

CP	Opinion	Comment	Name	Email	City	State
		<p>There's great worry about the reservations being distributed equally and having fair representation. What about college towns and students? Should they ALL be stereo-typically thrown in with the side that many ASSUME speaks to them? We wouldn't want reservations all in ONE district, that wouldn't be "fair" so why are many not just OK -- but EXPECT -- a way huge liberal District 1 with ALL of the college towns?</p> <p>One could say that this map may "favor" conservatives for no other reason than it doesn't favor the Left, but it gives both Districts a border with Canada, both have similar geography, population, both could have a college culture (to a point), and bother districts would need to fairly represent their respective reservations. This isn't drawn all funny to OBVIOUSLY include some counties and not others, it's up-down, simple, looks clean, represents the state.</p>	Lin Dsay	Lindsay3979@yahoo.com	Billings	MT
CP1	Dislike	Splitting Gallatin and Cascade county seems problematic. Also, I would think that A majority of Bozemenâ€™s population would not feel they are adequately represented being thrown in with eastern Montana.	Sabine Mellmann-Brown	s.mellmannbrown@gmail.com	Missoula	MT
CP1	Dislike	This map clearly favors one party and is a case study in gerrymandering. I do not support this map.	Amy Sowers	amysowers@mac.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1	Like	After reviewing all the proposed maps, this one is taking into account future population growth of the entire State and providing for a balanced approach to representation of the citizens of Montana. Additionally, the split of population is equal between all rural and city regions. I strongly support this redistricting plan.	Michael Klevitsky	michael.klevitsky@protonmail.com	Bozeman	Montana
CP1	Dislike	This map splits both Gallatin and Cascade Counties into two separate districts, which is not consistent with the interests of the people in those two counties. It does not create any competitive districts.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1	Dislike	While this map is population equal, it is NOT competitive. This map does not allow for the representation of all of Montana's diverse populations. Nor does it account for rising populations in particular areas. This map does not meet the 8 objectives the commission unanimously adopted. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP1	Dislike	This map does not create a competitive race. I also object to splitting counties..	Robyn Morrison	Robynmorrison1@me.com	Helena	MT
CP1	Like	Like this one, seems fair and meets all requirements	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT

CP1 Dislike	I do not support this map because it proposes splitting Gallatin County (2nd largest county in the state) in two as well as separating Cascade County. Also, it is not competitive, unduly favoring one political party, which leaves a huge number of citizens feeling as if their vote does not count.	Katherine Vargas	Kvargas59@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1 Like	this map would be ok. It contains a good balance of various peoples	b rian fraker/ anita brawner	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP1 Dislike	I do not support this map. It splits counties which makes absolutely no sense. Map lines should be drawn based on competitiveness, and this map does not meet that criteria.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP1 Opinion	<p>One important consideration in drawing districts is the rate of population growth or decline in the various districts. In particular, Flathead and Gallatin Counties should be in different districts. If not, one district will increase in population more rapidly than the other, and representation will be unequal for the next 10 years. At which time, we'll have to do this whole contentious process again.</p> <p>This map includes a small but rapidly growing portion of Gallatin County in the district with Flathead, promoting population inequity.</p> <p>I am unfamiliar with the ramifications of dividing Cascade County, but this seems unwise on its face.</p>	Dean Center	garbage4me@ymail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1 Dislike	Apparently whoever drew and accepted this map wanted one party to rule both districts. That is what Gerrymandering means: setting boundaries to help one party win and weaken the other party. The goal is to stop competition and automatically elect whoever pays the fee for the office.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1 Dislike	This map is an example of results-oriented winner take all gerrymandering by the Republicans. This map will not give the people of Montana the healthy, competitive system we deserve. Butchering Gallatin County, by far the fastest growing county in the state, is nonsense.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP1 Dislike	This map does not meet the 8 objectives the commission unanimously adopted. It is not fair, with one heavily leaning republican district and another leaning republican to a lesser degree. Splits towns and counties unnecessarily.	Nancy Loeza	nancyloeza@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1 Dislike	This map clearly favors one political party. If these district lines are chosen, the republican party will have two super districts and will have no incentive to consider the opinions of anyone who isn't an ultra-conservative (as is the case now in the legislature). I strongly oppose this district configuration.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP1 Dislike	Dumb. Why split counties? The only argument for this one it that it looks almost like a straight line	Justina Pape	n4g41n4@live.com	Belgrade	MT
CP1 Like	This is the best representation for our state.	Rick C Burrell	rickbslc@bresnan.net	Columbia Falls	MT

