



Montana Districting and Apportionment Commission

Commission members:

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

Joe Lamson
612 Touchstone Circle
Helena, MT 59601

Jack D. Rehberg
2922 Glenwood Lane
Billings, MT 59102

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

Dean Jellison
116 Crestline Ave.
Kalispell, MT 59901

Staff:

Susan Byorth Fox
Research Analyst
John MacMaster
Attorney

MINUTES

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

State Capitol
Helena MT
June 17, 2002

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF PRESENT

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

VISITORS

Visitors' list (ATTACHMENT #1)
Agenda (ATTACHMENT #2)

COMMITTEE ACTION

- Approved the minutes from the May 21, 2002, public hearing in Bozeman as amended
- Approved the minutes from the May 21, 2002, public hearing in Butte
- Approved the minutes from the May 22, 2002, public hearing in Helena
- Approved Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Wheatland, Golden Valley, Musselshell, Park, Gallatin, Broadwater, Lewis and Clark, Jefferson, Madison, Beaverhead, Butte/Silver Bow, Anaconda/Deer Lodge, Powell, and Granite Counties as the counties under consideration in the Southwest Region Plans
- Failed to adopt Plan 100 for the Southwest Region

- Adopted amendments to Plan 300 to address the suggestions made by Gallatin County residents
- Adopted amendments to Plan 300 to address the suggestions made by Silver Bow County residents
- Tentatively adopted Plan 300 as amended for the Southwest Region

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

The Executive Session was called to order by Commissioner Pretty On Top, Presiding Officer, at 3:00 p.m. Attendance was noted, all Commission members were present. (ATTACHMENT #3)

Commissioner Jellison **moved** that the minutes from the May 21, 2002, public hearings in Bozeman be approved.

Commissioner Rehberg **moved** to amend the minutes as follows:

- Page 11--first sentence-- . . . Chief Justice Haswell who ~~had been retired at that time~~ passed away . . .

The minutes passed unanimously as amended.

PLEASE NOTE: This change has been made to the original minutes which are on file in the Legislative Service Division.

Commissioner Lamson **moved** that the minutes from the May 21, 2002, public hearing in Butte be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Rice **moved** that the minutes from the May 22, 2002, public hearing in Helena be approved. Motion passed unanimously.

OVERVIEW OF SOUTHWEST REGION PLANS

Susan Fox, Research Analyst, Legislative Services Division, provided a recap of the Southwest Region Plans. (EXHIBIT #1)

Ms. Fox: Before we amended the Southcentral Region in Carbon County, all three plans include one piece of Carbon County in a district with all of Stillwater County and various portions of Sweet Grass County. Big Timber in all of the plans is in proposed district 47 with rural Park County. Proposed district 48 is the Livingston area in all three plans, varying only in how much we take outside of the existing district. Plan 300 is closest to the existing district. Plan 100 and 200 take additional areas north and possibly east of the Livingston area.

Plans 100 and 200 in Gallatin County add one district to the number of districts that exist today. Plan 300, by use of the negative deviation, was able to get in part of an additional district. Proposed districts 52 and 53 in all three plans are the traditional in-town Bozeman districts. Proposed district 51 is an existing district, but in Plan 100 and 300, it doesn't go near as far north as it does in Plan 200. In Plans 100 and 200, the new district is proposed district 56--a Belgrade district. We also have various portions of Plans 100 and 200 with Madison County. Plan 100 is closest to the existing district with Three Forks and Willow Creek with Madison County. In Plan 200, Three Forks is no longer with Madison County and includes part of Jefferson County. Plan

300 no longer shares Gallatin County with Madison County. It moves into Jefferson County using I-90 as the boundary. It also leaves Whitehall in Madison County.

All three plans complete the northern district. Golden Valley, Wheatland, and Meagher Counties are intact in all three plans. They only vary on which portions of Broadwater and Lewis and Clark Counties that are used. Plan 100 takes almost all of Broadwater County except for the Winston area. Plan 200 involves all of Broadwater County except for the southern tip that shares its school district with Three Forks. Plan 300 takes part of Broadwater County and the area that used to be shared with Meagher County and southern Lewis and Clark County.

