



Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission

Commission members:

Janine Pease Pretty On Top
Presiding Officer
P.O. Box 447
Lodge Grass, MT 59050

Joe Lamson
612 Touchstone Circle
Helena, MT 59601

Jack D. Rehberg
2922 Glenwood Lane
Billings, MT 59102

Sheila Rice
913 3rd Ave.
Great Falls, MT 59401

Dean Jellison
116 Crestline Ave.
Kalispell, MT 59901

Staff:

Susan Byorth Fox
Research Analyst
John MacMaster
Attorney

MINUTES

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed. Committee tapes are on file in the offices of the Legislative Services Division.
Exhibits for this meeting are available upon request. Legislative Council policy requires a charge of 15 cents a page for copies of documents.

Eleventh Meeting of Interim
Room 102, State Capitol
May 22, 2002

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Janine Pease Pretty On Top, Presiding Officer
Sheila Rice, Vice Presiding Officer
Joe Lamson
Jack D. Rehberg
Dean Jellison

STAFF PRESENT

Susan Byorth Fox, Research Analyst
John MacMaster, Staff Attorney
Lois O'Connor, Secretary

VISITORS

Visitors' list (ATTACHMENT #1)

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Pretty On Top, Presiding Officer, at 1:00 p.m. Attendance was noted; all Commissioners were present. (ATTACHMENT #2)

Commissioner Pretty On Top: The Commission was appointed in 1999 and will serve until 2003 Legislative redistricting is an accumulative process.

Susan Fox, Research Analyst, Legislative Services Division, provided a brief overview of the redistricting process and changes in population throughout Montana. (See Exhibits #1 and #2 from the minutes of the May 21, 2002, Bozeman public hearing.)

John MacMaster, Staff Attorney, Legislative Services Division, provided a brief overview of the mandatory and discretionary criteria for legislative redistricting adopted by the Commission. (See Exhibit #3 from the minutes of the May 21, 2002, Bozeman public hearing)

Commissioner Pretty On Top: This is the eleventh hearing that we have held, starting in Great Falls and going in a clockwise manner around the state. This is a process that is accumulative, and it is a very creative one. We did not start out with maps that showed all of the entire state. Some of you may say "Where did this map come from? Why didn't I have it two months ago?" We didn't have it two months ago. We have just generated the maps for this region very recently. We must realize also that there are three more weeks to study these maps and to provide any sort of testimony or correspondence that you wish to bring points of significance to us in our deliberations.

OVERVIEW OF THE SOUTHWEST REGION PLANS

Ms. Fox: We are completing districts in two other regions. The first one is Teton County with a single digit district 4 from the Northcentral district, and Lewis and Clark County completing the Teton County district in Plans 100 and 200. Plan 300 includes northern Powell County completing the district. We are also coming from the Southcentral portion of the state. Proposed district 49 in all three plans as Golden Valley, Wheatland, and Meagher Counties in their entirety. Portions of Broadwater County, in Plans 100 and 200, and also portions of Lewis and Clark County in Plan 300 which is similar to the present House District. In Carbon County, all three plans take the Roscoe Precinct out of the Carbon County district and attach it to a Stillwater County district. All of Stillwater County is in a district shared with parts of Sweet Grass County which is adjacent to a Sweet Grass and a Park County district that has Big Timber, rural Park County, and a Livingston district. All districts end at the Park and Gallatin County line.

Plans 100 and 200 includes an additional house district in Gallatin County. Plan 300 adds 2 house districts in Gallatin County. Madison County shares parts of different counties to complete the district. In Plans 100 and 200, it shares parts of Gallatin or Jefferson County. In Plan 300, it is Jefferson County. Madison County in the past had shared with Beaverhead, Gallatin, or Butte/Silver Bow Counties. It now pulls out of Beaverhead and Butte/Silver Bow Counties. In all four plans, there are four house districts in Butte/Silver Bow County. One of the districts was within the population deviation but the other three were under the 5% deviation.

Beaverhead County is the right population and is a house district unto itself in all three plans. Plans 100 and 200, Deer Lodge County is a house district unto itself. It slightly high from the plus 4% deviation, so in Plan 300, the population is split in Deer Lodge County. It uses the railroad tracks in Anaconda to split the district. It has shared a district with parts of Powell County in the past. In this case, the district comes down and includes the town of Deer Lodge but uses the Highway as the dividing line.

