

Public Comments: E-K

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission
Comments received between 11:59 p.m. on October 4, 2021,
and 5 p.m. on October 16

Distributed electronically October 16, 2021

From: [Robert Eddleman](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Congressional Districts
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 11:36:18 AM

Every one of the districts proposed by Democrats is ridiculous. Isn't it funny how they whine and complain about gerrymandering, yet every district they propose is exactly that. Follow the continental divide. Do it right.

Sent from my iPhone

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Trudy Eden
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 12:47:29 PM

From: Trudy Eden trudyeden142@gmail.com
Residence: Billings

Message:

My name is Trudy Eden. I have two doctorates, one in law and one in history and have spent much of my life engaged in one or the other. Montana is my home, as is the United States. It is essential that ALL citizens respect and ensure a FAIR AND COMPETITIVE political process.

All four of these goals matter most! Why set goals and then ignore them? That is the sure way to do an inadequate job, no matter what the task.

I support maps 6 and 9. Maps 6 and 9 are the two maps that BEST meet the four goals set by the Commission. The others fail to meet one or more. Please see

<https://wildmontana.org/2021/10/08/insights/redistricting-mt-congressional-maps-need-you/wildmontana.org>

for a chart with the details.

I'd like to thank the members of the Commission for the time and energy they are devoting to this very difficult task. It is one that assures that someone isn't going to be happy about the outcome. Such is the nature of democracy, which thrives when majority rule is not denigrated and minority positions are respected.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Cammie Edgar
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 4:19:50 PM

From: Cammie Edgar
Residence: Stevensville, MT

Message:
I support map CP-2.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Glenda Edgeworth
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 12:58:35 PM

From: Glenda Edgeworth
Residence: Stevensville, Montana

Message:

Map CP-1 is the best map that meets the criteria set into MT law by HB506 Section 1

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Mike And Gloria](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 1:30:50 PM

I have looked at all the maps and I firmly believe #8 is the most fair to all parties.

Gloria Edwards
Manhattan, Montana

Sent from my iPhone

From: nedwardswhittier@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Nicole Edwards](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Montana Congressional Maps that sincerely reflect Montana values
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 8:44:21 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Dear MT Districting and Apportionment Commission,

Thank you for all hard work and your comment to the great state of Montana! My name is Nicole Edwards and I was born, raised, and continue to live, work, and, play in the Gallatin Valley. I am writing to urge you to pick a congressional map that reflects the values of Montana. We need a map that is equitable in population and does not split counties or Indian reservations or makes things awkward for Montana's excersing their duties to participate in elections. Your decision will effect me, my children, and my extended family as well as my neighbors, co-workers, and friends. I believe that CP 6 is the best map I have seen. My number 2 map is CP 4, followed by CP 9,CP 2, and CP 8. None of the other maps seem to represent fair districting and Montanan sincerity and integrity. Please, please, please DON'T SPLIT GALLATIN county! Again, thank you for setting aside political gain in favor of the good of all Montanans. Best wishes on this very important task.

Sincerely, Nicole Edwards

P.S. the number 6 is my favorite number and the best map!

Sincerely,

Nicole Edwards

408 N 19th Ave Bozeman, MT 59718-3122

nedwardswhittier@gmail.com

From: [Hilary Eisen](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] redistricting maps
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 9:33:37 AM

hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment, again, on the proposed new Congressional district maps for Montana. I commented on the previous set of proposals and was very interested to review the final set of maps. As I stated in my previous comments, I believe it's very important for the 2 districts to be equal in population, competitive, and minimize any splitting of counties or communities. For these reasons, **I encourage the Commission to select map 9.**

Although in my previous comments I was skeptical of splitting Frenchtown from the rest of Missoula County, of the options presented I feel that this map most accurately divides the state without separating communities, establishes districts with clear district boundaries, and creates 2 equal districts. And, I think it is very important to not split the Flathead Reservation between two districts, so I appreciate that the entirety of that Reservation is included in the same district as all other Reservations in the state. I believe the counties included within each of the districts are more similar to each other than they are to the counties in the other district. As a resident of Gallatin County, I appreciate that Map 9 places Gallatin, Park, and Madison counties within the same district. There are many landscape-level land management projects ongoing in this corner of the state that stretch across these three counties and it is important to keep them within a single Congressional district. And, I agree that the two counties with major universities - Gallatin and Missoula - should be grouped together. Likewise, as somebody who grew up in Yellowstone County, with family residing throughout proposed District 2, I agree that these counties make sense to group together.

Thank you for your work to determine Montana's new Congressional districts, and to shape the future of our state.

Hilary Eisen
Bozeman, MT

From: karen.ekstrom
To: [Districting](#); maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov; jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov;
dan.stusek@mtleg.gov; kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: Districting maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:11:21 PM

Maylin Smith
Jeff Essmann
Joe Lamson
Dan Stusek
Kendra Miller

Dear Districting and Apportionment Commission Members,

I am writing to express my support for proposed districting maps 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9.

I believe that these maps best meet the criteria of not favoring one political party over another. They minimize dividing towns, counties, and federal reservations and keep communities of interest together. Finally, they are fair and competitive.

Maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 are unacceptable.

Thank you for your work on this project.

Karen Ekstrom

From: [karen.ekstrom](mailto:karen.ekstrom@mtleg.gov)
To: [Districting](#); maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov; jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; dan.stusek@mtleg.gov; kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Districting maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:11:53 PM

Maylin Smith
Jeff Essmann
Joe Lamson
Dan Stusek
Kendra Miller

Dear Districting and Apportionment Commission Members,

I am writing to express my support for proposed districting maps 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9.

I believe that these maps best meet the criteria of not favoring one political party over another. They minimize dividing towns, counties, and federal reservations and keep communities of interest together. Finally, they are fair and competitive.

Maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 are unacceptable.

Thank you for your work on this project.

Karen Ekstrom

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Eleanor
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:21:55 AM

From: Eleanor
Residence: Billings, MT

Message:

I believe CP 8 is the best proposal for the new congressional districts. Population is (almost) perfectly distributed between the two and does not stoop down to blatant gerrymandering like CP 3 or CP 4. CP 9 is not a bad choice either, but concentrating the Democratic powerhouses into one tiny district seems much less sensible than CP 8 where those gains are balanced out by smaller, more rural counties. Regardless of partisanship, I think CP 8 makes the most sense for Montana long-term with a fairly equal distribution of voters and counties and should be heavily considered for the final districting.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Brenda Elias](#)
To: [Joe Lamson](#)
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 1:56:36 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hello,

My name is Brenda Elias, and I live at 585 Clarke St., Helena. I have lived in the Helena area since 1995.

My biggest priority is ensuring competitive districts and not splitting communities, reservations, counties and towns.

I support maps 4, 6, 8, and 9 because they ensure competitive districts and do not split communities, reservations, counties and towns.

Thank you for your public service in serving on this important commission. I appreciate taking the time to read and consider my comments.

Regards,
Brenda Elias
585 Clarke St
Helena, MT 59601

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Sarah Elkins
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 2:15:48 PM

From: Sarah Elkins
Residence: Helena, Montana

Message:

Thank you for your work on this critical project!

CP-2 is the most appropriate map for redistricting, with equal populations, maintains county boundaries, is contiguous and has a district that is actually competitive – meaning either a Republican or Democrat has a decent chance of winning. All other maps fail to meet these criteria.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Tracy Ellig
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:42:12 PM

From: Tracy Ellig tracyellig@hotmail.com
Residence: Bozeman

Message:

I support CP 9. It is compact. Its voters share an affinity by geography and consequently also by economy and history. It creates a competitive district — good for debate and balance in our democracy.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: clinque@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Colleen Elliott](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]I favor Congressional Map Options 6 and 9
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 8:20:58 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Those options don't look gerrymandered, which might help with voter confidence. They also have districts with equal population, one that is primarily rural and one that is urban. Both districts will be competitive.

Thanks for the opportunity to speak.

Sincerely,
Colleen Elliott
1231 W Quartz St Butte, MT 59701-8935
clinque@icloud.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Amy Elliott
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 1:42:39 PM

From: Amy Elliott
Residence: Hamilton

Message:
I vote for CP1.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

Apportionment Commission

10/15/21

Being Republican I favor Proposal 7 because it is a clean line and most respects county lines. I also believe Proposals 1 and 3 good attempts to draw the lines fairly. It appears to me that Proposals 2, 4, 6, and 8 are attempt to distort the line in order to stack as much of the republican vote in the eastern district as possible.

In as much as Democrats dominate the commission I suspect you select a Democrat Proposal. Proposal 9, I believe is the only Democratic proposal that passes the smell test as far as cleanliness of line and not trying to predetermine the outcome. For my part, if you chose one of the other Democratic Proposals I would encourage our Attorney General to take the outcome to court on those grounds.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,

Alvin Ellis Jr.



ALVIN ELLIS *ALV*
18 ELLIS LN *2525*
RED LODGE, MT 59068-9647

From: [Julia Ellison](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Districts
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:56:42 AM

Please select a new congressional district that is population equal and competitive. Don't let politics get in the way of following the Montana constitution when it comes to redistricting. Please do your jobs in a fair and equitable way. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone

From: justiceender@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Justice Ender](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Avoid County Splits
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:11:48 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Map #CP2 seems to be the one that is least likely to create jurisdictional headaches.

Furthermore, any effort to split Missoula County's vote (such as #CP 9) would surely be seen, and rightfully so, as being done to give advantage to a specific political party.

Sincerely,
Justice Ender
4856 Monticello Pl Missoula, MT 59808-8677
justiceender@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Michael Enk
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:59:52 PM

From: Michael Enk trouter@q.com
Residence: Great Falls

Message:

My name is Michael Enk and I live in Great Falls. I have been a Montana resident since 1980.

It is very important to me that Montana's two districts be competitive so that the full breadth of Montana citizens' concerns and priorities for good government is given voice. The new map boundaries should not unduly favor one political party.

I support maps 6 and 9. It's clear that these maps best meet the goals of competitive districts with reasonably-balanced vote shares between the two major parties. The other maps fall short and do not accommodate fair representation for all Montanans.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: William Ensign
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:40:59 PM

From: William Ensign ensign@montanasky.net
Residence: Bigfork, MT

Message:

I have looked at the 9 redistricting maps and find CP-1 to be the best for all Montanans. CP-1 divides the state into logical East/West areas with a clear North South boundary line dividing only 2 counties.

This map provides equal populations of people of all political parties and work and interests.

Redistricting should not be a competition to get a political advantage (Gerrymandering) but should be just and fair and CP-1 is that.

I would like the people to have a voice rather than the partisan approach where lines have been drawn to manipulate the results to the advantage of one party or another.

It looks to me like most propositions advantage the Democratic Party which include areas that give both Representatives the major Democratic vote.

Please choose Prop 1 CP-1 for a fair boundary for each representative district. Prop 3 or Prop 7 might work but all the others will lead us to endless argument and litigation as they are unfair.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Leyla Eraybar
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 4:37:24 PM

From: Leyla Eraybar leyla.eraybar@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:

My name is Leyla Eraybar and I live in Missoula, Montana.

I believe it is important to minimize the splitting of counties, reservations and keeping competitive districts.

I support maps six and nine. These maps align with not splitting counties, reservations and keeping competitive districts.

Thank you for your consideration!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Carlotta Erickson
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:14:49 PM

From: Carlotta Erickson
Residence: Missoula

Message:

DO NOT gerryrig Montana. We stand for a fair vote election process in our state and in our country now and for the next ten years.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: SUSAN.ERICKSON85@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Susan Erickson](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Request for a Fair Congressional Map
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 3:56:00 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Dear Commission Members,

I hope you will choose a Congressional Map that is common sense, fair and competitive. I hope you will choose a Congressional Map that does not benefit one party over another. I prefer Map CP8 which splits the population of Montana equally. This map also includes Indian Reservations in both districts. The north/south configuration will require the representatives to listen to diverse voices from across our state.