Beaverhead County in all three plans is intact as a house district. Butte/Silver Bow County has four House Districts and it no longer shares with Madison County in all three plans. Jefferson County is too large for a district. It had to lose a little bit of population. Plan 100 takes the northern tip which is the Montana City area, but it does not take the entire Montana City area, up with the Lewis and Clark County district. Plan 200 takes the Cardwell area of Madison County and the remainder of Jefferson County. Plan 300 takes most of Jefferson County, not including Whitehall and shares a portion of the southern tip of Lewis and Clark County.

Plans 100 and 200 do not complete proposed districts 71 and 72. It would require the use of Missoula County. Plan 300 completed proposed district 72 but stops at the county line. The difference is that Granite County is kept intact. In Plan 300, Granite County was kept with most of Anaconda and the northern portion of Anaconda was kept with Deer Lodge in Powell County. Plan 200 is totally within Missoula County. Plan 100 completes Granite County with Deer Lodge, Elliston, and Avon areas in southern Powell County. Northern Powell County will be shared in Plan 100 with Missoula County. Powell County in Plan 200 would also be shared with Missoula County. In Plan 300, the Ovando area, Powell County, and the Plan 200 corridor is shared with the Lewis and Clark County district. Garrison, Avon, Elliston, and Gold Creek are shared with a middle Lewis and Clark County district. The Deer Lodge area is with the northern Anaconda district and includes the area of Opportunity.

The plans complete proposed districts 46 through 72 and proposed district 4 that was not completed from the Northcentral Region. We have all of Teton County in all three plans and northern Lewis and Clark County in all three plans. Plan 300 uses the highway and the Lincoln corporate boundary for its boundary. Plan 200 completes proposed district 4 and includes Teton County in its entirety and the northern two-thirds of Lewis and Clark County including Augusta and Lincoln. The boundary is south and includes several elementary school districts in the Lincoln, Augusta, and Sun River Valley areas.

Plan 300 gives us a clean line to start the Western Region. Plans 100 and 200 requires us to not adopt proposed districts 71 and 72.

Ms. Fox: The Commission received in their mailing amendment #1 which was derived from public testimony heard in the Southwest Region hearing. Amendment #2 was submitted by Commissioners Lamson and Rice based upon public testimony. Amendment #3 was derived from suggestions made by Powell County representatives when they testified at the Helena public hearing.

In your folders today, you received additional public comment. The manila envelope was submitted by Sherm Anderson of Powell County and it is a copy of a petition signed by Powell County residents. You also have proposed adjustments of certain Plan 300 house districts submitted by Rep. John Sinrud, Bozeman. (EXHIBIT #2) The additional proposed amendment (EXHIBIT #3) addresses the concern raised by Shelley Vance, Gallatin County Clerk and Recorder. Senator Grosfield and Representative Esp are also working on a set of amendments but specific information on those amendments is not known to date.

Commissioner Jellison: In the first packet we received, there is a letter from Nelson Rome from Deer Lodge that has scrolled across the bottom in large print "NO". May I assume that it is a postscript that he added and not a staff comment on the letter.

Ms. Fox: Correct, and that was the third time that he said "NO".

Commissioner Pretty On Top: I did speak with John Sinrud. He called twice to talk to me about his ideas that he was sending.

ADOPTION OF SOUTHWEST REGION PLAN

Commissioner Jellison: I **move** to adopt Plan 100 for the Southwest Region on the basis that it is the one most favored by the people who have been before us and the people who have written to us. It is also least disruptive of the existing districts of the three plans.

Commissioner Lamson: I am obviously going to oppose this motion. I do not believe that Plan 100 has, in fact, received the bulk of the testimony that was given to us during the public hearing. Fifteen people cited Plan 100 and fourteen cited Plan 300, and when the actual written testimony came in, Plan 300 was ahead on that. The bulk of the petitions dealt with an amendment to Plan 300 and did not support Plan 100 as I read it. I think the public testimony in large part has been all over the map.

Commissioner Rehberg: A lot of testimony given was given with the idea that Plan 300 was going to be crammed down their throats and they tried to make the best of it and find ways to improve Plan 300. If you read their testimony, they'll say that they did not really prefer it. But, knowing that that's probably what was going to happen, they were trying to find ways to make it acceptable. So, I would certainly question the 15 and 14.

Commissioner Rice: I hypothesized the motive behind various testifiers. What we found was testimony that refers to an amendment to Plan 300, testimony that supports Plan 300, and testimony that supports another plan. I would also like to respond to the idea that Plan 100 would be the least disruptive. Plan 300 is actually the closest to the existing districts as any of the plans. So with those two ideas in mind, I will be voting against the motion.

