


BROADWATER COUNTY
Board of County Commissioners

Office 406-266-9203, Fax 406-266-9276

515 BROADWAY
TOWNSEND, MONTANA 59644

COMMISSIONERS:

Gail M. Vennes - Chairman
Elaine Graveley - District 2
Laura Obert - District 1



November 15, 2012

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission
P.O. Box 201706
Helena, MT 59620-1706

Subject: Broadwater County Senate Boundary Re-Districting Proposal

Dear Commissioners:

The Broadwater County Board of County Commissioners, on behalf of the Broadwater County citizens, respectfully request that you consider pairing proposed House District 75 with proposed House District 74 to create one Senate district.

The proposed House District 75 is Jefferson County and proposed House District 74 consists of Broadwater County and a portion of Lewis & Clark County.

The citizens of these two districts share many similarities and therefore, we would request that you would consider joining these two House Districts, 74 and 75 to create one Senate district.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of Gail M. Vennes in cursive.

Gail M. Vennes, Chairman

Handwritten signature of Laura Obert in cursive.

Laura Obert

Handwritten signature of Elaine Graveley in cursive.

Elaine Graveley

Douglas Coffin
Representative-Elect for House District 93
Montana House of Representatives

November 15, 2012

From: Rep.-Elect Douglas Coffin HD 93



To: Montana Districting & Apportionment Commission

Re: Written Testimony to the Commission for Proposed 2013 Plan

The map of proposed redistricting for the Montana House of Representatives (below) effectively splits the University of Montana campus into three districts: HD 99 and HD 82 on the northern boundary and HD 82 and HD 93 on the southern boundary. The southern boundary formed by South Avenue would split UM's South Campus from the Main campus and splits the UM student resident housing in half. Overall, the redistricting plan divides "an area of interest" the University of Montana campus into three parts and dilutes the resident student voting block by placing one half in an urban district (93) and another in a rural district (82).

In order to maintain one district for the University of Montana, I respectfully request that:


1. The Commission could move the HD 82-93 boundary south to Pattee Canyon Rd. Alternatively, the commission could reassign the entire campus (Main and South) back into HD 93 and retain Higgins Avenue as the western boundary to preserve the heritage of the University Neighborhood that has stood for a century. Indeed, many homes in the surrounding neighborhood and buildings on the campus have been designated historical landmarks based on the relationship between the University district and the University of Montana Campus (including south campus since the 1930s). That is an area bordered by the Clark Fork River on the north, Higgins Avenue on the west, Pattee Canyon Rd. on the south and Mount Sentinel on the east. I ask that you respect this rich history.
2. The North boundary of HD 82 with HD 99 also splits off a north part of the campus that is used for administration and is destined for future development as a contiguous part of the campus. That would be 5th and 6th Streets east of Arthur Ave. and up to the Clark Fork River. That line should be redrawn as the river and Arthur Ave. That would retain the main, contiguous UM campus in one district.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

4730 Mark Ct., Missoula, MT 59812
CP: 406-544-5342, MTDougC@Gmail.com

Douglas Coffin
Representative-Elect for House District 93
Montana House of Representatives

99



82



CITY OF BILLINGS

THOMAS W. HANEL, MAYOR

P.O. BOX 1178
BILLINGS, MONTANA 59103
(406) 657-8296
FAX (406) 657-8390

November 13, 2012

Commissioner Jim Regnier, Presiding Officer
Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission
PO Box 201706
Helena, Montana 59620-1706

Dear Chairman Regnier and Commission Members:

The City of Billings is submitting comments on the Commission's tentative House District plan and your upcoming consideration of Senate pairings. This correspondence was approved by the Billings City Council.

The tentative House District plan is not what we hoped to see for Billings and Yellowstone County. As you know, we submitted a plan that was endorsed by several private and public agencies, including Yellowstone County, Billings and Laurel. It focused on the county's and this city's genuine communities of interest, which were explained in correspondence that you received in December, 2011 and in testimony at no less than three public hearings.