Thank you for considering my request.

Sincerely,
Susan Erickson
Teacher
Polson, Montana

Sincerely,
Susan Erickson
313 Montana Lndg Polson, MT 59860-8954
SUSAN.ERICKSON85@GMAIL.COM

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Steven A Esberg
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:10:20 AM

From: Steven A Esberg
Residence: Helena, MT

Message:

Don't make MT look like idiots.

One of the three North/South divisions is the obvious choice.

I prefer the rocky mountain split!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Evan Escue](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Proposal
Date: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 3:13:40 PM

Hello,

Here at MSU in our geometry class for teachers, we just did a project that involved creating new districts for the state of Montana. I highly encourage you to review the link attached, which provides the district lines, all math involved including populations, party splits, and wasted votes. We maintained our lines along county lines to keep things simple. Thank you in advance for your time.

-Evan Escue, Kelly Koch, Mariel Warren, Kalani Medrona, Blake Lensing, and Quinn Corbin

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Gale Eversole
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:18:37 AM

From: Gale Eversole Galeeversole@gmail.com
Residence: Bigfork

Message:

I strongly urge you to vote in favor of redistricting maps CP -4 and CP-8 to assure competitive districts and diversity of two tribes. Please please secure our tribes right to vote and count for our first citizens. I am strongly urging you to do the best you can for ALL people in the upcoming redistricting voting. Please

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Mary Fahnestock-Thomas](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Montana for a Second Congressional Seat
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 8:40:05 PM

To the Committee as a whole:

I strongly favor Map #8. It is the fairest with regard to political parties, hence to Montana voters.

My second choice would be Map #2, which is also fair to voters and doesn't split up counties.

Thank you for your work!

Mary Fahnestock-Thomas, voter
Hamilton, MT

From: [t falk](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:56:22 AM

I'm now a 43 yr resident taxpaying citizen of Montana

After review of the redistricting maps, I absolutely oppose map suggestion numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9.

I prefer map 1 or secondarily map 5

Thank you for hearing my voice

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kevin Farron
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 1:19:18 PM

From: Kevin Farron farronke@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:

Hello – My name is Kevin Farron and I'm a father, a husband, a hunter and an independent voter living in Missoula.

As a politically active independent, I feel that representing Montanans accurately and fairly is incredibly important. An oddity nowadays, Montanans pride themselves on split ballot results. Often, we vote for the person not the party. Competitive districts breed compromise and move us away from the extremes on either end of the spectrum – it's what Montana needs. For all of these reasons, drawing these districts is of utmost importance.

With that in mind, I support Map 9. This not only keeps the districts as whole as possible based on counties, cities and reservations, but it also passes the eye test. In other words, it's not some funny looking amoeba smelling strongly of gerrymandering – and it's not a left/right dividing line that may look good to the eye but would not provide fair or competitive districts. It's the happy medium, the compromise – again, the Montana way of doing things. The resulting districts should not determine our elections; the stances and the candidates should, and by creating as competitive as districts as possible, we all win.

Thank you for the chance to comment on this extremely important issue; I appreciate your careful consideration.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Eric Feaver](#)
To: [Joe Lamson](#)
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:30:24 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Eric Feaver
Helena MT
47 years a resident

My biggest priority is ensuring competitive districts

I support maps 2 and 6.

Thank you.

Regards,
Eric Feaver
901 Flowerree St
Helena, MT 59601

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: KD Feedback
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:13:12 AM

From: KD Feedback
Residence: Lincoln, Montana

Message:

I am curious about the seemingly foregone conclusion that Montana must be divided east/west. Historically, eastern Montana is sparsely populated, conservative and mostly Republican and western Montana with its greater population is more liberal and Democratic. It would clearly make more sense from a population numbers standpoint as well as political diversity to divide the state into a northern and southern district instead of the conventional eastern and western.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Lauri Fehlberg
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:27:36 PM

From: Lauri Fehlberg lfehlberg@dahlingroup.com
Residence: Bozeman MT

Message:

Please support map CP -1 as it splits the least amount of counties. Thank you

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Julia Fehrs
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:12:53 PM

From: Julia Fehrs juliafehrrs@yahoo.com
Residence: Bigfork

Message:

Map 2

Helena, Missoula, Butte, & Bozeman = Democrat super District.

Doesn't resemble the Historical divide.

The canada interface equals all of one district. Do not like this one!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Julia Fehrs
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:25:50 PM

From: Julia Fehrs juliafehrrs@yahoo.com
Residence: Bigfork

Message:
Map 6
Almost like Map 2
don't like

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Julia Fehrs
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:29:02 PM

From: Julia Fehrs juliafehres@yahoo.com
Residence: Bigfork

Message:
map 7
Competitive for both sides.
Canada interfaces with both east & west.
2nd best

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Julia Fehrs
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 2:00:34 PM

From: Julia Fehrs juliafehrr@yahoo.com
Residence: Bigfork

Message:

Map 1

Both east & west districts are split evenly for fastest growing counties.

Most competitive map for both parties.

Historical divide that MT. had 80 years ago for the 2 districts

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Doug Ferrell
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:08:13 PM

From: Doug Ferrell ferrelldoug@gmail.com
Residence: Trout Creek

Message:

My name is Doug Ferrell. I am a retired homebuilder and 45 year resident of Trout Creek, Montana.

I have reviewed the 4 goals outlined for the redistricting process, and I support them all, especially including not favor a political party and keep districts competitive.

After careful review, it seems to me that maps 6 & 9 do the best job of meeting the goals and criteria for this process. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Crystal Fiedler
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 4:11:31 PM

From: Crystal Fiedler crystal@distinctivelighting.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

Creating districts that don't favor either political party will be the best outcome for things we care about. Competitive districts mean that our elected officials have to listen to Montanans, a majority of whom share our conservative values. We believe that the maps 7 and 1 accomplish this goal.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: William Fiedler
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:14:40 AM

From: William Fiedler bill@distinctivelighting.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

Creating districts that don't favor either political party will be the best outcome for things we care about. Competitive districts mean that our elected officials have to listen to Montanans, a majority of whom share our conservative values. We believe that the maps 7 and 1 accomplish this goal.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Linda Fifer](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Map 4
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 7:28:07 PM

I support Map 4 for redistricting Montana. I like that it is population equal and is not competitive.

Thank you
Linda Fifer
Ravalli County

From: trina.filan@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Trina Filan](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]An important decision to make carefully - MT's new congressional map configuration
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:45:33 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Dear Commission Members:

Your work is so important to Montana as it moves into the next decade. We have big decisions to make together in the face of major changes and opportunities. Having a strong, equitable, and representative voice in Congress is one avenue to securing our success as a state looking to the future while honoring those who have built our present.

I ask that you strongly consider Map #CP6 as your choice for our Congressional Districting. This configuration will allow both districts to be competitive, important in a state with a growing and increasingly diverse population. This map gives this state one urban and one rural representative, vital as our demographics change and the importance of rural-urban understanding and cooperation grows. It also allows Indian reservations to remain whole, so that the voices of each Tribe might remain united in the decision-making process.

I have no doubt you are under great pressure and want to make a decision that will benefit all of the state's people - no small task. I thank you for your consideration of my opinion.

Sincerely,
Trina Filan
1412 N Benton Ave Helena, MT 59601-2807
trina.filan@gmail.com

From: [Doris Fischer](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov;
Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 2:40:41 PM

Dear Redistricting Commission,
Thank you for serving Montanans in arriving at a fair and competitive division of the state for redistricting purposes.

I have studied the nine alternatives, and find #9 the best option and #4 the second best.

Map #9 is a cohesive block of western Montana counties where no county is divided. Western Montana counties are used to working together on various programs as a region, and this would be one more example.

It is unfortunate that none of our Native American reservations fit into Map #9. For that reason, I could support Map #4; it includes two reservations.

Maps #1, 3, 5, and 7 appear designed to deliberately omit Great Falls and Bozeman. I strongly oppose those four options.

Please keep political considerations to an absolute minimum. Honor your commitment to reaching a fair and competitive product.

Thank you.
Doris Fischer
Sheridan, Montana

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Andy Fisher
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 11:35:22 AM

From: Andy Fisher
Residence: Arlee, MT

Message:

Maps 1,3 and 7 are the most logical on a geographic and economic basis. All the other maps are obvious attempts at gerrymandering. The quest for a competitive district is a charade. The fact is that Montana is a republican state. Mr. Trump won the state by 100,000 votes and republicans carried every statewide office and expanded their majorities in both houses of the legislature. The only democrat holding a statewide office is Senator Tester , who squeaked out an 8000 vote victory in 2018. A quick look at the map of which counties he carried in 2018 should convince any objective observer of the futility of pursuing a "competitive" (i.e. democratic) district.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [denise fisher](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Montana
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2021 9:38:25 AM

To Whom it may concern,

After reviewing the maps put out by this committee, or what has been approved by the committee, I believe map 2, 8 or 9 to be most fair to achieve and equal balance of the states population.

I hope this committee can be non-biased and look at the overall ability for every persons vote to count and not become so partisan that citizens of this state lose faith in the most trusted freedom we have, the ability to vote.

We're fortunate to have gotten another representative for Montana, lets make sure these congressional representatives are willing to represent everyone in the state and not just a select few. It's exhausting to call our representatives now and not feel they care what we think.

Thank you

Denise Fisher

PO BOX 1024

Livingston, MT 59047

--

Denise

From: [Frank Fitzpatrick](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL]
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:28:33 PM

I support map 3

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Theresa Floyd
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 11:49:39 AM

From: Theresa Floyd Residence: MISSOULA, MT

Message:

I strongly urge Montana's Districting and Apportionment Commission to add a competitive district where every voter will have a chance to have their say. Gerrymandering is the bane of our democracy. It's time to do the right thing and establish a competitive district in Montana where the results of the election are not a foregone conclusion.

Please choose one of the following plans for Montana's new district: 2, 4, 6, 8, or 9.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: john flynn
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:36:35 AM

From: john flynn
Residence: Red Lodge

Message:

I want the new congressional district to be competitive. Do not allow the Republicans to gerrymander the new district.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Reese Forsythe
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 5:14:48 PM

From: Reese Forsythe
Residence: Helena

Message:
I support CP-2 for Congressional redistricting.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Mason Foster
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 1:31:24 PM

From: Mason Foster maso_foster@yahoo.com
Residence: Missoula, MT

Message:

Map 8 is the most fair and balanced of the proposed redistricting maps and is the one that should be adopted for Montana, followed by maps 2 and 6.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Karen Foust
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 7:51:22 AM

From: Karen Foust karinafoust@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, Montana 59715

Message:

Please choose the formation delineated on map C-1.
I believe it to be the most equitable arrangement for our state.

Karen Foust
Bozeman

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Steve K. Fox
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 1:46:34 PM

From: Steve K. Fox stevkfox@icloud.com
Residence: Livingston MT

Message:

I choose Map 8 as it best represents the culture and the people of Montana that I was born into, grew up with and have lived with for over 70 years.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Patty Franklin
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:13:20 AM

From: Patty Franklin Residence: Hamilton, MT

Message:

My thoughts on the redistricting maps offered:

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal.

It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one).

And it divides the lowest number of counties (2).

That is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506.

Any other map besides CP-1 is a violation of the law created by HB506 in the 2021 legislative session.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Richard Frazier
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 1:57:47 PM

From: Richard Frazier rfraziertx@gmail.com
Residence: WHITEFISH, Montana

Message:

Of the proposed new congressional maps my preferences are best supported by maps CP2 and/or CP8.

They meet the state's constitutional requirements and provide fair representation for our indigenous citizens.

Thank you

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Shelley Freese](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov;
Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: support for Map 8
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:27:39 PM

Dear redistricting commission members.

I support Map #8 for the redistricting of Montana. Map #8 provides the fairest R/D division and is supported by Montana's Native Tribes.

Thank you for the work you are doing on this project to make sure all Montanans are represented in the fairest manner possible.