Commissioner Jellison's motion failed on a 2 to 3 vote with Commissioners Rehberg and Jellison voting yes and Commissioners Lamson, Rice, and Pretty On Top voting no.

Commissioner Lamson: I **move** the Commission tentatively adopt the house districts proposed in Plan 300 for the Southwest Region. These include proposed Southwest Regional Plan 300 House Districts #46-72. (EXHIBIT #4)

Ms. Fox: Does your motion also include proposed district 4?

Commissioner Lamson: Yes, it does include proposed district 4.

"Rationale:

All the house districts in Plan 300 meet the four mandatory criteria adopted by the Commission. All proposed districts within Plan 300:

- 1) Achieve population equality within the maximum deviations set forth in the United States and Montana Constitutions and U.S. Supreme Court decisions.
- 2) Are compact and contiguous as set forth in the Montana Constitution.
- 3) Protect minority voting rights and are in compliance with the Voting Rights Act as established in the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. 1973.
- 4) Do not use race as the predominant factor to which the traditional discretionary criteria are subordinated as outlined in Shaw v. Reno U.S. 630 (1993).

In addition Plan 300 balances and considers the three discretionary criteria adopted by the Commission.

- 1) The proposed house districts consider boundary lines of counties, cities, towns, school districts, Indian reservations, voting precincts, and other political units to the extent they are reflected in the geographical database. If the lines do not follow lines in the geographic database, they provide guidance.
- 2) The proposed house districts consider geographic boundaries as provided in the TIGER /Line files of the U.S. Bureau of Census.
- 3) The proposed house districts consider keeping communities of interest in tact. Communities of interest can be based on trade areas, geographic location, communication and transportation networks, media markets, Indian reservations, urban and rural interests, social, cultural, and economic interests, or occupations and lifestyles.

I will address how specific proposed house districts in Plan 300 meet the mandatory and consider the discretionary criteria of the Commission.

House Districts 46 & 47: These two districts include Stillwater, Sweet Grass and rural Park Counties. The Commission received testimony concerning the communities of interests created by these districts, which share the Yellowstone River watershed. These included common trade areas, agricultural economy, social and cultural characteristics, voting patterns, and major transportation networks. Plans 100 and 200 propose similar districts for this area. All towns remain intact in both HD 46 & 47.

House District 48: This is the Livingston District. The district reflects the shared economic, social, media market, cultural, political, and educational interests of the Livingston community. Similar Livingston districts are described all three plans presented to the Commission. Plan 300 is the most compact of the three proposals for Livingston.

House District 49: This district includes Golden Valley, Wheatland, Meagher, northern Broadwater and eastern rural Lewis & Clark Counties. The Commission received testimony concerning the shared communities of interests of the district, which shares the Highway 12

transportation network and major portions of the Musselshell River watershed. The district includes common trade areas, an agricultural and natural resource economy, social and cultural characteristics, and voting patterns. Plans 100 and 200 propose similar districts for this area. All towns remain intact in HD 49.

House District 50: The district includes northern Gallatin and the southern half of Broadwater Counties. The district shares many of the characteristics of rapid growth areas in western Montana. It is a combination of rural subdivisions and surrounding agricultural areas. The residents of the districts share in a diverse economy that involves agriculture, tourism, and commuters to jobs in neighboring urban centers. All towns within the district remain intact.

House Districts 51-57: These seven districts are all within Gallatin County, which is one of the state's fastest, growing counties. Bozeman is the urban center of the county surrounded by rapidly growing suburban communities.

House Districts 51, 55-57: These four districts are suburban/rural districts that border Bozeman to the east, south, and west. The districts are dominated by the common interests, which relate to rapid growth, suburban communities. They share social, educational, economic, media markets, and political characteristics.

HD 51 includes the rapid growth area to the east and south of Bozeman. HD 55 includes most of southern Gallatin County. It also includes the resort community of Big Sky that is within neighboring Madison County. Big Sky is included in HD 55 because of its geographic isolation from Madison County and its common interests with other communities within the Gallatin River Canyon.

Gallatin County's second largest community of Belgrade dominates HD 56. HD 57 reunites the community of Three Forks and surrounding eastern county communities with Gallatin County. All towns within the districts remain intact. An amendment to address suggestions from Gallatin County residents will be offered later.

