed (and is legal).

Acknowledging this, Alaska has an independent board to make these decisions, with guidance from the Constitution that districts be compact, contiguous and similar socioeconomically.

I'm hoping that coming districts will look more like turtles than snakes, and will not contribute to our paralyzing polarization.

Thank you for your hard work,
Heidi

--

Heidi McCroskey Heimerl, LMSW
[REDACTED]

"All that you touch you change. All that you change changes you. The only lasting truth is change." - Octavia Butler

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 11:29 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Ernest**

Last Name: **McReynolds**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99928**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Splitting Ketchikan in two for redistricting**

Public Comment: **I cannot see how this makes sense in any educated mind. Is this part of the “divide the people campaign” that seems to be going on in our country?**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 10:01 am

First Name: **Donna**

Last Name: **Mears**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **NE Anchorage**

Public Comment: **These are my personal comments. For context, I am on the board for the Northeast Community Council. From my observations, the most interactive space between legislators and constituents is at the community councils in my area. When districts are not geographically 'contiguous and compact', their elected officials are much less likely to show up. With the current maps presented from the board, the attachment of the northern reaches of Muldoon to Eagle River is much more likely to result in disenfranchisement than making a slightly greater populous area that is more geographically 'contiguous and compact'. I also have concerns about non-population facilities being added to distant areas. For example, in Board Composite v.2 Bartlett High School is in a district with population from JBER and Chugiak. Bartlett should be in a district with the families it serves.**

I also have serious concerns that Randy Ruedrich was involved in drawing the board maps (KCAW "Partisan redistricting plan could force some Southeast incumbents to run against each other next year 9/13/21). As the 'front' of a third-party group (Alaskans for Fair and Equitable Redistricting), his input on mapping should be submitting a third-party map, not helping draw the board maps. This is very, very concerning.

Alaska Redistricting Board
411 W. 4th Avenue, Suite 302
Anchorage, AK 99501

Mountain View Community Council
c/o ACLT
3701 Mountain View Dr. #100
Anchorage, AK 99508

Sept. 8, 2021

Greetings:

The Mountain View Community Council (MVCC) respectfully requests that the following recommended changes be incorporated into the redistricting proposals and eventual approved plan. Please include the enclosed recommended changes, which will result in minimal population change to all affected house and senate districts.

The MVCC boundaries are geographically defined within our bylaws, which are attached to this letter and available at: <http://www.communitycouncils.org/download/1103.pdf>. These boundaries are important to our community because they define our area, assets, and infrastructure. They give us basis to advocate for or against, request funding, and administer. As a Municipal charter-recognized entity, the MVCC takes pride in being so close to our grassroots and in tune with our neighbors.

The 2013 proclamation included the MVCC within two senate districts (H and J), as well as four house districts (15, 16, 19, and 20). The MVCC is an all-volunteer entity. Coordination with six state legislators for one neighborhood can be burdensome and sometimes results in confusion and lack of coordination on projects. Fortunately, there is a solution which would bring the state redistricting plan into closer alignment with local neighborhood boundaries and which does not significantly change the population counts of any districts.

By drawing the legislative district boundaries to mirror the MVCC boundaries (see attached maps), the following assets which are widely acknowledged as Mountain View community fixtures would be incorporated into the current house district 19, or any eventual house and senate districts which encompass Mountain View.

- **Mountain View Elementary School** (serves as the polling place for precinct 19-500, yet is located outside of the precinct as drawn by 2013 proclamation.)
- **McPhee and Refugee Gardens** (operated by Municipality, and Catholic Social Services)
- **Davis Park** (located on land leased from the Air Force)
- **Mountain View Lions Park** (owned / maintained by Lions Club)
- **Municipal Snow Collection Lot** and adjacent land north of the Glenn Highway

If these changes are incorporated, the MVCC would no longer be within districts 15, 16 and 20. It is important to note that districts 15 and 16 as currently drawn have zero population within the MVCC.

The 2013 proclamation which placed the above community assets into districts 15 and 16 likely did so because they are located on military-leased lands, not because they are part of another area in concept or practice. It is critical to note that these items are outside the military fence.

The items in question are used primarily by Mountain View residents, rather than military or other neighborhood residents. For example, only Mountain View families send their children to Mountain View Elementary; the base has its own schools. It is also worth mentioning that Mountain View Elementary, which serves as the polling place for precinct 19-500, is actually located outside of the district as currently drawn.

We hope these recommended changes can help produce a plan that respects community continuity and practicality. Please direct any questions you may have to Kirsten Swann at 907-538-4879. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Executive Committee Members of the Mountain View Community Council



Kirsten Swann, MVCC President



Jack Klauschie, MVCC Vice President




Rayette Sterling, MVCC Secretary



Jasmin Smith, MVCC Immediate Past President



Daniel George, MVCC FCC Representative



Elmendorf AFB

Wilson Village

Eagleleg Golf Course

East Bluff

Davis Park

Artesian Village

Mountain View

Anchorage


Fairview

Airport Heights

Russian Jack Park

2013 Proclamation House Districts

Anchorage



Legend

- Military
- City
- Borough
- Water Boundary



Prepared by:
Alaska Redistricting Board

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Date/Time: Thursday, September 9, 2021 9:13 AM

Name: Cathy Muñoz

Email or Phone: [REDACTED]

Zip Code: 99801

Issue of Concern: recommendation for district 34 configuration

Public Comment: Dear members of the board,

Thank you for your service. The work of the Redistricting Board is vitally important and I truly appreciate your contributions of time and energy to this work.