Sincerely,

Shelley Freese
Miles City, MT

From: [Shelley Freese](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov;
Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] support for Map 8
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:28:18 PM

Dear redistricting commission members.

I support Map #8 for the redistricting of Montana. Map #8 provides the fairest R/D division and is supported by Montana's Native Tribes.

Thank you for the work you are doing on this project to make sure all Montanans are represented in the fairest manner possible.

Sincerely,

Shelley Freese
Miles City, MT

From: [FREY JAMES C OR JUDITH A](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mt.gov; Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov;
Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Map Choice
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 4:56:09 PM

Having looked at all nine redistricting maps for the new House District, I would recommend that the committee chose Map #8. This is the most equitable choice.

James C. Frey, Ennis, MT

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Elizabeth Fullerton
Date: Saturday, October 9, 2021 1:46:04 PM

From: Elizabeth Fullerton Residence: Missoula, Montana

Message:

I have looked at all of the maps, and I prefer the maps where a new district will be competitive. Proposal 6 is best for this purpose. With only one congressional representative for so many years, roughly half of Montana's views have been ignored. Montana has a plurality of voters and we need that fact to be on display. Please choose competitiveness for the sake of our democracy.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: jfurshong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Joe Furshong](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Map #2 is Best!
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:21:32 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

.I've been following this for a long time and am aware of the inherent conflicts involved, from the deeply partisan to the impossibility of getting everything you want in one map.

After very careful thought I choose Map #2

- The bulk of SW Montana is contained in one compact district. This area, overwhelmingly urban, collects counties that have shared goals, issues, values.

- It is critical that the new district be as competitive as possible. I think this map will increase those chances the most.

- I want to see the seven reservations in one district and wish it could be in a western district, but the gerrymandering to do so would be absurd. Even though the likelihood of a native voice being truly heard in a large Eastern district, at least there is the benefit of all of the tribal issues being brought collectively to local elected officials.

Sincerely,

Joe Furshong

938 Highland St Helena, MT 59601-5118

jfurshong@mac.com

From: lfurshong@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Luke Furshong](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:54:37 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Map one seems the most logical and fair of all the maps. With the joy of two congressional seats in Montana comes the opportunity to have two fair districts to balance and and make sure all voices in Montana are heard.

Sincerely,
Luke Furshong
1113 Woodbridge Dr Helena, MT 59601-5479
lfurshong@mac.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Gil Gale
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:34:38 PM

From: Gil Gale galemt@cybernet1.com
Residence: Corvallis

Message:

I am Gil Gale. I live in Ravalli County and have been a Montana resident for over 34 years. I moved to Montana for work and outdoor recreation on its public lands.

- 1) The redistricting decision must choose an alternative that does not favor a single political party. Gerrymandering weakens our democracy by reducing the fair and accurate representation of the policy and legislative preferences of the people in Congress.
- 2) Native people's voices in Montana must be given a fair representation by keeping the Reservation units intact and unified within a single Congressional District.

I urge the Commission to select either Map #6 (most preferred) or Map #9. I believe Map 6 creates the most fair and least gerrymandered choice that gives the people of Montana the least politically biased and best balanced representation opportunities. I believe Map 6 creates the most fair and least gerrymandered choice that gives the people of Montana the least politically biased and best balanced representation opportunities.

Thank you for considering my recommendations. I urge the Commission to maintain an unbiased view when choosing the redistricting plan. It is unfortunate that this effort does not create two competitive districts instead of just one.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [ForceNineMT](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: [Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov](#); [Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov](#); [Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov](#); [Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov](#); [Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Congressional district maps
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:13:23 AM

"TO: Montana Districting Commission ("districting@mt.gov")

SUBJECT: Proposed Congressional District Maps

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I am a citizen of the state of Montana and I am submitting this email as my written testimony to express my opinion regarding the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I respectfully request it be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 (<https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf>) is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 (https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf) passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

There is an attempt by members of the Commission to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and favor the Democrats and disadvantage Republicans. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanan's who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I most strongly urge you to adopt the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Michael Gale

42452 Canal rd, Ronan, MT. 59864

mhgale@gmail.com

4066752113

From: [Mojito](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Map #6
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 8:31:31 AM

Hello,

I've lived in Montana my entire life and I support map 6. We need to keep competition and the principles of democracy intact.

Thank you.

Morena Garcia

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Frank Garner
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 12:59:23 PM

From: Frank Garner fgarner001@yahoo.com
Residence: Kalispell Montana

Message:

Proposals that put Ekalaka and Eureka in the same district make no sense. East west districts separated by geographical boundaries like the continental divide best represent historic regional and cultural boundaries in this state.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Layna George
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:20:58 PM

From: Layna George laynag@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula, MT

Message:
CP4 and CP8 are the most competitive and fair maps.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Peter Gesuale
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:21:53 AM

From: Peter Gesuale Residence: Billings, MY

Message:

Maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 are clear gerrymandering. Create competitive districts by considering the other maps and eliminating 1, 3, 5 and 7

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Glen Gilfeather](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Congressional District Mat
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 5:47:40 PM

I prefer the CP-2 map as it goes with county lines and will do the best job of representing the interests of all Montanan's. Thanks, Glen

Sent from [Mail \[go.microsoft.com\]](mailto:go.microsoft.com) for Windows

From: [Ann Gilkey](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Maps
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:23:40 PM

Thanks for taking input on the maps. We are paying attention.

I believe Map 2 is best. Map 2 is population equal, adheres to county lines, is compact and contiguous, and keeps communities of interest together. Next best are 6 and 8 for similar reasons. All three are competitive, which helps with accountability.

The worst options are: maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 - as they favor one party. Maps 3 and 5 are not population equal. Maps 1 and 7 slice up communities with similar interests/needs.

I appreciate your work and wish you good luck with this very important decision.

Ann Gilkey
Helena

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Jane Gillette
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:27:43 AM

From: Jane Gillette jane@drjanegillette.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

These comments are in support of Map 1. However, Map 5 is a close 2nd for the same reasons. 1) Intuitive: Many of the others maps are simply confusing. I understand that individuals who are passionate about this topic probably understand the other maps, but only Map 1 (and 5) is intuitively understandable to common folks. 2) Practical: Some maps (i.e. Map 6) would make it terrible for candidates/legislators to really connect with constituents. If we're sincere about giving people a voice, and committed to ensuring that elected officials do the very best job they're capable of, then we shouldn't select any map which significantly impedes the possibility of achieving those objectives. The distance from one corner of the state is too great and would inhibit people from connecting on a personal level with their legislator. 3) International collaboration and policy: Many issues of significance are related to our interactions with Canada (water, energy, commerce). Montana will be stronger if we have TWO individuals in congress advocating for these important issues. Any map which provides for only one person in congress being heavily invested in our relations with Canada, should be rejected.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Evora Glenn
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 4:13:14 PM

From: Evora Glenn evoradglenn@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:

I'm Evora Glenn and I live in Missoula, MT. I work to expand our use of renewable energy in Montana because I care deeply about the long-term prosperity of our state, which depends on a thriving economy and on safeguarding the natural resources we depend on.

Keeping communities of interest intact, competitive districts, and not unduly favoring a political party are the most important goals to me. Montana is a large state, with a diversity of communities sharing this landscape. Keeping communities of interest intact can help ensure that their interests get reflected in their government. Having competitive districts and not unduly favoring a political party can ensure that a breadth of Montana viewpoints can be reflected in our government and supports more cooperative governing.

I support the choice of map 9 and map 6. Both maps 9 and 6 create competitive districts, and minimally divide counties while ensuring that indigenous nations are intact.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my perspective.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Faith DeWaay
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 8:23:30 PM

From: Faith DeWaay fdewaay@centurylink.net
Residence: Butte, MT

Message:
I like maps 1 and 3.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Carl Glimm
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:33:40 AM

From: Carl Glimm carl@glimmhomes.com
Residence: Kila, MT

Message:

I believe that map 7 is the best followed second by map 1. These two maps keep the population equal and recognize the obvious difference between the east and west side of our state. I grew up on the east side and now live on the west side, while we are all Montanan's, there are differences that follow this natural geographic boundary. This is why in the past, it was an east / west split and why it should be again.

Conversely, these maps that reach into the west side to purposefully gerrymander the west district, into being "competitive" are nothing short of ridiculous. How do you rationalize a small portion of Flathead county being carved out to be with the east? Or all of NW Montana lumped in with the east side of the state? Only one reason "competitive".

Competitive? Where is that in the Constitution? Each district shall consist of compact and contiguous territory and as equal in population as practical. This competitive word is just another way to say gerrymandering. How do you reconcile the "compact" requirement (an actual requirement in the Constitution) with these gerrymandered maps?

Don't let your political ideology drive your decision here, do the right thing.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Ben Goertzen](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MT Voting Districts
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 2:41:51 PM

Hello,

I am submitting my comment regarding the proposed Montana Congressional maps.

Map #CP 1: this map is not a balanced map and should not be used to determine Montana's Congressional districts. It would create non-competitive districts.

Map #CP 3: this map is not a balanced map and should not be used to determine Montana's Congressional districts. It would create non-competitive districts and would not represent equal populations.

Map #CP 5: this map is not a balanced map and should not be used to determine Montana's Congressional districts. It would create non-competitive districts and would not represent equal populations.

Map #CP 7: this map is not a balanced map and should not be used to determine Montana's Congressional districts. It would create non-competitive districts.

Ben Goertzen
Born and Raised in MT

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Stephen Goheen
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 1:44:53 PM

From: Stephen Goheen ssgoheen@gmail.com
Residence: Corvallis, MT

Message:

After reviewing the 9 Commission Proposals, I am writing in favor of CP 8. I like the competitive nature of this split and that it keeps the reservations intact.

Thank you for considering my comment.

Stephen Goheen

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Rhonda Good
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:18:29 AM

From: Rhonda Good good_r_i@hotmail.com
Residence: Helena Montana

Message:

I like map 7. In my option it divided the fastest growing communities evenly between East and West. I dislike maps 2,4,6,8,9 because they appear to bring the fastest growing areas into one district and would disenfranchise many Montana voters.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Carrie Goodrich
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 3:26:07 PM

From: Carrie Goodrich carriegoodrich@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, Montana

Message:
We need Commission Proposal CP1.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Douglas Grant
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 12:53:41 PM

From: Douglas Grant
Residence: Butte Montana

Message:

CP2 is the proposed redistricting map I prefer the most in that it is the only one of the proposed maps that does not split any counties.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Jim Gray](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] For CP #2
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:47:49 AM

To the Redistricting Commission:

I write as a registered voter in Missoula County in favor of the proposed map for Congressional redistricting that you have designated as CP #2.

As this map will include a relatively equal number of voters in both proposed districts and that it follows existing county boundaries, I believe this to be as fair and as representational as is possible.

I have observed, with great consternation, the gerrymandering of districts in other states so that candidates can pick their voters, rather than voters picking their candidates. I believe the Commission in Montana is on the right track and I urge you to adopt CP #2 as the 2nd Congressional District.

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
James L. Gray
2719 Pinnacle Place
Missoula, MT 59808

--
Sent from Gmail Mobile

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: David Green
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 12:38:19 PM

From: David Green GREEN_DAVID53@YAHOO.COM
Residence: Park City

Message:

CP-1 is the correct way to separate the two districts. It evenly divides the state between larger cities, cities with colleges and it was the way it was before we lost a congressional seat. It does not give any one political party an unfair advantage.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Gloria Gregg
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 8:38:03 AM

From: Gloria Gregg mommagregg7@gmail.com
Residence: White Sulphur Springs, Mt

Message:

Proposal 1and7 are the most fair and equitable proposed maps. Thank You

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: eleanor joan guerrero
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:19:13 PM

From: eleanor joan guerrero artbyeleanor@aol.com
Residence: Red Lodge

Message:

I do NOT want redistricting that does NOT accord with the natural population makeup of the traditional area in a regular map formation. It should not be artificially distorted to include only Republican districts in the majority of districts. As an attorney, I see how gerrymandering destroys a district's integrity and warps any claims of election integrity. Allow the natural population trends to rule.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Margie Guevin
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 8:41:32 AM

From: Margie Guevin
Residence: Helena

Message:

After careful review of data provided, I suggest we go with map 2, 7 or 9. These maps show balanced populations without splitting counties or limited splitting of counties. Thank you

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kari Gunderson
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 6:57:59 PM

From: Kari Gunderson cnd2543@blackfoot.net
Residence: Bigfork

Message:

I live in the Swan Valley, just over the Missoula county line into Lake County. My county seat is Polson and my legislators are from Swan 2 precinct, SD 8 and HD 15.