House Districts 52-54: These three districts include the urban neighborhoods of Bozeman. Aligning districts in this manner creates opportunities for Bozeman's residents to elect representatives who reflect the social, economic, and political interests found within their neighborhoods. High population densities allow for the creation of compact districts that reflect Bozeman's communities of interests. The districts share common socio-economic, commercial, occupations, media markets, lifestyle, voting patterns, educational, and local government communities of interests.

House District 58: This district includes all of Madison County and a portion of southern Jefferson County on its northern border. The district shares an economy based upon agriculture, natural resources, and tourism. These communities share economic, political, social, educational, and cultural community interests. All towns within the district remain intact.

House District 59: This proposed district includes all of Beaverhead County. All three plans proposed identical boundaries for this district. Beaverhead County communities share common agricultural, economic interests, political, social, educational, and cultural community interests. All towns within the district remain intact.

House Districts 60-63: These four districts all are within Silver Bow County. Butte and Silver Bow County because of their strong historical communities of interests consolidated their city and county governments in the 1970's. These common interests have been long recognized by all previous redistricting commissions. Plans 100, 200, and 300 all propose four districts to be contained within the county boundary. The districts share common socio-economic, commercial, occupations, media markets, lifestyle, voting patterns, educational, and local government communities of interests.

An amendment to address suggestions from the Butte public hearing will be offered later.

House District 64: This district includes most of Jefferson County. Population growth necessitates sharing some of the county's population to achieve mandatory redistricting criteria. The rapid growth of the suburban communities in the county's northern half has been a major contributor to the area's recent development. Communities within the district share economic, political, social, educational, and cultural community interests. All towns within the district remain intact.

House Districts 65-69: These five districts are within southern Lewis and Clark County. They share the interests of Helena and its surrounding suburban neighborhoods. Growth patterns within this area have developed an expanding urban area that shares social, educational, economic, media markets, and political characteristics.

House District 70: This district includes the rural north Helena Valley, the central portions Lewis and Clark and Powell Counties. The Commission received bi-partisan testimony as to the shared communities of interests of residents within this area. These include common economic, political, social, educational, and cultural community interests. All towns within the district remain intact.

House Districts 71 and 72: These two districts include Deer Lodge, Granite, and southern Powell Counties. The districts share common economic interests based upon their natural resource and large public institution based economies. The residents of these two districts share historical and current economic, cultural, educational concerns, transportation networks, and political interests."

Commissioner Lamson: I think it should be noted that Sweet Grass County is the only county that has come before us so far and said "Please, split us." I would like to congratulate Sen. Grosfield and Rep. Esp for the good deal of time that they spent working on coming up with their alternative. Sen. Grosfield and Rep. Esp met last week with Adam Quinn, Democratic Party staff, and myself to go over some further amendments that are not included in the district that we are proposing today. We are very interested in continuing to explore some of those "tweakings" in that particular area. We just ran out of time in terms of being able to get back to the local people in the Livingston area. These amendments involve changes around the Livingston district proper, and we wanted the opportunity to visit with local folks. It was brought to our attention that there was certain past discrepancies within the way the districts are currently on the map. We will consider those amendments at a future executive session. It is important to remember that we are tentatively adopting all of these plans, so everything can be amended or changed in the future.

Commissioner Rehberg: Does your presentation include all the proposed amendments that you had?

Commissioner Lamson: No, I have amendments to offer.

Commissioner Rehberg: Why do you not just include them all?

Commissioner Lamson: Because we established this process every executive session where we present the overall plan

Commissioner Rehberg: As long as we are going to be doing it your way, why don't you just incorporate it?

Commissioner Lamson: Jack (Commissioner Rehberg), you voted for that process.

Commissioner Rehberg: Well, let's change it then. As having voted on the prevailing side, I would move that we change it if that is what is going to take, but I know that it wouldn't win. The only thing that has passed is what you have wanted. It seems simple to me that if you are going amend it, let's just talk about it all at once and not play the game.

Commissioner Lamson: We aren't playing any games here. We've established. . .

Commissioner Rehberg: Yes you are. You have been playing the game from day one.

Commissioner Pretty On Top: Our procedure is established, and we will go forward with it. We have before us the plan itself, and we will be looking at amendments subsequently.

