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

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

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD'S OPPOSITION TO RILEY PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER ESTABLISHING DEADLINES ON FINAL PLAN

INTRODUCTION

COMES NOW, the Alaska Redistricting Board ("Board"), by and through counsel, Patton Boggs LLP, and hereby opposes the Riley Plaintiffs' third Motion for Order Establishing Deadlines on Final Plan. The Riley Plaintiffs disingenuously use language from the Board's notice dated June 7, 2013, four days *prior* to this Court's Order on Motion for Reconsideration whereby it directed the Board to timely adopt a schedule for the Voting Rights Act portion of the *Hickel* process, as the basis for their request. The Board must go once more unto the breach to defend itself against the Riley Plaintiffs' Siren song and clarify for this Court the true facts, which clearly establish an order is once again not necessary.

ARGUMENT

1. The Riley Plaintiffs Rely on Outdated Information to Raise a Now Moot Issue.

Relying upon a quote from the Board's Notice, dated June 7, 2013, four days *prior* to this Court's Order Regarding Riley Plaintiffs' Motion for Reconsideration (hereafter "Reconsideration Order"), the Riley Plaintiffs assert that the Board has

PATTON BOGGS LLP 601 West Fifth Avenue Suite 700 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300 Fax: (907) 263-6345 somehow defied this Court's requirement that the Board timely adopt a schedule for

steps 2 and 3 of the Hickel process. Filed a mere ten (10) days after this Court's Order,

and three weeks prior to the deadline for completion of the Hickel Process, the Riley

Plaintiff's motion is an amalgamation of incorrect facts and improper assumptions. No

amount of references to Greek mythology can hide the Adikian nature of the Riley

Plaintiffs' motion.

In accordance with its adopted schedule, approved by this Court, on June 21,

2013, the Board adopted ten statewide draft Hickel plans. 1 Prior to adjournment of that

meeting, Board counsel reminded the Board of their obligation to set a schedule for

steps 2 and 3 of the Hickel process.2 Board counsel advised the Board it needed to start

considering dates and deadlines, and thinking about its schedule so the Board could

move forward with the process.³

The June 21 meeting was the first Board meeting since the Court issued its

Reconsideration Order. Since adopting its schedule on June 7, 2013, the Board had

been hard at work drafting various Hickel plans and preparing for the public hearings,

all while working in an office with no air conditioning.⁴ At the time the Riley Plaintiffs

filed their motion, the Board still had three weeks left on its approved schedule to

complete the first step of the Hickel process. The Board was aware of its obligations

¹ See Exhibit A (Board Meeting Transcript ("Bd. Tran."), dated June 21, 2013). The Board also adopted a two-district plan submitted by the Ketchikan Gateway Borough.

² Bd. Tran. at 19:21-20:9.

 3 Id.

PATTON BOGGS LLP

601 West Fifth Avenue Suite 700

Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300

Fax: (907) 263-6345

⁴ *Id.* at 17:22-19:19.

ARB'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR ORDER ESTABLISHING DEADLINES ON FINAL PLAN In Re 2011 Redistricting Cases, Consolidated Case No. 4FA-11-02209 CI Page 2 of 7

and fully intended to timely comply with the process. It has not, as the Riley Plaintiffs

remark, ignored this Court's order or used "contrived reluctance" in following the

process on remand.

Had the Riley Plaintiffs waited a reasonable amount of time, rather than a mere

ten days after this Court's order and three weeks before the Board was required to finish

step 1 of the Hickel process, this Court would not have been inundated with another

unnecessary motion. A motion now made moot by the United States Supreme Court's

recent ruling in Shelby County v. Holder.

The United States Supreme Court Has Rendered Its Decision in Shelby 2. County v. Holder, Thereby "Immobilizing" Section 5 of the Voting Rights

Act.

As the Board predicted, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in

Shelby County v. Holder on Tuesday, June 25, 2013, before the end of the term.⁵ The

high court held Section 4(b) of the Voting Rights Act unconstitutional, and further held

the formula in that section can no longer be used as a basis for subjecting jurisdictions

to preclearance.⁶ The Court did not issue any holding regarding Section 5 itself, but as

Justice Ginsburg noted in her dissent, "without that formula, §5 is immobilized."

Obviously, the Riley Plaintiffs' characterization of the decision as "speculative"

in nature and only a "potential decision" is wrong. The Board's Voting Rights Act

expert had in fact predicted such a result. Thus, Board counsel had advised the Board as

⁵ 570 U.S. __ (2013).

⁶ *Id.* at 24.

⁷ *Id.* at 1, n.1 (Ginsburg, J., dissenting).

Suite 700 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300

PATTON BOGGS LLP

601 West Fifth Avenue

to the effect such a decision would have on the Board's process. The Board has moved

forward with implementing step 1 of the Hickel process while keeping in mind steps 2

and 3 might be altered depending on the United States Supreme Court's decision. At

the same time, the Board understood it needed to be ready to move forward immediately

with the *Hickel* Process if Section 5 was upheld.

The Board did not, however, adopt a "no-action agenda" as the Riley Plaintiffs

suggest. The Board has worked tirelessly over the past couple of weeks drafting plans

that only comply with the Alaska constitutional requirements. On June 21, 2013, the

Board adopted ten statewide and one regional draft Hickel plans. On June 28, 2013, the

Board held its first public hearing on the draft plans, giving the third parties who

submitted *Hickel* plans an opportunity to present their plans on the record, as well as the

general public the opportunity to provide comments live or over a statewide

teleconference. The Board traveled to Fairbanks on July 1, 2013, where counsel for the

Riley Plaintiffs presented their own Hickel plan, and public testimony was again taken.8

On July 2, the Board is in Juneau for another public hearing.⁹ In the interest of

expediency, the Board will be meeting over the July 4th holiday weekend, with meetings

scheduled on July 5, 6, and 7 to work on adoption of its new final plan, which it hopes

to have adopted prior to the previously set *Hickel* plan deadline of July 12, 2013.¹⁰

⁸ Exhibit B (Amended Agenda for July 1 and 2, 2013, Public Hearings in Fairbanks and Juneau).

