# **Public Comments**

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission Comments received by 5:00 p.m. on December 13, 2022

Distributed electronically December 13, 2022

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 3:18 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Marcia Amrine

From: Marcia Amrine Marcia A@montana.com

Residence: St. Ignatius

### Message:

I would ask the commission to reconsider District 100, which runs from Browning to St. Ignatius with the Mission Mountains in the middle. This is so inconvenient for the representative to travel the 200 miles, across the mountains. District 100 is not compact and deprives the communities of Lake County of representation. It makes no sense to divide Lake County in this manner. Thank you for your consideration.

--

From: Michael Bayuk <mjbayuk@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 11:12 AM

**To:** Districting **Subject:** Redistricting

Thank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Michael J. Bayuk 1520 Charlie Russell Dr. Helena, MT

-

From: Sandra Bearchum-Allen <heavensdesireable@yahoo.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 1:54 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Redistricting Maps

Thank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Thank you Sandra Bearchum Sent from Mail for Windows

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:59 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Loren Bough

From: Loren Bough lorenbough@me.com

Residence: Big Sky MT

### Message:

I'm a resident of Big Sky. Please do not combine the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community. We very much need legislators from both counties to represent our unique interests in Helena.

Respectfully

Loren Bough

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 10:17 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Dana Boussard

From: Dana Boussard danaboussard@gmail.com

Residence: Arlee, MT

### Message:

Thank you so much for letting me comment on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is the best compromise for all Montanans. Please don't let politicians make changes. Doing so will make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map without changes.

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 6:57 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Ann Brodsky

From: Ann Brodsky abrodsky@mt.net

Residence: Helena, Montana

#### Message:

Congratulations to the Districting and Apportionment Commission for putting forth a legislative redistricting plan that satisfies ALL the Commission's criteria and was reached through compromise on both sides. Districts are equal in size, compact, and contiguous. They largely keep political subdivisions (cities and counties) intact, AND, last but certainly not least, they are competitive and reflect the political demographics of Montana. This has been an arduous undertaking and I applaud the Commissioners for moving forward a plan that well reflects Montanans. Thank you.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 3:38 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: John Childs

From: John Childs jfchildsgeo@msn.com

Residence: Bozeman, MT

#### Message:

I am writing to thank the redistricting commission for their efforts on reaching a fair and workable map. I am writing in support of the tentative final map. The map splits very few counties, approximately reflects the representation of voters in Montana, and appears to meet the other criteria of the commission. I understand that the tentative map is a compromise that was reached after long deliberation, and I hope that it will be kept as it is for a final version.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:03 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Chris Christensen

From: Chris Christensen chrisxtwo@gmail.com

Residence: BOZEMAN, MT

### Message:

I support adoption of legislative districting map CP-1. Of alternatives considered this map does the best job of giving each Montana voter a voice in elections.

Thank You

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 3:07 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Loy Chvilicek

From: Loy Chvilicek loyannchvilicek@gmail.com

Residence: Helena, MT

#### Message:

Dear members of the Montana districting in apportionment commission, thank you for allowing me to offer my thoughts on the redistricting process results.

Thank you also for this difficult job you had in front of you.

House, district P8 violates the rules, because it splits municipalities, separates communities of interest, and rather than following the rule of compactness and contiguous communities, it promotes division, and spread to the point that the communities will no longer be recognizable as communities!

I support HDP7.

Respectfully

--

From: Elizabeth Clark <emyclark218@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 11:02 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** State Senate Districts

# Hello,

I'm writing to ask this Commission to keep the area south of Bozeman city limits together in a state senate district. This is a very high growth area, and that brings unique needs along with it. We have new homes and development popping up constantly, and being able to have a Senator that understands our needs is important. Thank you so much for all your hard work.

Best, Elizabeth Clark

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 3:00 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Carol Collins

From: Carol Collins bigskymtsalmon@earthlink.net

Residence: Gallatin Gateway Montana

### Message:

Please keep Gallatin County portion of Big Sky in the same district It's already confusing enough for the people in the Madison county portion to figure out where they have to vote Makes no sense to split big sky up

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:46 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Camille Consolvo

From: Camille Consolvo caconsolvo@gmail.com

Residence: Great Falls, Montana

### Message:

Thank you to the Commission for your work on redistricting I urge the Commissioners to pass the tentative final house map HDP8 as is.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:01 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Patrick Dailey

From: Patrick Dailey pdailey15@hotmail.com Residence: Gallatin Gateway, MT 59730

#### Message:

Hi — I'm a resident of Big Sky. I am writing to let you know i am not in favor Of combining the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community. We very much need legislators from both counties to represent our unique interests in Helena.

Thanks,

Pat

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 7:24 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Daniel Delzer

From: Daniel Delzer dan@delzers.com

Residence: Big Sky, Montana

### Message:

I'm a resident of Big Sky. Please do not combine the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community. We very much need legislators from both counties to represent our unique situation.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 3:37 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Mary Dixon

From: Mary Dixon mldixon8@icloud.com

Residence: Clancy

### Message:

I am against redistricting Map HDP 8. Rural and urban communities need to be separate. I have lived in a state that did this and it was terrible for farmers and ranchers. The communities are very different and are better served if not combined.

Thank you, Mary Dixon

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 6:20 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Mary Catherine Dunphy

From: Mary Catherine Dunphy mcdunphy04@hotmail.com

Residence: Miles City, MT

#### Message:

I want to thank all those who diligently worked during the very complicated and tedious process of coming up with the Tentative Final House Map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. I hope you will pass the Tentative Final House Map as is. Thank you.

\_-

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 3:34 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Dan Eakin

From: Dan Eakin centralwolverine07@gmail.com

Residence: Sidney, MT

Message:

Madame Chair and Commission members,

Thank you for considering my comments. I support Map 8 (CP-1) going forward, even though it will not directly benefit my vote personally. I feel it does a better job meeting statutory requirements and goals compared to other maps.