The Senate District plan is almost as important to us as the House District plan. You may remember that it is Senate District 22, which stretches from south Billings to Miles City that catalyzed our participation in the districting process. We hope that you will avoid again creating that type of Senate District. This is especially important to us because we believe, based on your tentative House District plan, that all but House Districts 38 and 46 may be combined to create seven (7) Senate Districts that are wholly within the borders of Yellowstone County. Districts 38 and 46 are almost entirely rural in nature and combining them would make a large Senate District, but no larger than many of the other prospective eastern Montana districts. There is also a small portion of the Crow Reservation in Yellowstone County that is assigned to District 42 and we understand that it will probably be paired with District 41 to create a Senate District. We have examined the House Districts in the remainder of eastern Montana and believe that the Yellowstone County pairings coordinate well with surrounding counties, so there should be no barriers to granting our request. House District pairing could be as follows:

47 + 53	48 + 54
49 + 51	50 + 52
55 + 56	57 + 60
61 + 62	

There may be other preferred pairings, but we request that they result in seven (7) Senate Districts within Yellowstone County.

Please feel free to contact me if you have questions about the City's request.

Sincerely,


Thomas W. Hanel, Mayor

Billings Pride
City-wide

Montana State Senate

Senator Taylor Brown
Senate District 22
775 Squaw Creek Rd.
Huntley, MT 59037

November 15, 2012

TO: Members of the Montana Districting and Apportionment Committee

FR: Senator Taylor Brown, SD 22

RE: Public Comment on Senate Boundary

I would like to draw your attention to a proposed change in the boundary line for my House District that will have a definite negative impact on our local community known as the "Huntley Project", which comprises the towns of Huntley, Worden, Ballantine and Pompey's Pillar.


The physical location of my residence is about two miles south and 3 miles east of the town of Huntley. Currently it is House District 43, the majority of which would now become House District 38. The new line between HD 42 and HD 38 has been proposed to be moved just far enough north, so that my home would now be included in with a completely different area, the new HD42, which is predominantly Big Horn County, the city of Hardin, and the Crow Reservation.

It seems very suspicious to me that the line has been moved just far enough to cause me to reside just outside of the District that I have represented for four years. As a hold-over Senator in 2014, this would mean that I would then be forced live outside of the Senate District that I will represent in 2015-16.

More significantly, if I chose to run for the House, the line has been moved so that I would now have to run in Hardin and the Crow Reservation, in a completely different district. Because this move only affects less than 100 Voters, it smacks to me of yet another example of gerrymandering, that is designed to cause another current Republican legislator to be forced to run in a new District that is drawn to be predominantly Democrat. This trend seems to occur over and over in Districts across the state, and is very disturbing.

This change defies your original goal to maintain "Communities of Interest" and to respect existing "jurisdictional" boundaries. Instead you are proposing to split off part of our compact local community, and move it over with Big Horn County. Our Mailings Addresses are all served by the Huntley Post Office. Our children all attend the Huntley Project School District. We are not the Crow Reservation, we are the Huntley Project, and we don't like being manipulated for a political agenda.

This is a fairly simple fix. Please re-examine this seemingly insignificant, but highly politically-motivated move, and do not allow this kind of controversy and unfairness to continue.



Senator Taylor Brown
Huntley - SD22



Jefferson County Commission

118 W. Centennial

Post Office Box H

Boulder, Montana 59632-0249

(406) 225-4025 Voice / (406) 225-4148 Fax

Leonard Wortman, Chair Dave Kirsch, Commissioner Tom Lythgoe,
Commissioner

November 15, 2012

Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission
P.O. Box 201706
Helena, MT. 59620-1706

Jim Regnier, Presiding Officer
Jon Bennion, Commissioner
Joe Lamson, Commissioner
Pat Smith, Commissioner
Linda Vaughey, Commissioner

Dear Commissioners:

On behalf of the residents of Jefferson County, we request that H.D.75, which comprises all of Jefferson County North of Interstate Highway 90 and the Town of Whitehall be combined with H.D.74 which is made up of all of Broadwater County and a small portion of Lewis and Clark County, to create a Senate District.

