

Anchorage Daily Times

High
6:06 a.m. 28.6 ft.
6:52 p.m. 28.7 ft.
Low
0:40 a.m. 3.5 ft.
1:05 p.m. -0.9 ft.

SECOND ELECTION PLANNED

Unity Defeat Would Return Voters

By MARGARET SCHMIDT
Times Staff Writer

If unification is defeated in the Sept. 9 election, Anchorage borough voters will be back at the polls Oct. 7 to choose how they want to be represented.

In an often-emotional session last night that left even the members confused, the Anchorage Borough Assembly adopted two alternate reapportionment plans which it will

place before voters if the charter fails.

One of the plans is the one contained in the proposed charter to unify the city and borough. It calls for five two-member districts in the Anchorage bowl and a single-member district for the Chugiak and Eagle River area.

The second plan would split the entire borough, including Chugiak and Eagle River, into single-member districts.

Should the charter be adopted Sept. 9 the alternative plans would come before voters at the new government's first regular election sometime in the fall of 1976.

If the charter fails the plans will be voted on Oct. 7, at the same time the regular city election is scheduled. Balloting for assemblymen to fill the posts created by the plan chosen Oct. 7 would take place Dec. 16.

The matter of reapportionment of the

assembly dates back to February, when the Supreme Court ruled that the Chugiak-Eagle River borough, formed last year, was illegal. That area was returned to the Anchorage borough, making the present assembly malapportioned.

The charter commission, also elected in February, addressed that question by adopting a multi-member district plan, (See Page 2, Col. 1)

Unity Gets Alternatives

(Continued From Page 1)

leaving Chugiak and Eagle River as a single-member district.

Unsatisfied with the commission's work, Assemblyman Mary Frohne, who is also a member of the charter commission, first circulated an initiative petition calling for a vote on the two alternatives. When that appeared to be waning, Mrs. Frohne initiated a referendum asking for the same thing.

These factors combined could have placed the alternative proposals on the Sept. 9 unification ballot. However, the assembly, in an attempt to avoid voter confusion over that issue, elected to defer consideration of apportionment until after the Sept. 9 vote.

Last week a motion to adopt alternate plans for a vote was postponed until Sept. 15. Last night, however, Assemblyman Dave Rose moved that the postponing action be rescinded. The assembly concurred, although some members demurred that consideration of the issue at this point would confuse voters.

Rose even supported a suggestion by Assemblyman Lidia Selkregg that the assembly not set any other election pending the outcome of the Sept. 9 balloting.

That attempt failed, along with numerous

votes on various combinations of alternatives. Although some assemblymen favored a single-district plan, which merely altered the multi-district plan proposed in the charter, others raised the fear of court action if this were adopted by voters as it is not one of five plans presented to signators of the initiative and referendum petitions.

Although Mrs. Frohne, prime mover of these petitions, promised she would support this plan as meeting the philosophy of districting requested in the petitions, Assemblyman Chuck Evans, among others, urged the body to restrict its choices to the five plans promoted with the petitions to avoid possible future legal action.

The assembly also was prompted to action by state law, which calls for the Department of Community and Regional Affairs to effect apportionment if the assembly does not apportion itself by Oct. 15.

Borough Clerk Mary Coffey told the assembly the department has never apportioned a city or borough in Alaska, and was reluctant to do it for Anchorage, much preferring that the assembly do it.