

# Public Comments

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission  
Comments received by 5:00 p.m. on September 14, 2022.

Distributed electronically September 14, 2022

Date	Name	Email	City/State	Message
9/13/2022 18:59	Glenda Edgeworth	gedgeworth@aol.com	Stevenville MT	I like map four the best map one is a possibility but two and three are the worst. Keep districts in the same county not spread out all over in other county's.
				First - THANK YOU for your important work on behalf of Montanans! Below are my comments on the proposed redistricting maps for our Montana legislative districts. Of the four mandatory criteria for composing legislative districts the first, equal population, and the fourth, district must be contiguous, have been achieved in all four proposed maps. So that is good. The second mandatory criterium, the protection of minority voting rights, is achieved in proposed maps 2 and 3 but has been ignored by maps 1 and 4, which eliminate several majority Native American districts. This one is a "deal breaker," as they say. We simply must comply with the Voting Rights Act and do the right thing by protecting the rights of our minority Native American communities. This must be a part of whatever map is chosen in the end! The third mandatory criterium, having compact territory, seems to be achieved by all the maps pretty much equally, though variably. This is difficult to judge. They each have their share of what seem to be large districts, but some areas of our state have very low population densities, and the larger districts are a function of that low density. Next, for the goal criteria, I feel the most important is the first goal: that no plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party. Political parties tend to design district maps to benefit themselves, and an election is meaningless if it's not fair, so I believe not favoring one political party over another is arguably the most critical piece of this puzzle. Maps two and three come very close to meeting this goal while maps one and four ignore it entirely. Let's facilitate more competitive races for our state districts by creating maps similar to the balance in maps 2 and 3. In summary, all of the proposed maps pretty much meet the mandatory criteria for population equality, compactness of territory, and contiguousness. Maps two and three meet the mandatory criterium for protection of voting rights, while maps one and four do not. Maps two and three also meet the goal of not unduly favoring one political party, while maps one and four ignore that goal. For these reasons, I believe maps two and three clearly do a better job of meeting the mandatory and goal criteria for our legislative districts, and map three is perhaps marginally better in compactness of districts. I ask you with all my heart to choose a map that does not unduly favor one political party and fairly reflects and represents minorities and the political make-up of Montana voters. Please select map three, or something similar to it. Thank you for considering my comments and for your work on our behalf, Elizabeth Madden 408 Overbrook Drive Bozeman, 59715
9/13/2022 17:49	Elizabeth Madden	<a href="mailto:bethmadden64@gmail.com">bethmadden64@gmail.com</a>	Bozeman	
				As I look at the proposed maps for redistricting the state legislature I have a couple of primary concerns: -I'm extremely concerned about the partisanship occurring in our state (and country). I'd like to see district boundaries drawn in a way that as many districts as possible will be competitive, as opposed to overwhelmingly favoring one party or the other (which encourages extremists, on both the left and right). That will increase the need for candidates to avoid extreme positions as they will need votes from moderates and independents to win. We will be strongest if we can work together to find middle ground. -We should strive to have both the House and Senate reflect, as closely as possible, the voting tendencies of the State. Currently one party holds a greater percentage of the seats than they normally received in elections. -I strongly support maintaining boundaries that will give Native Americans a voice in the legislature. The two Republican proposed maps would likely reduce Native American representation. I'm opposed to that. I hope you can find some middle ground between the proposals submitted by the two parties. Bipartisanship and collaboration are critical if we are to be successful as a state.
9/13/2022 13:44	David Parsons	dparsons.mt@gmail.com	Florence, MT 59833	
				Please approve Map 2 or 3, as they would have the Legislature reflect Montana's population, both in terms of political views and ethnicity. We must have a Legislature that has a fair distribution of parties and ethnic groups, or the Legislature will lose its legitimacy. Please approve Map 2 or 3. Thank you!
9/13/2022 11:53	Sheri Sprigg	sksprigg@aol.com	Helena, MT	
				Respectfully, I would like to support maps 2 or 3. I am very concern about our state population being represented fairly. I am especially concerned about how our native peoples are represented on the reservations. Please do not continue with the other maps. Please support fair elections in Montana by working form maps 2 or 3. Thank you.
9/13/2022 11:08	Rhea Crelin	redwelsh28@gmail.com	Boulder, Montana	
				Respectfully, I would like to support maps 2 or 3. I am very concern about our state population being represented fairly. I am especially concerned about how our native peoples are represented on the reservations. Please do not continue with the other maps. Please support fair elections in Montana by working form maps 2 or 3. Thank you.
9/13/2022 11:05	Deborah A Gabse	dgabse@hotmail.com	Boulder, Montana	
				The Redistricting Committee must ensure that the districts reflect the actual partisan balance of MT and retain majority Native American districts. Maps 2 and 3 reflect these criteria.
9/13/2022 10:32	Mary Chronister	maryc47@bresnan.net	Helena, MT	
9/12/2022 20:57	william berthoud	wberthoud@msn.com	Roundup	Mr. Essman's map is the one