Granite County is intact in all three plans, it is just who it is paired with that is different. In Plan 100, Granite County is paired with the southern one-third of Powell County, including Avon, Elliston, and Deer Lodge. In Plan 200, Granite County looks like it is its own district but it does not have enough population and would take significant population in the Missoula County district to be completed. In Plan 300, Granite County is included with the southern Deer Lodge County and Anaconda district. The remainder of Powell County in Plan 100 will have to be completed with the Missoula County district. Plan 200 includes all of Powell County but it has to be shared

with the Missoula County district. Plan 300 completes all the districts for this region. The Ovando area would be included with the Lincoln portion of Lewis and Clark and Teton Counties. Avon and Garrison would be in a Lewis and Clark County district, using Highway 200 as the northern boundary.

Lewis & Clark County completes a district with northern Teton County. In Plan 100, it completes the district with Augusta, Lincoln, and Craig. Plan 200 includes Augusta and Lincoln, but the entire Wolf Creek elementary district is pulled into the district with the southeastern portion of Lewis and Clark County. Much of this district is now shared to the east with Meagher and Broadwater Counties. Plans 100 and 200 brings all the Lewis and Clark County population into a Lewis and Clark County district. Plan 300 has similar population in the Canyon Ferry area and it does not include Townsend, Toston, or Radersburg. There are two districts in Helena that needed addition population, two that were within the plus or minus deviation, and two that had extra population to give. There was enough population to shift between districts. Some of the districts in Plans 100 and 200 don't shift much in town while Plan 300 realigns districts, sharing more with outside districts. Plans 100 and 200 share more with the northern districts.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bob Marks, Clancy: The plans are fairly broad in description, and some of the changes are hard to determine. Could you describe Jefferson County?

Ms. Fox: Jefferson County was too big in population for its own district. Plan 100 takes much of the Montana City population and pulls it into a Helena and East Helena district. The remainder of Jefferson County is a house district.

Mr. Marks: Do you know where that line goes (boundary in northern Jefferson County)?

Ms. Fox: It is east of I-15 and much of the school district boundary is used. It does not take the entire Montana City school district out of Jefferson County. In Plan 200, the northern boundary of Jefferson County is intact. The southern boundary of Jefferson County is north of Cardwell. It is the Three Forks-shared school district, the town of Cardwell, and uses Highway 55 as the boundary, not including Whitehall. It goes around the southern city limits of Whitehall down Highway 55. Everything southeast of Highway 55 is in proposed house district 57 with Madison County. Whitehall is included in the Jefferson County district. In Plan 300, the boundary line is I-90. Everything south of I-90 is with the Madison County district, including Whitehall and Cardwell. Proposed district 64 in Jefferson County goes into Lewis and Clark County.

Tom Hatch, Powell County Commissioner: Has the Commission chosen one plan? What is the process from here?

Commissioner Pretty On Top: These plans have not come before us for a decision. There are on the table for review, discussion, and hearing. The record for discussion is open for three weeks. We will have an executive session out in the future which will be June 17 when a decision will be made on the plans, with amendments.

Rep. Masolo: Is Three Forks included in proposed house district 50 in Plan 300?

Commissioner Lamson: Three Forks is included in proposed district 57.

Rep. Masolo: So the main town in proposed house district 50 is Townsend?

Ms. Fox: Townsend, Toston, Radersburg, and most of northern Gallatin County that is outside of Belgrade, Manhattan, Bozeman, and Three Forks.

Rep. Masolo: So that is mainly the agricultural area?

Commissioner Lamson: It is mixed agricultural and moves into Bridger Canyon.

Commissioner Rehberg: This Montana districting material that you gave us on Plans 100, 200, and 300. Is that available? I notice that there weren't any over on the table.

Ms. Fox: That was just an oversight.

Commissioner Rehberg: That tells you what communities are in each district.

Rep. Masolo: The confusing thing is that it says house districts of 1990-- 40 and 50-- would now be proposed house district 65. I think that is an error. I'm sure that it would be proposed district 50.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: The numbers from the past are entirely redone on the new plans.

Rep. Masolo: I'm talking about page 12.

Ms. Fox: That has been changed on a revision.

Karla Rydeen, Powell County Clerk and Recorder: Do you have legal descriptions? Proposed Plan 300 takes the town of Deer Lodge, and it cuts right above the town over to Granite County. I was just trying to put together some information to see where it would split my precincts. I am uncomfortable with doing that with the information that I have.