I feel that this map can encourage people to get to know each other better and find empathy and common ground, which is a good thing for Montana right now and going forward. The urban/rural divide does need to be bridged, and I think this Map 8 can help do that.

If the population of Montana continues to grow and move westward, then the western part is going to have more districts while eastern Montana (other than Billings) will likely need to have geographically larger districts to reach the 10,000 population goal. This is especially true if out of state special interests continue to buy up rural lands to create their own fantasized dude ranches without any connection to Montana.

Also, another potential issue that may occur relates to a recent conversation I had with a Congressional candidate who shared her experience attending an informational session in Lewistown that was about the expected population boom coming from the refurbishing and upgrading of Montana's nuclear missile silos around the central Montana area in the next few years. If this happens, it will certainly affect the proposed districts in central Montana around Lewistown and Great Falls.

Regarding the concerns about compactness and "wheel spoke" districts going out from urban centers, I think Map 8 minimizes this and that other maps, such as Map 7, also have this issue. If you have compact, more circular districts in urban cities such as Missoula, Helena, and Billings, then you are going to have adjacent districts going outward from them, because districts are not perfectly circular or square. It's important to remember that the opposite could also occur, where you have larger, more rural districts cutting into urban areas.

Map 8 does split up counties, but I think this will happen with any map. Other maps also split up counties, including Richland County and Dawson County, despite the comments offered by Representatives Ler and Knudson. Richland County is currently split among their districts. I think Map 8 does not create a whole new split in Richland County, and will not disenfranchise Republican voters.

Some proposed districts in Map 8 are large, specifically HD 5 and 19, but I think this issue could be fine-tuned without discarding this map.

I think that Map 8 also does its best to respect tribal reservation communities, although it could be further studied on this issue. I support tribal communities and reservation boundaries being respected and having meaningful representation. The Billings Gazette recently had a great article about reservation communities such as on Rocky Boy being ignored by state and national candidates and legislators of both parties and disrespected by Havre folks that share

its district. Map 8 appears to support tribal communities being more heard and respected based on a government to government relationship.

As other folks have pointed out, no map is perfect. Map 8 is not perfect, but I think it should be advanced and built upon. It does try to be compact under 5-1-115 (4) (d), MCA, as much as possible to comply with the Voting Rights Act and the population goal of 10,000 voters per district.

Also, 5-1-115 (2), MCA, has the required criteria for the commission to consider in order of importance. First, most importantly, as equal as practicable.

Second, must coincide with political subdivisions as much as possible with minimal splitting of counties.

Third, being contiguous in one piece. Fourth, last in importance, compactness.

I think Map 8 best focuses on these requirements in their order of importance.

Thank you very much for your work and consideration.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 2:24 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Paul Ebright

From: Paul Ebright l.p.ebright@gmail.com

Residence: Columbia Falls

### Message:

Your redistricting plan for northern Flathead County is awful. Having Polebridge, West Glacier and Essex separate from Hungry Horse and Coram is ridiculous. Another awful house district is 100, which I believe puts parts of Glacier County and Lake County together. You should not have a district on both east and west sides of the continental divide separated by several hours of driving time. I believe Proposal #4 separates those 2 areas and also does a much better job of boundaries in northern flathead County. I believe a high school civics class could do a much better job of developing a redistricting map than your current proposal. I would ask that you relook at these areas and come up with better boundaries.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:50 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Chery Ehresman

From: Chery Ehresman cheryreedpoint@gmail.com

Residence: Billings Montana

Message:

Finally some fairness....based on commonsense and not sports rivals and jury meanderings...about time.. thank you

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 9:47 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Hilary Eisen

From: Hilary Eisen hilary.eisen@gmail.com

Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

Redistricting Commission,

Thank you for the work you have put into developing new House districts for Montana. I know this has not been easy, and appreciate that the Commission has put forth a compromise as the tentative final map. I support the Tentative Final House map because it splits the fewest counties, meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission, and has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana.

It's hard to find a compromise that makes sense for our unique state, but this map is likely the best possible option. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is and don't let politicians interfere in the Commission's hard work.

Thank you.

--

From: Janet Ellis <janetellis4mt@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:19 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Support for TCP1 redistricting map - citizen comment

#### Dear Commissioners -

Thank you for all your hard work aimed at drawing a fair legislative redistricting map for our state.

I am writing to support Tentative Commission Proposal 1 (TCP1). I support TCP1 because, of the maps before the Commission, I believe it is the map that most closely meets the self-identified, unanimously adopted, goals of the Commission, including:

- > Commission Goal 1: "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party." TCP1 is a compromise. Although it gives Republicans a slight partisan advantage, I do not believe it creates an extreme partisan advantage. Instead, I believe that the map fairly matches the overall partisanship of the state, which is appropriate.
- > Commission Goal 2: "The commission shall attempt to minimize dividing cities, towns, counties and federal reservations between two districts when possible." TCP1 splits the fewest counties and municipalities of any proposal that the Commission has considered.
- > Commission Goal 3: "Keeping communities of interest intact. The Commission may consider keeping communities of interest intact. Communities of interest can be based on Indian reservations, urban interests, suburban interests, rural interests, tribal interests, neighborhoods, trade areas, geographic location, demographics, communication and transportation networks, social, cultural, historic, and economic interests and connections, or occupations and lifestyles." In order to meet this goal, there are several reasons I think TCP1 is the best map:
- 1. As a resident of Helena, I support TCP1 because it keeps Lewis & Clark County intact.
- 2. TCP1 keeps both Park County and Bozeman intact, which was an aspect of the Congressional map that I disagreed with.
- 3. TCP1 also does the best job of keeping our state's Indian reservations intact. With about 9% of Montana's population Native American, allowing this population to be significantly represented in the Montana Legislature is important.
- > **Summary:** I understand that TCP1 meets all of the adopted commission criteria. Making changes to this map now may advantage one political party over another.

There are two final points I wish to make about the redistricting process:

- I believe the pairing of House Legislative Districts that will be used to establish Senate Legislative Districts should not unduly favor either party.
- I do not believe that the map should be redrawn to protect incumbent legislators in any way. Protecting incumbents is NOT one of the criteria that the commission adopted.