Ten years ago, when the redistricting map for Southeast Alaska was configured, it seemed odd at the time that district 34 did not include the closest communities to the north. The conventional argument then was that Skagway's tourist dominant economy better aligned with downtown Juneau. However, the geographic and transportation links between the northern communities of Haines and Skagway should have been the higher priority and a closer nexus in drawing the 2010 maps.

You now have an opportunity to better align the Mendenhall Valley with the northern communities Haines and Skagway. The geographic promixity makes this a logical configuration, as well as the close transportation connection of the AMHS.

I also support a newly configured 'ice worm district' which would include the smaller rural communities throughout the region and Yakutat to the north.

I had the honor of representing Juneau in the House of Representatives for four terms. In my work, I always placed a high priority on the needs of all of Southeast with the belief that the region is strongest when the smallest communities are healthy and strong.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments, and thank you for your service in this important work.

Sincerely,

Cathy Muñoz

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:54 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Kevin**

Last Name: **Murphy**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting plan for Southeast**

Public Comment: **What numbskull came up with the idea to spilt an island community into two different districts. Come on Man! Pull your heads out!**

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, September 15, 2021 6:43 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
[REDACTED]
Subject: concerns about east Anchorage

To whom it may concern:

The proposed maps for redistricting have several questionable elements in their current form. They violate the spirit and intent of district definition requirements as outlined in the Alaska constitution and case law:

For its state legislative lines, the Alaska constitution requires that districts be contiguous and compact. [Alaska Const. art. VI, § 6; *Hickel v. Southeast Conference*, 846 P.2d 38, 44-46 (Alaska 1992); *In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d 141, 143 (Alaska 2002)] Each district must also contain as nearly as practicable a “relatively integrated socio-economic area.” [Alaska Const. art. VI, § 6; *In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 47 P.3d 1089, 1091, 1094 (Alaska 2002); *In re 2001 Redistricting Cases*, 44 P.3d 141, 145-46 (Alaska 2002); *Hickel v. Southeast Conference*, 846 P.2d 38, 46-47 (Alaska 1992); *Kenai Peninsula Borough v. State*, 743 P.2d 1352, 1361-65 (Alaska 1987)] In making these decisions, the commission may consider local government boundaries, and should use “drainage and other geographic features” to describe districts wherever possible. [Alaska Const. art. VI, § 6; *Kenai Peninsula Borough v. State*, 743 P.2d 1352 (Alaska 1987)]

I am concerned that there has not been enough time to discuss the Anchorage maps in specific. How were these lines derived? What is the rationale behind the changes?

In Map 1 and 2, I see that my neighborhood is lumped with Far North area and parts of south Anchorage and the lower Hillside, neighborhoods with very little in common with mine. I live in East Anchorage near the Tudor Muldoon curve. The arbitrary line to the north along 36th Ave is inexplicable and divides neighbors in an arbitrary way.

In Map 2, a portion of East Anchorage is usurped into Eagle River. East Anchorage should not be lumped with Eagle River. There is little that is in common: geography, continuity, or socio-economic status. These are distinct communities with different issues and concerns. It would be more appropriate to place the JBER residents with Eagle River. Eagle River and Chugiak are natural complements (just look at the initiative to leave the municipality by Eagle River and Chugiak!).

For both maps, the Matsu Borough is clearly socio-economically distinct from Anchorage and has its own distinct political and social culture, healthcare infrastructure, identity, and economy. I firmly believe Borough boundaries should be respected. The same house district should not include both portions of the Anchorage Municipality and the Matsu Borough.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 5:06 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jori**

Last Name: **Nicholson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: **Ketchikan should not be split into multiple districts. We do not have the same issues as other SE communities and should have a United voice representing our issues**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 12:20 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Bonnie and Stan**

Last Name: **Oaksmith**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Ketchikan residents on North Tongass Highway**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Public Comment: **What would anyone consider redistributing Metlakatla, Gravina or any areas around Ketchikan north to Sitka? What gains or losses will occur? All the land is close to Ketchikan, certainly not Sitka!**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 12:16 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jaimie**

Last Name: **Palmer**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Removal of Saxman, South Tongass, Gravina, Hyder, and Metlakatla**

Public Comment: **Dear Board,**

Please reconsider your ridiculous redistricting plan for Revillagigedo island and neighboring communities. In southern southeast we have a reliance on each other and understand the needs across islands and communities. It is completely insane to think that south Tongass, Saxman or any other neighboring communities would have more in common with communities 100's of miles away. Here we share recreational facilities, medical, educational, etc. we are connected by way of life and community kinship. This could not be said of the proposed redistricting towns in the same way, and therefore no one would be able to vote in good faith on measures particular to a region 100 miles away. Please keep southern southeast Alaska as a district to include, the entirety of Ketchikan, Saxman, South Tongass, Hyder, Metlakatla, Gravina, and Prince of Wales.

Thank you.

Jaimie & Jason Palmer

Ketchikan, AK

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:13 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Selynna**

Last Name: **Parks**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **District line redrawing**

Public Comment: **As a resident of ketchikan alaska, I am here to comment it makes very little sense to make saxman a part of a different district especially Sitka. You can't just split up an island into 2 districts. Just let it stay as it was or think of something better. This is the most silly thing I've ever heard. Thank you.**

From: Admin Civic Engagement Lynda P [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:28 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Cc: Lynda Paquette <admin@civic-engagement-inc.org>
Subject: The redistricting maps

Dear Re-districting Board,

It's important to approach this task sans any political will. I believe you need to be impartial and do what is appropriate without gerrymandering districts to serve the republican will which is what has happened historically.

