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For a state where both political parties are represented, please, urgently, support Map 11. Montanans are supposed to be fair and independent. Map 11 is the only map that honors those qualities.

Thank you for your work,

Mary Fahnestock-Thomas
Hamilton, MT
From: Leonard Falk klaflw@gmail.com
Residence: Kalispell, MT

Message:
The only logical district line should follow the continental divide

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
The only map that creates fair and competitive districts is CP Map 11. Please adopt this map.

John Feckanin
Livingston, MT
As an Independent voter I support Map Proposal 11. Quit the bickering and do what is right for Montana.

Bruce
Commissioners,

We are very concerned about Map 11 that is being presented for a couple of reasons.
1. The grouping of the different categories of ethnic group is very unbalanced
   between Map 10 & Map 11. Map 10 all group are nearly equal and Map 11 there
   is a difference of nearly 40,000 in the Native American category.

2. Flathead County is divided and combined with the eastern part of the state.
   It is our opinion that you should not split a county. A county unit should
   be treated as a whole.

Both of these points should be taken very serious in the making of a new US Congressional District for Montana.

Therefore we oppose Map 11 and in favor of Map 10!

Sincerely,
Philip & Jeanne Fingar

Thank You, Phil & Jeanne
I am writing to strongly support Map CP-10. It makes the most sense geographically, culturally and economically. After viewing the comments on the interactive maps, it is clear that democrats are outraged at the proposed splitting of Gallatin county, despite the population center of the city of Bozeman being in the western district, but they have no problem at all with splitting Flathead county in map CP-11, another rapidly growing area with longstanding traditional ties to a “western district”. The hypocrisy is stunning. Map CP-10 also contains two reservations as opposed to the democrat version isolating the Flathead reservation. The truth is there is no perfect map, but CP-10 is far and away the better choice.

Sincerely,
Andrew Fisher, Arlee
Thanks for what you all are attempting to do. I appreciate the attempt to get 2 districts that can be on equal footing so that there ends up being representatives that attempt to earn "all" our votes. At the junction we are in, our representative has no interest in hearing from a democratic voter, he has never voted for anything that remotely looks bipartisan and this is frustrating for many of us that live in this state.

I hope you can vote for map 11 as it seems to divide the state with all groups being represented in both districts. Native groups are in both states and districts as in Bozeman/Livingston that seem to be becoming bedroom communities to each other remain together.

This is of critical importance at this point. The job you have is monumental and everyone on this committee needs to remember that it is country first than party. We cannot continue down the path where voters are in doubt that their vote means anything and those that are elected are more concerned about keep power than understanding how to help the constituents they are to serve. Make this map equal so that the people who run for office have to seek all our votes and listen to our voices instead of taking it for granted.

Thanks for what you're attempting to do in this divided time in our country. We expect alot from you and hope you deliver a bipartisan map to show to others in this country that people can work together for the betterment of the state and the country.

Denise Fisher
PO BOX 1024
Livingston, MT 59047

---

Denise
Please reconsider redoing Map 11 so it can be more competitive. It should be at less than 5% to be truly bipartisan or competitive. May 11 shows 2 districts with 34% and 7% leaning towards republicans.

May 10 is even worse leaning 28% and 11%. This does not give the democrats equal footing in the state or make either representative seek our peoples votes as what we have seen these past few years.

PLEASE, PLEASE, take the time to get this right. It is imperative that this country, this state can vote and feel like our votes make a difference or our voice.

Thank you

--

Denise
I am in support of the congressional district map proposed by the Republicans. It best supports the changing demographics of the state, thank you.
From: Steve Fitzpatrick fitzpatricks@bresnan.net  
Residence: Great Falls, MT

Message:
I am writing to express my opposition to the plan proposed by the Commissioners Lamson and Miller. I had the opportunity to watch bits and pieces of the hearing yesterday and it is quite obvious the Democratic commissioners are obsessed with moving a portion of Flathead County out of the western district and adding it to the eastern district. Every map the Democratic commissioners proposed took a significant chunk of Flathead County and tried to move it into the eastern district.

There is no good reason to put the communities of Kalispell, Bigfork, and Columbia Falls in the eastern district. There is a community of interest in the Flathead Valley and that community of interest should be kept together. It is preposterous to say the Flathead communities of Kalispell, Columbia Falls, Big Fork have more in common with Plentywood, Sidney, and Miles City than Whitefish, Polson, and Missoula. There is a community of interest in the western part of the State of Montana. The western part of Montana has similar economic, social, and historical connections that simply do not exist with places like Fallon and Richland counties. Of course, we all know why the Democratic commissioners are trying to move a large section of Flathead county into the east and that is because those voters tend to vote for Republican candidates. Even if those voters tend to vote for Republicans, that does not justify segregating Republican leaning voters from their community of interest.

It would be a shame if the redistricting commission adopted such an inappropriate division of the state. The whole purpose of creating a redistricting commission was to take politics out of the decision making process so the people of Montana could feel comfortable maps were being drawn for nonpolitical reasons. The Democratic map does not pass the smell test. I am afraid the adoption of the Democratic map will create the perception our system of government does not treat people fairly and this will ultimately enhance cynicism about government processes. None of this is good for our system of democracy. Therefore, I would ask you to reject the Democratic map and any version which continues to break up the Flathead.

I would also like to offer a comment on the discussion you had regarding "competitiveness." "Competitiveness" is just a better sounding word for "gerrymandering." I think it is an open question as to whether you can even consider political orientation under the Montana Constitution's equal protection provision. The Montana Constitution prohibits discrimination based on political views and I think a reasonable person could conclude gerrymandered maps violate the Montana Constitution's protections.

Regardless, the standard of "plus 5" which was discussed as the outward bound of "competitiveness" is a not an accurate measure of "competitiveness." I think most political professionals would regard any map with an average vote between 45% to 55% as "competitive." And the truth is that a district could be competitive with up to a 14% difference (43% to 57%). To give you an example, just look at the election results in Montana House of
Representatives District 20. In 2008, the vote was 53% D/44% R. In 2010, the vote was 41% D/59% R. In 2012, the vote was 48% D/52% R. Even though the percentage of swing vote fluctuated by up to 15%, the Democratic party certainly considered this a "competitive" district. In each election cycle, the Democratic party and their third-party aligned groups dedicated either staff or resources to support the Democratic candidate. I can tell you that because when I was running for election in 2010 and 2012 I felt that every time I turned around there was another canvasser knocking on a door for my opponent.

The "competitiveness" of an election is determined by far more than the map. The candidates, the quality of their campaign, and the general mood of the electorate have a far bigger impact on the "competitiveness" of an election. The reason the Democratic party has been losing so badly in the last few years is not because of the maps, but because of flawed campaign strategies that emphasize base motivation instead of persuasion. Nonetheless, the failure of the Democratic party to compete should not justify its gerrymandering attempts. Therefore, I would ask you to reject the Democratic party map.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Kendra Miller
To: Districting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Fwd: CALL TO ACTION: Redistricting
Date: Monday, October 25, 2021 5:33:30 PM

Please include for the public record. Thank you.

From: "Western Montana Liberty Coalition" <info@westernmontanalibertycoalition.org>
Sent: Monday, October 25, 2021 2:14:55 PM
Subject: CALL TO ACTION: Redistricting

Western Montana Liberty Coalition
To: undisclosed-recipients;
Subject: CALL TO ACTION - 2020 DISTRICTING AND APPORTIONMENT COMMISSION

Patriots,

Action Time: 30 minutes

Please help STOP THE STEAL of elections in Montana by making your voice heard!

The Districting & Apportionment Commission voided the 9 previous maps and came up with 2 new maps.

The map favored by the Democrats splits Flathead County in half and effectively neuters the most conservative county in the state.

Derek and Ronalee Skees spoke at length at our last meeting regarding the importance of sending our comments to the commission AND our presence in Helena next Saturday October 30, 2021.

There are several ways you can help:

1. Attend the next Districting and Apportionment Commission meeting **"In Person"** on **Saturday, October 30, 2021 @ 9:30 AM in the State Capitol, Room 102** and deliver your short (30 second) testimony to the Commissioners. (Talking points will be provided for you)
   
   **A bus has been chartered for Helena and the cost is FREE.**

   There are only 55 seats available on a “first call first served” basis but we need firm confirmation from each person.

   Call John O’Neil at (406) 755-7714 or Lauralee O’Neil at (406) 407-5639 to reserve your seat and get more details.