I am happy with the way the lines are drawn and appreciate being represented by Blackfeet tribal members.

Not unduly favor a political party like what the Republican party at both the national and state level are trying to do to retain unbalanced power and control ignoring low income people, people of color, and LGBTQ Montanans.

While none of the maps are perfect I support maps 6 and 9. These two options, 6 and 9, tend to not unduly favor a political party; minimize splitting counties, towns, and reservations; keep communities of interest intact; and are competitive districts.

Thank you for your consideration of my comments.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Patricia Gunderson
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 1:48:13 PM

From: Patricia Gunderson Residence: Bozeman

Message:

Please do not split Gallatin County in the new vote redistricting plan. Thank you very much.

I moved to Gallatin County in 1971 when my husband finished his tour with the US Army and attended MSU. We lived in Belgrade for 40 years I now live in Elk Grove alone. My husband died in 2018. This is home.

There are 56 counties in Montana, I think none of them should be split. Gallatin County is one county keep it that way.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: claire.goots@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Claire Gutschenritter](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]MT-Congressional Map
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 6:21:37 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

.To whom this concerns,

In consideration of the 9 congressional maps that are being examined, it seems to me that maps #4 and #6 should be prioritized over others. This is my conclusion because they are both competitive, divide MT's population equally, keep Indian reservations whole, and minimally split counties. Each map also delineates certain voices. For example, in map #4 areas with high tourism can unite their voices, and in map #6 urban and rural voices can also be united. The urban vs. rural experience is very different, as are the needs and perspectives of these two demographics. Both of their views on issues relating to MT should be heard loud and clear. Similarly, those areas with high tourism may see things differently than those areas without. Both perspectives should be voiced when decisions are being made for MT. Keeping the Indian reservations intact also allows perspectives from those locations to be heard with more clarity. It is important for as many perspectives as possible to be voiced before decisions are made on behalf of a group of people. It is my hope that congressional maps reflect a diversity of worldviews, and not favor one party over another. Making choices for a group, that comes down to a "my team is better than yours" mentality is not only unhealthy for the group (as it does not include listening) but will result in the demise of our precious democracy. It is for the good of all that everyone is able to be heard, with clarity, their choices based on their truths.

Sincerely,
Claire Gutschenritter
10 Velva Dr Kalispell, MT 59901-6326
claire.goots@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kathie Haacke
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 8:21:27 AM

From: Kathie Haacke
Residence: Billings, MT

Message:

I would choose proposal #1. It looks simple to follow and looks like it will divide the population closely with the West being more populated compared to the East.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: kathleen hadley
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 4:35:49 PM

From: kathleen hadley kathyh1016@gmail.com
Residence: Deer Lodge

Message:

Dear Commissioners,

My name is Kathy Hadley and I live in a rural area south of Deer Lodge, MT. I've been a resident of Montana for 42 years.

I agree with and appreciate all four of your goals for drawing a new map. The one I believe is most important is creating at least one competitive district followed by keeping communities intact.

I support map 9 as the one that best meets all of your goals. It is compact, keeps the reservations and most communities intact. My second choice is map 6 for the same reasons. Both maps 9 and 6 do not unduly favor a political party and minimize the splitting of counties and towns.

Thank you for doing this work on behalf of all Montanans.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Dr. William Nickolas Hagen
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:49:03 AM

From: Dr. William Nickolas Hagen wnhagen@outlook.com
Residence: Bigfork,MT

Message:

There needs to be a straight east- west division of the state. You can not split Flathead county or put it in the east part. Most of the maps proposed are the definition of Gerrymandering and not constitutional.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Dr. William Nickolas Hagen
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 8:01:09 PM

From: Dr. William Nickolas Hagen
Residence: Bigfork,MT

Message:

The maps that propose a southern or Missoula and Bozeman district are the definition of Gerrymandering. These are totally political and probable an unconstitutional. You need to be a unbiased group or at least pretend to be. I will be happy joint the lawsuit if this Gerrymandering is allowed as it is unconstitutional.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Ed Halland](#)
To: [Ed Halland](#)
Cc: [Districting](#); maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov; jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov; joe.lamson@mtleg.gov; dan.stusek@mtleg.gov; kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Redistricting
Date: Saturday, October 9, 2021 5:16:11 PM
Attachments: [cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf](#)
[cp5-congressional-october-19.pdf](#)

In addition, Please disregard Map 2. It is also based on political data and does not follow historical precedent.

-----Original Message-----

From: "Ed Halland" <edhalland@reagan.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 9, 2021 6:10pm
To: "Ed Halland" <edhalland@reagan.com>
Cc: districting@mt.gov, maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov, jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov, joe.lamson@mtleg.gov, dan.stusek@mtleg.gov, kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: Redistricting

Dear Redistricting Committee Members,

Please take into account the attached maps for the Two Montana Congressional Districts. The maps take the following into account as best as possible.

The maps are based upon population, not political data, and comply with Montana statutes and constitutional requirements. They create East and West districts which follow historical precedent. The districts are compact and contiguous. They minimize splits of cities and counties.

Of the Nine maps submitted,

CP1 is the Most favorable. Only Gallatin and Cascade Counties are split and the line is well west of the Municipalities of Bozeman and Great Falls, keeping the metropolitan areas intact.

CP5 is the Second Choice. Keeping all counties intact, with the exception of Hill County and a small portion of Chouteau County which are split. The Havre metropolitan area is intact.

Please disregard Maps #4,#6,#8 and #9.

These maps are based on political data and do not follow historical precedent.

Yours,

Edwin Halland

103 East Bridger Road, Bridger Mt. 59014

406-606-2159

edhalland@reagan.com

Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Ed Halland](#)
To: [Ed Halland](#)
Cc: [Districting](#); maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov; jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov; joe.lamson@mtleg.gov; dan.stusek@mtleg.gov; kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting
Date: Saturday, October 9, 2021 5:10:56 PM
Attachments: [cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf](#)
[cp5-congressional-october-19.pdf](#)

Dear Redistricting Committee Members,

Please take into account the attached maps for the Two Montana Congressional Districts.
The maps take the following into account as best as possible.

The maps are based upon population, not political data, and comply with Montana statutes and constitutional requirements. They create East and West districts which follow historical precedent. The districts are compact and contiguous. They minimize splits of cities and counties.

Of the Nine maps submitted,

CP1 is the Most favorable. Only Gallatin and Cascade Counties are split and the line is well west of the Municipalities of Bozeman and Great Falls, keeping the metropolitan areas intact.

CP5 is the Second Choice. Keeping all counties intact, with the exception of Hill County and a small portion of Chouteau County which are split. The Havre metropolitan area is intact.

Please disregard Maps #4,#6,#8 and #9.

These maps are based on political data and do not follow historical precedent.

Yours,

Edwin Halland

103 East Bridger Road, Bridger Mt. 59014

406-606-2159

edhalland@reagan.com

Thank you for your consideration.

From: [Joe Lamson](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 4:47:29 PM

From: "Audrey Hall" <Audrey.Hall.426408556@p2a.co>
To: "Joe Lamson" <joe.lamson@mtleg.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 15, 2021 4:45:37 PM
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hello my name is Audrey Hall. I've been in the area since I was a little girl first living in Cook city with my parents and then Bozeman and finally outside of Livingston. Fairness is important in our state, and I hope that the committee does not gerrymander for the benefit of one party.

My biggest priority is not unduly favoring a political party

I support maps 4, 6, 8 and nine.

Thank you so much for your time and consideration. We all appreciate the work that you were doing

Regards,
Audrey Hall
28 Cutthroat Ln
Livingston, MT 59047

Legislators are publicly elected officials. Legislator emails sent or received involving legislative business may be subject to the Right to Know provisions of the Montana Constitution and may be considered a "public record" pursuant to Montana law. As such, email, sent or received, its sender and receiver, and the email contents, may be subject to public disclosure, except as otherwise provided by Montana law.

From: [Sandie Hammer](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov
Subject: Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 7:31:22 AM

TO: Montana Districting Commission ("districting@mt.gov")

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I am a citizen of the state submitting this email as my written testimony to express my opinion regarding the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I respectfully request it be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

There is an attempt by members of the Commission to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and favor the Democrats and disadvantage Republicans. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I most strongly urge you to adopt the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Sandra J. Hammer

678 Hawk Drive Polson, MT 59860

sandie@sandiehammer.com

406-581-3033

From: [Sandie Hammer](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov
Subject: Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 7:31:22 AM

TO: Montana Districting Commission ("districting@mt.gov")

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I am a citizen of the state submitting this email as my written testimony to express my opinion regarding the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I respectfully request it be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

There is an attempt by members of the Commission to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and favor the Democrats and disadvantage Republicans. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I most strongly urge you to adopt the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Sandra J. Hammer

678 Hawk Drive Polson, MT 59860

sandie@sandiehammer.com

406-581-3033

From: [Sandie Hammer](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: [Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov](#); [Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov](#); [Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov](#); [Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov](#); [Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 7:31:46 AM

TO: Montana Districting Commission ("districting@mt.gov")

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I am a citizen of the state submitting this email as my written testimony to express my opinion regarding the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I respectfully request it be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

There is an attempt by members of the Commission to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and favor the Democrats and disadvantage Republicans. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I most strongly urge you to adopt the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Sandra J. Hammer

678 Hawk Drive Polson, MT 59860

sandie@sandiehammer.com

406-581-3033

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Carl Hamming
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 7:54:07 AM

From: Carl Hamming carlhamming@gmail.com
Residence: Anaconda, MT

Message:

I support Map #8. I find the proposed districting to be fair regarding population, population centers, demographics, and geographic representation. I appreciate that #8 has districts that span great distances on either side of the continental divide. I don't believe a simple western/eastern split of Montana would capture the spirit of Montana's communities and counties. I urge adoption of #8 because it does include variety and fair representation.
Thank you

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Elizabeth Hansen
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:43:31 PM

From: Elizabeth Hansen b_hansen5@hotmail.com
Residence: Billings, Montana

Message:

CP 1 is my choice. I find this map equal and non competitive. Everyone gets a vote.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Stacey Hargesheimer
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 3:28:46 PM

From: Stacey Hargesheimer stacey.hargesheimer@gmail.com
Residence: MISSOULA

Message:

Redistricting should not be gerrymandering. Please choose a map that reflects the fact that we have been purple for so long- before the last election cycle of known bullies and out of state politicians showed up and bamboozled half the state into thinking we were all red. According to a real news organization, NBC News(<https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/2020-elections/montana-results> [\[nbcnews.com\]](#)) Montana was 57% Republican and 41% Democrat voting in the Presidential election, a purple state, and our Senate and Governor's races were even closer. Knowing the facts, I am sure our congressional districts will reflect that.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [\[mtredistricting.gov\]](#))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Harold G Harper
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 5:12:58 PM

From: Harold G Harper hjharper@mt.net
Residence: Helena, Montana

Message:

Most critical is that the districts are competitive, so that a minority bloc, though a primary election, cannot dictate the general election results, and voters have reason to become and stay involved until the general. Candidates should have to actively campaign throughout both election cycles and be able to ignore no voter.

Areas of common interest should be grouped, political boundaries respected when possible, remembering that Tribal Nation boundaries were drawn before current county lines and should be respected when possible.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Melynda Harrison](#)
To: [Joe Lamson](#)
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 5:44:45 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hi!