Regarding the Kenai Peninsula:

There needs to be a Homer/Seward district please. It may be appropriate to include Hope and Cooper Landing as well.

Please have integrity and non-partisan intent as you proceed.

Thank you in advance.

Warmest Regards, Much Love,
Lynda
Civic Engagement Inc.
<https://civic-engagement-inc.org>
[REDACTED]
#Inoculate #BeCovidAware

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 11:13 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **JAMES**

Last Name: **PHILLIPS**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Saxman and South Tongass**

Public Comment: **The three fire departments here all help on calls, so is Sitka going to pay? if South Tongass and Saxman help on a call with the city of Ketchikan or North Tongass?**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 5:45 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **KAREN**

Last Name: **PITCHER**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Southeast Map Redistricting**

Public Comment: **Ketchikan is located in the lower corner of Revillagigedo Island. Ketchikan's road system goes approximately 20 miles either side of town. Both Saxman and South Tongass are part of Ketchikan's south of town road system. We are ONE community, all part of the Ketchikan Gateway Borough. To divide ONE community into different districts makes no sense. Additionally, Ketchikan is a hub city for Metlakatla and Prince of Wales Island which are directly connected to Ketchikan via ferry, and which use the Ketchikan hospital system as well as major retailers which are not available in those communities. Please continue to keep us united as ONE community, one district.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:01 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Adam**

Last Name: **Pollock**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99645**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **palmer**

Public Comment: **I live 5 miles from downtown Palmer (Buffalo Mine Road) . To have a district that is combining Palmer, Valdez, and Delta Junction is in complete violation of the intent in the AK. constitution that districts encompass communities in proximity to eachother and have similar needs and concerns. I would challenge you to explain to me what Valdez and Delta Junction have in common. It seems that this change was done with the intent to lump what had been a less conservative are(sutton, chickaloon) with the more conservative Delta area to weaken the chances of people like Warren Keogh against people like our current governor, who narrowly won. It also might be that the coal mine in Sutton that was vehemently opposed by an overwhelming majority of locals would have a better chance of proceeding by allowing people who live hundreds of miles away lopsided representation. Please look at the distance between Delta and Valdez and tell me what is contiguous about it? Please return the area just East of Palmer to the Mat-Su Valley where it belongs and return Delta and Valdez to their respective boroughs. Thank You**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 12:09 pm

First Name: **Pat**

Last Name: **Race**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99801**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Carveouts**

Public Comment: I'm very disappointed by the packing of sitting incumbents from the House Majority together into single districts where they will have to face off against one another. Yes, some of that was inevitable, but the very blatant carveouts we've seen in these first public drafts are a very bad first step into public for this board. It don't inspire a great deal of confidence in the process and frankly does a disservice to the good people who I know are involved in the process.

You must guard your work and ensure a fair and public process doesn't get undermined by political strategists.

Specifically, in Juneau you've drawn a tiny loop around Andi Story's residence. In Ketchikan, you've drawn a tiny loop around Dan Otiz's residence. In Anchorage, you've lumped Claman, Dummond and Fields into the same district. These are all choices you've made or mistakes you've made and they look pretty bad.

I understand some of these are being attributed to "glitches" and I look forward to corrections, but haven't seen them yet. I also look forward to a detailed explanation of why and how those glitches occurred and what's being done to ensure there aren't other "glitches" in the process ahead.

Our government and our elections are built on a foundation of trust and a transparent public process and I hope the redistricting board can live up to those foundational elements of our democracy.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 12:56 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Taylor**

Last Name: **Redmond**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Public Comment: **The plan to say south tongass is part of Sitka is ridiculous, how does that even make sense??? They're 2 different islands, just keep them the way they are**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 4:52 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Redistricting

Hello,

I am writing to urge you to go back to the drawing board on your redistricting maps. While I'm sure significant time and energy has been put into this effort thus far, it seems fairly clear that the proposed maps grant significant partisan advantages, while also grouping some dissimilar populations.

Your work is vital to our democracy. I hope your efforts will improve the outcome.

Nico Reijns
Girdwood, AK

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:50 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Tyrell**

Last Name: **Rettke**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Na**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan District redraw**

Public Comment: **It makes zero sense to put the area south of Ketchikan with another district. Geographically they are further away from Sitka, and community wise are completely (physically and metaphorically) disconnected from Sitka. Leave Ketchikan as one whole community. It is political gerrymandering to cut a community into pieces. They are all within the same borough, on the same island, and connected by a single road. Sitka is a separate island and has no connection to Saxman or South Tongass. Leave the district in tact.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 4:48 pm

First Name: **Doug**

Last Name: **Robbins**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99507**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Arbitrary divots to excise incumbent Independents and Democrats from constituents**

Public Comment: **There are arbitrary cut-outs that surgically excise Independent and Democratic incumbents from their current constituents and pair them in new districts with other incumbent Democrats.**

A one-square mile divot was placed around Representative Dan Ortiz' house, excising him from his home community of Ketchikan and doubling him up with Democratic Representative Kreiss-Tomkins in a district extending 500 miles to the north. The Board's maps also place a 1/4 square mile divot around Democratic Representative Story's house to remove her from her current constituents and double her up with Democrat Sara Hannen in a single district.