9/12/2022 20:08 Jacob Corcoran	jacob.helena@live.com	Helena, MT	My name is Jacob Corcoran. I would like to express preference for map 4 and if not 4, then map 1. It is clear that other maps attempt to gerrymander the districts in democrat favor. Instead of trying to win on policy, they are attempting to claim districts out of a sense of entitlement. They believe that they should have equality of outcome and that is just simply not American. As an indigenous man I find it insulting that the party that calls themselves the party for minorities believes they are entitled to more, for no other reason than because they want it. So again, I express my preference for map 4 to encourage both republicans and democrats to run their campaigns based on policy and values. If you cannot win on those, then you are entitled to nothing. Thank you for your consideration.
9/12/2022 18:08 Lana Claassen	claassen@itstriangle.com	Fort Benton, Montana	Chouteau County Clerk & Recorder and Board of Commissioners supports map HDP 4. The other maps slice & dice our election precincts and would cause a terrible nightmare. Not only is it extra work but it is additional expense having so many splits for ballots and coding for election machines. Areas that are being split on the other proposed maps have low population, so we do not see what is to gain by putting them in other house districts. They would make so little change in the numbers but cause major problems and expense changing up precincts for our elections.
9/12/2022 16:38 Martin A. Hamilton	hamovich@yahoo.com	Bozeman, MT 59715	I believe that our Montana democracy requires legislative district boundaries that are not created by gerrymandering. For that reason, I support Map 2 or Map 3. The Montana press reports that, if citizens continue to vote as in recent elections, then Maps 1 and 4 will result in a significantly greater proportion of Republican seats in the legislature than the proportion of Republicans among recent Montana voters; that is, Maps 1 & 4 promote gerrymandering. Maps 2 and 3 exhibit no gerrymandering; either map will result in the same proportionate split between Republicans and Democrats in the legislature as the state-wide vote split in recent Montana elections. I studied the four maps for their affect on me personally. I live in Bozeman, immediately north of Montana State University in a neighborhood that is more liberal than is Montana. Maps 1 and 4 slightly expand my neighborhood to form a geographical tiny legislative district. The proponents of Maps 1 and 4 justify that district because it is "compact." In fact, the district is an example of gerrymandering by "packing." If either of Maps 1 or 4 become law, my vote won't count for much because the outcome of such a packed district is predetermined by its boundary. Maps 2 and 3 merge my neighborhood with adjacent Bozeman communities where many of my friends and colleagues reside. Thus Maps 2 and 3 create a geographical larger district of people who share many economic and social concerns. The district is not packed and my vote will mean something. Please, don't condone gerrymandering — select either Map 2 or Map 3 for Montana.
9/12/2022 15:45 Chris Christensen	christtwo@gmail.com	BOZEMAN	Of 4 maps of proposed districts for state representatives only maps 2 and 3 allow all Montana voters to have an equal voice in elections for this office. Maps 1 and 4 create 70 majority republican and 30 majority democratic districts. This does not reflect Montanan's who vote 57% republican and 43 % democratic. Preventing each citizen from participating in a fair election is not OK. Maintenance of democracy requires fair elections. At this time of division, every effort should be made to encourage people to work together. Including diverse people from tribal, urban, suburban, and rural areas as much as possible in districts can help to build understanding. Thank You
9/12/2022 11:55 Ross Nelson	ross@gorgonzola.org	Helena	While both Republican and Democratic proposals seem fair on a per district basis, the Republican proposals are terribly unfair when viewed on a statewide basis. For example, in Essmann's proposal, Republicans would be favored to win 72 seats even though by population, they typically get only 57% of the vote statewide. Based on this, only the Miller and Lamson proposals should be considered. Miller's has a slight advantage by having more districts that are competitive, but beyond that, either seems more fair than Essman's or Stusek's.
9/12/2022 10:49 Duane Day	drday14@gmail.com	Lakeside, MT	Thanks for taking my comment. I believe that map 11 is the only map that fulfills all of the Commission's agreed-upon criteria. It creates a competitive Western district, avoiding unduly favoring a single party. It splits only a single county and does so without splitting towns or communities. It keeps federal reservations whole, and keeps both Gallatin and Lewis and Clark counties in the Western District, in alignment with their cultural and economic interests. Please confirm Map 11. thanks duane day
9/12/2022 9:19 Leighton A Dresch	leightoninmt@gtfalls.com	Great Falls	I wish to submit my preference for redistricting maps and they would be MAPS #1 OR #4. v/r Leighton Dresch
9/12/2022 8:31 Lisa Rosberg	lrosberg9@gmail.com	Livingston, MT	Madam Chair and members of the Redistricting Commission, I am writing to submit to you that based on the criteria your commission developed, you cannot support Maps #1 or #4. Map #2 for the State Senate Districts does meet all four of your fairness criteria as does Map #3 for the State House Districts. Maps #1 and #4 violate the voter rights act and the Montana constitution. They both fail on three of the four criteria that the commission developed. Maps #1 and #4 both fail on political fairness, competitiveness, and indigenous representation. Therefore, I support and the only choices available for you to support based on your four criteria are, Map #2 for State Senate Districts and Map #3 for State House Districts. I thank you for your time.

