

Plan	Opinion	Comment	Name	Email	City	State
TCP1 (Public)	Dislike	<p>This map fails greatly on the criteria on compactness in many proposed districts. Here are just a few of the extremely obvious one: #2â€“stretching long, skinny east to west piece. #100â€“stretching from St. Ignatius all the way north to part of Browning. (So this representative through about 5 other districts just to get from one end to the other.) #74 has a piece of Missoula all the way north past Condon. #42 goes from the Cooke City north to almost Ringling, but has this strange piece out. (This falls like the other district pointed out above that the representative would have to travel through multiple districts, at least when Yellowstone is closed, to get from Cooke City to the rest of the district.) #19 goes all the way from the SE corner of the state up North to Fort Peck, with a strange u shape at the top. This map likely used the Competitiveness Metric adopted by the commission on June 3. This metric directly violates MCA 5-1-115 (3)(d).</p>	Noelle Johnson	Noleeefb@gmail.com	Great Falls	MT
TCP1 (Public)	Like	<p>Districts 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 - Well done. I haven't looked at the granular data between these five (5) districts and partisanship and based on how they are formed, I am not sure anyone needs to. These are well formed, compressed, and seemingly well formed districts. It is shocking when I compare them to what the Commission did with Helena, Bozeman, and Missoula. Why couldn't we put together districts for all of Montana's cities in a manner similar to Districts 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 in Great Falls?</p> <p>The only reason I can think of is that Great Falls has over the last ten years moved to become a swing city. Whereas Great Falls was traditionally a Democrat stronghold, the city now is evenly split in its voting patterns, so there is no "partisan advantage" to running "rural areas" into the middle of Great Falls to secure more Democrat districts. What you did in Great Falls is an example of what you should have done with every city in Montana (Billings, Bozeman, Helena, Missoula, etc.). You moved the rural areas together (i.e. Sun Valley, Simms, Cascade, etc. / Vaughn with Chouteau County and Fort Benton), and put the urban areas into a concise districts.</p> <p>You did an admirable job in Great Falls. While I hate to be a cynic, my concern is that you all agreed to these concise districts only because you knew they were "swing districts" and it didn't matter.</p>	Gage Hart Zobell	gaghartzobell@gmail.com	Jackson	Montana
TCP1 (Public)	Like	<p>Similar to District 43 (Livingston) and District 22 (Miles City), Havre as the 9th or 10th largest city in the state deserves its own representative. Havre is a traditional swing district, so it elects representatives from both parties. It would have been easy to have split Havre into two districts along with District 5 and create two consistently Republican Districts. You didn't do this and I appreciate it. While Havre is the economic heart of the Hi-Line, it has a set of unique issues that deserve to be represented. Diluting Havre with the neighboring rural District #5 would have resulted in representation, at times, by someone potentially as far away as Malta over the interests of Havre and its special interest, inclusive of a college, major medical center, border patrol, etc. As a city of sufficient size, it deserves its own representation that is unmarred by partisan gerrymandering. Thank you.</p>	Gage Hart Zobell	gaghartzobell@gmail.com	Jackson	Montana
TCP1 (Public)	Like	<p>Excellent district. While it may have been tempting to "break" Miles City into two separate districts, thereby guaranteeing two extremely Republican Districts (please note Miles City has elected a democrat representative in the not so distant past), you refrained. The interest of Miles City, one of the larger of the small Montana cities with over 8000 residents, should be represented by their own representative. While the rural areas of Custer County are economically tied to Miles City, they are similar in economy and views with the rest of eastern Montana to be represented well by District 19 that includes Powder River, Carter, Fallon, Prairie, Wibaux, and McCone County. To me, this District shows that the Commission can create a district that represents the interests of the citizens and not partisan preferences.</p>	Gage Hart Zobell	gaghartzobell@gmail.com	Jackson	Montana

District 19 is a well created district. Population declines (and/or slowing growth) in Eastern Montana makes it hard to form districts that have sufficient population without breaking up the eastern cities (i.e. Glendive, Miles City, and Sidney) into multiple districts. District 19 is a very large district but pulls together the vast swaths of Eastern Montana into a district that represents citizens with similar economies and ways of life.