CP1 Like	Good split for fastest growing counties.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP1 Like	This map seems to provide the best overall balance of all the proposed options. It seems balanced between political parties and represented population in each district. Both proposed districts include a balance of urban and rural areas, which appropriately provides a voice for rural Montana in the state's affairs. It does this while recognizing the uniqueness of both the mountain and prairie portions of our state.	Hoby Rash	hobyrash@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP1 Like	This map best represents the varied interest of Western and Eastern Montana.	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP1 Like	I agree this map is the most fair for both sides and would be the most balanced for all,	Victoria L Wirth	vwirth1972@gmail.com	Victor	Mt.
CP1 Dislike	I am opposed to this map. It is not a good idea to split Gallatin County, one of the state's most populated counties. Gallatin County residents throughout the Gallatin Valley share similar interests, and many people from Manhattan commute to work in Bozeman, but this map separates them into 2 different districts. This map also unfairly advantages one political party. We need to have a map with competitive districts so politicians have an incentive to compete for the votes of all Montanans, not just their base.	Michelle Vered	vered352@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP1 Like	This map most closely meets constitutional criteria	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP2 Dislike	This map does NOT equitably represent tribal populations. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP2 Like	This proposal does not divide any of the counties and has fairly equal division of the population. It is both contiguous and compact.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP2 Dislike	One districts doesn't have border and too unequal!	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT
CP2 Like	Keeping the counties intact makes a lot of sense administratively and this is the only map that successfully does so. It's competitive, compact and contiguous.	Saxon Holbrook	saxon.holbrook@gmail.com	Clinton	MT
CP2 Dislike	This map would result in a lawsuit by native Americans because they have almost no voice in 1 of the districts. I would file the lawsuit myself.	Anita Brawner/ brian fraker	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP2 Like	I support this map. It is population equal, and it is competitive.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP2 Dislike	CP2 diminishes tribal participation by splitting Flathead Reservation & isolating the bulk of it from other tribal interests. CP2 does not share the northern border interests.	donna maughlin	donnajmontana15@gmail.com	plains	Select
CP2 Like	Map 2 is competitive and does not favor one party. Reservations are in a block.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP2 Like	This is one of the best maps. It is highly competitive, population equal, contiguous, splits the 4 fastest growing counties between the 2 districts, and has only one split, the southern boundary of the Flathead Reservation. This map is a good one.	Linda G Semones	lindasemones@hotmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT

CP2	Like	This map works. It is compact and competitive. Competitive elections are what we need in our fragile democracy.	Mark H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	Montana
CP2	Like	I could live with this map. One district is heavily republican and the other race will be highly competitive without giving either party an advantage. It is the only map that doesn't split counties. I also gives the urban and the rural voter a voice at the table.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP2	Like	I could live with this map. One district is heavily republican and the other race will be highly competitive without giving either party an advantage. It is the only map that doesn't split counties. I also gives the urban and the rural voter a voice at the table.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP2	Like	Definitely better than the first map, but still not ideal.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP2	Like	better than the first one in that the counties are intact... it isn't as pretty looking but meets the requirements.	Justina Pape	n4g41n4@live.com	Belgrade	MT
CP2	Dislike	Northern border should have split representation. Also, not divided appropriately for proper representation by both political parties.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP2	Dislike	Nope!	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP2	Dislike	Clearly a Gerrymandered map which does not meet constitutional requirement of compact	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP2	Dislike	Clearly a Gerrymandered map which does not meet constitutional requirement of compact	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP3	Dislike	Clearly worse than Map 1. Gallatin county is split relatively close to town. We should be able to do better than that.	Sabine Mellmann-Brown	s.mellmannbrown@gmail.com	Missoula	MT
CP3	Dislike	This map is clearly gerrymandered to favor the GOP. I do not support this map.	Amy Sowers	amysowers@mac.com	Bozeman	MT
CP3	Dislike	This map is a sick joke.	Amy Sowers	amysowers@mac.com	Bozeman	MT
CP3	Dislike	This map splits Gallatin County and Cascade County. The people in these counties have shared interests and should not be split into separate districts. It has an uneven division of the population and is not likely to create competitive districts.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP3	Dislike	This map is NOT population equal and it is NOT competitive. This map does not meet the 8 objectives the commission unanimously adopted. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT

		This map runs right through the middle of towns like Gallatin Gateway and Cascade. It also splits Gallatin County and Cascade County. Cascade County is one of the most competitive counties in Montana and deserves to be kept whole. Gallatin County is the fastest growing and second largest county in Montana and deserves to be the anchor for its own Western Montana district like Yellowstone County is the anchor for the Eastern Montana district.			
CP3	Dislike	Please don't choose this map.	Jacob Foster	jacob.foster1848@gmail.com	Missoula MT
CP3	Like	Like this one, seems fair and meets all requirements	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell MT
CP3	Like	This map would be ok. It does have a reasonable balance.	brian fraker/ anita brawner	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston mt
CP3	Dislike	I do not support this map. It is not competitive.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish Montana
		As with Map 1 and Map 7, this map places a portion of Gallatin County in the district with Flathead County, resulting in an inescapable population discrepancy between the two districts. There may have been a semblance of balance in 2020, but already the rapid growth in these counties have rendered the districts proposed in this map unequal in population. It will only grown worse and in 10 years, we will have to go through this contentious process all over again. The portion of Gallatin Valley included in District 2 with Flathead may seem small but it is rapidly growing and inequity will be inevitable.			
CP3	Dislike		Dean Center	garbage4me@ymail.com	Bozeman MT
		Map 3 has over 1,000 differences in population which is probably unconstitutional. This map cuts Democratic voting into separate districts in order to weaken the party in both districts.			
CP3	Dislike		Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman MT
		To use a term favored by our former President, this map would create two RIGGED congressional districts for the GOP.			
CP3	Dislike		Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade MT
		This map unduly favors the republican political party in both districts (fivethirtyeight.com). Two split counties, split towns, and district populations are not balanced.			
CP3	Dislike		Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman MT
		How could this map even be considered fair? It would clearly create 2 districts favoring one political party, again!			
CP3	Dislike		Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron MT
		Fair representation of Democrat and Republican parties and splits fastest growing population areas relatively well.			
CP3	Like		Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls MT
CP3	Like	This map could work fine	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula MT
		It's a relatively straight line, no gerrymandering. It doesn't favor a political party. No one has to drive through one district to get to another. Population deviation is insignificant.			
CP3	Like		Maryrose Beasley	mrosebeasley@gmail.com	Roundup MT
		Although not nearly as compact as CP1, this map does a good job of not gerrymandering and keeps the East and West intact.			
CP3	Like		Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton MT
		Absolutely no reason we should split Whitefish from Kalispell and its clear most from Flathead County agree, I can't support the horseshoe maps.			
CP4	Dislike		James Deere	jamesdeere96@yahoo.com	hardin mt

CP4 Opinion	Ouch. What is the logic behind this map except for political reasons? Splitting Kalispell from Whitefish, Glacier and part of the Flathead appears rather artificial. The only way to truly represent the differing opinions and cultures of this state is to have a district at large with representatives selected according to party proportions. Lets not gerrymander to achieve that goal.	Sabine Mellmann-Brown	s.mellmannbrown@gmail.com	Missoula	MT
CP4 Like	I like this map as it has equal populations, it's competitive, and represents tribes better.	Hank McClain	hank.mcclain@gmail.com	Clinton	MT
CP4 Like	This map is population equal and it is competitive. This means that there is a fair chance of either party winning a Congressional district. Since this map contains a competitive district, it encourages candidates to show up in the communities they're running to represent and that competitive district contains at least 2 Tribal Nations. This map is a fair and equitable district map. I strongly support.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP4 Opinion	This map has the advantage of including at least two tribal nations in each district. The population is evenly divided. While not my first choice, this may be a compromise choice.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP4 Dislike	Doesn't make sense to dip the east side district into Flathead.	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT
CP4 Dislike	this map has a tail just like a dog. It is not compact and contiguous.	anita brawner/ brian fraker	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP4 Dislike	Disenfranchises thousands of voters. Unpatriotic in my book.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP4 Opinion	This map is not highly competitive. It divides Flathead County. It is not a good choice.	Linda G Semones	lindasemones@hotmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT
CP4 Opinion	Although biased toward the Republicans, this map might form the basis of a reasonable compromise with adjustments Park County belongs in the Western district.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP4 Dislike	Unduly favors the republican political party in both districts. The new district would not be a strongly republican as the original district, but the new district should not belong to any political party as much as possible.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP4 Like	This one looks okay in that it would create 2 districts that are equal in population and are competitive.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP4 Dislike	Biased boundary areas will create large problems for fair voting amongst political parties. Do not like this one at all.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP4 Dislike	More gerrymandering	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP4 Dislike	Gerrymandering. Maps shouldn't need to resort to this.	Maryrose Beasley	mrosebeasley@gmail.com	Roundup	MT
CP4 Dislike	Clearly a gerrymandered map. Who in their right mind would pluck Kalispell (ONLY) out of the West and put it in the east.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT

CP5 Dislike	I think we need to stop thinking in the old east vs west way and more in the way that with the exception of Flathead county, the vast majority of population growth is along the I-90 corridor, cities like Billings (+12%) and Bozeman (+33%) have a completely different set of needs than the slow growing or stagnant cities of the north like Great Falls which only saw a 3% gain. And I see no reason our 3 largest cities, Billings, Missoula, and Bozeman should not be together, as they represent a majority of the economic growth as well as sharing many key interests with their urbanization, schools, healthcare, housing, etc. I strongly urge to keep these 3 cities together.	James Deere	jamesdeere96@yahoo.com	hardin	mt
CP5 Like	I think this is the best map for several reasons: counties are almost 100% intact, the districts are compact and contiguous, there is a balance of reservations on each district for equal representation, and each district is within 1% of equal population.	Gail Susan Asbury	asburyfamily5@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP5 Dislike	This map splits Gallatin County, which works against the shared interests of the individuals in this fast growing county. The population is very uneven in the two districts given the overall population of the state. It does not create competitive districts.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP5 Dislike	This map is NOT population equal and it is NOT competitive. This map does not meet the 8 objectives the commission unanimously adopted. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP5 Opinion	I do not believe in Redistricting a state with barely 1M people and 147,040 sq miles. I believe both representatives should serve "At Large" Mark Allred perhaps you have forgotten that we have had Democratic representation in the not too recent past. Max Baucus, , Pat Williams, and Mike Mansfield to name a few. Of course all of these are before your time. And Montana has had Democratic Governors prior to current Trump lap dog.	Laura Michele Nugent	ndrfns@gmail.com	Columbia Falls	MT
CP5 Like	this map is our preferred map because it contains a good balance and the districts are fairly contiguous. Not bad!	anita brawner/ brian fraker	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP5 Dislike	This map is not competitive. Two counties are split in this map which makes no sense. Also, it is not population equal.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP5 Dislike	CP5 should be disqualified for required population difference.	donna maughlin	donnajmontana15@gmail.com	plains	Select
CP5 Dislike	The population difference between the districts is around 7,500 which is the highest gap of all the maps. Map 5 is deliberately drawn to strengthen one party over the other and is undemocratic.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP5 Dislike	The creation of two Republican districts, what this map would create, it unhealthy for our fragile democracy.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT

CP5	Dislike	Both districts in this map unduly favor the republic party. It does not represent balanced populations. It does a poor job of keeping communities intact.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP5	Opinion	I'm torn... this one does seem to take native population into account but the standard deviation is huge... will growth cover that?	Justina Pape	n4g41n4@live.com	Belgrade	MT
CP5	Dislike	Again, this map would create 2 districts favoring one political party. No, thanks!	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP5	Like	Keeps communities of interest intact and allows for fair representation in fastest growing areas.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP5	Dislike	As a resident of Havre, this map is my least favorite. Splitting a County is difficult to avoid, but splitting a community must be avoided at all cost. In this example a resident of North Havre would be part of the eastern district and someone literally across the highway, part of the western district. This also has an incredibly high deviation and does not comport well to the legal standards required by Montana law. I would reject this proposal.	Andrew R. Brekke	arbrekke@bresnan.net	Havre	MT
CP5	Dislike	Nope!	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP5	Opinion	While this map does not meet the compaction test like CP1 and CP3, it does try to make the reservation influence more even for each side.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP5	Like	#5 is the one I recommend because it seems most like the one we used to have. It keeps communities of similar interest intact and doesn't split reservations. It's a fair map, split between democrats and republican numbers.	Dianne Hansen	diannedave2@gmail.com	Eureka	Montana
CP6	Dislike	I can't in good faith approve of maps with these massive horseshoe shapes, not to mention, this looks like a very clear case of gerrymandering. Also I believe keeping Park and Gallatin Counties together is very important.	James Deere	jamesdeere96@yahoo.com	hardin	mt
CP6	Like	This map offers an even split with the regards to population and creates at least one competitive district. It does not split Gallatin County. The only drawback is the Native American tribes are predominately in a single district.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP6	Dislike	This map does NOT equitably represent tribal populations. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP6	Dislike	One districts doesn't have border and too unequal! One district way bigger and doesn't make sense.	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT
CP6	Like	I like this map because it keeps counties together, includes a Native American reservation, and includes voices from both parties, Democratic and Republican. If the goal is to include a balanced representation of urban/rural, rich/poor, blue/red, I think this map is the best example presented. I do not support the splitting of Gallatin County or any other county for that matter. I do not support smothering a blue city into a largely red area (whereby voters don't feel as if they have any voice in national politics). I do not support including Native American reservations in one district only.	Katherine Vargas	Kvargas59@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT

	This map contains no balance with native Americans and would result again in a lawsuit!				
CP6 Dislike	This map is clearly gerrymandering! Without question!	brian fraker/ anita brawner	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP6 Like	I favor this map because it is competitive.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP6 Dislike	Sanders & Mineral are already large counties with small populations but CP6 isolates them by tossing them in with the Eastern district. We would never see a candidate or representative over here again.	donna maughlin	donnajmontana15@gmail.com	plains	Select
CP6 Dislike	Separates too many counties and separates counties that have mutual interest between the counties. Disenfranchises thousands of voters just like the 2011 census which infringes on freedom.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP6 Like	This is one of the better maps. It is population equal, highly competitive and one of the least split up maps. I hope you will chose this map or map 2.	Linda G Semones	lindasemones@hotmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT
CP6 Like	This map strikes a fair balance between the interests and communities making up our state. It could form the basis of a reasonable compromise.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP6 Like	I could live with this map because the new district does not unduly favor a political party. It gives an urban and a rural voter a voice.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP6 Like	This is an okay map. Still not perfect, but at least we might be able to have fairly equal representation.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP6 Dislike	Nope!	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP6 Dislike	This map wanders all over the place.	Maryrose Beasley	mrosebeasley@gmail.com	Roundup	MT
CP6 Dislike	Clearly another gerrymandered map. What do Sanders and Mineral County have to do with the East. This does not meet compact nor contiguous requirements.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP6 Dislike	I believe this type of division is not fair for the representative. They'll have to drive through another district to meet their people and talk with them.	Dianne Hansen	diannedave2@gmail.com	Eureka	Montana
CP6 Dislike	Friendlymonstermander. Not so horny or mean looking but still wanting to gobble gobble. A joke.	David A. Skinner	daskinner@centurytel.net	Kalispell	MT
CP7 Dislike	Not a fan, and seeing as almost no comments from Gallatin county are positive, I'd say moving forward with this map would be a slap in the face to the people of Bozeman.	James Deere	jamesdeere96@yahoo.com	hardin	mt
CP7 Like	It works because it provides both districts with the Canadian border -- this is important!	Lin Dsay	Lindsay3979@yahoo.com	Billings	MT

	Map #7 arbitrarily splits up Gallatin County and needlessly separates Bozeman from other western Montana population centers like Missoula, Butte and Helena. (Conversely, Billings and Great Falls are naturally "Eastern Montana" cities). A fairer modification of this map would move Broadwater County to the Eastern District; also move the northern portion of Lewis & Clark County, and the northern portion of Gallatin County to the East. Then most of Bozeman (south of I-90) could be moved to the West which seems like its natural affinity.	Eric Gustaf Edlund	eric.g.edlund@gmail.com	Missoula	Montana
CP7 Opinion					
	Maps 1, 3, 5 and 7 all add a large part if not all of Gallatin County to the eastern Montana district to dilute the Democratic vote. The idea of east/west divisions seems sound, but these four maps do not provide for competitive districts which are needed to make our representatives answerable to Montana voters.	Howard Heahlke	SLHQUILTER@HOTMAIL.COM	Bozeman	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	This map splits Gallatin County, which is a fast growing county with people who have shared interests. It does not create any competitive Congressional districts. I cannot support this proposal.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	While this map is "population equal," it is NOT competitive. This map does not allow for the representation of all of Montana's diverse populations. This map does not meet the 8 objectives the commission unanimously adopted. I strongly oppose.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	This map could possibly result in a lawsuit Because of lack of balance.	Brian fraker/ anita brawner	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP7 Opinion					
	I do not favor this map because it is not competitive.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP7 Dislike					
	This map is probably already out of compliance with the equal population requirement. It includes a rapidly growing part of Gallatin County in the district with Flathead County, so that District 1 will have an increasingly larger population than district 2. If this map were chosen, we would have to go through this entire contentious process again in 10 years. No map should be selected that puts Flathead and Gallatin Counties in the same district.	Dean Center	garbage4me@ymail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	Map 7 puts one party in control of both districts. Map 7 is an old fashioned idea for districting and is not in tune with what is happening in Montana in the 21st Century. Denying Montanans the right to vote is unpatriotic and blatant election tampering.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	his map is an example of results-oriented winner take all gerrymandering by the Republicans. This map will not give the people of Montana the healthy, competitive system we deserve.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	This and map 3 are the most unfair. They are designed to create two districts that both strongly favor the republican party.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP7 Dislike					
	Don't split Gallatin County.	DAVID G BALL	dgball8@gmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT
CP7 Dislike					