Ms. Fox: As John (MacMaster) had mentioned in the criteria, the Commission uses the TIGER/Line census files. Those are geographic lines not township lines. Traditionally, written legal descriptions are done using township boundaries. We do not have that. In the last 10 years, I had not developed that. That is something that is required within a county for you to do. It has been a problem in the last 10 years. I plan on being at the Clerk and Recorder's Convention in September to discuss some of that. It is a cumbersome switch from a traditional way of doing things to the new electronic version. There is a way that you can print out legal descriptions from the GIS systems, but I have not yet found anybody who thinks it is even useful.

Ms. Rydeen: We found that two communities were left off of the census in our county.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: We always have to use the Census information. That is all that we can do. But if we know about these things, it will help us understand the situation.

Commissioner Jellison: The answer that was given to the gentlemen with regard to what is the status of these various plans was good but not quite complete. Each of these plans is being considered and nothing has been adopted as far as the Southwest Region is concerned, but you should know that of the various other regions where plans have been adopted, Plan 300 has been adopted in each of them. That plan is supported by three members of the Commission, is not supported by two members of the Commission, and the odds are extremely likely that Plan 300 will be adopted for this region and for each region until we come to the end of Montana.

Ms. Rydeen: So can we fight city hall?

Commissioner Jellison: Yes.

Commissioner Lamson: As Commissioner Jellison pointed out, not quite all of the story has been told in terms of how the plans have been adopted. He should also point out that in all of the regions, there were significant amendments and changes made to Plan 300 that was based on bipartisan, local input that was taken at the public hearings. We made changes in the Northcentral, Northeast, and the Southeastern Region to accommodate the concerns of all kinds of communities. As we are working these things together, there are changes. I think that is an important thing to point out.

Commissioner Rehberg: I would like to point out that there is a difference between significance and minimal. There have been minimal changes made. Nothing really very significant.

Representative Dave Lewis, House District #55: Plan 300 includes portions of proposed districts 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70. It has been kind of chopped around. I would probably run in proposed house district 70, and I recognize the concerns of Powell County. But, probably, that is a reasonably consistent area as far as population is concerned. It is a long ways from the Granite County border clear to Bowman's Corner, and your neighborhoods are not going to have consistent interests. The upside would be campaigning in a district that has the best fishing that you are ever going to find. I am sure that there are people from Powell County, because I know that it is controversial in the fact that the County has been split.

In the way that Plan 300 comes forth, it effectively splits the Valley in three different districts and combines it with portions of the city. The criticism that I would have with that is that the valley area of the county has different issues and interests than the urban area of Helena. For instance, proposed district 66 which takes in the east valley and goes into the east side of Helena. There are very different issues in the north and south ends of that district. The same would apply to proposed districts 67 and 68. You are talking about combining apples and oranges as far as the populations are concerned and the interests and concerns that those populations have in slicing this direction. Proposed house district 70, its long, its broad, it covers a lot of country, and it splits different counties in an interesting fashion which I would never have anticipated when the process started. But, there is some basic logic to the fact that their rural constituencies would have a lot of the same common interests, even though they are a long ways apart.

Representative Gay Ann Masolo, House District #40: I was sent by Meagher and Broadwater Counties. We had a meeting and where in agreement to support Plan 200 because we believe that if you put Broadwater County. . . In one plan, I believe, was taking off the Winston area of Broadwater County. We were against that. In Plan 200, you were taking off the southern part, which those people usually do most of their business in Three Forks, but combined Meagher, Wheatland, and Golden Valley which we felt was a very agreeable group because we are mainly involved in agriculture which is the main industry in those counties.

Then I see Plan 300 which I have not seen until today, and I would like to know if you are going to send the plan to all those people who were at the meeting in Townsend?

Ms. Fox: It should have been in your packet with the rest of the mailing.

Rep. Masolo: It wasn't in mine but it may have been in the others. In just looking at Plan 300 today, I am term limiting out in 2002 so I am not concerned about this as much. It does just have the one town and it looks like it includes almost all of Broadwater County. It would be a lot of rural travel is what it would be. But, it looks like we probably have the same interests and it would be a compact area. I am just speaking for myself now because the one that we really did promote was Plan 200. I am sure that there will be written comment on Plan 300.