TCP1 (Public)

Like

Gage Hart Zobell

gagehartzobell@gmail.com

Jackson

Montana

This is a well formed district. The need for the traditional Dawson County district to "capture" more population was appropriately done into rural Richland County where western Richland residents may have more in common with Richey residents within Dawson County. Further, the inclusion of Culbertson and Bainville with Sidney into this District allows those residents to be represented along with a city, Sidney, where they share economic ties. Great job!

TCP1 (Public)

Like

Gage Hart Zobell

gagehartzobell@gmail.com

Jackson

Montana

Again, I am astounded at the partisan in these districts. District 43 encompasses all of Livingston, which it should, allows that growing city to secure representation for its unique issues, which do not always align with the rest of rural Park County. However, in creating District 42, you have incorporated rural Park County (inclusive of Paradise Valley, and Shields Valley) into what is essentially a Bozeman district. Why? East Bozeman and the environs do not have the same interests and agriculturally centered Shields Valley? You created District 45 which encompasses the south environs of Bozeman . . . yet extent it into Bozeman pass towards Livingston? Why not revise District 45 and District 42 so that District 45 covers the Bozeman area and the more rural areas outside of lumped in with District 42 to create a rural district inclusive of Shields Valley, Paradise Valley, the ranches along the Bozeman Pass, etc.

Instead, these districts look like pure partisanship to expand the democrat voters from within Bozeman city to represent the rural interests of Park County. Please stop with the gerrymandering.

TCP1 (Public)

Dislike

Gage Hart Zobell

gagehartzobell@gmail.com

Jackson

Montana

Reviewing this extreme gerrymander, I have never been more ashamed of my home state of Montana. Districts 47, 48, 49, and 51 are pure partisan gerrymanders that not only create new Democrat districts, but do not allow a growing city (Belgrade) to receive proper representation. Belgrade is the 8th largest city in the state and one of the fastest growing. If the area outside of city limits is included, we are looking at a community of between 20-25k people. The city and environs consistently votes Republican, in marked difference to its large neighbor Bozeman. Belgrade is a bedroom community to Bozeman, but has its own growing economy and unique challenges related to population growth, the airport, expanding school districts, etc. This is a city that deserves to elect two (2) representatives, potentially three, that represent its interests. Instead, you break Belgrade and environs into 5 different districts: (47) - which runs into the heart of Bozeman to guarantee enough democrat voters to move the district to a Democrat win; (48) taking the southside and running it into the heart of Bozeman to secure enough Democrat voters to secure a Democrat win; (49) combining the south environs with West Bozeman to secure enough democrat votes to again make a new Democrat District; (51) taking the north environs outside of Belgrade and running them into the heart of Bozeman to secure enough Democrat votes to flip the District; and then lumping into District 53 all of Amsterdam and Churchill and the west Belgrade environs (where a major elementary school feeding into Belgrade proper is located) into a strong conservative district. Why would you do this? Did you think you were serving the interests of the community of Belgrade by breaking the 8th largest city into 4-5 districts which are each small enough that we may typically expect a citizen of Bozeman to represent them? This appears to have been done purely for partisan reasons and you should be ashamed. I don't care if Belgrade votes Republican or Democrat, but let them have their own representation without being forced to share it with Bozeman.

Belgrade is a distinct and unique community and should have two - three of its own representatives that are not associated with Bozeman. The issues affecting Bozeman voters are not the same as Belgrade voters. Belgrade is not just "the rural area" outside of Bozeman anymore, it is the 8th largest city in the State.

I would advise that District 48, and 47, at the least, be redrawn to represent PURELY Belgrade City and environs. Then allow District 51 and 49 represent Bozeman and its environs.

TCP1 (Public) Dislike Gage Hart Zobell gagehartzobell@gmail.com Jackson Montana

District 62 combines communities of like interest and economic ties together, excepting for Basin and the "homes" outside of Boulder, MT. I understand that need for District 62 to find additional population, but Lincoln, MT or Clearwater, Greenough, and Potomac are more closely aligned than Basin. I believe the interest of Basin and the surrounding homes outside of Boulder and Clancy that are lumped into District 62 should be instead added to District 61 (the residual of Jefferson County - i.e. Whitehall, Boulder, etc.). The interests of Basin will be better represented by a representative elected for the majority of Jefferson County, as opposed to a representative in District 62 who represents Deer Lodge, Philipsburg, Drummond, Avon, Elliston, and Ovando. Make District 62 whole by giving them the area around Lincoln (which is closely time Ovando, Helmville, and Seeley Lake). Take a portion of N. Jefferson County away from District 61 and shift the boundaries to accommodate the change. This is only affecting a couple hundred people, but would likely result in better representation for the people of Basin.