Commission Jellison: "OBJECTION TO PLAN 300 -- Evidence has been presented to this Commission of a deliberate plan to sidestep the "One man, one vote principle that is the cornerstone of the set of laws that justifies and guides our work. There are identifiable areas where the Democrats usually get a majority of the votes and other areas where the Republicans usually get the majority.

The Courts, in interpreting the "one man, one vote" principle, have required legislative districts to be uniform in population but have allowed a 5% variation in recognition of the difficulty involved in establishing boundaries that create exactly equal districts. The evidence clearly shows that the designers of Plan 300 have manipulated District boundaries in a way intended to give a Democrat vote more power than a Republican vote.

In theory, our goal in redistricting is to create 100 districts that each contain 9,022 people. As proposed in Plan 300, the districts composed of areas that are expected to vote majority Republican consistently have close to 105% of the goal while districts composed of areas that are expected to vote majority Democrat consistently have close to 95% of the goal. This would have the effect of permitting fewer Democrat votes to obtain a favorable outcome in the overall election. For example, in a district that has 8,600 people, of whom 4,400 will vote Democrat, the Democrat candidate will win. Conversely, in a district that has 9,400 people, it will take more than 4,700 Republican votes to win. In overall effect, a Democrat vote has almost 10% more weight than a Republican vote.

The members of this Commission have a solemn duty to the voters of Montana to devise a redistricting plan that effectuates the "one man, one vote" principle. For a member of this Commission to vote to support a plan that deliberately violates that principle is a corrupt act that demeans the dignity of the Commission and is a clear breach of the duty of that Commissioner to the voters of Montana.

I will not vote for Plan 300 and I sincerely hope that the supporters of Plan 300 will search their consciences and reject that plan as well." (EXHIBIT #5)

Commissioner Rice: I know you have a legal background, and I know that in legal terms, there is a word for "research" that people do in the backgrounding of cases. Have you had an opportunity or do you know of anyone who has had the opportunity to look at this same issue in any other case, in any other census period?

Commissioner Jellison: I haven't had the opportunity to look at it myself. I have difficulty imagining that anybody else would ever have tried to do this sort of thing.

Commissioner Rice: You are aware that in most states the redistricting done by the Legislature or a committee of the Legislature?

Commissioner Jellison: I am not aware of that, but I will accept it.

Commissioner Lamson: I would, obviously, object to those characterizations of complying with an established criteria and criteria that has been used by this Commission, the previous Commission, and the previous Commission before that in terms of establishing this plus or minus 5%. That was established to achieve the goal of "one person, one vote", and the Courts have upheld that. To raise this red-herring issue that this is somehow some type of corruption of the process is factually incorrect. Most of the other states have their redistricting completed. According to the National Council of State Legislatures (NCSL), 35 of those states have now completed plans. Thirty four of the 35 plans have variations in the range of plus or minus 5%. This issue is a false issue--that you are denying people. Also, you should go back and look at the voting age populations of districts and take a look at how many people it actually does take to elect a representative. I believe that most of your figures are based on assuming that everybody within 9,000 votes. Of course, we are counting men, women, children, people who do not want to vote, prisoners, military service personal, and a whole variety of folks. So, to characterize these variations and deviations as something that is corrupt, I take strong exception to that.

Commissioner Jellison: I will agree that the numbers that I used are not based on voter residents in that district. I am simply trying to do a demonstration that was simple and would not take more than a few minutes to explain. I don't argue that those number are precisely correct in terms of the number of voters in the districts. But, I think that the principle is demonstrated by those things. You indicate that this is a false issue because other people have used and we have used for a long time this 5% leeway, tolerance. It is not the 5% that is the evil in what you are doing, it is the using of the 5% to pack Republican districts and to shorten or diminish the number of Democrats needed to win something in Democrat districts. That is something that the evidence before us indicates was consistent throughout the work that you have done. And, if that is true, that is a deliberate abuse of the 5% tolerance, is a deliberate violation of the "one man, one vote", and I think I have correctly characterized it in the statement that I made.

Commissioner Lamson: The Courts have not, as Professor (Jerry) Calvert pointed out at the Bozeman public hearing, upheld your position.

Commissioner Jellison: In response, I will simply say that this kind of manipulation has not been presented in a Court as far as I know.