Representative Gilda Clancy, House District #51: Presently, House District #51 is east of Montana Avenue and throughout the Valley and East Helena. In commenting on Plan 300, which I understand is the plan that will probably pass, it appears that East Helena will be taken from the district that I represent at the present time. In looking at proposed house district 66, I assume that it would be mostly replacing House District #51. My comments are much of the same as

Rep. Lewis in that this district does go into the city limits of Helena north. There is quite a bit of difference in interests in the county residents and the city residents.

Senator Mignon Waterman, Senate District #26: I am also term limited so I am not affected by these plans. But, I have lived in this community for over 30 years, and I think I know the communities of interest. I do have some concerns about Plan 300 that I understand is the one that you will likely be working off of. It splits communities of interest in my district. It splits along California Street as opposed to the Interstate which I think is the dividing line on the eastern edge. California Street is right in the middle of the community. The Interstate, if there is a dividing line and a logical dividing line, it is the dividing line. California will split school district lines, I think it would be better if I-15 were used as the dividing line on the southern end of that district. Likewise, Montana Avenue has been a dividing line in the past for this district, but presently, my district swings over and picks up some area to the West. That, likewise, is very similar to this community. It is a community of interest. Their kids attend school by the Capitol. I would urge you to look at that line because you are essentially splitting north/south. One area that I consider one area of interest, you are splitting it into three districts with the northern end of California and Montana Avenues being the dividing lines. It seems to me that Plan 100 leaves more of a compact area of interest. As you move out into the Valley, which I also represent, traditionally, the Interstate has divided there and splits more of an area of interest than going out on Montana Avenue. I urge you to look at that as well.

Commissioner Rehberg: How far north do you go?

Sen. Waterman: I go out to Sierra Road. I used to go, before the last redistricting, to the Gates of the Mountains. With the last redistricting, my district was brought in to Sierra Road and the Great Falls district represents the Gates of the Mountains area. That makes sense. My district used to go to the Broadwater County line. It has now come into the eastern side of East Helena. Again, the last Redistricting Commission spent some time looking, because the area on the west side of Canyon Ferry, the northwest side, is an area that is difficult to place. It originally had a number of them with the Townsend district, and ultimately, moved them with the Great Falls district because they fit better. But essentially, my district shrunk on two sides and remained the same on the other two sides. I obviously represent two house districts, and I have rural communities. I pretty much have the whole community of East Helena in my district and what I think of as the area of interest on the east side of Helena, which goes to the county line.

Senator Duane Grimes, Senate District #20: I would express some concern over Plan 300 for a number of reasons, particularly, with regard to the lower end of Jefferson County. For those of us, Jefferson County is one of the biggest growing counties in the state. We have worked very hard in Jefferson County to make sure that we are contiguous and a single county. We have done a very good job. The county is as unified as I've ever seen it. I would encourage you and urge you to keep that intact. If you talk to any of the County Commissioners no matter what their political persuasion and all of the locals at both ends, they would all say that for the first time we feel like that the south and north ends are much more unified than they ever used to be.

Now, that of course, carries over to the Legislative races. If you were to split out Whitehall and yet leave some of the rural area just north of Whitehall which Plan 300 does, it creates problems. It creates problems for those who are running from both parties; it creates problems for the communities and who they support; and it begins to fracture that unification that we fought so hard for over the last couple of decades in Jefferson County. For a number of reasons,

representing my constituents, I would say that Plan 300 is very unacceptable to large numbers of people. I also am very concerned about how it treats Meagher and Broadwater Counties--counties that also have much in common. I much prefer Plans 100 or 200 with regard to how it treats Broadwater and Meagher Counties who have to coordinate and work on a number of things together. My view, Plan 300, with regard to Jefferson County, is surreptitious in gerrymandering at its worst. There is obviously political motivations if Plan 300 was to be adopted as it stands. On behalf of all of my constituents of both parties and all of the future candidates who will be running, I would urge you to make that change to Plan 300 or just go with one of the other two plans.

Commissioner Lamson: You realize that Jefferson County has to lose part of its county because of population concerns. I realize that everyone would like things to remain the same in Jefferson County. You are more comfortable with losing virtually the northern part in one of the plans or a different part, the southern part, in the other plan?

Sen. Grimes: That is correct.