Thank you for considering these comments. Please contact me if you have any questions.

- Janet Ellis, 703 Breckenridge St., Helena, MT 59601; 406-431-9157

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 2:43 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: lindsie feldner

From: lindsie feldner skatehappy74@gmail.com

Residence: big sky, MT

### Message:

Please consider keeping Big Sky's voting district intact as one community. This would include part of the town that is in Madison County such as homes in Moonlight Basin, Spanish Peaks Club, Big Sky Resort, and YC. We ALL reside in Big Sky, our community is Big Sky, and it makes the most sense to keep the community voting together. Thank you for your consideration.

Lindsie Feldner

--

**From:** smurf40@netzero.net

Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 5:49 AM

To: Districting Subject: Map

hank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't™t let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Thank You

Lynn Ferguson Butte, MT

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 7:20 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Kym Fujinami

From: Kym Fujinami gorudiilox@gmail.com

Residence: Philipsburg, Montana

#### Message:

I think there are some shenanigans taking place in Granite County. We recently elected John Fitzpatrick to be our representative for district 77. One of the reasons he won his election is because of his appreciation and commitment to Philipsburg. He understands our small town needs and we believe he will be there for us on all important issues that effect us. Curiously, since this election, someone feels it is necessary to redistrict Georgetown Lake, where John Fitzpatrick lives. And specifically the new boundaries are excluding his property and his property alone. This would affect his ability to do his duly elected job for Philipsburg. Scandalous!! Our elections are becoming corrupt it is disgusting!!!

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 11:50 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Gary Fujinami, Council member

From: Gary Fujinami, Council member Kokoroltd@gmail.com

Residence: Philipsburg, MT

#### Message:

We finally have a representative that knows our issues here in Granite County in general, and Philipsburg specifically. Mr. John Fitzpatrick has already met with the town leaders and is sincerely interested in helping our town. He has a house at Georgetown lake so he is very interested in Philipsburg. Curiously, one version of re-districting draws the boundary around his house so he would represent a different region. I emplore you all to keep Mr. Fitzpatrick's house in our district so he can represent Philipsburg.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 12:08 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Dave Galt

From: Dave Galt GaltDavidMT@Gmail.com

Residence: Helena, Montana

#### Message:

I did offer testimony in person this morning, but wanted to clarify one point, and add a comment I didn't feel I had time to say.

When I spoke of the south end of Helena I was speaking of the proposed districts 64,65,66, and 68. The CURRENT precincts that I referred to in that south end historically have a minimum of 75% and a maximum of 86% democrat votes were 8, 13, 14, 17, and 22. All the above districts include one or more of these precincts which leads to the outcome that Mr. Gaub said that voters in the Helena Valley feel disenfranchised.

The point I did not submit is that we talk about similar "communities of interests" and keeping them intact. Suggestions that the valley residents, and the downtown Helena residents are in the same "community of interest" are false. Your discretionary criteria allows you to consider urban and suburban interests. While there are issues the Legislature addresses that impact every Montanan, there are numerous issues that may or may not impact urban, suburban and rural areas. The Helena valley is quite a bit different in its semi-rural, and agrarian lifestyle than the City of Helena. Including highly partisan districts that impact all the Helena area districts is not appropriate.

Thank you for your service in a difficult, time consuming and in many cases a thankless job.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 9:57 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Sharon Patton-Griffin

From: Sharon Patton-Griffin pattongriffin@yahoo.com

Residence: Great Falls, MT

Message:

Dear Redistricting Committee Commissioners:

Thank you for asking for input regarding the formation of Senate Districts for Montana's new legislative map. Please combine HD 11 and HD 12 together to form a competitive Great Falls Senate district.

Great Falls is a purple town and your map honors that fact by providing purple House districts. Please continue honoring your competitive criteria by creating a competitive Senate district for Great Falls.

Thank you!

Sharon Patton-Griffin, Ed.D. 256 Dune Drive Great Falls, Mt 59404 406.899.5917

\_\_

From: Weiss, Rachel

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:37 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Fw: Redistricting-no to Map 8

From: Vande-Sandt, Heather < Heather. Vande-Sandt@legmt.gov>

**Sent:** Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:34 PM **To:** Weiss, Rachel <Rachel.Weiss@legmt.gov>

Subject: Fw: Redistricting-no to Map 8

I received this and was asked to get it to the committee.

Heather Vande Sandt RMC, Legislative Services Heather.Vande-Sandt@mt.gov

From: Sandie Hammer <sandie@sandiehammer.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:21 PM

To: heather.vande-sandt@mt.gov <heather.vande-sandt@mt.gov>

Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting-no to Map 8

To Whom it May Concern:

Please redraw Lake County and do not split it up! You even split up the town of Polson! The majority of Lake County citizens are not being heard. This is very biased as this map seems to break up our County more than any other County or city.

Sandra Hammer 678 Hawk Drive Polson, MT 406-581-3033

Please distribute to the Commission.

Thank you, Heather

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

Get Outlook for Android [aka.ms]

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 1:53 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Lyn Hellegaard, HD97

From: Lyn Hellegaard, HD97 lhellegaard@msn.om

Residence: Missoula, MT

### Message:

Many of my constituents have expressed concern of disenfranchisement over the current maps being considered. The current legislative district is the only avenue they feel they still have a voice. They are greatly impacted by the City of Missoula and can't vote in city elections, are out voted by city residents on county commissioners. By putting Lolo voters with Missoula voters you are in effect silencing any voice Lolo might have. This doesn't not support the criteria of "communities of interest" being considered.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:18 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Margie M. Hendricks

From: Margie M. Hendricks margiemhendricks@gmail.com

Residence: Polson, Mt. 59860

Message:

I strongly support HB8P.