⁹ *Id*.

¹⁰ Exhibit C (copy of Board's Schedule from Board's website, www.akredistricting.org).

Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300

PATTON BOGGS LLP

Suite 700

West Fifth Avenue

Simply put, the United States Supreme Court issued a decision in Shelby County

before the Board finished the first step in the Hickel process, which directly affects the

remainder of the Board's work on remand. While the Board must still comply with

Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, it need no longer comply with Section 5. In other

words, there is no longer any need for step 2 and 3 of the *Hickel* process. Accordingly,

the Board's work should be completed and its new plan presented to the Court for

approval in the next several weeks, leaving well over eight months for "legal review" of

that plan. The Riley Plaintiffs' argument is not only wrong, but now moot. It should

therefore, be denied.

CONCLUSION

The Riley Plaintiffs' arguments are not well taken given the disingenuous

reliance on language posted four days before this Court issued its Reconsideration Order

while ignoring the Board's discussions on the topic, and waiting a mere ten days before

proclaiming the Board has not acted in a timely manner. The United States Supreme

Court has issued its opinion in Shelby County v. Holder, and the decision directly affects

and significantly shortens the Board's process on remand. It also moots the Riley

Plaintiffs' motion as step 2 and 3 of the Hickel process, designed to balance Section 5 of

the Voting Rights Act with Alaska constitutional redistricting requirements, is no longer

necessary. The Riley Plaintiffs' motion should be denied.

PATTON BOGGS LLP 601 West Fifth Avenue

Suite 700 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300

Fax: (907) 263-6345

ARB's Opposition to Motion For Order Establishing Deadlines on Final Plan In Re 2011 Redistricting Cases, Consolidated Case No. 4FA-11-02209 CI

Page 5 of 7

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 2nd day of July 2013.

PATTON BOGGS LLP

Counsel for Defendant Alaska Redistricting Board

Michael D. White

Alaska Bar No. 8611144

Nicole A. Corr

Alaska Bar No. 0805022

601 West Fifth Avenue Suite 700 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300 Fax: (907) 263-6345

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 2nd day of July 2013, a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served on the following via:

☑ Electronic Mail on:

Michael J. Walleri; walleri@gci.net
Jason Gazewood; jason@fairbanksaklaw.com
Gazewood & Weiner PC
Attorneys for Riley/Dearborn

Attorneys for Riley/Dearbor 1008 16th Ave., Suite 200 Fairbanks, AK 99701

Thomas F. Klinkner; tklinkner@BHB.com
Birch, Horton, Bittner & Cherot
Attorney for Petersburg Plaintiffs
1127 W. 7th Avenue
Anchorage, AK 99501

Jill Dolan; jdolan@co.fairbanks.ak.us Attorney for Fairbanks North Star Borough P.O. Box 71267 Fairbanks, AK 99707

Carol Brown; cbrown@avcp.org
Association of Village Council Presidents
P.O. Box 219, 101A Main Street
Bethel, AK 99550

Thomas E. Schultz; tschulz235@gmail.com Attorney for RIGHTS Coalition 715 Miller Ridge Road Ketchikan, AK 99901

Anita R. Tardugno, PLS

Legal Secretary

PATTON BOGGS LLP

Joseph N. Levesque; joe@levesquelawgroup.com Levesque Law Group, LLC Attorney for Aleutians East Borough 3380 C Street, Suite 202 Anchorage, AK 99503

Natalie A. Landreth; landreth@narf.org
Native American Rights Fund
Attorney for Bristol Bay Native Corporation
801 B Street, Suite 401
Anchorage, AK 99501

Marcia R. Davis; mdavis@calistacorp.com
Attorney for Calista Corporation
301 Calista Court
Anchorage, AK 99518

Scott A. Brandt-Erichsen; scottb@kgbak.us Ketchikan Gateway Borough 1900 1st Avenue, Suite 215 Ketchikan, AK 99901

Joe McKinnon; jmckinn@gci.net Attorney for Alaska Democratic Party 1434 Kinnikinnick Street Anchorage, AK 99508

029810.0101\4812-0349-5444.

PATTON BOGGS LLP 601 West Fifth Avenue

Suite 700 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 263-6300 Fax: (907) 263-6345

In the Matter Of:

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD

BOARD MEETING

June 21, 2013

PACIFIC RIM REPORTING STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTERS

STENOGRAPHIC COURT REPORTERS 711 M STREET, SUITE 4 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501 907-272-4383

www.courtreportersalaska.com

Exhibit A Page 1 of 13

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD BOARD MEETING on 06/21/2013

1	
2	
3	COPY
4	
5	
6	ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD
7	BOARD MEETING
8	
9	
10	June 21, 2013 12:00 p.m.
11	22.00 p.m.
12	411 West 4th Avenue, Suite 302 Anchorage, Alaska
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
[