Peter Boyce, Chief Executive, Anaconda/Deer Lodge County: After studying all three plans and discussing them with our City/County Commission, we would like to go on record opposing Plan 300. Plan 300 splits the county of Deer Lodge and the city of Anaconda. One of the boundary lines follows the railroad track through the city of Anaconda so that everything north of the tracks would be in proposed house district 71 and everything south, which is most of the population of Anaconda, would be in proposed district 72. We see a couple problems with that. First of all, Anaconda has a few unique issues. There are some significant Superfund issues in the area that are unique to the county, with the possible exception of Butte/Silver Bow County. We believe that the southern line where it stands now through the city of Anaconda would not give the citizens in that area complete representation which we believe they need. The southern one-half of Anaconda which is in proposed district 72 which is combined with Granite County, we believe there are, again, some very diverse issues between the Anaconda Superfund area and Granite County. We do have some commonalities in the Georgetown area, but we would favor either Plan 100 and 200 which would leave Anaconda/Deer Lodge County intact. We will also supply written comments in the future to give you some more detail on our feelings.

Commissioner Lamson: Doesn't part of the Superfund cleanup proceed toward Deer Lodge?

Mr. Boyce: It does. But when you look at the area, Anaconda/Deer Lodge County is affected in a more significant way. There are development restrictions in the area that are unique to Anaconda/Deer Lodge. There are deed restrictions on much of the land out there. So we feel in that sense, it is a little more restrictive than what a lot of Powell County is dealing with.

Kay Beck, Powell County Commissioner: One hundred years ago, the citizens of our area recognized the individual needs of Anaconda/Deer Lodge County and Powell County and managed, through legislation, to make the division. We have gone on to be good neighbors but with completely different interests. We really don't have a lot of interests, and I don't think that they want us any more than we want them. Ten years ago, our county had three precincts taken from the north end of the county. This was absorbed but not liked very well. This just seems to be more of pushing us in that direction. As a County Commissioner, if we do Plan 300, we are divided up working with people all the way up into Teton County someplace. We would like to be whole also. We would like to either see this plan amended to keep more of our county intact or look at Plan 200.

Karla Rydeen, Powell County Clerk and Recorder: I just want to reiterate what was apparently mentioned earlier. We didn't really have a chance to speak to this issue at all. We just received our information about 12 or 13 days ago.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: We, as Commissioners, did too.

Ms. Rydeen: I mean, we weren't included in the visits with staff.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: Our staff does not come with the maps in hand. When they visit, they are visiting in a general way concerning how the lines are drawn.

Ms. Rydeen: I was just under the impression that I would be able to visit with somebody and, maybe, they could help me define the lines.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: That is still very possible.

Ms. Rydeen: Two of our communities aren't even on the Census--Helmville and Gold Creek. We noticed this morning that it shows 71 people on the Census in Ovando. I have alone, with registered voters, 215 registered voters in Ovando. We will have material coming to you when we can get together to figure some more things out.

Commissioner Lamson: How many voters did you say were left out?

Ms. Rydeen: It shows 71 on the Census, and I have 215 registered voters in that area.

Ms. Fox: Did I hear you say that Helmville and Gold Creek were not on the census? Are they incorporated cities or towns or have they been created as a Census Designated Place? They should be census blocks with respect to population, but if they are not an incorporated city or town or if they have not been drawn as a Census Designated Place--Montana had about 80 added in the last ten years, but not every community. I have people say "What do you mean that we are not a place?" There is a certain census designation, and there is also a process with the Census Bureau that you can participate in to actually have those towns, even if they are not incorporated, show up as separate and distinct places instead of just a series of census blocks if you designate what the boundaries would be. I will help you look at it to determine which problem that it might be.

Tom Hatch, Powell County Commissioner: Before I get started, I would like to talk to one of the basic premises of this, and that is keeping communities of interest intact. May I have permission to approach the maps? First, I would like to go on the record that I, personally oppose Plan 300 and support Plan 200, primarily because I am self serving. I represent the people of northern Powell County. Helmville is right in here, and I represent people as far as the Seeley Airport clear up in the town of Seeley. This is all agricultural area in Plan 200 and proposed district 4 in Plan 300. The interests are identical.

Less than 40 years ago, our children would have to commute and live with foster parents in Deer Lodge while they were going to high school. There are members in north Powell County who are on the Fair Board. There is a lot of traffic going through here. Communities up north know everyone in the south county. We know the political movement and what is going on and we are very involved with activities--sports and all of that. I would really hate to see our county dissected, separated, or cut in half. I would like to go on record to say that I do oppose this plan (Plan 300).