--

From: Greg Hertz < greghertz6102@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 11:20 AM

**To:** Districting **Subject:** MAP HDP - 8

#### Commissioners

I have lived in Lake County the majority of my life. I went to grade school in Polson and finished high school in Ronan. I own two businesses in Lake County and my company is one of the larger employers in the county. I do have a very good understanding of communities of interest in Lake County.

The current configuration of HD88 and HD89 split communities of interest in both Lake and Flathead county.

I would suggest that you change the boundaries of HD 88 to include both the east and west shores of Flathead Lake up to the Lake County line. Then change the boundaries of HD 89 to include the east and west shores of Flathead lake which would put the Bigfork area in the same district as the Lakeside/Somers area and this district would be made up of mostly Flathead county. By making this change you would keep communities of interest together.

HD 100 also splits Lake County communities of interest and ties them to the Browning area. I understand that this is a native american district and you should try to keep it that way, however please don't use Lake County. The current Representatives for this district have been elected from the Browning area and rarely come to Lake County. It is a very long drive over Marias Pass and the Representatives must pass through 4 to 5 other districts just to get to Lake County. Instead of using Lake County to form this district you should look to go to Glacier, Pondera or Teton County. It would be easier for a Representative to meet with constituents and also keep communities of interest together. You should also be able to keep HD 100 as a tribal district. By doing this you would also keep southern Lake County together in one district.

In Flathead County, HD 98 makes no sense either. You are splitting Whitefish and then tying it to Columbia Falls. Those communities are very different. Please put Whitefish back together.

These maps are going to be in place for another 10 years. If you are trying to make districts more competitive by splitting communities of interest I suspect it will not make much of a difference in the makeup of the legislature. Just look at the change in Cascade county over the last 10 years. The district lines have not changed in those districts over the last 10 year. What has changed are the policies and candidates. If candidates want to win they need to promote policies that represent the district.

You will be doing a disservice to Montana by splitting communities of interest with a possible result of only gaining 3 or 5 seats for 1 party. Most Montanas are not following this process and will only know when the 2024 elections begin and realize how their community may have been unnecessarily split for very little gain.

I have served in the Montana Legislature since 2013 and have seen the democrat party continue to lose seats in the legislature since being first elected. Lines have not changed but parties policies have changed and that has primarily been the cause of the democrats losing seats. Do what is right for Montana voters and do not break up their communities of interest for the benefit of a few possible legislative seats.

#### Thank you

Gregory J. Hertz Polson, MT greghertz6102@gmail.com 406-883-1500 work 406-253-9505 cell

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 12:03 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Gina Klempel

From: Gina Klempel klemlog@aboutmontana.net

Residence: Kalispell

#### Message:

Map 8 is a map that clearly takes away the values and personalities of these two districts causing further division. The state of Montana wears many hats so to speak and they need to be on their perspective heads showing the differences in values and personalities. Why is there so much fear on behalf of the Democratic party. Voters should always look at voting records of all candidates if they have one and decide what represents their values and vision. Leave the two diametrically different districts alone and let the voter decide. This valley is growing beyond its vision and in the end we all will look and wonder what did the so-called powers that be do. Stretching a line only adds more discontent and dislike.

Thank you, Gina Klemel NO MAP 8

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 9:48 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: JEFFREY KROTT

From: JEFFREY KROTT krottjeffrey@gmail.com

Residence: HELENA

#### Message:

How does the Districting and Apportionment Commission's mission and action affect the delivery of quality mental health services in the State Of Montana?

Montana has been experiencing severe difficulties delivering quality mental health services to the people living in the State Of Montana.

Certain areas of the State of Montana has better access to higher quality mental health than other areas which don't have as much access to high quality mental health services. Jails, prisons, hospitals, the Montana State Hospital are more readily accessible to certain areas of the State Of Montana than other areas of the State of Montana.

Funding for mental health services in the State of Montana has actively been being cut, making it more difficult to get any mental health services in the State Of Montana, let alone quality mental health services in the State of Montana.

I have no idea how the redistricting process will affect the delivery of quality mental health services in the State Of Montana as a whole, as well as in rural districts in Montana, where one often has to drive hundreds of miles to access any mental health services, no matter the quality of the mental health services in rural districts.

Quality mental health services in urban areas are getting harder and harder to deliver as well.

So, whether rural or urban, the delivery of high quality mental health services in the State Of Montana has been getting harder and harder to supply and maintain.

Please try to make sure that the delivery of high quality mental health services is well provided for at a meaningful sustainable level.

Thank you for the very hard work that you all in this commission have been doing.

I have been watching your commission meetings on television, and I am very impressed with the level of seriousness and the level of interaction with the public that this commission and its membership have maintained.

Thank you once again, Sincerely, Jeffrey B. Krott Helena, Montana

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:22 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: jan lombardi

From: jan lombardi jan.lombardimt@gmail.com

Residence: Seeley Lake MT

#### Message:

Please support the current map before you. It does a good job of balancing the geography and interest of Montanans.

Thank you for your service to Montana.

--

From: klousen@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Kenneth Lousen <klousen@everyactioncustom.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:20 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Writing in Support of Legislative Map HDP-8.....

Dear Montana Districting and Apportionment Commissioners (via email),

## .Greetings Districting Commissioners....

HDP-8 is a fair districting map. It balances out population quite well and minimizes the breaking up of contiguous county areas. I strongly support this map and proposal, and urge you to adopt it. Making micro changes to suit one political party to it's advantage or another will be unfair to all districts. Please stick with this proposed compromise map as the best solution for redistricting.

Thank you. Respectfully,. Kenneth Lousen 2425 Skyline Drive Missoula, Montana 59802

Sincerely, Kenneth Lousen 2425 Skyline Dr Missoula, MT 59802-3105 klousen@gmail.com

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 3:46 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Gary Lusin

From: Gary Lusin bozpt@montana.net

Residence: Belgrade, MT

#### Message:

I own property in Big Sky and I have the majority of my life in this area. Whatever map is decided especially for HD 64 I strongly urge you to allow all of Big Sky to vote in that district. Almost all public access to all of Big Sky, including Moonlight area is from Gallatin County so all citizens in that area are involved in and use Gallatin County roads, businesses, etc, except for a small few up on the mountain.