ALASKA REDISTRICTING BOARD BOARD MEETING on 06/21/2013

	Page 2	1	Page 4 MR. TORGERSON: Bob Brodie?
2		2	MR. BRODIE: Yes.
3	Board Nembers Present:	3	MR. TORGERSON: Marie Greene?
4	John Torgerson, Chairman	4	MS. GREENE: Yes.
5	PaggyAnn McConnochie, Vice-Chair (via speaker phone) Robert B. Brodie	5	MR. TORGERSON: Jim Holm?
6	Jim Holm Marie N. Greene	6	MR. HOLM: Yes.
7		7	MR. TORGERSON: And John Torgerson, so by a
8	Counsel for Board:	8	5/0 vote, the agenda has been adopted.
9	Michael D. White PATTON BOGGS, LLP	9	Item four is the discussion on the limited
16	601 West 5th Avenue, Suite 700 Anchorage, Alaska 99501	10	appeal of the Alaska Supreme Court or Alaska Supreme
11	(907) 263-6300	11	Court of the superior court ruling involving I've
12	Also Present:	12	been handed a document, and I have had a chance to read
13	Leonard Lawson	13	that, I believe.
14	Rick Gifford Adam Berg	14	Peggy Ann, this is what I'll be bringing to
15	Darwin Peterson Bruie Weiss	15	you later.
16	Caroline Lee Marcia Davis	16	MR. WHITE: It should be e-mailed to her as
17	Steve Aufrecht Joe Levesque	17	well. Mr. Chairman.
18	,	18	MS. McCONNOCHIE: Yes, I have the e-mail.
19	Court Reporter:	19	MR. TORGERSON: Mr. White, you want to, as
30	Sonja L. Resves, RPR	20	much as you can, tell us what we got going on?
21	PACTFIC RIM REPORTING 711 M Street, Suite 4	21	MR. WHITE: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22	Anchorage, Alaska 99501	22	At the board's direction, we prepared a petition for
23		23	review on a very limited issue regarding the trial
34		24	court's order on the motion for reconsideration.
25		25	As you will recall, in that order, the Court
		2.0	
1	Page 3 PROCEEDINGS	1	Page 5 adopted our schedule as the court-ordered schedule, so,
2	MR. TORGERSON: We will call the meeting to	2	therefore, mooting the issues of schedule and public
3	order. The time is 12:04. We'll do a roll call,	3	hearings, because as this board knows all along, the
4	please.		
7	piease.	- 41	issue was never that it was not doing to accept public
5	MS CORE: Rob Brodie?	4 5	issue was never that it was not going to accept public input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't
5 6	MS. CORE: Bob Brodie?	5	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't
6	MR. BRODIE: Present.	5	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so.
6 7	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene?	5 6 7	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the
6 7 8	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present.	5 6 7 8	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after
6 7 8 9	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie?	5 6 7 8 9	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole
6 7 8 9 10	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present.	5 6 7 8 9	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people
6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm?	5 6 7 8 9 10	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson?	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval,	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval, Mr. Chairman. MR. BRODIE: Second.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in the past, including on the first remand in this case,
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval, Mr. Chairman. MR. BRODIE: Second. MS. McCONNOCHIE: Second.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in the past, including on the first remand in this case, whereby the board will adopt its plan, either one of
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval, Mr. Chairman. MR. BRODIE: Second. MS. McCONNOCHIE: Second. MR. TORGERSON: Since we're on	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in the past, including on the first remand in this case, whereby the board will adopt its plan, either one of these or something similar to a Hickel plan.
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval, Mr. Chairman. MR. BRODIE: Second. MS. McCONNOCHIE: Second. MR. TORGERSON: Since we're on teleconference, we'll go through the roll again.	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in the past, including on the first remand in this case, whereby the board will adopt its plan, either one of these or something similar to a Hickel plan. If Section 5 is thrown out, then that plan
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BRODIE: Present. MS. CORE: Marie Greene? MS. GREENE: Present. MS. CORE: Peggy Ann McConnochie? MS. McCONNOCHIE: Present. MS. CORE: Jim Holm? MR. HOLM: Here. MS. CORE: John Torgerson? MR. TORGERSON: Here. So we have all four board members present, one on teleconference. We are represented by counsel. Brings us to item three on the agenda, which is approval of the agenda. MS. GREENE: I move for approval, Mr. Chairman. MR. BRODIE: Second. MS. McCONNOCHIE: Second. MR. TORGERSON: Since we're on	5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	input and hold public hearings, just that they didn't believe it could be legally mandated to do so. But in the motion for reconsideration, the Court issued a part of its order indicates that after the board is finished with its process, that the whole entire litigation process starts over. He says people have 30 days to file, I assume, a complaint, just like they did last time. And it anticipates that the entire litigation process starts anew. And based upon previous historical proceedings on remand and the interpretation of Article 6, Section 11 of the constitution, the board does not believe that that is the proper interpretation, that while legal challenges certainly are allowed, the process for remand, we believe, is, as has been done in the past, including on the first remand in this case, whereby the board will adopt its plan, either one of these or something similar to a Hickel plan.