We make our request after hosting three separate meetings in Jefferson County specifically to discuss Senate Redistricting, in Boulder on October 23rd, in Clancy on October 24th, and in Whitehall on October 25th. Most comments were in favor of combining with either Madison or Broadwater Counties. One comment suggested Powell County. During the discussions most everyone agreed that since Madison and Beaverhead Counties have been together so long they should probably stay together for this cycle. It was felt that Jefferson and Broadwater Counties would fit together very well because they are both rural in nature yet both have an area of the County that has seen rapid growth. H.D.75 is slightly under the ideal size for a House District and H.D.74 is slightly over the ideal size. The result would be a Senate District that is within 17 people of being the ideal size for a Senate District.

Two adamant and unanimous opinions from those who spoke at our public meetings were that Jefferson County should not be combined with either Lewis and Clark or Silver Bow Counties.

We would also request that H.D.72, which is comprised of that portion of Jefferson County that lies South of Interstate Highway 90 except for the Town of Whitehall, a small portion of Silver Bow County, and all of Madison County, be combined with H.D.73, which is comprised of all of Beaverhead County and a small portion of Silver Bow County to form a Senate District.

Thank you for your hard work and your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

Leonard Wortman,
Chair

Tomas Lythgoe,
Commissioner


Dave Kirsch,
Commissioner

COM/ch
CC: Reading File

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Leonard Stemp 
ADDRESS: 928 Howard Ave
Billings, MT. 59101
EMAIL: Leonard.stemp@yahoo.com

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: TOM ELOREDOE

ADDRESS: 3115 HARROW DR

BILLINGS, MT 59102

EMAIL: TOME@FISMT.COM

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Kym Logan

ADDRESS:

2940 Prairie Dr.

Blgs. Mt. 59101

EMAIL:

jtllogan@myusacomm.net

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Ed Melcher

ADDRESS:

2331 Lewis Ave

Billings MT 59102

EMAIL:

BigEdMelcher@AOL.com

10/19/12

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Michelle Parroccia
ADDRESS: 617 Wheeler Crk Rd
Big Timber MT 59011
EMAIL: bella@itstriangle.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Great Falls and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Sandra L. LaFalle

ADDRESS: 2380 York Rd, Helena, MT 59602

EMAIL: _____

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Chris Gickler

ADDRESS:

575 Judith Lane Billings MT 59105

EMAIL:

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Don Blanton Jr

ADDRESS:

10041 Hwy 212 Joliet MT 59041

EMAIL:

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

EMAIL:

Joanne G. Blyden

6 Gray Lane

Joliet MT 59041

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston – a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Donald D. Blyton

ADDRESS: 6 Gray Lane

Joliet MT 59041

EMAIL: ~~DBlyton~~ DBlyton@AOL.com

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a **large amount of land**. **Districts shouldn't** be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.


NAME: Arnold W & Loretta A. Dell
ADDRESS: P.O. Box 574
Absarokee, Mt 59001
EMAIL: ldell@emont.net

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingstone should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Martin Stanley



ADDRESS: 723 1st Street SE

Park City, MT 59063

EMAIL: mksfeeds@yahoo.com

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Kathryn Stanley



ADDRESS: 723 1st Street S.E.

Park City, MT 59063

EMAIL: judgekes@yahoo.com

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingstone should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Dana Dribnenki

ADDRESS: Box 1467 (514 E 2nd Ave.)
Big Timber, MT 59011

EMAIL: _____

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Karen Dribnenki

ADDRESS: Box 1467 (514 E. 2nd Ave.)

Big Timber, MT 59011

EMAIL: _____

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingstone should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Rolland Karlin Rolland W. Karlin

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1113 716 Stock
Big Timber, MT 59011

EMAIL: rollandk@hotmail.com

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

ADDRESS:

EMAIL:

Denise Jones

P.O. Box 1553

Big Lake MT 59011

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingston, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Theresa Smith

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1559

Big Timber, MT 59011

EMAIL: _____

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Horinda Brewer

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 1525

Big Timber, MT 59011

EMAIL: thebrewers@mtintouch.net

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingstone should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Donald D Brewer

ADDRESS:

Po Box 1525 Big Timber MT 59011

EMAIL:

thebrewers@mtin touch.net

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME:

Jocuse Diablenki

ADDRESS:

*Box 269
Big Timber, Mt. 59011*

EMAIL:

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.