   Meet @ the Red Lion Inn parking lot in Kalispell at 4 AM on Saturday October 30, 2021 for the “ride of your life”.

2. Send an email to the Chair and Commissioners here: districting@mt.gov

   (suggested comments below)

3. Send the same e-mail directly to the Chair and Commissioners:

   Maylinn.Smith@mtleg.gov, Jeff.Fssmann@mtleg.gov, Joe.Lamson@mtleg.gov, Dan.Stosiek@mtleg.gov, Kendra.Miller@mtleg.gov

   (suggested comments below)

4. Send the same comments directly to the Commissioners through their website:   https://mtredistricting.gov/contact/[mgcp02.engage.squarespace-mail.com]

   (suggested comments below)

Subject: Congressional Redistricting Map

Chair Smith and Commissioners,

The two newly proposed maps (CP-10 and CP-11) are terrible maps as they are based on trying to carve out specific party districts and do not comply with Montana statutes and constitutional requirements.

Please throw out these two new maps and select map CP-1 as it’s the best map that adheres to the law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Your Name, Address, Phone Number & d Email Address (this is required information)

5. Provide comments on the interactive maps for CP-10 or CP-11 by clicking below and following the directions:

   [https://mtredistricting.gov/congressional-maps-proposed-by-the-commission/[mgcp02.engage.squarespace-mail.com]]

6. Attend the meeting virtually and provide your comments. Click below and follow the directions:

   [https://mtredistricting.gov/remote-participation-request/[mgcp02.engage.squarespace-mail.com]]

You MUST request remote participation online by 5 pm on Friday October 29, 2021 @ 5 PM.

**ADDITIONAL INFO**
Agenda for the commission meeting on Saturday is attached.

Pictures of the proposed new maps are attached and are posted below.

Please forward to friends, family, etc. who may be interested in this issue.

For Truth, Freedom and Health,

Flathead Liberty Coalition
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.
Montana's Leaders,

I strongly urge you to support Proposal 11 for Congressional Districting and Apportionment.

Proposal 10 is blatant gerrymandering at its worst and not worthy of your consideration for the sake of Montana's future.

Please approve 11 as true leaders of the State of Montana.

Thank you,

Russ Fletcher

339 S. 5th St. E.

Missoula, MT  59801

406-531-8119
Dear Presiding Officer Smith,

We read with interest the October 26 article on redistricting in the Billings Gazette, including Commissioner Essmann's comment that he is against the concept of competitive districts because Montana is trending Republican. We would like to point out that one election does not a trend make. Mr. Essmann admitted as much with his follow up statement: "I don't have data, but I expect that's going to continue to happen." Somewhat ironically, we think this comment nicely makes the point of why competitive districts are so important. Montana is a wonderful place to live precisely because we are a "purple" state. All of us have good reason to turn out and vote because the outcome of any given election is not a foregone conclusion, and in this state -- unlike in some of our neighboring states -- over the years we have had some balance in our politics, and are still able to vote out of office folks who do and say silly things like asking constituents to accept an argument based on an expectation despite acknowledging the lack of any supporting data for that expectation in the same breath. Please help keep Montana from becoming either North Dakota or California, and vote for Congressional Proposal 11. Thank you for your consideration.

Richard Foote and Kyle Gray
Park City, MT
From: Robert k foote rfoote87@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula Montana

Message:
After reviewing the two final redistricting maps, I feel that map 11 is the only fair map to provide an open election.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov)
I urge adoption of Congressional Proposal 11. Montana is a very large state and has different faces, democrat, independent and republican, depending on where you look. Certainly all voters should be represented in Congress, not just those of a single party.
Regards,
Darby Forrest
395 Flagstone Ave.
Helena, Montana
I urge the map districting committee to support Map 11. I have done research and this map is highly competitive for both parties and encourage conversation and dialogue about issues. It encourages compromise on issues and encourages people to see the point of view of others. It also closely follows the 1980s congressional districts and only moves to counties to reach population equality. I am in favor of the keeping the economic connection between Livingston and Bozeman together and giving them a unified voice. Keeping areas of common interests together such as Gallatin and Park county, Jefferson and Broadwater counties with Helena and the Rocky Mountain Front, Golden Triangle and Hi Line intact gives each area a voice stronger when addressing their specific important issues. Map #11 is clearly the best choice in fairness and competitiveness. Keeping the districts competitive will improve communication and possible solutions for the complex issues facing Montana.

Thank you for your time.
Lynne Foss
Bozeman.
From: Karen Foust karinafoust@gmail.com  
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:
This is the most equitable plan (link below) please choose it. Thanks

https://districtr.org/plan/45763 [districtr.org]

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Commissioners and committee members of the districting committee,
My name is Dana Fraley and I am a fourth generation Montanan. I am urging you to please vote for the CP-10 districting map that has been proposed. This map best represents Montanans because it does not split Flathead county which is where I live. This map would comply with Montana state law and constitution. I like this map because Flathead county needs to stay as one unit for the benefit of all people residing there. Keeping Flathead county as one will give the people in the western district a fair voice in elections and keep election integrity which Montana has done a great job of doing. If Flathead county is split up it would be a partisan attempt to split Flathead county along political lines causing only Democrats to be elected with no chance a Republican would be elected. We cannot let this happen as then we would be catering to the socialist agenda of the liberal Democrats. Please vote for the CP-10 districting map. Thank you,
Sincerely,
Dana Fraley
From: Dana K. Fraley fraley_dana@yahoo.com
Residence: Kalispell

Message:
Dear districting and apportionment commission committee,
My name is Dana Fraley and I am a fourth generation Montanan and I am urging you to vote for the CP-10 districting map because this map does not split Flathead County where I live. This county should be kept as one unit and has been for some time. This map complies with Montana State law and the constitution providing Montanans a fair voice and integrity in elections. If Flathead County is split it would be a partisan attempt by Democrats to make sure their candidate would win all elections. We cannot let that happen. Please vote for the CP-10 map for districting. Thank you.

sincerely,
Dana Fraley

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Angela Frandsen keefieang@gmail.com
Residence: Helena

Message:
I'm writing in favor of redistricting map #11 (Congressional Proposal #11) that places Lewis and Clark county in the western district. It places the Democratic-leaning Helena with similarly-leaning cities like Missoula and Butte (more moderate/Democratic leaning). It also keeps Lewis and Clark and Jefferson counties in the same district – northern Jefferson county is essentially an extension of Helena. It also places the conservative/Republican leaning Kalispell area in the eastern district, which seems to be a better fit politically.

This is of course reflects my own personal political bent. However, setting my personal political feeling aside, more importantly, CP#11 seems to be the option that makes the western district more politically competitive in the long run, that there's a slight chance that a Democrat could win it someday.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
I support resposal number 11. The line follows county alliance more directly and is generally more straight.
Hello,
Once again, after careful consideration, I’m writing to express a map preference. Nothing is perfect but my preference is for:

Map # 11. (Prefer)

A primary reason for this is because Gallatin County is growing so quickly. If it were all in one District it seems that the population between the districts could become imbalanced before the re-do period elapsed.

Thank you for your work and consideration.

Judith Fraser
Hamilton, Mt. 59840

Sent from my iPhone
Hello,

I am writing to you from Kalispell, MT. I am a small business owner and homeowner. I have lived in Montana for 16 years — 14 of those years in Flathead County, 2 in Teton County.

I am in support of Map #11 for redistricting purposes for the reasons below:

- This plan only alters two counties to reach population equality.
- Like-minded industries, such as ski tourism will be located within one district meaning the corresponding elected official will have to consider the larger state-wide needs and economy linked to outdoor winter recreation to support economic growth.
- Livingston and Bozeman are sister cities and this map keeps that relationship intact. Those that commute from one area to another are voting in their best interest and these closely located communities are not divided.
- Similarly, Jefferson and Broadwater counties remain together with Helena, making sure that most commuters are kept in the same district as their workplace.
- This map keeps the union towns of Helena and Butte together, as every redistricting plan in Montana has previously done. This ensures our workforce has a powerful voice for rights and their respective needs.
- The primarily ag communities of the Rocky Mountain Front, Golden Triangle, and Hi-Line stay intact with map #11. Keeping rural interests linked together means these communities have a stronger voice throughout a less-populated area of the state.
- Elected officials should tune in to Native voters' needs and map #11 creates a more competitive district where candidates will have to rely on and pay attention to Native voices.

Thank you to all members of the commission for your public service and time to review my comments.