Page 12 Page 10 that we adopt board draft plans A through G for the and split minimally those district -- those boroughs 1 purposes of public hearings and further discussion. 2 2 that had excess population over the house districts. Is there discussion on the motion? Marie MR. TORGERSON: Okay. Thank you. Board 3 4 Greene? option D basically takes the normal configuration of the 4 5 MS. GREENE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I 5 North Slope and the Northwest Arctic Borough as one think more than anything, I just really appreciate what 6 district. It takes the North Slope Borough down the we received so far, not only the drawing of the maps and Canadian border and then all the way down to just above 7 Lime Village, it looks like. And so it's a different where the lines are drawn, but also the deviation 8 approach to how we would divide up that traditional 9 numbers. 9 10 I think that's one thing that I really 10 district. Board plan E was drawn by one of our 11 wanted to stress throughout this go-around, that we 11 really have that type of data, that type of information. 12 drafters that were on loan, GIS, Department of Natural 12 13 And looking forward to the hearings and really hearing Resources. There are -- the major thing here, he takes 13 especially from rural Alaska how we can put our final 14 14 Prince William Sound, Yakutat and combines it in with Chugach, so it's another way to come into Anchorage, but 15 map together. 15 So I appreciate the hearings that have been 16 16 he has that approach. scheduled and looking forward to the comments that we're 17 17 Many of the districts have a different going to receive. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 18 18 approach. North Slope is divided somewhat and there is a somewhat larger configuration of the Bethel district. 19 MR. TORGERSON: You're welcome. There are 19 some strikingly similar districts, and then there are 20 Item F was drawn by another person on loan 20 21 some that are totally different. It's totally many to us for drawing. Basically, primarily the North Slope 21 22 options that are conveyed in all of those. 22 is divided. It looks like it takes in Northwest Arctic 23 Any more discussion on the motion? We will Borough, but then it takes in some more of the Yukon 23 24 do a roll call vote. Peggy Ann McConnochie? River looks like, and then it creates a district from 24 25 MS. McCONNOCHIE: Yes. the Canadian border to about Aniak, it looks like, so a 25 Page 13 Page 11 1 MR. TORGERSON: Bob Brodie? relatively large district that direction. 1 2 MR. BRODIE: Yes. It also takes population from Chugach and it 2 MR. TORGERSON: Marie Greene? combines it into Copper River, Glennallen, Valdez, going 3 3 that way. So that was option F. 4 MS. GREENE: Yes. 4 5 MR. TORGERSON: Jim Holm? Option G is primarily the same as A on all 5 6 MR. HOLM: Yes. the rural districts. The major difference is Mat-Su and 6 Anchorage districts are as they were in our proclamation 7 MR. TORGERSON: John Torgerson is a yes, so 7 plan. They weren't redrawn, but in A they are totally by a 5/0 vote, the board has adopted draft plans A 8 redrawn to different configurations, so just another 9 through G for purposes of public hearing. 9 10 That brings us to item number six, which is 10 option that we might look at. approval of third-party plans to take also to public 11 So there are seven options that I would 11 hearing. I'm not aware of any that have not been recommend the board take them all on the road for the 12 12 public hearings and try to get comment on. 13 received, but what we don't have posted is Calista 13 Corporation's. Eric is working on that now to print the 14 14 Mr. Brodie? maps and work his magic to get it into shape files or 15 MR. BRODIE: Mr. Chairman, I move to adopt 15 whatever he needs on there, so -all seven drafts for purposes of public hearing and 16 16 17 Mr. White went up and drew something on the discussion. 17 18 board. I'm not sure what that is. So so far, for you, 18 MS. GREENE: I'll second the motion. Peggy Ann, since you haven't seen this, we received a 19 MS. McCONNOCHIE: This is Peggy Ann. 19 full statewide plan from Gazewood and Weiner. We MR. TORGERSON: Peggy Ann, you got cut off. 20 20 received a plan -- we have in possession from Calista 21 21 Can you say that again? Corp, like I said, it's not up on the board yet in a 22 MS. McCONNOCHIE: I'm sorry. This is Peggy 22 23 form where the board might be able to look at it, but it 23 Ann. I was doing the same thing as Marie. It's a

24

25

will be soon.

MR. TORGERSON: It's been moved and seconded

wonderful idea. Let's go ahead and adopt all of them.

24

25

We received a statewide plan from AFFER.

BOARD MEETING on 06/21/2013 And we received a partial plan from the Ketchikan 2 Borough, basically drawing two districts, which would be Ketchikan, kind of a Ketchikan/Craig affair. They go over and take in Prince William, Metlakatla and then 5 they build another district that goes roughly Wrangell or Petersburg, Sitka, Yakutat, and then they left Juneau undrawn, but as one district, so they are staying out of 7 8 that suggestion on how that might be drawn. 9 MS. McCONNOCHIE: I saw that. 10 MR. TORGERSON: Yes. So we have three complete statewide plans and one regional plan, for lack 11 12 of a better word. 13 MR. BRODIE: Mr. Chairman, I move that we accept the three complete plans and one regional plan to 14 take with the board for purposes of public hearing and 15 16 discussion. 17 MS. McCONNOCHIE: This is Peggy Ann. I'll second that. 18 19 MR. TORGERSON: Thank you. Is there 20 discussion on the motion? 21 MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, just to let you know that Calista handed me a small map, if the board 22 23 wanted to look at that prior to. 24 MR. TORGERSON: We're going to take it on 25

the road. No, we're fine. It's probably too small to Page 15 do. Marie is probably very interested. I will be too, 1 2 but it's being printed off now. It just takes a little while for that thing to work. It was received timely 4 and that was the main thing. We're just not getting it 5 on the wall. 6 What we'll do is, of course, post that as soon as we can, so if members of the public wish to wait 7

a little while, we will have it up momentarily so we can 9 all review it then. 10 I'm not aware of any other plans.

Ms. Greene, you said that Southeast, Sealaska might be 11 12 submitting something? 13

MS. GREENE: That was my understanding, so I hope that we'll have something that will come in. I 14 know we received a letter from Southeast, but I was told 15 earlier that there may be a map coming from Southeast, 16 so that was going to be my question. 17

18 I hadn't heard anything lately, but I just 19 wanted to mention that.

20 MR. TORGERSON: Well, Mr. Brodie, if you would like to amend your motion to include a Southeast, 21 Sealaska plan. Our deadline was noon, but we generally 22 23 accept as much as we can. It's up to the board.

24 MS. GREENE: I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that

25 they will be participating in the hearing, so that's

what I welcome. 1

5

12

15

17

2 MR. TORGERSON: They will be down in Juneau

3 at the hearing. We're fine that way then.

MS. GREENE: We're fine. 4

MR. TORGERSON: The motion is to adopt the

Page 16

Gazewood/Weiner plan, the Calista Corporation, AFFER and 6

the regional plan of the Ketchikan Borough. It's been 7

moved and seconded. Any other discussion? We will do a

9 roll call vote.