TCP1 (Public) Opinion Gage Hart Zobell gagehartzobell@gmail.com Jackson Montana

Please see my comments related to District 96, 97, and 98. This appears a gerrymander created to increase the potential for a Democrat leaning district. You have broken Whitefish in half and then broken Columbia Falls in half. District 98 further removes the traditional environs surrounding Columbia Falls to create a "downtown Columbia Falls / downtown Whitefish" district.

Avoid partisan gerrymanders, please. While Whitefish should have its own district, so too should Columbia Falls. To the extent the populations are "too large" to include the surrounding environs, then put those environs together. If a city must be broken, then leave Whitefish intact and break Columbia Falls to accommodate an eastern district that includes Hungry Horse, Coram, West Glacier, Essex (all which are economically tied together) with half of Columbia Falls, and a west district tying the other half of Columbia Falls with La Salle. This would align more closely with the school districts as well as opposed to trying to create three districts by breaking Whitefish into two, Columbia Falls into three, and lumping the conservative voting areas of Hungry Horse, Coram, and La Salle into one district.

Stop the gerrymander.

TCP1 (Public) Dislike Gage Hart Zobell gagehartzobell@gmail.com Jackson Montana

Like other districts in this proposal, District 97/98 were clearly created for partisan reasons. You have broken Whitefish into two separate districts as opposed to allowing the city, and surrounding communities, be represented primarily within one district. This was either done to dilute the predominantly liberal Whitefish votes between two districts, or to spread them in an effort to create two Democrat leaning districts. The result is that you have District 97 with a large portion of Whitefish representing the interests of West Glacier and Essex, which are more closely aligned with the interests of Columbia Falls. Create one District primarily for Whitefish and one district primarily for Columbia Falls and surrounding environs.

TCP1 (Public) Dislike Gage Hart Zobell gagehartzobell@gmail.com Jackson Montana

Proposed District 73 ignores topography. Uninhabited mountains separate voters who live east of Missoula from voters who live south of Missoula. Their interests and demographics are not related and they should not be lumped together in a gerrymandered District.

TCP1 (Public) Opinion Jane M Van Fossen jvfmslamt@aol.com Missoula MT

Earlier this year, a Maryland judge struck down a newly drawn Maryland congressional map, ruling that it was an "extreme gerrymander." The map had constitutional failings, did not adhere to requirements focusing on compactness, and did not keep similar communities together. This proposed map for Montana is very similar to that Maryland map. The Missoula and Bozeman areas resemble fingers, rather than using the compactness of squares or circles. This map does not keep communities and neighborhoods of interest together, particularly in Bozeman and Missoula. Legislators in Gallatin County and Missoula County would be forced into unnecessary travel to meet with constituents. Acceptance of this specific map will set the state of Montana in a position that could be ripe for a lawsuit.

TCP1 (Public) Dislike Jay Putman jptmn@juno.com Missoula MT

This map gives the impression that Democrats need to find ways to get elected and may be being deceptive in this redistricting recommendation. I hope it isn't accepted. Thank you.

TCP1 (Public) Dislike Patti Anderson mtmudbaby@charter.net Clinton MT

TCP1 (Public)	Like	One more comment. I hope the Legislature doesn't mess this up when they create the Senate Districts.	Robyn Morrison	robynmorrison1@me.com	Helena	Montana
TCP1 (Public)	Like	I commented earlier, and I am quite pleased with this final recommendation. I am an independent voter and think the concerns of the two parties are irrelevant. Voters should vote by neighborhood.	Robyn Morrison	robynmorrison1@me.com	Helena	Montana
TCP1 (Public)	Opinion	The polling place is 64th and Hesper Rd. This split of the districts caused residents to wonder why they have to drive 15 miles to the Metra when they are within 2 miles of the polling place. Please consider.	Cathy Fitzgerald	cfitzgerald8888@yahoo.com	Billings	MT