I am Melynda Harrison from Livingston. I've lived in Livingston for 16 years and Montana for 20 years. I am raising my two teenagers here.

My biggest priority is minimizing splitting counties, towns, and reservations;

I support maps 4, 6, 8, and 9 because they meet the goals of the Commission.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Regards,
Melynda Harrison
105 N 2nd St
Livingston, MT 59047

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Cheryl Hart
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:02:08 PM

From: Cheryl Hart cherylhart@bresnan.net
Residence: Helena

Message:

I have lived in Helena for the last 20 years. Before that I lived near Salmon Idaho for another 20 years. I have rafted, skied and hiked as my primary recreation. I worked at the Salmon Public Library my last 10 working years. I appreciate Montana because there is dialogue between the Republican and Democratic parties. Idaho does not have that.

I appreciate that you say you do not intend to unduly favor a political party. As a nation, we need to keep dialogue to get away from the win at all costs mentality and polarity we now face.

I support maps 6 and 9. I support these two maps as best meeting your objectives of not favoring a political party, minimize county, towns and reservations splitting, keeping communities of interest intact, and competitive districts.

I am hopeful that you will do your best to achieve your stated goals. Thank you for considering my comments for a best possible representation for Montana.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Nancy Harte](#)
To: [Joe Lamson](#)
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:41:29 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

My name is Nancy Harte. I'm a Montana native, and have lived in Missoula since 1993.

My biggest priority is not unduly favoring a political party. We need an even playing field.

I support and prefer map 6. Also acceptable are maps 4, 8 and 9.

Thank you for your work on this vital project. Montana is smart for having a balanced commission to make these decisions.

Regards,
Nancy Harte
2904 Stratford Ln
Missoula, MT 59808

From: [Kathy Hassan](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] OUR CHOICE for REDISTRICTING MAP
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 10:12:15 AM

Honorable Redistricting Commission:

We are adamant that **Congressional Proposal #1** is the only choice for the five of you as decision-makers have to fulfill such an extremely critical task. This map fully meets the legislative intent of HB506 that was passed by our legislature and signed into law by Governor Gianforte. **Congressional Proposal #1** is the most compact with the north/south and the east/west dimensions being the most equal. In addition, only 2 counties are divided; Cascade and Gallatin. If, however, CP #1 does not acquire sufficient support, our next best recommendation to the Commission would be CP#7. We trust you will make a wise decision. Thank you for your effort.

Arthur C. and Kathleen S. Hassan, 86 Whitepine Creek Road, Trout Creek, MT 59874

From: clch4@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Carleen Hathaway](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Thank you for Choosing Fair and Competitive Districts
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 4:59:30 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Good afternoon,

My name is Carleen Hathaway. I am a Para Educator in Missoula County Public Schools and am writing today to request that you carefully examine the proposed maps, using the agreed upon goals when choosing Congressional districts. After looking at the proposed districts drawn, I personally would be comfortable with either Map CP2 (especially because I don't believe counties should be split!) or Map CP6 (which maintains Indian Reservations whole, and because a state this size simply MUST include an urban and rural seat for more equitable representation.)

I thank you for your time, effort and energy in looking at this information and taking into careful consideration all the voices in MT, not simply drawing lines that benefit one party over the other.

Sincerely,
Carleen L. Hathaway
clch4@aol.com
1965 Hummingbird Dr
Missoula MT 59808-1035

Sincerely,
Carleen Hathaway
1965 Hummingbird Dr Missoula, MT 59808-1035
clch4@aol.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Sam Hatziathanasiou
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 6:07:22 PM

From: Sam Hatziathanasiou sthatz@me.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:
Sam Hatziathanasiou, Westside, Missoula resident

Keeping communities of interest intact

I support map #6. This map keeps communities of interest intact and promotes a fair and balanced distribution.

Thank you for your time and efforts.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Thomas
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 11:47:12 AM

From: Thomas
Residence: Billings, Montana

Message:
Map proposal #1 makes the most sense. Cultural differences between eastern and western Montana needs to be kept intact.

Thank You,
Tom Hauptman

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: jeffphavens@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Jeffrey Havens](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Map CP 8
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 6:03:35 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Greetings Congressional Districting and Apportionment Commission members:

I trust you and yours are well.

I urge members to chose Map CP 8 in this selection process for the following reasons:

- 1) at least one Indian reservation are within each district;
- 2) each representative in both districts will be subject to diverse political opinions;
- 3) each district is politically competitive for both major political parties; and
- 4) the human population in each district is equal.

Many thanks for your public service, time, efforts and consideration. Best of luck to you and yours moving forward and progressing into the future.

Regards,
Jeffrey P. Havens

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Havens
706 1st St Helena, MT 59601-5360
jeffphavens@hotmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Everett Hawks
Date: Saturday, October 9, 2021 9:09:48 AM

From: Everett Hawks
Residence: Florence, MT

Message:

I would vote for CP1 if I had the choice. Looks to be the best option.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Gregory Hayes
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:17:53 PM

From: Gregory Hayes
Residence: Helena, MT

Message:

From the proposed maps, I can see that CP-2 is the only map that has equal populations, maintains county boundaries, is contiguous and has a district that is actually competitive. All other proposed maps fail to meet these criteria, and would therefore be a blow against democracy in the state of Montana. There are at least 45% of residents in MT that vote democratic, please do not gerrymander the districts so that there are simply 2 solid republican districts, this would be anti-democratic and wrong. Do the right thing for the future of this state.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: maryellenhelmer@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Mary Ellen Helmer](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:43:35 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

.I think #6 is best for conservation purposes.

Sincerely,
Mary Ellen Helmer
4808 Monticello Pl Missoula, MT 59808-8677
maryellenhelmer@gmail.com

From: [Suzanne Hendrich](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Finalist maps
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 9:31:59 AM

I urge the commission to move forward with population-equal and competitive congressional district maps: maps 2, 4, 6, 8, 9 do this. I think map 2 is preferable because it does not split up any counties, which might be a bit less confusing for voters. Competitiveness is vital for democracy, let people compare ideas between candidates and parties and make fair choices. I also think that having all Native Nations in one district might increase their representational clout, which seems fair to me. I think their voices should be heard and respected in this decision.

Thank you for putting partisanship aside, please!

Suzanne Hendrich
2114 Inverness Place
Missoula, MT 59801

From: [T Hendrix](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Please choose CP1
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 1:11:17 PM

Please choose CP1. It appears to be the most fair, balanced and simple.

Thank you,
T Hendrix

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Hannah Hernandez
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:04:53 PM

From: Hannah Hernandez precambrianmt@hotmail.com
Residence: Troy

Message:

Born and raised in MT. A life long wilderness enthusiast and advocate. Vested in creating a green rejuvenating community where all Montanans thrive not just the rich.

All of those principles matter. Montana communities operate at a variety of levels ensuring the integrity of each community is equally represented is the cornerstone of Democracy.

I support maps 6 and 9 because they create a competitive one competitive district, maintain the continuity of the Flathead Indian Reservation, and maintain the most communities and counties. Maps 6 and 9 create one competitive district, maintain the integrity of the Flathead Indian Reservation, and maintain the most counties and communities. Maintaining the integrity of the Flathead Indian Reservation is crucial to keeping that community intact.

Thank you for considering my comments.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Mike Hetherington
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:11:46 AM

From: Mike Hetherington mwhetherington@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:
Please record my vote for either #7 or #13

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kathryn Hetherington
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:10:56 AM

From: Kathryn Hetherington kathrynhetherington@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

I have reviewed all the posted plans and I would like to vote for #7 and #13

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: David Highness
Date: Friday, October 8, 2021 10:16:54 AM

From: David Highness
Residence: Helena

Message:

I am registering my support for Map CP2. CP2 is the map that checks all the boxes; contiguity, equal population, doesn't break up counties and it gives both parties a relatively fair shot at least one representative in congress. It's always going to be a compromise on someones part and this is the best compromise.

Thanks

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Dave Hill](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Map #8 is best
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:25:57 PM

Map #8 is my preference. First and foremost it creates a competitive district, district population numbers are nearly equal, districts are contiguous and compact, communities of interest remain mostly together, and county lines are followed.

Maps 1, 3, 5 and 7 are not of equal populations or divided so as to not be competitive.

Dave Hill
103 W Montana St.
Livingston, MT 59047

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Reine Hilton
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 6:00:27 PM

From: Reine Hilton
Residence: HAMILTON

Message:

I would pick either 1,3 or 7 because the regions are more compact without big handles. I also feel the western counties are more similar with the mountains as are the eastern counties with the farm land.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Colleen Hinds
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:38:17 PM

From: Colleen Hinds colleenhinds@hotmail.com
Residence: Heron

Message:

My name is Colleen Hinds, I moved to Mt in 1973. My children were born here in a log cabin. I recently retired from 40 years of a nursing career.

Not favoring political favors & keeping common interest communities together, like reservations.

I support map 6 or map 9 These choices best favor the criteria the commission has set up

Thank-you for this opportunity to comment on a process that should represent all concerned citizens to FAIR representation

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: samhines629@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Sam Hines](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 11:44:32 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hello,

I want to thank you for the important work you are doing that will affect Montanans for years to come. As you make your decision, I hope that you keep the criteria that you agreed upon at the forefront of your minds. Both the mandatory criteria as well as the goal criteria.

With that being said, I think that maps 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 best accomplish your criteria. Those maps are population equal. They do a better job of not splitting counties or reservations. And they also do not unduly favor a political party and are competitive.

As our country is becoming increasingly polarized, I hope Montana can do its part to lower the temperature by electing candidates that listen to both sides of the political spectrum and act based on what they think is right, not what their party is compelling them to do. Dan Salomon, my representative, is a great example of what can be achieved when politicians are elected that serve a diverse population. If we elect politicians that only have to cater to primary voters, only have to appease their own political party, then we are heading down a path of increasing intolerance.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sam Hines

Sincerely,
Sam Hines
434 N 1st St W Missoula, MT 59802-2926
samhines629@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Greg Hinkle
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 8:03:50 AM

From: Greg Hinkle gghink44@blackfoot.net
Residence: Thompson Falls

Message:

Please support Map CP-1. Follow the law in HB506 Section 1. Thank yo.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Katherine Hoffmann
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 4:08:19 PM

From: Katherine Hoffmann hoffmandennis364@gmail.com
Residence: Belgrade, MT

Message:

I prefer Map CP1 because of its overall fairness to all citizens and voters in Montana.

Thank you to the Commission and staff for your work during this important stage in Montana's history.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Patricia A Hogan
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:51:13 PM

From: Patricia A Hogan reckless50@gmail.com

Residence: MISSOULA

Message:

Good day, Commissioners – I think Districting Maps 2, 6, and 8 are good proposals; they seem to be fairly competitive.

Thank you for your service.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: latimerhoke@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Latimer Hoke](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]No need to split towns.
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 8:56:17 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I read your goals for the redistricting process. Some of the proposed maps meet your stated goals better than other maps.

I'd say that splitting actual towns makes no sense. Splitting counties only makes sense if it's to keep a Reservation within a single district.

In a state as big as Montana, certainly the farthest reaches of any given district are going to be quite far apart.

Maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 all split towns for no reason, so I'd exclude those.

Map 2 is pretty solid; it does not split any counties and is population-balanced.

Map 9 is also solid; it only splits Missoula County to keep the Flathead Reservation intact. It keeps things the most compact, too.

Map 4 is okay but it does awkwardly carve out Flathead County. Living in Eureka, I feel more connected to the Flathead than to Libby, so it seems Flathead and Lincoln Counties should be together.

Map 8 is...weird? But it seems to equalize that BOTH districts are quite far spread out.

Overall, if I had to pick one, I'd probably go with Map 9. Keeping the sovereign nation of a reservation intact is more important than county boundaries.

Thank you for your work on this thankless task, where no matter what you do, a large chunk of people will cry foul. On the flip side, a large chunk of people will also give you kudos. Again, thank you.