9/12/2022 8:29 Sarah Hall	Sch22499@gmail.com	Bozeman Montana	I am a resident of Bozeman, MT, and I am in favor of maps 2 and 3 and against maps 1 and 4. The maps put forth by Republicans create an unfair distribution of districts, and undermine tribal votes in this state. While maps 2 and 3 are less compact, they are functional and make sure that the tribes voices are heard.
9/11/2022 14:35 Michaela Hall	mahjmj97@gmail.com	Bozeman, Montana	I believe that maps 2 and 3 will provide the most fair and reasonable representation of our population's best interest. It will also ensure that Tribal populations will be equally represented. Maps 1 and 4 would undermine the voting abilities of Indigenous Montanans, and is not an accurate depiction of the political views of our state's general population.
9/11/2022 14:12 Rudolf Nelson	rudolfnelson7@gmail.com	Bozeman Montana	Maps 1 and 4 undermine the power of the tribal vote. Maps 2 and 3 seem most balanced and fair between the two main political parties.
9/11/2022 11:57 Philip Frandsen	frandsenphilip@yahoo.com	Missoula, MT	Perhaps I'm just a simpilton, but why redistrict at all? My guess is that it's about political jockeying to see if one party can get a majority of the people in a district to vote for me - and I don't like it. I think we can leave the districts with the boundaries they have and let the voters moving in and out determine who they want to vote for.
9/10/2022 17:38 william berthoud	wberthoud@msn.com	Roundup	No gerrymandering.
9/10/2022 13:11 Debbie Dent	ddent0116@yahoo.com	Meagher County, Wilsall, MT	After reading comments, looking at the 4 maps and watching the central district zoom meeting maps 2 and 3 look like they meet the most criteria set by the committee. I want to thank you for taking the time to work on this huge project. I can see the difficulty you face. Thank you for taking our comments. Sincerely, Debbie Dent
9/10/2022 8:16 Richard Edward Hickman	mthillbilly_2@outlook.com	Bozeman	Why would Democrats be allowed to break the law? They scream like they are being murdered at the slightest provocation or hint that they will not be allowed control. Hold them accountable and to their oath. We cannot allow their "above the law" approach to everything stand any longer. WE NEED TO FIGHT TIRELESSLY TO MAKE MONTANA MONTANA AGAIN! WE the REAL MONTANA NATIVES are tired of seeing our state being undermined and sold out to out of state interests, and out of state politicians who repeatedly sell out and try to brush aside OUR VALUES. STOP THE STEAL!
9/10/2022 7:25 Christopher Drewiske	Chris.drewiske@gmail.com	Belgrade, mt	I object to district maps 2 and 3. Those two maps are not even close to adhering to law MCA 5-1-115. Please avoid implementing district maps that go against our Montana laws. Thank you!
9/9/2022 23:06 Debra Morgan	hagunnd@yahoo.com	Hamilton, MT	Please consider map #4 for redistricting.
9/9/2022 17:42 Clarence Allensworth	popallens@yahoo.com	Belgrade MT	Compact legislative districts is what I want and we need
9/9/2022 16:35 Dominic Zumpank	dominiczumpanlivingston@gmail.com	Bozeman, MT	Gerrymandering, while a tool of all political parties is being used by republicans to eliminate Montanan voices. Keep things fair, and keep our voices heard.
9/9/2022 14:13 Marta Bertoglio	martabertoglio@yahoo.com	Montana City, MT	For Jefferson County, I like Map 1 of the submitted commission maps. Regardless of the map chosen, I think the following ideas should be at the forefront of your decision making: - It should based on "communities of interest" not based on political party percentages. Rural Montanans think more alike and they should be represented by someone who follows the majority of their concerns and values. People moved to the rural communities because of those values, schools, etc. Jefferson County has grown and the people in those rural communities deserve their own Legislative seat and should not be subservient to the voices in either cities of Butte or Helena. - Try to keep the Geographical boundaries as well. Thank you for your time.
9/9/2022 13:40 Vickie Peters	4lynn.vickie@gmail.com	Belgrade, MT	Good afternoon. I would like to voice my opinion with regards to the redistricting of maps 2 and 3 in Montana. I am a registered voter in the State of Montana. While I totally agree that Montana is certainly a great state that exceeds expectations, I do NOT believe that redistricting the boundaries for 2 and 3 is the answer as a tactic to gain more votes from either party. Actually it could decrease the number of republican seats and increase the democratic seats when typically honest voting is deployed. Let us keep and fight the good fight of faith and continue to keep Montana honest and friendly. I relocated from a state that practices gerrymandering as the norm. It was and still is a disaster. Corruption has seethed into and saturated that state which will remain nameless. I just want to focus on Montana, one of the few greatest states in the USA. Thank you.
9/9/2022 13:28 Christine Deveny	cmdeveny7@gmail.com	Helena	Dear Commissioners: I'm a third generation Montanan and haven't missed voting in an election since I turned 18. Voting is very important to me and I believe that having a voting system that ensures fair and full participation is essential to our democracy. As you make a key decision about redistricting Montana for future elections I ask you to put aside all political partisanship and do what is best for us citizens. This means basing your decision on reaching the goals of political fairness, competitiveness, population equity, and inclusivity for Native Americans. Maps #1 and #4 clearly both fail at this and should be immediately discarded. Maps #2 and #3 appear to achieve these goals and I believe should be the basis for your final decision. Thank you for your important work on this critical issue for Montanans.