CP7 Dislike	This is probably the worst map yet. Once again, the Republican party would have 2 districts and representation would be less than fair.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP7 Like	Keeps communities of interest intact and allows for fair representation of fastest growing population areas.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP7 Like	Probably the best map. It only divides Gallatin County, and keeps a natural geographical east/west split. As an aside, it seems that most criticisms of the compact east/west maps (1,3,7) are that they are NOT gerrymandered to give Democrats at least one possible district.	Michael Alan Bennett	pelican@bresnan.net	Missoula	MT
CP7 Like	This map could work just fine for a balance.	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP7 Like	While not as compact as others, this map meets the contiguous the best and follows the historic and geographic continental divide well.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP7 Like	I like the fact that both districts touch Canada.	Dianne Hansen	diannedave2@gmail.com	Eureka	Montana
CP8 Opinion	<p>Most of Montana's growth is along the i-90 Corridor and i believe keeping those cities under the same district is very important which this map came close to achieving, however, I don't like that Billings is split, this makes no sense apart from a POP standpoint, to a lesser extent, the same goes for Missoula. I'm also no fan of the "horseshoe bend" that wraps around to include Hamilton. I tinkered with variations of this map and have 3 that I feel keep the I-90 communities together whilst being more compact.</p> <p>https://districtr.org/plan/66331 https://districtr.org/plan/66330 https://districtr.org/plan/37397</p>	James Deere	jamesdeere96@yahoo.com	hardin	mt
CP8 Dislike	No good reason to cut counties in half. Also, the Left manages to keep most of Montana's blue counties in its grasp in District 1. That isn't real fair -- representation-wise -- to the growing conservative population. Sure, sure, everyone expresses grave concern for the reservations, the virtue signaling reads loud and clear, but it's not all about the reservations. Besides, they'll be played, divided, included, and excluded to the needs of the elite Left. Just look at the maps.	Lin Dsay	Lindsay3979@yahoo.com	Billings	MT
CP8 Opinion	While I appreciate the originality of this map including the attempt to have Tribal representation in each district, cutting through two major cities seems like a poor idea. In Billings and in Missoula your district will depend on wich suburb you happen to live in.	Sabine Mellmann-Brown	s.mellmannbrown@gmail.com	Missoula	MT
CP8 Like	I support this map. This is competitive and is supported by tribal communities.	Amy Sowers	amysowers@mac.com	Bozeman	MT
CP8 Like	This map equalizes the population and contains at least two Tribal Nations in each district. This map is competitive and keeps Gallatin County in a single district.	Anne Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT

CP8 Like	This map is population equal and it is competitive. This means that there is a fair chance of either party winning a Congressional district. Since this map contains a competitive district, it encourages candidates to show up in the communities they're running to represent and that competitive district contains at least 2 Tribal Nations. This map is a fair and equitable district map. I strongly support.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	Montana
CP8 Dislike	I don't approve of splitting up counties. Plus this even looks like it was gerrymandered. One districts doesn't have border and too unequal! One district way bigger and doesn't make sense.	Robyn Morrison	coevals_slather.05@icloud.com	Helena	Montana
CP8 Dislike	This is an acceptable map to allow for broad representation of Montana. I'd like to hear from the counties regarding the effects on election administration.	Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT
CP8 Like	This map while fairly well balanced, is nowhere contiguous or compact! It gets the no nod!	Saxon L Holbrook	saxon.holbrook@gmail.com	Clinton	MT
CP8 Dislike	This map is competitive. I like that the tribes support it. I favor this one.	anita brawner/ brian fraker	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP8 Like	Although this map is not as compact, it is the best option for Tribal communities, and creates a competitive district.	Mary Alexine	mkalexine@gmail.com	Whitefish	Montana
CP8 Like	This map reflects some original thinking. It's the only one that attempts North-South districts and therefore deserves extra consideration. On the Pro side, is that it separates the most rapidly growing communities in the state in a way that should slow the development of population inequality. On the Con side, District 2 is intolerably configured and not 'compact'. Additionally, it puts half the ranchers in each district and half the loggers in each district and half the tree huggers in each district, which would make it harder for an elected representative to actually represent the concerns of their constituency. I suggest some effort be made to reduce the irregularity and non-compactness of District 2, in hopes of producing a better map.	elizabeth a sheafor	bsheafor@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP8 Opinion		Dean Center	garbage4me@ymail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP8 Like	As a 4th generation Montanan, I support the right of everyone to be heard at elections and that means all votes count. Map 8 best represents the goals of the Commission and the intent of the Constitution. It does not favor one party over another. Both districts will be represented by both parties. Choosing Map 8 reflects the Montana way. The population is even with 1 person difference. The tribal reservations are intact. The growth communities are evenly represented in both districts.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT

CP8 Like	This map represents some outside of the box thinking that makes a lot of sense. It would be highly competitive, possibly in both districts, but certainly in the West. It also most fairly apportions the Native American vote between the two districts. I also like the idea of both representatives having being held accountable to the voters of Eastern and Western Montana. By far the best alternative.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP8 Like	This map is the map that meets the commissions goals. It does not unduly favor a political party. Each district has voters from tribal nations. Districts have balanced populations.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP8 Like	This map is probably the best of the alternatives. It is competitive, includes several but not all of the Indian Nations, and is the best map for Lake County and the Flathead Reservation. This forces both parties to engage with Native voters by including the Flathead, Crow, and Northern Cheyenne reservations in the district that affects me. It is compact, comprises a logical geographic unit, and evenly splits Montana's population in terms of numbers. Representation of varies ethic groups is relatively even. This is my preferred alternative.	Charles W Wheeler	sagebrushgoldens@earthlink.net	Ronan	MT
CP8 Like	I think this is the best map I've seen so far, as it allows for equal representation.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP8 Like	This one looks ugly but it has the best numbers... there is a sizable native population here and this map allows for them to have a better voice in both districts.	Justina Pape	n4g41n4@live.com	Belgrade	MT