Sincerely,
Latimer Hoke
PO Box 540 Eureka, MT 59917-0540
latimerhoke@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kelly Holmes
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 11:16:03 AM

From: Kelly Holmes
Residence: Billings, MT

Message:
My recommendation if for Proposal #1

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Tim Holmes
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 7:17:03 PM

From: Tim Holmes musegaze@yahoo.com
Residence: Helena

Message:

I've struggled over the proposed maps and come down favoring #9. It has the most geographically compact western district. It also seems to offer the most competitive districting option, which is one of the values highlighted for the task.

Thank you.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Barbara Holmes-Smith
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 4:03:24 PM

From: Barbara Holmes-Smith 56mamallama@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula MT

Message:

The redistricting map needs to be as balanced and fair as possible. A lot is riding on our second Senate seat! I understand the Native American communities have requested that at least two reservations be included in each district. That is a fair request. I also believe urban areas should not be split up, and that one of the districts should be as evenly drawn as possible, so as to balance the voting tendencies.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: violetolivia@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Violet Hopkins](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 12:44:58 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hello, I write today ask that you choose a congressional redistricting map that does not split up Indian reservations, has equal populations, doesn't split counties or cities arbitrarily, and allows for an urban and rural seats. Ideally, my family prefers maps 2,4,6,8 and 9 as they meet these criteria. Thank you for your thoughtful work.

Sincerely,
Violet Hopkins
548 Colorado Ave Missoula, MT 59802-5501
violetolivia@gmail.com

From: [Melissa Hornbein](mailto:Melissa.Hornbein@mtleg.gov)
To: maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov; jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; dan.stusek@mtleg.gov; kendra.miller@mtleg.gov
Subject: Public comment on congressional maps proposed by the Districting & Apportionment Commission
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:11:58 PM

Dear Commissioners Essman, Lamson, Miller, Smith, and Stusek,

Thank you for your vitally important work as members of the Districting & Apportionment Commission. I write to submit the following comment on the Commission's proposed maps:

Maps 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 generally comply with the Commission's constitutionally and statutorily mandated criteria in that they are population equal, comply with the Voting Rights Act, and are (to a greater or lesser degree) compact and contiguous.

Among these compliant maps, Map 2 most closely adheres to the Commission's discretionary criteria as well in that it adheres to county lines, is competitive, and keeps communities of interest together. Maps 2, 6, and 8 are the most competitive in that they give the people of Montana the greatest assurance that their vote will contribute to the election of officials who will best represent their district's interests. To a lesser extent, maps 4 and 9 also accomplish that goal. Maps 4 and 8 each include at least two tribal nations and thus may best balance tribal representation across both districts.

By contrast, maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 do not comply with the mandatory and discretionary criteria the Commission have adopted.

All of these maps favor one party unduly, and fail to create competitive districts. Maps 3 and 5 do not meet the most basic mandatory criteria in that they are not population equal. Maps 1 and 7 slice through populous counties and divide communities with common interests. For example, Missoula and Bozeman contain the State's flagship universities and have similar interests. Maps 1 and 7 divide Gallatin county and effectively separate communities with similar needs.

To summarize, **the Commission should reject Maps 1, 3 5, and 7** as non-compliant with both the Commission's mandatory and discretionary criteria. **The Commission should retain and further consider Maps 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9, with particular attention to maps 2, 6, and 8,** which appear to best embody the Commission's mandatory and discretionary criteria.

Thank you again for your hard work and consideration.

Best regards,

Melissa Hornbein
Helena, Montana

--

hornbein@gmail.com
406-471-3173

From: [Melissa Hornbein](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: Public comment on congressional maps proposed by the Districting & Apportionment Commission
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 5:29:51 PM

Please see below for entrained public comment emailed directly to individual commissioners.

Thank you,

Melissa Hornbein

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Melissa Hornbein** <hornbein@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 15, 2021 at 5:12 PM
Subject: Public comment on congressional maps proposed by the Districting & Apportionment Commission
To: <maylinn.smith@mtleg.gov>, <jeff.essmann@mtleg.gov>, <Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov>, <dan.stusek@mtleg.gov>, <kendra.miller@mtleg.gov>

Dear Commissioners Essman, Lamson, Miller, Smith, and Stusek,

Thank you for your vitally important work as members of the Districting & Apportionment Commission. I write to submit the following comment on the Commission's proposed maps:

Maps 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 generally comply with the Commission's constitutionally and statutorily mandated criteria in that they are population equal, comply with the Voting Rights Act, and are (to a greater or lesser degree) compact and contiguous.

Among these compliant maps, Map 2 most closely adheres to the Commission's discretionary criteria as well in that it adheres to county lines, is competitive, and keeps communities of interest together. Maps 2, 6, and 8 are the most competitive in that they give the people of Montana the greatest assurance that their vote will contribute to the election of officials who will best represent their district's interests. To a lesser extent, maps 4 and 9 also accomplish that goal. Maps 4 and 8 each include at least two tribal nations and thus may best balance tribal representation across both districts.

By contrast, maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 do not comply with the mandatory and discretionary criteria the Commission have adopted.

All of these maps favor one party unduly, and fail to create competitive districts. Maps 3 and 5 do not meet the most basic mandatory criteria in that they are not population equal. Maps 1 and 7 slice through populous counties and divide communities with common interests. For example, Missoula and Bozeman contain the State's flagship universities and have similar interests. Maps 1 and 7 divide Gallatin county and effectively separate communities with similar needs.

To summarize, **the Commission should reject Maps 1, 3 5, and 7** as non-compliant with both the Commission's mandatory and discretionary criteria. **The Commission should retain and further consider Maps 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9, with particular attention to maps 2, 6, and 8,**

which appear to best embody the Commission's mandatory and discretionary criteria.

Thank you again for your hard work and consideration.

Best regards,

Melissa Hornbein
Helena, Montana

--

hornbein@gmail.com

406-471-3173

--

hornbein@gmail.com

406-471-3173

From: laurahowemt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Laura Howe](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Oppose map #1
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 9:26:10 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I request you reject map number one. It unnecessarily splits two counties in half and even small towns! That is ridiculous. I believe the guidelines call for keeping counties intact and population areas intact, which that map does not do.

Thank you
Laura Howe
Stevensville

Sincerely,
Laura Howe
390 El Capitan Loop Stevensville, MT 59870-6004
laurahowemt@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Elisabeth Hudnutt
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 12:50:55 PM

From: Elisabeth Hudnutt ehudnutt@gmail.com
Residence: Choteau, MT

Message:

I am writing in support of plans #2, #6 and #8.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Lance Icenoggle
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 10:23:20 AM

From: Lance Icenoggle macguy36@yahoo.com
Residence: Billings, MT

Message:

To Whom It May Concern,

My concern with the re-districting issue is the socialists in Missoula, Helena and Butte will have too much say. We are now a red state and it needs to stay that way if the way of life we value is to continue. Otherwise, you can see what the criminals in our nation's capitol are doing. They want our entire country to be like Venezuela.

Sincerely,

Lance Icenoggle

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Tyler Ingraham
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:43:05 AM

From: Tyler Ingraham
Residence: Missoula, Mt

Message:

I vote for map seven. Using the divide as the boundary is the most logical way to divide the state. Regardless of previous election results. Montana is either East or West of the Rockies. That is the way it should be divided.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Tyler Ingraham](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Map seven
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 9:45:27 AM

Montana should be devided by the Rockies. Map seven does that. Thank you. Tyler Ingraham.
Missoula Mt.

From: [LaVonne Iverson](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] My choice
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 11:25:00 AM

This is the division I'm most in favor of

Sent from my iPad

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Jessica Jacobson
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 10:07:20 PM

From: Jessica Jacobson mtbootz@gmail.com
Residence: Kalispell, Montana

Message:

Greetings,

Weighing in on the Congressional maps, I prefer Congressional District Commission Proposal 2 – CP2 because it is the only map to meet the following three criteria: this map is: population equal, competitive, and following county lines.

Thank you.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Jim jacobson
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 7:55:42 AM

From: Jim jacobson
Residence: Missoula mt

Message:
No gerrymandering

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: tervo.kj@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Kristin Jacobson](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Montana Districting and Apportionment
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 9:55:37 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I am paying close attention to the Election Commissions work because as a Montanan, I demand fair, competitive districts. Our great 1972 Constitutional Convention did work of fairness and equity that could not be equaled today, and because of their work have led the nation in creating fair and equitable governing districts. I do not want maps that benefit one party over another, and want districts that will safeguard Montana's future. I prefer the maps produced by the commission that meet the Commissions goals: those are Maps 2, 4, 6, 8 and 9. These maps create equity, are competitive and population equal, minimally split counties, and keep communities of interest intact. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Kristin Jacobson
Helena, MT

Sincerely,
Kristin Jacobson
712 Gilbert St Helena, MT 59601-2611
tervo.kj@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kathy Webster James
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 4:23:22 PM

From: Kathy Webster James
Residence: Billings MT

Message:
I would like to see Proposal # 6.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Chuck Jarecki](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov
Subject: Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:36:34 AM

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I have been a citizen of the state of Montana since 1962, and I am submitting this email as testimony to express my opinion in regards to the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I ask that this email be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

It seems that some members of the Commission appear to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and appear to be made to favor one political party over another. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I urge you to select the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Charles M. Jarecki
218 Pheasant Ridge
Polson, MT 59860
Email: skywagon49@outlook.com
406-883-2248

From: [Chuck Jarecki](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov
Subject: Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:36:34 AM

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I have been a citizen of the state of Montana since 1962, and I am submitting this email as testimony to express my opinion in regards to the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I ask that this email be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

It seems that some members of the Commission appear to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and appear to be made to favor one political party over another. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I urge you to select the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Charles M. Jarecki
218 Pheasant Ridge
Polson, MT 59860
Email:skywagon49@outlook.com
406-883-2248

From: [Chuck Jarecki](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Cc: Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Proposed Congressional District Maps
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:37:02 AM

Dear Members of the Districting Commission:

I have been a citizen of the state of Montana since 1962, and I am submitting this email as testimony to express my opinion in regards to the upcoming decision to be made by the Commission concerning the proposed Congressional Districts. I ask that this email be made a part of the official record of the Commission and be considered during your deliberations. I have reviewed the various maps and believe that Map CP-1 <https://leg.mt.gov/content/Districting/2020/Maps/Congressional/Commission-Proposals/cp1-congressional-october-19.pdf> is the most appropriate choice for Montana in that it follows the law established in House Bill 506 https://leg.mt.gov/bills/2021/HB0599/HB0506_X.pdf passed during the most recent session of our Legislature.

Map CP-1 has the best configuration for compactness where the width and length of both districts are most equal. It has the minimal difference in populations between the two districts (plus or minus one). It divides the fewest number of counties (2).

CP-1 is the only map that best follows the intent of HB 506, which is the express will of the citizens of Montana. I believe that our Congressional districts must be formulated in accordance with HB 506.

It seems that some members of the Commission appear to ignore the law and gerrymander the boundaries of the two Congressional districts. Map CP-1 best meets the criteria set out in law by HB506 Section 1, as noted above. Of the nine (9) maps submitted/created, five clearly violate HB 506 and appear to be made to favor one political party over another. This is blatant partisan gerrymandering and completely unacceptable. These maps are offensive to all Montanans who believe in fair play and the rule of law.

In light of the foregoing, I urge you to select the boundaries for our proposed Congressional Districts as outlined in Map CP-1 and in accordance with the existing laws of Montana. Thank you for your time and attention to my concerns.

Charles M. Jarecki
218 Pheasant Ridge
Polson, MT 59860
Email:skywagon49@outlook.com
406-883-2248

From: [Marian Jensen](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Redistricting Proposals
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 8:07:32 PM

Dear Commissioners,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the redistricting proposals. We have reviewed all of them and given serious thought to the implications of each. Having lived in Butte for more than twenty years, we are hopeful that we will live in a new Congressional district that will faithfully reflect the cultural, political, and commercial character of southwest Montana.