In both Board Versions, Districts 1, 3 and 4 are identical. In both maps, population was taken from District 4, with a deviation of 2.65, (including Representative Story), to add to District 3, with a deviation of -2.85. A clearly better solution is to take population from adjacent District 1, which has excess population with a positive deviation of 1.17. The Board maps fail the test of the best solution for equal population.

Date: September 16, 2021, 4:49 pm

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **State Senate Districts**

Public Comment: **No Senate district maps are shown. Senate districts are a necessary part of the redistricting process, and the Board has failed in its constitutional duty to present these maps to the public.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Thursday, September 9, 2021 8:40 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Stephen**

Last Name: **Robbins**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99507**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Board Composite Version 1 and 2**

Public Comment: **HD-28, by the 2013 proclamation boundaries, is a nearly ideal district in terms of the 2020 census, with a population deviation of only 117 people from the ideal population. Demographic data from the state (circa 2017) show that HD-28 is also distinct in socioeconomic measures of education, household income, voter turnout, etc. Reapportionment of this district by division or inclusion of distant areas seems unnecessary and contradictory to guidance in the State constitution.**

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 4:36 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Issues with Redistricting Board Maps, Versions 1 and 2

There are a number of problems with the Version 1 & Version 2 maps prepared by the Redistricting Board.

1) No Senate district maps are presented. Senate districts are a necessary part of the redistricting process, and the Board has failed in its constitutional duty to present these maps to the public.

2) There are arbitrary cut-outs that surgically excise Independent and Democratic incumbents from their current constituents and pair them in new districts with other incumbent Democrats. A one-square mile divot was placed around Representative Dan Ortiz' house, excising him from his home community of Ketchikan and doubling him up with Democratic Representative Kreiss-Tomkins in a district extending 500 miles to the north. The Board's maps also place a 1/4 square mile divot around Democratic Representative Story's house to remove her from her current constituents and double her up with Democrat Sara Hannen in a single district.

In both Board Versions, Districts 1, 3 and 4 are identical. In both maps, population was taken from District 4, with a deviation of -2.65, (including Representative Story), to add to District 3, with a deviation of -2.85. A clearly better solution is to take population from adjacent District 1, which has excess population with a positive deviation of 1.17. The Board maps fail the test of the best solution for equal population.

3) The board maps double-up and triple-up Independent and Democratic incumbents and declared candidates.

First, these maps unnecessarily place incumbent representatives Drummond, Fields and Claman in a single district. Second, one Board version places incumbent Representative Snyder (D) in a single district with Representative Spohnholz (D); while the other map gerrymanders precincts according to partisan lean to ensure that the Democrat loses. Third, both Board maps place a declared Independent candidate, Jennifer Sonne, in the same district as Independent incumbent Schrage. The only doubling up that occurred for Republicans involves an older Republican who has already indicated an interest in retiring – just enough to create plausible deniability about partisan intent.

4) Population deviations in the Municipality of Anchorage are unnecessarily high and variable for urban districts. On the Board's Version 1 map, the range of deviations is from +1.86% to -2.22% in districts 9 through 24, representing the Municipality. In Version 2, the range of deviations in districts 9 through 24 is from +0.88% to -4.71. A court ruling on the 2001 Alaska redistricting held that urban districts should be held to a higher standard of population equality than rural districts, because of the ease of adjusting urban district boundaries. The Board's maps fail this principle by drawing urban districts with an unacceptably high range of population deviations.

In general, the over-riding objective in the Board's maps appears to be disadvantage Independent and Democratic incumbents. This is an abuse of power. They may be legal, as the Supreme Court recently ruled that districting maps don't have to be fair. But a system that allows the party in power to manipulate the election apparatus for its own benefit cannot produce elections with integrity. Ultimately, those who tolerate or condone the abuse of power will eventually find that a bigger bully will abuse power against them.

Regards,
Stephen D. (Doug) Robbins
[REDACTED] Anchorage, AK 99507

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 4:48 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): **Arbitrary divots to excise incumbent Independents and Democrats from constituents**

Public Comment: **There are arbitrary cut-outs that surgically excise Independent and Democratic incumbents from their current constituents and pair them in new districts with other incumbent Democrats.**

A one-square mile divot was placed around Representative Dan Ortiz' house, excising him from his home community of Ketchikan and doubling him up with Democratic Representative Kreiss-Tomkins in a district extending 500 miles to the north. The Board's maps also place a 1/4 square mile divot around Democratic Representative Story's house to remove her from her current constituents and double her up with Democrat Sara Hannen in a single district.

In both Board Versions, Districts 1, 3 and 4 are identical. In both maps, population was taken from District 4, with a deviation of 2.65, (including Representative Story), to add to District 3, with a deviation of -2.85. A clearly better solution is to take population from adjacent District 1, which has excess population with a positive deviation of 1.17. The Board maps fail the test of the best solution for equal population.

Date: September 16, 2021, 4:49 pm

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **State Senate Districts**

Public Comment: **No Senate district maps are shown. Senate districts are a necessary part of the redistricting process, and the Board has failed in its constitutional duty to present these maps to the public.**

From: Wendy Robbins [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:56 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Redistricting

I am concerned with the current two versions of Alaska's redistricting map as drawn by the Redistricting Board and feel the following issues should be addressed.

As currently drawn, many Anchorage districts exceed acceptable population deviations from the desired 18,335 especially considering the higher standard to which urban districts are held. Surely the Board can do a better job of equalizing population.

There appear to be arbitrary cut-outs that are designed to disadvantage Independent and Democratic incumbents while leaving Republican incumbents unscathed. The Board's maps doubles and even triples the number of Democratic incumbents living in the proposed new districts while leaving Republican districts alone. This smacks of gerrymandering and is completely unacceptable. I expect better of my leaders.