Thank you commissioners for serving on this commission. The work you are doing stands as the one of the most important jobs in Montana. Thank you for taking time to listen to and read public input. We live in Park County on the northeastern edge of Livingston with the street in front of us the city limits. I turned in my request to testify at the September 9 zoom meeting too late to receive a link. Please do not grant a supermajority to one party as you are deciding on a map for redistricting Montana. Maps 1 and 4 will come close to doing just that. What will be the point in holding elections when the outcome will be obvious as soon as you adjourn? The move is afoot to take away freedoms and control the lives of Montanans. I have chosen to address one plan that will occur if the Republican party is permitted to control elections in Montana. Maps 1 and 4 will assure Montanans that we will lose our very fine constitution and many freedoms. You are meeting today because of the wording in the Constitution that says how redistricting will occur. Your actions on this commission could mean the end of one of the best methods for redistricting in the United States. The choices you make in this commission could be the death knell to our very fine Montana Constitution. In the last public zoom meeting for redistricting for congressional boundaries that I observed, I was disappointed to hear Commissioner Stusek state that "Park County does not matter". Don't voters expect that their votes matter and count in every Montana County? My family's interests and lives are closely tied to both Park and Gallatin counties. My husband and I personally own property in both Gallatin and Park Counties. We both earned master degrees in Bozeman. Our sons were born at the Bozeman Hospital. My husband and I do business in both counties. We have worked in both counties. We have relatives in Gallatin County. We seek health care in both counties and are in Gallatin County at least 3 times a week. As I have previously stated, my family came to Montana in about 1904. Park and Sweet Grass County have little of interest other than hunting and places to drive through to other destinations. The current paring of Park and Sweet Grass counties disenfranchises most Park County voters as rural voters consistently outvote Park County and choose the candidates who refuse to listen to any input. Park County should be pared with Gallatin County and not be split because most residents who live in Park or Gallatin county and shop, do business, go to school, work, and recreate in both counties. Please choose a map that does not separate communities of interest and reject maps that unfavorably favor one political party over another and destroy representative government. Do not disenfranchise Democrats and Native Americans with excuses that maps meet the requirements of the law. If you commissioners choose a map that favors one party over another, voters are disenfranchised. The voting rights act and the Constitution guaranteeing freedom are not being met. As you make adjustments to the maps please keep them close to those maps that were used as examples and received public comment. Geographical boundaries such as mountain ranges are insignificant in this age of travel. We no longer use horse and buggies. Montana is prepared for keeping roads open year round. Of the current maps under consideration, maps 2 and 3 are the maps that would allow voters to have a voice in preserving our way of life by allowing everyone to be heard. Please choose map 2 or 3 or one that is similar which will keep Park and Gallatin County together and allow a discourse in preserving our Constitution and determining Montana's future.