--
Shannon Freix
406.499.2309
From: Carrie Frohreich skytrailz@yahoo.com  
Residence: Helena

Message:
Montana's Districting and Apportionment Commission has chosen 2 maps for public comment in preparation for selecting the final map to divide Montana into two Congressional districts for the next 10 years. Maps 10 and 11 can be found here: https://mtredistricting.gov/congressional-maps-proposed-by-the-commission/

Neither of the maps offer a truly competitive district. Map 10 has two Republican dominant maps by 28% and 11%. Map 11 has two Republican dominant maps by 34% and 7%. A truly competitive district would have a 5% or less dominant party.

Please fine-tune Map 11 to achieve one 5% or less Republican dominant district.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Commissioners - as a resident of Helena, I respectfully ask you to not split our community away the tri-county area (Lewis and Clark, Jefferson, and Broadwater). We are one large community and that is why I ask you to please support CP 11.

Thank you,
Bob Funk
1805 Virginia Dale St, Helena, MT 59601
I am in favor of congressional district proposal 11
I strongly support Congressional Proposal 11, which keeps Gallatin county intact and which puts Whitefish in the western district.

Thank you,

Kathleen M. Gadbow
I support Map #11.
From: Desmond Gallegos deaigallegos@yahoo.com
Residence: Missoula, MT

Message:
I believe the map proposed by Democrats makes the most sense. It’s a clear and logical way to divide the state and make the people in each district feel like their representative represents them. My entire family feels very strongly that the Democrats proposed map is the way to go.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
How perfect to have a chance to have 2 Congressional Representatives from each party! And from each side of the State. I heartily support Proposal 11 and hope you will keep in mind that parties come and go. Montanans are best served by representation from both sides of the state by representatives from both sides of the isle who keep allegiance first and foremost to Montana as a whole. Please pass Proposal 11 and thanks for asking.

Sincerely,
Molly Galusha
655 East Beckwith Ave
Missoula, Montana 59801

Sent from my iPad
This is a serious issue for us Montanans. We want a fair and evenly division. Splitting the state in half is probably the fairest way, but where to put the split?

Sent from my iPad
I urge you to support CP #11. We must have as much equality as possible across all measures and NOT favor 1 political party. Support CP#11 please. Thank you for your consideration in this matter. Respectfully,

Dawn Gandalf
32 Dagney Court
Trout Creek, Mt. 59874

Sent from Mail [go.microsoft.com] for Windows
From: Neal E M Ganser neal@ganserllc.com
Residence: Bozeman

Message:
Commissioners, Thank you for your work. It appears that Map CP-1 is the #1 candidate both by populations, the shortest dividing line and the least division of Gallatin County and most closely follows the criteria of HB-506. I support CP-1 FIRST. A second good candidate, CP-7, even with a slightly longer dividing line, also makes sense in that Cascade, Teton, Pondera, Glacier and Toole Counties are aligned with the plains Counties of Eastern Montana with their many similar interests and characteristics and Gallatin County is again divided in a reasonable way in that it seems to incorporate Bozeman into the growing cities of western Montana, This is #2 choice. CP #3 is a third place choice as it is reasonable in compactness and division length and the population difference is still small. Vote CP-1.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Looking at the two proposed maps, I would say the more fair one is proposal 11.

Linda Gardner
28965 Southside Rd
Alberton, MT
406-370-4725
Dear Commissioners -

I think it is imperative that your early pledges to give Montana balanced Congressional Districts be abided by and that you select Congressional Proposal #11.

Barbara Garrett
I'm disappointed with the choices we are left with, and unsure what constituent feedback was actually applied to get to this point.

I urge you to select CP #11 as the final map to represent Montana voters.

Jessica
From: Darin Gaub daringaub@protonmail.com
Residence: Helena, Montana

Message:
Given that we now have maps CP-10 and 11 to make comments on, but maps CP-12-13-14 are probably to come soon I'll limit my comments to 10/11 for now. First of all both maps violate state law in that they are clearly gerrymandered and ignore the rules of compact and contiguous. Both are nowhere near in keeping with the law as CP-1 already was and remains. Of these two CP-10 is the best, but will end up in court anyway. CP-11 is a non-starter, clearly a throw away violating state law, state historical norms, and divides like minded interests and people very clearly. Both maps use competitiveness for a key criteria as well, and that's illegal. It's illegal for a good reason as these same methods have been applied in other states where I've lived and those same states are a mess as the people are not represented, just special interests. In the end of these 10 is best, 11 needs tossed, and I'll wait for the follow on maps that will come soon.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
I vote for CD map 11
It is closer to politically balanced districts, does not split any communities and keeps districts of similar interests together.

Please consider my opinion in your decision.

Laura B Gerlach
528 N Warren st
Helena, MT
59601

Sent from my iPhone
From: Karl Gerst kcgerst@gmail.com  
Residence: BOZEMAN

Message:
Just from looking at the various map proposals, I can see that this process is quite complicated. But I think you need to try harder not to divide counties, and keep areas that are culturally similar together. Regarding the principle of dividing the population evenly, I think it is important to think about population trends so that during the 10 year period it is on average equally divided, but not necessarily exactly equal at the beginning. I know that is challenging, but redistricting should also be forward looking to ensure the best representation of our great state.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
I am in favor of Proposal 11 and opposed to Proposal 10.
Katlyn Gibbs
771 Helena Flats Rd.
Kalispell MT 59901

Sent from my iPhone
From: David F Gibson gibsondfg@msn.com
Residence: Bozeman, Mt

Message:
I have reviewed the current redistricting proposed maps. As our population has grown we now have the opportunity to have two representatives in Congress as we formally did. I favor Map 11 as the most equitable of the two presented. However I recommend that the commission consider not splitting a county (Flathead). Population shifts will be made in the next ten years which will alter in various ways how well the present proposals meet the present criteria. I suggest putting Flathead completely in one district or the other.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Using MAP CP #10... I live in Bozeman and a good friend of mine lives two blocks away and would be in another congressional district.

Only CP#11 consists of fairly drawn district lines between the two political parties

Thomas Giebink
1069 Boylan Rd
Bozeman Mt 59715
sent from Pixel3
This is exactly how Texas became, effectively, a far right autocracy. I know... I lived there thru the transition that started benignly when George W Bush became governor... gained momentum under Perry and became toxically malignant under Abbott.

They are using the same playbook here in MT now

tom

Sent from Mail [go.microsoft.com] for Windows

To Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission:

Gallatin County has never been divided before. We live one hundred yards from our neighbor. One of the new maps would put us in different Congressional Districts! Please don't do this!!! Michael Alexander Sirr M.D.

As listed on your own website:

Goals for Congressional Districts:

"The commission shall attempt to minimize dividing cities, towns, counties and federal reservations between two districts when possible."
From: Malcolm M Gilbert mg166757@umconnect.umt.edu
Residence: Helena, MT

Message:
In comparison to Map 10, Map 11 will likely yield the most competitive House races. Democrat-leaning counties should be lumped together to better reflect the “purple” identity of Western Montana. I would prefer that Cascade County be lumped into the Western District as well, but that would come at the cost of unequal population distribution and weakened compactness, leaving it vulnerable to VRA challenges. Further, Map 11 is the better choice because it aggregates tribal voters living on reservations into a single voting block. Even though indigenous voters cannot be described by a single voter profile (much like any district), strengthening tribal nations’ influence on the outcome of elections may drive increased participation/engagement and generally improve tribal representation up and down the ballot. With that said, the Map 11 on-reservation indigenous vote would be stuck in the solidly-red Eastern District. So, if the indigenous voter profile generally leans blue, the strength of conservatism in the Eastern District may end up having the opposite influence on indigenous voter engagement. Regardless, Map 11 is the best of the two options because it will yield the most competitive races.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Members of the Montana Redistricting commission.

I am writing to you today to provide my public comment and support for the map on the left side of the picture below.

This is why I think this map makes the most sense for the state.

1. It keeps all counties in the state intact in each district, except Gallatin County. Of all the counties in the state, Gallatin is the fastest growing. This is a good reason for that county to have double representation.

2. Kalispell is properly located in the western district. It should be a foregone conclusion that the city that is the furthest west Montana city should be located in the western district.

3. It is the most compact proposal. Montana is the 4th largest state in America by land mass. It is a huge state to cover and we ought to make it as manageable as possible for our next two members of Congress.

Thank you for taking the time to review my comments as you consider this important decision. Thank you also for your service to our state.