Finally, any redistricting plan, by necessity, should include Senate District pairings. New House Districts should not be approved prior to allowing the public to see Senate District pairings. It's impossible to assess an overall plan without these. The Board has a duty to simultaneously present both House and Senate districts to the public.

Thank you for taking testimony. I look forward to seeing updated maps.

Sincerely,

Wendy Robbins
[REDACTED]
Anchorage, AK 99507

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 7:42 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jamelia**

Last Name: **Saied**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Public Comment: **In the last Redistricting where I live, in Centennial Village, was moved from District 15 in Anchorage to District 13 in Eagle River. We want to be moved back to Anchorage, more in common both economically and socially with the people on the other side of the street rather than with Eagle River, 15 miles away.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 11:56 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Michael**

Last Name: **Salita**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **9990**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **South Tongass/Saxman; Sitka**

Public Comment: **Got any reason to explain introduce such an odd request of putting South Tongass and Saxman residents to Sitka? Sounds like a terrible idea to the community unless you got a good reason for this lmao**

From: Tami Schleusner [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, September 13, 2021 9:48 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Redistricting

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing as a concerned citizen of Metlakatla. I am worried about the ramifications of the proposed redistricting of my hometown. We have deep, natural ties to our current district. Our nearest neighbor, Ketchikan, would be considered a completely different district, which does not make sense. We have direct economical ties to Ketchikan and other neighboring towns. Gavin Hudson has shared with you an extremely well-written and thought out letter. I hope that you have taken the time to read it.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Tami Schleusner

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Tuesday, September 14, 2021 3:42 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 3:41 pm

First Name: **Sally**

Last Name: **Schlichting**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99801**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Board Composite v2 District 3/District 4**

Public Comment: **This map shows the most egregious example of Republican gerrymandering I have ever seen. I don't need to tell you why. You know why. You have purposefully put Rep. Story's house in Rep. Hannan's District. As a Southeast Alaska resident for more than 50 years, I am appalled, I vehemently object, and I demand that you revise this map to show Rep. Story's place of residence in the district she currently represents. Your redraw is a blatant attempt to push out a duly elected Democrat so that you can change the balance of power in the state by brute force because you disagree with who was elected in District 4. In fact it's laughable it is so brazen. You are not doing your jobs to redraw districts in a nonpartisan fashion. Shame on you. We live in a democracy. Which means sometimes people you don't agree with get elected. Get used to it.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:45 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Renee**

Last Name: **Schofield**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Dividing Ketchikan Gateway Borough**

Public Comment: **KEEP the entire borough in one district. May common sense prevail.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 4:31 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Melody**

Last Name: **Scott**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Southeast Alaska**

Public Comment: **Please reconsider redistricting southern southeast Alaska. It would be unfair to the voters and the representatives to have such a large area to cover. Not sure the purpose of putting all the native communities into one very large district.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 12:59 pm

First Name: **Elizabeth**

Last Name: **Serrano**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **N/A**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99501**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Map 1**

Public Comment: **To whom it may concern,**

Redistricting map one will be detrimental to our city and the individual communities that make it up. Breaking up existing communities such as Fairview and Northeast Anchorage in the way it does on this map does nothing to serve the constituents in those areas. It would diminishes the power of the voice for those that live in these typically lower income areas. Redistricting is an important part of the democratic process, however if the process is used to diminish the voices of BIPOC and low income individuals by breaking those communities into pieces this can be seen as nothing more then gerrymandering.

I would ask that if one of these maps be chosen that you would go with Map two, which keeps those historically older and low income communities together.

Thank you for your consideration.

Elizabeth Serrano

From: TJ Sheffield - [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 6:01 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Redistricting comments

I have been an Anchorage, Alaska resident for 35 years.

As I understand the redistricting proposal, the idea to combine parts of the Anchorage Municipality of with the Mat-Su Borough to form a house district is not only unconstitutional but has no logical basis. These two geographic locations are in NO WAY compatible in any sense, even as a "socio-economic" entity.

Stop this immoral Gerrymandering!

TJ Sheffield
Anchorage, Alaska

From: Sue Sherif [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 10:07 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Testimony to Redistricting Board

I have looked at the two Redistricting Board map proposals posted on the Board's website this week and am writing to question the consistent population deviation for all 5 Fairbanks North Star Borough proposed districts in both plans. The population deviation tables clearly show that the highest overpopulation of individual districts in the state under either plan is in these five districts.

While I understand the challenges of distributing Alaska's farflung population in anything close to the mandated target population for each district, as a resident of the Fairbanks North Star Borough currently living in a district that ignores the established boundaries of the Fairbanks North Star Borough (current District 6), I am distressed that the board chose this time to compact what amounts to approximately 22% of an additional district into the 5 proposed districts. When I see a number of underpopulated districts in much more populous areas to the south, I question the Board's decision.

All 5 of the Borough districts are overpopulated by more than 4% each, and while that deviation may fall within the nominally acceptable range, for all the highest deviations to fall within one political subdivision does not fall within the spirit of the mandate for districts of equal sizes. If it were just one or two districts within Borough boundaries, I would see it as unfortunate but acceptable, but seeing overpopulation of all of the districts within the Borough, I would like to hear the Board's rationale for why this is acceptable.

I understand the alternative may be to once again put my neighborhood back into a district that has no socioeconomic relation, but I would hope that the Board can return to their maps to find a more acceptable solution than the ones proposed.