Allowing that population to all vote for a representative of that area makes sense.

Please support a map that allows all of Big Sky area, including all of Moonlight area and Spanish Peaks area to be represented by someone from that area.

Thank you.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 11:13 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Al Malinowski

From: Al Malinowski al\_mal@yahoo.com

Residence: Big Sky. MT

#### Message:

It has come to my attention that there is a proposal to consider changing the boundary between the Gallatin and Madison county portions of Big Sky to be combined and represented by one legislator. As Big Sky will remain part of two different counties, I believe it is imperative that our community continue to be represented by legislators from both counties in Helena. Changing the current representation model would be a significant setback for our community.

As an unincorporated area, our unique interests require detailed understanding at the State level. Limiting our representation from what it is today would be a mistake for the residents of Big Sky would be inconsistent with the current local level representation that currently exists and has developed into a strong, collaborative effort.

I hope you will recognize the success our unique community has under the current structure and preserve those valued relationships by not further pursuing this re-districting effort.

Respecfully,

Al Malinowski

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 6:59 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Angela Marshall

From: Angela Marshall angelamarshall8@gmail.com

Residence: Big Sky MT

#### Message:

I'm a resident of Big Sky. Please do not combine the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community that very much needs legislators from both counties to represent our unique interests.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:04 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Linda Meyer

From: Linda Meyer linda5724@gmail.com

Residence: Corvallis MT

Message: Hi Blue Bench,

Have you been following the Redistricting process? We'd love your help! Now's the time to provide comments to the Districting and Apportionment Commission on the legislative maps. If you can't make the Public Comment session in person on Dec 10th, you can help by sending an email in support of HDP8.

Thank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Respectfully, Linda

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:06 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Sherry Nelson

From: Sherry Nelson flatheadpolson@centurytel.net

Residence: POLSON

# Message:

Re-districting of Lake County: Dividing the city of Polson is ridiculous. Let's keep our community together. This would be such a manipulation for political reasons.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:09 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Suzzann Nordwick

From: Suzzann Nordwick suzzann@nordwick.com

Residence: Butte, Montana

#### Message:

First, I'd like to note that there are areas (including Missoula, Bozeman, Helena, Great Falls and Billings) of the proposed map that don't meet one of the legitimate criteria for districts, as stated in Article V, Section 14 part 1 of the Montana Constitution, which is, "Each district shall consist of compact and contiguous territory." By all appearances those areas look to be drawn for the soul purpose of combining rural and urban voters. And since it is well known that on average these two groups vote differently, this map not only distorts the intent of the compact district criteria, but also dilutes the power of rural voters. And because there are some issues that are more important to rural voters, decreasing their impact on election outcomes is unfair. One way this has been more successfully addressed is in Butte-Silver Bow, with the commissioner district boundaries. Of the 12 commissioners, two districts are comprised with mostly rural voters. (see:

https://buttesilverbow.maps.arcgis.com/apps/View/index.html?appid=045495b837894f4db88c5fb8ee84fcf6&extent=-112.6900,45.9359,-112.3604,46.0515.html)

Second, I'd like to note that additionally many areas of the currently proposed map appear "neither compact nor fair" and are indicative of an illegal process called "gerrymandering", which according to the Washington Post, is the process of redrawing district lines to give an advantage to one party over another. In a March 1, 2015 news story, Christopher Ingraham describes 3 ways a 60/40 population can be divided into 5 districts: 3 & 2 (perfect representation), 5 & 0 (compact, but unfair) and 2 & 3 (neither compact nor fair). (See:

https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/03/01/this-is-the-best-explanation-of-gerrymandering-you-will-ever-see/)

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 8:54 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Karen O'Donnell

From: Karen O'Donnell mtgardener@protonmail.com

Residence: Helena, MT

#### Message:

Dear Members of the Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission,

Thank you for the opportunity to offer my opinion on the redistricting process results. I am very much opposed to proposed redistricting Map HDP8 for the following reasons:

Map HDP8 is BAD for Montana! It splits municipalities terribly. Residents of small rural communities are divided by Interstate highways as well as other geographical barriers. Cities and towns should not be split into different districts! The integrity of a city or town should be maintained within one district. Map HDP8 puts part of a city in one district, while another part of the same city is in a different district. By doing that, the residents of Cities are divided into different entities – the residents in West Montana City, for example, are in HD68 and the residents of East Montana City are in HD61. Having this small city in two different districts is schizophrenic. Splitting up municipalities causes further fractures to our communities that are unnecessary and unfair, instead of keeping communities of interest together which is one of the important rules for redistricting!

As well as making the district impossible for its House Representative to travel through it on a regular basis to become familiar with the constituents and their needs and interests, HPD8 creates a district so huge in geographic size that there is no chance for community within the district!

Within these proposed districts, there are small rural municipalities within 10 minutes of each other, and others that are 2-1/2 hours away from each other! This is crazy! Representatives would have to drive through many other districts to serve the communities that are located in their own district with the HDP8 map. This makes no sense whatsoever! Districts should be comprised of a consolidated area, not little pockets of land here, there, and everywhere! Dividing them up the way HDP8 proposes, makes about as much sense as dividing up the State of Montana into fifty little pieces located throughout the other fifty states

America. The proper representation of people cannot possibly happen using this technique! Additionally, folks in rural communities will lose any voice they once had due to being lumped together with large urban areas.

HDP8 violates the rules because it splits municipalities, separates communities of interest, and rather than following the rule of compactness and contiguous communities, it promotes division and spread to the point that the communities will no longer be recognizable as communities!

I would be much more likely to support HDP7, which will ensure communities are contiguous and condensed into more maintainable communities.

Thank you for taking your valuable time to read this opinion, and for all you are doing for our State!