NAME: Gene Dinkov

ADDRESS: Box 269

Big Lake, MT 59011

EMAIL: _____

Dear Chairman Regnier,

As I review the map for eastern and central Montana, there appears to be only one common sense direction to pair certain House districts as Senate Districts:

1. House districts 37 & 39 – House district 37 (very rural Eastern Montana) is a very large area, probably the largest House district. Combining it with House district 39 (Miles City) makes sense for three reasons. First, Miles City is a trade center for House district 37. All of the people in these rural areas go to Miles City for shopping, entertainment, and for big events. Second, adding Miles City to House District 37 adds the necessary population for a Senate district without adding a large amount of land. Districts shouldn't be too difficult for any one person to travel or campaign in. Finally, this configuration is already what people in this area have grown accustomed to since it is very similar to the current district. Voters in this area should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
2. House districts 38 & 46 – These two rural districts belong together for a couple of reasons. They both have coal-centered economies (Bull Mountain mine in Roundup and Colstrip mine in Rosebud). They both include rural portions of Yellowstone, and folks from that county have expressed a desire to have fewer, not more, multi-county Senate and House districts that use portions of Yellowstone. Fourteen districts would remain in Yellowstone – an even number that would ensure all remaining pairings stay within the county. It also would make for a very compact eastern-central Montana district.
3. House districts 43 & 40 – These two central Montana districts should be combined for a Senate district. They both use portions of Fergus County, which would unite the county into one. There has historically been a purely central Montana district such as this, which is a community of interest based on agriculture. Voters here should have an opportunity to elect someone in 2014.
4. House districts 33 & 34 – The Hi-Line should be kept intact by combining House districts 33 & 34. This is larger than the present district, but the Hi-Line did lose almost a whole House seat. The historical and cultural ties along this long stretch of land make for a community of interest.
5. House districts 35 & 36 – These two districts sit at the heart of the present oil boom in Montana, and they are presently combined for a Senate district in the current map. Putting these two districts together for a Senate district will make for a very compact, navigable seat for whoever is elected in November of 2012.
6. House districts 58 & 45, 44 & 59 – Red Lodge and Carbon County are currently paired with Stillwater, a combination that seems to work and make sense for its residents. Stillwater and Park Counties are also currently tied to Livingstone, a small regional hub for this area that combines all of Park Counties together. Livingston should not be combined with a Bozeman district. These four districts, as two Senate districts, keep intact the Yellowstone River Valley.



NAME: Connie Dempster

ADDRESS: PO Box 591

Park City, MT 59063

EMAIL: connie@assoc-mgt.com

Tentative Commission Plan (as adopted 8/17)



Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME:

Betty Jane Pucher

ADDRESS:

P.O. Box 443

East Helena, MT 59635

EMAIL:

bettikoop@bresnan

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: ERMINIA Kirschman

ADDRESS: 1255 Angus RD

Helena, MT. 59602

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: _____

Robney L. Kershner

ADDRESS: _____

1255 Angus Rd

Helena MT 59602

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Ralph R. White

ADDRESS: 3670 Old Hwy, 12 E,

East Helena port, 59635

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Mary Ann Hayes

ADDRESS: PO Box 112

E. Helena MT 59635

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: DAN FANCHER

ADDRESS: 121 W. RIGGS

EAST HELENA, MT

EMAIL: DAFANCHER@MSN.COM

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Cindy Bibson

ADDRESS: PO Box 93 (2910 Sunrise Rd)
Fort Harrison MT 59602

EMAIL: cindyvey@hotmail.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME:

Eric Croft

ADDRESS:

3289 Recheville Rd Helena MT 59602

EMAIL:

ecroft@bresnan.net

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: B. G. Stumberg IV

ADDRESS: 3205 Wheatland Dr

Helena, MT. 59602

EMAIL: stumberg@msn.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Jaqueline D. Trude