To that end we support three of the proposals.

- Proposed map # 2 – This district best represents the interests of Butte and southwest Montana by including Butte with the other university towns of Missoula and Bozeman. The transportation corridor of I-90 and I-15 is a vital part of southwest Montana’s commercial interests, and this district includes a healthy part of it all the way to Park County. No counties are split, maintaining the integrity of both Missoula and Gallatin counties. This configuration also provides a highly competitive mix of both political parties.
- Proposed map # 6 – This district also represents the cultural and commercial interests of Butte as we see them. The educational communities of the three college towns are all included, as well as the I-90/I-15 corridor transportation corridor. Neither Gallatin nor Missoula County are split. The advantage of this map is that it includes a considerable portion of the Flathead-Salish Kootenai Reservation. We believe this inclusion helps reflect the state’s cultural diversity and gives our elected Representative and other voters incentives to understand and support tribal political interests, one way to give more than lip service to honoring the power of diversity. This configuration is also a highly competitive mix of both political parties.
- Proposed map # 9 – This district adequately represents the cultural and commercial interests of Butte, like the previous two. It still includes the educational communities and the transportation corridor. However, it is less competitive with respect to the political breakdown. Although it splits Missoula County and lacks the diversity component, we support map # 9 because at least it reflects the geographic contiguity of southwest Montana.

Thank you for the hard work the Commission has done to accomplish a difficult task, doing the people's work.

Marian and Roger Jensen

3113 S. Dakota St.

Butte, MT 59701

406 498-4755

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Carrie R Johnson
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 8:41:17 AM

From: Carrie R Johnson carrie@johnson-wilson.com
Residence: Manhattan

Message:

My vote for the redistricting map is MAP 1 although I think it is unfortunate that Gallatin County and Cascade county are split. I think it is unnecessary as I don't think the population variant will be all that significant in years to come to warrant it being split. MAP 1 splits the four fastest growing counties evenly between the districts and it allows for two reservations to be included in the western district. MAP 1 is the most competitive map for both parties given the choices available.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Dan Johnson](#)
To: Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov; Jeff.Essmann@mtleg.gov; Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov; Dan.Stusek@mtleg.gov; Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov; [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Congressional Maps
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 11:17:37 AM

Redistricting Commission,

CP 1 is a wonderful common sense, and fair map. I am very proud of the commission's work in developing this map. It is by far the best map and I am glad that it is illustrated as map 1. It accomplishes all of the legal requirements and most importantly it doesn't look like it is two odd shaped Gerrymandered districts. From everyone that I have spoken with this was their number one concern. If this map comes out as the selected district there is no way either political party can complain about what the commission has developed. It only divides 2 counties and is a generally straight line north to south that divides east and west and keeps the population equal. This is some very solid work on behalf of the commission and I commend you all on your efforts. Thank you for your service and thank you for keeping politics out of building congressional districts.

CP-2 is an awful map that is heavily gerrymandered looks weird and only includes Native American representation in one district. Some would call it racist. Montanans would not be happy with this map if it was adopted.

CP-3 this map isn't too bad but it has that weird foot in Gallatin County which increases the population spread. That can only mean that it was meant to favor a certain party.

CP-4 Absolutely ridiculous. I don't even know what else to say about that. There is nothing to like about this map. The democrats definitely worked hard on this map.

CP-5 Larger deviations in population. It looks Gerrymandered because of Hill County. Overall I don't think it would upset many people but I don't believe it is the best option. The Republicans worked hard on this map.

CP-6 Selfishly this is my favorite map. It is heavily gerrymandered and it puts my county (Jefferson) in Eastern Montana somehow. But overall Montanans would be furious if this map was adopted. This would be the least competitive map but would also most closely represent political parties.

CP-7 This map is a good map. It meets all the criteria. I don't think that if this map was accepted it would upset Montanans as a whole. I still favor CP-1 to this map. This one just isn't as clean. I can't tell which one is preferred by the Republicans but my guess would be either this map or CP-5.

CP-8 If I was a political hack from California that had never been to Montana this is the map I would draw. This map is the worst by far and doesn't at all represent Montana cultural differences. Billings is Eastern Montana and if you split Yellowstone County you only have one purpose and that is politics. If you think Rosebud County and Missoula County live the same way culturally than you have never been to Montana.

CP-9 Probably the second most gerrymandered map and once again purposefully no Native American representation. I would absolutely consider this map racist. It does keep districts clean and meets population deviation requirements. Although I would make the same argument; do the people in Lincoln County live like the people in Richland County do? If competitive districts was a goal which I don't necessarily agree with, the eastern seat will never be won by a Democrat again. It would be a double digit win every election.

Thank you for taking the time to read my input and I tried to make my input as politically neutral as possible and put average Montana folks views above my own. I have talked with countless people about this and I feel pretty confident with the representation of my input. It changed my opinion after speaking with folks from around the State. I have been to 26 counties in the last few months

and 3 different reservations. Most people want an even district with a clear line from north to south separating Montana east from west. Like I said my vote would be for CP-6 but that would not be the best map for Montana.

Dan Johnson

406-570-2101

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: David Johnson
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 11:12:36 AM

From: David Johnson drdavidbjohnson@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

I would like to express my support of Commission Proposal map CP-1, as it follows precedent with an east/west division and divides the least amount of counties.

Thank you,
David Johnson

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: EA Andy Johnson
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 9:05:40 AM

From: EA Andy Johnson eandyj007@gmail.com
Residence: Butte

Message:
EA Andy Johnson
3470 Quincy St.
Butte, MT 59701
eandyj007@gmail.com

Dear Commissioners:

Please accept my following comments on the proposed Congressional Districts for Montana. Map 1 is a fairly even east-west split of our state. Importantly, it gives each congressman an equal portion of our upper education system to monitor and assist as necessary. It's unfortunate that Cascade County needs to be split. Gallatin County certainly does not. Include it all in the east district. The populations are going to change yearly anyway. A most important factor in my mind is that people easily know who their congressman is or will be and maintaining county boundaries keeps it simple.

My vote goes to Map 1.

Map 2 is an obvious attempt to pervert the process towards one party. It looks like a sprawling amoeba.

Map 3 is another fairly even east-split of our state. It is a better split of Cascade County so that more of the Great Falls area is included. Also, as stated for Map 1, include ALL of Gallatin County. The population splits need not be exact.

Map 4 has a BIG embayment into the western district. Another obvious attempt at gerrymandering?

Map 5 I cannot support this map because it seems another ludicrous attempt at gerrymandering. This time the embayment goes well into the eastern district.

Map 6 is another silly attempt at gerrymandering. Is an amoeba trying to ingest part of the eastern district?

Map 7 appears lop-sided and unnatural. I question whether the populations are as equal as stated. Also, exactly which district contains Bozeman and the College is not immediately obvious. Is the campus split?

Map 8 is silly from the outset. Is someone trying to make Montana look stupid? The Commission needs to think about that. How we divide our state will reflect on how seriously we take our political responsibilities and will be available for all the world to see.

Map 9 is a tight little ball of democrat strongholds. It's obvious. No thought of an east-west division is apparent. It would take a team of surveyors a year to figure out where the boundaries of the goofy division of Missoula County is. And someone determined this map HAD to be included?

In summation, there seems to be a lack of serious thought given in maps 2,4,5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. They seem to be almost mocking the intent of our Legislature to equally divide our state into two reasonable Congressional districts.

EA Andy Johnson
October 15, 2020

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Laura Johnson
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 9:30:26 AM

From: Laura Johnson bzn.mt35@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:

I'd like to express my support of Commission Proposal CP1 for redistricting issues.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Phil Johnston](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Montana Districting
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 12:39:52 PM

Good afternoon,

After reading through the various proposals, I believe proposal # 8 as it gives both districts rural and urban representation, and gives good voting opportunities for both parties.

Phil Johnston

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Brice Jones](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Congressional district/s
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 8:11:37 AM

Dear Commission,

Please reconsider district plans for congressional districts to ensure fairness in elections and equality for all voters in Montana. Maps should not be drawn to benefit rural voters over urban voters, or gerrymandered to make it easier for one party to win based on map lines.

I believe plans 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 as having one competitive district, while Republican proposals 1, 3, 5, and 7 would create two solidly Republican districts leaving it hard for any democratic candidate to win.

If your idea is fairness in elections, then show it in your actions and the congressional district maps. If you're more concerned about making sure Republicans win all representative races, well, you are not supportive of democracy.

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter,
Brice Jones

From: [Tom Jones](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] CONGRESINAL DISTRICTING MAPS
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 3:25:43 PM

This is in response to the map information posted on the front page of the 10/13/21 issue of the Billings Gazette. The only information given on each map is the percentage of votes that Trump and Bidden received in the split. I couldn't care less. I want to know what percent of Montanans live on each side of the line. No town should be split and if at all possible, no county should be split.

Proposals #1, #3 and #5 look good but that is not knowing the % of voters on each side of the line. #7 is close. There is no rhyme or reason for #4 or #8. Proposals #2, #6, & # 9 are the Demarcates trying to concentrate their voting power, not the serving the Citizens of Montana.

Again, what is the percentage of voters on each side of the line? Not Republican or Demarcate but MONTANANS. The split should be within one percent.

Thomas C. Jones

1035 Princeton Avenue

Billings, MT 59102-1837

HM: (406) 256-9181

CELL (406) 670-4364

From: [Beth Judy](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] I would like to weigh in on the redistricting maps, please!
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 6:23:29 PM

Greetings,

I'm grateful for the opportunity to weigh in on the 9 maps being considered for this important state redistricting.

To me, maps 2, 6, and 8 are the best. And to me, maps 1, 3, 5, and 7 are the worst.

Map 2 is population equal, adheres to county lines, is compact and contiguous, and keeps communities of interest together.

Maps 2, 4, 6, and 9 are compact and contiguous with equal populations. 8 is population equal too.

Maps 2, 6, 8, and to a lesser extent 4 and 9 are competitive. Montanans will have true power in elections. Candidates will have to really campaign.

Thanks for listening! And for working on this and making the best choice for all Montanans.

--

[Beth Judy](#)
Author, [Bold Women in Montana History](#)
[bethjudy.com](#) [[bethjudy.com](#)]

Keep on truckin'!

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Thomas Kallenbach
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 10:52:19 AM

From: Thomas Kallenbach tjkallenbach@gmail.com

Residence: Bozeman, Montana

Message:

After reviewing the choices and considering the reasoning behind the proposed maps, I am writing to express my support for Map Number 1.

Thomas J. Kallenbach, P.E.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Clare](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Redistricting Maps
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 6:06:28 PM

CP 2 is the only map that meets all 3 very important criteria.

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Mary Ann Keenan
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 7:06:24 AM

From: Mary Ann Keenan
Residence: Billings MT

Message:

Montana should be divided so that Republican and Democratic areas are as equal as possible so that one party does not dominate the state.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Richard Kehler](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Comments on Congressional Districting
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:48:37 PM

Dear Sirs

Thank you for the opportunity to comment as a Montana citizen

I believe proposal #8 would make the most sense

Next best would be proposals #6 or 2.

Richard Kehler

Sent from my iPhone

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Irene Kelley
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 12:50:04 PM

From: Irene Kelley irene.kelley@live.com
Residence: Great Falls

Message:

Hello. My name is Irene Kelley. I live in Great Falls.

I think keeping communities, counties, and reservations intact as much as possible is a good goal.

Therefore I think maps 6 and 9 look the best. I saw a comparison table of the different proposals as critique by an independent source. Maps 6 and 9 had met criteria with the least disruption to people.

It will be interesting to see how this all turns out. I would have found it VERY helpful if I had historical data on how the counties had voted in past elections. And since I am not a demographer, I will listen to your reasons and judge for myself if they are sound. Thank you for your time.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Roy and Ardie Kelm
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 9:07:35 AM

From: Roy and Ardie Kelm psalm86.11@zoho.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:
Please adopt CP map #1.