Sincerely, Karen O'Donnell --

From: Catherine Parke <ourart.cparke@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 10:36 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** One brief additional comment to my testimony to the Districting & Apportionment Commission

**Public Hearing** 

#### To the Commission:

Thank you for the important Districting & Apportionment Commission Public Hearing on December 10, 2022. I add one brief comment (in **boldface**) to my testimony that urged the Commission, in putting together the Senate Districts, to reunite the parts of Missoula Northside community that could not be kept together on the House Map. Because the goals and criteria regarding population, not unduly favoring one party over another, and keeping communities whole do not, in this case, conflict with one another, Northside community can be kept whole. **And keeping Northside whole is both logical and important to crucial work we residents are doing to support and improve the well being and safety of our community.** 

Thank you for all your work.

Yours truly,

Catherine N. Parke Northside community, Missoula, MT

---

Catherine Parke⇔OurArt Studio
702 Charlo Street, Apt A, Missoula, MT 59802
573-289-0825 (mobile); ourart.cparke@gmail.com

□Kyexiq eper\$vszivf

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:38 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Eva C Patten

From: Eva C Patten evapatten1@gmail.comBozeman

Residence: Bozeman, Montana

#### Message:

We are fortunate in Montana to have a redistricting commission, especially one that has adopted additional criteria beyond the mandatory list to insure fairness to both parties, that divide fewer city, county and reservation boundaries. Thank you for your work and therefore I support HDP-8 as best for goals set forth by the commission and the Voting Rights Act

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 2:06 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Eva C Patten

From: Eva C Patten evapatten1@gmail.com

Residence: Bozeman, Montana

#### Message:

Thank you for months and months of work developing criteria, hearing from Montanans. I support HFP-8. Thanks for your many hours of listening, developing criteria and so forth. A lengthy and admirable pursuit

--

From: Angie Paulsen <apaulsen@co.broadwater.mt.us>

Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 4:39 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Districting and Apportionment Commission public comment Broadwater County

Dear Districting and Apportionment Commission,

Please accept this written comment on behalf of Broadwater County in support of House District Proposal #1, PM-H1 and PM-S1, to keep Broadwater County together as much as possible.

Thank you,

#### **Angie Paulsen**

Clerk & Recorder/Elections Administrator/Surveyor Broadwater County 515 Broadway Townsend, MT 59644 PHONE 406-266-9219

Disclaimer: Email communications may be subject to public disclosure. Most written communications to or from Broadwater County Employees and Officials regarding County Business are public records and may be available to the public and media upon request.

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 7:48 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Barry Plaga

From: Barry Plaga bplaga@3rivers.net

Residence: Big Sky, MT

Message:

Hey Barry! It's Jane Gillette. Sorry to bother you.

We are residents Big Sky. Please do not combine the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community. We very much need legislators from both counties to represent our unique interests in Helena.

Here's the link:

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 8:17 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Gail and John Richardson

From: Gail and John Richardson envirogail@q.com

Residence: Bozeman

#### Message:

We enthusiastically support the Tentative Final House map laid out by the Commission for several reasons. We believe this compromise will benefit Montana, a 60-40 split reflecting the approximate makeup of our voters' preferences at this time. This map also splits the fewest counties and meets the goals and criteria set by the Commission. We understand that both sides had to give in these negotiations which is as it should be. But the Tentative Final House map is probably the fairest to both parties and to the people of Montana that could be devised, so we urge the Commission to pass it as it is configured. We thank the Redistricting Commission for its public service and difficult work that benefits us all.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 12:23 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Rita Rozier

From: Rita Rozier rtrozier@gmail.com

Residence: Livingston

#### Message:

I thank you for your work in constructing the Tentative Final House map.

I support it because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. The Tentative Final House Map is a compromise but a good one that comes as close to being "fair" to all Montanans as is possible. Please pass it as it is, without further change. Thank you.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:18 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: James H. Sadler

From: James H. Sadler jimsadler1220@gmail.com

Residence: Missoula

#### Message:

Please form my district with folks with like interests. I live in an area with 4H projects and horses. Apartment dwelling city folks have a different point of view. Counting heads is not satisactory. Do not disenfrachise rural people

--

From: senatorsands@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of Senator Diane Sands

<senatorsands@everyactioncustom.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:34 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Writing in Support of Legislative Map HDP-8

Dear Montana Districting and Apportionment Commissioners (via email),

I support the compromise Map HDP-8 as best addressing the criteria the Commission adopted.

Although currently representing SD49(for another 3 weeks), I have served in the legislature through 2 other redistricting commissions and I commend the Commission for tremendous outreach and public input to the process. You are all to be commended for your work. Thank you.

My district currently goes all the way from Missoula's Reserve Street to the Ravalli County line and west to Idaho! A huge district. I heartedly agree with the Map 8 plan for that district.

I would like to remind everyone that we in the legislature recognized the size of many districts and the difficulty for legislators to travel a huge area. Fortunately zoom has increased our access to district meetings and the provision of a public all funded constituent account provides support for legislators to cover the expenses of traveling and participation in districts. It helps.

Thank you for all the negotiations toward a consensus map. Your willingness to compromise to get where you are is appreciated. Please adopt Map 8.

Senator Diane Sands Senate District 49 Western Missoula County

Sincerely, Senator Diane Sands 4487 Nicole Ct Missoula, MT 59803-2791 senatorsands@gmail.com

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:58 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Hal Schmid

From: Hal Schmid hschmid@montana.com

Residence: Arlee, Montana

Message:

Duplicating the individual emails sent.

Chair Smith and Commissioners:

Thank you for the important work you are doing and for your commitment to Montana's future.

I have followed the commission's work this fall and this week, and I listened to state-wide public comments today online. I would like to say that I am particularly impressed with the melding of passion, civility, and transparency in this commission's bipartisan work as well as the patience and decorum exemplified by the chair. These are the best of Montana values as I know them.

I am comfortable with map HDP-8. I support that proposed map. There is no "perfect" here, and I am therefore impressed with the comprises that HDP-8 embodies.

