

Plan	Opinion	Comment	Name	Email	City	State
HDP1-1	Dislike	All 4 of the map options create very large Eastern Districts with long travel distances for Legislators and representatives. The focus was obviously toward benefitting the Western portion of the State and disadvantaging the Eastern Third of the people in this State!!!	Gary W. Parry	parrygary7@gmail.com	Colstrip	MT
HDP1-1	Dislike		Gary W. Parry	parrygary7@gmail.com	Colstrip	MT
CP2	Dislike	I think we all can see this is a very politically motivated map that is trying to give one party a leg up over the other. This isn't a true Democracy when we have to manipulate boundries to attempt a power grab. Dislike!	Talitha Mitchell	talitha.m.mitchell@gmail.com	Three Forks	Montana
HDP3-1	Like	This map is good. It meets three of the mandatory criteria: creating districts that are relatively equal in population, districts that are contiguous, and districts that protect minority voting rights, because it protects the rights of Montana's Native American voters. In terms of the fourth criterion, compactness, this map is no worse than the other three, which all have many districts with non-compact shapes. Importantly, this map meets one of the essential districting goals, which is that "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party." It would likely preserve the status quo from recent elections, which is 57 House seats for Republicans versus 43 seats for Democrats.	Will Swearingen	wds59hp@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
HDP2-1	Like	This map is good. It meets three of the mandatory criteria: creating districts that are relatively equal in population, districts that are contiguous, and districts that protect minority voting rights, because it protects the rights of Montana's Native American voters. In terms of the fourth criterion, compactness, this map is no worse than the other three, which all have many districts with non-compact shapes. Importantly, this map meets one of the essential districting goals, which is that "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party." It would likely preserve the status quo from recent elections, which is 57 House seats for Republicans versus 43 seats for Democrats.	Will Swearingen	wds59hp@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT
HDP2-1	Dislike	This map is good. It meets three of the mandatory criteria: creating districts that are relatively equal in population, districts that are contiguous, and districts that protect minority voting rights, because it protects the rights of Montana's Native American voters. In terms of the fourth criterion, compactness, this map is no worse than the other three, which all have many districts with non-compact shapes. Importantly, this map meets one of the essential districting goals, which is that "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party." It would likely preserve the status quo from recent elections, which is 57 House seats for Republicans versus 43 seats for Democrats.	Will Swearingen	wds59hp@gmail.com	Bozeman	MT

This map should be rejected. While it meets two of the mandatory criteria, creating districts that are relatively equal in population and contiguous, it fails in terms of the third criterion, protecting minority voting rights, because it would significantly disadvantage Montana's Native American voters. According to a recent op-ed by 10 Montana Native-American legislators, this map would make it very difficult for Montana's Native Americans to elect Native American legislators. Finally, in terms of the fourth criterion, compactness, this map, like the other three, is not particularly good. All four have many districts with non-compact shapes. What is clear is that this map seems to be designed to maximize the Republican advantage. According to the Montana State News Bureau analysis, this map would likely give Republicans 70 or more House seats and lock in a supermajority for the next decade. This runs counter to one of the key districting goals, which is that "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party."

HDP 4-1 Dislike

Will Swearingen wds59hp@gmail.com Bozeman MT

While this map meets two of the mandatory criteria, creating districts that are relatively equal in population and contiguous, it fails in terms of the third criterion, protecting minority voting rights, because it would significantly disadvantage Montana's Native American voters. According to a recent op-ed by 10 Montana Native-American legislators, this map would make it very difficult for Montana's Native Americans to elect Native American legislators. Finally, in terms of the fourth criterion, compactness, this map, like the other three, is not particularly good. All four have many districts with non-compact shapes. What is clear is that this map seems to be designed to maximize the Republican advantage. According to the Montana State News Bureau analysis, this map would likely give Republicans 70 or more House seats and lock in a supermajority for the next decade. This runs counter to one of the key districting goals, which is that "No plan may be drawn to unduly favor a political party."

HDP1-1 Dislike

Will Swearingen wds59hp@gmail.com Bozeman MT

This map (3) does not satisfy the MANDATORY criteria, bullet point 3, set forth by the commission and required by the state constitution that districts must be compact. It also does not satisfy any of the three goals, by favoring a political party, and dividing the city and communities of Bozeman. This creates 7 districts that extend out from central Bozeman like spokes on a wheel, which will require a single person to represent urban, suburban and rural constituents with their single vote. This is impossible, and will surely alienate constituents in all of these districts. (not to mention the other sprawling districts in outside of Bozeman on this map)

HDP3-1 Dislike

Sunil Bhat sunilbhatdo@protonmail.com Bozeman MT

Sherley, Laura

From: MDAC <contact@mtredistricting.gov>
Sent: Thursday, September 1, 2022 4:30 PM
To: Districting
Subject: [EXTERNAL] MDAC Comment from: Will Swearingen

From: Will Swearingen wds59hp@gmail.com
Residence: Bozeman, MT 59715

Message:

I'd like to delete one of my sets of comments on Map 2. I meant to Like it but entered it as Dislike the first time. How do I correct that? Thank you.

--

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

HDP2-1	Dislike	This map (2) does not satisfy the MANDATORY criteria, bullet point 3, set forth by the commission and required by the state constitution that districts must be compact. It also does not satisfy any of the three goals, by favoring a political party, and dividing the city and communities of Bozeman. This creates are 7 districts that extend out from central Bozeman like spokes on a wheel, which will require a single person to represent urban, suburban and rural constituents with their single vote. This is impossible, and will surely alienate constituents in all of these districts. (not to mention the other sprawling districts in outside of Bozeman on this map)	Sunil Bhat	sunilbhatdo@protonmail.com	Bozeman	MT
HDP 4-1	Like	This is the only map that follows the standards laid out in the Montana Constitution and thus is the only map that can be considered. It is also the only map that is drawn up fairly and accurately based on community like-mindedness.	Leah DeLange	sr71blackbird@tutanota.com	Bozeman	MT
HDP 4-1	Like	Map 4 satisfies all the requirements. Map 4 makes sense for the people of Montana.	Jolene Crum	jolenecrum@gmail.com	Belgrade	MT
HDP 4-1	Like	This Option covers the entire county which makes more sense than breaking it up into pieces and not representing the full population of Mineral County.	Sarah B Damron	sruth255@yahoo.com	Superior	MT
HDP2-1	Dislike	Maps 2 and 3 clearly indicate gerrymandering. I live in Big Sky, for example, and to have our district bundled with Red Lodge is ridiculous. Two mountain ranges separate us!	Laura Kusto	laura.jelinek@gmail.com	Big Sky	MT