Commissioner Rice: On Plan 200, on the deviations, would you consider proposed districts 71 and 72 as incomplete districts that we are going to have to add population to? Right?

Ms. Fox: Correct, because neither one has sufficient population, between the plus or minus 5% population deviation, both would have to be completed with Missoula County population.

Commissioner Rice: So, both of those districts will look different than they do today?

Ms. Fox: Correct. You would not be able to complete them until you go to the next region.

Mr. Hatch: I know that the house district up north of Seeley goes with Missoula County. So, I think it would be more acceptable with some corrections along the northwestern border.

Representative Christine Kaufmann, House District #53: When I ran (for the Legislature) a couple of years ago, I thought the district seemed funny--"Like, why is this little jog going up here into this neighborhood and why is this little jog cut out of what seemed to be a natural neighborhood on the west side of my district?" That was before I really appreciated that a Commission sat down, such as this, and tried to figure out things with population and how to make things work out. As I look at the plans as they relate to the city of Helena; and I am sure that these people have many concerns in their rural areas that I really can't speak to, but in terms of the urban districts in Helena, I like Plan 300.

Some people have testified that it divides up communities of interest, but it also unites some. Because the areas that I was speaking about, which are west of Montana Avenue and north of Broadway Avenue, which I used to live in that community, the line went right down the street in front of my house; and I thought "This is odd. These are my neighbors." Plan 300 corrects that problem in that particular neighborhood. Also over on the west side of what we call the "mansion district", it kind of gets that neighborhood a little bit more together. I appreciate the difficulty of what you are trying to do and that it must be almost impossible to not divide up some communities of interest. You have also united some in the area that I suppose would likely become my district. It does include a section of the Valley. But, my district, before hand, went way out into the draws of Grizzly and Orofino Gulches. I guess that I consider that a trade off. I know that there are some differences in rural and urban folks interests, but I think that part of what we do is that we have to understand those differences and try to represent all the people in our districts. I would go on record in support of Plan 300.

Representative Hal Jacobson, House District #54: To echo some sentiments that were expressed by Sen. Waterman, I think that all three plans indeed have their merit. I think, however, that as far as House District #54 goes that Plan 200 better deals with the overall constituent base that I currently represent and would continue to represent to a certain degree under all three plans. I recognize that yours is a thankless task. While all three plans have their merits, and I am not going to personally oppose any one of the plans, I would express preference for Plan 200 as it relates to what it does to may house district.

Commissioner Rehberg: What number would your new district be?

Rep. Jacobson: Actually, it would take on two numbers under the three plans. Under Plan 100, my district becomes proposed district 69; under Plan 300, it becomes proposed district 69; and under Plan 200, it becomes proposed district 68.

Jon Rush, Helena: If you turn to your Plan 300, Southwest Region, Helena, I would like to point out something that was referred to as the "mansion district". Right where you see the word "Lawrence", just above the "a", the last green spot, that is where my house is. I have lived there since 1978. Across the street from me lives the current Attorney General and the former

Attorney General who have lived there for almost 20 years. These are people whose kids went to the same school, from elementary school all the way through, as mine did. They are what I would call my community of interest. Yet, under Plan 300, they jump over to proposed district 69 which is actually made up of newer residential areas as it turns the corner heading west on Mount Helena. I join up with people out in the Valley as far as Franklin Mine Road. Not having anything against Valley people, they don't have the same community of interest as the old "mansion district" folks.

Plan 300 divides up my neighborhood and the people who have the same interests because they chose to live in that neighborhood. It puts me in with folks who have decided to live in the Valley because they want the Valley-type of lifestyle. Proposed districts 67 and 66 reflect the same set up, and it reminds me of what I saw in the (Great Falls) Tribune about what happened in Great Falls. Turn it sideways and it is striped. It looks real close to a gerrymander there too. Plan 300 completely breaks up the communities of interest. If I had to choose one of the three plans, I would go to Plan 100. Plan 100 keeps the whole west side and what we call the downtown area on both sides of Last Chance Gulch in one district. We, the folks who live in that area, all have a common interest and we have chosen to live in that tightly compacted downtown area. I think that ought to be the type of representation that we want out of there--someone who understands our needs. The Valley needs to be represented by someone from the Valley who understands their needs, and not by someone from uptown.

Dulice Rogers, Powell County Treasurer: I am not in favor of Plan 300. I would like to see more of Plan 200 because the town of Anaconda and the community of Deer Lodge have dissimilar interests. They have a charter form of government and we do not. I hope that you look at keeping Powell County intact.