With map HDP-8, my state house district voting shifts toward Missoula County from Lake County. I am comfortable with that. A third-generation native of Missoula, I moved across the county line to the Jocko Valley east of Arlee in July 1984. Since that time, my employment has been predominantly in Lake County—shifting from working in the woods to working at educational institutions in Arlee, St. Ignatius, and Pablo. But in so many ways I remain largely based out of Missoula and three of my four siblings (and their families) live in Missoula County.

So, looking at my own several related communities and the state as a whole, let me reiterate that I am comfortable with, and support, the proposed redistricting lines drawn in map HDP-8.

Lemlmtš.

Hal Schmid Arlee, Montana

--

From: Kierstin Schmitt <montanaks@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 9:38 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** REDISTRICTING - SUPPORT Tentative Final House map

Thank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Thanks, Kierstin

Kierstin Schmitt Corvallis, MT

From: Kierstin Schmitt <montanaks@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 9:29 AM

To: Districting
Subject: REDISTRICTING

Thank you so much for your hard work on the Tentative Final House map. I support the map because it splits the fewest counties, has a 60-40 split that roughly reflects the voters of Montana, and meets all the criteria and goals of the Commission. This map is a compromise. Please don't let meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans. Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as is.

Thanks, Kierstin

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 6:06 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Theresa Seth

From: Theresa Seth tseth455@gmail.com

Residence: Gallatin Gateway MT

#### Message:

Wow what a task you all have undertaken. Thank you. I reviewed the proposed districts and believe the current proposal as of 12/12/2022 is better than earlier maps because the distribution more accurately reflects voter outcomes in the state. I understand the current proposal to result in an approximate 60 to 40 split Republican/democrat. This map is definitely Better but this still underrepresents in democratic voters in the state by 3-5% if you look back further than 2022 and 2020. Please try to better represent the voice of all Montanans. At a minimum please don't go back to maps that are even less representative. The urban areas clearly need more representation than we currently have.

Thank you and please prioritize voter views, voter representation and not just consolidating urban voters into as few districts as possible. Urban and urban interface districts need a voice.

--

From: Alison Sweeney <a.bernadettes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 13, 2022 12:56 PM

**To:** Districting **Subject:** HDP8

Thank you all for working hard on the redistricting process, it's so important!

# Please pass the Tentative Final House Map as it is.

It largely reflects the 60-40 split that roughly represents the voting trends of Montana's population.

It splits the fewest counties which is good for logistical reasons.

Most importantly to me, it keeps districts competitive so that our politics don't recede to the fringes of party agendas. This just makes it hard to accomplish anything!

Keep Montana pragmatic and practical please.

Alison B. Sweeney Bernadette's Handmade Jewelry Bozeman MT 406-404-5740 alison-bernadettes.com

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Monday, December 12, 2022 9:50 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Annie Hosefros Thomas

From: Annie Hosefros Thomas anniethomas@itstriangle.com

Residence: McLeod

Message:

Thank you for your time and dedication in discerning an appropriate map for Montana voters.

Please support the tentative Final House map.

I think this map is best because it splits the fewest Montana counties.

It's a 60-40 split, and does reflect Montana voters, and this map is a compromise. But, it meets all the criteria and goals that the Commission set forth.

Please do not allow meddling politicians make the map worse for Montanans.

Please pass this Tentative Final House Map as is. As is. Thank you.

Annie H. Thomas McLeod

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 3:28 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Rick Tryon

From: Rick Tryon ricktryon@msn.com

Residence: Great Falls, MY

Message:

Members of the redistricting committee,

As a Great Falls City Commissioner I would like to recommend that you seriously consider PM-H15 to the Cascade County map.

As a lifelong Great Falls resident, I can assure you that this configuration makes a lot of sense and is a logical map.

Thanks for your consideration.

Commissioner Rick Tryon Great Falls City Commissioner

--

From: stugiej < stugiej@protonmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 8:40 AM

To: Districting
Subject: Redistricting

I support map #7. Why was only one map selected for public comment? Please reconsider allowing both maps 7 & 8 for public comment.

Thank you.

Jo Vilhauer Miles City, MT

Sent from Proton Mail mobile

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Sunday, December 11, 2022 6:30 AM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Richard Wambsgans

From: Richard Wambsgans rich@delzers.com

Residence: Big Sky, Montana

#### Message:

I'm a resident of Big Sky. Please do not combine the Madison portion of Big Sky with a Gallatin County legislative district. This would be a huge set-back for our community. We very much need legislators from both counties to represent our unique interests in Helena.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 2:48 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Susan A Webber

From: Susan A Webber nitzitapii@gmail.com

Residence: Browning Montana

#### Message:

I represent Senate District 8 that currently consists of parts of 4 Montana counties including 2 Indian Reservations. I oppose any changes to the redistricting that would limit Native American representation in the Montana state legislature. The tribe have must continue to have a say in legislation that will have an impact in Indian Country, tribal sovereignty and our right to govern ourselves in an increasing hostile political environment.

Far too long Montana has been governed by right wing conservative republican policy makers who would prefer to silence minority, female, LGBTQ. and the poor's voices. Montana needs those voices.

I want all of Glacier County, the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, to stay intact so these tribes retain their right to be represented in state government.

Glacier County cannot be divided as it has been. This segregation of non-indian and Indian citizens of this county only foster's racism and discrimination. In order to heal this country need to begin with bringing people together at the very foundstion of our political system, our neighborhoods.

Thank you Sen. Susan Webber. SD 8.

\_\_

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 5:51 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Camillyn Weber

From: Camillyn Weber camillyn@icloud.com

Residence: Big Sky Montana

#### Message:

The suggestion of pulling all of Big Sky into a Madison County legislative district does not address the "elephant in the room." Specifically, Jack Creek Road is not open to the public. As a result, all of Big Sky's services, eg. health care, fire department, police, schools are all from Gallatin County. Big Sky residents would lose critical representation from Gallatin County if they are pulled into Madison County, which currently provides none of these services to Big Sky. Due to lack of access to Madison County, it would be more reasonable to pull the Madison side of Big Sky into Gallatin County.