10 Jim Holm?

MR. HOLM: Yes. 11

MR. TORGERSON: Marie Greene?

13 MS. GREENE: Yes.

MR. TORGERSON: Bob Brodie? 14

MR. BRODIE: Yes.

16 MR. TORGERSON: Peggy Ann McConnochie?

MS. McCONNOCHIE: Yes.

18 MR. TORGERSON: John Torgerson is a yes. So

by a 5/0 vote, the board has adopted the third-party 19

20 plans for purposes of public hearing.

21 That brings us down to item seven, which is

basically board member comments. I'll start. We had a 22

little issue with the website yesterday, so I want to 23

24 apologize to those that I said we would have board plans 25

on the web by Wednesday night. We were going to put a

7

8

Page 17 few of the unadopted ones so everybody could get a flavor of what they were, but that didn't happen until

last night about 5:00 or 4:30 or something, but we are

in the process of hiring a web person, firm, a private

firm to come in and take care of our website issues. 5

6 None of us knew how to do that, so anyway

there is linked on our website now a link to Google. I forgot the name.

9 MS. McCONNOCHIE: It's called a Google drive 10 on the internet for anybody to be able to go on and 11 download them.

MR. TORGERSON: These plans, I'm pretty sure 12 13 that all of these are on there. And probably G is not 14 on there, the board-adopted plans. As soon as Eric can,

15 he will have the third-party plans on there also. 16 And then we will continue to work to get

17 them on the web, because I think they are a little 18 easier to get off than the Google drive, but to any 19 degree, they are available, or will be available

20 shortly, all of the adopted plans.

21 Mr. Brodie, any comments?

22 MR. BRODIE: No. sir. Well, just like to

thank everybody who participated in the last two weeks. 23

24 The air conditioning was broken in this building and

25 sometimes they were working in subtropical weather. It

Page 18 was 90 degrees in my office for several days, which made should timely set that schedule, so I know it's been a really busy time. I know I hated coming over here this 2 me wish I was in Hawaii. week. It was like walking into a sauna, and I saw So in any event, I know a lot people worked 3 everybody doing the hard work and the dedication. hard under adverse conditions and they did a good job. I would like to thank the DNR people who came over and 5 So I wanted to thank everybody for that, but 5 6 just wanted to put it to mind for people to start pitched in to give us their input and opinion. 6 7 looking and thinking about the schedule, so we can get 7 MR. HOLM: I would like to thank you for all that announced as we move forward with the process 8 the hard work. We're getting there, I guess, I hope. Eric especially has done a great job, and I appreciate 9 sooner rather than later. 9 MR. TORGERSON: No other discussion or 10 10 it. things to discuss, we will adjourn this meeting. The MR. TORGERSON: We would have been sunk 11 11 time is 12:26. As I said, anybody wants to wait around 12 without Eric. Marie, do you have any comments? 12 for the Calista map to be printed, I will go check with 13 MS. GREENE: No comments. 13 Eric right now and get a timeline on it. Thank you, 14 MR. TORGERSON: Peggy Ann, any comments? 14 Peggy Ann. I will see you a little later on this 15 MS. McCONNOCHIE: I will just echo what 15 people have said before. I just really appreciate the 16 afternoon. 16 17 With that, we are adjourned. Thank you. 17 incredible staff that we've had available to us, first and foremost Eric. He has done a wonderful job. And 18 (Proceedings concluded at 12:26 p.m.) 18 19 -000then also Aaron and Ray for their hard work, and you, 20 20 Chairman Torgerson. This is not easy for any of us, and yet we 21 21 22 22 are still here plotting away, making sure we get it right, so I look forward to the conclusion of the 23 23 24 process after we get the public hearings done. 24 25 25 MR. TORGERSON: This is the first day in Page 21 Page 19 about 15 that we haven't had fans running. The silence CERTIFICATE 1 1 is deafening, but it's -- anyway, we did start this 2 process on the 12th and of course today is the 21st. I, SONJA L. REEVES, Registered Professional Reporter 3 3 4 Our next meeting will be the public hearing, 4 and Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, do 5 which will be June 28th at the Anchorage LIO. And then hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings were taken 5 Monday, July 1st, will be in Fairbanks at the Fairbanks before me at the time and place herein set forth; that 6 the testimony and proceedings were reported 7 LIO. And Juneau will be July 2nd in the Beltz room of 7 stenographically by me and later transcribed by computer 8 the capital, which I understand they use as an LIO 8 9 during the interim time, so that's the next meeting transcription; that the foregoing is a true record of 9 10 times. 10 the testimony and proceedings taken at that time; and And then the board will start drawing --11 that I am not a party to nor have I any interest in the 11 12 meeting after the public hearings on July 5th. Those 12 outcome of the action herein contained. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and 13 have been noticed. That is Friday, of course, right 13 after the 4th, but it was the only time we could get the 14 14 affixed my seal this 27th day of June 2013. full board together, was working over the weekend. So 15 16 we will be working the 5th, 6th and 7th. I have noticed 16 through the 12th, as we have a majority, but not all 17 17 18 members, so if we need to continue on then, we will 18 SONJA L. REEVES, RPR continue on until we finish this process. 19 My Commission Expires 8/7/15 19 20 Mr. White? 20 MR. WHITE: Mr. Chairman, the only thing 21 21