Paul Beausoleil, Powell County Commissioner: I would like to reiterate the remarks that our Chief Executive, Pete Boyce, gave in regards to Plan 200. The Plan 300 going right down the railroad track through the city of Anaconda really splits the city in itself. By the same token, on the other side of the track, as they so state, it is a common remark that "You live on the other side of the track" if Plan 300 goes through. Plan 200 will keep us more intact, and you will be hearing more from residents of Anaconda/Deer Lodge County.

Scott Mendenhall, Candidate, House District #39: I have some real concerns about Plan 300. For the record, as it stands, I'm against Plan 300. I would be more favorable toward Plan 100. As I was looking at the maps associated with Plan 300, it looks like it is almost a foregone conclusion that is what you are going to do. I would echo the sentiments of Sen. Grimes related to adjusting the northern boarder, in Plan 300 proposed district 64. All of the districts along the northern part of Jefferson County, proposed districts 69, 68, 66, and 65, look to me like that they are under the threshold by a few percent. You could add some population and still be within the deviation standard. You can pick that up on the southern end of Jefferson County by pulling Whitehall and Cardwell back into the district and taking it out of proposed district 58 which is Madison County. You could then replace those that came out of Madison by all of its neighboring counties or districts. Beaverhead and Gallatin Counties and Three Forks are over populated so you could take a few out of there. In terms for the reason for this, I work on economic development for Jefferson County. I can tell you that Cardwell and Whitehall are not at all associated with Madison County. In fact, they are often at odds. Not to say anything against Madison County, but from a community of place standpoint, I echo what Sen. Grimes said in

terms of our county starting to pull together. We work together with a number of entities within the county on lots of issues, and those entities are comprised of people all up and down the county--Whitehall, Boulder, and Montana City. As much as the Commission can do to adjust those borders to encompass more of the southern part of Jefferson County, I would be in favor of that.

Bob Marks, Jefferson County: I was a candidate in Jefferson County for some 20 years and went through three different reappointments, so I got to know a lot of territory--all the way from Augusta to Toston and Whitehall. A group of people in Jefferson County came to the Commission previously, and their interest was to keep Jefferson County as whole as it could be because one of the previous plans had split it into several pieces. I think that this plan does that to some extent. If you are going to talk about community of interest, since I have nothing else to do, I volunteered to become Chairman of our local economic development corporation in Jefferson County. As Mr. Mendenhall mentioned, we have made great progress into developing a community of interest in Jefferson County. I have to say that Plan 300, and Plan 200 to some extent, flies in face of that. When it comes to the districts, would proposed districts 63 and 64 be a Senate district?

Commissioner Lamson: We haven't decided yet.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: We won't do the pairings until later, so we don't know how they will be paired.

Mr. Marks: Just in case it does and if proposed districts 63 and 64, I think that is the way it has been done sometimes in the past, you take consecutive numbered districts and put them together for Senate districts. I think that really flies in the face of and makes no sense. If you do that with Plan 300, you are going to have the part of Jefferson County that has the least to do with Butte/Silver Bow County put in the Senate district because it takes part of Butte and puts it in with the part of Jefferson County that is the farthest away from Butte. I just ask you to take a look at that. The other thing is that when I mentioned some of the unity that is in Jefferson County, and if you are going to have to take a piece off, the north end toward the East Helena area, their center of economic, social, and educational interest, that is the part that would more likely fall into the Helena area domain more comfortably than taking the south part out and putting it into Madison County.

Mr. Hatch: I would like the Commission to know that right about here in Powell County, all of the high school students attend Drummond and there is a commonality there. If you need population that will work. Plan 100 is my preferred plan, but as you can see, there is more commonality between Drummond and Granite County and it might be more palatable to both Drummond and Powell County.

Mr. Marks: Is there still some time to make comments on these plans?

Commissioner Pretty On Top: Yes, our record for this region is open for three more weeks.

Mr. Marks: Is there a way that people who have interest in this could get more definitive maps and land data and sit down with people on your staff so that we have a hunch that we know what we are doing?

Commissioner Pretty On Top: We invite you to call on Ms. Fox directly or you can call any one of the Commissioners. Our date for the tentative approval of the Southwest Region is June 17, 2002.

There being no further testimony, the public hearing adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

CI2255 2156loxa.