Sue Sherif

[REDACTED]
Fairbanks, AK 99712 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

September 15, 2021

Alaska Redistricting Board
P.O. Box 240147
Anchorage, AK 99524

RE: Support for map submitted by Doyon, Limited and partners

Dear Members of the Alaska Redistricting Board,

This letter is to express our support for the map by Doyon, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Fairbanks Native Association, and Sealaska submitted to the Redistricting Board of Alaska.

In the past, Alaska Native involvement in the redistricting process have been heavily reliant on the court system. We write now in hopes that this board will be willing to achieve apportionment that accurately reflects the many cultures and values that make up over one fifth of Alaskans that identify as Alaska Native.

We urge this Board to give strong consideration to the map developed by Doyon, Tanana Chiefs Conference, Fairbanks Native Association, and Sealaska. The work that these organizations have done as it relates to an accurate Census count and to communicate the impacts of redistricting as a means to advance or suppress the political power of Alaska Natives has been significant and we are grateful for the opportunity to stand together on this critical issue.

From acknowledging tribal sovereignty to protecting the land and resources, we should be able to hold our representatives accountable and be sure that they are truly representing the interests of our people.

In the past, the Interior Alaska Native communities have been fractured in deference to keeping a certain balance in the greater Fairbanks, Northern, and Western Alaska. The map presented to you by Doyon and partners, if adopted, would be the first time in recent decades that the Interior Athabascan communities will have an influential voice in Juneau.

In developing a map that seeks fair and unfractured representation, it is not fair to lump all Alaska Natives together. Small communities will suffer if used as "filler" to reach target populations without thought and consideration given to their individual priorities. Doyon and partners have endeavored to give deference to ANCSA regions, river systems, and local government boundaries while maintaining our cultural and familial connections.

Please strongly consider utilizing the map provided by Doyon and partners as a starting point for your work.

Sincerely,



Dorothy Shockley, CEO

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 11:11 am

First Name: **Yarrow**

Last Name: **Silvers**

Group Affiliation, if applicable: **Board members of Scenic Foothills CC. I am speaking for myself.**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99504**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Maps 1 and 2 Anchorage area/ East Anchorage**

Public Comment: **First, I wanted to say something about the process of mapping Anchorage. All week I attended and watched as considerations were being given to making smooth, compact contiguous boundaries and of Socio-economic factors as defined by where people live, work, play, and shop. All those considerations, as well as public transparency seem to have gone out the door with Anchorage. After a full week of discussion on other areas, Anchorage maps were dropped in pretty much blindly, with very little discussion or indication of how the maps were arrived at.**

I also have concerns about Randy Ruedrich's involvement in the mapping. He is not on the redistricting board and his long standing partisan involvement in the community should preclude his involvement in this process, other than to present a third party map of his own. Public trust has been eroded and I can not help but wonder if the jigs and jags which exist at the expense of compactness throughout the Anchorage map, that force D incumbents out of their districts and into competition with each other in 2 or 3 different instances, while uniquely protecting Republican incumbents, exists due to Mr. Ruedrich's involvement. While current incumbent addresses are not supposed to be a consideration in the mapping process, it is apparent that they were, not just in the instance of Anchorage but also in the one block square that deviates from the road line which pulls Rep. Story out of his district. I believe the Anchorage map should be thrown out entirely and started from scratch with respect to socio-economic concerns, compactness and contiguousness. The blatant square surrounding Rep. Story's house should be brought back to the road line that divides the two districts along the rest their length.

Speaking to the two maps individually, one change I would like to see on map two is North East Anchorage included in a North East Anchorage district similar to the current maps and parts of JBER used to even out the population with Eagle River. Many people who work on base live, play and shop in Eagle River and I believe this would be a more socio-economically appropriate pairing. I also think there would be value in keeping Eagle River entirely separate of Anchorage due to the growing Eagle Exit movement, which is a clear indication of the lack of Socio-economic cohesiveness between the

two regions, and which may result in Eagle River being in a borough of its own at some point during the use of these maps.

Now I will talk about map one. Map one does not appear to be smooth, compact and contiguous, but instead jigs and jags and in particular, East Anchorage is shaped like a pinwheel, diced and chunked with its pieces going to Elmendorf, Eagle River, and South Anchorage. This results in East Anchorage residents having its votes diluted and being under represented as minority pieces of districts with larger areas of differing socio economic concerns.

I will now discuss my district, and how the map affects this specific area. I am in the district listed as district 19 on the map, which has chunks of Nunaka Valley and the Muldoon curve removed and another chunk reaching out to include the residence of the currently neighbouring districts representative, and seems to be specifically designed for Lance Pruitt to select his voters for a come back rather than the other way around; while simultaneously removing two incumbents from their seats. This may not have been the intention, but it definitely carries a strong appearance of partisan gerrymandering and is disrespectful to the Alaska Constitution which discourages the practice of gerrymandering, as well as to the residents of these areas.

I believe that everybody who lives in Anchorage likely knows that most people don't work, live, play and shop in both South Anchorage and East Anchorage nor do they work, live, play and shop in both Eagle River and East Anchorage. They know that East Anchorage is socio-economically distinct, with lower average incomes than much of Anchorage, and in particular South Anchorage and most of Eagle River. East Anchorage is sometimes seen as an area of older, low income neighborhoods, seedy strip malls and dive bars and is often looked down on and disparaged by the very districts that would be tasked with representing its parts and pieces under this map. As a lifelong Alaskan who has lived in many areas of Anchorage including South Anchorage and now East Anchorage where I have resided for the last 7 years, I can tell you that what many people don't know about East Anchorage is that it is a close knit community, where neighbors go out of their way to get to know one another, help each other out and give back to the community.