22

23

24

25

22 that I see that hasn't been covered is that the board

24

needs to start considering dates and deadlines for if

process. The court order did indicate that the board

it's required to remove step two and three of the Hickel

OARD MEETING OIT 00/21/20			
	6th 19:16	anticipates 5:12	
•	7	apologize 16:24	
-00o- 20:19	7	appeal 4:10 9:1	
	7th 19:16	appears 6:6	
1		application 7:12	
11 7:16	9	approach 10:9,16,18	
12:04 3:3	90 18:1	approval 3:17,18 6:22,23 7:4 9:3 13:11	
12:26 20:12,18	98 6:14	Arctic 10:5,22	
12th 19:3,17	Α	areas 9:21	
15 19:1		Article 5:15 7:16	
17th 9:22	Aaron 18:19	asks 6:11	
1998 8:13	accept 5:47:3 14:14 15:23	assume 5:11	
1st 19:6	adjourn 20:11	authorized 6:20 8:25	
2	adjourned 20:17	aware 13:12 15:10	
<u></u>	adopt 5:21 11:15,24 12:1 16:5		
2001 8:8,11	adopted 4:8 5:1,24 8:2 13:8 16:19 17:20	В	
2011 6:7	adverse 18:4	back 6:7,22 8:10	
21st 19:3	affair 14:3	based 5:14	
28th 19:5	AFFER 13:25 16:6	basically 10:4,21 14:2 16:22	
2nd 19:7	afternoon 6:18 20:16	Beltz 19:7	
3	agenda 3:17 4:8	Bethel 10:19	
<u> </u>	ahead 11:24	bit 9:8	
30 5:11	air 17:24	board 3:15 5:3,9,16,21 6:22 8:3,25	
A	Alaska 4:10 6:24 8:13 9:19 12:14	9:6,7,15 10:3,11 11:12 12:1 13:8,18, 22,23 14:15,22 15:23 16:19,22,24	
4	allowed 5:18 6:1 7:25	19:11,15,22,25	
4:30 6:17 7:6 17:3	amend 15:21	board's 4:22	
4th 19:14	amended 8:1	board-adopted 17:14	
	amendments 8:13	Bob 3:5 4:1 8:20 9:16 13:1 16:14	
5	amicus 8:5	Bob's 9:16	
5 5:23	Anchorage 9:13,14,23 10:15 11:7	border 10:7,25	
5/0 4:8 8:25 13:8 16:19	19:5	Borough 10:5,6,23 14:2 16:7	
5:00 17:3	anew 5:13 7:22	boroughs 9:24 10:1	
5th 19:12,16	Aniak 10:25	bringing 4:14	
	Ann 3:9,24 4:14 6:25 8:22 11:19,20,	brings 3:16 9:2,12 13:10 16:21	
6	23 12:24 13:19 14:17 16:16 18:14 20:15	Brodie 3:5,6,20 4:1,2 7:11 8:20,21 9:18 11:14,15 13:1,2 14:13 15:20	
6 7:16	announced 20:8	16:14,15 17:21,22	

conditions 18:4 determine 6:21 broken 17:24 deviation 12:8 **build** 14:5 configuration 10:4,19 **difference** 9:19 11:6 configurations 11:9 building 17:24 direction 4:22 11:1 constitution 5:16 7:13,14 8:13 **busy** 20:2 continue 17:16 19:18,19 discovery 6:3 C discuss 20:11 conveyed 12:22 copies 6:12 discussion 7:9 8:14 11:17 12:2,3,23 Calista 13:13,21 14:22 16:6 20:13 14:16,20 16:8 20:10 Copper 11:3 call 3:2,3 8:15 12:24 16:9 district 9:22,25 10:1,6,10,19,24 11:1 copy 7:1 called 17:9 14:5,7 **CORE** 3:5,7,9,11,13 Canadian 10:7,25 districts 6:2,10 9:20,22 10:2,17 11:6, 7 12:20 14:2 Corp 13:22 capital 19:8 divide 10:9 Corporation 16:6 care 17:5 divided 9:5 10:18,22 Corporation's 13:14 case 5:20 counsel 3:16 **DNR** 18:5 cases 8:9 document 4:12 court 4:10,11,25 5:8,25 6:5,11,24 7:6, cetera 7:22 12,21,25 8:4 9:1 19:25 download 17:11 chairman 3:19 4:17,21 6:20 7:11 court's 4:24 6:6 7:24 9:18 11:15 12:5,18 14:13,21 15:24 draft 6:13 9:3,7,10,11,16 12:1 13:8 18:20 19:21 court-ordered 5:1 drafted 7:19 **challenge** 6:1,9 7:25 covered 19:22 drafters 10:12 **challenges** 5:18 7:19 creates 10:24 drafts 9:6 11:16 chance 4:12 curiae 8:5 drawing 10:21 12:7 14:2 19:11 **check** 20:13 cut 11:20 drawn 10:11,20 14:8 checking 7:5 **cycle** 8:12 drew 13:17 Chugach 10:15 11:2 drive 17:9,18 D combines 10:14 11:3 comment 11:13 Ε data 12:12 comments 12:17 16:22 17:21 18:12, dates 19:23 e-mail 4:18 13,14 day 18:25 e-mailed 4:16 complaint 5:11 6:3 days 5:11 8:2 18:1 earlier 15:16 complaints 6:9 deadline 15:22 easier 17:18 complete 14:11,14 deadlines 19:23 easy 18:21 completely 6:8 deafening 19:2 echo 18:15 compliance 5:25 dedication 20:4 edited 6:16 complied 8:3 define 7:13 effectively 9:22 complying 7:23 **degree** 17:19 entire 5:10,12 concluded 20:18