Adam Gilbertson
Army veteran
Business leader

Laurel, Montana

Get Outlook for iOS [aka.ms]
I vote in favor of proposal 11 for redistricting.
Annette Gillespie
Missoula MT
I encourage the commission to adopt the previous distribution of counties set up in the 1980s. To me it makes sense be fair and just.

John Glen, 343 Glenhaven Dr., Billings MT 59105

Sent from John's iPhone
From: Louise Glimm ljglimm@gmail.com
Residence: Conrad

Message:
Proposal CD 10 is preferred over CD 11. CD 10 keeps Flatheadcounty with tourism and the lumbar industries together. It is more compact and meets the constitutional requirements. Populations is about equal. Thanks for reading my comments.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Cp 11 is the fairest map. As a resident of the Flathead reservation I appreciate a somewhat competitive district that allows all citizens a voice in the electoral contest. Thanks for your consideration. Steve Glow, Dixon, MT
From: Gary Glynn gjglynn@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula MT

Message:
I support the adoption of Congressional District Commission Proposal 11-CP 11. As a lifelong Montana who has lived in many cities and counties in the state, I believe Montana citizens deserve the right to have their vote respected. In my view a western district that encompasses the cities of Butte, Bozeman, Helena and Missoula, and an eastern district that contains Billings, Great Falls, and Kalispell is the fairest and best way to respect the rights of Montana voters.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov)
Good morning commissioners,

I participated in the redistricting meeting via Zoom on Tuesday for as long as I could but was never called to testify. I hope it’s not too late to provide my input now.

Two of the goals of the commission that are important to me are to keep communities of interest together and to keep towns, cities, counties and reservations whole. Toward that end, I’d encourage keeping Madison County and all of Gallatin County together in the same district. Maps 2, 6 and 8 meet both of those goals.

Both Madison and Gallatin County have economies that are heavily dependent on outdoor recreation. People come from all over to fish our rivers and play on our gorgeous public lands. Not only are both of our economies dependent on outdoor recreation but they are also entwined when it comes to healthcare. When the people of Madison County need vision care or glasses, hearing aids or more advanced healthcare, we go to Bozeman. People live in Madison County but commute to Bozeman to work. And then there’s Big Sky. Big Sky sits in both counties and is economically important for both. People also live in both Gallatin and Madison County and work in Big Sky.

Keeping Gallatin County whole and keeping Madison and Gallatin counties in the same district ensures towns are kept whole and communities of interest stay united. Keeping us in the same district will strengthen our ability to influence our member of congress when it comes to policies about healthcare and protecting our public lands and the National Park System that are vital to outdoor recreation.

I’m encouraging the commission to pick a map that keeps Madison and Gallatin counties together.

Thank you for your time in doing this difficult but so important work.

Cindy Gockel
Ennis
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Please use CP11 as the District map for Montana's House Representation in Congress. Montana needs an out delegation to represent both parties.

Sincerely,
Charney Gonnerman
1535 Liberty Ln Missoula, MT 59808-2026
charneylg@gmail.com
From: James Gonzales gonzomadness@gmail.com
Residence: EAST HELENA MONTANA

Message:
Congressional proposal 11 is better for Montana, a fairer division.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Page Goode makeroomdesign@gmail.com  
Residence: Missoula MT  

Message:  
Please select the proposed Congressional Map No. 11 for Montana. Such a new district would provide at least one potentially competitive district in the western district, which map No. 10 would not. If No. 11 is not selected, there would be little or no real potential competition allowing the possible election of democrats, and we might as well abandon the idea of establishing a new district and just continue our at-large all-Montana election but for two congress people. I support fair and non-gerrymandered elections, and I strongly urge you to select Map 11 to establish the new congressional district.

--  
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov)
I support the adoption of map #11 because it doesn’t favor any political party.
Sincerely,
Sandy Goodwin
Clancy, MT 59634

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Maylinn, Jeff, Joe, Dan and Kendra:

You are charged with the difficult task -- and important work -- of fairly apportioning our state's two upcoming congressional districts. Thank you for the great amount of time, effort and thought you have put into this critical effort.

As a resident of rural Gallatin County I am writing to voice my support for CP 11.

By maintaining Gallatin and Park counties intact, CP 11 retains the cohesion of the two counties' complimentary tourism economies that together are dependent upon Yellowstone National Park, ski resorts, and fly fishing, which collectively support many thousands of jobs and hundreds of millions of dollars in Gallatin and Park counties combined. Keeping the two counties in the same district -- and hence represented by one congressman -- ensures that both counties' economic interests will be consistently, and better, represented by a singular Representative in Washington.

CP 11 also keeps Helena and Butte together, as previous redistricting maps did, and avoids, to a greater degree than CP 10, the integrity of cities, towns, counties and federal reservations.

In addition, CP 11 meets the requirements of equal population and does not unduly favor either political party.

For these reasons I support CP 11.

Thank you, again, for your good work on the Districting & Apportionment Commission.

Bruce Gourley
Churchill, MT
406-599-1754
To the Commission:

I strongly support map #11 as it allows for competitive races. Given the recent egregious actions of the Governor and the AG, it is obvious to this long-time observer of Montana politics that the GOP is interested in power, not in governing with the aim of helping all Montanans. I clearly remember all the campaigners proclaiming their support of Montana values. Gerrymandering, in my book, is not one of those values.

Sincerely,
Tom Graff
Missoula, MT

Barbecue may not be the road to world peace, but it’s a start.
Anthony Bourdain
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

My name is Jason Granvold and was born and raised in Montana. I remember the last time Montana had two Congressional Representatives. I am excited that Montana once again will have two Congressional Representatives. I would like you to support Congressional District Proposal #CP11. Map #CP11 distributes the population equally among the two Representatives. This proposal only splits one county and does not split any towns. As a Montana voter, I feel that if my town were split between the two Representatives, then it might be confusing to know who my Representative is when my neighbor might have a different one. Proposal #CP11 is close to the historical district boundaries. It only shifts one and a half counties from the last time Montana had two Congressional Representatives in the 1980’s, whereas CP10 shifts four and a half counties. As a Montanan who take pride in Montana’s history, I favor having the Congressional Districts as close as the ones in the past. I hope you will consider supporting CP11 as it appears to be the best for Montana.

Sincerely,

Jason Granvold
1619 S 8th St W Missoula, MT 59801-3446
jgranvold@yahoo.com
Dear Commissioners,

To meet the criteria and goals for Congressional Mapping, there is only one map left that closest meets both the goals and criteria.

That map is CP #11.

This map is population equal and is within the competitive range and doesn’t unduly favor one political party.

This letter is to confirm my support for CP #11.

I also urge you to support Map CP #11.

Respectfully,
Rochelle Gravance
Proposal 11 ensures **fairness** even more than it does ensure competition, in my view, and is highly preferable to Proposal 10 because it respects the potential voting power of all Montanans.

Jockeying for partisan advantage has characterized both Republican and Democrat party efforts for decades and many voters, including me, are sick of it.

Proposal 11 gives us a chance for a government by the people again-- not just by the party with the biggest current political clout. I strongly believe voters should pick their representatives and that representatives shoud not pick their voters.

Thanks to the committee for your deliberation and for consideration of balancing voting power for the next 10 years. I like to think that in our state and country, **fairness**, though perhaps still aspirational, is one of our foundational values.

Sincerely,

Jim Gray

Missoula

--

Sent from Gmail Mobile
Dear Montana Districting & Apportionment Commission,

I commented on the first round of 9 maps that were submitted for review and with these 2 new proposals would like to express my support for Map 11. I believe that it is important for there to be at least one competitive statewide district. Based on past voting trends, that would only be possible under Map 11’s configuration.

Thank you,
Mary Greenup

Mary Greenup
Whitefish, MT
From: Steven Gregersen stevengregersen@yahoo.com
Residence: Fortine, MT

Message:
CP 10 is definitely better than CP 11.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Robert Gresswell bgresswell@gmsil.com
Residence: Bozeman MT

Message:
The Democrats’ map for redistricting the state is the more balanced and should be supported. Don’t split Gallatin County. Thank you.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
I choose proposal #11. Denice Griffin
Good Afternoon Commission.

First, let me thank you for the work that you are doing. It is a huge undertaking and I appreciate your efforts. I understand that based on the census, it appears that you will need to split either Flathead or Gallatin County. I happen to practice law in both counties. For the reasons below, I am asking you to choose map 11.