9/9/2022 13:14 Sue Beland csbeland@yahoo.com Livingston--Park County

To elect Montana legislature representatives and senators the new district maps must reflect community interests, economics and opinions. To divide up district areas into districts solely on the basis of compactness is to disenfranchise voters holding such similar interests, economic basis and opinions. The proposed Democratic maps, HDP 2 and HDP 3, are proportionally fair and are likely to elect a legislature that reflects Montana voters and the real communities within their boundaries. These maps can provide the opportunity for a legislature to represent the essential variety of interests and diversity of opinions with the noted communities. This type of legislature is essential for all Montanans. The map chosen must be fair to minorities and represent the political situation in Montana not the extreme gerrymandering as set out in HDP 1 and HDP 4. Please approve either HFP 2 or HDP 3 to ensure the district chosen is proportional to the share of voters. The selection of either of these maps would meet the commission's goal of having a map that does not unduly favor one political party.

9/9/2022 12:54 Michael J. Bayuk mjbayuk@gmail.com Helena, Momtana

Dear Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission: So important are fair and proportional maps for our Montana democracy. Two maps fit this description: HDP2 and HDP3. Proportional to the political split, Montanans would be equally represented by their legislature. That is the goal! Two maps are significantly gerrymandered: HDP1 and HDP4. The argument for "compactness" is a decoy. These maps would not give Montanans equal representation in our legislature. The goal is lost! Please support full democracy at this important time. Thank you.