Thank you.

--

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 4:53 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Mary Wisman

From: Mary Wisman marywisman@qwestoffice.net

Residence: Belgrade

#### Message:

Please DO NOT MAKE BELGRADE a part of Bozeman. Belgrade is made up of far more separate and individual people with direction totally unlike those of Bozeman. Belgrade likes being a unique community. Please allow Belgrade their individuality.

--

From: Scott Wurster <wursters@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:27 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** Written testimony submitted for Dec. 10, 2022 hearing

Saturday, December 10, 2022

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee, and for the record,

I am Scott C. Wurster from Whitefish. Although I'm an active and committed Democrat, I appear today representing myself only.

First, thank you each for your hard effort, and for laboring together under agreed-upon criteria to create competitive House Districts spread around the map. Even if there wasn't ultimately total consensus on the entire map, it's heartening to see the consensus process work as well as it did, particularly for our area.

In these difficult and divisive times, we are fortunate among the States to have an objective, rational and fundamentally fair process enshrined in our State Constitution to protect election integrity. Other States are less fortunate in this regard.

I firmly believe the record you've created overwhelmingly supports the legal conclusion that your work product on State House Districts statewide is genuinely proportional. While Republicans remain the majority, balance on legislative committees under this map should be enhanced.

Under your agreed criteria, focusing on one area unavoidably affects proportionality considerations in relation to other geographic areas. The challenging task of balancing competing goals required the Committee to make some difficult choices.

Yet you reached consensus on the proposed new House Districts in the Flathead map. Well done.

I was reassured, but not surprised, to see that both final maps put forward last week adopted this general configuration proposed for Whitefish and Columbia Falls - one that I advocated in prior testimony before this Committee. Oversimplifying greatly, you divided old HD 005 in a way that improves GOP chances for winning there, and *vice versa* in old HD 003. Both parties gained a bit, lost a bit, and now face new challenges to winning in '24. Those of us locally on both sides of the aisle who've been paying close attention and chatting informally, all seemed to recognize that proposed new House Districts 098 and 097 are both - truly - more competitive.

That is fundamentally fair. It rectifies an imbalance. Under the previous map, in all of Flathead County, only one house district changed hands in ten years.

The wider consideration remaining before you now is how to pair House Districts into competitive Senate Districts. Referring again to the previous map, no Flathead County Senate District changed hands the entire decade. If this Commission pairs new HD 098 with 097, it would keep Whitefish and Columbia Falls together in a senate seat, and create one of the most highly competitive senate districts in Montana.

It looks like both final maps considered last week allow for this possibility.

I'm asking this Commission to respect its adopted criteria and goals and pair proposed HD 098 with 097 together into one new Senate District, keeping the northern Flathead Valley together as a community of

interest, and allowing for a highly competitive senate seat that will promote and foster robust, respectful and full debate, Regular Order, and the Rule of Law.

Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott C. Wurster Whitefish

Scott C. Wurster wursters@gmail.com

This e-mail is confidential and may be legally privileged. Its use or disclosure by anyone other than a designated addressee is unauthorized. If you are not an intended recipient, please delete this e-mail from the computer on which you received it and the cloud. Legal information is not legal advice. Per Circular 230, any U.S. federal tax information included is not intended, written, and cannot be used for avoiding IRC penalties, or promoting, marketing or recommending such to anyone else.

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Saturday, December 10, 2022 1:09 PM

**To:** Districting

**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Scott C. Wurster

From: Scott C. Wurster wursters@gmail.com Residence: Whitefish, Montana 59937

Message:

Saturday, December 10, 2022

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee, and for the record,

I am Scott C. Wurster from Whitefish. Although I'm an active and committed Democrat, I appear today representing myself only.

First, thank you each for your hard effort, and for laboring together under agreed-upon criteria to create competitive House Districts spread around the map. Even if there wasn't ultimately total consensus on the entire map, it's heartening to see the consensus process work as well as it did, particularly for our area.

In these difficult and divisive times, we are fortunate among the States to have an objective, rational and fundamentally fair process enshrined in our State Constitution to protect election integrity. Other States are less fortunate in this regard.

I firmly believe the record you've created overwhelmingly supports the legal conclusion that your work product on State House Districts statewide is genuinely proportional. While Republicans remain the majority, balance on legislative committees under this map should be enhanced.

Under your agreed criteria, focusing on one area unavoidably affects proportionality considerations in relation to other geographic areas. The challenging task of balancing competing goals required the Committee to make some difficult choices.

Yet you reached consensus on the proposed new House Districts in the Flathead map. Well done.

I was reassured, but not surprised, to see that both final maps put forward last week adopted this general configuration proposed for Whitefish and Columbia Falls – one that I advocated in prior testimony before this Committee.

Oversimplifying greatly, you divided old HD 005 in a way that improves GOP chances for winning there, and to a slightly lesser extent, vice versa in old HD 003. Both parties gained a bit, lost a bit, and now face new challenges to winning in '24. Those of us locally on both sides of the aisle who've been paying close attention and chatting informally, all seemed to recognize that proposed new House Districts 098 and 097 are both – truly – more competitive.

That is fundamentally fair. It rectifies an imbalance. Under the previous map, in all of Flathead County, only one house district changed hands in ten years.

The wider consideration remaining before you now is how to pair House Districts into competitive Senate Districts. Referring again to the previous map, no Flathead County Senate District changed hands the entire decade. If this Commission pairs new HD 098 with 097, it would keep Whitefish and Columbia Falls together in a senate seat, and create one of the most highly competitive senate districts in Montana.

It looks like both final maps considered last week allow for this possibility.

I'm asking this Commission to respect its adopted criteria and goals and pair proposed HD 098 with 097 together into one new Senate District, keeping the northern Flathead Valley together as a community of interest, and allowing for a highly competitive senate seat that will promote and foster robust, respectful and full debate, Regular Order, and the Rule of Law.

Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott C. Wurster Whitefish

--