First and foremost, Map 11 truly creates two competitive districts based on the information available to us. Map 10 does not. That should be of paramount importance to the commission and should be the ultimate decision making fact.

Regarding Flathead, the way that you are dividing it places most of the economic drivers and population centers (but for Whitefish) in the same district. This is much fairer than the map that separates the communities of Bozeman, Belgrade and Three Forks them from Big Sky, West Yellowstone and Livingston. Any person representing Big Sky should also represent Bozeman. The two communities have obviously deep ties and most of Big Sky’s workforce lives in and around Bozeman. I just attended a community event in Big Sky regarding all of the non-profits and government agencies that have a hand in Big Sky. Many of the presentations touched on the fact that the philanthropic groups like the Yellowstone Club and Spanish Peaks invest heavily in Bozeman and surrounding area because it heavily benefits Big Sky. Also, the transportation district runs between Bozeman and Big Sky and the Gallatin county commissioners in Bozeman oversee Big Sky and the surrounding area (as it is not an incorporated town.) Likewise, Gallatin and Park counties share workforce, transportation and other infrastructure as Livingston is a bedroom community of Bozeman. Because of these ties, any representative should represent all of those areas. Therefore, Map 11 should be selected by the commission.

Thank you for taking the time to review my comments. If you have any questions, please let me know.

Alanah

--
Griffith & Cummings, PC
Alanah Griffith
11 Lone Peak Dr., Ste. 202
P.O. Box 160748
Big Sky, MT 59716
(406) 624-3585
E-mail correspondence is not always confidential. If you wish to discuss sensitive or confidential matters, it is best to do so by telephone or in person.

This e-mail contains information that may be attorney-client privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete this e-mail from your computer system as soon as possible. Thank you.
Dear Committee Members:

Although neither map is perfect, **Map 11** is much more logical for keeping working/commuting communities intact. I urge you to select it.

Thank you for your work on this important task to fairly represent Montana in Congress,

Yvonne Gritzner
From: Raymond Gross raygross0144@gmail.com
Residence: Dillon, Mt

Message:
I support Proposal 11. It seems to be the fairest division based on political affiliation.

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

Please consider adoption of Congressional Proposal 11. Montana’s are diverse and all voters, whether Independents, Democrats or Republicans, should be represented in congress.

Thank you for your consideration.

Deanna Grubbs  
5638 York Rd  
Helena

Sent from my iPhone
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

.I urge your support for map #CP11 because it is more competitive. If lawmakers have to work for our votes they will be more responsive to their constituents.

This map is also closest to the 1980’s districts.

I appreciate how it does not split any towns.

Thank you for demonstrating your commitment to Montana by serving on this commission.

Sincerely,
Linda Gryczan

Sincerely,
Linda Gryczan
800 8th Ave Helena, MT 59601-3715
LindaGryczan@gmail.com
It’s important to keep in mind, not everyone in MT is republican. Therefore, I think we should go with the Democrats maps so everyone has a voice as to what happens in the future.

Thanks
Margie
I strongly urge you to adopt Congressional Proposal 11 as the redistricting map for Montana's two congressional seats. This proposed map would acknowledge that Democrats as well as Republicans live in Montana and may have a role to play in Congress, whereas the other proposal appears to minimize any potential Democratic influence in Congress. Thank you for your consideration.

Janet Guffin
Missoula, MT 59801
I have reviewed the two finalist maps for congressional districts and information regarding both, and I vote for Congressional Proposal 11.

In my opinion, it is the only one that meets all of the agreed-upon criteria, it is the only one that can be considered competitive and does not unduly favor a political party, it does a better job at not splitting communities, and it better keeps communities of interest intact, among other reasons.

Thank you for your important work on this project.

Sincerely,
Katie Guffin
406-546-5222
Missoula, MT
From: Stephen Guggenheim sjsguggenheim@gmail.com  
Residence: Bozeman, MT

Message:
I favor the proposed redistricting map 11 because Livingston and Bozeman are connected in many ways. People commute for work and commerce between the two cities. Also Gallatin County should not be divided.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Commission Members,

I am in favor of CP #11 because it meets the criteria for fairness.

Thank you for your consideration and for your hard work.

Yours truly,

Mrs. Barbara J. Gulick
2018 12th St. W.
Billings, MT 59102
406 259 3622
From: Representative Steve Gunderson gundy4mthd1@gmail.com
Residence: Libby, Montana

Message:
Both CP10 and CP11 subvert the election process and gerrymander. Flathead County has always been a cultural and economic part of the Western portion of the state and needs to remain there. Return to CP1 that splits Montana properly along the Continental Divide. CP1 continues to be the best split between districts and has served Montana historically well.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Committee Members,

I am writing to support Map CP #11. I support this map because it is drawn in a way that more fairly represents our Montana communities. Please vote for fair districting in Montana.

Thank you.

--
Tami Haaland

tamihaaland.com [tamihaaland.com]
Please give strong consideration to adopting Proposal #11 as the map that best represents a fair and equitable opportunity for all Montanans.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.

Pat Haffey
Helena, MT

Sent from my iPad
From: Dr. William Nickolas Hagen wnhagen@outlook.com
Residence: Bigfork, MT

Message:
Map 11 cuts Flathead county in half and puts it in the Eastern district. Flathead is clearly in the western district by geography and economical basis. Never has it been considered part of the east. This is clearly a politically created map to create a democrat district. There is no other explanation for this. It is clearly unconstitutional and illegal. Also you can not isolate the tribes in a unfair fashion.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Redistricting Committee Members,

I am disappointed that you didn’t go with map #1.

Of the two maps you are giving us, Map # 10 best represents the stated criteria putting Helena and Great Falls in the Eastern district. Gallatin County is split with Bozeman in the Western District.

My vote is for Map #10.

Respectfully,

Edwin Halland,
Bridger Montana
edhalland@reagan.com
From: Robert Hall
deanlovestocamp@yahoo.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:
Robert J Hall
Missoula, MT
I have lived here now for about 2 and a 1/2 years.

I fully support map 11. It is the only map that meets the given criteria in establishing the boundaries. The commission's goals are to not favor one party over the other, but to keep the districts competitive. Map 11 minimizes splitting town's, counties, and reservations. It keeps communities of interest in tact which is the major goal of the commission.

My biggest objection to the Republican backed map is the manner inwhich it is drawn. Both districts entirely favor one party.

I thank you for allowing me to contribute my input.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Chair Smith and Commissioners:

Map CP-1 is by far the map that best adheres to the law.

The two newly proposed maps (CP-10 and CP-11) are terrible maps as they are based on trying to carve out specific party districts and do not comply with Montana statutes and constitutional requirements.

CP11 is the most egregious:

Congressional districts should have a balance of geographies, communities and populations. This map does not achieve that goal. It’s ludicrous to think Flathead should be part of the Eastern district. The two university cities should definitely be separated. This map all but eliminates the Canadian interface for the Western district.

There is questionable adherence to the Montana Code Annotated 2021 - Redistricting Criteria:

(2) (a): “The districts MUST be compact, meaning that the compactness of a district is greatest when the length of the district and the width of a district are equal. A district may not have an average length greater than three times the average width unless necessary to comply with the Voting Rights Act.”
— Has a cartographer confirmed that the Western district in this map actually complies with the Redistricting Criteria for compactness?

(3) A district may not be drawn for the purposes of favoring a political party or an incumbent legislator or member of congress. The following data or information MAY NOT BE CONSIDERED in the development of a plan: (b) political affiliations of registered voters
— The recently adopted consideration of competitiveness should not usurp mandatory criteria. Clearly gerrymandering in the name of competitiveness is at work in this map.

Thank you for your consideration,

Mary Halloran
2810 Felton Lane
Missoula, MT 59803
406-544-2018
marykhalloran@gmail.com
From: Tyler Hammond fiestabowl_2003@yahoo.com
Residence: Big Sky, MT (Madison County)

Message:
I support CP11 as the new congressional map for our state. As a resident of Big Sky living in Madison County, it would be very unfortunate to see the new congressional map split through Gallatin County. I stand in agreement that Madison, Gallatin, & Livingston counties should all be designated to the western district, as displayed in CP11. I thank you for considering my comment.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Montana Districting Commission Members,

Both the maps being proposed as final options right now seem to artfully draw lines in a way that would make it easier for Republicans to win one or both seats. As someone who has historically voted Libertarian whenever possible, I find gerrymandering absolutely fascinating (to put it diplomatically). Looking at map 10 and 11, it seems Map CP #11 is the lesser of the two evils. Please move that one forward.