conclusion 18:23

conditioning 17:24

degrees 18:1

Department 10:12

Eric 17:14 18:9,12,18 20:14

essentially 6:7

event 18:3	good 7:18 18:4	interested 15:1
evidentiary 6:4	Google 17:7,9,18	interim 19:9
excess 9:21 10:2	grabs 9:13	internet 17:10 .
explanation 9:9,17	great 18:9	interpret 7:13,14
F	Greene 3:7,8,18 4:3,4 8:16,17 11:18 12:4,5 13:3,4 15:11,13,24 16:4,12, 18:13	interpretation 5:15,17 7:23 involving 4:11
Fairbanks 19:6	guess 9:19 18:8	issue 4:23 5:4 16:23
ans 19:1		issued 5:8
ile 5:11,24 6:9,17	Н	issues 5:2 17:5
iled 7:6 8:2	handed 4:12 14:22	item 3:16 4:9 9:2 10:20 13:10 16:2
iles 13:15	happen 17:2	J
iling 9:1	hard 18:4,8,19 20:4	
inal 5:24 6:22,23 7:4 12:14	hated 20:2	Jim 3:11 4:5 8:18 13:5 16:10
ine 14:25 16:3,4	Hawaii 18:2	job 18:4,9,18
finish 19:19	heard 15:18	John 3:13 4:7 8:24 13:7 16:18
finished 5:9	hearing 6:4 11:16 12:13 13:9,12	July 6:7 19:6,7,12
irm 17:4,5	14:15 15:25 16:3,20 19:4	June 19:5
flavor 17:2	hearings 5:3,5 9:4 11:13 12:2,13,16	Juneau 14:6 16:2 19:7
forced 9:22	18:24 19:12	justifications 6:1
foremost 18:18	held 8:12	
forgot 17:8	Hickel 5:22 19:24	K
form 13:23	Highway 9:13	Ketchikan 14:1,3 16:7
forward 6:21 12:13,17 18:23 20:8	hiring 17:4	Ketchikan/craig 14:3
Friday 19:13	historical 5:14	kind 14:3
full 13:20 19:15	hold 5:5 8:10 9:4	knew 17:6
full-blown 7:22	Holm 3:11,12 4:5,6 7:7,8 8:18,19	NIOTE LEV
	13:5,6 16:10,11 18:7	L.
G	hope 15:14 18:8 house 9:25 10:2	lack 14:11
Gazewood 13:20	nouse 9:25 10:2	large 11:1
Gazewood 13.20 Gazewood/weiner 16:6	I	larger 10:19
generally 15:22		left 14:6
Girdwood 9:14	idea 11:24	legal 5:18 7:19
GIS 10:12	include 15:21	legally 5:6
	including 5:20 8:2,5	
give 18:6	incredible 18:17	letter 15:15
Glennallen 11:3	information 12:12	Lime 10:8
go-around 12:11	input 5:5 18:6	limited 4:9,23 7:12 9:1