-I am against Maps 1,3,5, and 7 proposed by republican advocates. These maps will split in straight lines an east - west delineation. They are not competitive; they split towns and counties in all proposals; they do not provide fair representation for the Tribal Reservations as a block; and most are not population equitable, at least one (#3), is not even constitutional.

- Maps 2,4, and 6- Democratic proposals: follow mostly a traditional east - west delineation; do not split towns and counties; are largely competitive; and all population equitable.

-Map 8 (my preference) is a North - South delineation: very, very competitive; allows 3 Reservations to be a block on the north side and 2 in the south insuring better representation; it does split Billings (which local Billings residents have advocated), this makes the north-south split population equitable; it has Missoula and Bozeman campuses in a block on the south side. The #8 map line split has the best diversity and makes all candidates work for the vote. Under the Federal Legislative rules, it does not matter where a Candidate lives, they can compete across the State. And remember the Voting Rights Act establishes that Tribes and Minority groups are protected to have their established communities protected and not split up. The Tribes have come out advocating for at least 2 Reservations to be in a District.

In summary I am here today to advocate for Proposal 8:

—This is the only map that proposes a North-South plan that creates a competitive district that follows the Redistricting Commission criteria. The competitive North-South option ensures both representatives will have to represent diverse voices across Montana.

—This district would help to ease the perceived divide between Eastern and Western Montana, with both communities, especially the city of Billings, having Representation in both districts.

—This plan would also maximize the power of the Native vote, with 3 reservations being in a competitive district where both parties have to compete for every vote. This would force both parties to compete for Native votes and establish a responsive government to government

CP8 Like	relationship with our tribal nations.	Gordon Ash	kmprash@centurylink.net	Kalispell	MT
CP8 Dislike	Both seats should share representation of northern border. Does not provide compact, nor contiguous representation. Not a good boundary at all.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP8 Dislike	gerrymandering at its finest	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP8 Dislike	This map is ridiculous. Its boundaries wander all over. Representatives should not have to drive through another district to reach their constituents.	Maryrose Beasley	mrosebeasley@gmail.com	Roundup	MT

CP8 Like	I support this map as my first choice. It has the support of our tribal communities, it keeps Gallatin & Park counties together which have similar interests, and it has low population deviation. It also preserves the goal of competitiveness by creating a district that either Democrats or Republicans could win, which means that politicians will have to pay more attention to what the voters want, not sit back in a safe district where they are never challenged.	Michelle Vered	vered352@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP8 Dislike	Clearly this map is a joke or a red herring. To put Ravalli County and Ekalaka together is crazy. Fatguyinalazyboymander. This is beyond nuts, no geographic logic at all, same intent of getting Kalispell out of western Montana, same tawdry thinking.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP8 Dislike	My comment for this Map was incorrectly registered as Like.Itg should be Dislike: Map #8: While this has a low deviation of 1, the shape of this district division is neither compact nor contiguous. The western district (1) looks like an upside down handgun. The western district would more properly be described as the southern district here and would have no direct access to the profitable Canadian border, or to Idaho, while the Eastern District (2) would have access to the Dakotas, Wyoming and Idaho.	David A. Skinner	daskinner@centurytel.net	Kalispell	MT
CP8 Dislike	This map creates fairly compact districts and, for the most part, leave county lines intact. But why does it place Great Falls with the southwest District but separates most of Missoula County from the Flathead?	Marc L Sabin	mlsabin@gmail.com	Corvallis	MT
CP9 Opinion	I dislike this map because it's makers are saying to the reservations: "you can't sit with us." This map shows an easy row to hoe for the Left, in the left, with Bozeman, Missoula, and Dear Lodge powerful in numbers in District I. Why leave out the reservations? Oh, because they can't sit with the college towns and the elite,but maybe their numbers will help to overwhelm District 2 and tip the vote at some point in the future? This is maddening. Whoever is doing this, remember you're OUR REPRESENTATION, you work for us, you are NOT GOD!	Sabine Mellmann-Brown	s.mellmannbrown@gmail.com	Missoula	MT
CP9 Dislike	This map splits Missoula County and the people in that county have shared interests. There are very few Tribal Nations in district 1 of this map. I oppose this proposal.	Lin Dsay	Lindsay3979@yahoo.com	Billings	MT
CP9 Dislike	This map does NOT equitably represent tribal populations. I strongly oppose.	Anne L Christensen	annelchristensen@gmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT
CP9 Dislike	One districts doesn't have border and too unequal! One district way bigger and doesn't make sense.	Ashley Moon	admoondesign@gmail.com	Helena	MT
CP9 Dislike		Michael Blend	michaelblend09@gmail.com	Kalispell	MT