Montana is changing. The population base is changing and will continue to change as niche-skilled people make the choice to “live where they want” and work via the internet and others leave the state because they can’t find work in their own industries. Or their farms/ranches have collapsed due to big-ag subsidies, drought, policies that harm family-owned outfits, and poor soil management. There are massive forces at work that will continue to cause our population demographic to shift in coming decades.

The knee-jerk reaction is for Republicans to cling to power through any means possible, even unethical gerrymandering. That’s not democracy folks, that’s plutocracy. Close cousin to apartheid. Not impressed.

There’s an alternate path. What if Montana Republicans worked on representing both their base... and swing voters? What if Republican leaders parked their big corporate interests and elitist wealth-protections, and instead looked at the root cause issues that hurt rural voters—and many urban lower/middle class folk too? In short, what if you focused on REPRESENTING the shifting demographic?

Just a thought.

Meanwhile, as noted earlier, Map CP #11 is the lesser of the evils. Please move that one forward.

I await the form reply that indicates that nobody read this message with any deep attention. But... I hope maybe, just maybe, someone will see and hear and will reply in person—as an act of representation.

All the Best,
Anika Hanisch
Belgrade, MT

------------------------------------------
Anika M. Hanisch
Writer and Founder
www.MontanaCoauthor.com [montanacoauthor.com]

“Hands in Soil, Pen to Paper”
On Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/anikahanisch/ [instagram.com]

Email: anika@MontanaCoauthor.com
Ph: 406.581.9405 (Voice Only, NO TEXTS)
Snail: PO Box 1048 / Bozeman, Montana 59771
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Hello,

My name is Elias Hannon, and I live in the Bonner area east of Missoula. I urge you to chose congressional district commission proposal 11 - CP 11. It is essential that the map does not end up giving any one political party an advantage, which I believe CP 10 does.

Thanks so much for your consideration.

Elias Hannon

Sincerely,
Elias Hannon
905 9th St Missoula, MT 59802-5717
elias.w.hannon@gmail.com
The two newly proposed maps (CP-10 and CP-11) are not representative maps for Montana as they are based on trying to carve out specific party districts and do not comply with Montana statutes and constitutional requirements.

Please throw out these two new maps and select map CP-1 as it’s the best map that adheres to the law.

Thank you for your consideration.

Stefanie Hanson, 194 Frontage Park, Kalispell, MT, 59901. 406-250-1782, E: hansonstefanie7@gmail.com
From: Stefanie Hanson  
To: Districting  
Subject: [EXTERNAL] redistricting maps  
Date: Tuesday, October 26, 2021 4:50:35 PM  

I really don't like either map and would rather you go with Map 1 that was originally, however if these are the only 2 maps we have to pick from then I like Map 10 the best because it keeps the communities of interest in the west that are predominantly forest production and tourism together. It keeps our communities of interests centered around tourism and service industries together which are all shared between glacier national park, kalispell, whitefish and columbia falls.

Map 10 complies best with the Montana law and the constitution where both districts are compact, contiguous and nearly equal in population. also, both districts include a canada interface but this map keeps communities of interest together better than Map Cp 11.

I highly dislike Map 11 because it is gerrymandering at its best by splitting flathead county and putting part of flathead county in the eastern district when they have nothing alike with that side of the state. Flathead county has zero political, economic or cultural ties with the vast number of counties in the easter district. It isolates one tribal community from all other tribal communities which is unfair. It is designed to attempt to split the flathead along political lines.

I have faith in you that you will pick Map CP 10 for our congressional redistricting rather than CP 11. Thanks for your help in keeping our state a fair election and not splitting flathead county.

Stefanie Hanson, 279 Birdseye Trl, Kalispell, MT 59901
From: Stacey Hargesheimer stacey.hargesheimer@gmail.com  
Residence: Missoula MT 59801 

Message:  
Please choose map 11 for redistricting – it is the most fair out of the two presented. Montana is a purple state so map 11 is closer to that fact than map 10.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: John Hart
drjh43@gmail.com
Residence: Helena

Message:
John W Hart, Helena resident. Retired former Professor of Theology and founding Director of the Environmental Studies Program, Carroll College.

I support Map C11. C11 is less partisan; keeps communities of interest intact more than other proposal.

It is the more partisan of the two proposals, apparently favoring the Republican Party.

I thank the Commission members for their time spent on hammering out the redistricting proposals, for providing an opportunity for Montana voters to comment on the proposals, and for reviewing my comments.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Kathleen Harvey harvey62010@hotmail.com  
Residence: Missoula Montana  

Message:  
Please use CP10 redistricting map. Thanks for all you do! Kathleen  

--  
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Juanita Hastings juanita.k.hastings@hotmail.com
Residence: Miles City, Montana

Message:
It is my hope that you follow the Constitution when redistricting. The #1 Map first proposed followed as closely to the law as was possible. Unfortunately, those maps submitted earlier and the public comments regarding them have been scrapped. I do not think we need any more gerrymandering in our State. Rise above partisanship and make this process fair for all. Flathead and Ekalaka should not be in the same district for example.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Sam Hatziathanasiou shampoo_jive.0y@icloud.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:
My name is Sam Hatziathanasiou, I live in Missoula and have loved living here for several years.

I support map 11. This map combines places where political interests and community needs are more aligned and will allow for more effective design and implementation of useful legislation. Map 11 also promotes a more competitive and fair electoral and legislative landscape. [@Q4. Districting Oct 30 – Why did you pick your map?]

The map that includes Kalispell with Missoula is NOT competitive politically and will not encourage or allow candidates and lawmakers to advocate for policies that best address the needs of each of these very different places.

Thank you for your consideration. Please help keep Montana fair and balanced.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
CP #11 is the only map that doesn't unduly favor one political party. Both maps split a county between the two con:

- #11 splits Flathead county, which is where I live, and is predominately Republican throughout the county.
- #10 splits Gallatin county, and also the city of Big Sky between two Congressional districts. Big Sky is already split between two counties: Madison and Gallatin.

CP 311 is the only map that doesn’t unduly favor one political part. Both maps split a county between the two Congressional districts:

- #11 splits Flathead county, which is predominately Republican throughout the county.
- #10 splits Gallatin county (which includes the city of Bozeman, which is predominately Democratic), and also splits the city of Big Sky between the two districts (it is already split between two counties: Madison and Gallatin.

I believe the main goals should be for:

- both districts to be “population equal;” both plans achieve this goal; and
- each district to be fairly divided between the two main political parties (Democratic and Republican); CP #11 is the only one to come close to that goal.

Catherine Haug
Bigfork MT (in Flathead County)
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Greetings Commission Members:

The purpose of this message is to urge you to select the most fair of the two Congressional district maps that remain in contention, which is CP 11.

The alternative (CP10) obviously favors one political party primarily by splitting Gallatin County and some of its key municipalities.

In addition, CP 11 better reflects 1980s Congressional boundaries precedent. CP 11 is clearly the most fair to both political parties that retains equal populations in each district.

Regards,
Jeffrey P. Havens
706 1st Street
Helena, MT 59601

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

Please choose map #11. Of the 2 proposed maps, it does not favor 1 political party over another, which is the most fair redistricting of the 2 choices.

Thank you,
Dr. Kim N. Hawkins
Missoula, MT

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
Dear Committee Members,

I support Proposal 11 for the following reasons:

1) Follows the historical precedent of the 1980’s Congressional districts.
2) The deep economic connection between Livingston and Bozeman is respected under Proposal 11.
3) This map keeps union towns of Helena and Butte together, as every redistricting plan in the past has done.
4) Keeps all of the Rocky Mountain Front, Golden Triangle, and Hi Line intact where agriculture remains such an important part of the local economy.

I have testified twice previously and have been impressed with your commitment to allow all who want to testify, to voice their opinions and thoughts. We are fortunate to have this citizens committee to tackle one of the most important issues facing our state and ultimately we will all benefit from this work.