9/9/2022 12:28 Diane W. Bayuk entremom3@yahoo.com Helena, MT

9/9/2022 12:14 Kiersten Iwai	kiersten@forwardmontana.org	Bozeman, Montana	<p>Note: Forward Montana testified during the public hearing on September 2nd. We wanted to supplement our testimony with written comments and additional information. Madame Chair and members of the Commission, My name is Kiersten Iwai and I am the Executive Director of Forward Montana, the largest youth civic engagement organization in the state. I am also a resident of Bozeman and love this community very very much. I am writing today to speak in support of a legislative map that is fair, legal, and representative of the ways our communities live, work, and vote. As you all know, Bozeman is the fastest-growing community in the state. Our city limits are constantly changing. People regularly commute into and out of Bozeman for work, school, and recreation, meaning that any map that attempts to divide Bozeman proper from its more rural outskirts would misrepresent the way our community functions. When districts are drawn to encompass more than one type of voter, candidates must work harder to understand the wants and needs of their constituents and find common ground. This leads to better candidates, regardless of party. Further, relying on the current city limits of Bozeman to determine districts will surely create a map that will be outdated as quickly as Bozeman grows. If Gallatin County's population continues to grow at its current rate, then by 2030, when the next Census takes place, our county's population will have grown by at least 30,000 people, most of whom will likely be concentrated in Bozeman. To draw a map that will represent our state as it is and as it will be is surely a daunting task for any Commission, and we appreciate the work you have done so far. Under maps 1 and 4, though, which draw the city of Bozeman into confined districts, our Representatives ten years from now will be saddled with representing far more people than their counterparts in the outlying districts— a population variation that will almost certainly surpass the maximum allowable deviation of 1% before a new legislative map is drawn. Maps 2 and 3, by creating districts that stretch from Bozeman to the surrounding communities, ensure that one district's population will not skyrocket while another's stagnates. Under maps 1 and 4, the Republican party is projected to win 71 out of 100 seats with only 57% of the vote. These maps, therefore, are in conflict with the "one person, one vote" principle that is essential to a functioning democracy. Maps 2 and 3, on the other hand, allow for accurate representation, with Republicans projected to win 57 seats with 57% of the vote. That just makes sense. Forward Montana is not aligned with any political party, but we do know that Montana voters should choose their representatives, not the other way around. For these reasons and more, Forward Montana supports commission maps 2 and 3, and asks that maps 1 and 4 as they are currently drawn be removed from consideration. Thank you for your time.</p>
9/9/2022 12:13 Amy Talcott	amyktalcott@gmail.com	Livingston, MT	<p>Dear Chair and Redistricting Commissioners, I an writing to express my support for district maps HDP-2 and HDP-3. These maps best represent how Montanans have historically voted and do not unfairly favor one party over another. Thank you for your efforts to maintain fair district maps for Montana that safeguard our democracy. Sincerely, Amy Talcott 814 W. Clark St. Livingston, MT 406.823.9855</p>
9/9/2022 11:22 Donna and James Onstott	uplandfarm1@gmail.com	Livingston, MT	<p>We live just north of Livingston in the Meredith Ranch subdivision. This area and the surrounding areas are essentially Livingston "suburbs". Our social, economic, and health care ties are almost exclusively with the City of Livingston. We get our mail at the Livingston Post Office. Under map proposal number 4, we would be included in a district where we have no social or economic commonalities with the majority of the population. This proposal ignores several of the Commission's mandatory criteria and stated goals for redistricting including: compact districts in terms of travel and transportation, minimizing division of towns and counties, and keeping communities of interest intact. More generally, we also object to proposal 4, as well as to proposal 1, because they reduce the power of the Native American vote, in violation of the mandatory criterion to protect minority voting rights. Based upon this and our judgement about the relationships within our local and county communities, we prefer proposal 3. Thank you for your consideration of these comments.</p>
9/9/2022 11:00 Teresa C Hall	art.terryhall@gmail.com	Bozeman, Montana	<p>I find it interesting that Democrats often voice concerns about disenfranchising voters when, by purposefully setting District boundaries that specifically benefit their voters, they are tenaciously disenfranchising rural voters. Maps #2 and #3 are drawn to take away the voices of rural voters by overpowering them with voters of Central Bozeman and MSU. These maps are violating the State Constitution by unduly favoring a political party by overruling the vote of rural, less dense populations with the density of Central Bozeman and MSU. In addition, these maps are not drawn compactly or contiguously, thereby violating the Montana Constitution. I'm one of those voters who will be disenfranchised if the Gerrymandering is allowed to pass. I strongly oppose maps #2 and #3.</p>
9/9/2022 10:09 Sally Stephenson	salgalstephenson@yahoo.com	Bozeman, MT	<p>The issue is not about winning and losing for Montanans. It is about having our votes count and having fair and equitable representation in our state. Please consider how unrepresentative the Republican proposals for redistricting are. I urge you to think of ALL of us when making your decision in this very important process. Thank you, Sally Stephenson</p>

