


Population trend for Election Districts in 2010

Election District	Pop. 2000	DOL 2008 Est.	2010 Extrapolation	Diff. From Average	SJR 21 w/ 48 Eds Diff. From Average
1 Ket.	15,031	13,832	13,532	-3,777	-892
2 Sit-Wran-Pet	14,991	14,104	13,882	-3,427	-542
3-Jun	15,203	15,207	15,208	-2,101	784
4-Jun	15,508	15,220	15,148	-2,161	724
5 SE islands	15,048	13,368	12,948	-4,361	-1,476
6 Interior Bush	14,906	14,564	14,479	-2,830	55
7 Fbks	15,494	16,725	17,033	-276	2,609
8 Fbks	15,552	16,597	16,858	-451	2,434
9 Fbks	15,723	17,323	17,723	414	3,299
10 Fbks	15,599	17,017	17,372	63	2,948
11.N. Pole	15,904	17,129	17,435	126	3,011
12 Valdez-Hwys	16,303	17,465	17,756	447	3,332
13 Mat-Su	16,231	22,529	24,104	6,795	9,680
14 Mat-Su	16,119	22,384	23,950	6,641	9,526
15 Mat-Su	16,137	22,477	24,062	6,753	9,638
16 Mat-Su	16,104	20,015	20,993	3,684	6,569
17 Anch	15,819	17,171	17,509	200	3,085
18 Anch	15,639	17,032	17,380	71	2,956
19 Anch	15,841	17,394	17,782	473	3,358
20 Anch	15,837	17,330	17,703	394	3,279
21 Anch	15,850	17,321	17,689	380	3,265
22 Anch	15,831	17,353	17,734	425	3,310
23 Anch	15,847	17,671	18,127	818	3,703
24 Anch	15,812	17,415	17,816	507	3,392
25 Anch	15,836	17,464	17,871	562	3,447
26 Anch	15,823	17,443	17,848	539	3,424
27 Anch	15,820	17,261	17,621	312	3,197
28 Anch	15,839	17,279	17,639	330	3,215
29 Anch	15,846	17,322	17,691	382	3,267

30 Anch	15,839	17,229	17,577	268	3,153
31 Anch	15,811	17,216	17,567	258	3,143
32 Anch	15,839	16,717	16,937	-372	2,513
33 Kenai	16,466	17,488	17,744	435	3,320
34 Kenai	16,409	17,477	17,744	435	3,320
35 Kenai	16,436	17,613	17,907	598	3,483
36 Kodiak	14,928	14,240	14,068	-3,241	-356
37 Bristol B- Chain	15,150	13,623	13,241	-4,068	-1,183
38 Bethel-YK	14,921	15,793	16,011	-1,298	1,587
39 Nome	14,966	15,862	16,086	-1,223	1,662
40 Kotz-Barrow	15,155	14,693	14,578	-2,731	154
TOTAL	627,413	679,363	692,351		
Average Population	15,673	16,993	17,309		14,424

By Sen. Olson Office



NCSL Changes in the Sizes of Legislatures 1960-2006

State	Size in 1960	Size in 2006	Year(s) of Change(s)*
Alabama	141	140	1974
Alaska	60	60	No change
Arizona	108	90	1966
Arkansas	135	135	No change
California	120	120	No change
Colorado	100	100	No change
Connecticut	330	187	1966, 1972
Delaware	52	62	1964, 1968, 1972
Florida	133	160	1962, 1964, 1966, 1972
Georgia	259	236	1968, 1972
Hawaii	76	76	No change
Idaho	103	105	1962, 1964, 1966, 1984, 1992
Illinois	235	177	1972, 1982
Indiana	150	150	No change
Iowa	158	150	1964, 1966, 1970
Kansas	165	165	No change
Kentucky	138	138	No change
Louisiana	144	144	No change
Maine	184	186	1962, 1968, 1972, 1984
Maryland	152	188	1962, 1966, 1974
Massachusetts	280	200	1978
Michigan	144	148	1964
Minnesota	202	201	1972
Mississippi	189	174	1962
Missouri	191	197	1962
Montana	150	150	1966, 1972
Nebraska	43	49	1964
Nevada	64	63	1962, 1966, 1982
New Hampshire	424	424	No change
New Jersey	81	120	1966, 1968
New Mexico	98	112	1964, 1966
New York	208	212	1964, 1966, 1972, 1982, 2004
North Carolina	170	170	No change
North Dakota	164	141	1962, 1964, 1966, 1972, 1976, 1982, 1992, 2004
Ohio	177	132	1962, 1964, 1966
Oklahoma	165	149	1964, 1972
Oregon	90	90	No change
Pennsylvania	260	253	1964, 1966
Rhode Island	144	113	1962, 1966, 2004
South Carolina	170	170	No change
South Dakota	110	105	1972
Tennessee	132	132	No change
Texas	181	181	No change
Utah	89	104	1964, 1966, 1972
Vermont	276	180	1966
Virginia	140	140	No change
Washington	148	147	1972
West Virginia	132	134	1964
Wisconsin	133	132	1972
Wyoming	83	90	1964, 1966, 1972, 1982, 1992

\* The year is the election year in which a change took effect, not necessarily the year that the change was adopted.