Regards,
Rep Denise Hayman
From: Hayward Terry & Diane buttehaywards@hotmail.com  
Residence: Butte, MT

Message:
We favor the new congressional district as proposed by the democrats as it more fairly splits the counties for a more equal & fair representation of the people that live there.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: David F Hedeman hedemandf@netscape.net
Residence: Kalispell, MT

Message:
Dear Redistricting Commissioners:
Thank you for your work and for taking my comments. I am writing to support Congressional Proposal 10 map. Kalispell and the rest of the Flathead should be in the western district and not the eastern. Our interests are timber, recreation, and tourism. That is not the best fit for an eastern district dominated by agriculture. Lewis And Clark County is a much better fit for the eastern district. Thank you.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Katherine Heffernan kjohnheff@gmail.com
Residence: Missoula

Message:
I will reside in the western District no matter what you do. I have lived in Montana for 41 years and have lived in Helena, East Helena, Missoula, Seeley Lake, and Whitehall. I am a retired biology/earth science teacher.

I support Map 11 because it places Helena and Butte in same district. It also places Bozeman and Missoula in the same district. While both maps split one county, Map 11 does not split communities. I think that eastern Montana has deep Republican roots and that is safely Republican no matter how you draw an east/west split. However, western Montana is "purple" and that tradition should be creating a competitive district for both parties. Map 11 keeps communities with similar interests and histories together and doesn't split up towns.

Neither map is perfect but I don't like that Map 10 puts Helena and Butte in different districts. I feel like these areas have much history in common. I also feel like Missoula and Bozeman have much recent history in common such as rapid growth and lack of housing for ordinary people.

Thank you for your time and effort in this difficult task.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Bradley R Heil heilbbk@mt.net
Residence: Helena

Message:
please use map 11

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

First of all, thank you for your service and work on this project. I know that whatever you do, many will be unhappy and that is unpleasant.

I respectfully request that you support Map CP #11 due to the fact that it is competitive. In these times of division in our state and country, we need to work to find ways for both sides to feel like they can be “in the game”, and have a chance to be heard at the voting box. I think this is the criteria that should be the tie-breaker in order to create a more harmonious state.

Thank you for considering my position.

Kind Regards,

Dennis Heinzig
1617 Whitefish Hills Dr.
Whitefish, MT 59937
Dear Redistricting Commission,

I encourage you to choose Map 11 as the redistricting map for state elections. This map has the least impact on separating counties with similar issues, is divided equally in population, and is competitive. Montanans in the western part of the state deserve to have their voices heard in elections to select a congressman/woman who will reflect their interests. Map 11 will ensure that anyone running for the congressional seat, regardless of party affiliation, will need to appeal to a broad range of the population as well as address broader interests than we have in our current congressman.

Please select Map 11.

Respectfully,

Linda L Henderson
426 King St
Missoula, MT

Sent from my iPad
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I support the Map#CP11

Solely on the fact that it does not split towns.

Sincerely,
Emily Herndon
11675 Chumrau Loop Missoula, MT 59802-9543
emiherndon@aim.com
I am in favor of redistricting proposal number 11 based solely to not split to cities/communities that proposal 10 does.

Emily Herndon  
11675 Chumrau Loop  
Missoula, MT 59802
From: Janet Hess-Herbert janet.hessherbert@gmail.com  
Residence: Helena, MT  

Message:  
Thank you for all your hard work on this endeavor. I have waited to comment until you were down to the final maps. I would like to see Proposal 11 move forward as the map for Montana's congressional districts.

--  
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov)
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I have lived in Montana for 67 years—my whole life. I seen lots of changes, some that are exciting and some that make me sad. But Montanans have an innate ability to always work together for the benefit of ALL Montanans. This is pretty amazing considering the diversity of the mountain West and the plains of Eastern Montana. I hope both congressmen remember that even though they represent a certain district, they must work for the benefit of ALL the people of Montana.

I feel map CP11 works best for Montana citizens. This map only splits one county, not several. It doesn’t split any cities. Division in communities is never good and there is enough division in our lives as it is! Thank you

Sincerely,
Rhonda Hihnson
543 Fox Meadow Ln Hamilton, MT 59840-9273
bamarhonda@yahoo.com
The plan that keeps Flathead county in the west seems the most reasonable. This would put the counties west of the Continental Divide all together which is most reasonable.
Please vote in favor of Proposal 11. This distribution provides a fair and equitable representation.

Thank you,

Charlie F. Hinch
95 S Fork Rd
Choteau, MT 59422
In the interest of fair representation, please vote in favor of Proposal 11!
Thank you!
Marsha J. Hinch
95 S Fork Rd
Choteau, MT 59422
From: Colleen Hinds colleenhinds@hotmail.com
Residence: Heron 59844

Message:
Kendra.Miller Greetings! Please push for Map 11! It is most fair for the unheard voices or poor Montanan’s the Union worker & especially Native Americans! We Need to do Better this next decade .Thank-you

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Colleen Hinds colleenhinds@hotmail.com
Residence: Heron 59844

Message:
Dan.Stusek I favor Map 11. It keeps economic areas together like Gallatin & Park County & Helena& Butte. Places that whole families share. It is the best for Native Americans in Montana who need to have their voices heard & empowered not ignored. Big Sky Country is for All not just the wealthy

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Colleen Hinds colleenhinds@hotmail.com
Residence: Heron 59844

Message:
Greetings Re-districting Commission, I realize you can’t pleas everyone BUT Map 11 speaks most fairly to the unheard voices of Montanan’s. Native Americans need to be heard & Map 11 will give them that empowerment & it is so blind not to be open to their needs. map 11 shows uniting economics of “sister” communities

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Colleen Hinds colleenhinds@hotmail.com
Residence: Heron. 59844

Message:
Maylinn Smith, I urge you to push for Map 11. I realize it’s difficult to please all but Map 11 is the fairest for the unheard voices of poorer working class Montanans. I pick Map 11.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov/mtredistricting.gov)
Members,

Please do not support Map 11. I believe it is Map 2 that you should adopt.

Thank you.

Greg Hinkle
From: John Hoffland
Residence: HELENA

Message:
Please fine tune Map 11 so that we can truly have at least one competitive district that should have less than a 5% lean toward Republicans. It damages democracy when the people believe that their vote is worthless.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
My comment is this, follow Montana law. The additional goal of making the districts competitive does not add anything to this process. Follow the law to the letter.

My feeling is that the map 10 does a better job of following Montana law.

Brent Hoffman
811 Birch St.
Helena, MT 59601
I'm sure the committee knew that it would be impossible to please everybody. I have not been following the development closely, but my perception is that Map11 is a fairer division than Map10. I also note that Map11 has been better received by commenters than Map10. I think that is an indication that you got it right.

Regards,
Mel Holloway
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

I strongly urge you to support Apportionment Map #11.

It is NOT unfairly favorable to either major political party;
It does NOT split the small communities of Gallatin Gateway and Big Sky;
It does NOT lump Lewis & Clark County in with Eastern Montana;
It splits only one county, and no towns.

This is the only fair option among the two selected maps.

Thank you for your service to Montana's future, and to democracy in our fine state.

Sincerely,
Krys Holmes
533 Diehl Dr Helena, MT 59601-5404
holmeskrys@gmail.com
Dear folks:

In my opinion, the Redistricting Commission should throw out all previous maps and go with this map proposed by Tonya Dyas that has NO SPLIT Counties or Reservations.

In addition, it ensures "communities of interest" have approximately equal representation in BOTH districts, as well as that BOTH districts have borders with Canada.

As Tonya wrote:

"I don't think more perfect maps could be drawn. These proposed maps are based strictly upon population & contiguous counties. Absolutely no gerrymandering was involved. No counties are divided and none of the Tribal groups are divided. Best yet, the population difference between District 1 & 2 is only +/- 50 people for a population deviation of 0%..

It complies with all the Montana statutes and constitutional requirements.

The population of the green district is 542,062 (-50) and the orange district is 542,163 (+51) for a net difference of 101. The big thing is that NOT ONE COUNTY IS SPLIT!"

The important point is that this map is LEGAL.

As I said in my comments last time, we should be focusing on COOPERATION as EQUALS, not on competition between those who accept Reality and their places in it and those who do not.

Thank you.

Theresa Holmes
Manhattan, MT 59741
Sent with ProtonMail [protonmail.com] Secure Email.
Hello from Hamilton.