Commissioner Lamson: There has been numerous Court cases where people have said one party is going in and disadvantaging us at the effect of another thing, and they have not prevailed.

Commissioner Jellison: But, not in terms of using that 5% tolerance as the device by which they are going to do that.

Commissioner Lamson: Again, the Courts have said numerous times that the plus or minus 5% is the standard.

Commissioner Jellison: I think that there is the strong probability that we are going to wind up in Court and we will see.

Commissioner Lamson: No doubt.

Commissioner Lamson's motion passed on a 3 to 2 vote with Commissioners Rice, Lamson, and Pretty On Top voting yes and Commissioners Rehberg and Jellison voting no.

Commissioner Lamson: "I **move** to amend Plan 300 to address suggestions raised at the Bozeman public hearings to realign the intersection of House Districts 55-57. This amendment also necessitates some minor changes in adjoining House District 50 to accommodate the shifts in population. A description of the amendment was included in the mailing to the Commission and labeled as "Gallatin County Amendments II."

Rationale:

This amendment addresses suggestions by Gallatin County residents to adjust the borders where House Districts 55-57 intersect west of Bozeman. This amendment adjusts the three districts to more closely follow subdivision growth patterns in this area. The amendments meet the mandatory criteria and address the discretionary criteria established by the Commission." (EXHIBIT #6)

Commissioner Lamson: This amendment also has the added benefit that it does allow for the possibility of including Clerk and Recorder Shelley Vance's suggestion. Also, I would like to take a look at Rep. Sinrud's amendment to see how the two merge. That amendment will be handled at a future time.

The motion passed on a 3 to 2 vote with Commissioners Rice, Lamson, and Pretty On Top voting yes and Commissioners Rehberg and Jellison voting no.

Commissioner Lamson: "I **move** to amend Plan 300 to address suggestions raised at the Butte public hearings on changes to House Districts 60, 61, and 63. A description of the amendment was included in the mailing to the Commission and labeled as "Butte-Silver Bow County Amendments II."

Rationale:

This amendment addresses suggestions by Silver Bow County residents to adjust the boundaries of House Districts 60 and 61. The resulting changes in those two districts require some minor shifts in House District 63 to accommodate for the population ripple effects.

The amendments meet the mandatory criteria and address the discretionary criteria established by the Commission."

The motion passed on a 3 to 2 vote with Commissioners Rice, Lamson, and Pretty On Top voting yes and Commissioners Rehberg and Jellison voting no.

Commissioner Lamson: As I stated earlier, there are some changes that could possibly be made in looking at the boundaries around northern Powell County--the Ovando area--between proposed house districts 4 and 70 to serve some of the concerns of the Powell County

residents. I plan on visiting some more with folks in those areas to see if we can accommodate some of those concerns in a future executive session.

Commissioner Rice: "I move to tentatively adopt Plan 300 as amended for the Southwest Region."

Motion passed on a 3 to 2 vote with Commissioners Lamson, Rice, and Pretty On Top voting yes and Commissioners Rehberg and Jellison.

Commissioner Rehberg: How difficult would be to give us the populations of districts that we have tentatively approved with the deviation?

Ms. Fox: I have it calculated because I prepared those amendments for you. I will provide the information to you.

Commissioner Rehberg: Joe (Commissioner Lamson) says that I have it. Has it been given to us?

Ms. Fox: This population hasn't been given to you with the amendments on it.

Commissioner Rehberg: I want to know what we are looking at. The amendments come and we have no idea because you are doing your own thing.

Commissioner Lamson: But I told you in the packet that came how I came up with the figures.

Commissioner Rehberg: I realize that, but you have the figures and I am not going to take the time to try to put yours and mine together.

Ms. Fox: I don't usually put it the packets because I never know which combinations are going to be used. Because those amendments were submitted early, I do happen to have the numbers.

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS -- KALISPELL, PABLO, MISSOULA

Ms. Fox: On August 12, 2002, we will be at the Kalispell public hearing at 7:00 p.m. We will come back down and be at Pablo at 1:00 p.m in the afternoon then in Missoula that same evening, August 13, 2002, at 7:00 p.m. The mailing would go out on July 29 for the Western Region. September 16, 2002, the executive session to adopt the western region plans will be held at 1:00 p.m. in Helena.

There being no further business, the executive session adjourned 4:15 p.m.

CI2255 2249loxd.