As a final illustration of how this map is damaging to East Anchorage residents I'd like to point to the Chantsnu park community gathering space which East Anchorage residents fought for a decade to have created, rather than another strip mall. Chantsnu park has become the beating heart of the East Anchorage community with Winter ice skating, community gardens and a purpose built Saturday Market space with a covered pavilion and playground. The fact that map 1 rips this community center out of East Anchorage and puts it into a New Eagle river district whose representatives will have little incentive to safeguard it, is a real indication that this map does not adequately take social economic factors into consideration, but instead has the appearance of being motivated by politically partisan gerrymandering.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 1:12 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Peter**

Last Name: **Stanton**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Opposition to Dividing Ketchikan in Southeast-v1 and Southeast-v2**

Public Comment: **I am seriously concerned by and opposed to how Revillagiedo Island and the community of Ketchikan have been divided in both of the Proposed Redistricting Plans adopted on September 9th. Ketchikan is the hub city of southern Southeast Alaska, and it is clearly linked to Metlakatla, Prince of Wales Island, and Wrangell as a “relatively integrated socio-economic area.” It does NOT make sense to divide Ketchikan by separating the majority of Ketchikan from friends and neighbors in the precincts of Saxman and South Tongass, and from the closely-linked communities of Hyder, Metlakatla, and Prince of Wales. It is very easy to create a simple, compact district in southern Southeast containing Ketchikan, Wrangell, all of Prince of Wales Island, Metlakatla, and Hyder. The census population of this area (19,168) is in fact even larger than the ideal average district size of 18,335. Thank you for your consideration.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE


Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 7:31 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Shellie**

Last Name: **Tabb**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Moving S Tongass Hwy/Saxman**

Public Comment: **This redistricting is completely backwards and appears to be gerrymandering AK Native communities. I am a voter and I strongly disagree with this redistricting proposal.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 9:41 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Jess**

Last Name: **Tacker**

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting**

Public Comment: **Saxman and South Tongass of Ketchikan should not become a part of Sitka. It makes zero sense to redistrict half of one island to another island. It'd be confusing for residents and visitors alike. Please reconsider and do not approve this. Please visit Ketchikan and then take a plane ride to Sitka to see why this wouldn't make any sense.**

.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 12:39 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Mary**

Last Name: **Thompson**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Ketchikan Gateway Borough**

Public Comment: **Sitka, Alaska on Baranof Island is 184 miles north of Revilla Island, the location of the City of Ketchikan and the Ketchikan Gateway Borough. Slicing off the south end of the Ketchikan road system and adding that population to a separate community on another island nearly 200 miles away makes no sense. Please reconsider.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE


A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 1:35 pm

First Name: **Edward**

Last Name: **Toal**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99517**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Gerrymandering**

Public Comment: **We can see the gerrymandering and it isn't OK. Just because this kind of cheating is legal doesn't make it right. Do what is right instead of what puts your people in power.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 14, 2021, 2:23 pm

First Name: **Quinn**

Last Name: **Tracy**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99801**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **District 2 and District 3**

Public Comment: **The surgical carve outs of Rep. Ortiz's home into District 2 and Rep. Story's home into District 3 seems to either be an absurd coincidence or blatantly bad faith redistricting. There are plenty of more logical options to draw the District 3 boundary through the Mendenhall Valley. Out of all the possible neighborhoods in Ketchikan, the decision to carve out Rep. Ortiz's neighborhood is incredibly egregious. Delineating political districts is an important function of democracy and doing so in bad faith is concerning. Please reconsider these delineations.**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Sunday, September 12, 2021 10:06 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Meghan**

Last Name: **Traudt**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable):

Public Comment: As a resident of Ketchikan, I am strongly against any consideration to split the Borough into two different legislative districts. While I know that the board stated the maps with these proposals were a mistake, it's impossible not to think otherwise. Ketchikan has never had more than one representative and given how the proposed map is drawn, I do not see that this is necessary now. The proposal to move Gravina into district 2 is also ludicrous. The Ketchikan International Airport is located on Gravina so as residents of Ketchikan, we will have one representative for our community and another for our airport? How does this make sense?

Additionally, given the proximity some communities have to Ketchikan (Metlakatla, Hyder) and how they utilize services here, I believe consideration should be given to maintaining the same representative in the state legislature as members of those communities are more likely to have the same concerns as Ketchikan rather than Sitka.

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 4:11 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Donna**

Last Name: **Turner**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Redistricting Map**

Public Comment: **It makes no sense to divide Ketchikan, Saxman and North Tongass into another district . Keep it as the way it is. Dividing our Island make me upset. Hands off please**

From: Brett Watson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 9:18 AM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Opposition to Proposed Redistricting Maps

I am writing to voice strong opposition to the two proposed maps (Board Composite v.1 and Board Composite v.2) adopted September 9th, 2021 by the Redistricting Board.

Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution requires that "Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area."

I believe that this criteria is violated with respect to the new HD23, which in both Board Composite v.1 and Board Composite v.2 combines the North Muldoon area with areas in Eagle River.

Eagle River and North Muldoon represent significantly different socio-economic areas. These areas are serviced by different high schools, which are instructive for understanding the demographics of these areas:

Bartlett High School has the following racial demographics : **18% of the students are White**, 9% are African-American, 32% are Asian or Pacific Islander, 16% are Multi Ethnic, 12% are Alaskan Native or American Indian, and 13% are Hispanic.