Thank you!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](#))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Beth Kennedy
Date: Tuesday, October 12, 2021 4:18:06 PM

From: Beth Kennedy griznuts77@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula, Montana

Message:

I strongly encourage you to vote for a fair redistricting map that does not favor one political party over another. Gerrymandering is against all our democracy was meant to be.

Please support map numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, or 9 which will allow all sides to have a chance of being represented.

Thank you for the work you do!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Sable Kerzmann
Date: Monday, October 11, 2021 3:45:23 PM

From: Sable Kerzmann
Residence: Kirby, MT

Message:

NO to Proposal #4, ABSOLUTELY NOT to Proposal #8. I am a Northern Cheyenne Tribal member- this proposal only has the potential to harm our voice & vote.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Ita Killeen MD
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 9:41:55 PM

From: Ita Killeen MD ikilleen@bridgergeoplan.com
Residence: bozeman

Message:

I favor Maps #8 and #4 because they keep reservations together with their unique set of needs , thereby having a voice and more likely to be represented in decision making. The 2 districts seem like they will be competitive and they keep the rapidly growing urban centers with college populations of Missoula and Bozeman together with Helena, Butte and Great Falls– these urban communities have very different issues than the more rural parts of the state and deserve to have representation.

Thank you!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Ita Killeen
Date: Wednesday, October 6, 2021 12:24:52 PM

From: Ita Killeen
Residence: Bozeman

Message:

Gallatin County should not be split on the redistricting map. Gallatin County faces huge growth in the next 2 -3 decades resulting in issues that are different from the important issues facing rural Montana. Gallatin County deserves to have fair representation and splitting it would constitute unfair gerrymandering.

I have lived in Bozeman for 22 years and have already seen tremendous growth. My husband is a 3rd generation Montanan. We need to accommodate growth while preserving the quality of life that makes Montana a great place to live.

Thank you for your consideration.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Mary King
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 6:38:28 AM

From: Mary King
Residence: Huson, Montana

Message:
I support map proposal 3.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Robert King
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 6:37:30 AM

From: Robert King
Residence: Huson, Montana

Message:
I support map proposal 3.

Thank you for your good work!

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](#))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Shane Klakken
Date: Thursday, October 7, 2021 6:51:12 AM

From: Shane Klakken
Residence: Grass Range, MT

Message:

Don't let the progressive left cheat. Western Montana is already lost. Hopefully the rest of the state can survive. All I see on those maps is gerrymandering. The top middle map may be as accurate as it can get.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Gina Klempel
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 3:53:24 PM

From: Gina Klempel klemlog@aboutmontana.net
Residence: Kalispell

Message:

I have studied the maps that are being proposed and find 6 of them to be obviously gerrymandering and blatantly meant to destroy the integrity of this state by separating it into submission and division. I have found Map number 1 and somewhat 3 and 5 to be the most fair and workable. I could site many reasons for my conclusions but I know that you are busy and have heard these concerns before.

Map number 5 or 1 is pleasing to myself as an Independent and well-informed voter.

Thank you,
Gina Klempel

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Bill](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Montana Redistricting
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:34:16 PM

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission:

October 15, 2021

I'm writing to give you my opinion about the redistricting of our state to accommodate a second U.S House seat. I applaud you for setting out some common sense parameters – equal populations, compact and contiguous districts, minimizing the favoring of one political party or splitting counties or towns, and making them as competitive as possible. At first I didn't understand "communities of interest", but now realize that separating people with similar cultural interests dilutes their representation and hence their voice.

There are plenty of bad legislators from both parties, and having seats that are truly in play is vital to electing good legislators and maintaining and improving our representative form of government.

I'd first assumed that a division somewhere down the middle would be a simple and easy way to apportion things, but I quickly realized that would ignore many of the criteria you adopted or have as goals. I've learned what you probably understood from the beginning – it's complicated.

Map proposals 1, 3, 5, and 7 would not foster competitive races. I consider myself a true independent and I would like to see a legislator from any party, or an independent, have a chance to win a seat. I believe these proposals minimize such a chance.

Map proposals 2, 4, 6, 8, and 9 are much more evenly drawn and I think would allow any good candidate a good chance to become a representative.

I urge you to adopt proposal 2. Proposal 6 is my second choice and 8 is my third choice; I think proposals 4 or 9 would be adequate.

Thank you for the time and effort you've put in on this important redistricting decision. I imagine you've had people from both sides beating you up about it. I appreciate your efforts.

Respectfully,

Bill Klenn

408 Overbrook Drive

Bozeman, 59715

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Eric Knutson
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:01:26 AM

From: Eric Knutson ericknutson007@gmail.com
Residence: Dayton

Message:
I like map 1

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Crystal Kobayashi
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 8:04:25 AM

From: Crystal Kobayashi crystal.kobayashi@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:

Map #2 of the proposed maps given by the commission is the map I would like to see for Montana. I want a competitive district and having one would help with the partisan nature of politics we have been seeing in past years. Please choose Map #2. Thank you.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: forgetmenotmt@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Martha Kohl](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Map # 9
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 9:11:08 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I've looked carefully at all the available maps, and think that Map # 9 best suits our needs in Montana. This map is very compact and only splits one county (and does that in order to keep the Flathead Reservation in tact. It offers an equal population split between the two districts. I also like that one of the districts will be politically competitive, which should lead toward a representative who has to work hard to earn and keep the respect of his or her constituents.

Thank you for considering my perspective.

Sincerely,
Martha Kohl
307 Clancy St Helena, MT 59601-6302
forgetmenotmt@icloud.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kate kolwicz
Date: Saturday, October 9, 2021 1:34:35 PM

From: Kate kolwicz
Residence: Missoula, MT

Message:
CP-2 is the only sensible choice here.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: koppconsulting@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Justin Kopp](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:44:54 AM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Map #CP 2 best meets Commission goals.

Sincerely,
Justin Kopp
1013 N Cody Ave Hardin, MT 59034-1201
koppconsulting@live.com

From: kosorokartstudio@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Mike Kosorok](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Please Choose Montana's Congressional Map Carefully
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 1:05:14 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

.All Americans are suffering from a Trump Administration hangover. We have lost the value of truth and common decency. We are allowing a growing malignancy within our democracy. Make your decisions based on the United States Constitution and the commonwealth of all Montanans. Stay clear to gerrymandering.

Mike Kosorok

Sincerely,
Mike Kosorok
PO Box 492 Red Lodge, MT 59068-0492
kosorokartstudio@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Kimberly Kradolfer
Date: Sunday, October 10, 2021 12:38:01 PM

From: Kimberly Kradolfer
Residence: Helena, MT

Message:
I urge the commission to adopt Map C2.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov>
[\[mtredistricting.gov\]](https://mtredistricting.gov))

From: [Amy Krzyzek](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Support for maps 4 and 8
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 9:21:55 AM

Hello committee,

I would like to express my support for maps 4 & 8 for their competitiveness, population equality, and for giving voice to Native people in Montana by including at least 2 tribes in each proposed district.

Thank you for your time.

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Michael Kubas
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 1:11:19 PM

From: Michael Kubas mkubas@dadco.com
Residence: Great Falls, MT

Message:

I support this process and the four goals the commission adopted. I believe map 9 best supports the goals of the commission. I oppose map 1, 3, 5, and 7 as they likely result in two uncompetitive seats. I like idea of keeping communities of interest intact. Map 9 and to a lesser degree, Map 6 does this best in my view.

Respectively,

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: mike.kujawa.butte@everyactioncustom.com on behalf of [Michael Kujawa](#)
To: joe.lamson@mtleg.gov
Subject: [spam]Montana Congressional map
Date: Wednesday, October 13, 2021 1:30:22 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I urge you to select map#CP2. I feel Montana deserves two competitive districts without splitting any counties or city's. It represents Montana as both an urban and rural state.

Sincerely,
Michael Kujawa
521 Storm View Rd Butte, MT 59701-8252
mike.kujawa.butte@gmail.com

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Keith Kubista
Date: Friday, October 15, 2021 7:31:01 AM

From: Keith Kubista kredtailhawk@gmail.com
Residence: Stevensville MT

Message:

Please consider the following comments about the proposed maps being considered.

Map CP1 is the only map that fulfills the legislative intent of HB506 and all other criteria. I like this map because it has a difference of only 1 person between the two congressional districts, it divides only 2 counties, and it is the MOST COMPACT of the 9 proposed maps with the north/south and east/west dimensions.

It divides the most rapidly growing 4 counties evenly between the east and west districts, which would accommodate growth over the next decade. This is the fairest map for both parties.

It allows for two reservations to be included within the western district giving a strong voice for the tribes in the new western district.

I dislike the other maps below for the following reasons:

Map CP2 has a difference of 87 people between the two districts, and it is not compact. It is not compact because one district extends across the northern portion of Montana that creates only one congressional seat bordering the economic driver of Canada, and the other district is configured in a "C" shape in the SW corner of Montana. The districts are not as equal as possible in length and width configurations. For these reasons this option should be eliminated.

Map CP3 has a difference of 560 people between the two districts, and divides 2 counties. The difference of 560 people between the two districts eliminates this option.

Map CP4 divides 3 counties, and does not meet the compactness criteria. Map CP4 fails to meet the compactness criteria because one district has an extension very far to the west into the other district, creating a "backwards 7" configuration. This is clearly a gerrymandered map violating communities of interest, and configuration criteria,

When you look at the illegal criteria of competitiveness adopted by the Commission, the divide through the Flathead places all the strong republican precincts in the east, and the democrat ones in the west, linking them to the democrat strongholds of Helena with Butte and combines both major university towns into one district. This has the double effect of dividing the political power of the strongest Republican County in the state. This obvious gerrymandering continues when you evaluate all the locations, creating another Democrat super district in the west, and a double-digit political lead in the east for the Republicans.

Map CP6 splits 3 counties, and probably fails to meet the compactness criteria the most. This map has one district in a "C" shaped configuration in SW Montana with the other district extending the total northern length of Montana and actually curling around the western edge of the other district in SW Montana. It creates a Super Democrat District out of the west, and a super republican one, which by the way has all the other tribes in it, for the east. This one

would likely meet legal challenges by both the GOP and all Tribal governments.

Map CP8 splits 4 counties. This map also fails to meet the compactness criteria with one district in a "U" shape and the other district in an "M" shape superimposed on top of the "U" shape. This map ignores the compact and contiguous criteria, as well as totally splitting communities of interest in the west. This map is radically different from our historical division of 80 years, and although it is an attempt to put two tribes in the west, it is the CSKT and the Crow, which have never been in the same community of interest such as coal.

Map CP9 Fails to meet the compactness criteria because one district extends along the total northern width of Montana and the other district is a block in the SW corner of Montana so the length width criteria of the two districts is very imbalanced. It is an obvious violation of compact, contiguous and communities of interest, as well as once again allowing only one seat to represent the critical interface with Canada. The biggest stand out failure of this map is in violation of Federal Election Law, where it actually has no tribal nations in the new western seat.

Thank you,
Keith Kubista
Stevensville MT

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [MDAC](#)
To: [Districting](#)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Rod Kuntz
Date: Saturday, October 16, 2021 7:59:09 AM

From: Rod Kuntz kuntz@bresnan.net
Residence: KALISPELL

Message:

Redistricting should be done on a geographic based East/West divide. Any attempts to carve out territories beyond a linear deviation are clearly politically motivated—gerrymandering at its worst. Flathead county belongs on the West side; in fact, the Continental Divide pretty much does your job for you, no need to get so creative. Small adjustments to ensure population equity aside, Montana's interests can be most fairly represented by an east/west delineation.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (<https://mtredistricting.gov> [mtredistricting.gov])

From: [Kane Kuchynka](#)
To: [Joe Lamson](#)
Subject: [spam]Redistricting Maps
Date: Thursday, October 14, 2021 3:23:02 PM

Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

6 years

My biggest priority is minimizing splitting counties, towns, and reservations;

6

Thanks

Regards,
Kane Kuchynka
417 Arrow Trail
Bozeman, MT 59718