We Hamilton voters are strongly in favor of redistricting proposal Map 11, for the following reasons:

- This plan closely follows the historical precedent of the 1980s Congressional districts, moving only two counties to reach perfect population equality.
- Areas that heavily rely on ski tourism to support the local economy are kept in one district, forcing a Congressperson to pay attention to the needs of areas that use the winter outdoor recreation to drive economic growth.
- As has always been the case when Montana had two congressional districts, the deep economic connection between Livingston and Bozeman is respected under Proposal 11, ensuring district lines don’t divide the flows of workers, innovation, and dollars between the two communities.
- This map keeps Jefferson and Broadwater counties together with Helena, making sure that most commuters are kept in the same district as their workplace.
- This map keeps the union towns of Helena and Butte together, as every redistricting plan in Montana has previously done.
- This map keeps all of the Rocky Mountain Front, Golden Triangle, and Hi Line intact, where agriculture remains such a vital part of the local economy. Rural interests are an important part of Montana's diversity and heritage that should be kept together for a stronger voice in Congress.
- Native voters are empowered under this plan, as there is a competitive district with a reservation, meaning that every candidate has to rely on Native votes to win the district. Non-competitive districts don't elevate voices and ensure accountability in the same way.

Thank you and please choose Map 11.

Becky Homan and Alex Shaffer
***************
801 S 3rd Street [x-apple-data-detectors]
Hamilton MT 59840 [x-apple-data-detectors]
***************
(314) 852-1171
becky.homan@gmail.com
From: Don Hook don.hook@gmail.com  
Residence: Sand Coulee Mt  

Message:  
After looking at the history of map proposals the CP10 map is the only one that makes sense. CP11 looks like a gerrymandered pile of hot garbage that divides communities and will lead to lawsuits. You cannot consider dividing counties purely on perceived political lines, any further attempts to gerrymander this process will be meet with stiff opposition.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Please choose map CP 11. It's the only remaining map that is competitive and doesn't favor a political party. Map 10 clearly favors one party over another and is unfair. It also moves several counties away from the 1980's congressional line which was a far more fair map for its time. Choosing map CP 10 would be a blatant giveaway to a single party and that's not what Montana is about; we have a long history of fairness in political competitions and there's no reason to make the state a gerrymandered laughing stock in this country.

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

I urge you to approve Map CP#11. As a resident of Gallatin County, I object to the county being split up between districts.

Eileen Hosking
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Dear Commissioners,
I am writing in the hope that you will do the right thing and create competitive Congressional Districts. Please consider the merits of CP 11 over CP 10. I hope you will avoid splitting cities and counties to the extent possible.
Sincerely,
Jeff Howe
Stevensville, MT

Sincerely,
Jeff Howe
390 El Capitan Loop  Stevensville, MT  59870-6004
jhowemt@gmail.com
Members of MT Districting & Apportionment Commission:

Please consider democracy & fairness when selecting the final map. Just because the state is “trending in one direction,” according to Essman, that makes it even more crucial that minority voices are heard & not suppressed by gerrymandering. Otherwise we head toward autocracy. Therefore, please consider adopting Congressional Proposal 11. Even though Republicans will still have the edge, there is at least a tiny chance that other viewpoints might prevail.

Thank you for considering my opinion.

Rosalind Hudgens
523 Plymouth St
Missoula, MT 59801
Dear Commission Members:

You have done well to reduce the many possible districts to a choice between two districting maps. I favor Proposal 11 because it is more politically competitive. It does not amount to gerrymandering because a Democratic win in the western district is by no means a sure thing. It just leaves the door open to more political dialogue. Isn’t that what our country and state need?

Sincerely,

Jim Humphrey
Great Falls, MT
Hello,

I am a college professor at Rocky Mountain College. I have taught there for 28 years, in the departments of chemistry and biology. I was born and raised in Eastern Montana. Other than a few years away, I have lived in Montana my entire life and love my state!

I would like to support Proposal 11. I feel it is very important to have this district be competitive so it can reflect the will of the people. Where I live, in Eastern Montana, our district won't be competitive no matter what. In order for the state to be poised to move forward in the future, it is imperative that we have a competitive district. Proposal 11 will be more competitive than Proposal 10. I think we must give the Democrats a chance at having one of the seats - one representative from each party will help make sure Montanans get fair representation.

Again, I am strongly in favor of Proposal 11. Thank you for considering my opinion.

Sincerely,

Cristi Hunnes
My name is Jeff Hunnes. I am a lifelong Montanan, born and raised in Miles City. I have lived and worked in Billings for the past 37 years. My wife and I raised 3 children here - all of whom are now living outside Montana.

I support Proposal 11 as the most competitive and evenly balanced proposal for Montana's congressional districts. Our state has long enjoyed some level of independence and equity in its political makeup. I believe Proposal 11 has the best chance of maintaining some badly needed balance for Montana.

Thanks for your consideration.

Jeff Hunnes
Dear Commissioner Joe Lamson,

Good afternoon,

I am writing to ask that you choose map CP 11. It appears to be the less biased of the two and will more fairly reflect the values of Montana. Thank you for your service to our state.

Sincerely,
Emma Hunter
920 Defoe St Missoula, MT 59802-2410
emmamerle@gmail.com
Redistricting Commission,

I support Map 11 as the better redistricting map and oppose Map 10.

Map #11 is better because:

- It closely follows the historical precedent of the 1980s Congressional districts, moving only two counties to reach perfect population equality.
- Areas that heavily rely on ski tourism to support the local economy are kept in one district, forcing a Congressperson to pay attention to the needs of areas that use the winter outdoor recreation to drive economic growth.
- As has always been the case when Montana had two congressional districts, the deep economic connection between Livingston and Bozeman is respected under Proposal 11, ensuring district lines don’t divide the flows of workers, innovation, and dollars between the two communities.
- This map keeps Jefferson and Broadwater counties together with Helena, making sure that most commuters are kept in the same district as their workplace.
- This map keeps the union towns of Helena and Butte together, as every redistricting plan in Montana has previously done.
- This map keeps all of the Rocky Mountain Front, Golden Triangle, and Hi Line intact, where agriculture remains such a vital part of the local economy. Rural interests are an important part of Montana’s diversity and heritage that should be kept together for a stronger voice in Congress.
- Native voters are empowered under this plan, as there is a competitive district with a reservation, meaning that every candidate has to rely on Native votes to win the district. Non-competitive districts don’t elevate voices and ensure accountability in the same way.

I oppose Map #10 because:

- This plan breaks with the Historical precedent in Montana by separating the towns of Helena and Butte, diluting union strength and breaking apart a community of interest that’s existed for over a century.
- This plan creates two districts which unduly favor one party. With two congressional districts now instead of one, a fair map should include one competitive district that either party can win.
- This plan dilutes the power of Montana farmers and ranchers by breaking up the Golden Triangle and critical grain and cattle producing regions in Montana. This is cracking the farm and ranch vote pure and simple.
- This plan separates commuters that live in Jefferson county from the place where so many of them work in Helena. This is clearly breaking apart a community of interest.
• This plan splits the towns of Big Sky and Gallatin Gateway even though there is no clear reason to do so since Gallatin county could have been split in such a way to keep them together. This is a partisan cut of Gallatin County designed to crack apart Democratic votes and splitting two small towns for no reason violates your criteria on minimizing the unnecessary division of towns.
• This plan separates Park and Gallatin County from one another, cutting apart an area with vital economic connections and shared interests. Plan 11 better acknowledges this community of interest.

Thank you.

Ryan Hunter
I appreciate the work of the Commission. It appears to me that CP 11 would best represent all Montanans.
Gene Huntington
725 North Warren
Helena, MT 59601
From: Karen Huso khuso@aol.com
Residence: Joliet Montana

Message:
The right to vote is the most important part of maintaining a democracy. It should never become a partisan issue. When redistricting needs to occur, due to changes in population, that redistricting needs to be as fair as humanly possible. It needs to allow every person's vote to be of equal importance. I implore the redistricting commission to choose the map that allows every vote in Montana to count. I believe that Map 11 will do this without being a political strategy to give one party dominance over another.
Thank you for the work that you do. The redistricting committee is a very important part in maintaining our democracy.

--

This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
From: Paulette Hutcheon pauled327@gmail.com
Residence: Helena

Message:
It is imperative that our state's new redistricting more fairly represents currently disenfranchised Montanans-native people and moderates. Please select Map 11 for a more equitable chance that all Montanans have a voice.

--
This e-mail was sent from a contact form on MDAC (https://mtredistricting.gov [mtredistricting.gov])
Hello Commission members,

Thank you for your work.

I have looked at the two latest maps and have seen how #11 has a district that doesn’t unduly favor a single political party. The map is population equal, splits Flathead county, and is within the competitive range. It gives us a voice in the process, a small voice, but at least a shot of being competitive.

I write to urge you to give map #11 serious consideration.

Thank you,
Marlene Hutchins

"You keep talking, I'll be right back." - Rush White