CP9 Like	I like this map because it minimizes splitting counties up and competitively includes people with both red and blue perspectives. What I don't like about it is the following: All the communities of interest (Native American Reservations) would be largely included into the eastern half of the state only. For this reason, I favor map number 6. Although #6 does separate a few counties, it does so only to keep the reservation intact.	Katherine Vargas	Kvargas59@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP9 Like	Given the size of Montana, the geographic distances between reservations, and wide swath of the State lacking population centers, there are enormous difficulties in creating a map which checks all the boxes. On criticism by detractors of this map which simply does not make sense is the "District 2 is too big." Well, it's smaller than the current district, so there really ought not be a hardship. That said, none of the maps check all of the boxes. Some are worse than others. This one really seems to be the most equitable.	Gregory Bonilla	boneyard993@gmail.com	Helena	MONTANA
CP9 Dislike	This map is again not fair to the native Americans and would result in another lawsuit! We definitely could file. Also clear gerrymandering.	anita brawner/ brian fraker	12chickadee31@gmail.com	livingston	mt
CP9 Opinion	My initial response to this map was that it was too contrived to be reasonable. However, after looking over the other maps, this one now seems quite reasonable. First, District 2 is geographically huge compared with District 1, but really, with the population of Eastern Montana declining in many counties, any Eastern District is inescapably going to be large. Second, this map places the most rapidly growing areas of the state in the 2 districts so that the population in each will remain reasonably equal over time. Third, this map places people with similar concerns in each district, so that the elected representatives can actually represent the ranchers and energy workers in District 2, and the loggers and skiers in District 1. Indigenous peoples would predominantly be in District 2, and should therefore have the ear of their representative, as well.	Dean Center	garbage4me@ymail.com	Bozeman	MT
CP9 Like	Map 9 is less competitive. It puts the tribal nations in one district. It keeps communities of interest together. Map 9 is not my first choice as it will not give everyone's vote an equal chance or require candidates to earn votes.	Mark T Beland	mtbeland@yahoo.com	Bozeman	MT
CP9 Opinion	This map is not the worst. But it divides Missoula County to keep the Flathead Reservation whole. And, it is not highly competitive. Maps 2 and 6 are better.	Linda G Semones	lindasemones@hotmail.com	BOZEMAN	MT
CP9 Like	This one works. To address the imbalance of Native American representation, I would extend the new district to the East, covering Carbon and Big Horn Counties.	Marcus H Smith	marcushsmith@yahoo.com	Belgrade	MT
CP9 Dislike	Both districts favor the republican party. The new district to a lesser degree, but still.	Nancy Metcalf Loeza	nancyloeza@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT

CP9 Like	This is another acceptable map that allows for equal representation. I don't like that all reservations are in one district, though.	Marita McDaniel	mcdaniel@blackfoot.net	Heron	MT
CP9 Dislike	This map does NOT allow for split representation on the northern border, which is necessary. Also does NOT allow compact and contiguous qualities. This map is rather ridiculous.	Rae Grulkowski	rae@carpsinc.com	Great Falls	MT
CP9 Like	This map appears to meet the majority of the required criteria. District 1 is compact and contiguous and with a state as large as Montana and a population as unevenly distributed, the large size of District 2 is probably unavoidable. There are flaws (all Indian Nations are in District 2 as is the entire Canadian Border) but I believe this is the best option.	Charles W Wheeler	sagebrushgoldens@earthlink.net	Ronan	MT
CP9 Dislike	nope!	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP9 Dislike	Nope!	Keith Baer	KeithB@Montana.com	Missoula	MT
CP9 Dislike	There is nothing neat or clean about this map. Wanders everywhere. I can't take it as a serious offer to such an important decision. The creator should look up the definition of gerrymandering.	Maryrose Beasley	mrosebeasley@gmail.com	Roundup	MT
CP9 Dislike	Another clearly gerrymandered map which fails the compact and contiguous requirements. Sanders and Mineral should not be in the East. Kalispell is also a Western area and city.	Theron Nelson	terryndar@hotmail.com	Hamilton	MT
CP9 Dislike	I call this the Cleansingmander. Pardon me the irony of noting that the party which pretends to support tribes has come up with a district map that doesn't have a single square inch of reservation lands and probably the smallest number of Indian voters of any of the "competitive" districts. How can this be serious?	David A. Skinner	daskinner@centurytel.net	Kalispell	MT