Index: lines..pulling

lines 12:8

link 17:7

linked 17:7

LIO 19:5,7,8

litigation 5:10,13 6:8 7:15,22

loan 10:12,20 lodge 6:23

lot 18:3

M

made 9:21 18:1

magic 13:15 main 15:4

major 9:19 10:13 11:6

majority 19:17

making 18:22

mandate 6:7

mandated 5:6

map 12:15 14:22 15:16 20:13

maps 8:3 12:7 13:15

Marie 3:7 4:3 8:16 11:23 13:3 15:1

18:12

Mat-su 9:10 11:6

Mcconnochie 3:9,10,21,24,25 4:18 6:25 8:22,23 11:19,22 12:24,25 14:9,

17 16:16,17 17:9 18:15

meeting 3:2 19:4,9,12 20:11

meetings 6:20

member 16:22

members 3:15 15:7 19:18

mention 15:19

mentioned 6:12

Metlakatla 14:4

Michael 7:1.5

mind 20:6

minimally 10:1

momentarily 15:8

Monday 19:6

mooting 5:2

motion 4:24 5:7 7:9 8:15 11:18 12:3,

23 14:20 15:21 16:5

move 3:18 6:21 7:3 11:15 14:13 20:8

moved 11:25 16:8

Ν

Natural 10:12

night 16:25 17:3

noon 15:22

normal 10:4

North 10:5,6,18,21

Northwest 10:5,22

notice 5:25 7:1

noticed 19:13,16

number 8:5 13:10

numbers 12:9

0

office 18:1

opinion 18:6

option 11:4,5,10

options 11:11 12:22

order 3:3 4:24,25 5:8 6:6 7:24 8:4

19:25

P

p.m. 20:18

part 5:8 9:14

partial 14:1

participated 17:23

participating 15:25

party 9:5

past 6:20

Peggy 3:9,24 4:14 6:25 8:22 11:19,

20,22 12:24 13:19 14:17 16:16 18:14

20:15

pending 7:4

people 5:10 6:1 7:25 8:5 18:3,5,16

20:6

percent 6:14

person 10:20 17:4

Petersburg 14:6

petition 4:22 6:5,11,24

pitched 18:6

plan 5:21,22,23,24 7:19 8:1 9:10,11, 16 10:11 11:8 13:20,21,25 14:1,11,14

15:22 16:6.7

plans 9:3,8,11,15 12:1 13:8, 14:11,14

15:10 16:20,24 17:12,14,15,20

plotting 18:22

pointed 6:16

population 9:12,21,25 11:2

portion 8:11

possession 13:21

post 15:6

posted 9:3 13:13

prepared 4:22

present 3:6,8,10,15

pretty 6:14 9:24 17:12

previous 5:14

primarily 10:21 11:5

Prince 10:14 14:4

print 13:14

printed 15:2 20:13

prior 14:23

private 17:4

proceedings 3:1 5:15 20:18

process 5:9,10,13,19 6:8 7:18 8:7,9

17:4 18:24 19:3,19,25 20:8

proclamation 11:7

progress 6:13

proper 5:17

properly 7:17

public 5:2,4,5 9:4 11:13,16 12:2 13:9, 11 14:15 15:7 16:20 18:24 19:4,12

pulling 9:20

purposes 11:16 12:2 13:9 14:15

16:20

put 12:14 16:25 20:6

Q

question 15:17 questions 7:9 8:14

R

Ray 18:19 read 4:12

recall 4:25 8:1

receive 12:18

received 12:7 13:13,19,21,25 14:1

15:3,15

recommend 11:12

reconsideration 4:24 5:7

redistricting 8:8,12

redrawn 11:8,9

regional 14:11,14 16:7

related 9:4

relevant 8:11

remand 5:15,19, 7:20

remove 19:24

represented 3:16

required 7:19 19:24

Resources 10:13

responded 8:5

reverse 6:6

review 4:23 7:24 15:9

Richardson 9:13

River 10:24 11:3

road 11:12 14:25

roll 3:3,23 8:15 12:24 16:9

room 19:7

roughly 14:5

ruling 4:11

running 19:1

rural 11:6 12:14

S

sauna 20:3

schedule 5:1,2 20:1,7

scheduled 12:17

Sealaska 15:11,22

seconded 7:8 11:25 16:8

Section 5:16,23 7:16

seeking 6:23

set 20:1

shape 13:15

shortly 17:20

silence 19:1

similar 5:22 9:11 12:20

sir 17:22

Sitka 14:6

Slope 10:5,6,18,21

small 14:22,25

sooner 20:9

Sound 10:14

South 9:14

Southeast 15:11,15,16,21

spell 7:4

split 10:1

staff 18:17

start 6:2 16:22 19:2,11,23 20:6

starting 6:8 7:21

starts 5:10,13

statewide 13:20,25 14:11

staying 14:7

step 19:24

stress 12:11

Strictly 7:15

strikingly 12:20

stuff 6:15 8:3

submit 7:24

submitting 15:12

subtropical 17:25

suggestion 14:8

summarize 7:18

sunk 18:11

superior 4:11 5:25

Supreme 4:10 7:24 8:4 9:1

T

takes 9:10 10:4,6,13,22,23 15:2

talked 6:19

technically 6:16

teleconference 3:15,23

thing 10:13 11:23 12:10 15:3,4 19:21

things 6:10 20:11

thinking 20:7

third-party 13:11 16:19 17:15

thrown 5:23

time 3:3 5:12 8:1 19:9,14 20:2,12

timeline 20:14

timely 15:3 20:1

times 19:10

today 6:19,23 7:6 19:3

told 15:15

Torgerson 3:2,13,14,22,24 4:1,3,5,7,

19 7:8,15 8:14,18,20,22,24 10:3

11:20,25 12:19 13:1,3,5,7 14:10,19,24

15:20 16:2,5,12,14,16,18 17:12 18:11,

14,20,25 20:10

totally 11:8 12:21

traditional 10:9

trial 4:23 6:3,6 8:10

type 6:10 12:12

typos 6:15

U

unadopted 17:1

understand 7:11 19:8

understanding 15:13

undrawn 14:7

urban 9:21

utilizes 9:12

٧

Valdez 9:10,12,13 11:3

Village 10:8

vote 4:8 8:25 12:24 13:8 16:9,19

votes 8:24

W

wait 15:7 20:12

walk 9:8

walking 20:3

wall 15:5

wanted 12:11 14:23 15:19 20:5,6

weather 17:25

web 9:3 16:25 17:4,17

website 16:23 17:5,7

Wednesday 16:25

week 20:3

weekend 19:15

weeks 17:23

Weiner 13:20

western 9:19,21

White 4:16,19,21 7:10, 13:17 14:21

19:20,21

William 10:14 14:4

wonderful 11:24 18:18

word 14:12

wordsmithing 7:4

work 6:13 13:15 15:3 17:16 18:8,19

20:4

worked 18:3

working 13:14 17:25 19:15,16

Wrangell 14:5

Υ

Yakutat 10:14 14:6

yesterday 16:23

Yukon 10:23

Alaska Redistricting Board

June 27, 2013

The Agenda for the Alaska Redistricting Board June 28th public hearing has been amended.

A M E N D E D A G E N D A 06-28-2013 Public Presentation and Public Testimony

ANCHORAGE LIO

10:00am to 4:00pm

10:00am

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call
- 3. Discussion of VRA mapping schedule
- 4. Presentation of third party plans

Presentations limited to the times shown below

A. Ketchikan Borough 5 minutes

B. Alaska For Fair and Equitable Redistricting (AFFER) 30 minutes

C. Calista 30

minutes

12:00

Public testimony on all plans

Testimony is limited to three minutes each

4:00pm Adjourn

The Agenda for the Alaska Redistricting Board July 1st, 2013 public hearing has been amended.

AMENDED AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARING ON BOARD DRAFT REDISTRICTING PLANS AND THIRD PARTY PLANS

07-01-2013 MONDAY

FAIRBANKS LIO 12:30PM TO 4:00PM

12:30pm

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Roll Call of Members
- 3. Presentation of third party plan

A. Gazewood and Weiner

30 minute

4. Public hearing

Testimony will be limited to three (3) minutes per speaker.

4:00pm ADJOURN

Adjourn

There are, as of noon 6/27/2013, additional proposed maps now available on the Alaska Redistricting Board website www.akredistricting.org

The additional maps are: AFFER amended Calista amended Calista Option 2

ADDITIONAL BOARD MEETINGS

The Alaska Redistricting Board intends to hold a meeting at its Anchorage office on:

- July 5, 2013 at 11:00AM
- July 6, 2013 at 10:00AM
- July 7, 2013 at 10:00AM
- July 8, 2013 (time to be announced)
- July 9, 2013 (time to be announced)
- July 10, 2013 (time to be announced)
- July 11, 2013 (time to be announced)

All board meetings will be teleconferenced at 1-855-463-5009 and streamed at AKL.TV.