State	2005 Population	Rank	Total Legislators	State Rank	Senate Size	State Rank	Approximate Senate District Size	Rank	House Size	State Rank	Approximate House District Size	State Rank
Alabama	4,557,808	23	140	24	35	16	130,223	19	105	16	43,408	21
Alaska	663,661	47	60	39	20	25	33,183	44	40	30	16,592	41
Arizona	5,939,292	17	90	35	30	20	197,976	10	60	26	98,988	8
Arkansas	2,779,154	32	135	26	35	16	79,404	30	100	18	27,792	32
California	36,132,147	1	120	29	40	12	903,304	1	80	22	451,652	1
Colorado	4,665,177	22	100	34	35	16	133,291	18	65	25	71,772	12
Connecticut	3,510,297	29	187	9	36	15	97,508	27	151	6	23,247	36
Delaware	843,524	45	62	38	21	24	40,168	41	41	29	20,574	38
Florida	17,789,864	4	160	17	40	12	444,747	3	120	13	148,249	3
Georgia	9,072,576	9	236	3	56	4	162,010	16	180	3	50,403	20
Hawaii	1,275,194	42	76	36	25	22	51,008	38	51	27	25,004	34
Idaho	1,429,096	39	105	32	35	16	40,831	40	70	24	20,416	39
Illinois	12,763,371	5	177	13	59	3	216,328	9	118	14	108,164	7
Indiana	6,271,973	15	150	18	50	6	125,439	21	100	18	62,720	14
Iowa	2,966,334	30	150	18	50	6	59,327	34	100	18	29,663	31
Kansas	2,744,687	33	165	16	40	12	68,617	33	125	10	21,957	37
Kentucky	4,173,405	26	138	25	38	14	109,826	26	100	18	41,734	23
Louisiana	4,523,628	24	144	22	39	13	115,990	24	105	16	43,082	22
Maine	1,321,505	40	186	10	35	16	37,757	42	151	6	8,752	45
Maryland	5,600,388	19	188	8	47	9	119,157	23	141	8	39,719	25
Massachusetts	6,398,743	13	200	6	40	12	159,969	17	160	5	39,992	24
Michigan	10,120,860	8	148	20	38	14	266,338	6	110	15	92,008	9
Minnesota	5,132,799	21	201	5	67	1	76,609	31	134	9	38,304	26
Mississippi	2,921,088	31	174	14	52	5	56,175	35	122	12	23,943	35
Missouri	5,800,310	18	197	7	34	17	170,597	14	163	4	35,585	27
Montana	935,670	44	150	18	50	6	18,713	48	100	18	9,357	44
Nebraska	1,758,787	38	49	40	49	7	35,894	43	Unicameral			NA
Nevada	2,414,807	35	63	37	21	24	114,991	25	42	28	57,495	18
New Hampshire	1,309,940	41	424	1	24	23	54,581	36	400	1	3,275	49
New Jersey	8,717,925	10	120	29	40	12	217,948	8	80	22	108,974	6
New Mexico	1,928,384	36	112	31	42	11	45,914	39	70	24	27,548	33
New York	19,254,630	3	212	4	62	2	310,559	5	150	7	128,364	4
North Carolina	8,683,242	11	170	15	50	6	173,665	13	120	13	72,360	11
North Dakota	636,677	48	141	23	47	9	13,546	50	94	21	6,773	47
Ohio	11,464,042	7	132	28	33	18	347,395	4	99	19	115,798	5
Oklahoma	3,547,884	28	149	19	48	8	73,914	32	101	17	35,128	28

State	2005 Population	Rank	Total Legislators	State Rank	Senate Size	State Rank	Approximate Senate District Size	Rank	House Size	State Rank	Approximate House District Size	State Rank
Oregon	3,641,056	27	90	35	30	20	121,369	22	60	26	60,684	16
Pennsylvania	12,429,616	6	253	2	50	6	248,592	7	203	2	61,230	15
Rhode Island	1,076,189	43	113	30	38	14	28,321	45	75	23	14,349	42
South Carolina	4,255,083	25	170	15	46	10	92,502	28	124	11	34,315	29
South Dakota	775,933	46	105	32	35	16	22,170	46	70	24	11,085	43
Tennessee	5,962,959	16	132	28	33	18	180,696	12	99	19	60,232	17
Texas	22,859,968	2	181	11	31	19	737,418	2	150	7	152,400	2
Utah	2,469,585	34	104	33	29	21	85,158	29	75	23	32,928	30
Vermont	623,050	49	180	12	30	20	20,768	47	150	7	4,154	48
Virginia	7,567,465	12	140	24	40	12	189,187	11	100	18	75,675	10
Washington	6,287,759	14	147	21	49	7	128,322	20	98	20	64,161	13
West Virginia	1,816,856	37	134	27	34	17	53,437	37	100	18	18,169	40
Wisconsin	5,536,201	20	132	28	33	18	167,764	15	99	19	55,921	19
Wyoming	509,294	50	90	35	30	20	16,976	49	60	26	8,488	46
TOTAL	296,410,404		7,382		1,971				5,411			

Source: National Conference of State Legislatures, population figures based on the U.S. Bureau of the Census state and county quick facts for FY 2005. Compiled April 2007.