Eagle River High School has the following racial demographics : **65% of the students are White**, 6% are African-American, 3% are Asian or Pacific Islander, 14% are Multi Ethnic, 4% are Alaskan Native or American Indian, and 11% are Hispanic.

Information comes from the most recent Anchorage School District [Ethnicity Report](#), dated Oct 30, 2020.

Only a small area in North Muldoon is currently combined with Eagle River in Anchorage Assembly District 2. Proposals for Eagle River to become independent from the Municipality of Anchorage do not include the larger North Muldoon area in their proposals. Advocates for an independent Eagle River note on their [website](#): " Whereas, "Eagle River-Chugiak-Peters Creek-Eklutna-JBER", hereinafter referred to as "District 2", have common demographic, economic and political interests that historically have been ignored or militated by special interest groups in the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA)."

Thank you for your Board service and consideration of my comments.

Sincerely,
Brett Watson

From: Tyler Watson [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 4:00 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: Testimony Regarding Draft Redistricting Maps

Dear Redistricting Board,

My name is Tyler Watson, a resident of HD27, and I'm representing myself. I'm writing because I'm concerned about the draft maps released and their implications for East Anchorage districts. I understand that as the Redistricting Board you must juggle several constitutional requirements in creating new districts, but from my perspective the draft maps released fail almost all of the criteria aside from lack of deviation from the ideal district size.

Article VI, Section 6 of the Alaska Constitution: "Each house district shall be formed of contiguous and compact territory containing as nearly as practicable a relatively integrated socio-economic area. Each shall contain a population as near as practicable to the quotient obtained by dividing the population of the state by forty. 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 whenever possible."

In reading this constitutional mandate and looking at the draft maps I'm struck by large sections of Muldoon being put into a district with Eagle River. Those two communities are not even "relatively integrated" and while both are in Anchorage, these maps seem to ignore the local boundaries of Muni Assembly districts and Community Councils. I don't think any resident of Muldoon or Eagle River would say they identify with the other as living in the same community and I fear representation for both communities would be weakened by such a district.

From my view Muldoon has much more in common with neighborhoods to the west such as Wonder Park, Russian Jack, Airport Heights, and Mountain View. I ask the board to reconsider these draft maps and strive to keep Anchorage districts within Anchorage proper. Eagle River and East Anchorage each deserve representation dedicated to them and focused on their needs.

Thank you,

Tyler Watson
Anchorage, AK

--

Tyler Watson
[REDACTED]

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD


WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Saturday, September 11, 2021 2:21 AM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Roger**

Last Name: **Whitesides**

Email or Phone Contact: 

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Removing Roosevelt drive from Ketchikan district**

Public Comment: **Makes no sense!! Sounds like some one is trying to influence our election negativity's is what I think!!**

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

Sent: Friday, September 10, 2021 10:15 PM

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

First Name: **Joe**

Last Name: **Williams, Jr.**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99901**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **Moving Saxman away from Ketchikan**

Public Comment: **This is among the very sad suggestions I have ever heard of. A public hearing must be done here in Saxman.**

From: Judy Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, September 16, 2021 5:49 PM
To: Testimony <testimony@akredistrict.org>
Subject: East Anchorage-Eagle River redistricting

My husband and I have lived and voted in Eagle River since 2013. I've spent time looking over the Board's v1 and v2 proposed redistricting maps for the East Anchorage-Eagle River communities. I'm opposed to both maps for these reasons:

- One of the outlined standards for redistricting in Alaska is defined this way, “a relatively integrated socio-economic area.” East Anchorage and Eagle River are two very different communities, communities that face very different challenges. The representation for both areas should reflect that.
- Ft. Richardson has been in the same district as Eagle River-Chugiak for the last ten years. Because our community has the highest per capita active duty and retired military population in the state, it makes sense to tie JBER to Eagle River, — two communities that have close socio-economic ties — instead of trying to shoehorn in a slice of East Anchorage.
- Eagle River/Chugiak is trying to split from the Anchorage Municipality. For that reason alone, Eagle River should be kept intact. There will be plenty of stumbling blocks if the split occurs, without having to decide whether East Anchorage will be caught up in that division.

Judy Williams
Eagle River, AK
Retired

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

WEBSITE RESPONSE

A website response from the Map Comment form as been received with the following submission details.

Date: September 16, 2021, 4:22 am

First Name: **Stephen**

Last Name: **Wright**

Group Affiliation, if applicable:

Email or Phone Contact: [REDACTED]

Your ZIP Code: **99654**

Issue of Concern (Please provide map name if applicable): **If district should be plus or minus 100 for size adjusting the the district sizes based on population**

Public Comment: **Also the current numbering of the districts must correspond to and consistently match.**

Like 1 North Region

2 ,3 Northern

4, 5, 6 ,7 Fairbanks

8,9,10,11,12,13 South Central, Valley

14,15,16,17,18,19,20 South Central Anchorage

21,22,23,24.25, South Central Continued

26, 27, 28, 29, 30 South Central Extended

31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36 Kodiak to Kenai

37, 38, 39, 40, South East extended with Ketchikan as District 40.

Consider my input natural the more the more flow and grouped the better.. The mapping tried for a few hours and then the system reset my map and I had to start from scratch, I noticed the mapping tools I used would not allow manual line drawing, If it had a feature to auto balance districts based on sequentially numbering of the districts, that would be a nice way to balance the population for a truly consistent representation based on geography.