<p>9/9/2022 8:31 K Johnson      longliveliberty77@att.net      Bozeman, MT</p>	<p>Hello. We urge you to approve the redistricting map which is legal and fair - the one that evenly distributes Democrat and Republican districts within the clear limits and boundaries of the law in our State Constitution: 6 Democrat and 6 Republican, and contiguous. We moved from a state where we felt our votes did not count due to such obvious and blatant gerrymandering of voting districts, as well as proven fraud. One reason we moved to Montana was to get out of a state where there was unlawful and extremely partisan activity regarding voting practices, including unfair and unequal redistricting in order to give favor to one party over another. This is wrong. We implore you to FOLLOW THE LAW in our state and approve only a redistricting map that follows those laws as well, giving no favor to one political party over another, draws the lines according to the law, not the maps that violate those laws. If the laws are not followed, then they have no meaning, and we are a state of lawlessness. Is this what Montana represents? Lawlessness in order to gain a desired outcome? We ask you to govern justly, lawfully, and in a way that represents all the people in our state, not any particular political party. Thank you.</p>
<p>9/9/2022 7:58 Jaysen Anderson      locke023@hotmail.com      Bozeman, Montana</p>	<p>I am writing to point out, what I hope would be obvious to a board dedicated to the redistricting maps, that maps #2 and #3 of Bozeman are far from "compact" but rather snake in and out in an obvious attempt to group rural farming voters, like myself, within the city limits. Not only does this unfairly dilute our vote within the community, but it always clearly ignores state law that redistricting of the map cannot take previous election results into consideration; or how else would one so cleverly weave such an elaborate web of districting lines. The results are far from compact and, as such, need to be rejected as a fair solution.</p>
<p>9/9/2022 7:42 Gayle Samuell Skees      gmskees@gmail.com      Columbia Falls</p>	<p>I think we need to ask: Why was redistricting set up in the first place? Was it to assure equal representation for the public in each district due to the ongoing movement of people within a state and an influx of people from other states? It makes sense that redistricting was indeed set up to assure the public was represented equally within the state. It also makes sense that the public needs to be more involved in these happenings if only to express their opinion when they see an attempt from one group to cheat and try obtain a larger number of representatives by gerrymandering, this is quite obvious when looking at their suggested redistricting maps. It is of my opinion, that any representative that cannot bring himself or herself to follow a just and righteous legal process for the greater good of the people, needs to be removed. You all know which maps are more equally portioned and follow the rules of redistricting! Do not sell out the people of the great state of Montana for your own personal gains, do what is right!</p>

## Sherley, Laura

---

**From:** MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 3:07 PM  
**To:** Districting  
**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Shelley Freese

From: Shelley Freese shelleyfreese@gmail.com  
Residence: Miles City

Message:

Dear Redistricting Commission, in light of the fact that Montana's current partisan breakdown reflects a 57%R vs. a 43%D ratio, please consider adopting either proposed map 2 or 3. Both the 2 and 3 maps preserve this partisan ratio, as well as helping ensure that the native and minority voices in our state will be represented. In contrast, Maps 1 and 4 are heavily gerrymandered, resulting in the dilution of both voice and representation for Native Americans and other minority groups. Maps 1 and 4 also create a 40% advantage for R's, rather than the actual 14% advantage R's currently enjoy. Please consider adopting Map 2 or Map 3, and in the process, maintain all Montanans' ability to participate in truly representational government. Thank you.

--

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



## Sherley, Laura

---

**From:** MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 14, 2022 10:33 AM  
**To:** Districting  
**Subject:** MDAC Comment from: Jan Neish

From: Jan Neish neishacademy@hotmail.com  
Residence: Pocatello

Message:

I write for Island Park News, covering West Yellowstone Town Council issues. Combining the recreation areas around the Park and the Big Sky area in maps 2 and 3 could possibly help these recreational areas, imo. Idaho did similar with Fremont county's district now including the Salmon area.

In the age of digital streaming, the longer travel distances involved in maps 2 and 3 are less a consideration.

Representatives can still attend town councils on zoom, as I do weekly from Pocatello.

It would be nice to no longer be the forgotten southern child in the Bozeman area mindset and have legislators that can focus on recreational area needs. I suggest map 2 that includes Lone Mountain.

--

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