\* Due to equal sizes, rankings may not range from 1 to 50.

## Two legislative redistrictings - one in 2012 and perhaps another in 2014

Alaska could go through two legislative reapportionments after the 2010 census. The first would be the result of our own state districting process. Inclusive within this process will be contentious litigation that always results. And in Alaska, it has not been infrequent that the Court has taken control and redrawn the plan by appointed court masters.

Now comes the test! Any Alaska plan, or even election laws must be pre-cleared by the U.S. Justice Department civil rights division to ensure it complies with the requirements of the federal U.S. Voters Rights Act of 1965, and subsequent revisions. Alaska is in a special category with nine other states (*all in the Old South*). There were a number of reasons why we earned inclusion, but one was an "English language" test for voting in our state constitution. This was never implemented, and subsequently repealed. **Note:** In fact, Alaska did not even implement voter registration until the election of 1968.

Nevertheless, getting tangled up with U.S. Justice preclearance on the state 2012 plan could cause delay preventing resolution and implementation prior to the 2012 elections. The result of delay would be some kind of interim plan for 2012, i.e. use of the existing plan, the state proposed plan, or temporary court imposed plan.

### **The problem been with us since before statehood, and is built into the small size of our House and Senate**

Alaska's increasingly skewered districting map is a natural result of a very small but fixed number of our 20 member Senate and 40 member House (*smallest in the nation*). The size of the House and Senate is fixed. However, the state's population has grown much faster in the urban areas, along the railbelt, and in coastal cities like Juneau, than in the smaller communities scattered along the extensive Alaska coastline and in the vast rural Interior of the state. This means districts in urban centers become more numerous and compact, but rural districts become fewer and must become huge and ungainly to gather sufficient population for a district, taking in regions completely unrelated and separated from each other.

For example, Sen. Johnny Ellis, D-Anchorage, can walk his downtown Anchorage district North and South, East and West, in just a few hours. Sen. Al Kookesh, D-Angoon, must catch a plane to Juneau (or ferry), catch Alaska Airlines to Anchorage, and then fly to Aniak of the Lower Kuskokwim or Holy Cross on the Lower Yukon. This district is half the size of Alaska.

*- Continued on next page*

We started with an enlarged hour of 40 districts that  
fit the Alaska socio-economic map perfectly

*- Continued from previous page*

At statehood our first district plan for the House fit the "constitutional socio-economics criteria" almost perfectly. We wonder whether constitutional crafters of this first plan (*done at the 1955 Constitutional Convention*) knew that an increase in the House from 24 members to 40 members would fit the existing socio-political map so well, making most happy. Nevertheless, it did just that "political job. It kept everyone happy, and that may have been especially important during the time of Congressional review and creation of the Statehood Act (*as well as our own Alaska local vote on statehood*).

**Note:** *The constitutional committee charged with drafting the scheme was not without its bit of controversy and regional politics, i.e. Anchorage against everyone else, the latter reportedly wanting a plan, at least partially, radiating out from turban centers.*

*So, to avoid the "others," meaning Anchorage delegates, reportedly Fairbanks Delegate George Cooper and Nenana/Yukon Delegate Jack Coghill, put together a little mid-night caucus in Delegate George Cooper's basement. Meanwhile, one of their faith kept the Anchorage delegation busy at the Fairbanks Second Avenue Mecca Bar.*

**Note:** *As most states did at this time Alaska had a Senate based on regional geography.*

This 1955 plan by "population count" was out-of-date by statehood, but another census was just around the corner. Further, everyone probably understood this, because the 1960 reapportionment plan had to do some serious revising, and yet produced little acrimony. *It was the only plan that has escaped court review and litigation.*

The point is that the first statehood districts fit the socio-economic map perfectly. However, from that day on every decennial redistricting forced the outlying and coastal districts into contortions, struggling to fit constitutional criteria and then the mandates of the ethnic criteria imposed by the 1965 U.S. Voters Right Act and subsequent revisions. Further, almost simultaneously the U.S. Supreme Court Tennessee case brought down the traditional regional Senates across the country. This was a political shock in itself

With a 20 member Senate and 40-member House, and a landmass that imposes huge barriers, we are now about out-of-gas in being able to meet the mandates of the U.S. Voters Rights Act. The issue is! Might the U.S. Justice Department question the size of our legislative bodies, and due to their small fixed size, our ability to provide ethnic representation required under the U.S. Voters Rights Act.

*- Ongoing series of back grounders*