Dear Redistricting Advisory Committee,

Supervisor Gjerde kindly responded to myearlier comments to your committee sent Oct. 22, 2021 by sharingthe cited map and associated data table you prepared Wed Oct.20th. I feel the proposed new District 4 boundary is largelyresponsive to my earlier suggestions, though the population of eligible voters in that redefined area (17,522) still lags below the mean district target of 18,325.

I favor returning Caspar to District 4(where it currently resides) to make up that population deficit.

District 5's deficit should be addressed bymoving its boundary east into outlying portions of Districts 1 and 2, not by taken lands from District 4 which has the lowestpopulation. District 5 shares a common agricultural base withDistricts 1 and 2. Districts 1 and 2 still have populations over the mean as shown inDraft Map 7 and their common boundary with District 5 is thelogical place to redefine boundaries to rebalance thepopulations in those 3 districts while ensuring state andfederal guidelines are met.

Thank you forconsidering my suggestions. Please contact me if I can clarifymy recommendations further.

best wishes, ~Thad