ADDRESS: 62 Martinez Gulch Rd

MT - City, MT. 59634

EMAIL: ajaxh20@aol.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: NORMA R. HERRON

ADDRESS: 2360 BUCKBOARD DRIVE

E. HELENA MT 59635

EMAIL: NEHERRON@Q.COM

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: CHAD F. HERRON

ADDRESS: 2360 BUCK BOARD

EAST HELENA - 59635

EMAIL: NCHERRONI @ g. com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Judith M Veltkamp

ADDRESS: 1426 Big Horn Rd

Helena MT 59602

EMAIL: hjveltkamp@yahoo.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: HAROLD J Veltkamp

ADDRESS: 1426 Big Horn Rd

Helena, MT 59602

EMAIL: hjvcltkamp@yahoo.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: CLUCK PASKE

ADDRESS: 6165 TIMBER TRAIL DR

Helena MT 59602

EMAIL: chpaske@earthlink.net

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Marlin & SUSAN SANDER

ADDRESS: 835 Vallejo Road

Helena MT 59602-6549

EMAIL: _____

Marlin & Susan Sander

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME:

ROBERT LEACH

ADDRESS:

3043 Canyon Ferry Road

East Helena, MT 59635

EMAIL:

rleach@peoplepc.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Jodi Anderson

ADDRESS: 1198 Cobblestone Rd

Helena, MT 59602

EMAIL: cfrbcsecretary@bresnan.net

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Arlene Greydanus GREYDANUS

ADDRESS: 4290 Cougar, Helena 59602

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Arlyn Greydanus Arlyn Greydanus

ADDRESS: 4240 Cougar Dr. / P.O. 6992

Helena, MT 59602 - 59604

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Donald F Anderson

ADDRESS: 2675 Matys CT
Helena, MT 59602

EMAIL: don and linda @ bresnan.net

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Linda K. Andersen

ADDRESS: 2675 Matyas Court
Helena MD 59602

EMAIL: matyas2675@gmail.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Robert R. Buckmaster

ADDRESS: P.O. Box 357 407 E Main
East Helena MT
59635

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Rebecca A. Buckmaster

ADDRESS: PO Box 357 (407 E. Main Street)

East Helena, MT 59635-0357

EMAIL: _____

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME:

Dannette Warren

ADDRESS:

8473 Green Meadow Dr.

Helena, MT 59602

EMAIL:

dannie1234@msn.com

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME:

ARTHUR R. CLINCH

ADDRESS:

2445 YORK ROAD

HELENA, MT 59602

EMAIL:

MTCOAL@ADL.COM

Mr. Chairman:

After review of the so-called tentative map for the state House, it's clear that two areas come straight from the Democrat's map without input from local communities - Great Falls and Helena. These areas also have unjustifiable deviations and districts that don't comply with compactness standards. They have nothing to do with communities of interest. Substantial changes must happen before Senate pairings can be discussed.

First, the Great Falls tentative map comes directly from the Democrats map, even though there was substantial support for the map that was produced locally. The local map paid attention to neighborhoods and traditional communities within the city and county. Why are you only paying attention to Democratic ideas? The Democrat map includes a district within the city of Helena and Malmstrom Air Force Base that is not compact.

Second, the Helena tentative map is also largely from the Democrats map, despite dozens of people coming from the Helena Valley saying they deserved their own representative. From Lincoln Road to the Helena city limits, the Valley is hacked up between five different districts. Why does the voice of Valley voters mean less than those of the city? In addition, many of these districts are not compact, which goes against your criteria.

Go back to the drawing board in these two areas. Several dozen people came to your hearings and discussed communities of interest and other redistricting criteria. It doesn't appear their input is being incorporated.

Democrats got away with gerrymandering the state last time because they didn't listen to the people. Don't let them do that again. Fix the House seats before you consider the Senate seats.

NAME: Barbara & Jon Rush

ADDRESS: 720 Holte

Helena, Mt. 59601

EMAIL: _____

Barbara & Jon Rush

*Gerry Mandering is not O.K. Perhaps
you can't win elections fairly?*